Aristocratic Identities in the Roman Senate From the Social War to the Flavian Dynasty

By

Jessica J. Stephens

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
2016

Doctoral Committee:

      Professor David Potter, chair
      Professor Bruce W. Frier
      Professor Richard Janko
      Professor Nicola Terrenato

Dedication

To those of us who do not hesitate to take the long and winding road, who are stars in someone else's sky, and who walk the hillside in the sweet summer sun.

Acknowledgements

I owe my deep gratitude to many people whose intellectual, emotional, and financial support made my journey possible. Without Dr. T., Eric, Jay, and Maryanne, my academic career would have never begun and I will forever be grateful for the opportunities they gave me. At Michigan, guidance in negotiating the administrative side of the PhD given by Kathleen and Michelle has been invaluable, and I have treasured the conversations I have had with them and Terre, Diana, and Molly about gardening and travelling. The network of gardeners at Project Grow has provided me with hundreds of hours of joy and a respite from the stress of the academy. I owe many thanks to my fellow graduate students, not only for attending the brown bags and Three Field Talks I gave that helped shape this project, but also for their astute feedback, wonderful camaraderie, and constant support over our many years together. Due particular recognition for reading chapters, lengthy discussions, office friendships, and hours of good company are the following: Michael McOsker, Karen Acton, Beth Platte, Trevor Kilgore, Patrick Parker, Anna Whittington, Gene Cassedy, Ryan Hughes, Ananda Burra, Tim Hart, Matt Naglak, Garrett Ryan, and Ellen Cole Lee.

This is also the place to express my deepest thanks to my advisor, David Potter, whose intellectual guidance was outstanding and whose unending support gave me the confidence I needed during a particularly trying time in my life. I also thank Bruce Frier for his keen commentary, dry wit, and kindness. Nic Terrenato, Sara Forsdyke, Ray Van Dam, and Ruth Scodel made me a better scholar through their graduate courses and my work with them individually. I will forever be grateful to Richard Janko for his support, terrifying command of English, and our shared love of gardens and cats.

Last but certainly far from least, I cannot thank Chelsea Del Rio enough for her constant friendship, defense note-taking, and many beer lunches, Bill's outings, and Old Town evenings. To Stephanie Smith, I give my thanks not only for her commentary on chapter drafts but also her encouragement from across the pond. My family deserves special recognition for their love and support throughout my long journey to this point. Thank you to my father, Mark, for reading every word of my dissertation, to my mother, Ann, and sister, Holly, for listening and sending love from afar, and to Alex, for being my partner through it all. My thanks also to Vincent, the most constant writing companion. There are many others whom I have probably failed to include here, but it is not because I am unappreciative. Numerous people make a dissertation possible, in a myriad of ways. My sincere thanks to those named and unnamed and, needless to say, all remaining errors are entirely my own.

Table of Contents

Abstract

The period between the end of the Social War and the Flavian dynasty saw a remarkable change in the composition of the senatorial class at Rome. Waves of new men entered the Roman Senate alongside members of the traditional aristocracy and sought to fundamentally change what it meant to be Roman in order to gain acceptance. A representative of the first wave as an Italian municipal senator, Cicero sought to redefine aristocratic values in order to create a more inclusive senatorial class. Augustus advanced these new values and actively appropriated a variety of institutions of memory that were at the heart of Roman aristocratic identity. These institutions, including the *gens*, public processions, and inherited social and political values, defined senatorial actions in the competitive and traditional environment of the Roman Senate and drew distinctions between senators who had claim to these institutions (the traditional Roman aristocracy) and those who did not (newly incorporated Italian, and later provincial, elites). Augustus advanced new men and old aristocrats alike, delicately balancing the interests of both.

The varied reactions of members of one aristocratic *gens*, the Calpurnii Pisones, to imperial appropriation of these institutions demonstrates the longevity of identity and memory among the traditional aristocracy well into the Principate. Indeed, much political turmoil during the reigns of the Julio-Claudians resulted from aristocratic rejection or misunderstanding of new expectations for senatorial conduct. Simultaneously, senators from the periphery of Italy and the province of Spain, including Thrasea Paetus, Seneca, and Lucan, responded to the old

aristocracy's continued attempts to assert traditional values and the new political reality where personal success was linked directly to imperial favor. They sought out historical examples, most importantly that of Cato Uticensis, with whom to relate in order to connect with the Roman past, legitimize their standing with the old aristocrats, and link themselves to their emperor, Nero. However, it was not until the accession of Vespasian, himself an Italian elite without recourse to many of the institutions of memory that had defined the Julio-Claudian emperors, that the aristocracy's influence waned and new Roman identities could flourish.

Chapter One: Intersections of Identity and Memory in the Roman World

In Book Two of his *De Legibus*, Cicero offered Atticus another reason, apart from the beauty of the countryside, for why he enjoyed retiring to Arpinum to escape the hustle and bustle of Rome. Cicero explained that Atticus, who had been born and raised in Rome, would not be able to share his enjoyment fully,

> Because truly there are twin fatherlands for my brother and myself. For here we were born from a most ancient origin, here are our sacred possessions, here our tribe, here the many footsteps of our ancestors. What more? You see that villa, that is there now, was built by the exertion of our father, who when he was in poor health he spent his time here entirely in the pursuit of literature. But in this place itself, when I was born, he lived with my grandfathers and the villa was small in accordance with ancient customs, just like that Curius in his Sabine farm. Why there is something important to me here I do not know, and it lies in my mind and my senses, through which this place perhaps delights me more, if indeed even that most wise man is said to have repudiated immortality so that he could see Ithaca again.[1]

The tension between his native hometown, Arpinum, and his adoptive home, Rome, was something that many men like Cicero felt after the extension of Roman citizenship to the majority of the Italian peninsula after the end of the Social War. Citizens formerly of one town were now citizens of two. Cicero's perspective in this passage marks an interesting point in the rapidly changing Roman world of the 1st century BCE, in which what it meant to be "Roman" was actively debated by elite members of Roman and Italian lineages. As a *novus homo* (new

---

[1] All translations are my own unless noted otherwise. Cic. *Leg.* 2.3: *Quia si verum dicimus, haec est mea et huius fratris mei germana patria; hinc enim orti stirpe antiquissima sumus, hic sacra, hic genus, hic maiorum multa vestigia. Quid plura? Hanc vides villam ut nunc quidem est, lautius aedificatam patris nostri studio, qui cum esset infirma valetudine, hic fere aetatem egit in litteris; sed hoc ipso in loco, cum avus viveret et antiquo more parva esset villa, ut illa Curiana in Sabinis, me scito esse natum. Quare inest nescioquid et latet in animo ac sensu meo, quo me plus hic locus fortasse delectet, siquidem etiam ille sapientissimus vir, Ithacam ut videret, inmortalitatem scribitur repudiasse.*

man), Cicero walked a fine line between appealing to the masses of newly enfranchised Italian voters and fitting in with his colleagues in the Senate who hailed from old aristocratic Roman families.

In this dissertation I examine how two groups of newly minted senators from the periphery of the traditional centers of Roman political power attempted to gain social and political acceptance alongside the traditional and long-standing Roman nobility in the context of the Roman Senate.[2] I begin by examining the factors that contributed to the identity formation of the old Roman aristocracy, which I call aristocratic institutions of memory. These institutions served to transmit components of Roman aristocratic identity from generation to generation and include the *gens*, public processions, and inherited social and political values. They served to define senatorial actions in the competitive and traditional environment of the Roman Senate and to draw distinctions between senators who had a claim to these institutions (the traditional Roman aristocracy) and those who did not (newly incorporated Italian elites).

Then I examine how members of the first group, Italian elites newly enfranchised after the Social War, sought to redefine aristocratic values in order to participate more fully in the Roman Senate. Among these new members were Cicero, an Italian municipal senator, and Augustus, another relative outsider, who advanced these new values and actively appropriated a variety of institutions of memory that were at the heart of elite identity. In his accession to supreme power, Augustus did not entirely dismantle the social fabric of the Republic. Instead, whether consciously or not, he slowly and methodically manipulated these institutions of

---

[2] My work does not focus on defining these groups, but rather questions how memory shaped the identity of the various groups. The term "old aristocracy" will be used for those families who have traditionally belonged to the category of the *nobiles*. *Novi homines* designates men without curule office holding ancestors. The phrase "municipal and provincial senators" refers to those from regions less well integrated into the Roman world. At this point in the Roman world, the categories of patrician and plebeian were less important than they had been in the past.

memory to redefine what it meant to be Roman. His more inclusive definition catered to the *novi homines* but also sought to mitigate the disenfranchisement of the old aristocracy through their incorporation into the imperial family by marriage or ancestry.

In the end, however, and despite outliving many of those who had experienced the Republic, Augustus was ultimately unsuccessful in fully reforming and appropriating these aristocratic institutions of memory. As a result, they served as cultural bridges across the span of civil wars and the transition to imperial government for the members of old aristocratic families, and were at times fiercely protected and employed. In charting the varied reactions of the members of one old aristocratic family, the Calpurnii Pisones, to the changes in and appropriation of these institutions and in the composition of the Roman Senate more generally, we can see how some accepted the new system, while others ran afoul of newly conceived values and modes of acceptable behavior. I determine that the source of much political turmoil during the reigns of the Claudians resulted from aristocratic rejection or misunderstanding of new expectations for senatorial conduct.

Additionally, my work offers a new interpretation of so-called Stoic opposition to Nero by placing these individuals in the historical context of the Roman Senate rather than relegating them to the narrow context of specific philosophical or political movements. Representatives of this second group of elites, who hailed from towns (*municipia*) incorporated by the *Lex Roscia* in 49 BCE and from the province of Spain that rise to prominence under Nero, include Seneca, Lucan, and Thrasea Paetus. These men responded to both the old aristocracy's continued attempts to assert traditional values and the new political reality where personal success was linked directly to imperial favor. In order to navigate between the two sides, they sought out historical examples with whom to relate in an attempt to forge a link with the Roman past and

legitimize their standing with the old aristocrats. The most important of these was Cato

Uticensis, who additionally served as a link to their emperor, Nero, a later relative of Cato.

The interventions of this dissertation are several. First, the only studies of the Roman

Senate generally divide around the reign of Augustus, focusing either on the Republican Senate

or the Imperial Senate and they primarily aim to understand the distribution of power in the body

itself, its membership, the involvement of the Senate in different regions, or procedural workings

and functions.[3] Additionally, studies have been undertaken on the religion of Roman senators,

their relationship with magistrates during the Republic, and various prosopographical studies

have been done on its members.[4] However, to date, no study has been conducted on the Roman

Senate that crosses the transitional boundary between Republic and Principate with an eye to

understanding how memory and, its related components of history and identity influenced

senatorial actions.[5] My work complicates studies that focus solely on specific institutions of

memory, time periods, or prosopography. By building on these studies, I trace changes in

Roman identity from the Republic to the Empire as elites from different places entered the

---

[3] On the workings of the Republican Senate, see Bonnefond-Coudry (1982) and (1992); Taylor and Scott (1969); Shatzman (1975); Sherwin-White (1977); Mason (1987); and Ruoff-Väänänen (1978). On the Senate in the Imperial period, see Demougin, Ségolène (1982); Schumacher, Leonhard. (1982); Potter, (1987); Talbert (1984); Gale (2003); Wells, (2009); and Marshall, (2013). Wiseman (1971) is the sole study that traverses the Republic / Principate divide, but only examines the imperial Senate until the death of Augustus and within the limited inquiry of new men in the Senate.

[4] See Eckstein (1987; Várhelyi, Z. (2010); Schultz (2006); DeTreville (1987); Hackl, U. (1982); Eck (1970); Alföldy (1977; and Broughton (1951).

[5] The major difficulty with the separation between Republic and Principate is that is a relatively modern one. While ancient historians refer to the Republic and use the word *princeps* to describe the Emperors, it is unclear whether or not they demarcated the periods as stringently as modern historians do today. The *pariochae* of Livy sadly do not make it down to the end of Augustus' reign, but the summary for the years 29-27 BCE made no mention of a new political reality. Vellius Paterculus, despite his fervent support of Augustus, toed the line by remarking that the senate had regained its sovereignty and form of the Republic had been restored (see 2.90.3-4). Tacitus acknowledges the political changes in the opening of his *Annales*, but does not call it a new period regardless of the benefit of hindsight. Despite this, modern historians tend to treat these periods as separate, preferring to study one or the other, or focus on the period of change itself, the reign of Augustus. While acknowledging the profound changes that affected the Roman world during the end of the Republic and early Principate, this dissertation seeks to bridge the gap and finds many commonalities between the two periods.

4

Senate alongside members from ancient Roman families. Using institutions of memory to track social and political change among the different elite groups operating in the Senate challenges the narrative that senatorial unrest during the early Principate was due exclusively to the loss of political power. Rather, it was at least partially a result of a methodical attack on and usurpation of the institutions of memory that informed aristocratic identity and were transmitted from generation to generation.

In the first century BCE, the Roman world saw massive social and political changes as a result of the grant of suffrage to former Italian enemies, increased aristocratic competition for lucrative and prestigious military positions, and the foundation of a new political system with the transition from a republic to a monarchy. Despite the political and social upheaval of this era, modern historians have largely presumed a continuity of Roman identity. It is in this tumultuous period that my inquiry begins and aims to demonstrate that the memories of aristocratic families and Roman history itself became the grounds upon which Roman identity was negotiated by new senators and contested, restricted, and controlled by senatorial members of the old Roman aristocracy. To begin to understand the complexity of this period, we must first examine the intersections of identity, memory, and the Roman Senate.

Perhaps no governmental institution in ancient Rome surpassed that of the Roman Senate in preserving memory due in large part to its membership of aristocrats and the structures of their traditions. The Roman Senate was the ultimate location of Roman-ness, whose members were quintessentially Roman without question. All members sought to be as Roman as they could, in this most Roman of contexts. This held true for those senators who originated from outside traditional centers of Roman politics, namely various Italian *municipia* and the provinces. The Senate spanned the whole of Roman history, from the beginning of the regal period to the end of

the Byzantine empire, and as such makes for an interesting case study in how Roman identity changed over time.

Identity and Rome[6]

Recognition that social and cultural identity can refer to either an individual or a collective, and that multiple identities can be held at the same time has driven a recent surge in historical, sociological, and psychological study of this human characteristic. In the study of Rome, defining identity has been difficult. There was no term in Latin that embodied "Romanness": the term *Romanitas* is a later invention that the Romans themselves never used.[7] To ascertain what it meant for a Roman aristocrat to be Roman is actually rather difficult because, thanks to much recent scholarship, it is clear that what it meant to be Roman changed significantly over time and depended heavily on geographic location.[8]

Studies of identity in the Roman world have primarily focused on the provinces and borders of the empire, where the "civilizing" mission articulated in the ancient narratives of Roman imperialism suggested that a monolithic block of Romans, who seemingly maintained the same identity for centuries, conquered foreigners and barbarians. Adherence to the substance of these ancient narratives prompted study of the imposition of Roman culture on these barbarians

---

[6] I choose to use the term "identity" rather than "ethnicity" in keeping with the understanding that ethnicity is but one kind of identity. The work of Farney (2007) examines the ethnic identities of elite Romans, noting that a man could have multiple ethnic identities to draw upon depending on the situation. Objections to the use of "ethnicity" are perhaps best summed up by Mattingly (2013), 214: "Western notions of ethnicity and social identity are to a large extent the product of modern nationalism and tend toward a model of singular identity affiliation, whether related to ethnicity or religion… the construction of ethnicities (whether in the past or by archaeologists trying to make sense of material cultures) all too often represent a compression of multiple possibilities for defining identities into a singular and potentially misleading focus."

[7] For that reason, I prefer to use the word Romanness over Romanitas.

[8] On changing identities, see Dench (2005); Farney (2007); Wallace-Hadrill (2008); and Gardener, Herring, & Lomas (2013).

and the coinage of the term Romanization. The term had its origins in 19th century German

scholarship, with Mommsen and Niebuhr, where the political structure of Rome was assumed to

be similar to that of the modern nation-state and whose expansionist policies mirrored the

colonialism in which contemporary Europe was engaged.[9] Romanization was a top-down

imposition of cultural change and an explicitly militaristic program linked to both the

colonization of Italy and the acquisition of empire beginning in the 4th century BCE and

conducted by Romans from the city of Rome. Archaeological evidence has been typically been

viewed as the foremost indicator of Romanization, in particular the appearance of urbanization,

the building of villas, and the construction of "Roman" architecture, but the establishment of

Roman-like magistrates and laws and the adoption of Latin have also been marshaled in favor of

arguments about Romanization.[10]

In stark contrast to this position, most recent scholars have realized that what it meant to

be Roman depended on a wide variety of components depending on geographic origins, time

period, and social status. This understanding has led to attempts to distinguish the degrees to

which Roman expansion and imperialism changed the identities of native and local populaces

and how these populations exhibited different identities in different contexts.[11] These identities

---

[9] For an overview of the origins of the 19th century ideas on Romanization, see Linderski (1984) and
Frezouls (1983). The assumption that the more primitive cultures of Italy and the Mediterranean accepted
this imposition in recognition of the superior culture of the Romans is one part of the problem with this
understanding of the term. Another problem arises with the idea that wholesale acceptance of Roman
culture was uniform throughout different regions not only in Italy but also in what would become
different provinces. Many recent scholars have realized that what it meant to be Roman depended what
time period one lived in, where an individual was from, and what social status an individual had.

[10] These identifiers of Roman culture are not without their own controversies, but this subject is beyond
the scope of this dissertation.

[11] Recent monographs include Mattingly (1997); Lawrence (1998); van Dommelen and Terrenato (2007);
Wallace-Hadrill (2008); Mattingly (2013) coined the term discrepant identity to describe this complicated
mixture of native and Roman identities, arguing "It is clear, for instance, that the contact situations
generated by Roman imperialism produced profound and highly varied changes in behavior, material
culture, and social organization at the core, in the provinces and beyond the frontiers. A fundamental
issue concerns whether we are witnesses to genuine ethnogenesis or to enhanced ethnic identification, or

have been termed "discrepant identities" or categorized as examples of creolization or hybridity, and have been extensively studied in the Roman provinces, particularly those of Britain and North Africa.[12] Focus has typically been on elites, but recent attempts have been made to restore agency to non-elite populations in response to the top-down model of Romanization.[13]

Furthermore, the question of the impact of Roman conquest on Italian, as opposed to provincial, identities has only recently been undertaken.[14] Recent work has led to the realization that Italians were not the same as Romans and that there was simultaneously active acceptance of and resistance to Roman imports. For example, in many areas they spoke multiple languages (often Latin and their native tongue), worshipped Roman and native cults, and maintained a variety of their own cultural customs alongside adopted Roman ones to varying degrees.[15] Within the context of the Roman Senate, however, consideration of identity has focused largely on questions of political partisanship, which draws distinctions between nobility, populists, the plebs, and the *novus homo*.[16] In the 1st century BCE, though, there were other issues afoot-

---

whether the observed changes are better explained as a manifestation of other sorts of identity transformation. Moreover, if ethnicity was at some points a significant marker of identity, the archaeological evidence suggests that it was not a constant in time and space" (210). Gruen's (1992) examination of Roman adoption of Hellenistic culture examines the Hellenization of Rome, a topic with a long bibliography.

[12] Mattingly (2004) and (2011) examines this phenomenon mainly in Britain and North Africa; Downs (2000) does so in southern Spain; and MacMullen (2000) gives a broad overview of all the provinces.
[13] For a small sample of the monographs investigating Romanization in the provinces, see Haverfield (1912); Broughton (1968); Millett (1990); Keay and Terrenato (2001); and van Dommelen and Terrenato (2007).
[14] MacMullen (2008) tellingly does not even contain a chapter about Romanization in Italy, belying the commonly held assumption that by the time of Augustus, Italy was Roman. For recent scholarship questioning this assumption, see Vallat (1995); Mouritsen (1998); Keay and Terrenato (2001); Lomas (2012); Roselaar (2012); Gardner, Herring, and Lomas (2013); and Haeussler (2013).
[15] See Buchet (2012) for a case study on religion in the Latin city of Tibur; See Langslow (2012) for a discussion of integration, language, and identity in the Italian penninsula. He concludes by saying, "In addition to epigraphic and literary evidence relating to languages and their use, we need to use especially archaeological and literary evidence reflecting 'ethnolinguistic vitality', with a view to relating our 'linguistic' evidence to its historical social context in its community dynamics- local, regional, and supraregional." That is to say, the issue is rather complicated and different in different places.
[16] In addition to fn. 2, see Taylor (1971); Wiseman (2009); Haeussler (2013).

namely the integration and enfranchisement of Italian elites who gained access to the Senate as a result of the municipalization of their communities after the Social War. Prior to this period, Italians could find the path to Roman political power through the patronage of prominent Roman aristocrats, but in the 1st century BCE the old aristocracy was confronted with a wave of newcomers on a scale unlike anything the Senate had seen before.

As the Roman political landscape changed, so too did the composition of its elite class. Indeed, the strongest argument in favor of this perspective was the Social War, whose outcome resulted in the enfranchisement of most of the Italian peninsula.[17] The dilemma Cicero found himself in, with his dual loyalty to Arpinum and to Rome, reflected the dilemma of identity facing new men in the Roman Senate in the 1st century BCE. The changing dynamics of senatorial membership contributed to a crystallization of aristocratic identity that sought to exclude these newcomers, pitting old against new and restricting "Romanness" to a certain group of senators.

Memory, Identity, and Rome

The fact that memory and identity are inextricably linked is perhaps best said by James Joyce's Stephen Dedalus when he declared, "I, entelechy, form of forms, am I by memory."[18] In the modern world of the individual, memory is the only connection between the self of today and the self of tomorrow.[19] But in the Roman world, the individual was far more a part of the collective and, in the aristocratic sphere especially, the past weighed heavily on the present in a

---

[17] Here the term enfranchisement is restricted to its political meaning of obtaining suffrage.

[18] Joyce *Ulysses*, 189.

[19] MacIntyre (1984), 204-216, sees modernity partitioning our lives into segments and memory as one of the only narrative connectors.

way that differs from our own modern lived experiences.[20] In his analysis of the ancient world,

Assmann argues, "cultural memory preserves the store of knowledge from which a group derives

an awareness of its unity and peculiarity," a process which he terms "the concretion of

identity".[21] The transmission of this knowledge is done through the formation of institutional

channels of communication that can include rituals, images, and texts.[22]

During the Roman Republic, the identities of Roman aristocrats were intimately bound

with both familial memory and the history of Rome: the atria of aristocratic homes were lined

with portraits of ancestors accomplished in military and political affairs, sons had the same

names as their fathers, thus conflating identity from generation to generation, and funeral

processions revived deceased members of the family when their portraits were carried through

the streets by actors pretending actually to be them. In Roman aristocratic society, which was

nearly synonymous with the Roman senatorial class, the very fabric of history was littered with

ancestral precedent and aristocratic values that informed the identity of elite members of society.

Memory means many things in different contexts. To list a just a few, we can speak of an

individual's memories of events they have experienced, memory as a neurological process,

---

[20] Memory means "social memory." Memory studies first began with the conception of collective memory, as defined by the French sociologist Maurice Halbwachs. Influenced by his mentor, the sociologist Emile Durkheim, Halbwachs was interested in the idea that people remember as a society and communally and ultimately defined this phenomenon as "collective memory." He differentiated collective memory from history by stating that collective memory was living and therefore changeable, while history was dead, immune to change. The first challenges to Halbwach's definition of collective memory came as a result of his usage of the term "collective." The association of collective with an external entity and term from the field of psychoanalysis was problematic for scholars who did not believe there could be an external bank of memory into which individuals could somehow tap. Another critique, this offered by Connerton (1989), Fentress and Wickham (1999), and others, was that Halbwachs failed to explain how collective memory could be transmitted from individual to individual, generation to generation, and so on. Both of these strains of critique led to a rejection of the term "collective" in favor of "social" or "cultural."

[21] Assmann (1995), 130; See Hopkins (1991) for a discussion of how identity was transmitted from generation to generation through ritual in the Roman world and how the meaning of the ritual changed over time.

[22] On the link between memory and identity in the ancient world more broadly, see Assmann (1992).

commemoration of individuals or events, and monuments that are visual and physical markers of memory.[23] Historical writing can be considered a kind of memory act.[24] Traditionally, one of the primary functions and goals of the discipline of history has been to preserve the past. As Peter Burke wrote, "The historians' function is to be a 'remembrancer,' the custodian of the memory of public events which are put down in writing for the benefit of the actors, to give them fame, and also for the benefit of posterity, to learn from their example."[25] Burke went on to clarify that the relationship between memory and history has been significantly complicated by the acknowledgement that each involves "conscious or unconscious selection, interpretation and distortion," which in turn is socially conditioned.[26] While uncomfortable in equating memory with history as other scholars have done, Burke conceded that history does serve as a kind of social memory that links a community by means of a shared past. Indeed, ancient historians often conceived of their writing as serving that function. Herodotus, father of history himself, enunciated the preservation of memory as one of his main objectives, and Roman historians were no different.

Ranging widely in chronology and geography, Stéphane Benoist explores the relationship between memory and history further in her edited volume that includes studies on the ways in

---

[23] On the neurological processes of memory, see Schacter (2000); For anthropological perspectives on memory, see Climo and Cattell (2002); and Ricoeur (2004), who examines many of these connotations of memory in addition to the relationships between memory and history and memory and forgetting. On the relationship between memory and narratives, see Plantinga (1992).

[24] On the relationship between history and memory, see Burke (2011), who views history as social memory. Contra, see Nora (1989), 8, who argues that "On the one hand, we find an integrated, dictatorial memory- unself-conscious, commanding, all-powerful, spontaneously actualizing, a memory without a past that ceaselessly reinvents tradition, linking the history of its ancestors to the undifferentiated time of heroes, origins, and myth- and on the other hand, our memory, nothing more in fact than sifted and sorted historical traces." On historiography as a form of memory in the Roman Republic, see Walter (2004), 212-356. Walter examines the poetry and historical writings of most of the elites of the middle Republic in terms of their production and maintenance of memory for the elites. He does not, however, examine the intersection of memory and identity during this period.

[25] Burke (2011), 188.

[26] Burke (2011), 188.

which memory of political leaders is manipulated, how memories are sanctioned, and how archaeological monuments function to write and rewrite history.[27] Another French historian, Pierre Nora, specifically examined the role of memory in the writing of French history in his edited volumes *Les Lieux de Memoire*, which (as the title suggests) examine specific physical locations of memory throughout France along with non-physical locations (like tropes, trends in historical treatment, etc.).[28] While not explicitly about Rome, these studies demonstrate the wide variety of possibilities studying memory provides to historians, but most importantly that memory and history are very much interconnected.

In the context of the Roman world, memory refers to a wide a variety of connotations: the rhetorical art of memory recall, mental function, historiography, inscriptions, monuments, tradition of the ancestors (the *mos maiorum*), and mourning practices.[29] These kinds of cultural memory were "housed in rituals, texts, places, and monuments, and could endure, even if un-used, for millennia."[30] Gowing offered a definition of specifically Roman memory when he said, "Romans attached a heightened importance to memory, which manifests itself in almost every aspect of their existence, from celebrations of the dead to oratory to law, suffusing and animating their art, their buildings, and their literature. For Romans the past wholly defined the present, and to forget – to disconnect with – the past, at either the level of the individual or of the state,

---

[27] Benoist (2009).

[28] Nora (1984). This is obviously very useful to the study of Rome, but more importantly for my work, he sees the replacement of memory with history in modern France (as the nation was experiencing significant changes in national identity). He argues that this replacement is purely a modern phenomenon that takes place in the nation-state, but I think this was perhaps also the case in the early Imperial period where, perhaps through a curious twist of fate, we see mainly "outsiders" and newly incorporated elites doing the writing of history. On this topic, see Allen de Ford (1912); Ramage (1961); and Watts (1971).

[29] Walter (2004), 26-35. On historical memories and Roman identity, see Miles (1995), esp. 67-74; and Wallace-Hadrill (2008), 259-260. On the relationship between memory and mourning practices in the Roman world, see Hope and Huckison (2011).

[30] Latham (forthcoming), 16; on functional and stored memory, see Assmann (2011), 119-134, and Erll (2011), esp. 28-37 and 53-61.

risked the loss of identity and even extinction."[31] Gowing goes on to expand this definition of memory by focusing on its relationship to the past, concluding that history writing for the Romans was an exercise in *mnemohistory*.[32] *Mnemohistory* is simply the past as it was remembered, but not necessarily how it happened in reality.[33]

Thus we can see that the social memory of the Romans was located in their building, monuments, histories, and institutions. Institutions can be defined as the behaviors, language, norms and values expressed in specific social structures within a given environment, such as the levy, the triumph, the Senate, and the census.[34] These social sites were both the locations of memory and the means by which the knowledge contained in social memory could be transmitted from generation to generation. One of the most prominent locations for the transmission of memory between generations and social classes were the numerous public processions staged in Rome for much of its history. For the Romans, public processions ranging from public funerals to triumphs were essential to marking out elite identity. The public performative aspect served to reinforced ideas about a communal identity while simultaneously separating the celebrated elite identity from the identity of the non-elite onlooker.[35]

Social memories could shape identity and history, and in time, be shaped by history. The implications of social memory, as defined above, are quite far reaching. If one considers the social institutions of a given society, social memory is to be found potentially everywhere. Thus, applying this theoretical framework to the historiographical, archaeological, and literary sources of Rome provides a novel way of understanding the actions of the elite in Rome, those of both

---

[31] Gowing (2005), 2.

[32] Gowing (2005), 7-15. Here Gowing follows the useful discussion of Assmann (1997), 6-22, who rightly argued that the ancients were more concerned with the past as it was remembered than with the actual past.

[33] Assmann (1997), 9-14.

[34] Hopkins (1991).

[35] Connerton (1989), esp. chapter 2 on Commemorative Ceremonies.

the newly enfranchised seeking cultural acceptance and the old Roman aristocracy reacting to the changed circumstances that followed the creation of an imperial government.

While certain features of Roman society ensured the promulgation of unchanging memory, the historical memory of Rome was constantly shifting to reflect rewrites of Roman history designed to be didactic for the reader and which placed contemporary concerns above historical accuracy. Since history was initially the domain of the educated and wealthy, Roman elites wrote histories intertwined with familial traditions and memories.[36] They commemorated their ancestors in funeral processions, and created public spectacles in the form of triumphs and entertainments that employed images and recreations of battles, respectively, to recall to the Roman people their past successes. Memory was the only defense against oblivion in a world without mass literacy, a centralized system of record keeping, or mass-produced images. Because memory touched nearly every part of aristocratic daily life, it remains an important phenomenon for historians to understand and one whose influence on social and political life has barely begun to be examined.

Aristocratic memory was generated in both public and private spheres. Private memory is perhaps harder for us to locate, but included oral family traditions, records preserved in family archives, the ancestral masks (*imagines*) and labels of titles (*tituli*) of a family, and funeral orations given for deceased members of that family. There may also be material items like booty from war that were a source of memory for a family, although they were often dedicated and housed in a temple, thus becoming public. Public memories tend to be much easier for us to locate and are generally those of the elite, including the histories of the Republican period, temple dedications, the records of the Senate, and many other such sources.

---

[36] Walter (2004), 218-219.

For the Roman elite, there were few ways to assure that their memory lived on after they themselves passed away.[37] The primary means was through service to the state.[38] However, obtaining offices or military victories was a highly competitive struggle, dependent on different factors at various periods in Roman history and always restricted to the elite.[39] What compelled the Roman aristocracy to achieve immortality were values held communally, which also changed over time. Thus, there was a strong link between actions, values that shaped identity, and memory in the Roman aristocracy. As time passed, the actions of Roman aristocrats passed into the category of history and were treated by annalists, historians, antiquarians, literary figures, biographers, and other writers. Genres were not as distinct in the Roman world, and the topics of Roman history served as inspiration to writers of every sort. In fact, it is arguable that the very act of writing, in any genre and in Latin or Greek, was a means of entering into competition with aristocrats, both contemporary and past, in order to express Roman identity.

Thus, memories of individuals and events were preserved in not only in historical accounts, but also statues, inscriptions, numismatic iconography, architecture, and monuments, and could be located even in such features as roads named after their builders, the layout of cities, the calendar, and the names children were given. Institutions like the levy, census, and comitia were also repositories of memory for the Roman people.[40] The landscape of the city was itself a source of memory, as were religious beliefs, governmental institutions like the *comitia*, and the offices whose titles changed not at all for hundreds of years. These kinds of memory

---

[37] For concern about reputation into posterity, see Flower (2006).

[38] The term 'state' is used for convenience and does not refer to the modern conception of the nation-state, an entity that has little meaning in the ancient world.

[39] An important qualification is to say that the kind of memory focused on here is that of the Roman aristocracy. How memory worked among Roman non-elite, foreigners, or non-citizens is difficult to recover as a result of the nature of our sources, which are mainly elite in perspective, however inscriptions can preserve some perspectives of these groups.

[40] Hopkins (1991).

were distinct from direct experiences and individual memory, which tend to fade in the span of a lifetime. In many ways, then, memory was indivisible from identity in elite Roman circles.

However, the long political hegemony of Rome, and later its cultural hegemony, provides a rare and underexplored opportunity in world history to examine how the identity of a people changed over time as former enemies gained political enfranchisement and eventually became "Roman." As we will see in this dissertation, the identity of these old aristocratic Roman families was challenged by newcomers in the 1st century BCE. And even before, there was no single Roman identity. As Farney demonstrates, aristocrats in the Republic held multiple ethnic identities that they advertised in specific situations in addition to a variety of social and familial identities.[41] As modern scholars of memory have discovered, memory changes over time, as values shift, to serve the contemporary needs of those recalling events or people.[42] This legacy of memory as creative process lasted long into the Principate, but has not been examined in terms of understanding how changing memories and identities may have dictated aristocratic behavior. Indeed, memory functioned the same way in the Roman world and resulted in changing identities for both the old aristocracy and outsiders who gained access to the political levers of Rome.

Memory in Rome: Practice and Studies

The importance of memory studies has not been lost on historians of ancient Rome: to date, there have been a several approaches to the study of memory in the context of Rome. Far and away the most common application of memory studies to Rome is the attempt to understand how the Republic was remembered from the vantage point of the Principate. We can perhaps

---

[41] Farney (2007).

[42] Schacter (1999); Schacter and Scarry (2000); Squire and Schacter (2002); and Hirstein (2009).

locate the beginning of this trend with Wirszubski, whose monograph examined the political

ideal of freedom (*libertas*) in the late Republic and early Principate.[43] While not explicitly

engaging with memory, Wirszubski identified the concept of Republican *libertas* as a driving

force behind discord in the imperial period. Similarly, Ramsay MacMullen's monograph entitled

Enemies of the Roman State followed upon the same idea in a series of case studies examining a

variety of groups that ran afoul of the imperial government largely as a result of their failure to

adapt to the new political reality, due in part to their memory of the Republic.[44]

The focus on memory of the Republic in the Principate continued with the publications of

Gowing's *Empire and Memory* and Gallia's *Remembering the Roman Republic*.[45] Gowing sought

to locate the memory of the Republic both in the literature of the early Principate and the

Imperial fora. Gallia utilized numismatic iconography along with literature and inscriptions to

examine imperial attempts to control memory of the Republic. T.P. Wiseman sought to restore

the agency to the common people of Rome in his *Remembering the Roman People*, where he

attempts to reconstruct the political events of the late Republic from their perspective.[46]

Other studies of memory focused on specific texts, with Livy and Virgil, among others,

well represented.[47] Archaeologists have joined the memory boom by examining the impact of

the landscape on shaping memory and art historians have followed suit.[48] Many scholars tend to

---

[43] Wirszubski (1950).

[44] MacMullen (1966). These books spurred interest in the question of *libertas* that continues today with Arena's (2012) recent monograph *Libertas and the Practice of Politics in the Late Republic* and Wilkinson (2012) *Republicanism during the early Roman Empire*.

[45] Gowing (2005) and Gallia (2012).

[46] Wiseman (2008).

[47] Jaegar (1997); Meban (2008); Seider (2013); for other studies of memory in literature, see Tress (2004) on Callimachus and Ovid, and Rosati (2014) on memory in Statius.

[48] On memory and Roman art / topography, see Favro (2014), Hughes (2014), Anguissola (2014), Miano (2011), Rea (2007); on memory and archaeology, see Alcock (2002).

focus on the control of memory by various groups through memory sanctions.[49] Flower's

monograph on the sanctions imposed on defeated or disgraced members of the aristocracy stands

as one of the most thorough to deal with memory studies in the Roman context. According to

Flower, "In Roman thought, memory was not taken for granted as a natural state or product.

Rather, oblivion was the more normal condition, as the past receded from the present and was

simply no longer connected to it. Hence, as a carefully cultivated and deliberately invoked

culture of commemoration, Roman memory (*memoria*) was designed precisely in opposition to

the vast oblivion into which most of the past was conceived as having already receded."[50] The

most current work on memory in Rome is an amalgamation of these approaches in the form of a

volume edited by Galinski.[51]

Methodology

As is clear from the overview above, memory studies have traditionally focused solely

on a specific author (Livy), control of memory (studies on *damnatio memoriae*), and particular

loci of memory (monuments). Furthermore, these works attempt to understand how memory

worked in ancient Rome or sought to explain how the political past informed an imperial present.

However, as these examples demonstrate, the majority of work on memory in the Roman world

focuses on specific aspects of memory of something or memory in a particular context, such as

the Republic, memory control, literature, forgetting, or ancestor masks. These studies also

typically divide into those that focus on the Republic, the Augustan period, or the Principate and

---

[49] Flower (2006); Flower (1998); and Damon (1999). See also Benoist (2007); Benoist and Anne Daguet-Gagey (2008); and Hedrick (2000).
[50] Flower (2006), 2-3.
[51] Galinski (2014).

rarely do they span these political boundaries. While these approaches have greatly informed our understanding of Roman society, they present narrowly focused analyses that do not answer questions about the impact of memory on identity or how either changed over time. Furthermore, there has been no attempt to see memory as providing a continuum of identity during the late 1st century BCE and early 1st century CE in aristocratic social and political life.

Thinking about the Roman past from the perspective of memory studies enables us to identify institutions of memory where social norms were dictated, communicated, and passed between generations. Among the many institutions of memory that played a prominent role in Roman society, this dissertation focuses primarily on the *gens*, the values held in common by Roman aristocrats, the Senate itself, and public processions. Each of these institutions informed elite Roman behavior and identity, as we shall see in the next chapter. Additionally, such issues as aristocratic competition, Roman social and cultural values, changing identities in an expanding empire, familial relations, and various philosophical and intellectual currents can all be informed by examining the impact memory had on them.

It is in periods of cultural and social change that the tensions between the past and the present, different identities, and shifting values become readily apparent. This dissertation examines a period of momentous change in the Roman world during which groups of newly admitted senators actively negotiate their identities by appropriating on history and memory to essentially 'become Roman' in the eyes of their peers. The reaction of the 'old' aristocracy comprises the other side of the coin.

In this introductory chapter, I have suggested that memory was an integral part of nearly every aspect of elite Roman existence and that not enough attention has been paid to its role in the social and political lives of Roman aristocrats (both from old Roman families and "outsiders" from Italian *municipia* and the provinces). The primary location where this can be studied is within the context of the Roman Senate, in large part due to the quantity of sources and information we possess about this body. It is also the location in which Romanness has rarely been considered, the assumption being that all those in the Roman Senate were unquestionably thought of as being Roman. In order to understand the ways in which identity is created in this context during the first centuries BCE and CE, Chapter Two of the dissertation examines a series of 'institutions of memory' that serve to influence behaviors, actions, and the maintenance of identity within elite spheres. These institutions are both formal and informal, both carefully cultivated over centuries and suddenly invented, and inevitably influenced aristocratic actions and political decisions in the Roman Senate. They include the family structure of the *gens*, social values and morals as preserved in didactic history, public processions, and the Senate itself.

The case studies of this dissertation begin in Chapter Three, which chronologically encompasses the tumultuous period after the Social war to the reign of Augustus. Chapter Three centers on the writings and actions of two individuals, Cicero and Augustus. Each of these men represent important groups that were slowing coming to prominence in the 1st century BCE: Cicero, the *novus homo*, and Augustus, the Italian elite adopted into the old aristocracy. By examining how Cicero navigated his own identity as a *novus* in his speeches, the ways in which Italian elites pushed back against aristocratic conceptions of identity that had been closed off to them becomes clear. As the first Roman emperor, Augustus sought to claim all of Italy as

quintessentially Roman during his reign in the late first century BCE and did so by inventing new conceptions of the peninsula and new norms of behavior under the guise of a return to past prominence and morality. At the same time, Augustus could not simply ignore the presence of old aristocratic families who had traditions, beliefs, and prejudices of their own. Indeed, some of Augustus' own actions demonstrated the divisions between "Roman" senators and those who were not yet "Roman" enough. This chapter will argue that Augustus walked a fine line to accommodate the old aristocracy while simultaneously opening the Senate to Italian municipal senators, who would comprise the majority of his support.

The next case study examines the "Roman" response to the significant changes in the senatorial and aristocratic classes introduced by Augustus and continued by the Claudians. The "Romans," in this instance, are a branch of an old and well-established aristocratic family, the Calpurnii Pisones. The members of this family traced their ancestry back hundreds of years to the second king of Rome and were themselves attempting to negotiate their own way in the changed political world of the Imperial period. Through a prosopographical study of this family, I demonstrate the varied reactions family members had toward the changing definitions of what it meant to be Roman aristocrats as power was consolidated in the hands of the emperor and Italian and provincial elites rose through the ranks.

Closely related to this is the next case study, which examines how the memory of Cato Uticensis in the first century CE was appropriated and changed by senators from northeastern Italy, a region long associated by the Romans with barbarians and whose elite had only recently been enfranchised into Roman politics. Drawing on a Republican precedent like Cato was an attempt to lay claim to a respected lineage by Thrasea Paetus, Seneca, and Lucan. These

21

outsiders failed to understand the changing dynamics of imperial rule and aristocratic values, and ultimately paid with their lives in the Pisonian Conspiracy of 65.

Through this series of case studies rooted in these diverse contexts, we will see how identities were invented, reaffirmed, and rewritten by individuals drawing on their own memory or familial memories and Roman history. In the final chapter, I bring together the themes of the whole dissertation by looking briefly at the events of the Year of the Four Emperors, when the struggle between old aristocratic families was finally resolved and Italian elites took control of the imperial project.

Ultimately, the Roman Senate was a place of negotiated identity, which in turn relied heavily on memory and history as its informants, along with institutions of memory that pervaded all aspects of elite life. Individual members made use of historically based inventions to integrate into the order, while others clung to traditions memorialized by their ancestors. Outsiders adopted Roman culture while natives rewrote history to accommodate the present. The one unifying factor from Republic to Empire, from pagan to Christian, and from "Roman" to "barbarian," was that of the malleability of memory to explain the changing identities and histories of Rome.

Chapter Two: Institutions of Memory in Roman Aristocratic Circles

Writing in the first decades of the second century CE, Juvenal derisively examined the

state of the nobility throughout his eighth Satire.[1] In the beginning, he quipped:

> What value do family trees have? What good is it, Ponticus, to be valued by the
> length of your bloodline, to show the painted faces and statues of your ancestors-
> the Aemilii standing in their chariots and the diminutive Curii, a Corvinus less his
> shoulder and a Galba lacking his ears and nose? What profit is there to boast of
> the records of a great Fabricius, or, after these thing, to seize upon the smokey
> masters of horse with a dictator in the many branches of your family tree, if, in the
> presence of a Lepidus, one is living badly? Why have so many portraits of
> warriors, if one plays dice through the night in front of the Numantines, if you
> begin to sleep at the rising of the morning star, when their leaders were moving
> the standards and striking camp? Why should a Fabius, despite being born in the
> Herculean family, rejoice his great altar and the title 'Allobrogicus' if he is
> greedy, if he is idle and softer than a Euganean lamb, if, having rubbed his loins
> smooth with Catanian pumice, he dishonors his rough ancestors and, as a buyer of
> poison, pollutes his family with a likeness that ought to be broken? Even if old
> wax portraits adorn your whole atrium on all sides, the only and singular measure
> of nobility is virtue.[2]

Juvenal lambasted a nobleman named Rubellius Blandus, who may or may not have been the

husband of Drusus Caesar's daughter Julia or her son, Gaius Rubellius Plautus, as an example of

---

[1] Little is known of Juvenal's life, which makes determining the date of his writing or publication difficult at best. Most scholars agree that his flourit was in the early second century CE. On Juvenal's life and the dating of his *Satires*, see Courtney (1980), 1-9, and Green (1998), xviii.

[2] Juv. 8.1-20: *Stemmata quid faciunt, quid prodest, Pontice, longo / sanguine censeri, pictos ostendere uultus / maiorum et stantis in curribus Aemilianos / et Curios iam dimidios umeroque minorem / Coruinum et Galbam auriculis nasoque carentem? / quis fructus generis tabula iactare capaci / Fabricium, post haec multa contingere uirga / fumosos equitum cum dictatore magistros, / si coram Lepidis male uiuitur? effigies quo / tot bellatorum, si luditur alea pernox / ante Numantinos, si dormire incipis ortu / luciferi, quo signa duces et castra mouebant? / cur Allobrogicis et magna gaudeat ara / natus in Herculeo Fabius lare, si cupidus, si / uanus et Euganea quantumuis mollior agna, / si tenerum attritus Catinensi pumice lumbum / squalentis traducit auos emptorque ueneni / frangenda miseram funestat imagine gentem? / tota licet ueteres exornent undique cerae / atria, nobilitas sola est atque unica uirtus.*

a noble with no other claim to glory than his family lineage.[3] Ridiculing the *imagines*, the

military accomplishment of ancestors and their commemoration, and the ancient origins of

certain families, Juvenal questioned the validity of appealing to a prestigious and lengthy family

tree when its descendants fail to meet the same standards of nobility as their ancestors. In his

advice for his addressee, an otherwise unknown Ponticus, he reserved his mockery for families

that had gone extinct or had passed into obscurity, thus removing any real criticism of living

people.[4] In many ways, then, no small part of his target was the institutions that had long defined

the traditional Roman aristocracy and to which contemporary aristocrats still laid claim, despite

their lack of pedigree.

How could those markers of aristocratic identity so vitally important to the Roman ruling

class throughout the Republic now be mocked? As we will see, Juvenal's criticisms of the

nobility had their foundations in the works of Seneca and the younger Pliny, who had themselves

probably been influenced by the writings of Cicero and the remaking of the Roman world begun

by Augustus.[5] These actors had begun redefining what it should mean to be a Roman aristocrat

since well before Juvenal was born. Each, in turn, attacked the revered and long-standing

markers of aristocratic identity, including statues of ancestors, *imagines*, family trees, military

successes, and severe and austere self-presentation. Juvenal was perhaps the most vociferous in

part because his work was written in a time after the traditional Roman aristocracy had declined.

How did this come to pass?

In order to answer this question, it is first necessary to understand the role of these

institutions of memory in creating Roman aristocratic identity. Then it will be possible to

---

[3] There is much speculation about the identity of this man, but as Green (1998) suggests, "J.'s whole point is that the man who he is addressing is a nobody, whose blood is his one claim to distinction" (172).
[4] Courtney, (2013), 336.
[5] See Sen. *Controv*. 1.6.3–4, Sen. *Ep*. 44.5, Plin. *Ep*. 5.17.6, *Laus Pisonis* 5–11, and Chapters Three and Five below.

examine how men newly incorporated into the Senate from Italian *municipia* and the provinces sought to appropriate, change, or reject these markers as they negotiated their place alongside members of the traditional Roman aristocracy.

Institutions of Memory in Roman Aristocratic Life

Understanding the history of these aristocratic institutions of memory will form the basis for determining how aristocrats in the late Republic sought to identify themselves. The first institution of memory to be considered here is that of the Roman Senate. Traditionally dating its existence to the very foundation of Rome, the Senate had its own traditions and customs that shaped its procedures, its membership, and its role in Roman society. Because admission was originally based on familial connections, moral behavior, and election to office, the importance of understanding how memory generated by these institutions informed members of the Senate becomes readily apparent. Memory of familial lineages, practical experience serving the Roman state, foreign alliances, and conquest were but a few of the channels of memory that influenced the day-to-day functioning of Rome's advisory body. Closely related to the Senate was the institution of the *gens*, which shaped aristocratic Romans in the image of their ancestors by means of imbuing their sons with their families' history and the political achievements of their namesakes. Naming practices reinforced notions of lineage and duty to surpass ancestral achievements, as well as providing a template of the values and behaviors descendants should follow.

Indeed, aristocratic emulation of ancestors was based on a set of values that remained remarkably unchanged through the middle Republic, but came under increasing scrutiny and attack in the 1st century BCE. These values informed not only political and social engagement,

25

they also defined elite Roman identity as distinct from those of their Italian and Mediterranean

neighbors. The very act of writing history served to preserve these aristocratic values and the

deeds of an individual's ancestors for generations of Republican Romans. At first, the historians

of Rome were those members of the aristocratic class whose own ancestors often were the

protagonists in their accounts. For historians, and those who appealed to and employed past

precedent, the Roman past was a veritable lesson in positive and negative *exempla* that dictated

proper aristocratic conduct in addition to giving an account of the past. Additionally, the actual

writing of history could enable an author to achieve a sort of Roman status through his command

of the past, his emphasis on certain episodes, and his invention of speeches, themselves

demonstrations of the Roman preoccupation with rhetoric.[6]

The final institution, public processions in Rome, was carefully remembered, coveted,

and celebrated by the *gens*, and served as the ultimate broadcast of aristocratic values and status.[7]

These processions included, but were not limited to, the funeral processions and triumphs that

broadcast aristocratic identity and accomplishments not only to the larger population of Rome

but also to their fellow competitors for glory and recognition. It was in these processions that the

private memory and history of the *gens* emerged into the public sphere where aristocrats

---

[6] Ennius, although not a historian, comes to mind. Later authors like Livy, Pliny the Elder, and Tacitus
may have written in part as a means of emulating past Roman aristocrats in order to better claim their
legitimacy as Romans themselves.

[7] A number of other institutions of memory could be included (most notably those of entertainments,
religion, and ritual more broadly), but those selected here seemed to me to be most influential in
determining aristocratic identity during this period. These institutions continued into the Julio-Claudian
period providing a bridge between the Republic and Principate that is illustrative of the social and
political milieu in which Roman aristocrats found themselves. But perhaps most importantly, these are
the institutions that came under attack from the Princeps. As we will see in Chapter 2, Augustus and his
predecessors made concerted efforts to modify public funerals, virtually eliminated triumphs in favor of
ovationes, and appropriated ancestors for imperial purposes. No other aristocratic institutions of memory
were so important to identity in the late Republic and few, if any, institutions experienced the same
degree of imperial interference. If anything, aristocratic involvement in religious activity was one of the
few areas promoted by the imperial family perhaps as a result of the creation of the imperial cult.

demonstrated their Romanness for the crowds, which included the lower classes and visitors to the city.

What follows is a brief history of each institution that will serve to identify the ways in which the institution conveyed memory and to argue that these institutions are essential for understanding how Roman aristocrats of the 1st century BCE conceived of themselves in the context of the Roman Senate.[8] In order to better understand the turmoil of the late 1st century and the difficulties faced by the Julio-Claudian emperors in their dealings with the Senate, we need to first acknowledge that there was cultural continuity between the Republic and Principate. There was also change, but focus on the cultural transformations wrought by Augustus has overshadowed the fact that society as a whole did not change overnight. This chapter attempts to understand the aristocratic institutions of memory that influenced aristocratic behavior in the early Principate from their origins to the 1st century BCE.

The Roman Senate

I will begin by examining what the Roman Senate was, what it did in the Republican period, and who its members were. I will then turn to an examination of how the Senate functioned as an institution of memory. Being a Roman senator required citizenship, a right Rome parceled out inconsistently to cities, colonies and towns across Italy over the late 4th and 3rd centuries BCE. Throughout the Republic, Rome would grant certain towns rights ranging

---

[8] One of the few studies that have attempted this sort of history writing is Geoffrey Sumi's (2005) monograph *Ceremony and Power: Performing Politics in Rome between Republic and Empire*. This work focuses primarily on the years 44-43 and investigates the struggle for power between members of the nobility who sought the support of the people and the army by means of a variety of public performances. He begins his work with a "typology of Roman Republican ceremonial," and this chapter is in part modeled upon his theoretical framework.

from full citizenship to Latin status to *civitas sine suffragio*.[9] The vast majority of Italians were granted citizenship without the vote, thus restricting access to the Senate to a small population of Roman citizens among a much larger population of Italian non-citizens. However, there were some cities granted citizenship and in time their elites made their way to the Roman Senate. The evidence suggests that proximity to and good relations with Rome were of significant importance to determining grants of citizenship and admission to the Senate at this time. However, in certain circumstances citizenship could potentially be awarded as a result of personal relationships or military achievement.[10]

In their dealings with Italy more broadly, senators forged connections with Italian elites but membership to the Roman Senate depended heavily on a number of factors including the date of Roman conquest, the type of treaty negotiated with Rome, or the nature of social, political, military, or economic ties that local elites had with eminent Roman families.[11] Once in the Roman Senate, these men would come in contact with senators whose families had been part of the Senate for centuries, whose fathers adorned the pages of the Roman annalists, and whose conquests may have included their own places of birth. These aristocrats have been labeled as

---

[9] Sherwin-White (1973), 38-95, 200-210.
[10] Sherwin-White (1973), 291-295, thinks this is exceptionally rare in the early to middle Republic, but becomes more common after consecutive consulships of Marius.
[11] D'Arms (1981). In the middle Republic, epigraphic evidence attests at least sixteen senatorial *gentes* from Latium and at least thirteen from Etruria; see Liccordari (1982), 16-57; Gaggiotti and Sensi (1982), 245-274; Torelli (1982), 275-299; and Torelli (1995), 43-77. In comparison, for the same period the southern Italian cities of Capua and Cales produced only three known senatorial *gentes*, the area of Picenum one, and none were attested from such restive regions as Samnium, Campania, Apulia, Calabria, and Lucania. See Gasperini and Paci, (1982), 201-244; Torelli (1982), 165-199; and Camodeca (1982), 101-163. The epigraphic record provides evidence that comes with caveats: I use it here to detail general trends of senatorial membership that likely do not reflect a comprehensive picture of the origins of Roman senators. The availability of evidence, problems with dating, and the fact that this kind of evidence can only record those who engage in the epigraphic habit are all well-known issues, but hardly require leaving the evidence behind completely. Etruria and Umbria also, perhaps unsurprisingly, were among the first to accept citizenship when it was offered (by the *lex Iulia*) in 90 BCE.

the *nobiles*, but the definition of this term has been contested for decades.[12] In this study, I avoid

the label of *nobiles* primarily because of its political connotations. Rather than focusing on the

members of the Roman Senate and dividing them into factions or parties, such as the *optimates*

and *populares*, I define the groups under consideration here as those who had access and

recourse to the aristocratic institutions of memory and those who did not.

Those who did not have typically been labeled *novi homines,* and I do use this term in my

discussion of Cicero, since he used it to describe himself.[13] Otherwise, I prefer the term

"outsider" to describe Italian and provincial elites who entered the Senate and did not have the

same kinds of access to the aristocratic institutions of memory until after their sons and

grandsons became senators. As van der Blom notes, there was no ancient definition of *novus*

homo, but clearly there existed some category that differentiated those from Italian

---

[12] The term was originally discussed by Mommsen, who identified *nobiles* as a group that included
patricians, patricians who had effected a *transitio ad plebem*, and those descended from plebeians who
had held curule offices. Afzelius adopts the view that Gelzer's narrow conception of nobility only came to
prevail in the period of the Gracchi and that previously the wider conception, which joins nobility with
the *ius imaginum*, held sway and this notion fits the evidence from the 1st century BCE. For the debate
over the definition of *nobiles*, see Afzelius (1938); Gelzer (1969); Syme (1939); Syme (1986); Badian
(1967); Strasburger (1939) and (1937); Bleicken (1972), (1975), and (1981); Nicolet (1966), (1976a),
(1976b), and (1977); Martin (Diss. 1965); Meier (1980); and Brunt (1982). Most recently, van der Blom
(2010), 35-59, offers a brief overview of the debates and definitions offered by those listed above. I am
starting to think that definitions of these terms cannot accurately reflect the flexible nature of the Roman
aristocracy to adapt depending on the circumstance- at times the old aristocracy seemed to embrace new
men (Marius and Cicero come to mind).
[13] Dondin-Payre (1981), 23 and 38, argued that *novus homo* should not be thought of as the opposite of
nobilis because they were defined on different foundations (one on lack of ancestry and the other on
values and political success). She also discussed the positive "ideal" of the rustic new man as being
uncorrupt and strict (24-25). As with all of these terms, I suspect that their meaning changed over time.
Brunt (1982), 13; Cassola (1999), 475; and Burckhardt (1990), 82-3, note that there was a group of
Roman politicians who did not fit into either category of *nobilis* and *novus homo* and therefore label them
flawed. Others, including Flower (1996), 61-2, and Dugan (2005) 7-8, suggest that in the political life of
the late Republic, these distinctions are used in a variety of different ways and with rhetorical intentions
and meanings that are sometimes contradictory. Nicolet (1966) examined the equestrian order, from
which many of these new senators originated, and argued, against long-held views, that membership of
the equestrian order depended on membership of the eighteen centuries of *equites equo publico*, and that
the census of 400,000 HS was only a necessary qualification rather than a guarantee.

municipalities without ancestors who had served in the Senate from those with ancestors.[14] I suspect these categories were far more flexible than our extant sources suggest and were highly dependent on political expediency and context, particularly in the late Republican period.

Throughout the Republican period, Roman aristocratic houses truly did shape the culture of the Roman Senate. Many members of the same *gens* held multiple offices, were active in the Senate simultaneously, and, by their success in obtaining office, raised the expectations for later descendants to accomplish at least the same achievement.[15] Roman aristocrats from old families sought ways to distinguish themselves from their newer colleagues by means of the path by which political advancement was formalized, with emphasis placed on the possession of curule offices and accumulation of *imagines*, the series of ancestral images of illustrious and accomplished men of a particular family.[16] As Wiseman states: "A patrician would have a series of ancestral images going back to the days of the kings, but a man whose great-grandfather had been one of the first plebeian magistrates would still be [as] proud to be 'known' by his handful of *imagines* as the superior of a man with none."[17] As the transition from Republic to Principate progressed, these would take on a huge significance for members of those families who could lay claim to them.

---

[14] van der Blom (2010), 35. I think she is correct in viewing the terms *nobilis* and *novus homo* as political and ideological terms, which then explain the "ambiguity and fluidity in their usage" (37).

[15] For a complete study of the Roman *gens* see Smith (2006). This aristocracy based on tenure of office evolved over the course of the 3rd and 2nd centuries to include members of the rising plebian class but still excluded a large portion of the Italian elite.

[16] For a complete discussion of *imagines*, study of their political implications, their funeral uses, and the changes in rituals associated with the *imagines* see Flower (1996) and below. On the role of traditional ideas of moral values advertised in senatorial inscriptions and the continuity of values from Republican to Imperial periods, see Alföldy (1982), 37-53. Alföldy notes the changes in conventions over time (indications of personal achievement disappear, while nomenclature, listing of all offices held, and relationship to the emperor become standard).

[17] Wiseman (1971), 2; Bonnefond-Coudry (1982) examines intergenerational tensions in the Senate during the Republican period.

As an increased number of offices induced men from outside the traditional aristocracy to compete in the Senate, the introduction of laws in the early 2nd century sought to protect aristocratic status by excluding new men in any numbers from the paths of political success.[18] Attaining the Senate was possible, but ascending the hierarchy within its walls was somewhat difficult for political outsiders unless extenuating circumstances changed the political calculus.[19] The flexibility of the system in accepting new members while preserving the highest offices for members from aristocratic families is borne out by the fact that there were only three consuls attested as *novi homines* between 191 and 107 BCE, but also helps explain the meteoric rise of Gaius Marius, a new man from Cicero's hometown of Arpinum, at the end of the century.[20] The tumultuous last decades of the 2nd century BCE set the stage for even more turbulent events to come. The sources are muddled and written much later, but show that the Senate and the people

---

[18] The *lex Villia annalis* of 180 BCE fixed the order in which offices were to be held and established a rank of status for ex-magistrates. This law successfully ensured that power generally remained in the hands of the old aristocracy as a result of the power and influence it required to obtain office (including the expensive granting of munificence and bribery in exchanges for votes). In retaliation for these aristocratic attempts at control, the introduction of the secret ballot through the *lex Gabinia* of 139 BCE reduced the ability of the traditional scions of power to coerce less powerful members of the Senate because their votes could no longer be tracked. I suspect that access to the Roman Senate ebbed and flowed as historical context required throughout the Republic. In the early Imperial period, greater access to the Senate as a result of municipalization, increased grants of citizenship, and imperial patronage may have actually created a greater "crystallization" than had occurred in the Republican period.

[19] In his analysis of Hopkins' conclusion that the nobility was "wide open" between the years 249 and 50 BCE, Burckhardt (1990) makes the good point that the Roman nobility could be very flexible when it wanted to be: "The potential for integration into the nobility was remarkable: new members in turn took over its values and its mentality and tried to measure up to the tradition that they encountered. This process was greatly facilitated by the fact that, viewed socially, the difference between the homines novi and the well-established was significantly smaller than the difference between the class eligible to rule and the simple plebeians. From the perspective of social circumstances, then, there were few obstacles to the process of integration. Therefore, although attaining the consulship might have been a difficult task for a given homo novus, the political system and the nobility could easily deal with its new members" (87). But as Brunt, Burckhardt, and others have pointed out, Hopkins' conclusions are fairly optimistic. There was clearly a barrier at certain times for new men in the Senate, and many of those new men who did make it in never reached an office higher than the praetorship.

[20] Wiseman (1971), 3; Harris (1971) and Torelli (1995) examine evidence for Etruscan senators admitted to the Senate before the Social war, and Wiseman's (1971) prosopographical lists of the period after 139 BCE demonstrate increasing admissions after 118- but many of those listed are impossible to date with certainty, making it very difficult to make generalizations about numbers in this period.

were engaged in a struggle for power that was unprecedented in Roman history. When the Gracchi subverted centuries of custom that dictated seeking the approval of the Senate before the promulgation of a bill before the people, and instead brought their proposals directly to the people in the *comitia tributa*, this began the long slide from power that the Senate had enjoyed for the majority of the Republic. For much of the remainder of the Republic, the Senate found itself reeling from one hostile and armed magistrate to another. In the first century BCE, Senate had to contend with the reality of the grant of suffrage to former Italian enemies, uncontrollable aristocrats hungry for competition and greater status through military conquests, increased numbers of influential provincials, and the rise of one-man rule with the victory of Octavian at Actium in 31 BCE. These changes had profound implications for the Roman Senate, its membership, and the future imperial administration.

The first of these changes, the Social War and its aftermath, proved to be instrumental in not only theoretically granting access to the Roman Senate but also creating the conditions under which aristocrats turned to their institutions of memory as a means to preserve their status, assert their identity, and keep *novi homines* from the highest offices and socio-political circles.[21] In the 1st century BCE, the threat to identity posed by the extension of citizenship to Italians and rise of

---

[21] The events of the Social war are difficult to reconstruct because the ancient accounts are typically much later in date and not unproblematic. Appian, Diodorus (as preserved by Photius), the Epitomes of Livy, Florus, Eutropius, and Orosius are the primary sources. Plutarch mentions the war in his *Life of Cato* and fragments of L. Cornelius Sisenna also contribute some information. What follows is my attempt at a somewhat coherent narrative of the main events of the war. The war broke out in 91, with the murder at Asculum of Q. Servilius (either *praetor pro consule* in 91 or *proconsul* in 90) and other Romans, after the alliance of Italian cities against Rome had become known to him. Fighting ensued in the following year with the allies achieving some significant inroads (victories at Aesernia and Nola, and the death of the consul Rutilius at the river Tolnus, although the allies were defeated there by Marius). In 90, Roman victories against an uninformed allied army attempting to help the Etruscans and Umbrians and near the Fucine Lake effectively ended resistance in the north, leading the rebels to abandon their capital at Corfinium. At roughly the same time, Sulla was successful at Pompeii, Stabiae, and Herculaneum. Then Sulla attacked the Samnites, capturing the second capital of the rebels, Bovianum. Additional Roman victories occurred in 88, but it was not until the following year that Samnite and Lucanian rebels finally ended their resistance after the grant of citizenship by the regime of Marius.

populist politicians caused these institutions to become the standards with which the old

aristocracy measured Romanness. Attempts to modify what it meant to be Roman, advanced by

municipal elites, were rejected in favor of elevating these institutions and drawing distinctions

between old and new Romans.

The Social War was the culmination of nearly a century of discontent. The allies had

sought incorporation previously, but members of the old aristocracy always rebuffed their efforts

successfully, both in the late 2nd century with the defeat of the Gracchan reforms and the *Lex*

Licinia Mucia in the early 1st century BCE.[22] In a fragment of his *Pro Cornelio*, preserved to us

by Asconius, Cicero argues that the *Lex Licinia Mucia* of 95, which was an attempt to restrict the

Roman citizenship claims of certain allies, was useless and destructive to the Republic.[23] In her

reassessment of the law, the role it played in instigating the *Bellum Italicum*, and the literary

evidence related to the law, Tweedie acknowledges that the attitudes the aristocracy toward non-

citizens (or new citizens) were intolerant and hostile.[24] The very existence of the Social War

should cause historians to pause and reconsider the process of Romanization in Italy up until this

period. How did Italians, who were supposedly romanized, decide to wage war with the city

from which their adoptive culture came? In terms of the Romanization debate, this question has

---

[22] Kendall (2012), 113: "In all those cases, the issue of *civitas* had always been connected with agrarian reform dealing with the use of *ager publicus* (usually introduced as a way to smooth over allied protests over reclamation of *ager publicus* they claimed as their own). The Roman Senate and its magistrates, drawn as they were from large landowners whose wealth by law had to come from land which they either owned or used without owning it (legally or otherwise), tended automatically to oppose tinkering with *ager publicus*."

[23] Asc. *Corn.* 67-8 C: *Legem Liciniam et Muciam de civibus redigendis video constare inter omnis, quamquam duo consules omnium quos vidimus sapientissimi tulissent, non modo inutilem sed perniciosam rei publicae fuisse. L. Licinium Crassum oratorem et Q. Mucium Scaevolam pont. max. eundemque et oratorem et iuris consultum significat. Hi enim legem eam de qua loquitur de redigendis in suas civitates sociis in consulatu tulerunt. Nam cum summa cupiditate civitatis Romanae Italici populi tenerentur et ob id magna pars eorum pro civibus Romanis se gereret, necessaria lex visa est ut in suae quisque civitatis ius redigeretur. Verum ea lege ita alienati animi sunt principum Italicorum populorum ut ea vel maxima causa belli Italici quod post triennium exortum est fuerit.*

[24] Tweedie (2012) 124-8; Tweedie relies on evidence from Cicero's *Brut.* 63, *Off.* 3.47, *Balb.* 54, and *De or.* 2.257 to make her case.

generally been answered with the rationale that the Italians waged war in order to be enfranchised into the political system.[25]

As Mouritsen argues in his monograph *Italian Unification*, the question of why the Italian allies went to war with Rome dates back to Mommsen's treatment of the Roman world with the framework of the 19th century's emphasis on nationalism problematically overlaid onto the ancient past.[26] Mommsen determined that the allies wanted citizenship so badly they would go to war over it, an outcome of centuries of sporadic political integration, Romanization, and desire for Roman citizenship.[27] Since then, scholars have tended to take the later Roman sources at face value (as Mommsen did) and have largely ignored the paradox set up by Mommsen, that after the outbreak of war the allies sought independence from Rome rather than citizenship. Mouritsen's controversial solution to this problem lies in his detection of two conflicting literary traditions, arguing that Mommsen and subsequent scholars wove these traditions together without realizing their implications.[28] These two literary traditions emerged at different times and served different purposes: the earliest tradition, which Mouritsen dates to the time of the Social war, framed the war in terms of ridding Italy of Roman hegemony.[29]

---

[25] The "Italian Question" directly affects this discussion. The bibliography is enormous and this list reflects only a selection of secondary sources that exist on this subject: Salmon (1982), Keaveney (1987), Mouritsen (1998), Bispham (2007), Coşkun (2008), Kendall (2013). The Italian Question serves as a backdrop against which we must consider the social and political acceptance of municipal Italians in the Roman Senate. The question, put simply, is what the Italians were fighting for during the Social War. Was it that they wanted enfranchisement into the Roman political system and the rights of citizenship, or to end Roman domination altogether?

[26] Mouritsen (1998), 23-38.

[27] Mommsen *RG* (1854), I.429.

[28] Mouritsen (1998), 58.

[29] Mouritsen (1998), 5-22.

In Diodorus' account, the Social war was about ending Roman hegemony in Italy and creating a new state.[30] "The insurgent leaders had a plan for a new, non-Roman system in Italy in which decision-making would rest with them…the leaders organized these states (most of which were tribal) into a kind of confederacy, calling it Italia, a name well calculated to appeal to all who resented the exclusive behavior lately practiced by the Romans."[31] According to Diodorus, the victory in the Social war solidified Roman power in the peninsula and the extension of the vote was not a concession or compromise.[32] As Mouritsen argues, it was later authors, including Strabo, Plutarch, Florus, and Appian, who conflated the notion of independence from Rome with the desire of the Italians for enfranchisement into the Roman political system.[33] However it is possible that both movements were simultaneously active- that some allies wanted independence, while others wanted citizenship.

Regardless of the exact rationale for the Social war, what seems clear is that speaking of the war as taking place between Romans and Italians seriously flattens out the different circumstances of each ethnic group surrounding their participation (or aid to the Romans, in the case of the Latins) and the outcomes experienced by each group. Some, like the Samnites, fought to the bitter end and were harshly punished for their persistence. Others capitulated to Roman forces without much of a fight and gained the right of rapid suffrage for their obedience.

---

[30] Diod. Sic. 37.1.6: διὸ τοῦ πρωτείου κατὰ τὰς ἐν τοῖς πολέμοις ἀνδραγαθίας ἐκ τῶν ἀποτελεσμάτων κριθέντος ὑπάρχειν παρὰ Ῥωμαίοις καὶ τοῖς τὴν Ἰταλίαν οἰκοῦσιν ἔθνεσιν, ἡ τύχη καθά περ ἐπίτηδες τούτους εἰς διάστασιν ἀγαγοῦσα τὸν ὑπερβάλλοντα τῷ μεγέθει πόλεμον ἐξέκαυσεν. ἐπαναστάντων γὰρ τῶν κατὰ τὴν Ἰταλίαν ἐθνῶν τῇ τῆς Ῥώμης ἡγεμονίᾳ καὶ τῶν ἐξ αἰῶνος ἀρίστων κεκριμένων ἐλθόντων εἰς ἔριν καὶ φιλοτιμίαν, ὁ γενόμενος πόλεμος εἰς ὑπερ βολὴν μεγέθους κατήντησεν, ὃς ὠνομάσθη Μαρσικὸς ἀπὸ τῶν ἀρχηγῶν γενομένων τῆς ἀποστάσεως Μαρσῶν.
[31] Salmon (1982), 129.
[32] Diod. Sic. 37.2.3.
[33] Mouritsen (1998), 5-22; Flor. 2.6.3; Plut. *Vit. Cat. Min.* 2.1-4, *Vit. Mar.* 32.3; App. *B Civ.* 1-2; for an opposing view, see Salmon (1982), Keaveney (1987), Kendall (2013).

Out of these varied situations came the eventual enfranchisement into Roman politics for new citizens, but not necessarily acceptance by their Roman peers.[34]

Initially, the influx of new potential members to the Senate after the Social War ended in 88 BCE was large. When Sulla was abroad and Cinna reigned in Rome, Italians found the doors to the Senate open to them in part as a result of the proscriptions afflicted by both sides. Upon his return Sulla sent assurances to the Italians that their citizenship would not be stripped from them, and he did not hesitate to promote his allies to senatorial status when he doubled the size of the Senate.[35] However, due to the restrictions placed on the sons of the proscribed by Sulla, many descendants of the rebel leaders of the Italians were barred from entry into the Senate until much later when Caesar repealed the law.[36]

The Social war of the early 1st century did indeed lead to the enfranchisement of most of Italy, however, the implementation of this enfranchisement was slow and uneven.[37] Despite obtaining enfranchisement, municipalities across Italy had various levels of access and acceptance in Roman political circles. The inability to achieve the consulship suggests that these Italians did not have a similar standing socially to the senators from older *municipia* and Rome. As we will see in Chapter Three, the few who did penetrate the social barriers and were able to mobilize voters attempted to advance new definitions of Romanness that did not involve lineages

---

[34] Bispham (2006), 413 argues "With the grief and bitterness of the Social and Civil Wars still raw, a precocious integration into the wider life of the Roman res publica was only for the favored few: for most the centre which might welcome and repay their [the new citizens of the peninsula] attentions would necessarily at first be the local."

[35] Wiseman (1971) 6-7. For the make up of those allies (mainly those dispossessed by Marius and Cinna, their sons, and *equites equo publico*; not, as Sallust in *Cat*. 37.6 argues, *gregarii milites*), see Hill (1932).

[36] Wiseman (1971), 8.

[37] See Gruen (1995), 508-523, for his analysis of the Senate's membership between 78 and 49 BCE. Gruen breaks the Senate into traditional groups (consular families, praetorian families, senatorial families, and *novi homines*) by office. This is useful to a point, but relies on the belief that these groupings represent defined ideas about identity that may not have been so rigid in actuality: see Salmon (1982); Wiseman (1971); On the juridical situation, see Bispham (2006), 203 and 414-415.

and *imagines*. In this period, what it meant to be Roman was changing, but there was plenty of pushback from the established elites, who adhered to centuries old traditions and values that guided their actions.[38] Indeed, eventually Italy was unified, but much later than most historians currently think.

The thirty years after the Social war was a critical period for the Senate. *Novi homines* gained access to the post-Sullan Republican Senate, but, as we will see in the next chapter, were not fully embraced by their fellow senators, who hailed from long lineages of aristocratic politicians and military commanders.[39] The links between municipalization, enfranchisement, and social standing at Rome were defining features for municipal senators during the middle part of the first century BCE. In his discussion of how the Senate decided to grant the status of *municipium* to various Italian towns, Bispham observes, "In ignoring many important Italian settlements the Senate displayed both how easily it could allow the logic and pragmatism required for the creation of a municipal system in Italy to be tempered by political considerations, and a haughty indifference toward those to whom it had been effectively forced to concede the citizenship."[40] This uneven treatment of various Italian cities and new citizens kept certain elites out of the Senate for decades to come. Although Cinna had held a census after the conclusion of the Social War in 86 BCE, when Sulla came to power its results were

---

[38] Sherwin-White (1973), 166: "At some point in the middle of the first century these lands [rural] were divided up and shared out as *territoria* to the more important villages and market towns…The importance of this reform is that by the introduction of real uniformity throughout Italy, extended in 49 BC to the Alps, and by the removal of the *territorium* of the City, the distinction between urban and municipal senators, still echoed by Cicero, was gradually forgotten, and the unification of Italy into one nation was greatly forwarded.
[39] Nicolet (1970), 1223, discerns 75 *equites* who enter the Senate after the Social War from Latium, Campania, the *ager Romanus*, and Roman colonies, with the majority joining between 70-50 BCE.
[40] Bispham (2006), 412.

essentially ignored, thus excluding many of the eligible Italian elites from acting on their

citizenship.[41] The next census did not take place for nearly 30 years, in 69 BCE.

The consulship of Pompey the year before had ensured the election of censors both

amenable to his politics and willing to fill the *comitia centuriata* with new municipal members

who would likely be very grateful to Pompey. This period saw quite a bit of fluctuation in the

number of *novi homines* into the ranks of the Senate, with an uptick during the particularly

tumultuous decades of the 60s and 50s.[42] With Pompey facing significant resistance from the old

aristocracy in the implementation of his policies, his admission of *novi homines* made good

political sense.[43] Finally then, after the census of 69 BCE, Italian elites found their entrance into

the Senate easier, but were confronted with an aristocratic identity in which they were unable to

partake. The differences between senators who hailed from the old aristocracy and those without

recourse to lineage and family achievements sparked conflict between the two groups.

The subsequent civil wars offered additional access to the Senate. However, it was not

until Caesar's extension of citizenship to those residents in Transalpine Gaul in 49 as a result of

the *lex Roscia* that the Senate again admitted to its ranks numerous municipal senators.[44] Caesar

took the opportunity to replace those lost in the conflict and increased the senate, not without

controversy, with many men from the newly incorporated territories in the north. These men

---

[41] Nicolet (1966), 406-8; Wiseman (1969), 63-4.

[42] Wiseman (1971), 182.

[43] In the time between the Social War and the end of the Republic, many Romans acted as patrons and magistrates of Italian communities. However, evidence of patronage from literary sources reveals that the vast majority of these social networks occurred after the year 60 BCE. Bispham (2006), 457: employing strict criteria that requires the usage of the words *patronus* or *cliens* or some additional evidence that suggests clear ties, Bispham finds that out of the 60 Romans attested as patrons only 16 are attested before 60 BCE with nine serving as patrons to Italian communities in the 60s.

[44] Suet. *Iul.* 76.3: *Eadem licentia spreto patrio more magistratus in pluris annos ordinavit, decem praetoriis viris consularia ornamenta tribuit, civitate donatos et quosdam e semibarbaris Gallorum recepit in curiam.* "With the same disregard for ancestral custom, he named magistrates for future years, bestowed consular emblems on ten ex-praetors, and admitted to the Curia men who had been given citizenship, and in some cases half-civilized Gauls."

were loyal to Caesar and helped him immensely in pushing through his many reforms, but were never accepted as legitimate entries into the ranks. Additionally, there is evidence from the *Tabula Heracleensis* of possible restrictions to membership in the senate by a decree of Caesar, including requiring a certain amount of military service before an individual could hold political office.[45] However, its fragmentary nature makes it impossible to gauge its effects on the whole of Italy. In conjunction with the delay in admitting Italians to the Senate after the Social War, attitudes toward *novi homines* as recorded by Cicero, and the negative reputation Caesar gained for advancing Italians and provincials, the *Tabula Heracleensis* is additional evidence of the difficulty some Italians had in taking advantage of their enfranchisement. As a result of Caesar's largesse, that of the other triumvirs, and the general turmoil of the civil wars, Italians found access to the Senatorial rolls easier in the years 45-29 BCE.[46] After the accession of Augustus, there occurred several revisions of the senatorial membership, which had swollen to over 1000 members during the Triumviral period.[47]

As a result of these events, the first century BCE reflected a period in which *novi homines* were enfranchised, barred from political life through a number of legislative actions, and then given the right to participate with varying degrees of success and social acceptance. With the institutions of aristocratic memory alive and well in the first century BCE, senators

---

[45] Crawford (1996), pp. 355-391, n. 24: *Tabula Heracleensis* 83-91: *queiquomque in municipieis colon<i>eis praefectureis foreis conciliabuleis c(iuium) R(omanorum) IIuir(ei) IIIIuir(ei) erunt alioue/ quo nomine mag(istratum) potestatemue su<f>ragio eorum, quei quoiusque municipi{a} coloniae praefecturae/ for<i> conciliabuli erunt, habebunt, nei quis eorum que in eo municipio colonia {e} praefectura{t} <f>oro concilia/bulo <in> senatum decuriones conscriptosue legito neue sublegitoneue co{a}ptato neue recitandos curato/ nisi in demortuei damnateiue locum eiusue quei confessus erit, se senatorem decurionem conscreiptumue / ibei h(ac) l(ege) esse non licere. vacat/ quei minor annos (triginta) natus est erit, nei quis eorum post k(alendas) Ianuar(ias) secundas in municipio colonia praefe-/ctura IIuir(atum) IIIIuir(atum) neue quem alium mag(istratum) petito neue capito neue gerito, nisei quei eorum stipendia/ equo in legione (tria) aut pedestria in legione (sex) fecerit.*
[46] Wiseman (1971), 182.
[47] Suet. *Iul*. 41.1, Talbert (1984), 55.

from newly created Italian *municipia* had little social capital. As we will see, it was only with the civil wars and Augustus that the process of unification began, but Roman aristocratic culture and identity did not change enough to socially accommodate municipal senators until the Flavian dynasty. It would be later still before senators from all provinces would gain similar social standing at Rome.

The longevity of the Roman Senate makes it one of the most consistent markers of elite identity in the Roman world. That individuals could be part of the same institution, nominally at least, for over 1200 years is a remarkable testament to the ability the Senate had to transmit memory from generation to generation. As a *locus* where Roman aristocrats served alongside their friends and family members, and where their ancestors had served, the Senate linked contemporary aristocrats to their histories and familial memories. At the same time, the Senate was regularly the arena in which aristocratic identity was claimed and made. An ancestor's senatorial motions, actions, and speeches were remembered in this space and became the model for his descendants to emulate and imitate. Performing the same ceremonial rituals, being consulted on matters of war and peace, and debating political positions created physical remembrances of past senators who were doing the same things decades or centuries after their predecessors.

The Senate itself pervaded the urban fabric of Rome. For the majority of the Republic, the body held meetings in the *Curia Hostilia* reportedly built by the third king of Rome, Tullius Hostilius, in the *Forum Romanum*.[48] Sulla expanded the curia to house his larger Senate, and the building was burned down during the rioting after Clodius' death in 52 BCE. Sulla's son, Faustus Cornelius Sulla, rebuilt the curia and it was later replaced, again by a bigger building to

---

[48] Liv. 1.30; Bartoli (1963); Platner- Ashby (1929), 142-3.

house an increased number of senators, by Caesar and Augustus, who finished the construction after Caesar's assassination.[49] This building in the center of Rome was a physical reminder of the presence of the Senate, and when they met in the ancient *Curia Hostilia* in particular, the weight of memory must have been heavy on those present.

But the Senate did not always meet in the curia. During the Republic the Senate met in many places inside and outside the sacred boundary of the city, including on the Capitoline hill, in the Temple of Castor and Pollux, the Temple of Concord, the Temple of Fides, on the Palatine, in the Temple of Bellona, and at the Colline Gate.[50] Many of these temples had been vowed and built by victorious generals, who were usually senators, and housed the spoils of war that they brought back along with various Roman documents.[51] Additionally, many of the records of the Senate were housed in various temples in Rome, the most important of these including the Temple of Jupiter Capitolinus that housed copies of the laws, senatorial decrees, and military diplomas.[52] Other repositories of records included the temple of Juno Moneta, the curiae Hostilia, Pompeia, and Iulia, and the Temple of Castor and Pollux.[53] Laws were also kept in the Temple of Fides, plebeian records in the Temple of Ceres, records of land distribution in

---

[49] Aug. *RG* 19; Cass. Dio 51.22.1.

[50] Bonnefond-Coudry (1989), 25-197. In her comprehensive analysis, Bonnefond-Coudry analyzes the literary evidence and the archaeological evidence (where possible) for each of the sites she lists in her chart on page 47.

[51] Culham (1989) provides a comprehensive of the kinds of record keeping there was in Rome. Linderski (1995), 210-14, examines the possible locations for the pontifical records. For example, the *aedes Herculis Musarum*, which M. Fulvius Nobilior built as a triumphal monument after his victory in 189 B.C. over the Aetolians, is said to have housed *fasti*, on this see Platner-Ashby (1929), 255; Degrassi, 80; Simpson (1993), 63.

[52] Platner-Ashby (1929), 302; Liv. 9.46 describes how Nobilior made public many of the workings of the legal processes which had been the provenance of the elites before. On the kinds of records in the temples, see Linderski (1995), 213-14, and Simpson (1993), 64.

[53] On the Temple of Juno Moneta, see Liv. 4.20.8: *quis ea in re sit error quod tam ueteres annales quodque magistratuum libri, quos linteos in aede repositos Monetae Macer Licinius citat identidem auctores…* On this corrupt passage, see Frier (1999) 147; More generally on the *libri lintei magistratuum* and the *Annales Maximi*, see Frier (1999); On Juno Moneta, see Meadows and Williams (2001), 30-1, and Simpson (1993), 63-4.

the Temple of Diana.[54] The working census-records were kept at the atrium of Libertas.[55] Thus, the physical meetings of the Senate and the repositories of senatorial documents were peppered throughout the city of Rome. These locations ensured the visibility of the senatorial class and served as *loci* of memory through their service as meeting places and as archives of Roman political careers.

The record of the *acta senatus*, first instituted by Julius Caesar, preserved the daily actions of the Senate.[56] Although it is unlikely that these records were available to individuals outside the institution, senators probably had access to them.[57] The fullness of these records remains unknown to us, but whether the records were "a full, verbatim record of all proceedings in the House" or "an edited record of proceedings, either in direct or indirect speech" matters little.[58] They provided an account of the people, issues, and decisions of the Senate, which were available to successive members and formed a foundation of institutional memory. In addition to these public sources of senatorial memory, aristocratic families often maintained their own archives full of documents from the political careers of their most eminent ancestors.[59]

Often institutions become more formalized, guarded, and important to their membership when they seem to come under attack from outsiders. Perhaps for the first time in their history, Roman aristocrats of the 1st century BCE felt threatened by Italian elites because of their recent enfranchisement and the numbers in which they were entering the Senate. In response, the institutions of memory by which they could differentiate themselves most clearly from those new

---

[54] Meadows and Williams (2001), 30-1 and Culham (1989), 110-12.
[55] Culham (1989), 104.
[56] Suet. *Iul*. 20.
[57] According to Suetonius (*Aug*. 36: *ne acta senatus publicarentur*), Augustus sought control over access to the the acta. What this means is rather unclear- it could refer to publication within the Senate or the acts being put into public circulation. For further discussion, see Talbert (1984), 310.
[58] Talbert (1984), 317 and 318 respectively.
[59] Scullard (1973), 252; Culham (1989), 104-105.

members of the Senate became ever more emphasized, more important, and more closely associated with their identities as the 'real' Romans. Within the walls of the Senate, members from old aristocratic families repeatedly referred to the accomplishments of their fathers and father's fathers. Even the new members, as we will see, sought to invent for themselves lineages and famous ancestors, and hoped their own sons would one day be able to reference their own accomplishments. In short, they mimicked the old aristocrats and that important institution of the *gens*, which itself was closely entwined with public processions and the promulgation of the values that had for centuries defined the essence of Romanness.

The Roman Gens

Even today the importance of family relationships is unavoidable and is perhaps most apparent when examining the inscriptions on grave markers or obituaries in the newspaper. The lives of individuals are typically reduced to generic descriptions based on the place of that person in their family: 'loving husband and father,' 'beloved child,' or 'veteran, brother, and son.' These descriptions reduce a lived experience to family relationships, a commemorative choice echoed from antiquity. Roman catacombs and tombs also identified the individuals they housed in terms of family relationships, thus speaking to the importance of the family in Roman society.[60] Nowhere was this more prominent, however, than in the structure, naming practices, and political histories of old aristocratic families in Rome which comprised the institution of the *gens*. The social organization of families from the early Roman Republic through the Imperial period was intertwined with the issues of identity and lineage, and defined by the memory of

---

[60] Hope (2011).

family history.[61] These aristocratic families had long been the stewards of the *res publica* and formed the veritable ruling class. They held the political offices, they conducted the affairs of the state in war and in peace, and they maintained control of their monopoly on power for as long as they could. This privileged position was increasingly contested in the 1st century BCE, with the enfranchisement of Italian allies, and into the Principate with the increasing presence of provincial elites in the Senate.

As Roman dominion increased over the Italian peninsula, ever more municipal Italian families were seeking enfranchisement and social acceptance into the Roman political system, but they were at a distinct disadvantage. The *gentes* of Rome had historical precedent that they appealed to without hesitation to achieve election. Italian families enjoyed social and political ties with established Roman aristocratic families that would ensure some level of incorporation; however, they were unlikely to achieve the status of equals socially and politically. Indeed this inequality led later generations to the Social War.

How to define the *gens* has been a continual problem for Roman historians, particularly because the institution itself changed over time. Additionally, the term has taken on a variety of meanings in different fields, with layers of understanding contributed by modern fields including anthropology, archaeology, and history. To understand what the Romans meant by *gens* is difficult because the vast majority of writers did not deem it necessary to define a term that was so culturally central to their understanding of what it meant to be Roman. Cicero preserved for us a legal understanding from the famous jurist Q. Mucius Scaevola of what the *gens* was, but in

---

[61] As Pollini (2007) argues, "In the highly structured and status-conscious society of ancient Rome, there was a hierarchy of remembrance intimately bound to a hierarchy of power in the hereditary nobility. As Paul Connerton aptly put it, "Power speaks *through* blood." And in ancient Rome it was this hierarchy of power that largely controlled and conditioned collective memory, that which is commonly shared by a given group or community. Roman nobles who distinguished themselves in life by their achievements, especially on behalf of the State, were entitled to live on not just in the private memory of their individual families but also in the collective memory of the community" (p. 241).

the context of how to correctly provide a definition rather than out of concern for the institution of the *gens* itself. According to Cicero, "Those are *gentiles* who are of the same name as one another. That is insufficient. And who are born of noble blood. Even that is not enough. Who have never had any ancestor in the condition of a slave? Something is still wanting. Who have never parted with their civic and political life? This, perhaps, may do. For I am not aware that Scaevola, the pontiff, added anything to this definition."[62] Cicero's definition is of particular importance because it comes from the perspective of a *novus homo* at precisely the period with which this inquiry is concerned. The definition hinges on the phrase "*capite non sunt deminuti*" which is discussed later on in the Digest as a Roman idea that encompasses the rights of liberty (*libertatis*), citizenship (*civitatis*) and the family (*familiae*).[63] The emphasis on participation in civic life would be the defining factor for Roman aristocratic *gentes* in the late Republic. Any ancestral accomplishments and fictive lineages that stretched further and further back into the Roman past were all touted with increasing enthusiasm in the 1st century BCE.[64]

Within the institution of the *gens* there is perhaps no better example of the transmission of familial memory than that of how Romans were named. Roman men usually had three names: a *praenomen*, a *nomen*, and a *cognomen*. The *praenomen* is equivalent to the first name, and for Romans these were limited to list of approximately sixteen different names.[65] The second part of the Roman name was the *nomen* and this was typically in the form of an adjective that denoted

---

[62] Cic. *Top.* 29: *Gentiles sunt inter se qui eodem nomine sunt. Non est satis. Qui ab ingenuis oriundi sunt. Ne id quidem satis est. Quorum maiorum nemo servitutem servivit. Abest etiam nunc. Qui capite non sunt deminuti. Hoc fortasse satis est. Nihil enim video Scaevolam pontificem ad hanc definitionem addidisse.*
[63] *Dig. 4, 5, 11; cf. Just. Inst. 1, 16, 4.* This definition comes largely from examples provided by Cicero, along with other Roman authors: Cic. *De or.* 1, 40, 181; 1, 54, 231; *Tusc.* 1, 29, 71; Liv. 3, 55, 14; 22, 60, 15: On the "*capitis minor*," see Hor. *Carm.* 3, 5, 42.
[64] Wiseman (1974); Hekster (2006); Hekster (2009).
[65] On Roman names, see Rix (1995), 724–32: Rix summarizes the characteristics of Roman nomenclature in its Indo-European context and provides bibliography on Latin onomastics in general.

the extended family or *gens*.[66] Finally, the *cognomen* identified a branch of the *gens*. However, additional *agnomina* provided further distinction within the family from another member with the same name, which could be a significant problem, since Romans of elite families often had the same name from generation to generation.[67] An *agnomen* could also be an honorific title granted by the state, of which perhaps the most famous example is that of Publius Cornelius Scipio Africanus. Roman women generally had only one name, and it was based on the *nomen* of her father. For example, in the family of the *Calpurnii Pisones*, the women were all named Calpurnia.[68]

With these naming practices came additional familial expectations. As Beroin summarizes, "a Roman citizen of high birth has a moral and social obligation to remember his origin (*genus*), his names (*nomen* and *cognomen*), his ascendants and his family in a wider sense, including the lineage on the father's, the mother's, and the in-law's side."[69] She goes on to clarify that remembrance is not enough: Romans were expected to imitate their ancestors both in gesture and in deeds.[70] As a result of this expectation and the Roman habit of exactly naming children after their fathers, "thus remembering one's father also means resembling him, even being identical to him and replacing him."[71] These expectations were located firmly in the structure of aristocratic *gentes* at Rome and were maintained well into the Principate.[72]

---

[66] Smith (2006), 4, 19, 20; Smith also notes the influence of Etruscan culture on Roman naming practices.
[67] Baroin (2010), 48: In her detailed analysis, Baroin draws on a wide variety of ancient sources that demonstrate these familial expectations.
[68] Sider (2005), fn1 p100.
[69] Beroin (2010), 19; Varro, *Ling*. 7.1.3: *Quare cur scriptoris industriam reprehendas qui herois tritavum, atavum non potuerit reperire, cum ipse tui tritavi matrem dicere non possis?*
[70] Beroin (2010), 20.
[71] Beroin (2010), 20.
[72] Studying Roman onomastics has made me wonder about Roman individuality. In many ways, this study has led me to believe there was a far smaller degree of individuality in Romans than there are in modern peoples and yet there is plenty of evidence to suggest that there did exist notions of an individual. Indeed, names could often reflect a physical characteristic that was relevant to a particular individual.

Thus, it was the institution of the *gens* that instilled both the memory of the past and the values of the present in its sons. And, it was the gens that served as a defining feature in aristocratic behaviors during the early Principate. In their attempts to adopt Roman naming practices, Syme observes that "rare and peculiar *gentilician*, confined for the most part to one district of Italy or to one family of senatorial rank, illustrate the origin and vicissitudes of *novi homines* under the early Principate, especially persons from the central highland zone, and fill out with colour and relief the social and political history of the age."[73] So profoundly important were these naming practices, and perhaps also the accompanying expected behaviors, that newly enfranchised elites sought to mimic them into the imperial period. It is to the behaviors of aristocrats that we now turn, another component of gentilician identity, which were informed by a set of values agreed upon, publically demonstrated, and maintained throughout the Republican period.

Aristocratic Values and Historical Writing

Within the aristocratic *gens* and the Roman Senate, correct behavior was dictated by a set of values passed down from generation to generation. These values were, in part, what gave the aristocracy legitimacy and the authority for political rule in the eyes of the people.[74] Over time

---

Although this question seems of paramount importance when discussing identity in any context, I do not believe there have been any studies on this question to date, in either the Roman or the premodern world more generally.

[73] Syme (1970), 61.

[74] For discussion of the traditional position (that Roman aristocrats advertised certain values and were thought of a elites because of these values, which differentiated them from the people), see Wiseman (1971); Scullard (1972); Lomas (2003); Rosenstein (2006); and Hölkeskamp (2010), esp. 49-52. On the role of patronage, where the patrons are the exemplars of Roman values and clients are socially inferior, see Meier (1966) and (1980); Bleicken (1981); for the position that patronage was not the only force driving politics, see Brunt (1988). Pushing back against this is Millar (1998), who argues for a much more democratic understanding of the relationship between the *populus Romanus* and the aristocracy.

new values were slowly added as social norms and political events required. As a result, the set

of values held in common by the Roman aristocracy changed over time as the citizen-body of

Rome grew, as the society came into contact with other peoples, and as newly enfranchised elites

sought to add, appropriate, or modify existing values so as to be able to claim legitimacy.

Evidence of Republican aristocratic values comes from an anecdote provided by Pliny the

Elder about Quintus Metellus' praise of his father, Lucius Caecilius Metellus, a victorious

general in the First Punic war. The values reported in this funeral oration expands previous ones,

and Pliny tells us that Metellus said,

> Lucius had been pontifex, consul twice, dictator, master of the cavalry, and a
> member of the fifteen-person board assigning land. He led many elephants from
> the first Punic war in triumph, he had achieved the ten greatest and best
> achievements, which wise men spend their lives seeking: for he had wished to be
> a warrior of the first rank, the best orator, the bravest commander, that the greatest
> affairs be conducted by his will, that he enjoy the greatest honor, be considered
> the greatest senator, that he find much wealth honorably, that he leave behind
> many children and be most famous in the state; these things happened to him and
> not to any other since the foundation of Rome.[75]

Service to the state was among the foremost values that Roman elite possessed, in part because

this was the way in which men could attain fame and wealth.[76] Thus, mid-Republican values

---

Following in his footsteps, Sumi (2006) examines the public nature of political activity at Rome, and how
the public had a larger role to play in late Republican politics than is traditionally thought.

[75] Pliny *HN* 7.139-140: *Q. Metellus in ea oratione, quam habuit supremis laudibus patris sui L. Metelli
pontificis, bis consulis, dictatoris, magistri equitum, quindecemviri agris dandis, qui plurimos elephantos
ex primo Punico bello duxit in triumpho…decem maximas res optimasque, in quibus quaerendis
sapientes aetatem exigerent, consummasse eum: voluisse enim primarium bellatorem esse, optimum
oratorem, fortissimum imperatorem, auspicio suo maximas res geri, maximo honore uti, summa sapientia
esse, summum senatorem haberi, pecuniam magnam bono modo invenire, multos liberos relinquere et
clarissimum in civitate esse. haec contigisse ei nec ulli alii post Romam conditam.*

[76] Rosenstein (2006), 370-1:"This strong link at Rome between service to the Republic and personal
prestige had two important consequences. First, aristocratic ambition provided the impetus that made the
government go. No salaries attached to public office; no professional bureaucracy managed the city's
day-to-day affairs. The operation of the government depended entirely upon the voluntary efforts of
individual members of the upper class who, in so doing, both sought prestige but at the same time defined
themselves as members of the Republic's elite…. Second, the linkage meant that office holding assumed
enormous importance in the economy of aristocratic values, for it was tenure of a magistracy that enabled
a person to perform the greatest services for Rome, confer the greatest benefits upon his fellow-citizens,

included military valor (*virtus*), wisdom (*sapientia*), being a skilled orator, obtaining wealth honorably, fertility, being famous (*clarissimus*) and achieving praise for one's deeds (*laus*).

Additionally, some fragments dating to the late 2nd and the 1st centuries BCE articulate negative *exempla* of aristocratic values. L. Cornelius Sisenna remarks on individuals who feel too much joy, have insufficient mental ability, or lack control of their minds.[77] Munatius Rufus, in his laudation of Marcus Cato's governance of Cyprus, offers as evidence that fact that when Cato was transporting money from Cyprus to Rome he neither profited nor spent the money on sexual indulgences.[78] Striking a similar tone, Quadrigarius condemns wasting money in luxury and wickedness.[79] These negative exempla and many others were examined more thoroughly in the works of Sallust and Livy.

The vast majority of these values remained in place, or perhaps even gained importance, in elite circles of the late Republic. Aristocratic competition, which had been so productive for the Republic when turned outward, undermined the very foundations of the political structures of Rome in the 1st century. The achievements of ever-greater commands and prestige by their fathers and grandfather compelled descendants to seek similar modes of power. But more importantly, as certain aristocrats turned to newly enfranchised members of the senate for support and to municipalities for their votes, members of the old aristocracy found their status, identity, and way of life threatened. These newcomers would bring different ideas about what it meant to be Roman to the venerable institution while embracing certain aspects of the old aristocracy's identity, including many of their values.

At the end of the Republic, there were plenty of individuals of all types still driven by

---

and so win the greatest glory."
[77] Sissena, preserved by Nonius 527M = 847L and Non. 58M =81L; Cornell (2013) vol. 2, F46, 628-629 and 634-635.
[78] Munatius Rufus, preserved by Valerius Maximus 4.3.2; Cornell (2013) vol. 2, F1, 740-741.
[79] Q. Claudius Quadrigatus, preserved by Gellius 6.11.7; Cornell (2013) vol. 2, F10, 504-505.

competition to foment strife, either politically or militarily and competition for recognition (*laus*), increased reputation (*dignitas*), virtue (*virtus*), and authority (*auctoritas*) continued well into the Julio-Claudian period. There is perhaps no better summation of how varied aristocratic values had become than Sallust's famous comparison between Cato and Caesar in the *Bellum Catilinae*. He tells us,

> But in my memory there were two men with great virtue, though with different manners, Marcus Cato and Gaius Caesar. With respect to these men, since an opportunity has presented itself, it was not my plan to pass them by in silence without my investigating the nature and character of each to the best of my ability. Therefore, they were nearly on par in birth, age, eloquence; the greatness of their minds was equal, likewise their fame, but differently in each. Caesar was considered great for his favors and his generosity, Cato because of the integrity of his life. The former was made famous by his kindness and compassion; for the latter, seriousness augmented dignity. Caesar acquired renown by giving, by supporting, and by forgiving, Cato by bestowing nothing. In the one there was a refuge for the wretched, in the other, ruin for the evil. The indulgence of the former was praised, the steadfastness of the latter. Finally, Caesar intended to work and be careful, to ignore his own business while focusing on that of his friends, to deny nothing that was worthy to give. He was hoping for a great command for himself, an army, and a new war where his courage could shine. But for Cato there was a zeal for moderation, propriety, but most of all, seriousness; he did not combat wealth by means of wealth, nor factions with factionalism, but with strong excellence, with moderate shame, and with innocent self-restraint. He preferred to be good rather than seem it. So the less he sought fame, the more it followed him.[80]

This passage enumerates the wide variety of ways for aristocrats to be successful in the political

---

[80] Sall. *Cat*. 53.6-54.6: *Sed memoria mea ingenti virtute, divorsis moribus fuere viri duo, M. Cato et C. Caesar. Quos quoniam res obtulerat, silentio praeterire non fuit consilium, quin utriusque naturam et mores, quantum ingenio possum, aperirem. Igitur iis genus, aetas, eloquentia prope aequalia fuere, magnitudo animi par, item gloria, sed alia alii. Caesar beneficiis ac munificentia magnus habebatur, integritate vitae Cato. Ille mansuetudine et misericordia clarus factus, huic severitas dignitatem addiderat. Caesar dando, sublevando, ignoscundo, Cato nihil largiundo gloriam adeptus est. In altero miseris perfugium erat, in altero malis pernicies. Illius facilitas, huius constantia laudabatur. Postremo Caesar in animum induxerat laborare, vigilare; negotiis amicorum intentus sua neglegere, nihil denegare quod dono dignum esset; sibi magnum imperium, exercitum, bellum novum exoptabat, ubi virtus enitescere posset. At Catoni studium modestiae, decoris, sed maxume severitatis erat. non divitiis cum divite neque factione cum factioso, sed cum strenuo virtute, cum modesto pudore, cum innocente abstinentia certabat; esse quam videri bonus malebat: ita, quo minus petebat gloriam, eo magis illum assequebatur.*

arena, containing values still familiar from earlier periods of the Republic. At the same time it emphasizes relationships and moral character beyond the context of military situations.

Inculcated with these values generation after generation, Roman aristocrats knew how they should act in nearly any circumstance, thanks to the transmission of stories about historical figures who provided both positive and negative exempla for them to follow. These exempla, with which Roman youths were educated from an early age, combined with the expectations of their *gens* to imitate and surpass their ancestors formed a link with the past that preserved ideas about what it meant to be a Roman aristocrat. In this way, aristocratic values, despite their change over time, were an institution of memory that continued to inform aristocratic behavior and actions well into the Principate.

Performance: Triumphs and Funerals

From early in the history of the Roman city, aristocratic families demonstrated the excellence of their ancestors and aristocratic values in public displays.[81] It was through public performance that family members could advance the family name, legitimize their powerful political positions, and demonstrate their service to the state. The Senate granted both the privilege of the triumph and the right to a public funeral, making these three institutions of memory connected for much of the Roman Republic. While the consuls were elected by the people, these public processions served not only as advertisements during election season but

---

[81] Hölkeskamp (2010), esp. 53-75; Östenberg (2015), 16. Sumi (2005), 1, examines some of these institutions from another perspective, more in keeping with the controversial work first done by Millar (1998): "This study, then will focus on those public ceremonies at which the elite and governed came into contact, where political power was on display, where the elite attempted to justify its privileged status as political leaders and the people confirmed this status or wrested it away: oratory at public meetings (*contiones*) and the law courts (*quaestiones*), voting assemblies (*comitia*), public entertainment (*ludi* and *munera*), and festivals, funerals, and triumphs."

also as reinforcements of societal hierarchies that placed the aristocratic families in control of the

state. As Rosenstein argues,

> The collective ascendancy of the Senate, in other words, rested upon the citizens'
> regular, almost ritual approbation of individual aristocrats' claims to have lived up
> to the set of elite ideals that both Rome's rulers and the public embraced. With
> every public judgment that someone had so well served the res publica through
> his courage in battle, his solicitude for clients, and his management of the public's
> business that he deserved to be elevated to high office, the leadership of those
> who collectively embodied those ideals was legitimated and strengthened. And
> from this perspective, the pageantry that advertised the success of individual
> aristocrats in meeting these ideals – triumphs, funerals, and the like – was just one
> more way in which the public, by its participation and approval, could voice its
> acquiescence in and support for the moral economy that underpinned the elite's
> supremacy at Rome.[82]

The symbiotic benefit of these public processions to both the aristocracy and the people was the

creation and maintenance of a particular Roman identity that could be passed down from

generation to generation during the performance of the rituals.[83] These processions had

enormous purchase among Rome's citizens because of their inclusive nature and the way that

they defined Roman values.

The importance of these public performances continued throughout the Republican

period, and indeed grew in importance during the 1st century BCE as a result of increased

aristocratic competition and the influx of new members who had little claim to some of these

public displays.[84] Public funerals and triumphs were reserved for the upper echelon of the Senate,

for those who had achieved exceptional victories or had performed extraordinary service to the

state. Much scholarly work has been done on the topics of aristocratic funerals and triumphs,

---

[82] Rosenstein (2006), 373.

[83] Latham (forthcoming), 8 notes that "both the *pompa triumphalis* and *pompa funebris* were seemingly
more politically consequential [than the *pompa circensis*], their spectacle might have been more
captivating, their place in the Roman social imaginary larger."

[84] On funerals, see Flower (1996), 91-127. On speeches and public processions / ceremonies, see Latham
(forthcoming) specifically on the *pompa circensis* and more generally Sumi (2005), 1-15: he describes
them as "ceremonies of power" in which aristocrats communicated with the people and vied with each
other. On triumphs, see Versnel (1970) and Beard (2007).

making any comprehensive synthesis here impossible. Instead, I will briefly attempt to situate these institutions in their aristocratic and cultural milieu so as to understand their impact on Romans in the 1st centuries BCE and CE.

Perhaps the oldest of these public displays was the Roman triumph. Traditionally dating back to the Regal period, the triumph was a procession through the city granted to a victorious general by the Senate after a significant victory. In most scholarship on the Roman triumph, the focus has primarily been on ascertaining the components of the procession (from who took part to what the individuals wore and beyond), its origins (spurring long philological discussions of the relationship between θρίαμβος and *triumpe* and the Hellenistic / Greek origins of the procession), and its route through the city.[85] More recent scholarship has recognized the fact that our sources on the triumph are late, dating from the end of the 1st century BCE, and reflect more about their contemporary ideas on the procession than any kind of historical accuracy.[86] Art historians and archaeologists have also explored the subject of the triumph due to topographical interests and the wide variety of material culture that has triumphal imagery, including but not limited to coins, burial monuments, arches, and statues.[87] Scholars have struggled to find the 'facts' of the triumph asking questions about who celebrated them, what the route was, and

---

[85] Versnel (1970) remains the most comprehensive study on the Roman triumph. These mechanical elements comprise the focus of the first part of his monograph. He clearly lays out the previous debates and the evidence, but in so doing assumes his audience has as firm a grasp on the institution as he did. The second part attempts a synthesis of the elements discussed in Part I, concluding that the ritual was Etruscan in origins, influenced by ideas of Hellenistic kingship, and rooted in Roman conceptions of *rex*. This remains a valuable contribution, but does not engage with the social context of the triumph. Richardson (1975) examines the triumph in the early second century BCE. Finally, Beard (2008) engages many of the same questions, but seeks to complicate our understanding the procession of the triumph by questioning the sources and modern assumptions that have no basis in our sources.
[86] Beard (2008), 294-5.
[87] On the imagery of the triumph, see Brilliant (1999), 221-229; 183-191; on the route of the procession, see Coarelli (1968) and Favro (1994).

whether the *triumphator* was a god or simply-god like for a day.[88] The fact remains that many of

these questions remain unanswerable because we lack the evidence or evidence dates to such a

later period it is difficult to know how accurately it describes the distant past.

That the triumph was an important component of Roman aristocratic identity is an

accepted fact.[89] Not only was the triumph often the pinnacle of an aristocrat's political career, it

served also as a celebration for all of Rome involving all segments of society from the army to

the people to the Senate.[90] The ceremony, in brief, entailed the victorious *triumphator* riding in a

four-horse chariot, with his face painted in red in imitation of Jupiter and wearing the purple

triumphal outfit topped with a golden crown.[91] Preceding him were his troops jeering bawdy

jokes as they passed the people gathered to watch, placards with illustrations of the important

battles, spices and other material rewards of conquest, and prisoners of war about to be executed

before the sacrifice on the Capitolium.[92]

In the middle Republic, the Senate awarded triumphs to the victorious generals they

deemed worthy or, at least, politically expedient to appease. Later, the procession was only

awarded to consuls while two other victory celebrations, the *ovatio* and the triumph on the Alban

Mount were available for lesser military achievements.[93] As Richardson noted, the number of

---

[88] Versnel (1970); Beard (2008); see also Chapter 3.

[89] For a concise history and description of the procession, see Sumi (2005) 29-35.

[90] Östenberg, Malmberg, and Bjørnebye (2015), 4: "Elite movement could be interpreted…as dialogue between the elite and the *populus Romanus*."

[91] Suet. *Iul*. 49.4.

[92] Plut. *Pomp*. 45.2, Plin. *HN* 7.98; Plut. *Aem*. 34.1-4; Liv. 45.39.14; The triumph on the Alban Mount was the only of the three not to require senatorial grant, see Richardson (1975), 52

[93] On the differences between a triumph and an *ovatio*, see Plut. *Marc*. 22; Plin. *HN* 15.19; and Gell. *NA* 5.5.20-23. Beard (2008) 290: "On a smaller scale, the triumphal chronology does reveal some striking changes in the pattern of celebration. The triumph on the Alban Mount, for example, is first attested in 231 BCE, is celebrated four times over the next sixty years, and is not heard of again after 172. The pattern of the twenty-one known ovations, between the first in 503 BCE and the dictatorship of Caesar, is even more complicated: there is a clutch in the early years of the Republic, then a long gap (none, or perhaps one, celebrated between 360 and Marcellus' ovation in 211), followed by a rash of seven between

triumphs dramatically increased after 200 BCE and according to the *Fasti Triumphales*, there were triumphs on almost a yearly basis in the 1st century BCE.[94] The names of the *triumphatores* inscribed include members of the most famous and prominent *gentes*. This institution linked each *triumphator* to his predecessors, who more often than not were his colleagues, his ancestors, or the colleagues of his ancestors.

In recent studies of movement through the eternal city, it has been argued that monuments and routes themselves were conduits of memory as well as expressions of aristocratic communication and competition.[95] In addition to conveying memory, the triumph made distinctions between Romans and non-Roman captives, different classes of Romans, and were a celebration of the very aristocratic values that trickled down to shape most classes of society.[96] Moreover, while the rituals and the triumphs changed over time, as all institutions do, they maintained their importance in society and as aristocratic advertisement well into the early Principate.

Funerals served as another important public display of the accomplishments and importance of aristocratic families in the Republic.[97] Polybius explains the funeral ceremonies he witnessed in Rome to his primarily Greek audience, describing in detail what Roman aristocrats valued and sought to remember. He writes:

---

200 and 174, then a lull again until three were celebrated in the late second and early first centuries BCE —each for victories in slave wars."

[94] Richardson (1975), 52-7. Because they were displayed in the Augustan era, the *Fasti Triumphales* will be discussed in more detail in Chapter 3.

[95] Östenberg, Malmberg, and Bjørnebye (2015), 4.

[96] Östenberg, Malmberg, and Bjørnebye (2015), 4: "Identity is central to this discussion and will be noted as both inclusion (movement as expression of common ideas) and exclusion (restricted movements, and movement as expression of power, status, and gender)."

[97] Bodel (1999), 259-281, esp. 259: "The ceremonial conventions of Roman funerals served the interests of elite self-advertisement, and the emotional charge invested in these regularly recurring public rituals made them natural vehicles for the popular expression of grief or protest."

Whenever one of their illustrious men dies, in the course of his funeral, the body with all of its paraphernalia is carried into the forum to the Rostra, as a raised platform there is called…[H]is son…or, failing him, one of his relations mounts the Rostra and delivers a speech concerning the virtues of the deceased and the successful exploits performed by him in his lifetime…after the burial…they place the likeness of the deceased in the most conspicuous spot in his house…These likenesses they display at public sacrifices adorned with much care. And when any illustrious member of the family dies, they carry these masks to the funeral, putting them on men…as like the originals as possible in height and other personal peculiarities. And these substitutes assume clothes according to the rank of the person represented. If he was a consul or praetor, a toga with purple stripes; if a censor, whole purple; if he had also celebrated a triumph or performed any exploit of that kind, a toga embroidered with gold. These representatives also ride themselves in chariots, while the fasces and axes and all the other customary insignia of the particular offices lead the way…On arriving at the Rostra, they all take their seats on ivory chairs in their order. There could not easily be a more inspiring spectacle than this for a young man of noble ambitions and virtuous aspirations…Besides the speaker over the body about to be buried, after having finished they panegyric of this particular person, starts upon the others whose representatives are present, beginning with the most ancient, and recounts the successes and achievements of each. By this means, the glorious memory of brave men is continually renewed; the fame of those who have performed any noble deed is never allowed to die…But the chief benefit of the ceremony is that it inspires young men to shrink from no exertion for the general welfare, in the hope of obtaining the glory, which awaits the brave (Trans. Shuckburgh).[98]

---

[98] Polyb. 6.52.11-54.3: ἐν δὲ ῥηθὲν ἱκανὸν ἔσται σημεῖον τῆς τοῦ πολιτεύματος σπουδῆς, ἣν ποιεῖ(ται) περὶ τὸ τοιούτους ἀποτελεῖν ἄνδρας ὥστε πᾶν ὑπομένειν χάριν τοῦ τυχεῖν ἐν τῇ πατρίδι τῆς ἐπ' ἀρετῇ φήμης. Ὅταν γὰρ μεταλλάξῃ τις παρ' αὐτοῖς τῶν ἐπιφανῶν ἀνδρῶν, συντελουμένης τῆς ἐκφορᾶς κομίζεται μετὰ τοῦ λοιποῦ κόσμου πρὸς τοὺς καλουμένους ἐμβόλους εἰς τὴν ἀγορὰν ποτὲ μὲν ἑστὼς ἐναργής, σπανίως δὲ κατακεκλιμένος. πέριξ δὲ παντὸς τοῦ δήμου στάντος, ἀναβὰς ἐπὶ τοὺς ἐμβόλους, ἂν μὲν υἱὸς ἐν ἡλικίᾳ καταλείπηται καὶ τύχῃ παρών, οὗτος, εἰ δὲ μή, τῶν ἄλλων εἴ τις ἀπὸ γένους ὑπάρχει, λέγει περὶ τοῦ τετελευτηκότος τὰς ἀρετὰς καὶ τὰς ἐπιτετευγμένας ἐν τῷ ζῆν πράξεις. δι' ὧν συμβαίνει τοὺς πολλοὺς ἀναμιμνησκομένους καὶ λαμβάνοντας ὑπὸ τὴν ὄψιν τὰ γεγονότα, μὴ μόνον τοὺς κεκοινωνηκότας τῶν ἔργων, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὺς ἐκτός, ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον γίνεσθαι συμπαθεῖς ὥστε μὴ τῶν κηδευόντων ἴδιον, ἀλλὰ κοινὸν τοῦ δήμου φαίνεσθαι τὸ σύμπτωμα. μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα θάψαντες καὶ ποιήσαντες τὰ νομιζόμενα τιθέασι τὴν εἰκόνα τοῦ μεταλλάξαντος εἰς τὸν ἐπιφανέστατον τόπον τῆς οἰκίας, ξύλινα ναΐδια περιτιθέντες. ἡ δ' εἰκών ἐστι κίας, ξύλινα ναΐδια περιτιθέντες. ἡ δ' εἰκών ἐστι πρόσωπον εἰς ὁμοιότητα διαφερόντως ἐξειργασμένον καὶ κατὰ τὴν πλάσιν καὶ κατὰ τὴν ὑπογραφήν. ταύτας δὴ τὰς εἰκόνας ἔν τε ταῖς δημοτελέσι θυσίαις ἀνοίγοντες κοσμοῦσι φιλοτίμως, ἐπάν τε τῶν οἰκείων μεταλλάξῃ τις ἐπιφανής, ἄγουσιν εἰς τὴν ἐκφοράν, περιτιθέντες ὡς ὁμοιοτάτοις εἶναι δοκοῦσι κατά τε τὸ μέγεθος καὶ τὴν ἄλλην περικοπήν. οὗτοι δὲ προσαναλαμβάνουσιν ἐσθῆτας, ἐὰν μὲν ὕπατος ἢ στρατηγὸς ᾖ γεγονώς, περιπορφύρους, ἐὰν δὲ τιμητής, πορφυρᾶς, ἐὰν δὲ καὶ τεθριαμβευκὼς ἤ τι τοιοῦτον κατειργασμένος, διαχρύσους. αὐτοὶ μὲν οὖν ἐφ' ἁρμάτων οὗτοι πορεύονται, ῥάβδοι δὲ καὶ πελέκεις καὶ τἆλλα τὰ ταῖς ἀρχαῖς εἰωθότα συμπαρακεῖσθαι προηγεῖται κατὰ τὴν ἀξίαν ἑκάστῳ τῆς γεγενημένης κατὰ τὸν βίον ἐν τῇ πολιτείᾳ προαγωγῆς ὅταν δ' ἐπὶ τοὺς ἐμβόλους ἔλθωσι, καθέζονται πάντες ἑξῆς ἐπὶ δίφρων

In this passage, Polybius makes clear that public visibility of the family and emphasis on memory of ancestors during the funerary events was paramount to aristocratic Roman identity during the middle Republic. While aristocratic families would commemorate all of their ancestors with funerals, it was only those successful enough to hold curule offices that were awarded *imagines* and possibly also public funerals, paid for by the state with a grave on the Campus Martius.[99] Whether public or private, these public funeral processions affected the practices, ideologies, and identities of non-elite Romans as well by demonstrating the values held by the elite and were emulated by the people.[100]

To date, the most comprehensive study of the *pompa funebris* is contained within Flower's monograph on ancestor masks.[101] Similar in many ways to the *pompa triumphalis*, the

---

ἐλεφαντίνων. οὗ κάλλιον οὐκ εὐμαρὲς ἰδεῖν θέαμα νέῳ φιλοδόξῳ καὶ φιλαγάθῳ· τὸ γὰρ τὰς τῶν ἐπ' ἀρετῇ δεδοξασμένων ἀνδρῶν εἰκόνας ἰδεῖν ὁμοῦ πάσας οἷον εἰ ζώσας καὶ πεπνυμένας τίν' οὐκ ἂν παραστήσαι; τί δ' ἂν κάλλιον θέαμα τούτου φανείη; πλὴν ὅ γε λέγων ὑπὲρ τοῦ θάπτεσθαι μέλλοντος, ἐπὰν διέλθῃ τὸν περὶ τούτου λόγον, ἄρχεται τῶν ἄλλων ἀπὸ τοῦ προγενεστάτου τῶν παρόντων, καὶ λέγει τὰς ἐπιτυχίας ἑκάστου καὶ τὰς πράξεις. ἐξ ὧν καινοποιουμένης ἀεὶ τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἀνδρῶν τῆς ἐπ' ἀρετῇ φήμης ἀθανατίζεται μὲν ἡ τῶν καλόν τι διαπραξαμένων εὔκλεια, γνώριμος δὲ τοῖς πολλοῖς καὶ παραδόσιμος τοῖς ἐπιγινομένοις ἡ τῶν εὐεργετησάντων τὴν πατρίδα γίνεται δόξα. ἡ τῶν εὐεργετησάντων τὴν πατρίδα γίνεται δόξα. τὸ δὲ μέγιστον, οἱ νέοι παρορμῶνται πρὸς τὸ πᾶν ὑπομένειν ὑπὲρ τῶν κοινῶν πραγμάτων χάριν τοῦ τυχεῖν τῆς συνακολουθούσης τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς τῶν ἀνδρῶν εὐκλείας.

[99] Flower (1996), 96: "Such funerals [public funerals] were the exception because they were given 'at public expense' and the state provided the grave, usually on the Campus Martius. However these funerals were few and are not attested before Sulla. They were a feature of the heightened competition for recognition in the late Republic. They were also unusual for their grandeur since they were not subject to the normal rules which limited lavish displays at funerals."

[100] Flower (1996), 127: "When viewed as a pageant of Rome's history, it is hard to imagine a more accessible source of these traditions for the ordinary Roman citizen. Polybius stressed how such funerals made the past seem alive and relevant to present concerns. The spectacle, centred around the imagines of the ancestors, acted as powerful verification of traditional values and especially of the success and prestige of the families represented. The public part of an aristocratic funeral, which comprised the procession of ancestors and the funeral eulogy in the Forum, was reserved for the families of office-holders and set them apart from ordinary citizens in a conspicuous way. The spectators were made to feel an integral part of a celebration of the common heritage they shared with their leaders. A sense of community was created between different layers of society and between generations. The continuity and prestige of the family's overall position was emphasized at a moment of significant change when a member was lost."

[101] Flower (1996), Chapter 4, pgs 91-127, but also see Wiseman (1974); Bodel (1999), 259-281; and

aristocratic funeral existed to revive the illustrious ancestors of the deceased, allow them to process through the streets of the city, and advertise a family's contributions to the state.[102] By actually becoming their ancestors or having actors become their ancestors through the wearing of the *imagines*, descendants and actors were brought back to life their ancestors at every funeral of prominent family members.[103] As a result, each generation of a particular family would be reminded of their ancestor's exploits and accomplishments any time a family member died.[104] After the procession, the wealthiest aristocratic families would host a public banquet for the people, which provided yet another opportunity to reflect on the standing of the family, the accomplishments of the deceased and his ancestors, and the values to which all present should adhere.

Conclusions

Aristocratic identity in the mid Roman Republic was intimately linked to these institutions of memory. The Senate itself functioned as a place where memory and identity were defined by its membership and aristocrats within its membership appealed to their family lineages, their ancestor's accomplishments, and their own fulfillment of shared values to advance their careers and social standing. As aristocratic competition increased in the first century BCE after the Social War and with the eventual admission of Italian elites into the senatorial ranks,

---

Östenberg (2015).

[102] Flower (1996), 91-2. Östenberg (2015), 19-20 notes that the triumphal procession, the ceremony through which a young man joins public life, and the funeral procession all involve movement between the house, the Forum, the Capitolium, and a gate of the city.

[103] Flower (1996), 2.

[104] Flower (1996), 122-125: The first instance of a woman having a funeral procession and eulogy comes in 102 BCE, when the consul Q. Lutatius Catulus eulogized his mother, Popilia. This seems to have set a precedent with attestations of aristocratic women of the 1st century BCE increasingly given the same treatment as men.

these institutions assumed ever more important places in the lives of Romans from old

aristocratic families and served as the standards against which both lesser ranked senators and

novi homines were impossibly measured.

The next chapter examines how two members of the Italian elite, Cicero and Augustus,

attempted to appropriate and modify these institutions in order to advance their own political

careers on the one hand and eliminate the threat of aristocratic competition on the other. Many

of the reforms in aristocratic culture advocated by Cicero and implemented by Augustus reacted

against the narrow understanding of what it meant to be Roman that these institutions of memory

supported, and ultimately sparked the contentious debates over elite Roman identities that

persisted into the Julio-Claudian regime.

Chapter Three: A Tale of Two "Outsiders"

In the turbulent year of 63 BCE, the consul Marcus Tullius Cicero offered a defense of

Lucius Licinius Murena, *consul designatus*, on the charge of bribery (*ambitus*). In the speech,

Cicero found himself answering the charge that Murena was of humble origins made by Servius

Sulpicius Rufus, one of the prosecutors and descendant of a most ancient and patrician Roman

family. In his response to this charge, Cicero expressed a considerable amount of

disappointment:

> Although I now thought, judges, that it had been accomplished by my labor that
> mean origins not be set against many brave men, I who attend to the matter of the
> remembrance not only of the Curii, Catones, Pompeians, those most brave men of
> ancient families, but of new men, these recent families, the Marii, Didii, and
> Caelii. In truth, since I had broken those barriers of the nobility after so great a
> period of time, so that the approach to the consulship, as it had among our
> ancestors, hereafter lay open no more to the nobility than to the virtuous, I did not
> think that the prosecutors would speak about the newness of his family when the
> consul designate from an ancient and famous family was being defended by a
> consul and son of a Roman knight.[1]

Remarkably, Cicero did not rebut the charge that Murena came from a new family when this

would have been the easiest way for it to be addressed. Murena, as a member of the plebian *gens*

Licinia, could trace the history of his family's political participation at Rome back to the early

days of the Republic and could claim consular ancestors from the mid fourth century onward.

Instead, Cicero addressed the insult itself, suggesting instead that the ancestry standard was

---

[1] Cic. *Mur.* 17: *Quamquam ego iam putabam, iudices, multis viris fortibus ne ignobilitas generis obiceretur meo labore esse perfectum, qui non modo Curiis, Catonibus, Pompeiis, antiquis illis fortissimis viris, novis hominibus, sed his recentibus, Mariis et Didiis et Caeliis, commemorandis id agebam. Cum vero ego tanto intervallo claustra ista nobilitatis refregissem, ut aditus ad consulatum posthac, sicut apud maiores nostros fuit, non magis nobilitati quam virtuti pateret, non arbitrabar, cum ex familia vetere et inlustri consul designatus ab equitis Romani filio consule defenderetur, de generis novitate accusatores esse dicturos.*

outdated and it was now inappropriate to hold 'mean origins' against men. The mean origins to

which Cicero referred is that of *novi homines*, who had no accomplished ancestors, did not

belong to the old Roman aristocracy, and had only recently, but reluctantly, been given greater

purchase in the Roman political system.[2] As this passage makes clear, family lineage was still

one of the key components to Roman aristocratic identity in the middle of the 1st century BCE.

But perhaps more telling is Cicero's disappointment that it continued to be.

       In his rejection of the ancestry claim here, Cicero instead carefully suggested that bravery

(*fortis*) should have more import than ancestry. Cicero skillfully linked the names of *novi*

homines (Marii, Didii, and Caelii) to aristocratic names (Curii, Catones, and Pompeians)

inseparable from the virtue of bravery in Roman history, making an argument that the recent

achievements of members from the *gentes* Maria, Didia, and Caelia were as important to Roman

political life as those of the most ancient families and ought to be remembered as a result.

Additionally, he states that politics in the past had been more open and welcoming to new men

than they were in his contemporary day. This at once appeals to the *mos maiorum* (custom of the

ancestors), lending gravity and antiquity to his argument regardless of whether or not it was

true.[3]

       At the same time though, Cicero hesitated not at all to bring his own accomplishments to

the aid of both his defendant and his own reputation. The passage suggests that the intention

---

[2] van der Blom (2010) examines Cicero's works to understand his use of *exempla* as a *novus homo* both to serve his own political career and to be a model for other *novi homines*. In her analysis, van der Blom argues that Cicero emulated a variety of historical figures in order to legitimate his claim to political office. She argues that Cicero continually had to defend his position in the Roman Senate against the better claims of those members of old aristocratic families and adapted his behavior and persona to fit the specific needs of the context in which he found himself at any given time, resulting in a variety of behaviors that at times were contradictory. Where van der Blom sees Cicero attempt to create *exempla* and becoming one himself, I see Cicero advocating different ways of being a Roman senator that sought to undermine aristocratic institutions of memory to which he had no access.

[3] Linke (2010).

behind Cicero's labor for the consulship was, at least in part, to open the path for other *novi homines*. He takes up the position of remembrancer of these famous Roman families, thus insinuating himself into the Roman aristocracy, if not into the families themselves. He simultaneously acknowledges his position as remembrancer of new families as well as his own status as a new man. Cicero's achievement of breaking through the barriers the Roman aristocracy had erected around the most coveted political office was the first of its kind in nearly 30 years and his speech makes the case that it was his *virtus* that enabled him to do so.[4] It was this virtue that also enabled Cicero to claim common ancestors with all present listening to the case. By using the inclusive *maiores nostros*, Cicero includes himself in the category of Roman descendants. The sentence as a whole emphasizes the traditional value of *virtus* as a quality those seeking the consulship should possess rather than simply being born into a noble family.

This passage illustrates the very real difficulties new men faced in Roman political life and the Senate at this time.[5] In the last chapter, an examination of aristocratic institutions of memory demonstrated the ways in which the Roman nobility defined and advertised their identities into the 1st century BCE. The focus of this chapter is to explore the perspective of the most famous of new men, Cicero, and to determine how his discussions of new men sought to expand the traditional set of values Roman aristocrats lived by. At the same time, in his search for social acceptance and inclusion Cicero participated in some of the same activities that were so fundamentally important to aristocratic identity, including public processions and speeches,

---

[4] Wiseman (1971), 7.

[5] The difficulty is described most succinctly in Quintus Cicero's essay on Running for Consul where he described in detail how a new man should go about seeking the consulship, providing advice that ranged from what to say and how to conduct oneself in public to instruction on how to cultivate friendship for votes. His advice included being transparent about being a *novus homo*. See Cicero, *Comment. pet.* 1.2: *Prope cottidie tibi hoc ad forum descendenti meditandum est: "Novus sum, consulatum peto, Roma est." Nominis novitatem dicendi gloria maxime sublevabis.* "Nearly every day as you descend into the forum, you must reflect on your situation: 'I am a new man. I seek the consulship. This is Rome.' You will raise up the newness of your name most of all through praise of your speaking ability."

advertisement of family heritage, and political office. Walking this fine line between promoting new values and new men and appealing to aristocratic institutions of memory proved to be somewhat successful for Cicero. For another quasi-outsider, Gaius Octavius Thurinus the future emperor Augustus, Cicero's attempts at creating an inclusive environment did not go far enough. In his long lifetime, Augustus would systematically appropriate these aristocratic institutions of memory in order to check the power of the Roman nobility and create a new social order in the Roman Senate.

Cicero and Arpinum

Cicero was born in 103 BCE to a wealthy *eques* of Arpinum, located approximately 120 km (75 mi) south and east of Rome.[6] The town had long ties with Rome, beginning when it was captured from the Samnites at the end of the 4th century BCE.[7] At that point, Arpinum became a *praefectura*, a judicial center where Roman magistrates (*praefecti*) would come periodically to

---

[6] One component that is missing from this dissertation is an accounting of how the equestrian class came to be prominent in the late Republic and early Imperial period. Nicolet (1966) remains the fundamental study of the Equestrian order in the Republican period. He began his study by defining the order as belonging to the *equites equo publico* and having the census rating of 400,000 sesterces. He then examined the legal institutions that affected the equestrian order (the equestrian census, the 18 tribes, and their role in elections). Next he examined the relationship equestrians had with senators, their influence in literature, and their struggle for control of the courts. For the Julio-Claudian period, Demougin (1982) built off the work of Nicolet. On 546, she argued that Claudius oversaw the recruitment of equites on a broader basis, although the order originated primarily in Italy until the end of the Julio-Claudian period, with changes in the proportion recruited from the Regiones. Through prosopographical evidence, she reveals thirty-one men recruited from Rome and Italy (540). In her edited volume, Demougin et al. (1999) analyze the rise of the equestrian order from the 2nd century BCE to the 3rd century CE throughout the empire and various authors argued that equestrians were powerful in local and municipal life all over the Empire and sought upward marriage strategies for advancement. On Spain, see Caballos Rufino (1999). On Asia, see Demougin (1999); Raepsaet-Charlier (1999), 215-36, demonstrates that the primary mode was the marriage of the daughters of already high-status equites into senatorial families; at a lower level municipal elites used the order in a similar fashion to rise socially. On equestrians in the early Principate, see Saddington (1996).
[7] Diod. Sic. 20. 90 and Liv. 9. 44 and 10. 1.

sit in judgment.[8] As a *praefectura*, Arpinum was subject to Roman laws and overseen by Roman

magistrates when they were sent from Rome, but this occurred sporadically and the town

governed itself with little to no meddling from Rome throughout the 3rd century.[9] Its citizens had

the right of *civitas sine suffragio* until 188 BCE when the grant of full citizenship was made to

the town.[10] The grant of full citizenship, however, mattered little to the average Arpinate

because of the difficulty in and low likelihood of traveling to Rome to exercise that right.[11] For

elite Arpinates, however, the 120 km was not impossible and their wealth ensured that they could

leave to travel. Once they arrived in Rome, however, Italian elites were rarely seen as

thoroughly Roman and certainly not as equals to the Roman nobility despite the connections they

would make to the Roman aristocracy, both in terms of business arrangements and patronage

connections.[12] It was not until after the social war and the restructuring of local Italian

communities that their claim to equal social and political standing would become valid.

Thus, Cicero's father was a citizen of Rome but, as an *eques*, remained outside the

traditional Roman aristocracy despite his dealings with them.[13] It was only after the admission to

the Senate of the Arpinate, Gaius Marius, in about 123 BCE, that access to Roman politics

opened for other elites of Arpinum.[14] Even still, that Arpinum maintained its own political

---

[8] Festus, *Gloss. Lat.* 233.24.

[9] Bispham (2007), 96.

[10] Liv. 38. 36; Festus, *Gloss. Lat.* 262; Cic. *Planc.* 20,

[11] When Cicero is determining what to do before Caesar arrives at Rome on his march from the Po, he determines to go to Arpinum if Caesar approaches along the Appia and from whence there is less likelihood of meeting anyone hostile on the road (Cic. *Att.* 8.16 and 9.1). This may support the notion that Arpinum, even in Cicero's day, was rather off the beaten path. Further testimony from Cicero suggests that it was still difficult to travel to Arpinum on account of the terrible road: Cic. *Att.* 9.9.2: *Arpinum, cum eum convenero, cogito, ne forte aut absim cum veniet aut cursem huc illuc via deterrima*.

[12] Bispham (2007), 244-6 discusses the fact that men from Italian communities had an irreplaceable role in drafting the *leges* that granted municipal status to their towns and cities and would have had to have significant ties to political figures in Rome to get the legislation passed.

[13] Cicero's father had contact with the prominent Romans Marcus Aemelius Scaurus, Marcus Antonius (d. 87 BCE), and Lucius Crassus, at whose house the young Cicero had access to excellent teachers.

[14] Wiseman (1971), 30-31.

character at least through the lifetime of Cicero's grandfather is supported by evidence provided

by Cicero himself. Cicero tells us that the consul Marcus Aemilius Scaurus approved of his

grandfather's opposition to the introduction of a secret ballot around the year 115 BCE by

saying, "Would that you had preferred to be occupied in the highest state with us than in the

municipality."[15] The use of the word "*municipalis*" is an anachronism on the part of Cicero

rather than an accurate description of the political organization of Arpinum at the time since it

was not technically a *municipium* yet. The distinction between the municipal political sphere

and that of the *res publica* is not entirely made clear in this passage, but is nevertheless

significant because it demonstrates that even a closely linked Italian city like Arpinum had some

degree of political independence from Rome and its elite operated in different, but not entirely

unconnected, circles from those in Rome.[16]

In the Social War Arpinum sided with Rome. Despite the fact that its inhabitants had

enjoyed citizenship for nearly 100 years, in 90 BCE Arpinum was given the status of

municipium, the legal institution that paradoxically increased incorporation of peoples into the

Roman political system and simultaneously granted more control to the *municipium* over its

internal affairs.[17] According to Bispham,

> "Belonging to a particular *municipium*, and being a *municeps* (member of the
> *municipium*), was one way of defining a man's place within the Roman state, his
> rights and his duties; the *municipium* was also a place in some sense apart from
> the Roman *res publica*…the new Roman citizen was part of the *populus
> Romanus*; he belonged to a tribe; he had a census rating. The progress of

---

[15] Cic. *Leg.* 3.36: *Ac nostro quidem <avo*** M. Scaurus consul> qui cum res esset ad se delata, {M. Scaurus consul} 'Utinam' inquit 'M. Cicero, isto animo atque virtute in summa re publica nobiscum versari quam in municipali maluisses.'*

[16] See Bispham (2007), 111-112 and Nicolet *REL* (1967), 287-8, for further discussion.

[17] See Sherwin-White's (1973) discussion of the fact that Roman citizenship did not negate incompatibility of membership in another community (especially pages 57-58). In other words, citizenship does not a Roman make and citizenship is not the same thing as municipalization. For discussion of how *municipia* still maintained significant control over internal politics and affairs, see Sherwin-White (1973), 159-160 and Bispham (2007), 112.

municipalization meant that concern for these vital areas, which had once been the prerogative of the Roman state, gradually shifted into the domain of the *municipia*. A man's tribe was generally determined by his *municipium*, his *origo* (legal origin); and the *tabula Heracleensis* envisages decentralization of the census (ll.142-58). Both areas of course continued to have a function within the Roman *res publica*, but the ongoing decentralization of power, financial autonomy, organizational duties, and jurisdiction are a crucial outcome of the municipalization of Italy after the Social War."[18]

For places like Arpinum, whose citizen body had already been granted suffrage, many of the rights of citizenship were already in place, including the right to intermarriage with Romans, the vote, assignment to a tribe, and so on. However, the political structures at Arpinum remained under the control of the Arpinates. With municipalization came the official formation of familiar Roman magistracies, including the *quattuorviri* and *duoviri*, senators and *decuriones,* and recognition by the Roman people in the granting of a charter to the city in question.[19] If anything, elites in Arpinum after the social war both had more autonomy and what they conceived of as a greater link to the city of Rome, since now their own cities looked and functioned like Rome.

This probably had a profound ideological impact on Italian elites, who appeared in Rome ready to participate in political life as equals, only to find Roman aristocrats upholding a series of institutions to which these men had little to no access and which were used to draw distinctions between Romans and others. As Bispham notes, "The emergence of local families onto the broader Italian state, as *equites* or senators, is thus bound up with promotion and/or the acquisition of a *lex*; the *lex* presses for recognition of the collective as a Roman community in much the same way as the local elites press for acceptance by their peers at Rome, and the former can in one sense be interpreted as a function of the latter."[20] This is vitally important to our understanding of the interactions between municipal elites and Roman aristocrats. It was the

---

[18] Bispham (2007), 11; on the census in *municipia* and colonies, see the *Tabula Heracleensis*, 142, and Wiseman (1969), 67-69.
[19] Bispham (2007), 405-407.
[20] Bispham (2007), 245.

process of municipalization that removed the most visible political differences between these two groups, and with the increasingly valid claim that Italian elites had to the upper echelons of Roman political life, aristocrats were forced to find other ways to differentiate themselves. These ways included their claims to the institutions of memory discussed in Chapter Two. These were the social means to draw distinctions between Romans and non-Romans. Despite assumptions that the long relationship to Rome had already thoroughly "Romanized" many of Italy's inhabitants, a more complex picture has emerged of the relationship between Rome and her allies in recent year that calls into question the smooth assimilation of towns throughout Italy.[21] While little suggests that Arpinum preserved its own language and customs in the face of Roman expansion and incorporative policies, we must be hesitant about making assumptions about assimilation because of evidence from other locations and the difficulty that Cicero himself had in making his way in Roman politics as a *novus homo*.[22]

Thus Cicero saw the municipalization of Arpinum when he was serving on the Roman side in the Social war, under Pompeius Strabo, father to Pompey the Great, and later Sulla. The grant of municipal status to his hometown, along with his own service to Rome, his family's ties to Roman aristocratic households, and the success of previous Arpinates, including Gaius Marius, seven times consul, probably encouraged Cicero to enter into Roman politics. But his sense of equality as a Roman citizen must have been short lived. As a man from Arpinum, a

---

[21] Postcolonial reactions against the top-down perspectives advocated by classicists in the 1970s have produced a number of monographs examining specific relationships between Italian cities and Rome, which seek to complicate the traditional Romanization model of complete assimilation shortly after conquest. For an example of this assumption about Arpinum specifically, see Rawson (1975), 1. For discussion, see Lomas (2013), Haussler (2013), Isayev (2013), and Dench (2006).

[22] Inscriptions, including one in N. Oscan dialect at Corfino ca. 100 BCE, reevaluation of the archaeological evidence of farms throughout Italy, and the late appearance of villas (once thought to be the indicator of Romanization) suggest that Roman culture, language, and networks did not necessarily follow immediately upon the heels of conquest. See discussions in Keay (2001), Terrenato (2001), and van Dommelen (2007).

town with ties to Rome stretching back hundreds of years, Cicero was given no special differentiation from any other *novus*. Even Cicero himself suggested that Arpinum was rural, off the beaten path, and difficult to reach, while clearly expressing a fondness for his hometown and his own connection to the place.[23] Cicero spent much of his career trying to justify that connection along with his status as a *novus homo*.

Cicero, Aristocratic Values, and the Novus Homo

The many and varied works of Cicero that have survived the millennia give historians of Rome a detailed view into the complex political and social situation of the mid 1st century Republic. Indeed his speeches, letters, and philosophical treatises, often the only contemporary accounts of political events and intellectual debates, achieved fame almost immediately in the Roman world and have come be regarded as some of the most quintessential expressions of Republican Rome. However, Cicero's legacy was far from certain at the time of his death. As a result of our dependence on his sources, Cicero was not as fundamental a person to the political upheavals of the Republic as he suggested in his own works. The fact that he was repeatedly abandoned by his political allies, most notably Pompey before Cicero's exile in 58 and Octavian in the proscriptions of 43, excluded from participation in the assassination of Caesar, and marginalized in the contemporary historical account of Sallust suggests that Cicero was never fully regarded as a member of the aristocracy which he came to defend so passionately in his later treatises. Despite achieving the consulship, his proscription denied him the ceremony of a public funeral and his works were largely relegated to school texts to teach style. As Rawson

---

[23] Cic. *Att*. 2.11.2: *nam Arpinum quid ego te invitem?* " τρηχεῖ᾽, ἀλλ᾽ ἀγαθὴ κουροτρόφος, οὔτ᾽ ἄρ᾽ ἔγωγε / ἧς γαίης δύναμαι γλυκερώτερον ἄλλο ἰδέσθαι; *Att*. 9.6.1: *ergo utar tuo consilio neque me Arpinum hoc tempore abdam, etsi, Ciceroni meo togam puram cum dare Arpini vellem, hanc eram ipsam excusationem relicturus ad Caesarem*; *Att*. 16.8.2: *Romamne venio an hic maneo an Arpinum* (ἀσφάλειαν *habet is locus) fug<i>am ***

notes, "In the first couple [of] centuries after his death his reputation stood less high than it was to do later" and even the 1st century CE rhetorician Quintilian, who praised Cicero "as not the name of a man but of eloquence itself," acknowledged that this could be controversial.[24]

Many of Cicero's early speeches reflect his awkward place in society as a Roman orator and politician but also as a *novus homo*. In order to improve his status, Cicero had to be an astute student of the values and customs of the Roman aristocracy from whom he sought social and political acceptance. From his youth, he had the opportunity as a result of his studies in the house of Lucius Crassus and at Athens with many other aristocratic Roman young men. One of these, Titus Pomponius Atticus, would become Cicero's closest confidant but also, after Cicero's murder, would come to correspond readily with Antony and Octavian.[25] From these circumstances, Cicero would embark on his political career armed with a detailed knowledge of the aristocracy but yet apart from them.

Cicero has long been consulted as a source for aristocratic values, in part because his writings are some of the few to survive in their entirety from the tumultuous 1st century BCE. That Cicero espoused many of the values of the Roman nobility is unsurprising because of his familiarity with them as a pupil in Crassus' household, on account of his experience with his fellow students (aristocrats) in Athens, and his immersion in the Roman political world as a

---

[24] Rawson (1975), 299; Quint. *Inst*. 10.1.112: *Cicero iam non hominis nomen sed eloquentiae habeatur…* and Quint. *Inst*. 10.1.105: *oratores vero vel praecipue Latinam eloquentiam parem facere Graecae possunt: nam Ciceronem cuicumque eorum fortiter opposuerim. Nec ignoro quantam mihi concitem pugnam, cum praesertim non id sit propositi…* Much cited are the less-than-celebratory notices of his death: see Livy (quoted by Sen. *Suas*. 6.17), Assinius Pollio preserved in Sen. *Suas*. 6.24-25, Cornell (2013) vol. 2, F7, 864-865, and most thoroughly and positively, Plut. *Cic*. 47-48. There are many biographies on Cicero including Smith (1966), Stockton (1976), Everitt (2001), and Schuller (2013). Everitt, in particular and as demonstrated by his title *Cicero: the life and times of Rome's Greatest Politician,* takes an unabashedly positivist view of Cicero that is likely more reflective of later opinions of the man than those of his contemporaries.

[25] Nep. *Att*. 19-20.

young orator. Indeed, reference to them is ubiquitous in his works.[26] However, scholars have often overlooked the subtle ways he interwove old aristocratic values with the virtues that *novi homines* could advertise.[27] Cicero did, in fact, attempt to revolutionize elite society by making it more inclusive of *novi homines* like himself, but did so by suggesting that new men shared many of the same virtues of the aristocratic class and brought additional strengths to the Roman political scene. At the same time, Cicero had no interest in enfranchising peoples from outside of Italy, focusing instead on the advancement of Italians.[28]

For the first two decades of his career, Cicero acknowledged his own status as a new man in his works and sought to advance the status of *novi homines* by marrying the values so vaunted among Roman aristocrats with the strengths and values he saw in his fellow new men.[29] These references appear in the published speeches against Verres, *Pro Fonteio*, *Pro Cluentio*, *Pro*

---

[26] For just a few examples, see Cicero's definition of optimates in the *Pro Sestio*, 96-99; the *Philippics* (as negative *exempla*); *De Re Publica*, and *Pro Cluentio*. At *Pro Cluentio* 154, Cicero articulated some of the trappings of Roman senators that were linked to aristocratic values: …*senatorem hoc queri non posse… quodque permulta essent ornamenta quibus eam mitigare molestiam posset, locus, auctoritas, domi splendor, apud exteras nationes nomen et gratia, toga praetexta, sella curulis, insignia, fasces, exercitus, imperia, provinciae; quibus in rebus cum summa recte factis maiores nostri praemia tum plura peccatis pericula proposita esse voluerunt.* [that a senator could not make this complaint… because he had a great many honorable circumstances which in his case might lessen the inconvenience,--the place, the authority, the dignity it gave him at home, the name and influence it conferred on him among foreign nations, the toga praetexta, the curule chair, the ensigns of the rank, the forces, the armies, the military command, the provinces, all which things our ancestors wished to be the greatest rewards for virtuous actions, and by them they wished, also, that there should be the greatest dangers held out, as a terror to offenses.]

[27] Several scholars treat how Cicero talked about aristocratic values in particular works, for example, Pitcher (2008) examines the second *Philippic* as a source for Ciceronian ideas about aristocratic values; Richlin (2002) looks at how conceptions of the body (beginning with Cicero's) reflect societal values in Rome; and MacDonnell (2005) examines Cicero's use of *virtus* through his entire corpus to better understand the metamorphosis of that specific value over time. However, these rarely approach the texts as trying to change the status quo. Additionally, Arno (2012) argues that Cicero did not seek to revolutionize society (p.18) but acknowledges that he was trying to "shape the very definition of Roman identity for his politically elite contemporaries (p. 11)." Rosenstein (2006), 378 goes further and sees in Cicero's writings significant changes to aristocratic values, but focuses instead on their articulation in Sallust.

[28] See Cic. *Pis.* 14 and 47 for his treatment of Gauls and Syrians.

[29] Cicero uses the term *novus homo* in eight of his speeches and treatises (also several times in his letters, but to refer to a specific individual who was a new man) when he is discussing treatment of new men by the aristocracy and social values. These are the passages that I will focus on for this discussion.

Murena, and the *De Lege Agraria*, all made or published between 70 and 63, the latter two during Cicero's consulship. In his later works that reference *novi homines*, Cicero did not explicitly label himself as such when talking specifically about them.[30] These include the *Pro Sestio*, *Pro Plancio*, and the *De Officiis*, dating respectively to 56, 54, and 44 BCE. Whether or not the decision to refer to his own status as a *novus homo* was intentional or signified any change in self-presentation is impossible to know, and may not have been consistent in the works that are now lost to us. It is interesting to note that the difference in treatment coincides with his exile, but anything beyond this observation is mere speculation. How Cicero talked about *novi homines* in these texts reveals his concern for advancing the reputation of new men and his attempt to make aristocratic values more inclusive.[31] There is a marked change from his early texts to the later ones that perhaps signals resignation at achieving change in the conservative institution of the Senate.

In his speeches against Verres, Cicero repeatedly returned to the topic of *novi homines* and the animosity toward them advanced by the Roman nobility. Criticism of the nobility was notably sharp in Cicero's *Actio Secunda* of his Verrine orations, a set of speeches Cicero wrote against Verres that were undelivered but published for circulation and based on courtroom

---

[30] In later speeches and treatises, Cicero makes oblique reference in indirect statement to his status stating that "he was a man arisen from himself" (*quem vos a se ortum*; Cic. *Phil.* 6.17) and that he could "proclaim true glory in this [achieving all magistracies without defeat] on my own behalf" (*mihi ista licte de me vera cum gloria praedicare*; Cic. *Pis.* 2).

[31] van der Blom (2010), 51, discusses the ideology of new men that Cicero presents in his speeches during her analysis of the definition of *novi homines* (pgs. 35-59). She concludes the chapter with "Therefore, an understanding of his usage of the terms *nobilis* and *homo novus* forms a crucial foundation to the analysis of Cicero's promotion of himself through references to his own historical role models" (59) and acknowledges that Cicero was flexible in his usage of both terms. However the chapter does not note the signature difference in usage over time that Cicero seemed to prefer direct reference to his own status early in his career and oblique reference later. In her conclusion, she does note that Cicero "referred to his *novitas* and made a virtue out of it when necessary, but also avoided the issue when detrimental to his case" (325).

testimony.[32] It is significant that these speeches were not delivered in person before members of the jury, which had been comprised entirely of members of the Senate until a short time before this trial when the passage of the Lex Aurelia (c. 70 BCE) ensured equal representation for *equites* and tribunes on juries. At the trial itself, Cicero clearly found sympathetic jurors from these groups (Verres fled on the advice of his counsel, Quintus Hortensius Hortulus, before the nine days allowed for the defense to prepare its case had even elapsed) and it is perhaps to these men that the published Verrines were aimed.[33] During one of his many written attacks on Hortensius, commonly thought of as the best orator of his day, Cicero articulated some of the merits of *novi homines* and the hostility of the nobility toward them:

> Those matters, which seem to be trivial, are not able to change anyone's mind, namely that the vileness and audacity of that man have easier access to your own friendship, Hortensius, and to the friendship of the rest of the great and noble men than our virtue and integrity have. You hate the assiduity of new men, you despise their temperance, you condemn their modesty, and you truly desire that their ability be suppressed and their virtue be abolished: You love Verres![34]

In this passage, Cicero asserted that *novi homines* possessed those aristocratic quality of *virtus* and added in some additional qualities championed by the new comers: *integritas*, *industria*, *frugalitas*, *pudor*, and *ingenium*. Furthermore, Cicero insinuated that the closed-rank mentality

---

[32] Frazel (2004), 128. Butler (2002) sees Cicero's delivered speech against Verres, the *actio prima*, as reflecting his Arpinate origins in a "tightly run equestrian household" and its presentation of Cicero as an "extremely clever collector, organizer, and presenter of evidence" (59-60) but argues that it lacks the *eloquentia* so necessary for Roman senators (84).

[33] Plin. *HN* 3.69; Dyck (2008), 143. Hortensius's family, the plebeian *gens* Hortensia, had been active in Roman politics for at least two generations prior to the orator's success, marking this family as somewhere in the middle between the old nobility and new men like Cicero. On the political Hortensii, see *MRR* 1, 420, 449 and 523-524; Münzer, *RE* 8.2 (1913), 2466.21 s.v. Hortensius no. 4.

[34] Cicero, *Verr. actio* 2, 3.7: *illa quae leviora videntur esse non cuiusvis animum possunt movere, quod ad tuam ipsius amicitiam ceterorumque hominum magnorum atque nobilium faciliorem aditum istius habet nequitia et audacia quam cuiusquam nostrum virtus et integritas? Odistis hominum novorum industriam, despicitis eorum frugalitatem, pudorem contemnitis, ingenium vero et virtutem depressam exstinctamque cupitis: Verrem amatis!*

of the nobility put class and political alliances before the quality of the man in determining *amicitia*.

Later Cicero makes many of the same arguments based on the nobility's hatred of the hardworking nature and virtues of *novi homines*.[35] However, he goes further in suggesting that it is not simply the virtues the aristocracy objects to, rather it is the fact that they consider the *novi homines* to be of a different origin entirely and that origin was not Roman. Cicero complained "There is scarcely one man of noble birth who looks favorably on our industry; there are no services of ours by which we can secure their good-will; they differ from us in disposition and inclination, as if they were of a different origin and a different nature."[36] Cicero claims Romanness but is denied it by the aristocracy.

In the fourth book of the *Actio Secunda*, Cicero attacked the nobility more directly and specifically targeted two of the dearest institutions of memory that the aristocracy used to define their identity at this time, the *imagines* and the *gens*. He argued,

> Finally, let that famous nobility cease to complain that the Roman people more freely granted and have always granted honors to new and assiduous men. That virtue is most powerful in this city, which rules all nations on account of its virtue, must not be lamented. Let the image of Publius Africanus be in other households, let others be honored by the virtue and the name of the dead; that man was so great, so deserving of the Roman people that he ought not be commended to one family but the whole state. It is my duty in any way, because I also belong to his state, which that man made great, distinguished, and famous, especially because to the best of my ability, I am engaged in these virtues in which that man

---

[35] Nearly the exact same complaints can be found in the following speeches of Cicero: Cic. *Verr. actio* 2, 5.181: *Videmus quanta sit in invidia quantoque in odio apud quosdam nobilis homines novorum hominum virtus et industria…* [We see how unpopular with, and how hateful to some men of noble birth, is the virtue and industry of new men]; *Font.* 11: *An vero vos id in testimoniis hominum barbarorum dubitabitis quod persaepe et nostra et patrum memoria sapientissimi iudices de clarissimis nostrae civitatis viris dubitandum non putaverunt? qui Cn. et Q. Caepionibus, L. et Q. Metellis testibus in Q. Pompeium, hominem novum, non crediderunt, quorum virtuti, generi, rebus gestis fidem et auctoritatem in testimonio cupiditatis atque inimicitiarum suspicio derogavit.*

[36] Cic. *Verr. actio* 2, 5.182: *Hominum nobilium non fere quisquam nostrae industriae favet; nullis nostris officiis benivolentiam illorum adlicere possumus; quasi natura et genere diiuncti sint, ita dissident a nobis animo ac voluntate.*

was foremost: equality, assiduity, temperance, defense of the pitiable, hatred of the wicked; a connection of livelihood and occupation which is nearly as important as that of family and name in which you are interested.[37]

The suggestion that other families should display the *imago* of famous Romans, who were not part of their *gens*, was unacceptable. The historian Paulus Clodius, writing around the turn of the 1st century BCE, commented on genealogies falsified after the Gallic sack when the records had been destroyed, but more convincingly condemnatory is the work of the 1st century historian, M. Valerius Messalla Rufus.[38] Nearly an exact contemporary of Cicero, Rufus was born no later than 101 BCE to the most ancient of patrician *gentes* and elected consul in 53 BCE. He wrote his treatise on families and, although the text is lost, a testimony from Pliny may shed light on its contents.[39] Pliny tells us, "There exists a complaint of the orator Messalla, which prohibited another's image from the Laevini to be included in his own lineage. A similar motivation for old Messalla elicited those books, which he wrote about families: when he had passed through the atrium of Scipio Pomponianus and seen those men creeping into the name of Scipio by the testamentary adoption of Salvitto, for this was their cognomen, to the disgrace of the

---

[37] Cic. *Verr. actio* 2, 4.81: *Deinde ista praeclara nobilitas desinat queri populum Romanum hominibus novis industriis libenter honores mandare semperque mandasse. Non est querendum in hac civitate, quae propter virtutem omnibus nationibus imperat, virtutem plurimum posse. Sit apud alios imago P. Africani, ornentur alii mortui virtute ac nomine; talis ille vir fuit, ita de populo Romano meritus est ut non uni familiae sed universae civitati commendatus esse debeat. Est aliqua mea pars virilis, quod eius civitatis sum quam ille amplam inlustrem claramque reddidit, praecipue quod in his rebus pro mea parte versor quarum ille princeps fuit, aequitate, industria, temperantia, defensione miserorum, odio improborum; quae cognatio studiorum et artium prope modum non minus est coniuncta quam ista qua vos delectamini generis et nominis.*

[38] Not much is known about Clodius and his reference is to the falsifying of genealogies by men seeking favor from those who were "trying to force their way into the best families and the most notable houses, although they were not relations." Cf. Clodius as preserved in Plut. *Numa* 1.1.: τὰς μὲν ἀρχαίας ἐκείνας ἀναγραφὰς ἐν τοῖς Κελτικοῖς πάθεσι τῆς πόλεως ἠφανίσθαι, τὰς δὲ νῦν φαινομένας οὐκ ἀληθῶς συγκεῖσθαι δι' ἀνδρῶν χαριζομένων τισὶν εἰς τὰ πρῶτα γένη καὶ τοὺς ἐπιφανεστάτους οἴκους ἐξ οὗ προσηκόντων εἰσβιαζομένοις.

[39] Cornell (2013), 386, refers to the text as *De Familiis* out of convenience, but we do not actually know its title.

Africani)."[40] Although the date of Rufus' treatise is also unknown, this attitude reveals what

Roman aristocrats thought about the insertion of unrelated individuals into aristocratic lineages-

that it was unacceptable and that there was still interest in protecting that institution from

intruders.[41] That Rufus seizes on Scipio as an example might just be coincidental, but the

testimony further reveals that later descendants felt the same way.[42] The close association of the

gens Valeria with the imperial family, beginning with Augustus and continuing into the reigns of

the Claudians, suggests that protecting the lineage of the *gens* from false relations was still a

concern well into the Imperial period.[43]

The next instance where Cicero referred to *novi homines* was in the speech he made in 66

BCE on behalf of Aulus Cluentius Habitus, an Italian from Larinum charged with the murder of

his step-father, Oppianicus, by poison. Eight years before, Cluentius had been embroiled in

another legal case with his family, against the same Oppianicus, and was widely believed to have

bribed the jury (at that point comprised entirely of senators) to ensure his conviction. In a

lengthy digression, Cicero attacked the tribune of the plebs, Lucius Quinctius, who had taken up

the side of Oppianicus after the trial in his own attempts to reform the membership of juries.

This Lucius Quinctius was a new man and Cicero mocked him for his arrogance, purple roble

---

[40] Plin. *HN* 35.8: *exstat Messalae oratoris indignatio, quae prohibuit inseri genti suae Laviniorum alienam imaginem. similis causa Messalae seni expressit volumina illa quae de familiis condidit, cum Scipionis Pomponiani transisset atrium vidissetque adoptione testamentaria Salvittones — hoc enim fuerat cognomen — Africanorum dedecori inrepentes Scipionum nomini.*"

[41] Cornell (2013), 387, suggests the text was written after 46 BCE. This is still within the lifetime of Cicero and, if not intended as a direct rebuttal to Cicero's ideas, certainly as a remonstration of ideas circulating at Rome about the nature of ancestor masks, lineages, and the place of 'outsiders' in political and social culture.

[42] Immediately after his story about the usurpation of Scipio's *imago*, Pliny's text demonstrates both how the Messallas were still concerned with protecting their lineage and how well the ideas of Cicero took hold in the 1st century CE: "But- let it be permitted for me to say with the blessing of the Messallas- even to lie about the images of famous men was another love of virtue, and more honest by far than to merit that no one should seek after them: *sed — pace Messalarum dixisse liceat — etiam mentiri clarorum imagines erat aliquis virtutum amor multoque honestius quam mereri, ne quis suas expeteret.*

[43] A descendant, M. Valerius Messalla Corvinus, was a subordinate commander at Actium, celebrated a triumph in 27 BCE, and encouraged his sons to cultivate connections with Tiberius.

hanging to his feet, and overall pretense to nobility.[44] Using Quinctius as an example of how far

the status of new men had come, Cicero remarked "and do we still reiterate our complaints, that

new men have not sufficient encouragement in this city? I say, that there never was a time or

place where they had more; for here, if a man [Quinctius], though born in a low rank of life, lives

so as to seem able to uphold by his virtue the dignity of nobility, he meets with no obstacle to his

arriving at that eminence to which his assiduity and innocence conduct him."[45] Cicero again

labels himself among the ranks of new men and his positive outlook on the situation of *novi*

homines at Rome likely has more to do with his own personal success at this point than a

fundamental shift in attitude among the nobility. This same year saw Cicero's delivery of the *Pro*

Lege Manilia and his alliance with Pompey, one of the most powerful men in Rome. In three

short years, Cicero would be consul.

The year 63 BCE was the height of Cicero's political career at Rome. At Murena's trial,

he served as co-council with Crassus and his old adversary, Hortensius. Additionally he

delivered a series of speeches entitled *De lege agraria contra Rullum*. In the second of these

three speeches, Cicero referred to his own status as a new man for the last time in his extant

works and described the difficulties that new men faced:

> After a very long interval, almost beyond the memory of our times, you have for
> the first time made me, a new man, consul; and you have opened that rank which
> the nobles have held strengthened by guards, and fenced round in every possible
> manner, in my instance first, and have resolved that it should in future be open to
> virtue. Not only did you elect me consul, which is itself the greatest honor as far
> as you are concerned, but also you made me consul in such a way that only a few

---

[44] Cic. *Clu.* 111.1-2: *Facite enim ut non solum mores et adrogantiam eius sed etiam voltum atque*
amictum atque etiam illam usque ad talos demissam purpuram recordemini. Is, quasi non esset ullo
modo ferendum se ex iudicio discessisse victum, rem ab subselliis ad rostra detulit.
[45] Cic. *Clu.* 111.3-4: *Et iam querimur saepe hominibus novis non satis magnos in hac civitate esse*
fructus? Nego usquam umquam fuisse maiores; ubi si quis ignobili loco natus ita vivit ut nobilitatis
dignitatem virtute tueri posse videatur, usque eo pervenit quoad eum industria cum innocentia prosecuta
est.

nobles were made consuls in this state, and no new man before me.[46]

With nearly the exact wording that we found in his defense of Murena above, Cicero argued that

nobility of birth was not sufficient qualification for holding office. Instead, according to Cicero,

virtue was qualification enough and the path to success, integration, and acceptance was made

difficult by the opposition of the old aristocratic families in Rome.

At the beginning of the speech, he had begun by appealing to traditional Roman values,

thus marrying the very Roman conception of the *mos maiorum* with his argument that new men

could be as virtuous although they lacked such aristocratic identifiers as *imagines*:

> It is in accordance with the customs and established usages of our ancestors, O
> Romans, that those who, by your kindness, have overtaken the images of their
> family, should, the first time that they hold an assembly of the people, take an
> opportunity of uniting thanks to you for your kindness with a panegyric on their
> ancestors, and in the speech then made, some men are, on some occasions, found
> worthy of the rank of their ancestors. But most men only accomplish this, —
> namely, to make it seem that so vast a debt is due to their ancestors, that there is
> something still left to be paid to their posterity. I, indeed, have no opportunity of
> speaking before you of my ancestors, not because they were not such men as you
> see me also to be, who am born of their blood, and educated in their principles,
> but because they had never any share of popular praise, or of the light of honors
> conferred by you.[47]

---

[46] Cic. *Leg. agr.* 2.3: *Me perlongo intervallo prope memoriae temporumque nostrorum primum hominem novum consulem fecistis et eum locum quem nobilitas praesidiis firmatum atque omni ratione obvallatum tenebat me duce rescidistis virtutique in posterum patere voluistis. Neque me tantum modo consulem, quod est ipsum per sese amplissimum, sed ita fecistis quo modo pauci nobiles in hac civitate consules facti sunt, novus ante me nemo.*

[47] Cic. *Leg. agr.* 2.1-2: *Est hoc in more positum, Quirites, institutoque maiorum, ut ei qui beneficio vestro imagines familiae suae consecuti sunt eam primam habeant contionem, qua gratiam benefici vestri cum suorum laude coniungant. Qua in oratione non nulli aliquando digni maiorum loco reperiuntur, plerique autem hoc perficiunt ut tantum maioribus eorum debitum esse videatur, unde etiam quod posteris solveretur redundaret. Mihi, Quirites, apud vos de meis maioribus dicendi facultas non datur, non quo non tales fuerint qualis nos illorum sanguine creatos disciplinisque institutos videtis, sed quod laude populari atque honoris vestri luce caruerunt. De me autem ipso vereor ne adrogantis sit apud vos dicere, ingrati tacere. Nam et quibus studiis hanc dignitatem consecutus sim memet ipsum commemorare perquam grave est, et silere de tantis vestris beneficiis nullo modo possum. Qua re adhibebitur a me certa ratio moderatioque dicendi, ut quid a vobis acceperim commemorem, qua re dignus vestro summo honore singularique iudicio sim, ipse modice dicam, si necesse erit, vos eosdem existimaturos putem qui iudicavistis.*

Here Cicero explicitly referred to the aristocratic (and Roman) value of surpassing the accomplishments of the ancestors in the same section as he discussed the merits of his own ancestry. Cicero argued that his own ancestors were no less honorable simply because they had not been recognized by the people, a veiled reference to the fact that his ancestors had not held public office. That Cicero made these statements to curry favor with the voting population of Rome is to acknowledge just one part of their significance.[48] They are also part of his careful attempt to modify the identity of aristocratic Roman senators.

He continued his speech by further examining the difficulties new men faced when running for the office of consul in Rome. They had to work harder, wait longer after they hold the praetorship, and there usually needed to be some pressing emergency for which the people sought leadership outside the traditional circles of power for them to win the election.[49] When they were elected in circumstances other than these, Cicero observed that there was usually a negative backlash, making it a point to mention that this was not the case in his election and re-emphasizing his status as a *novus homo*.[50] Slightly later in the speech, Cicero actively disassociates himself from the nobility, an action that demonstrates how powerful politically

---

[48] Jonkers (1963), 56-8.

[49] Cic. *Leg. agr.* 2.3: *Nam profecto, si recordari volueritis de novis hominibus, reperietis eos qui sine repulsa consules facti sunt diuturno labore atque aliqua occasione esse factos, cum multis annis post petissent quam praetores fuissent, aliquanto serius quam per aetatem ac per leges liceret…*

[50] Cic. *Leg. agr.* 2.3-4: *qui autem anno suo petierint, sine repulsa non esse factos; me esse unum ex omnibus novis hominibus de quibus meminisse possimus, qui consulatum petierim cum primum licitum sit, consul factus sim cum primum petierim, ut vester honos ad mei temporis diem petitus, non ad alienae petitionis occasionem interceptus, nec diuturnis precibus efflagitatus, sed dignitate impetratus esse videatur. [4] Est illud amplissimum quod paulo ante commemoravi, Quirites, quod hoc honore ex novis hominibus primum me multis post annis adfecistis, quod prima petitione, quod anno meo, sed tamen magnificentius atque ornatius esse illo nihil potest, quod meis comitiis non tabellam vindicem tacitae libertatis, sed vocem vivam prae vobis indicem vestrarum erga me voluntatum ac studiorum tulistis. Itaque me non extrema diribitio suffragiorum, sed primi illi vestri concursus, neque singulae voces praeconum, sed una vox universi populi Romani consulem declaravit.*

Cicero had become (or at least, thought he had become).[51] The acknowledgement of his own

status as a *novus homo* in the *De Lege Agraria* is the most forceful and final in Cicero's extant

speeches. His openness probably reflects his pride in attaining the consulship and his belief that

he had finally been accepted in the political and social world of the Senate. On this last point,

Cicero was fundamentally wrong.

Eight years passed before Cicero spoke directly of *novi homines* in his extant speeches

again. During that time, Cicero's political star fell from its heights as consul and *pater patriae* to

exile and irrelevance.[52] But even in disgrace, Cicero still advocated for newcomers in Roman

politics and attempted to appropriate aristocratic institutions as a way of claiming his own

importance in Rome. The clearest examples of this included Cicero's public procession

(*profectio*) from Brundisium to Rome upon his departure from the city in 58, his return (*reditus*)

from exile in 57, and the speech he made in the Senate, his *Post Reditum in Senatu*.[53] As one

scholar notes, "Cicero made a spectacular show of his *profectio* (dressed in black, accompanied

by an escort, offering a statue of Minerva on the Capitol) as well as the *reditus*, which was staged

and retold very much in terms of a triumph."[54] As we know, despite Cicero's proliferation of

speeches, epic poems, and philosophical treatises after his return, his political career still suffered

under the dominance of Pompey, Crassus, and Caesar. Perhaps his deliberate omission of direct

---

[51] See Cic. *Leg. agr.* 2.5: *non dubitanti fidele consilium, non laboranti certum subsidium nobilitatis ostenditur* and *Oratio* 2.6: *sed mihi videntur certi homines, si qua in re me non modo consilio verum etiam casu lapsum esse arbitrabuntur, vos universos qui me antetuleritis nobilitati vituperaturi.*
[52] Plin. *HN* 7.117; App. *B Civ.* 2.7.
[53] According to a passage in Cicero's *De domo sua* (section 30), passage of the bill recalling Cicero depended heavily on Italian support and perhaps it is not surprising, then, that Cicero also wrote a speech to the people (*Post Reditum ad Quirites*). On his return, see Cic. *Sest.* 71–92, 116, 128–31, where Cicero says he was meet at Brundisium by supporters, towns sent welcoming embassies along his route to Rome, and he was greeted at Rome by crowds that accompanied him to the Forum and Capitol. The similarity of these processions to the triumph has been examined by Sumi (2005) 39-41; their religious overtones are examined by Luke (2014). Sumi (2005) also discusses the importance of public speeches in the political life of the late Republic (pgs. 17-22).
[54] Östenberg (2015 review).

references to his status as a *novus homo* is a result of this political marginalization, but it is difficult to know for sure. What is certain is that Cicero continued to use the term *novus homo* in order to advocate the advancement of non-nobles and to advance change in the societal structures in the Roman Senate.

The first speech after Cicero's exile to use *novus homo* was his *Pro Sestio*. Delivered in 56 BCE, Cicero offered a defense for one of the main actors in his recall from exile against charges of fomenting public violence in violation of the *lex Plautia de vi*.[55] This speech is most famous for its excursus on *optimates* and *populares* with which the last third of the defense is preoccupied.[56] Toward the end of this excursus, Cicero begins his conclusion:

> But so that my speech may have some end, and that I finish speaking before you are so weary of listening to me attentively, I will finish my argument about the best men and their leaders and the defenders of the republic. I will call upon you, O young men, both those who are of noble birth to the imitation of your ancestors and those who are able to follow nobility by genius and virtue, I will urge you all to that conduct by which many new men have become distinguished with honor and glory.[57]

In this section, Cicero carefully made a distinction between aristocratic young men and those who were not. Here Cicero prioritized equally the claims to power of aristocrats and *novi homines*, but went further by suggesting that the better conduct was that of the *novi*. This is clear from the following section, when Cicero seamlessly blends traditional Roman values with the strengths of new men.

> This is the only path, believe me, to praise, dignity, and honor: to be praised and beloved by men endowed with good wisdom and good natures; to know the

---

[55] Kaster (2006), 18.

[56] Cic. *Sest*. 96-139; Kaster (2006), 31-37; for analysis of this section regarding *optimates*, see Wiseman (2002), 292–3.

[57] Cic. *Sest*. 136: *sed ut extremum habeat aliquid oratio mea, et ut ego ante dicendi finem faciam quam vos me tam attente audiendi, concludam illud de optimatibus eorumque principibus ac rei publicae defensoribus, vosque, adulescentes, et qui nobiles estis, ad maiorum vestrorum imitationem excitabo, et qui ingenio ac virtute nobilitatem potestis consequi, ad eam rationem in qua multi homines novi et honore et gloria floruerunt cohortabor.*

constitution of the state, most wisely established by our ancestors, who, when they could no longer endure the power of kings, created annual magistrates so that they were in charge of the perpetual council of the senate of the republic, but that those in this council would be selected from the whole people, and entry into that highest order would lie open to the assiduity and virtue of all the citizens.[58]

The only standard by which men could be distinguished should be through the approval of their fellow citizens and through their knowledge of (and dedication to) the state, according to Cicero. In this passage, the emphasis on inclusiveness and the same virtues that had been repeatedly ascribed by Cicero in his earlier speeches and treatises, *industria* and *virtus*, mark this passage out for our understanding of the role that he saw for *novi homines* in Rome. As we have seen, time and again Cicero argued that no longer should the aristocracy have a monopoly on *virtus*. Perhaps the emphasis on the dichotomy between *optimates* and *populares* is not the one we should focus on in this speech, which has traditionally been the case, but instead we should think about the relationships between *novi homines*, the people, and the traditional aristocracy alongside the issues of municipalization and incorporation.

The final appearances of *novi homines* are found in Cicero's *Pro Plancio*, a letter of his addressed to T. Fadius in exile, and in his *De Officiis*.[59] In the first, Cicero enumerated the virtues of Plancius, a new man, who had always been in attendance in the city, been diligent, generous, and attentive to his friends, and followed the path by which the greatest number of new men had attained honor.[60] In his letter to Fadius, Cicero offered consolation by saying, "Your

---

[58] Cic. *Sest.* 137: *Haec est una via, mihi credite, et laudis et dignitatis et honoris, a bonis viris sapientibus et bene natura constitutis laudari et diligi; nosse discriptionem civitatis a maioribus nostris sapientissime constitutam; qui cum regum potestatem non tulissent, ita magistratus annuos creaverunt ut consilium senatus rei publicae praeponerent sempiternum, deligerentur autem in id consilium ab universo populo aditusque in illum summum ordinem omnium civium industriae ac virtuti pateret.*

[59] Cicero's *Pro Plancio* dates to 56 BCE; the letter to Fadius was written in 52 BCE; and *De Officiis* dates to 44 BCE, the year before Cicero's proscription.

[60] Cic. *Planc.* 67: *Sed ut redeam ad Plancium, numquam ex urbe is afuit nisi sorte, lege, necessitate; non valuit rebus isdem quibus fortasse non nulli, at valuit adsiduitate, valuit observandis amicis, valuit*

virtue has given you more than fortune has taken away: for you have obtained what not many

new men have obtained; you have lost what many of the most noble men have lost."[61] Again, the

emphasis Cicero placed on the virtue of a new man and his equivalence to the noblest men was

central to Cicero's inclusive message. And finally, *novus homo* appeared in the context of a

discussion about houses in Cicero's *De Officiis*. The house in question belonged to Cn. Octavius

Rufus, a new man, first consul from his family, and distant relative of the future emperor,

although he belonged to different a branch of the family.[62]

By rejecting the exclusivity of the values of the old aristocracy, Cicero articulated a case

for a new set of guiding principles that were far more inclusive and that reflected a changed

Roman reality after the Social War. As Roselaar argues, "An Italian aspiring to be fully accepted

in Roman society thus had to walk a fine line between showing his allegiance to cultural

behaviour acceptable in Rome, and adhering to his identity as an Italian from a local

community."[63] While many historians, including Syme and Wiseman, have acknowledged the

difficulty *novi homines* had in actually achieving political office well after the Social war had

ended, they have not, however, hazarded an explanation as to why *novi homines* had such a

difficult time other than to rely on the newness of their rank.[64] Indeed, the length of time

liberalitate; fuit in oculis, petivit, ea est usus ratione vitae qua minima invidia novi homines plurimi sunt eosdem honores consecuti.

[61] Cic. *Fam*. 5.18: *Plus tibi virtus tua dedit quam fortuna abstulit, propterea quod adeptus es quod non multi homines novi, amisisti quae plurimi homines nobilissimi.*

[62] Cic. *Off*. 138: *Et quoniam omnia persequimur, volumus quidem certe, dicendum est etiam, qualem hominis honorati et principis domum placeat esse, cuius finis est usus, ad quem accommodanda est aedificandi descriptio et tamen adhibenda commoditatis dignitatisque diligentia. Cn. Octavio, qui primus ex illa familia consul factus est, honori fuisse accepimus, quod praeclaram aedificasset in Palatio et plenam dignitatis domum, quae cum vulgo viseretur, suffragata domino, novo homini, ad consulatum putabatur.* (We have heard that Gnaeus Octavius—the first of that family to be elected consul— distinguished himself by building upon the Palatine an attractive and imposing house. Everybody went to see it, and it was thought to have gained votes for the owner, a new man, in his canvass for the consulship.).

[63] Roselaar (2012), 11.

[64] Syme (1939) and Wiseman (1971).

between the enfranchisement and the actual acceptance of local Italian elites into Roman political and social circles varied widely based on the relationships between those local elite and Roman senators and there is much evidence that suggests the difficulty Italian elites faced in their attempt to participate in the Roman political sphere.[65] However, the grant of suffrage did not guarantee acceptance and integration across the board. What was it that made newcomers to Rome so difficult to accept?

It was a question Cicero obviously wrestled with. In the second book of his treatise *De Legibus*, Cicero famously confessed his attachment to Arpinum. After Atticus asked him to clarify what he had said earlier about having twin fatherlands, questioning whether or not one can claim two at once unless the fatherland for wise Cato was Tusculum rather than Rome.[66] Cicero answered defending his perspective that even Cato the Elder had had two fatherlands, saying "there are two fatherlands for that man and for all from the municipalities, one by nature, the other by citizenship…therefore I will never deny that my fatherland is here, although the other is greater and this one is contained within it…[every native of a municipal town] has [two] citizenships but considers [the greater one] his only citizenship."[67] Written in 51 BCE, this passage reflects the loyalties that Cicero had throughout his political career: devotion to Rome and to his birthplace, Arpinum. Various passages suggest this work was incomplete and, as a result, perhaps not published in his lifetime.[68] It is therefore tempting to take this passage as an

---

[65] See Wiseman (1971) 7, 18, 22, and 63.

[66] Cic. *Leg.* 2.5: Atticus: *Equidem me cognosse admodum gaudeo. Sed illud tamen quale est quod paulo ante dixisti, hunc locum—id est, ut ego te accipio dicere, Arpinum—germanam patriam esse uestram? Numquid duas habetis patrias, an est una illa patria communis? Nisi forte sapienti illi Catoni fuit patria non Roma, sed Tusculum.*

[67] Cic. *Leg.* 2.5: Marcus- *Ego mehercule et illi et omnibus municipibus duas esse censeo patrias, unam naturae, alteram ciuitatis…Itaque ego hanc meam esse patriam prorsus numquam negabo, dum illa sit maior, haec in ea contineatur * * * habet ciuitatis et unam illam ciuitatem putat.* The text here is corrupt, but the meaning seems relatively clear; see Dyck (2004) 258-260.

[68] Dyck (2004), 11-12.

honest appraisal of at least one Italian, who might represent the feelings of Italians at large, at the mid point of the 1ˢᵗ century BCE. At the very least, this passage reflects questions that the *novus homo* that Cicero wrestled with: about his own identity within the context of political circles in Rome and how he could mitigate the shortcomings that his colleagues saw in him.

Cicero's speeches provide evidence of his own reworking of Roman identity and inform us of what established conventions he fought to overturn.[69] The way in which Cicero described the relationships between Romans and *novi homines* is the primary evidence we have for the slow acceptance of municipal senators. In the Roman Senate, the social integration of Italians lagged far behind the grant of suffrage after the war. The one arena wherein *novi homines* could potentially equal their aristocratic colleagues was in public speaking. Throughout the history of the Republic, aristocrats regularly made speeches in public meetings (*contiones*) and judicial proceedings (*quaestiones*).[70] When Cicero's political participation stalled, he returned to the law courts, defending not only men but also the idea of *novi homines* as equals in Roman politics and in the Senate in particular. The works of Cicero, therefore, provide the somewhat different perspective of a *novus homo* on the values that he perceived were important for an aristocrat to possess. One example comes in the invective he published against Piso, where he says, "When the Roman people made me *quaestor* among the first of the candidates, and first *aedile*, and first praetor, as they did by a unanimous vote, they were paying that compliment to me on my own account and not to my family, —to my habits of life, not to my ancestors,—to my proved virtue, and not to any nobleness of birth of which they had heard."[71] Elsewhere, Cicero suggested not so

---

[69] See also Cicero's *Pro Balbo*.
[70] Suni (2005), 17.
[71] Cic. *Pis.* 1.5: *Me cum quaestorem in primis, aedilem priorem, praetorem primum cunctis suffragiis populus Romanus faciebat, homini ille honorem non generi, moribus non maioribus meis, virtuti perspectae non auditae nobilitati deferebat.*

subtly that heritage mattered little when compared to virtue, the very same description he used in nearly every reference to *novi homines* in his extant works.[72]

In summary, Cicero tried his hardest to be a Roman aristocrat while advocating for a more inclusive attitude in the Roman Senate that would help his fellow *novi homines*. He attempted to obtain public processions, including a triumph, as the nobility did. He tried to be successful (and was for a time) in Roman politics and the law courts in the fashion of the most powerful political figures of the Republic. He sought recognition for his written works, an interest of Roman aristocrats since the middle Republic. He looked forward to having an *imago* while he railed against the prestige of lineage; he advocated appropriating the *imagines* of other families, while consistently appealing to the *mos maiorum*; he praised *novi homines*, but stopped applying the label to himself.[73] Cicero's ideas about an inclusive set of values dictating merit in the political circles of Rome probably reflected the thoughts of many Italian senators and new men. They also influenced the policies of another relative outsider to Roman political life, Gaius Octavius Rufus, who attempts at inclusion would both end the civil wars that had plagued the 1st century BCE and create continued problems for his successors, the Claudii.

---

[72] Cic. *Rep*. 6. 23-24: *Quin etiam si cupiat proles illa futurorum hominum deinceps laudes unius cuiusque nostrum a patribus acceptas posteris prodere, tamen propter eluviones exustionesque terrarum, quas accidere tempore certo necesse est, non modo non aeternam, sed ne diuturnam quidem gloriam assequi possumus. Quid autem interest ab iis, qui postea nascentur, sermonem fore de te, cum ab iis nullus fuerit, qui ante nati sunt— qui nec pauciores et certe meliores fuerunt viri—praesertim cum apud eos ipsos, a quibus audiri nomen nostrum potest, nemo unius anni memoriam consequi possit.*

[73] On his desire to pass his own *imago* down, see Cic. *Verr. Actio* 2, 5.36: *Nunc sum designatus aedilis; habeo rationem quid a populo Romano acceperim; mihi ludos sanctissimos maxima cum cura et caerimonia Cereri, Libero, Liberaeque faciundos, mihi Floram matrem populo plebique Romanae ludorum celebritate placandam, mihi ludos antiquissimos, qui primi Romani appellati sunt, cum dignitate maxima et religione Iovi, Iunoni, Minervaeque esse faciundos, mihi sacrarum aedium procurationem, mihi totam urbem tuendam esse commissam; ob earum rerum laborem et sollicitudinem fructus illos datos, antiquiorem in senatu sententiae dicendae locum, togam praetextam, sellam curulem, ius imaginis ad memoriam posteritatemque prodendae.*

The Roman Senate From the Death of Cicero to the Accession of Augustus

In the aftermath of Caesar's assassination, Cicero mistakenly thought he could resume his participation in political life. In his *Philippics*, Cicero launched an unprecedented attack on Antony in order to label him a *hostis* of the Roman state and rapidly published the fourteen speeches so as to enable them to achieve maximum and speedy effect.[74] As we all know, Cicero paid the price of these speeches with his life, after Caesar's heir, Octavian, abandoned him in favor of an alliance with Antony.

As seen in this brief account of Cicero's demise, the triumviral period is difficult to understand because allegiances shifted swiftly, politics became muddied, and we lack reliable contemporary sources. The contemporary account of the first civil war by Caesar is heavily biased, as are those accounts finished and written by his supporters, and only treat the events down to Caesar's final victories in Spain. Many historians have relied on later accounts, including those of Appian and Cassius Dio, to understand the political and social history of this period, but these sources present a variety of problems for the historian.[75] Indeed the propaganda that proliferated at this time colored all later accounts to the point where discerning between fact and fiction is very difficult indeed.

What we do know is that, as we saw in Chapter Two, the Senate during this period swelled to include over 1000 members. Many of these men were Italian and were granted unprecedented access to the Senate by the triumvirs.[76] In 43 BCE, the consuls included Aulus Hirtius, Caesar's loyal legate in the Gallic wars and whose family originated from Ferentinum,

---

[74] Stevenson and Wilson (2008), 3 and Kelly (2008), 23.

[75] See Gowing (1992) for an analysis of the narratives from the perspective that the Appian and Dio were interpreters of history rather than simply transmitters (2).

[76] Osgood (2006), 257; still the most thorough discussion is Syme (1939), 78-96.

and Caius Vibius Pansa, a new man whose children would be successful in the Principate.[77]

Caesar appointed men like Publius Ventidius, a man from Picenum, to the Senate.[78] This man would rise rapidly by means of his service to Caesar to the point of being rewarded with a consulship in 43 and granted a triumph in 38 for his victories over the Parthians.[79] Decidius Saxa and Canidius Crassus benefited from the patronage of the triumvir Antony.[80] The former governed Syria and the latter was consul in 40 BCE.[81] Marcus Vipsanius Agrippa, whose family had no role in Roman political life before this period, would have an exceptional career thanks to his promotion by the future emperor. Agrippa would be consul in 37, the first of many honors in a long career.[82] In 36 another newcomer, Marcus Cocceius Nerva, would attain the consulship and his family would eventually count among its number an emperor.[83] In addition, promagistracies were regularly given to *novi homines* during the decade of the 30s. These men had been legates for the triumvirs and were often elevated to senatorial office after their service in the provinces.[84] During this period, as Syme notes, "Municipal men in the Senate of Rome…now came from all Italy in its widest extension, from the foothills of the Alps down to Apulia, Lucania, and Bruttium. Not only do ancient cities of Latium long decayed, like

---

[77] Broughton, *MRR* 334-335; Syme (1939), 71.

[78] Ventidius was thoroughly despised by Lucius Munatius Plancus, correspondent to Cicero during the tense stand off between Antony and Brutus in 44/3. He called Ventidius a mule-driver (Cic. *Fam.* 10.18.3: *sic perculsas illius copias Ventidiique mulionis castra despicio*); Pliny gets the story wrong when he refers to Ventidius being marched in the triumph of Pompey Strabo and attributes the insult to Cicero instead of Plancus (Plin. *HN* 7.135: *triumphare P. Ventidium de Parthis voluit quidem solum, sed eundem in triumpho Asculano Cn. Pompei duxit puerum, quamquam Masurius auctor est bis in triumpho ductum, Cicero mulionem castrensis furnariae fuisse, plurimi iuventam inopem in caliga militari tolerasse*). Plancus may have disliked Ventidius for his probable equestrian status and rapid rise to success- Plancus survived the civil wars by changing sides as necessary. His lineage is uncertain, except that his father, grandfather and great-grandfather were all named Lucius as well (*CIL* X.6087 (Orelli 590)).

[79] Gell. *NA* 15.4.

[80] Syme (1939), 79-80.

[81] Syme (1939).

[82] Broughton *MRR*, 395.

[83] Broughton *MRR*, 399; Syme (1936), 267.

[84] e.g. Agrippa, Taurus, T. Flavius Petro, T. Flavius Sabinus (ancestor of the future emperor), C. Velius Rufus, C. Vellius Paterculus, and so on. See Syme (1939), 349-368, for a more inclusive list.

Lanuvium, provide senators for Rome- there are remote towns of no note before or barely named, like Aletrium in the Hernican territory…Treia in Picenum, Asisium in Umbria, Histonium and Larinum of the Samnite peoples."[85] There were in total 108 *novi homines* (securely attested) who were admitted to the Senate between 44 and 29 BCE, with an additional 25 probable *novi homines*.[86] All senators needed to be in residence in the city of Rome and with the influx of Italian senators during the Triumviral period, their new visibility must have been disconcerting to the old aristocracy.[87]

Against this onslaught, the old aristocracy had few options. Some, like Asinius Pollio, consul of 40 BCE and partisan during the civil war between Caesar and Pompey, effectively withdrew from political life. Others perished. But still others survived and eventually found political advancement possible, if not palatable, under what would become a new regime. The end of the Republic did not necessarily signal a drastic change among old aristocratic families and those formerly on the periphery of power in Rome. These same aristocrats, clamoring for social and political enfranchisement through competition, had no idea the Republic had ended for good. Instead what was apparent was the potentially temporary victory of Augustus, who could not live forever and who kept having problems of succession. In the meantime, aristocratic *gentes* maintained their traditions in naming, funeral processions, maintenance of *imagines*, and adherence to aristocratic values handed down to them by their ancestors. As they saw *novi homines*, and worse, celebrate triumphs and gain promotion to the Senate, Romans from the traditional aristocracy must have clung to those elements that marked them as different and truly Roman. If anything, in this tumultuous period, their institutions of memory became even more

---

[85] Syme (1939), 360.
[86] Wiseman (1971), 183.
[87] Eck (1997), 74: "Rome was the legal *origo* of all senators. They were thereby detached from any legal tie with their previous home town and ceased to be subject to the duties and obligations of their communities of origin." See also Talbert (1984): 152-4.

important for maintaining aristocratic Roman identities against the influx of men who lacked them in the Roman Senate.

The proof that these institutions maintained their importance comes not from any historical account, but rather in a close examination of the actions of Augustus during his reign. Gaius Octavius Rufus, who would later be given the title Augustus, was born into an equestrian family, old and rich, from which his father was the first to be a senator as Suetonius tells us.[88] His meteoric rise and consolidation of power has long been termed a revolution in the social, political, and cultural spheres of Roman society.[89] Statements like "The present inquiry will attempt to discover the resources and devices by which a revolutionary leader [Augustus] arose in civil strife, usurped power for himself and his faction, transformed a faction into a national party, and a torn and distracted land into a nation, with a stable and enduring government," "Never, however, was there a greater progress made toward one single way of life, a thing to be fairly called 'Roman civilization of the Empire,' than in that lifetime of Augustus," and "The goal of his 'cultural program'…was nothing less than a complete moral revival" have been typical of the reign of Augustus.[90] The assumption underlying each of these statements is that Augustus was instigator of a vast sea change in culture during the course of his tenure. It is true that many things did change, but change was incremental, uneven, reversible, and only became visible to those living through it in hindsight.

---

[88] Suet. *Aug.* 2: *ipse Augustus nihil amplius quam equestri familia ortum se scribit vetere ac locuplete, et in qua primus senator pater suus fuerit.* See also Syme (1982), 398: "No citizen by his last will and testament can change the legal status of his heir. He cannot transfer him from plebeian to patrician, or vice versa; and he cannot assign him to a different tribe. That lay beyond the posthumous power of Caesar the Dictator. The designate heir was C. Octavius C. f. Scaptia from Velitrae. The youth needed to enter the *gens* of the patrician Iulii, acquiring thereby their tribe, the *Fabiae*."
[89] Syme (1939); Syme (1989); Zanker (1990); Wallace-Hadrill (2008).
[90] Syme (1936), 2; MacMullen (2000), x; Zanker (1990), 2-3, respectively.

In thinking about political advancement during the decade of the 20s and teens, we must remember neither that Augustus' rule nor his continued rule nor even the success of his chosen heir were inevitable facts for the aristocratic survivors of the civil wars. The peace, at first, must have been tenuous and the threat the old aristocracy posed to Augustus explains their exclusion from political power. At this point, there was plenty of uncertainty about the future of the Roman state. By the time of Augustus, Italian senators were still not completely incorporated into the Roman elite, and the literary, epigraphic, and archaeological evidence present a complicated picture of integration of new elites in the Senate and simultaneous attempts to appease the old aristocracy.[91]

Augustus and the Senate

In the year 28 BCE, Augustus took the title *princeps senatus*, conducted a census, and held a *lectio senatus* (revision of the senate roles).[92] While Augustus' census enrolled over four million citizens of Italian ancestry, senatorial admissions granted to elite Italians was hardly

---

[91] There have been many studies of Augustus and the Senate: their typical focus centers on the settlement of 27, questions of legality, and how Augustus assumed power while at the same time claiming a restoration of the Republic. A modest selection of articles and books that deal with these questions include: Mommsen *Romisches Staatsrecht*, I³, II³ ii 916, III (Leipzig, I887-8); Syme (1939); Francisci (1941); Chilver (1950); Salmon (1956); Sattler (1960); A.H.M. Jones (1970); Brunt (1971); and Turpin (1994). For a more specific focus on Augustus and the Senate, see Wiseman (1971); Nicolet (1976); Talbert (1984 a and b); Brunt (1984); Syme (1986). Nearly all of these studies rely primarily on the testimony of Suetonius and Cassius Dio, and tend to be dismissive of the contemporary accounts of Nicolaus of Damascus (the extant parts of which deal only with Octavian's early life and the assassination of Caesar) and Velleius Paterculus.

[92] Aug. *RG* 7.2; Cass. Dio 52.42.1: καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα τιμητεύσας σὺν τῷ Ἀγρίππᾳ ἄλλα τέ τινα διώρθωσε καὶ τὴν βουλὴν ἐξήτασε. πολλοὶ μὲν γὰρ ἱππῆς πολλοὶ δὲ καὶ πεζοὶ παρὰ τὴν ἀξίαν ἐκ τῶν ἐμφυλίων πολέμων ἐβούλευον, ὥστε καὶ ἐς χιλίους τὸ πλήρωμα τῆς γερουσίας αὐξηθῆναι. "After this he became censor with Agrippa as his colleague, and in addition to other reforms he instituted, he purged the senate. As a result of the civil wars, a large number of *equites* and also foot-soldiers were in the senate without justification in merit, so that the membership of that body had swollen to a thousand."

comparable.[93] Perhaps the fact that the senate had swelled to include a thousand members during

the tumultuous triumviral period provided the grounds upon which to refuse entry to many

Italians and removal of the less than desirable Italians already enrolled. During this purge, he

removed nearly 200 of the senators from the ranks of the senate by first asking them to judge

whether their knowledge of their family and their lives justified their being members of the

Senate.[94] That Augustus referred to their family indicates a return to standards from before the

civil wars, where lineage was of great importance in political life. At the same time, he qualified

admission by granting access to those who had lived appropriately, thus leaving the door open

for new men. We are not given names of the first fifty who left voluntarily and any attempt to

know whom they were is speculative. The next 140 were apparently publicly shamed as a result

of their reluctance to leave the Senate with the initial group, but they too left "of their own

volition" and Dio tells us that among them was one Quintus Statilius, who was removed from the

tribunate.[95] At roughly the same time Augustus increased membership of the patrician class, by

---

[93] Aug. *RG* 8: *Lustrum post annum alterum et quadragensimum feci, quo lustro civium Romanorum censa sunt capita quadragiens centum millia et sexaginta tria millia.* According to Wiseman (1971), 182: from 28 to 19 BCE, there were only 5 *novi* admitted to the senate based on secure attestations, 18 additional if questionable attestations are included. These numbers are inherently problematic for drawing any significant conclusions because they are based on fragmentary evidence. For a good discussion of the debate over the census of 28 BCE and numbers of new citizens during the reign of Augustus, see Wiseman (1969), 72-75; Brunt (1971), 113-120; Nicolet (1976); Lo Cascio (1994).

[94] Cass. Dio 52.42.2: τούτους οὖν ἐκκρῖναι βουληθεὶς αὐτὸς μὲν οὐδένα αὐτῶν ἀπήλειψε, προτρεψάμενος δέ σφας ἐκ τοῦ συνειδότος τοῦ τε γένους καὶ τοῦ βίου δικαστὰς ἑαυτοῖς γενέσθαι τὸ μὲν πρῶτον πεντήκοντά που ἔπεισεν ἐθελοντὰς ἐκστῆναι τοῦ συνεδρίου, ἔπειτα δὲ καὶ ἄλλους ἑκατὸν καὶ τεσσαράκοντα μιμήσασθαί σφας ἠνάγκασε. Now though it was his wish to remove these men, he did not erase any of their names himself, but urged them rather, to become their own judges of the knowledge of their families and their lives; he first persuaded some fifty of them to withdraw from the senate voluntarily, and then compelled one hundred and forty others to imitate their example.

[95] Cass. Dio 52.42.3: καὶ αὐτῶν ἠτίμωσε μὲν οὐδένα, τὰ δ' ὀνόματα τῶν δευτέρων ἐξέθηκε· τοῖς γὰρ προτέροις, ὅτι μὴ ἐχρόνισαν ἀλλ' εὐθὺς ἐπειθάρχησάν οἱ, ἀφῆκε τὸ ὀνείδισμα, ὥστ' αὐτοὺς μὴ ἐκδημοσιευθῆναι. οὗτοι μὲν οὖν ἑκούσιοι δῆθεν ἰδιώτευσαν, Κύιντον δὲ δὴ Στατίλιον καὶ πάνυ ἄκοντα τῆς δημαρχίας, ἐς ἣν ἀπεδέδεικτο, εἶρξεν. He disenfranchised none of them, but only posted the names of the second group, for he spared the members of the first group the reproach of the publication of their names, because they had not delayed but had straightway obeyed him. So all these

adding whom we again do not know.[96] Additionally, Augustus restricted the movement of the

senators, forbidding them to leave Italy without his permission.[97] This description of Augustus'

first exercise of control over the Senate is a perfect demonstration of the mixed approach he took

throughout the rest of his reign. He sought both to placate the nobility by nodding to tradition,

but concurrently seemed to have attempted to incorporate Italians more fully in governance.

Augustus' next revision of the senate came in the *lectio* of 18 BCE when he revised the

role, and either at the same time or soon after increased the census rating required for senatorial

membership and limited the wearing of the *latus clavus* to senators alone.[98] The property

requirement proved onerous and apparently contributed to a fall in senatorial membership that

was relieved in part through the generosity of the emperor himself.[99] At some point between 28

and 18, Augustus formed a *consilium* comprised of members chosen by lot, the consuls, and one

representative from the other offices, and rotated every six months to discuss business before it

was brought before the entire membership.[100] Some scholars have seen this as a curb on

senatorial power, and indeed it certainly restricted control of business to a smaller group of

---

men returned to private life of their own free will, so far as appearances were concerned; but Quintus Statilius was deposed, decidedly against his will, from the tribunate, to which he had been appointed.
[96] Through the *Lex Saenia* in 30 or 29 BCE, see Cass. Dio 52.42.5: τό τε τῶν εὐπατριδῶν γένος συνεπλήθυσε, τῆς βουλῆς οἱ δῆθεν ἐπιτρεψάσης τοῦτο ποιῆσαι, ἐπειδὴ τό τε πλεῖστόν σφων ἀπωλώλει (οὐδὲν γὰρ οὕτως ὡς τὸ γενναῖον ἐν τοῖς ἐμφυλίοις πολέμοις ἀναλίσκεται) καὶ ἐς τὴν ποίησιν τῶν πατρίων ἀναγκαῖοι ἀεὶ εἶναι νομίζονται. And at the same time he increased the number of patrician families, with senate's permission, inasmuch as the greater part of the patricians had perished (indeed no class is so wasted in civil wars as the nobility), and because the patricians are always regarded as indispensable for the perpetuation of our traditional institutions.
[97] Cass. Dio. 52.42.6: ταῦτά τε οὖν ἔπραξε, καὶ προσαπεῖπε πᾶσι τοῖς βουλεύουσι μὴ ἐκδημεῖν ἔξω τῆς Ἰταλίας, ἂν μὴ αὐτός τινι κελεύσῃ ἢ καὶ ἐπιτρέψῃ.
[98] Cassius Dio (54.17.3) gives us the number of one million HS; however Suetonius (*Aug.* 41) provides 1.2 million HS. On the *latus clavus*, see *Dig.* 23.2.44 and Talbert (1984), 11-12 and 39-40. The right of the *latus clavus*, which Augustus took away from *equites*, did not last beyond the reign of Caligula. For more on the *latus clavus*, see Millar (1977), 290 ff.; Chastagnol (1975), 375-394; and most recently Levick (1991).
[99] Cass. Dio. 55.13.6; for grants of one million HS to senators by Augustus and Tiberius, see Tac. *Ann.* 1.75 and 2.37. Cf. Syme (1986), 1-14 and 32-5.
[100] Suet. *Aug.* 35 and Cass. Dio 53.21.4-5 and 56.28.2-3.

senators even if its membership changed.[101] It is in this smaller body that *novi homines* found

powerful positions, with seventeen known or attested, in addition to sixteen who were non-

senators, nine members of other senatorial families, and fourteen who were members of the old

aristocracy.[102] Their presence in the *consilium* should imply that their numbers in the main body

of the Senate were relatively large, but it is going too far to suggest that the nobility was in

eclipse or somehow absent.[103] Indeed the position of prominence that Italians had achieved

during the civil wars of the 40s and 30s was both reaffirmed and limited by Augustus: many

were probably removed during these revisions of the senatorial rolls, while others saw their

fortunes made by promotion to the patriciate, the restriction of the *latus clavus*, and inclusion in

the *consilium*.

How these revisions of the senatorial rolls were received is difficult to say, but there are a

number of clues that members of the Senate and aristocracy did not all accept one-man-rule

readily. According to the historian Cremutius Cordus**,** at the second reduction in the membership

of the Senate, none of the senators were even allowed in unless each was on his own and had the

folds of his clothing searched.[104] There is some debate based on the problematic evidence as to

whether this threat against Augustus' person dates properly to the *lectio* in 28 or 18 BCE. This

precaution, if it did take place in 28, demonstrates the lack of trust between the victor and the

Senate in the early stages of the regime. If it happened in 18, it marks a longer period of political

opposition to the princeps than is usually granted.

---

[101] Crook (1955), 8-20 and Talbert (1984), 136-7, 167, 286, 488-89; On the resentment that the revisions of Augustus caused, see A.H.M. Jones (1960) 19-26.

[102] See the prosopographical lists in Crook (1995), 148 ff.

[103] Syme (1986), 32-49: I think Syme overstates this by focusing specifically on the consulship, which a prosopographer would naturally do. The composition of the Senate included plenty of noble families, as is evidenced by his next chapter examining sixteen aristocratic consuls between 16 and 7 BCE.

[104] A. Cremutius Cordus as preserved in Suet. *Aug*. 35.1-2, Cornell (2013) vol. 2, F4 p 973. Although this does not matter particularly for my argument, see the good discussion in Cornell (2013) vol. 3, 592-93.

Other clues that Augustus' regime was not well received by elites of all stripes come in the form of a number of conspiracies against the life of the Princeps. A conspiracy aimed at assassinating Augustus in 23, perhaps urged on by Augustus' own poor health, failed but demonstrated the tenuousness of the government instituted by Augustus.[105] Velleius tells us of another conspiracy in 19 BCE that was also unsuccessful.[106] Despite modern prejudices against his account, Velleius offers some interesting information and, as a close contemporary of the events, may be more trustworthy than many scholars have allowed. In his discussion of the conspiracy of 19 BCE, Velleius tells us that the consul, a *novus homo* named Gaius Sentius Saturninus, conducted himself in the manner of consuls of old, particularly in his old-time severity (*prisca severitate*) and great firmness (*summaque constantia*), but most of all in his conduct in the elections where he refused to allow a popular candidate, Egnatius Rufus, to stand for election.[107] This conduct, as Velleius notes, is familiar from consuls of old and suggests the way in which aristocratic behavior from the past continued to be emulated by the newly incorporated men of the early Principate.[108]

In spite of these reactions from the Roman elite, Augustus continued making changes to the Senate. As Dio tells us, even after the *lectio* of 18 BCE there were still some "unsuitable

---

[105] On the conspiracy of Murena and Caepio, the sources are muddled: Cassius Dio (54.3) mixes up the date of the conspiracy, placing it in 22, while Velleius Paterculus 2.92-93 has been labeled mendacious (Syme (1939), 333 fn. 2) and is largely ignored because of his biographical tendencies (McDermott (1941), 255). In a rather interesting view, Wittchow (2005) sees a historical inspiration for Virgil's wounding of Aeneas (the assassination of Julius Caesar) and allegorical allusion to Augustus in Iulus (68-69). The parallel is only made more explicit, according to Wittchow, because of the perils Augustus faced in 23, when ill and the object of conspiratorial assassination. On the conspiracy of 23, see also Stockton (1965), Daly (1984), Syme (1986), Arkenberg (1993a), and Arkenberg (1993b).
[106] Vell. Pat. 2.91-93.
[107] Vell. Pat. 2.92; Syme (1986), 44, determined that Sentius was a *novus homo*. On the conspiracy of Rufus, see Phillips (1997).
[108] Vell. Pat. 2.92: *Quod ego factum cuilibet veterum consulum gloriae comparandum reor, nisi quod naturaliter audita visis laudamus libentius et praesentia invidia, praeterita veneratione prosequimur et his nos obrui, illis instrui credimus.*

persons that remained on the lists" and other revisions were held in 13 and 11 BCE.[109] More

important than attempts to determine who was removed from the senate, a nearly impossible task

with our evidence, is to acknowledge the power Augustus wielded over the make-up and

procedures of the Senate. Between the *lectio senatus* of 18 and the final *lectio* of Augustus in 4

CE, the number of Italian senators enrolled in the senate is striking because of its sharp

increase.[110] While it seems there was finally some degree of acceptance of Italian elites into the

Roman senate under Augustus, certain regions under Roman control are largely excluded,

including northern Italy and many of the provinces.[111] Their incorporation into the Senate in

significant numbers would not officially come until the adlection of Claudius in 48 CE, and, as

we will see in Chapter Five, their social acceptance would take much longer.

In 9 BCE, Augustus' *Lex Julia de senatu habendo* was passed and it contained a number

of measures that sought to codify senatorial procedures. These included fines for absenteeism,

required quorums for various kinds of business, designated days for senatorial meetings,

publication of the names of senators on a public board for anyone to see, and the order of

sententiae.[112] Additionally, the law excused older senators from attending if they so desired and

it seems that many continued to attend well after age 60 or 65. In addition to this law, Augustus

proposed or supported a number of other laws that regulated aspects of senatorial life during his

reign, thus extending the changes Augustus wrought on the Senate far beyond its procedures or

---

[109] Cass. Dio 54.14.2: ἀλλὰ καὶ μετὰ τοῦτο, ἐπειδή τινες οὐκ ἐπιτήδειοι καὶ τότε ἐγγεγραμμένοι ἦσαν; for the *lectio* in 13, see Cass. Dio 54.26.3-5. Jones (1955) thinks the revision in 13 was not a *lectio* but rather a *recognitio equitum* based on Augustus' claim in the Res Gestae (8.2) to have held only three *lectiones* (10).

[110] Wiseman (1971), 183: Wiseman counts 19 securely attested with another 22 as possible entrants at this time. On the *lectio* of 4 CE, see Cass. Dio 55.13.

[111] On northern Italy and the provinces of Spain, see see Chapter Five and Wiseman (1971), 12. For the eastern provinces, see Halfmann (1979), esp. 78-81, where he notes that the majority of eastern senators entered in the later Julio-Claudian period.

[112] On the quorums, see Cass. Dio 55.3.1-4 and Suet. *Aug*. 35; on *sententiae*, see Gell. *NA* 4.10.1, Plin. *Ep*. 5.13.5-7 and 8.14.19; for a full discussion of the law, see Talbert (1984a) 56-58.

membership.[113] These laws regulated morality and whom senators could marry, defined the

crime of treason against the state and the imperial family, and controlled where senators could sit

at public entertainments.[114] The final change Augustus instituted to the body came at the end of

his reign, in 13 CE, when he made the decisions of the Senate's *consilium* equal in authority to

that of the entire body.[115] This was a very short-lived change, reversed by Tiberius in the early

years of his rule.[116]

Over the course of his tenure, Augustus had not only repeatedly revised the membership

of the Senate and instituted new restrictions on members' social behavior, but also fundamentally

changed the Senate's role in foreign policy, military affairs, and the finance of the state.[117] At the

same time, many of these changes were made under the veneer of the restoration of the republic

and a return to ancestral precedents.[118] As has been noted by many historians previously,

Augustus' long tenure and successful designation of an heir ensured the continuation of his

governmental and social changes. How much change Augustus instituted, however, is really

only clearly visible in hindsight: there was much continuity as well. Augustus encouraged the

participation of the old aristocracy in the Senate, and now, alongside new men, members still

vied for the consulship, albeit under changed circumstances. The Senate had an even more

---

[113] *RG* 6.

[114] These included the *leges Julia de maiestatis* and *Julia de theatralis*. The dates of these laws are uncertain, but the second probably dates to around 5 CE. The third, the *lex Julia de Julia maritandus ordinibus*, is referred to in the *Carmen Saeculare* of 17 BCE, and so was in place by then. On Augustus' use of the *lex Julia maiestas*, see Tac. *Ann*. I.72; Dio 56.27; Suet. *Oct*. 55.

[115] Cass. Dio 56.28.

[116] Tac. *Ann*. 1.6. Talbert (1984a), 61- 62: "Yet in fact, very remarkably, the quite unthinkable and unexpected occurred, greatly to the senate's advantage. Tiberius abolished the consilium altogether… For the senate to acquire a regular judicial role was quite definitely an innovation of Tiberius' reign."

[117] Syme (1936); Syme (1986); Talbert (1984), following Tacitus *Ann*. 1.2, goes too far when he says "The senate was indeed permanently deprived of certain major functions, most notably oversight of foreign policy, together with military and financial affairs" (488). Senators still held proconsulships in provinces, still conducted military campaigns, acting in the name of the Princeps assuredly, but still participating in these areas. They also advised the Emperor as part of the Senate.

[118] Syme (1939); Syme (1986); Galinsky (1996); Wallace-Hadrill (2008).

privileged place in Roman society being marked out by clothing, seating, and relation to the Princeps himself.

Augustus and the Gens

While Augustus opened the Senate to certain Italians, he also worked carefully to maintain good ties with old aristocratic families that had survived the civil wars. Their relative exclusion from the consulship in the 20s was perhaps a way of consolidating his own position, but, as we saw above, famous gentilician names soon crept back into the consular *fasti* in the decade of the teens.[119] Additional means that Augustus used to placate, win over, and ultimately consolidate aristocratic support had to do with Augustus' manipulation of the traditions of the *gens*. With his adoption into the *gens* Julia, Augustus obtained the lineage necessary to be equal with the old aristocratic families of Rome, although one wonders what was whispered about him behind closed doors. In this position Augustus secured his own marriage to Livia Drusus in 38 BCE, becoming the stepfather to Tiberius Claudius Nero, his eventual heir to the imperial throne, and cementing his ties with one of the most prominent and historically important *gentes* in Rome. However, Augustus also followed the traditional means of creating political alliances through strategic marriage arrangements for members of his own family and his close associates. The restoration of old aristocratic families that had fallen into difficulties also aided Augustus.[120] Moreover, he appropriated the famous ancestors of other *gentes* in his Forum Augustum and the many funeral processions he held for his unfortunate family.

Through the two marriages of his sister, Octavia, and the marriages of his sister's daughters and sons, Augustus brought members of the aristocratic *gentes* Antonii, Domitii,

---

[119] For example, the consuls of 22, 21, and 20, Lucius Arruntius, Marcus Lollius, Publius Silius Nerva, respectively, were all newcomers.

[120] Families revived by Augustus included the Quinctii, Valerii, Lentuli, Quinctilii, Ahenobarbi, and Fabii.

Aemilii, Valerii, and two branches of the Claudii into his extended family.[121] The eldest of

Augustus' nieces, Marcella *maior*, was married to Agrippa and Iullus Antonius (son of Mark

Antony, later exiled), and Marcella *minor* married Marcus Valerius Messalla Appianus and

Lucius Aemilius Lepidus Paullus. At the same time, Augustus brought his supporters, many of

them new men, into the imperial fold by offering them promotion or marriage. Most famous of

these was the marriage of Julia and Agrippa, whose five children met with either untimely early

deaths (in the cases of Gaius and Lucius) or served as additional ties to old aristocratic houses.[122]

A grandniece of Augustus, Vipsania, daughter of Agrippa and his second wife, Marcella, married

Publius Quinctilius Varus of Teutoburg fame, thereby linking the restored Quinctilii even more

closely to the Princeps.[123]

Those aristocratic families without marriage ties to the imperial family often achieved

political success.[124] While the Fasti Capitolini is lacking for a large portion of Augustus' reign,

---

[121] Marriage alliances did not signal complete political agreement and often ended up being a temporary alliance, especially in the later Republic. However, with the supremacy of Augustus these marriages perhaps came to be more politically important and permanent. On marriages to the family of Augustus, see Syme's (1936) brief discussion on p 493 and Syme (1986) Table III "The Family of Augustus." As Syme observed, "Discreet, obscured or held down by Caesar Augustus, the descendants of Pompeius Magnus begin to come up again in the last decade of the reign (after A.D. 4), and enjoy favour with his successor" (Syme (1960), 12). These included Marcus Crassus Frugi, cos. 27 CE; Faustus Sulla cos. 31 CE.

[122] Agrippina was married to Germanicus, son of Nero Claudius Drusus and Julia to Lucius Aemilius Paullus, thereby strengthening previously existing ties between the *gentes*.

[123] *Kölner Pap. I* (1976), 10 (Augustus' funeral oration for Agrippa).

[124] All the details of how elections worked under Augustus remain unclear. Lily Ross Taylor (1960) suggests that after Caesar the tribal voting system was nothing more than a sham (p. 315), but there must have been some sort of transition from a functioning electoral system in the Republic to that under Augustus. Tibiletti (1953) and A.H.M. Jones (1955) maintain that elections were competitive in spite of imperial control. Frei-Stolba (1967) thoroughly examines elections beginning in the time of Cicero, changes made to elections by Caesar and the triumvirs, how we think elections functioned under Augustus, and then elections into the Flavian period. She concludes that the princeps offered up a list of candidates for approval by the Senate. Levick (1967) examines evidence for elections to all the magistracies, concluding that there was no formal control by the *princeps* over the selection process in the majority of elections but his selections were elected (*de facto* rather than *de iure*). At the same time, Levick concludes that the consulship was different. By the time of Pliny, the emperor openly controlled the election of consuls (Plin. *Pan.* 92.3) but this was not the case in the early Principate. In the case of

what remains is enough to formulate some hypotheses about how the consulate functioned under Augustus. Early in his reign, Augustus held the consulship in successive years with members of a new class of nobility to the exclusion of the old aristocracy. After 23, this was no longer true and at some point between 12 BCE and 2 CE, it became typical to have more than two consuls per year.[125] This expansion of the number of consuls enabled Augustus to integrate more members of the Roman aristocracy, old and new, politically and to give them appropriate channels through which to compete. The *fasti consulares* show that the Cornelii, Calpurnii, Licinii, Sulpicii, Fabii, and Aelii all saw members achieve the consulship during the reign of Augustus.[126] These aristocratic names were mixed in the *fasti* with the names of newcomers, including Marcus Vinicius, Lucius Tarius Rufus, Caius Valgius Rufus, Caius Caninius Rebilius, and Quintus Haterius.[127] This trend continued into the first century CE, with more names of *novi homines* appearing in the consular *fasti* alongside fewer old aristocratic names.[128] The distribution of the consulship among many of the most prominent families of Rome was

Augustus, imperial influence was wielded through a variety of means (speeches of support, letters to the Senate, etc.), but did not result in the control of the elections through direct intervention (pgs. 229-230). However, the result was largely the same as if Augustus had exercised his power over the consulship. Subsequently, Swan (1982) analyzes Dio's language choices to conclude that nomination did happen under Augustus, but fails to understand that despite the fact that Dio was well versed in Roman institutions and terminology (439-440), it is entirely possible that Dio is retrojecting earlier or contemporary processes back onto the Augustan era. Most recently, Syme (1999), 13, determines that a seat in the *curia* could be won in two ways, by holding the quaestorship or by direct adlection: "Adlection, like the grant of the *latus clavus*, depended on the will of the Princeps: he proceeded either in virtue of censorial powers specially conferred, or simply by *auctoritas*." Sumi (2005), 228-237, arrives at the roughly same conclusion as Levick.

[125] The primary source of the consular lists is the *Fasti Capitolini*, on which see Degrassi (1954) *Fasti Capitolini*. The *Fasti Capitolini* will be discussed in more detail below.

[126] From the consular *fasti* as listed in Degrassi (1954) and Cooley (2012).

[127] From the consular *fasti* as listed in Degrassi (1954) and Cooley (2012): these men were all suffect consuls. On the suffect consulship, see Phillips (1997).

[128] Marsh (1931) 63, and Syme (1939) 362, 372-3; Jones (1955) considered this a result of the *Lex Valeria Cornelia* (also called the *Tabula Hebana*) of 4 CE (p. 18). Contra, see Brunt (1961), who argues that it was the lack of male members of the imperial family, the unwillingness on the part of Augustus to alienate aristocratic families, and the coming of age of many of the sons of Augustus' supporters that led to the increase in suffect consuls starting in 5 BCE and that the *Lex Valeria Cornelia* had little do to with the influx of new men to the consulship.

significant because it reflected a return to Republican traditions of the early and middle Republic, when the consulship was not dominated by one individual or *gens*. The majority of the recipients were those not connected to the imperial family through marriage, and perhaps we can view the distribution of the consulship as a means of patronage by Augustus that replaced the matrimonial link.

Another means by which Augustus attempted to incorporate families into his imperial program was through the appropriation of the majority of important Roman historical figures (the *summi viri*) in his Forum Augustum.[129] The Forum contained two sets of statues, with clear affinities with the *imagines* and their *tituli*.[130] It is this fact that makes the Forum Augustum important for my argument here: we have already seen the importance of the *imagines* to aristocratic Roman *gentes* in terms of the role they played in the creation of aristocratic identity and the maintenance of familial memory. By erecting statues of famous Romans, many of whom were outside his own family, that were reminiscent of aristocratic *imagines*, Augustus achieved two important goals: He effectively appropriated their memory within the construction of a monument devoted to his aggrandizement while at the same time honoring any living descendants publicly. Thus the *summi viri* in Augustus' Forum were another way for Augustus to both appropriate aristocratic ancestors and honor those with whom he did not arrange matrimonial ties or political advancement.

---

[129] The most complete discussion of the Forum Augustum to date is Spannagel (1999). Zanker (1970) examines the Forum Augustum in detail (but Spannagel and especially Geiger have added more recent archaeological finds to add to the discussion). Zanker (1988) details the iconography of the entire Augustan building program. Geiger (2008) is the most in-depth discussion on the *summi viri* and Shaya (2013) builds on Geiger's conclusions.

[130] Rowell (1940); Flower (1996), 224-236; Geiger (2008) 25-27.

Perhaps begun as early as the late 20s BCE, the Forum was not quite complete at the dedication of its unfinished temple to Mars Ultor decades later, in 2BCE.[131] Suetonius says the Forum was built to increase the available space for law courts, but Dio tells us that this was actually the new center for provincial administration, the location from which governors would depart from and return to Rome, and where the Senate would debate on waging war, awarding ornamental triumphs, and where young men would don the *toga virilis*.[132] If the Forum did in fact function as Dio suggests, the impact of Augustus choice about who to include gains even more significance since the leading men of Rome would see its statues every time the business of state was conducted. Lining the semi-circular halls and porticoes on either side of the Forum were marble statues of the ancestors of the Iulii probably beginning with Aeneas and the great

---

[131] The ancient sources give no clear date for the beginning of construction. Suetonius (*Aug.* 29.2) tells us that Augustus vowed the temple of Mars Ultor at Philippi, in 42 BCE. Ovid confirms this and adds that the god won his title Avenger a second time through the recovery of the Parthian standards (*Fasti* 5.569-96). We know that the temple of Mars Ultor did indeed become the repository of the standards (*RG* 29.2), but the vexing question is whether or not there were two temples of Mars Ultor built by Augustus. Dio (54.8.3) tells us in his account of the recovery of the standards in 20 BCE that a temple of Mars Ultor on the Capitoline for the standards was built on Augustus' orders. This Capitoline temple must be the round temple of Mars Ultor accompanied by standards shown on coins issued at various mints in and around 19/18 BC. But did Augustus really build a temple on the Capitoline only to have the standards it was built to house move to the temple in his forum after its completion? On this question see Rich (1988), 71-128; Spannagel (1999). Geiger (2008), thinks a slightly later starting date, closer to 19 BCE, is correct (59).

[132] Suet. *Aug.* 29.1-2: *Fori exstruendi causa fuit hominum et iudiciorum multitudo, quae videbatur non sufficientibus duobus etiam tertio indigere; itaque festinatius necdum perfecta Martis aede publicatum est cautumque, ut separatim in eo publica iudicia et sortitiones iudicum fierent*; Cass. Dio 55.10.2-4: …ἑαυτὸν δὲ καὶ τοὺς ἐγγόνους, ὁσάκις ἂν ἐθελήσωσι, τούς τε ἐκ τῶν παίδων ἐξιόντας καὶ ἐς τοὺς ἐφήβους ἐγγραφομένους ἐκεῖσε πάντως ἀφικνεῖσθαι, καὶ τοὺς ἐπὶ τὰς ἀρχὰς τὰς ἐκδήμους στελλομένους ἐκεῖθεν ἀφορμᾶσθαι, τάς τε γνώμας τὰς περὶ τῶν νικητηρίων ἐκεῖ τὴν βουλὴν ποιεῖσθαι, καὶ τοὺς πέμψαντας αὐτὰ τῷ Ἄρει τούτῳ καὶ τὸ σκῆπτρον καὶ τὸν στέφανον ἀνατιθέναι, καὶ ἐκείνους τε καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους τοὺς τὰς ἐπινικίους τιμὰς λαμβάνοντας ἐν τῇ ἀγορᾷ χαλκοῦς ἵστασθαι, ἄν τέ ποτε σημεῖα στρατιωτικὰ ἐς πολεμίους ἁλόντα ἀνακομισθῇ, ἐς τὸν ναὸν αὐτὰ τίθεσθαι, καὶ πανήγυρίν τινα πρὸς τοῖς ἀναβασμοῖς αὐτοῦ ὑπὸ τῶν ἀεὶ ἱλαρχούντων ποιεῖσθαι, ἦλόν τε αὐτῷ ὑπὸ τῶν τιμητευσάντων προσπήγνυσθαι…

men of the Republic led by Romulus.[133] The selective nature of the membership in the *summi viri* in the Forum Augustum is one of the most important features of the imperial propaganda presented by this building project. While the evidence of the statues is fragmentary and incomplete, and in some cases terribly preserved, Geiger lists those statues attested and provides reasonable inferences about others that were probably included.[134] His estimate that the Forum Augustum held approximately 150 statues seems plausible.[135] Briefly we will look at who Augustus included in his Forum, and who is missing.[136]

The information for the list of honorands comes from an inscription that contains the text of an *elogium* from the Forum Augustum.[137] The primary focus of the Forum was of the Roman past, expressed in the statuary of the *summi viri*. While we are unsure of the identity of every statue, those that are reliably identifiable reveal the inclusion of famous Romans only.[138] The Alban and Roman kings were among the statues headed by that of Aeneas, along with his father Anchises and his son Ascanius. There were probably women included on the side of the *summi viri*, including perhaps Lavinia, Hersilia, Carmentis, Tanaquil, Lucretia, Virginia, and Cloelia.[139] Included are Postumius Albus Regillensis (the victor over the Latin league at the battle of Lake Regillus), Marcus Furius Camillus (dictator and victor over Veii), Marcus Valerius Corvus

---

[133] Zanker (1970), Rich (1988), Spannagel (1999), and Geiger (2008) are in general agreement about who was included among the *summi viri* but disagree over their arrangement. Where exactly each statue was placed does not matter to the argument here.

[134] Geiger (2008), 103-162.

[135] Geiger (2008), 120.

[136] The list we have of members is far from complete. Attestation is problematic in some instances as well. The resulting argument from silence is weak, but there are some good reasons to understand why Augustus might have omitted various participants from Roman history.

[137] *CIL*.VI.8.3.

[138] If, in fact, Agrippa and Augustus' father were granted statues among the most famous aristocratic Romans, then my argument would be even stronger. The *summi viri* both bolstered aristocratic families (public recognition and celebration of the role their ancestors had played in Roman history) and undermined them (Augustus was in control of this commemoration, thus taking over for the families, and inclusion of people like Agrippa would be to grant them status equal to that of the old aristocracy).

[139] Geiger (2008), 115.

(triumphator over the Samnites, Antiates, and the Marsi), Lucius Cornelius Sulla (whose law prohibited some of the Italians from seeking office), and most of Augustus' own family. Such figures, including members of the *gens Iulia* and heroes from the early Republic, were possibly supplemented with statues of late Republican heavyweights like Sulla, Marius, Pompey, and Cicero.[140] Among these were included members of the *gentes* Valerii, Furii, Junii, Metelii, Claudii, and the Fabii, some of whose descendants now held consulships and were intermarried with Augustus' family.[141] Many of these individuals celebrated triumphs in battle over Italians; perhaps this was ancient history by the time of Augustus, but there seems little in the way of implying Italian unity. As Shaya concludes,

> In sum, the *summi viri* traced a simple unity of purpose from the city's foundation, through the Alban kings, and up to its present. The collection placed the continuity of this purpose in the trust of Augustus, whose image stood at its center as the heir and consummation of Rome's earlier renowned leaders. It was a representation of the advancement of the Roman empire. Its story was one of expansion. Here, with the consolidation of power in the hands of Augustus, the past was reimagined as a time in which Rome's leaders undertook a long, unified, and great imperial project—the very building of Rome.[142]

---

[140] Spannagal (1999) and Geiger (2008) determine that the following figures were probably included among the *summi viri*: 7 kings of Rome (but probably not Tarquinius Superbus, possibly Titus Tatius in his place); the Alban kings, including Aeneas, Aeneas Silvius, Alba Silvius, Calpetus Silvius, Proca, and Capys Silvius; C. Iulius Iul(l)us (member of board of decemviri); L. Iulius (possibly the consul of 90 and censor of 89); C. Iulius Caesar (father of Julius Caesar); C. Iulius Caesar Strabo; M. Claudius Marcellus; Tiberius Claudius Nero (mother was Livia Drusilla); Drusus; Tiberius Sempronius Gracchus (father of tribunes); Brutus (of 509 fame); Marius; P. Cornelius Sulla; Postumius Albus Regillensis (victor at Lake Regillus); A. Cornelius Cossus; M. Furius Camillus; M. Valerius Corvus; L. Papirius Cursor; App. Claudius Caecus; C. Fabricius Luscinus; C. Duilius; Q. Fabius Maximus Verrucosus; P. Cornelius Scipio Africanus; C. Cornelius Cethegus; M. Porcius Cato (thought to be Cato the Censor because of *censorius* in the inscription); L. Cornelius Scipio Asiaticus; M. Aemilius Lepidus; L. Aemilius Paullus; C. Claudius Pulcher or C. Claudius Nero; P. Cornelius Scipio Aemelianus; Q. Caecilius Metellus Macedonicus; Q. Caecilius Metellus Numidicus; L. Licinius Lucullus; Pompey; Sextus Appuleius (son of Octavia maior); Poss Marcus Agrippa; probably the natural father of Augustus (see also *CIL* VI.8.3 40301); and M. Valerius Maximus. There is general consensus that the following were excluded: Brutus, Cassius, Antony. Cicero was probably also included, while Cato Uticensis was most likely excluded.
[141] Flower (1996), 232. Anderson (1984) offers plausible reasons Augustus selected these individuals: they were precedents for Augustus' own career and ancestors of his supporters and relatives by marriage.
[142] Shaya (2013), 80.

It therefore seems reasonable to conclude that the target audience for the Forum Augustum was the old Roman aristocracy, whose famous ancestors were linked to the conquest of the Roman empire and whose descendants were now operating in a political system alongside countless new men. The primary emphasis of these individuals is their place in the Roman past and as conquerors of the Italian people, but with the inclusion of some new men (including Marius and Cicero), the message was potentially more conciliatory than it seems at first glance. That the careers and service of men like Marius and Cicero could be on par with the exploits of the most famous and aristocratic of Romans was a bold statement that mirrored many of Augustus' other attempts to appease the old aristocracy while incorporating municipal elites.

The entire construction reflected the ideological program and personal vision of Augustus in a way that earlier monuments did not.[143] To be excluded from Augustus' choice was to experience a rejection of one's own family history as being important to that of the state.[144] In the early stages of the Principate, oblivion was unacceptable to noble families who continued to compete with one another and with their ancestors for position.[145] To a great extent, Augustus was successful in his attempt to ally himself with as many noble families as possible through political advancement, matrimony, and the appropriation of ancestors. Ultimately, his goal, whether intentional or not, was to restructure the Roman elite by removing their reliance on

---

[143] Zanker (1988), 195 and Geiger (2008), 64.

[144] As Geiger (2008), 8, argues, "Private collections [of statues], such as those of the *imagines* of the families of the nobility, may have impressed the crowds in their funeral processions but were clearly conceived as expressions of the status of these families in the state rather than of the state itself. But Augustus was the State….exclusion had even more far-reaching consequences than inclusion…non-inclusion in a normative list of persons often amounts to instant oblivion."

[145] In his discussion of Ovid's description of the Forum, articulated by Mars, Geiger argues (181) that "it is telling that in the description in the *Fasti* both the Iulii and the *summi viri* are referred to as groups only, and the large central sculptural assemblages of Aeneas and Romulus are the only ones that are singled out specifically. This is the impression most viewers would get, the collection and the very numbers of the great men of the Republic being a more impressive statement than the characteristics or achievements of any particular individual" (181). This seems unlikely, particularly when considering how the elite remembered their past.

family and memory and replacing it with individual relationships with the imperial family. To that end, Augustus also employed public processions.

Augustus and Public Processions (funerals and triumphs)

As Sumi notes in his analysis of public performance during the triumviral period, "Later, when Octavian became princeps and began calling himself Augustus, he brought…public performances under his own control and transformed them into the court ceremony of the Principate."[146] The public performances most important to our discussion are those of the public funeral and the triumph, both institutions of aristocratic memory that Augustus largely appropriated and modified. These institutions had formed key parts of Roman aristocratic identity in the Republic and remained important to traditional Roman *gentes* into the Imperial period.

We have already seen the important social and political function these funerals had during the Republican period for aristocratic families, which was probably maintained during the Julio-Claudian dynasty. During the Republic, aristocratic funerals served to distinguish the aristocracy from the general populace while allowing them participation in the public spectacle, to reinforce traditional values, and to highlight the continuity and importance of a particular family in the political and social fabric of Rome. This apparently did not change in the early years of Augustus' reign, when he granted many public funerals.[147] Unfortunately, evidence of these grants under Augustus is lacking in our sources and it therefore difficult to trace the change

---

[146] Sumi (2005), 1.
[147] Cass. Dio 54.12.2; in her monograph *Funus Publicum,* Wesch-Klein (1993) examines public funerals in literary and epigraphic sources both in Rome and the western provinces in an attempt to provide a comprehensive overview of the institution from the Republican through the imperial periods. She suggests that the funerals of Sulla, Caesar and Augustus were the primary influences for the development of imperial funerals throughout the imperial period.

over time in this aristocratic institution, but we can see the development of imperial funerals.[148]

The tragic early deaths of several members of Augustus' family enabled him to change these

institutions to reflect better the modified social and political reality of the Imperial period. As

part of the changes wrought by Augustus, some scholars have seen a shift in the focus of

funerary ritual away from the civic center of Rome, the Forum, to more private interior spaces of

the house and the suburban environment where the pyre and the burial site were located.[149]

Bodel argues that "monopolization by the emperor of particular modes of self-display resulted in

a diffusion of the traditional forms to new venues outside the city and an internalization in

private domestic contexts of themes and (we may perhaps now add) behaviors previously

associated with the public civic spaces of Rome."[150] This certainly began during the reign of

Augustus, but did not come to full fruition until later in the Principate when what had been a

vital part of the social fabric of Roman elite public life slowly waned.

     Augustus had his first experience with the aristocratic funeral at a young age in 51 BCE,

when as a 12 year old he delivered the funeral oration for his grandmother, Julia, sister of

Caesar.[151] During his first consulship in 43, he held a funeral at public expense for his mother,

Atia, and this would become routine during his rule.[152] In the last decades of the 1st century

BCE, Augustus delivered eulogies for Marcellus in 23, Agrippa in 12, Octavia in 11, and Drusus

in 9, and he did the same for Gaius in 2 CE and Lucius in 4 CE. In some ways, the numerous

---

[148] The only reference to the grant of a public funeral under Augustus is that of Sextus Appuleius, who was the husband of Octavia and therefore part of the imperial family (*ILS* 8963; PIR^2 A 960). On the relationship between imperial funerals and the Roman aristocracy see Price (1987), 56-105.

[149] Bodel (1999), 259 and Wesch-Klein (1993), 15-29.

[150] Bodel (1999), 271: The evidence does not necessarily support Bodel's claim that *imagines* and funerals were suddenly transformed by the time of Tiberius into domestic and private affairs (271-2). His reliance on a much later source (one example from App. *Hisp.* 89) and sources who were themselves outside the traditional Roman aristocracy (Sen. *Ben.* 3.28.2, Sen. *Ep.* 44.5 and 76.12; Mart. 2.90.5-6; Plin. *Ep.* 5.17.6; and Juv. 8.1-3) is problematic at best.

[151] Nic. Dam. FGH 90 F 127; Suet. *Aug.* 8.

[152] Suet. *Aug.* 61 and Cass. Dio 47.17.6 (although Dio gives the date of the funeral as 42).

tragedies that befell the heirs of Augustus provided a succession of funerals, which cemented and

normalized the procedure of including *imagines* of non-ancestors.[153]

In addition to serving as opportunities to shape funerary customs and set imperial

precedent, they also foreshadowed the shape of Augustus' own funeral in 14 CE. As Flower

states, "the first *princeps* borrowed and adapted traditional aristocratic ancestor masks to create

an iconography for his new political order and to design a series of magnificent funerals which

reflected his family's leading position within the community."[154] Public days of mourning,

processions through the city with the *imagines* of both the Iulii and other famous Romans

unrelated to the deceased, multiple funeral orations (instead of a single eulogy), placing the

corpse in the forum or a temple to lie in state, and triumphal-like presentations were some of the

innovations Augustus put in place for funerals for the imperial family.[155]

At Augustus' funeral, these traditions were continued with the inclusion of *imagines* of

Romans not directly related to him and with additional honors bestowed by the Senate.[156] As

Dio tells us, Augustus left instructions for his funeral that were supplemented by honors voted to

him by the Senate.[157] He also described the funeral procession: an image (εἰκὼν) of wax, one of

gold, and one borne on a triumphal chariot processed through the streets followed by the

imagines of his ancestors and other Romans prominent in any way, including that of Pompey the

Great.[158] It seems likely that many of the men whose statues adorned the Forum Augustum

---

[153] According to Cass. Dio 54.29.4-6, the aristocracy reacted poorly to this practice after the funeral procession of Marcellus.
[154] Flower (1996), 223.
[155] On Agrippa, Octavia, and Drusus lying in state, see Cass. Dio 54.35.4-5 and 55.2.2; on the *imagines* at imperial funerals, see Tac. *Ann*. 3.5.1; on multiple *laudationes*, see Tac. *Ann*. 3.5.1, Cass. Dio 56.34.4, Suet. *Aug*. 100.3; on Drusus' funeral's similarity to triumphal processions, see Sen. *Dial*. 6.3.1.
[156] Cass. Dio 56.34, Tac. *Ann*. 1.8, and Suet. *Aug*. 100.2.
[157] Cass. Dio 56.33.
[158] Cass. Dio 54.34: ταῦτα μὲν αἱ ἐντολαὶ εἶχον, μετὰ δὲ τοῦτο ἡ ἐκφορὰ αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο. κλίνη ἦν ἔκ τε ἐλέφαντος καὶ χρυσοῦ πεποιημένη καὶ στρώμασιν ἁλουργοῖς διαχρύσοις κεκοσμημένη· καὶ

appeared in the funeral procession, thus marking a significant departure from traditional

aristocratic procedures.[159]

Alongside these imperial spectacles were the funeral processions of the aristocracy, both

private and public processions granted by the Senate. We know that public funerals continued to

be awarded regularly by Tiberius.[160] However, they may have become problematic for the

emperor because they reminded families of where they came from, what their ancestors had

achieved, and perhaps what they themselves had failed to achieve. Regardless of whether or not

the funeral was a state-sponsored "public" funeral, the funeral procession itself was public and

took place in the socially and politically prominent landscape of Rome, as we saw in Chapter

Two. To support the notion that aristocratic families did feel threatened by the usurpation of

their ancestors and the increased *dignitas* of the imperial family, one needs only consider the

funeral of Junia, sister of Brutus and wife of Cassius, who died in 22 CE and whose procession is

---

ἐν αὐτῇ τὸ μὲν σῶμα κάτω που ἐν θήκῃ συνεκέκρυπτο, [εἰκὼν δὲ δή τις αὐτοῦ κηρίνη ἐν ἐπινικίῳ
στολῇ ἐξεφαίνετο.] καὶ αὕτη μὲν ἐκ τοῦ παλατίου πρὸς τῶν ἐς νέωτα ἀρχόντων, ἑτέρα δὲ ἐκ τοῦ
βουλευτηρίου χρυσῆ, καὶ ἑτέρα αὖ ἐφ᾽ ἅρματος πομπικοῦ ἤγετο. καὶ μετὰ ταύτας αἵ τε τῶν
προπατόρων αὐτοῦ καὶ αἱ τῶν ἄλλων συγγενῶν τῶν τεθνηκότων, πλὴν τῆς τοῦ Καίσαρος ὅτι ἐς
τοὺς ἥρωας ἐσεγέγραπτο, αἵ τε τῶν ἄλλων Ῥωμαίων τῶν καὶ καθ᾽ ὁτιοῦν πρωτευσάντων, ἀπ᾽
αὐτοῦ τοῦ Ῥωμύλου ἀρξάμεναι, ἐφέροντο. καί τις καὶ τοῦ Πομπηίου τοῦ μεγάλου εἰκὼν ὤφθη,
τά τε ἔθνη πάνθ᾽ ὅσα προσεκτήσατο, ἐπιχωρίως σφίσιν ὡς ἕκαστα ἀπηκασμένα ἐπέμφθη. "Then
came his funeral. There was a couch made of ivory and gold and adorned with coverings of purple and
gold. In it his body was hidden, in a coffin down below; but a wax image of him in triumphal garb was
visible. This image was borne from the palace by the officials elected for the following year, and another
of gold from the senate-house, and still another upon a triumphal chariot. Behind these came the images
of his ancestors and of his deceased relatives (except that of Caesar, because he had been numbered
among the demigods) and those of other Romans who had been prominent in any way, beginning with
Romulus himself. An image of Pompey the Great was also seen, and all the nations he had acquired, each
represented by a likeness which bore some local characteristic, appeared in the procession."
[159] I agree with Rowell (1940) when he concludes: "In consideration, then, of this forum and the political
and patriotic conceptions which it illustrated so brilliantly, we have no longer any valid reason to question
the veracity of Dio's statement that the *imagines* of all great Romans, beginning with Romulus, were
present at Augustus" funeral, together with those of his own family, historical and legendary (43)."
[160] Cass. Dio 57.21.3, 58.19.5; Talbert (1984), 370-1. Tiberius requested public funerals be granted by the
Senate for Sulpicius Quirinius in 21 CE (Tac. *Ann*. 3.48.1), Lucilius Longinus in 23 CE (Tac. *Ann*.
4.15.1-2), Lucius Calpurnius Piso in 32 (Tac. *Ann*. 6.10.3 and Dio 58.19.5), and Aelius Lamia in 33 (Tac.
Ann. 6.27.2). More on the significance of Piso's funeral in chapter 4.

remarked upon by Tacitus for its apparent opposition to the Emperor from the outset.[161] Her

failure to name the Princeps in her will and her decision to incorporate the *imagines* of the *gentes*

Manlii, Quinctii, and other noble families must have been a direct response to the appropriations

made by Augustus. Tiberius seems to have responded with the extravagant funeral of Drusus in

the following year, but the funeral for Livia in 29 was a much more simple affair.[162] The apparent

competition in funeral processions demonstrates a response from the aristocracy to the

appropriation of their institutions by the imperial family, which, with the accession of Tiberius,

was simply another aristocratic family, the Claudii.

Through his incorporation of ever more old aristocratic families into the funeral

processions of his own family, Augustus tried to eliminate competition between Roman elite

families. What Augustus may not have counted on was the way in which this process may have

threatened the Roman elite and contributed to the rise of *maiestas* trials and conspiracies under

his successors. Another surprising phenomenon likely contributed to the perception that

aristocratic culture as represented in public funerals was under attack: the spectacle of the mock

funeral. Pliny tells us of a public funeral for a talking crow, who had greeted the emperor

Tiberius from the Rostrum, was given the escort of two Ethiopians and flute players, and was

processed by many mourners to his pyre along the Via Appia.[163] Seneca relates the story of an

---

[161] Tac. *Ann.* 3.76.
[162] Tac. *Ann.* 4.9.2 and 5.1.4; Flower (1996), 253-4.
[163] Plin. *HN.* 10.121-2: *Reddatur et corvis sua gratia, indignatione quoque populi Romani testata, non solum conscientia. Tiberio principe ex fetu supra Castorum aedem genito pullus in adpositam sutrinam devolavit, etiam religione commendatus officinae domino. is mature sermoni adsuefactus, omnibus matutinis evolans in rostra in forum versus Tiberium, dein Germanicum et Drusum Caesares nominatim, mox transeuntem populum Romanum salutabat, postea ad tabernam remeans, plurium annorum adsiduo officio mirus. hunc sive aemulatione vicinitatis manceps proximae sutrinae sive iracundia subita, ut voluit videri, excrementis eius posita calceis macula, exanimavit, tanta plebei consternatione, ut primo pulsus ex ea regione, mox interemptus sit funusque aliti innumeris celebratum exequiis, constratum lectum super Aethiopum duorum umeros praecedente tibicine et coronis omnium generum ad rogum usque qui constructus dextra viae Appiae ad secundum lapidem in campo Rediculi appellato fuit.*

imperial governor of Syria who held funeral banquets in honor of himself and ended with his

eunuchs chanting, "he lives, he lives!"[164] There were many instances where mock funerals

served as political protests. One such case was that of Gaius Turranius, who, after being

dismissed from the office of urban prefect by Caligula, commanded his slaves to lay him out as if

he were dead and to announce his death publicly until he was restored to office.[165]

The mockery of funerals seems to have continued throughout the 1st and 2nd centuries CE.

Although fictional, Petronius' Trimalchio orders his slaves to bring out his funeral clothes and

bids his guests to pretend he is dead.[166] Another fictional mockery of a funeral is Seneca's

depiction of the funeral of the emperor Claudius in his *Apocolocyntosis* as being more of a party

than a funeral.[167] Juvenal makes a pun by characterizing funerals that are to be applauded

(*plaudendum*) instead of mourned (*plangendum*).[168]

The importance of public funerals in Roman elite life dwindled beginning with the

Flavian dynasty, whose members had no *imagines* and claimed their authority to rule based on

favor from the gods.[169] It was this break with the past that made *imagines* less dangerous to the

Imperial program but also signaled how different the imperial Senate was from the Republican.

Fewer members could trace their lineage back to old houses from Italy, more members

originated in the provinces, and the emperor himself had a different background from members

---

[164] Sen. *Ep*. 12.8.
[165] Sen. *Brev. Vit*. 20.3; other instances happened outside the city of Rome, including the attack on an unpopular Roman senator (Manlius Patruinus) by the people of Sena. They beat him up and then held a mock funeral in front of him as if he were dead. Tacitus *Hist*. 4.5 tells us that they were executed for this show.
[166] Petron. *Sat*. 77-78.
[167] Sen. *Apocol*. 12.1-2.
[168] Juv. 1.146.
[169] Suet. *Vesp*. 1 and 2; Tac. *Hist*. 2.76.2. Syme (1958), x: "In armed competition for the purple, the premium on ancestors fell sharply." See also, Flower (1996), 262.

of the previous dynasty. The award of public funerals became much rarer later (the last ones we know about are for Verginius Rufus in 97 and L. Licinius Sura under Trajan).[170]

As a result, it seems that public funerals granted by the Princeps provided too much opportunity to challenge the imperial narrative of the dynastic Julio-Claudians and did not matter very much to the Flavians because of different justifications for their rule. They probably did present a problem again for the Antonines, since the basis of their right to become emperor was the concept of the best man. This may have engendered public competition in funeral processions, but the changed nature of the Roman elite (at this point few could claim descent from old aristocratic families) may have mitigated that threat. As Flower notes, *imagines* retained their importance among some members of the Roman aristocracy through the second century at public funerals but were later severely restricted under the Severans.[171] This is probably a result of the dynastic nature of the Severans when the right to rule was based on birth.

The other procession that was tremendously important to aristocratic *gentes* in the Republican period and was changed by Augustus was the triumph. All Roman historians know that after 19 BCE the triumph was only awarded to members of the imperial family: The last man outside the imperial family who celebrated a triumph was Cornelius Balbus for victories in Africa. Suetonius challenges this notion by attributing the award of over thirty triumphs to victorious generals during Augustus' reign.[172] Scholarly discussion of the triumph in the imperial period has largely ignored this passage and adhered to the importance of the last

---

[170] Talbert (1984), 370-1.
[171] Flower (1996), 263-4: she relies on the testimony of Plutarch (Caes. 5 and Mar. 9.2), Tacitus, Pliny (Plin. *Ep*. 2.7.7, 3.3.6, 5.17.6, and 8.10.3), Suetonius (*Aug*. 4, *Ner*. 37, *Galb*. 2-3, and *Vesp*. 1), and Appian (*Iber*. 89).
[172] Suet. *Aug*. 38: *Nec parcior in bellica virtute honoranda, super triginta ducibus iustos triumphos et aliquanto pluribus triumphalia ornamenta decernenda curavit.*

triumph, despite the lack of interest displayed by the ancient authors in describing it this way.[173]

For instance, Tibullus celebrated the triumph in 27 BCE of his patron, Marcus Valerius Messalla Corvinus for a victory over the Aquitanians, and predicted a future triumph for his son, Marcus Valerius Messalla Messalinus.[174] This was never awarded, but his son did receive triumphal insignia for successes in Illyricum and participated in the triumphal procession of Tiberius in 12 CE.[175]

The 'lesser' award of the *ovatio* continued to be granted to victorious generals into the Julio-Claudian period, and that of triumphal insignia (*triumphalia ornamenta*) was common up until the reign of Hadrian.[176] The *ovatio* still involved a public procession, but the victor entered the city and processed on foot or horseback (instead of in a chariot), wearing a wreath of myrtle instead of laurel, dressed in a *toga praetexta* rather than the purple *toga picta*, and was accompanied by flautists, not soldiers.[177] Still less impressive than the triumph or the *ovatio* was the award of triumphal insignia. The sources are vague on what this award included, but we know there was no public procession, no soldiers, no captives on display, and no spoils of war.[178] The relevant but muddled passage is from Suetonius' *Life of Claudius* and describes Claudius' triumph, in which those awarded the triumphal insignia by the Senate were marching. Suetonius

---

[173] Beard (2008), 301: "But ancient writers' treatment of what has become famous in modern scholarship as the "last traditional triumph," Balbus' celebration of 19 BCE, is almost as surprising." See Plin. *HN* 5.36 and Vell. Pat. 2.51.3.

[174] Tib. 1.7, esp. 1–22; 2, 5, 113–20.

[175] Vell. Pat. 2.112. 2; Ovid, *Pont*. 2. 2.75–90; Suet. *Tib*. 20.

[176] The last ovation we know of is given to Aulus Plautius by Claudius in 47 CE (see Tacitus, *Ann*. 13, 32 and Suetonius, *Claud*. 24, 3). There were instances where historians considered the awards undeserved: see Cass. Dio 58.4.8 and Tacitus, *Ann*. 12.3 and 13.53. Despite the number of references in ancient literature, we do not really know what *triumphalia ornamenta* (insignia) were, see Boyce (1942) and Eck (1999). On triumphal-like gifts to foreign kings, see also Liv. 30.15.11–2 and App. *Pun*. 32.

[177] On the entry into Rome, see Val. Max. 2.8.7, Suet. *Tib*. 9.2, Dion. Hal. 5.47.2, Plin. *HN* 15.125. On the toga and crown, see Dion. Hal. 5.47.3. On the accompanying flautists, see Gell. *NA* 5.6.21, Plin. *HN* 15.125, and Plut. *Marc*. 22.2.

[178] Beard (2008), 70.

tells us, "Those who had received triumphal ornaments in the same war followed [the chariot], but the rest went on foot wearing a *toga praetexta*, with Marcus Crassus Frugi on a horse with full trappings and a palmed outfit, because he had received the honor twice."[179] This description is hardly helpful and scholars have essentially determined that the award included the right to the symbols of the triumph.[180] Needless to say, the *ovatio* and the triumphal insignia were not the public celebration of a victorious general that the triumph was. Augustus' restriction of the triumph, if in fact he did, was balanced by the opportunity for these lesser rewards and must have placated the aristocracy for a time. There was no way they knew that the triumph had gone for good, but nevertheless their desire for competition had an outlet still.

Additionally, the questions that have dictated debate center on the authenticity of the extant sources on the triumph, the relationship between historians and the sources they used in discussing the triumph, which triumphs actually happened and which were 'invented,' and so on.[181] There has been no greater example of this treatment than what the *Fasti Triumphales* have been subjected to since their discovery in 1546 in the Forum Romanum.[182] Found in front of the temple of Antoninus and Faustina, the fragments were set up in the Palazzo dei Conservatori on

---

[179] Suet. *Claud*. 17: *…secuti et triumphalia ornamenta eodem bello adepti, sed ceteri pedibus et in praetexta, M. Crassus Frugi equo phalerato et in veste palmata, quod eum honorem iteraverat.*
[180] Versnel (1970) and Beard (2008).
[181] Beloch (1926); Cornell (1986); Drummond (1989) 173–6; Oakley (1997) 38–72, 100–4; Wiseman (1995) 103–7; Forsythe (2005) 59–77; Beard (2003) and (2008); Sumi (2005), 247-250; and Östenberg (2009). Versnal (1970) discusses the *fasti* three times, and only as a confirmation of literary texts.
[182] Typical questions that have been asked are well represented by those posed by Beard (2008), 74: "The inscribed Fasti Triumphales were an extraordinary achievement of Roman historical reconstruction and the backbone of many modern studies of the ceremony's history, to be sure. But how accurate a document is it? To what extent is a (more than symbolic) chronology of Roman triumphal celebrations within our grasp—whether we rely on this inscribed text or on the records transmitted by historians such as Livy? The more difficult problem lies not in identifying the clearly mythical, and the equally obviously historical, examples but in how to draw a line between them… How far back in time can we imagine that the compilers of the inscribed Fasti, or other historians working in the late Republic and early Empire, had access to accurate information on exactly who triumphed, when and over whom? And if they had access to it, did they use it? To what extent were they engaged in fictionalizing reconstruction, if not outright invention?"

the Capitoline hill and they were supposedly restored by Michelangelo.[183] They have come to be

called the *Fasti Capitolini* as a result of the location in which they are housed and they comprise

lists of consuls from the beginning of the Republic and triumphs starting with Romulus (the

Fasti Consulares and *Fasti Triumphales*, respectively). In spite of their placement in a

triumphalist space, the controversies over the location where and date when the *Fasti* were

erected, and their problematic dating scheme, the *Fasti* can tell us quite a bit of important

information about Augustus' appropriation of the institution of the triumph.[184]

Against much of the current scholarship surrounding the *Fasti*, I submit that it does not

actually matter if the *Fasti* accurately reflected the consulars of years past or triumphs

celebrated. For our discussion, the relationship between historians and the *Fasti* is also of little

concern. Most importantly for our purposes here, the *Fasti Capitolini* were an Augustan

monument that served both to reward those families whose ancestors had celebrated a triumph or

been consul and to symbolize Augustus' control over these institutions.[185] This interpretation fits

nicely with how Augustus balanced appropriation, inclusivity, and the aristocracy: He acted to

control the triumph while offering other avenues for aristocratic achievement (the ovation and

---

[183] Beard (2003), 24.

[184] We do not know exactly where in the Forum Romanum the *fasti* were set up, nor are we able to pin point any more specific date than during the reign of Augustus. For a long time, the author of the *fasti* was thought to be Verrius Flaccus, freedman and tutor of Gaius and Lucius, based on an inscription fabricated by Pirro Ligorio. He was motivated to falsify an honorific inscription to Verrius Flaccus at Praeneste by the philological emendation of Ottavio Pantagato to a passage of Suetonius (*Gramm. et Rhet.* 17.4) that suggested Placcus had a statue at Praneste near which he had inscribed the *fasti* on a marble wall. See Cooley (2012), 386-392 for additional discussion. The dates of the *Capitoline Fasti* are consistently one year off from the dates used by Varro and Livy. On their placement in the Palazzo dei Conservatori, see Beard (2003).

[185] Scholars typically fall into two camps about Augustus and the end of triumphal processions for non-imperial generals: as a means of senatorial control, see Syme (1939), 404, Eck (1984), 138–9, and Hickson (1991), 138. As a result of technical and legal reasons, see Brunt (1990), 447; with a slightly different emphasis, J. S. Richardson (1991), 8. I prefer a more nuanced understanding that can accommodate the evidence from Suetonius (of many triumphs being awarded) and the changes Augustus made to the institution itself. Indeed, if Augustus made modifications to the *Fasti* (including removing the triumph of Antony), the conception of this monument as an instrument of control is even clearer. See Simpson (1993), 64-69 for a brief overview.

triumphal insignia) that were available to a wider community in the Senate. His treatment of funeral processions, marriage ties, political advancement, and the commemoration of famous Romans mirrored that of the triumph and ultimately achieved the recommendations of Cicero in his discussion of the acceptance of *novi homines*. By appropriating famous Romans who were not his own ancestors in the Forum Augustum and funeral processions, Augustus acted as Cicero had urged in his Verrine orations. At the same time, the honor this inclusion brought to aristocratic families sought to mollify their concerns. Augustus was always careful to preserve something for the old aristocracy and actively sought to remove the threat of competition by modifying and appropriating the aristocratic institutions of memory that had fomented discord in the Republic.

Augustus and Aristocratic Values

Investigation of Augustus' regime has long included examination of the moral program instituted by the first Princeps.[186] Many of the values that Augustus championed can be seen in the discussion above, as demonstrated in his selection of men for inclusion in the Forum

---

[186] There is a lengthy bibliography examining the relationship between advertised values and imperial ideology in the Augustan period: See Charlesworth (1937), Wickert (1954); Beranger (1953); and Ryberg (1966). A selection of these inquiries attempt to understand the cannon of virtues, from where (Greek philosophy and history) they were drawn, and how Augustus wielded them. For a good overview of this history of scholarship on imperial virtues, see Wallace-Hadrill (1981). In his article *Virtutes Imperatoriae*, Classen (1991) examines where imperial virtues came from (not Cicero's *Pro Lege Manilia* nor a Platonic or Stoic canon) and concludes that there was no imperial canon of virtues based on the wide variety of virtues advertised by emperors of the 1st and 2nd centuries on coins: "Zusammenfassend können wir in Beantwortung der Fragen, die wir anfangs gestellt haben, feststellen, daß die Tugenden, die Augustus auf dem clipeus aureus zugeschrieben werden, nicht als Zeugnis für das Fortleben des platonisch-stoischen Kanons der spater sogenannten Kardinaltugenden angesehen werden können noch auch einer eindeutig festgelegten und greifbaren römischen Tradition; sie sind vielmehr aus besonderem Anlaß zusammengestellt, um die einmalige Leistung eines einzelnen zu ehren, und so ist durch diese vier Tugenden (*virtus, clementia, iustitia, pietas*) kein römisches Kaiserideal fixiert worden, wie die Münzen und archäologischen Denkmäler ebenso gelehrt haben wie die literarischen Zeugnisse; vielmehr haben wir zu konstatieren, daß es einen bestimmten Kanon römischer Kaisertugenden nicht gegeben hat" (38-39). More recent scholarship on imperial virtues includes Galinsky (1996), 80-126 and Wallace-Hadrill (2008), 73-143.

Augustum, his legislation regulating morals and marriage, and his promotion of ancestors and famous Romans in imperial funeral processions. These choices celebrated many traditional aristocratic values (including military valor and public service), while at the same time making them more universal and public as opposed to the provenance of one segment of society. One additional piece of evidence provides interesting comparisons between Cicero's discussions of aristocratic virtues: the *Clipeus Virtutis* of Augustus.

At the session of the Senate on January 13, 27 BCE, Octavian became Augustus and, as part of his honors, a golden shield dedicated to him by the Senate was set up in the Curia Iulia. As Augustus tells us, the inscription on the shield listed four values: *virtus* (virtue), *clementia* (clemency), *iustitia* (justice), and *pietas* (piety).[187] The first of these is familiar from Republican sources beginning with the earliest Roman historians down to Cicero's works. In fact, in light of Cicero's constant juxtaposition of *novi homines* with *virtus* one wonders if this value was chosen not only because of its Romanness but also because it had achieved an inclusive meaning. It was no longer only for victorious generals or Republican heroes, but could also extend to right behavior, success in the law courts, and many of the other aspects Cicero had suggested previously. Clemency was made a famous virtue by Augustus' adopted father, Julius Caesar, while piety had been advertised by Sulla and Pompey and justice heralded the return to laws and morals left behind during the triumviral period.[188]

While paying homage to these precedents, the shield also looked to the future.[189] What values should inform senators during this period of changing senatorial membership, as

---

[187] *RG* 34.
[188] On Pompey's use of pietas, see App. *B Civ*. 2.104. His son, Sextus, also made use of the term (Cic. *Phil*. 5.39); see also discussions in Classen (1986), esp. 282-283; Weinstock (1970), 233-243; and Galinsky (1996), 81-88.
[189] Galinsky (1996), 84.

municipal and provincial senators rose in prominence to replace many of the dying noble

families of the Roman Republic? The answer provided by Rosenstein is as follows:

> Although aristocrats continued to seek prestige from holding public office,
> playing a prominent role in public affairs, and serving the interests of friends and
> clients after 44, the extent to which they could do so was entirely at the whim of
> the emperor. A monarchy precluded the open political competition that was the
> foundation of aristocratic liberty. Now whatever glory and renown were to be
> gained from serving the *res publica* would be apportioned as the emperor saw fit.
> Monarchy also subverted the moral economy that had sustained aristocratic
> authority in the Republic. Offices and honor came no longer from the people's
> acknowledgment of individual character and achievement but through imperial
> favor. Patronage, too, henceforth derived ultimately from the same source.
> Consequently, their inner lives were all that aristocrats could truly claim to
> control any more. [190]

This generalizing statement is probably a more accurate description of the later 1st century CE

than the Julio-Claudian period, but is typical of the way in which the transition between Republic

and Principate is handled by scholars. Because a variety of factors were unknown in 27 BCE

(including what precisely Augustus meant by handing over control of the *res publica* to the

Senate and people of Rome), aristocratic values did not shift overnight. Competition for office,

public recognition, and enhanced reputation continued. The values on the shield were familiar,

but divorced from broader understandings of aristocratic behavior they represented values that all

senators, including newcomers, could attain. The shield, combined with the other changes

Augustus wrought to the aristocratic institutions I examined above, aimed to create an inclusive

Senate for both the old aristocracy and Italian elites who now made up much of its membership.

The Augustan Period and the Inclusiveness of "Tota Italia"

The appropriation of aristocratic institutions was not the only way in which Augustus

exerted control. As we saw in his promotion of *novi homines* in the triumviral period, in the 20s,

---

[190] Rosenstein (2006), 380.

and in his later reign, Augustus sought to integrate Italian aristocrats into the hostile atmosphere of the Senate. The answer of when full integration was finally achieved, for many historians of Rome, is found in the reign of Augustus and his propaganda, which emphasized the idea of *tota Italia* and marked the culmination of a centuries long process of Romanization in the Italian peninsula.[191] As an example, Mouritsen argues, "At the turn of the eras, Italy had become the homogeneous, romanised, heartland of the empire…Presumably the term '*Italia*' could be used indiscriminately; Livy may also have been inspired to do so by the Augustan *tota Italia* propaganda, which emphasized the Italian element of the Roman past."[192] This sentiment is mirrored by Torelli: "*Tota Italia* and its culture, the Augustan culture, are the refined, final product of that tortuous, centuries-long itinerary [of Romanization]."[193] According to Salmon, "Fortunately the conspiracies and struggles over succession in Augustus' last year did not lead to a revival of dissension between Romans and Italians, much less to separatism. The unification of Italy stood firm, reinforced if anything by the measures taken in the last ten years of Augustus' life."[194]

Rather than understanding Augustus' program of inclusivity as the culmination of processes of integration, however, it seems to me that the evidence suggests it was rather the beginning. I argue that the majority of the evidence scholars martial for *tota Italia* was located at Rome and aimed at an audience in the city and the Senate because it was the aristocratic portion of this population that still needed to be convinced that inclusivity was good and necessary. Furthermore, to call the evidence for *tota Italia* a program or propaganda is to smooth over the

---

[191] Syme (1939), 359; Salmon (1982), 159; Mouritsen (1998), 47; Torelli (1999), 165; MacMullen (2000) does not even consider that Romanization during Augustus' reign could happen in Italy; Wallace-Hadrill (2008) suggests that the change occurred between the social war and Augustus, see p. 449.
[192] Mouritsen (1998), 47; contra see Kendall (2013).
[193] Torelli (1999), 165.
[194] Salmon (1982), 152.

ambiguity of the evidence. In much the same way as Augustus' appropriation of aristocratic

institutions of memory both bolstered and undermined the importance of the old aristocracy and

his incorporation of newcomers ranged from political to matrimonial ties, the instances where

tota Italia is invoked by scholars are far from being clear cut. Instead, if there was a program of

tota Italia, it was as nuanced and ambiguous as Augustus' other actions so as to create a new

inclusive society while accommodating aristocratic traditions.

The first component inevitably included in every discussion of *tota Italia* is the oath

sworn by all of Italy to Octavian, which was later recounted in his *Res Gestae*:

> I pacified the sea from pirates. In this war, I handed over to their masters for punishment
> nearly 30,000 captured slaves who had fled from their masters and taken up arms against
> the Republic. All Italy, of their own volition, swore an oath to me and demanded me as
> leader of the war in which I was victorious at Actium. The Gallic and Spanish provinces,
> Africa, Sicily, and Sardinia swore the same oath. There were more than 700 senators who
> served under my standards then; among these were 83 who either before or after were
> made consuls up to the day on which this was written, and priests, approximately 170.[195]

Generally scholars quote only the first part of 25.2, but removing this oath from what surrounds

it is to ignore the rhetoric of the entire passage. The beginning describes the struggle between

Octavian and Sextus Pompey, whom the former characterizes as a pirate and Pompey's men as

runaway slaves. Thus Augustus begins the passage with the domestic, Roman concerns. Then

he expands the scope to include the oath sworn by Italy, and, as we learn later in the same

sentence, the provinces of Gaul and Spain swear the same oath. Africa, Sicily, and Sardinia are

not dependent on the word *provincia* since they are in the nominative case. Here we see

distinctions made by Augustus about specific places: the *res publica* is the first, Italy second, and

---

[195] *RG* 25.2-3: *Mare pacavi a praedonibus. Eo bello servorum qui fugerant a dominis suis et arma contra
rem publicam ceperant triginta fere milia capta dominis ad supplicium sumendum tradidi. Iuravit in mea
verba tota Italia sponte sua, et me belli quo vici ad Actium ducem depoposcit; iuraverunt in eadem verba
provinciae Galliae, Hispaniae, Africa, Sicilia, Sardinia. Qui sub signis meis tum militaverint fuerunt
senatores plures quam DCC, in iis qui vel antea vel postea consules facti sunt ad eum diem quo scripta
sunt haec LXXXIII, sacerdotes circiter CLXX.*

then the provinces. While not called a province, Italy nevertheless does seem distinct from the

res publica but the entire passage is inclusive of the entire Roman world as being loyal to

Augustus. The ambiguity of this passage created something in this passage for everyone, new

men and old aristocrats alike.[196]

The next aspect of Augustan propaganda usually discussed in the context of *tota Italia* is

the literary 'program' of those poets who had Augustus as their patron.[197] Their work is usually

interpreted to promote an Italian unity, and this literary circle includes Horace and Virgil. As

Salmon admits "Horace's pan-Italian tone is less obvious, but it can be felt unmistakably in the

poem published in 23, especially in the six so-called Roman odes."[198] Horace's mention here

links the Punic wars to their destructive force on Italy, "O shame, O mighty Carthage, made

loftier by the ignominious ruins of Italy!"[199] This is the only place in the Roman Odes where

Italy is mentioned by name and it refers to the shared suffering of Roman and her Italian allies

during that dark period. Appealing to so distant an event may have been an attempt to

acknowledge the longstanding ties between Rome and the Italians; however, the theme of Italian

unity with Rome was not actually paramount in Horace's poetry. Rather, these odes celebrated

Rome first and foremost.

---

[196] For analysis of the oaths sworn to the Roman emperors, see Herrmann (1968). He examines the six examples of oaths we have from the Roman Imperial period and firmly rejects the notion that they were based on patron and client relations. Instead, he sees them as having parallels to oaths made to Hellenistic kings and argues for a political tradition for these oaths in the military oaths of the Roman Republic.
[197] Livy is not treated here because he merits an entire chapter of his own. Briefly, in his work he treats Northern and Southern Italians rather differently from Central Italians, and all Italians very differently from Gauls. This is perhaps to be expected, but I think that he is really trying to incorporate Northern Italians into the social and political framework of Rome. It is easier for him to deal with the Southern Italians because of their Greek heritage. Gauls are treated so poorly because Livy, from Patavium, is at pains to draw clear distinctions between Northern Italians and barbarians.
[198] Salmon (1982), 145-6.
[199] Hor. *Car*. 3.5. 38-40: *O pudor! o magna Carthago, probrosis / altior Italiae ruinis*!

While Horace's nod to Italian unity may be less obvious, various scholars have argued that the theme of unity was exploited to fullest extent by Virgil's *Aeneid*.[200] At the beginning of his description of the shield of Aeneas, Virgil wrote that on the shield "the Lord of fire had wrought the Italian story, and the triumphs of the Romans; hardly was he ignorant of prophecy and unmindful of things to come."[201] Much depends on the interpretation of the entirety of the *Aeneid*, but even here the ambiguity is clear. The Italian story and the triumphs of the Romans are connected but separate, much in the same way as Augustus separated the story of civil wars from the Italian oath in his *Res Gestae*.

Although hardly thought of as a member of Augustus' literary circle, the same kind of treatment can be seen in the text of the contemporary Greek geographer, Strabo. In his description of the Roman empire around the death of Augustus, the image of Italian unity seems relatively apparent:

> The excellence of the government and of the Roman Emperors has prevented Italy (which has often been torn by civil war from the very time when it became subject to Rome), and even Rome itself, from proceeding further in the ways of error and corruption. But it would be difficult for the Romans to govern so vast an empire in any other way than by entrusting it to one person — as it were, to a father. And certainly at no other period have the Romans and their allies enjoyed such perfect peace and prosperity as that which the Emperor Augustus gave them from the very moment when he was clothed with autocratic power…[202]

---

[200] Syme (1939), 465-6, more recently see Reed (2007) and Pogorzelski (2009); Torelli (1999) examines the impact of the myth of Aeneas in the Romanization process of the Republic and makes some very valuable contributions to the debate (see 165-183). Additionally, his case studies based on archaeological evidence add to the complexity of Romanization in Italy but he ends his examination too early (with Augustus) when it seems clear that the "Romanization" of Italy continued into the 1st century CE at least.

[201] Verg. *Aen.* 8.626-8: *illic res Italas Romanorumque triumphos / haud vatum ignarus venturique inscius aevi / fecerat ignipotens…*

[202] Strabo 6.4.2: καὶ αὐτὴν δὲ τὴν Ἰταλίαν διαστᾶσαν πολλάκις, ἀφ᾽ οὗ γε ὑπὸ Ῥωμαίοις ἐστί, καὶ αὐτὴν τὴν Ῥώμην ἡ τῆς πολιτείας ἀρετὴ καὶ τῶν ἡγεμόνων ἐκώλυσεν ἐπὶ πλέον προελθεῖν πλημμελείας καὶ διαφθορᾶς. χαλεπὸν δὲ ἄλλως διοικεῖν τὴν τηλικαύτην ἡγεμονίαν ἢ ἑνὶ ἐπιτρέψαντας ὡς πατρί. οὐδέποτε γοῦν εὐπορῆσαι τοσαύτης εἰρήνης καὶ ἀφθονίας ἀγαθῶν ὑπῆρξε Ῥωμαίοις καὶ τοῖς συμμάχοις αὐτῶν, ὅσην Καῖσάρ τε ὁ Σεβαστὸς παρέσχεν ἀφ᾽ οὗ παρέλαβε τὴν ἐξουσίαν αὐτοτελῆ…

Augustus and Italy are inextricably linked in their prosperity and peace, and this may perhaps

reflect the views of a Greek who had purchased whole-heartedly at least part of the propaganda

of Augustus.[203]

Another piece of evidence used to discuss the Augustan propaganda of *tota Italia* actually

dates to the mid 1st century CE and has long been considered a natural step in the evolution of the

Italian peninsula under Roman rule. This evidence forms a nice transition between the literary

and the archaeological, in that it discusses changes wrought on the landscape by the power of

Rome. In his *Natural Histories*, Pliny the Elder describes the division of Italy into eleven

regions by Augustus:

> Now we will relate the periphery of Italy and its cities, in which matter it is necessary to
> premise that we will follow the author, the Divine Augustus, and the description made by
> him of all Italy, in 11 regions, but in this order, which is made following the line of the
> shore. In any case, it is not possible to preserve in this speech the vicinities of the cities,
> and thus we will follow the arrangement of the interior part [of Italy] in his [Augustus']
> writings, with the name of the colonies designated, which he reported in that number.
> Nor is it easy to follow their situation and origins, with the Ignaunian Ligurians –to say
> nothing of the others omitted here- granted land three times.[204]

Historians have long used this evidence from Pliny to discuss the control exercised by Augustus

over all of Italy, without explaining how this contributed to the notion of *tota Italia*.[205]

Usually the division of Italy is related to the collection of taxes, the ease of conducting

the census in each *regio*, and the overall conception of Italy as part of the Roman system as

---

[203] See also the opening of Nicholaus of Damascas' life of Augustus for similar sentiments (FGrH 90 F 125).

[204] Plin. *HN* 3.46: *Nunc ambitum eius urbesque enumerabimus, qua in re praefari necessarium est auctorem nos divum Augustum secuturos, discriptionemque ab eo factam Italiae totius in regiones XI, sed ordine eo qui litorum tractu fiet; urbium quidem vicinitates oratione utique praepropera servari non posse, itaque interiore parte digestionem in litteras eiusdem nos secuturos, coloniarum mentione signata, quas ille in eo prodidit numero. nec situs originesque persequi facile est, Ingaunis Liguribus — ut ceteri omittantur — agro tricies dato.*

[205] Thomsen (1947), 2; Salmon (1982), 146, where he states that "these writers [Horace, Virgil, Livy, Tacitus] are reflected in the pages of the Elder Pliny where the eagerness to identify Italy with Rome is constant." What Salmon touches on here is precisely my point: that the discussion of *tota Italia* is alive and well long after Augustus' reign.

opposed to being a separate province. However, the difficulties in understanding Pliny's

description have proved insurmountable in attempts to determine which *municipia* belonged to

which *regio*, since Pliny includes some in multiple regions and seems unsure himself exactly

where the borders were located.[206] As Thomsen notes, when discussing the methodology

employed by Augustus in determining the boundaries of the *regiones*, "Augustus did not adapt

radical methods, but apparently yielded to the historical tradition and endeavored to keep the

Italic tribal territories intact…The only – and irrefutably proved – instance of an old main tribe

split up between several regions is found in the Samnites, who were divided between the first,

the second, and the fourth region."[207] These divisions seemed to preserve tribal groupings and in

turn suggest that Augustus had a sense of these groupings. Rather than beginning a new

ideology of unity, the *regiones* seemed to preserve distinctions between Italic peoples, with the

interesting exception of the Samnites.[208] Perhaps Augustus' decision to divide the Samnites

preserved some vestige of a memory of their refusal to lay down arms during the Social war. At

any rate, the division of Italy acknowledged differences between the peoples of Italy and

emphasizes those differences by tribal unit rather than by stressing the Italian nature of the

peoples living there.

The theme of *tota Italia* does not seem to appear in the Parthian commemorations of

Augustus or in the most of the construction projects at Rome.[209] Also missing from discussions

of *tota Italia* is the *Milliarium Aureum*, the golden milestone of Augustus, one piece of evidence

that encapsulated perfectly both Roman control over Italy and the empire at large, but also a

---

[206] Thomsen (1947), 61, 85, and 142.
[207] Thomsen (1947), 143.
[208] For a more complete discussion of Pliny, and his relationship to Strabo and Ptolemy, see Nicolet (1991), 171-187.
[209] Rich (1998) 71-128; Wiseman (2003).

sense of connection and belonging.[210] The *Milliarium Aureum* was a column with a bronze

inscription that listed the names of the major cities of the Empire and their distances from Rome

measured from the Severan Wall.[211] The importance of this monument comes from the fact that it

was from this point that all the roads of Rome originated and this connection was commemorated

by Augustus himself. As Dio tells us, Augustus was given the *cura viarum* in 20 BCE and it was

"in this capacity that he set up the golden milestone."[212] According to the Elder Pliny, it stood in

the Forum but its location has not been identified to date.[213] Placing the names of Italian and

provincial cities in the heart of Rome made a statement simultaneously imperial and inclusive in

nature, thus addressing not only the aristocracy (whose ancestors conquered those towns) but

also new additions in the Senate (whose ancestors, or perhaps even themselves, hailed from those

towns).

Based on the evidence examined above, it seems clear that the so-called Augustan

concept of *tota Italia* merits closer study than most modern historians of ancient Rome have

offered. The historical process of enfranchisement of Italian allies took longer than commonly

acknowledged, while their social acceptance by certain of the Roman elite was likely still being

negotiated in the early Principate. As one historian argues, the loyalties of municipal elites in the

Augustan period were split between local *patriae* and the imperial dynasty.[214] To say that Italian

unity, and therefore the Romanization of the Italian peninsula, had been achieved by the time of

Augustus simply is not borne out by the evidence. Augustus' own building program in the city

---

[210] Elsner (2000), 181.

[211] See S. Platner -Ashby (1929), 342; Brodersen (1995), 165-94; Z. Mari, *LTUR* 3 (1996), 250-1.

[212] Cass. Dio 54.8.4: τότε δὲ αὐτός τε προστάτης τῶν περὶ τὴν Ῥώμην ὁδῶν αἱρεθεὶς καὶ τὸ χρυσοῦν μίλιον κεκλημένον ἔστησε.

[213] Plin. *HN* 3.66.

[214] Gabba (1994), 141-2.

of Rome, actions toward the aristocracy, and the *lectiones* of the Senate suggest a more nuanced approach.

Interestingly, in a famous passage of his *De Re Rustica*, Varro described a map of Italy inside the temple of Tellus in Rome.[215] Although the temple was built in 286 BCE, there is no reason to assume the map was equally old and there are many reasons in the context of the late Republic why it would be added to the temple in Varro's lifetime.[216] Most importantly, Varro's discussion of the map included reference to places and roads that suggest a late 1st century BCE date. The map then, is a clear indication of inclusivity. In fact, it may have been created or restored by Cicero, when he undertook repairs after it was damaged in the chaos caused by Clodius.[217] But when compared to the map commissioned by Agrippa of the whole empire located in the publicly accessible *Porticus Vipsania*, Augustan propaganda appears focused on the theme of imperialism rather than that of Italy.[218] Thus while it is possible to see glimpses of *tota Italia* in Augustus' reign, there is still plenty of room for skepticism that unity had been achieved.

---

[215] Varro, *Rust*. 1.2.1: *Sementivis feriis in aedem Telluris veneram, rogatus ab aeditumo, ut dicere didicimus a patribus nostris, ut corrigimur a recentibus urbanis, ab aedituo. Offendi ibi C. Fundanium, socerum meum, et C. Agrium equitem R. Socraticum et P. Agrasium publicanum spectantes in pariete pictam Italiam.* There are two generally held interpretations: that the picta Italia was actually a map (current consensus) and that it was a personified image of Italy. On the image as a map, see Holscher (1978), 315-75; Holliday (2002); Koortbojan (2002), 33-48; and Zinserling (1959/60), 403-48. On the image as a personified representation of Italy, see Brodersen (1995), 155 and Kubitschek, *RE* X.2, 2042.

[216] Roth (2007), 295-299.

[217] Roth (2007), 287, acknowledges that this is just a guess, but it certainly an attractive one: as he notes, "Cicero, whose house was in the vicinity of the temple, paid for its restoration soon after his return from exile at some point during the y ears 56 to 54 BC: in his speech *De haruspicum responsis* (XIV. 31), held before the Senate in 56 BC, Cicero attributes the damage to the temple to Clodius and his followers' outrageous behaviour, and describes himself as responsible for the building's upkeep. In 54 BC, Cicero claims to have seen to the temple's restoration, and to have placed a statue of his brother Quintus in front of it (*Q.fr*. III. 1. 14)."

[218] Nicolet (1991), 98-114; Dilke (1985), 112-29; Brodersen (1995), 165-94.

Conclusions

As we saw above, Cicero sought to change how Roman aristocrats thought of *novi homines* by arguing that they shared ancestors, values, and love of Rome. As is clear from the evidence, the late Republican Senate was sharply divided not only along political lines but also between members from long-standing aristocratic families and Italian newcomers. This division did not simply end with the civil wars of the 1st century BCE and Augustus did not rectify it in the Senate during his term. Instead, Augustus aimed at an inclusive Senate. Through the combined efforts of the Forum Augustum, imperial funeral processions, and political advancement, Augustus overcame many of the barriers that Cicero lamented and was able to link himself to an astounding number of old aristocratic and newly risen elite families whose family members comprised the Senate. These actions threatened the old aristocracy's monopoly on Romanness in a way that erupted in the 1st century CE, in part because of the fact that the remaining Claudians largely followed Augustus' policies. This policy of the imperial family, as unintentional as it may have been, goes a long way in explaining the successes, and abject failures, of political Pisones and Italian senators from Tiberius to Nero, the subjects of my next two chapters.

Chapter Four: Aristocratic Responses

In his ninth *Philippic*, Cicero urged the Senate to set up a statue in commemoration of Servius Sulpicius Rufus, who died in 43 BCE after being wounded in battle against Antony. Sulpicius had studied rhetoric under Cicero, been a partisan of Caesar, and belonged to one of the most ancient patrician families at Rome, the *gens* Sulpicia. At the beginning of his advocacy, Cicero famously said, "The life of the dead is situated in the memories of the living."[1] After emphasizing that the statue would grant Sulpicius immortality among all men, Cicero then turned to an emotional appeal on behalf of Sulpicius' son, also named Servius Sulpicius Rufus.[2] He wrote,

> The piety of his son will seem to have great influence regarding the honor for the father; although he who is cast down by mourning is not present, nevertheless you ought to be disposed as if he were present. But he so cast down that no one ever grieved more for the death of an only son than that man lamented the death of his father. And indeed I think that it also pertains to the fame of Servius Sulpicius the son that he should appear to have excelled the honor owed to his father. Although Servius Sulpicius could leave behind no monument more famous than his son, a copy of his morals, virtue, firmness of character, and nature, whose grief can either be alleviated by your honor or by no consolation at all.[3]

---

[1] Cic. *Phil.* 9.10: *Vita enim mortuorum in memoria est posita vivorum.*

[2] Cic. *Phil.* 9.10: *Cui si statuam in rostris decreto vestro statueritis, nulla eius legationem posteritatis obscurabit oblivio. Nam reliqua Ser. Sulpici vita multis erit praeclarisque monumentis ad omnem memoriam commendata.*

[3] Cic. *Phil.* 9.12: *Multum etiam valuisse ad patris honorem pietas fili videbitur; qui quamquam adflictus luctu non adest, tamen sic animati esse debetis ut si ille adesset. Est autem ita adfectus ut nemo umquam unici fili mortem magis doluerit quam ille maeret patris. Et quidem etiam ad famam Ser. Sulpici fili arbitror pertinere ut videatur honorem debitum patri praestitisse. Quamquam nullum monumentum clarius Ser. Sulpicius relinquere potuit quam effigiem morum suorum, virtutis, constantiae, pietatis, ingenii filium, cuius luctus aut hoc honore vestro aut nullo solacio levari potest.* For modern work on this expectation, see Baroin (2010), 20.

In this passage, the word *effigiem* connotes the aristocratic and gentilician expectation for the son to be a 'copy,' a 'likeness,' and an 'image' of his father. As we saw in Chapter Two, these social expectations were preserved in the various aristocratic institutions of memory, where family history and public service combined with memory and emulation to shape the very definition of what it meant to be a Roman aristocrat. Sulpicius was awarded the statue in the Forum and granted a public funeral, thus enabling his entire family to resurrect their ancestors, march them through the streets of Rome, deliver his eulogy from the *rostrum*, and add another *imago* to their atrium walls.[4]

After decades of civil war and proscriptions, aristocratic institutions of memory including the funeral ritual remained some of the few points of continuity in elite Roman socio-political life. Despite his attempts to co-opt aristocratic institutions of memory by subsuming family members into his own household by means of ancestry or marriage, appropriate public processions including funerals and triumphs, and redefining traditional values, Augustus was unable to erase the memories and histories of aristocratic families. The importance of these institutions to aristocratic identity survived in powerful aristocratic families through the tumultuous years of the late Republic.

Senators from families who had survived civil war and proscriptions were faced with a new political reality after the final victory of Octavian, but their codes of conduct and values remained largely the same. Public funerals of aristocrats, both those granted and paid for by the Senate and those that were financed privately, continued well into Tiberius reign. Triumphal processions continued through the decade of the 20s and were replaced with less magnificent public processions (the *ovatio*), and public service in the Senate was given new distinction and

---

[4] Schneider (1834).

additional importance in the last decades of the first century. Competition still existed, and perhaps even intensified, as an increased number of less prestigious offices were available for the elite to hold and more senators from Italian origins attained office through imperial favor.[5]

The rise of Italian elites and *novi homines* along with Augustus' appropriation of aristocratic institutions had a significant impact on the behavior of senators: some accepted the changes and their new colleagues while others adhered more vehemently to traditions that separated the senate into groups based on ancestry and prestige. There had always been a hierarchy in the Roman Senate. This hierarchy had traditionally fallen along lines of prestige and lineage, and the membership of the Senate could be divided into multiple groups throughout the Republican period. Those from old and accomplished families, like Scipio Africanus for example, belonged to one part, while those whose ancestors had achieved the status of senator but who had themselves failed to achieve certain offices or fame through service to the state belonged to another. Another group that found prominence after the Social War was that of the *novi homines*, which we examined through the case study of Cicero in the last chapter.

The members of the Senate who belonged to the first group, those with long and prestigious lineages, are the focus of this chapter. One family in particular, the Calpurnii Pisones, will serve as our case study. Some members of this family adapted to the new social and political climate choosing not to challenge the imperial *domus*, while others continued to be influenced by the persevering institutions of memory and competed with the imperial family ultimately leading

---

[5] Based on evidence from inscriptions detailing senatorial careers stretching back to Sulla, we know there was a trend toward more detailed listing of all the offices and honors an individual achieved. In the Principate, the inscriptions commemorating the careers of senators and equestrians are much more detailed and suggest the possibility to determine definite patterns in senatorial and equestrian careers. What seems most interesting to me is that although the positions listed on imperial senatorial and equestrian inscriptions dated back to the Republic, they now seem to take on a new prestige and status in the Principate. They must have been officially incorporated into the *cursus honorem*, which itself seems to have become much more complicated as the growing imperial bureaucracy created additional offices.

to their political and social demise. Underpinning all their actions were the expectations codified

in the aristocratic institutions of memory that had so recently been coopted by Augustus.

The aristocratic family of the Calpurnii Pisones had a long and glorious past that lived

with them well into the 1st century of the Principate and is representative of the traditional

Roman aristocratic family in many ways. With accomplished ancestors who took part in the

Hannibalic War, the family achieved immense prominence in Roman politics during the late

Republic.[6] Their ancestral traditions were famous, their lineage relatively clear, and their claims

to glory were perhaps as great as many of the men given more scholarly attention at the end of

the Republic.[7] Indeed, family members continued to participate in the political sphere well into

the 1st century CE, with varying results. Unlike many other aristocratic families whose members

dwindled during the civil wars, the Calpurnii Pisones emerged from the conflict fairly intact,

although individuals championed opposing sides in the late 1st century BCE.

Under Augustus, various members had to be convinced to return to politics, while others

eagerly sought offices and the favor of the princeps. These members were satiated by the

political advancement they gained under Augustus and by their intermarriage with the imperial

family because these strategies fit nicely with their conception of Roman identity as defined by

institutions of memory. After Augustus's death, the relationship between certain members of the

family and the princeps deteriorated, leading to a spate of treason trials, prosecutions, and

conspiracies. Traditionally, historians have considered the senatorial discontent of Julio-

Claudian period a result of aristocratic desire to return to the Republican political system and the

---

[6] It is probably in this late Republican context that their claim to be descendents of Calpus, son of Numa Pompilius, arose.

[7] For commentary on their ancestral *imagines*, see Cic. *Pis*. 1, *Laus Pisonis* 1-17, Mart. 4.40.1-4, and Plin. *Ep*. 5.17.6, and below. In fact, the family tree of the Calpurnii Pisones, despite some problems during the Julio-Claudian period, is one of the clearest lineages we have been able to reconstruct.

opportunities for advancement it provided.[8] This chapter examines other plausible motivations behind the actions of various members of the *gens* Calpurnia, identifying the aristocratic institutions of memory as contributing factors to the challenge to the imperial throne made by some members. Additionally, the pressures facing old aristocratic families in the Imperial Senate from newly incorporated municipal senators lead to competition similar to that among aristocrats of the Republic, but more intense in some ways as a result of the fewer meaningful avenues for increasing their reputation.[9] Thus the senatorial actions of the Calpurnii Pisones provide an interesting case study for exploring how the transition from Republic to Empire during the reign of the Julio-Claudians was in fact a tumultuous period in social and political relationships among the elite.

When compared to the behavioral expectations of the late Republic and the Augustan period, we shall see that social conduct for senators under Tiberius continued to evolve. Thus, the period of Julio-Claudian rule was a time when members of the Calpurnii Pisones variously accepted the changes imperial rule wrought on Roman society or remembered their great ancestors and Republican values, thus challenging the aristocratic family of the Claudii (who ultimately won and maintained control of the imperial seat). In either case, they had to contend with new senators from elite municipal and provincial families who were challenging the very definition of Roman identity.

---

[8] See especially MacMullen (1966), Gowing (2005), and Gallia (2012).

[9] With the development of an increasingly complex bureaucracy (in comparison to the Republic) in the Principate, there were more offices on offer. However, not all offices carried the same poltical or prestigious weight. With all these additional offices (and potential dead ends to one's career), it seems that achieving the highest honors in the Empire must have been truly difficult (if one did not have the right connections) and required the devotion of one's entire life to its attainment. Thus the drive to display all the posts and priesthoods one held seems more understandable. Is it possible that the Principate (and Augustus himself) ushered in a period of greater aristocratic competition than the late Republic? Is it also possible that the new *cursus honorem* was so complex and civilian-based that individuals were truly part of and so invested in the governing structure of the empire that the threat of civil war precipitated by the quest for recognition was largely eliminated?

The starting point for our discussion of the Calpurnii Pisones will be how the Senate and Tiberius characterized the treasonous actions of Gnaeus Calpurnius Piso in the *Senatus Consultum Pisonianum* (SCP) published in the year 20 CE.[10] This document demonstrates continued change in what the Imperial *domus* deemed acceptable aristocratic values, which had begun under Augustus and was further modified by Tiberius. Piso's actions were guided by his memory of his ancestors' accomplishments as preserved by the still important institutions of memory discussed in Chapter Two. An examination of the eminent careers of the Calpurnii Pisones from the Republican period will demonstrate the weight of the history with which Gnaeus Calpurnius Piso was burdened and how that legacy influenced his actions in his province.

Against the historical context of the long and rich history of aristocratic competition in the Roman Republic and the great achievements of his family, the influence of the aristocratic institutions of memory on the actions of Gnaeus Piso will become clearer. How his actions influenced the actions of various other Pisones under the Principate will expose the reign of the Claudians as one of both continuity and change, not only in governmental structures, but also in social roles, acceptable aristocratic values, and the ways in which aristocratic families had to negotiate, sometimes unsuccessfully, the changing definitions of what it meant to be Roman. It is in the actions of his descendent, Gaius Calpurnius Piso, explored in the next chapter, that we will see the unification of the multiple senatorial groups and their ultimate failure to unseat the Claudii. And, as we shall see in the conclusion of this dissertation, it is only after another round of civil strife and accession of an Italian elite to the imperial throne that the old aristocracy's influence wanes and its members reduced to a minority of the Senate.

---

[10] On the title of the inscription, see Potter (1999), 65-88 and Damon and Takács (1999), 1-12. Following Potter, in this study the inscription will be referred to the *Senatus Consultum Pisonianum* (SCP) rather than the *Senatus Consultum de Pisone Patre* (SCPP).

The Trouble Between Piso and Germanicus: The Sources and the Events

What actually happened between Piso and Germanicus is difficult to determine, in part

because our historical sources are not unproblematic. The information about Piso's downfall

comes primarily from two sources: the first is the *Senatus Consultum Pisonianum* (SCP), a

senatorial decree issued after the suicide of Piso, which summarizes the charges against Piso and

the other defendants, the Senate's judgment of his guilt, and the various punishments meted out

to Piso and his family.[11] The SCP was produced roughly contemporaneously with the trial and

subsequent punishments, while our second source for the events, Tacitus' *Annales*, was written

nearly 100 years after the events it describes.[12] Generally the SCP and Tacitus' account have

---

[11] This document was found on six bronze copies (A-F) in the province of Baetica, in modern day Spain. The text is nearly complete, with the majority coming from copies A and B, running 176 and 126 lines long respectively. Missing or never present in Copy B, Copy A has the heading "The Decree of the Senate Concerning the Gnaeus Piso the Father, displayed when N. Vibius Serenus was proconsul," [*senatus consultum de Cn. Piso patre propositum N. Vibio Sereno procos*]. The end of the SCP decrees that the text need only be displayed in the most populus city in each province and legionary headquarters, but Vibius seems to have gone above and beyond in his publication based on the numerous copies in his province and varied find spots. The find spots we know are scattered around the province, and many scholars see Vibius' enthusiastic publication as an attempt to curry favor with powers at Rome (see Damon and Takács (1999), 2. The two copies differ in both layout (number of columns and their length) and how they were hung for viewing. See Damon and Takács (1999), 3. The vast majority of the text (lines 12-171) depends on one independent verb, *censuerunt* in line 11 at the beginning of the inscription. The two copies differ in both layout (number of columns and their length) and how they were hung for viewing.[11] The vast majority of the text (lines 12-171) depends on one independent verb, *censuerunt* in line 11 at the beginning of the inscription. See Damon and Takács (1999), 3-6.

[12] Tacitus' account is the lengthiest account of any trial in his work and spans the end of book 2 (beginning in chapter 43) and the beginning of book 3 (through chapter 18). In his account, there are several invented speeches (which some scholars consider fairly accurate because they might depend on summaries in the *acta senatus*) and references are made to popular opinion which, in addition to his strong anti-Tiberian sentiment, make Tacitus' account strongly biased. Many scholars think Tacitus had access to the *acta senatus*, the official records of the Roman Senate, thus making Tacitus' account accurate: see Syme (1984), 1014-42; Talbert (1988), 199-222; Shotter (1989), 5; and Griffin (2009), 178-180. Griffin, in particular, prioritizes Tacitus' version of the dispute between Germanicus and Piso as well as the trial of Piso saying, "As far as explanation goes, Tacitus' account is far superior to the decree, with its simple black and white motivation. It is also far superior to the popular version that Tacitus recovered by reading between the lines of the decree…" (p.179). I think the discrepancies between the SCP and Tacitus' account in books 2 and 3 of the *Annales* are significant and not to be dismissed as lightly as Griffin does. I am convinced by Damon (1999) who carefully examines the construction of

been used in tandem for the purpose of illuminating Tacitus' historical methodology and accuracy.[13] The content of the SCP has problematized Tacitus' narrative by calling into question the chronological integrity of Tacitus' narrative: Tacitus placed the trial of Piso in the first half of the year while the SCP specifically dates the passing of the decree to December 10th, 20 CE, suggesting that the trial had taken place in the second half of the year.[14]

Furthermore, studies of ancient historiography, intertexuality, methodology, and narrative structures have demonstrated the willingness on the part of all ancient historians, Tacitus included, to invent speeches, manipulate chronology, and embellish events in order to achieve a more compelling and entertaining narrative.[15] While regularly acknowledging the privilege of hindsight that Tacitus enjoyed, rarely is the effect of memory on Tacitus' account considered. As we saw in Chapter One, memory, identity, and history in ancient Rome were inextricably linked and often influenced by contemporary needs. Because Tacitus was writing from a later perspective, when Romanness was largely judged on different criteria from those that were applied in the Julio-Claudian period, one must approach his account of the early 1st century CE with some level of skepticism.[16] Since the SCP was a source composed contemporaneously with

---

Tacitus' narrative about the episode and concludes that: The mirror story is a structure that highlights the narrator's role in and authority over the narrative…The historian, professing a commitment to the truth but only imperfectly in control of that truth, falls somewhere between them (146). There is some truth to Tacitus' account, but I certainly do not think it should be prioritized over the SCP, particularly for the questions that I engage with here.

[13] See Eck et al. (1996); Flower (1997); Cooley (1998); Talbert (1999), 90-92, 143-162; and González (1999), 123-142.

[14] SCP 174-5; Eck (1996) thinks the date for the trial was November 30th (p. 193). For a good overview of the problem and scholarly attempts around it, see Woodman and Martin (1996) 68-77.

[15] Woodman (1988); Damon (1999); Gowing (2009); Woodman (2009); Kraus (2009), 106.

[16] As we see in Plin. *Ep*. 9.23.2, Pliny famously relates a conversation between a Roman knight and Tacitus, where the former asks the historian whether he is an Italian or a provincial. On the question of Tacitus' origins, I follow Syme (1958), 796-807, who concludes he was most likely from *Gallia Narbonensis*. As we saw in Chapter Three, the question of identity was largely framed in terms of whether an individual was Roman, from an aristocratic family, or Italian and possibly a new man.

the events, it captures the attitudes and outlooks of the time more accurately than Tacitus'

narrative could.

This is not to suggest, however, that the SCP was an unbiased source. In actuality, it was

a carefully crafted document produced by the imperial senate for a multitude of political and

social purposes. In particular, the SCP was concerned to educate future generations on proper

ways to behave and provided the traditional method of doing so through positive *exempla* (the

imperial family, the Senate, and Germanicus specifically) and negative *exempla* (Piso, mutinous

soldiers, and Plancina).[17] As such, the SCP becomes an excellent source for the values deemed

appropriate and inappropriate during the reign of Tiberius.

What seems a reasonable reconstruction of the events that lead to Piso's trial follows.[18]

In 17 CE, the emperor Tiberius had sent Gnaeus Calpurnius Piso, a close friend, as *legatus*

Augusti or governor to the province of Syria. On October 10th in 19 CE, Germanicus Caesar died

in Syria but not before he had renounced his *amicitia* (friendship) with Piso and ordered him to

leave the province. Two years earlier, Germanicus had been sent to reorganize the provinces and

kingdoms in Asia, with the grant from Tiberius of an extraordinary command that superseded the

powers wielded by the governors of those provinces. There arose some confrontation between

Germanicus and Piso with the result that, when Germanicus fell ill, he accused Piso of having

poisoned him. This revocation started in motion a series of events, which would culminate in the

prosecution and suicide of Piso. From what would be his deathbed, Germanicus sent Piso the

letter that would ultimately result in his prosecution and eventual suicide before the completion

of the trial. Upon Germanicus' death, a brief power struggle for control of the province ensued

---

[17] On the moral lessons of the SCP, see Cooley (1998).
[18] This summary is based on both the SCP and Tacitus' narrative and aims only to give a general sense of the events that actually happened. There is still much debate surrrouding the entire episode, including questions about Germanicus' death and Tiberius' role in the whole affair.

between a companion of Germanicus, Gnaeus Sentius, and Piso, who had returned to Syria in order to resume command. Fighting broke out, Sentius succeeded in maintaining control of the province, and Piso was allowed to depart for Rome. At the beginning of 20 CE, Germanicus' ashes carried by his widow, Agrippina, arrived in the city and, in early April, were interred in the mausoleum of Augustus. At some point during this period, Piso also arrived in Rome and was prosecuted by the friends of Germanicus.

Beyond this basic narrative, the SCP reveals far more about what behaviors and actions the imperial household deemed appropriate. We will see that the values proscribed in the SCP were not the same as those ascribed to Piso by that same document. Building upon the characterization of Piso by the SCP, I argue that Piso's actions demonstrated the longevity of a two of institutions of memory in particular: the *gens* and aristocratic values that were more Republican in nature than Imperial. The conclusion that senators from old aristocratic families continued to emulate their ancestors and ancestral values in the face of imperial control and advancement of Italian newcomers helps explain the rash of treason trials and senatorial opposition to the princeps during the remainder of the Claudian regimes.[19]

Much scholarly focus on the SCP has concentrated on the punishments imposed on Piso, largely as a result of interest in the circumstances of *damnatio memoriae* and the way that the SCP reveals the ideology of the *domus Augusta*.[20] By examining the punishments, where

---

[19] Most of the opposition has been attributed to the memory of *libertas* or as a philosophical position (stoic opposition) to an individual princeps. This seems to focus too narrowly on one or two aspects that likely contributed to opposition but cannot completely explain it. See chapter 5.

[20] As is frequently pointed out, *damnatio memoriae* is an entirely modern term. On control of memory, see Vittinghoff (1936) and Flower (2006). On the focus on punishments exacted on Piso's memory, see Bodel (1999), Flower (1998), and Flower (1999). One of the questions that Eck (1996), Bodel (1999), and Flower (1999) wrestle with is how much authority the Senate had in banning a man's *imago*. Eck argues that the Senate had full authority to do so, while Bodel stresses that the senate interfered with what had traditionally been governed by the *mos maiorum*. Flower comes down on both sides, saying "It seems evident that the Senate had indeed arrogated to itself the power to interfere precisely in such family

scholars concede a link to Republican precedents and then considering how the crimes of Piso

are framed, we will see that both parts of the document look backward to the Republic.

In a long section beginning with the Senate' determination that Piso's suicide was not

punishment enough, the SCP details the various penalties that Piso would posthumously suffer:

> For these reasons, the senate judged that he had not inflicted on himself the necessary penalty, but had averted a greater one and which he understood to have threatened himself from the piety and severity of the those judging him; thus [the senate] added to these penalties, which he had exacted on himself……that the mourning on account of his death not be undertaken by the women by whom he ought to be mourned in accordance with the custom of the ancestors if this decree of the senate had not existed……that the statues and images of Gnaeus Piso the father, which were positioned everywhere, be torn down…if anyone of the family, or anyone of those who had been related or associated with the Calpurnii, has died and is to be mourned, that the image of Gnaeus Piso the father not be led amongst the other masks, with which they are accustomed to celebrate the rites of their funerals, nor may his image be placed among the images of the Calpurnian family……that the name of Gnaeus Piso the father be erased from the titular statue of Germanicus Caesar, which the Augustal Priesthood had placed in the campus Martius for him at the altar of Providentia……that the property of Gnaeus Piso the father be confiscated (for the state), with the pastureland excepted, which was in Illyricum……moreover it is pleasing that the curators of determining public spaces take care that the constructions, which Gnaeus Piso the father had built over the Porta Fontinalis for the sake of connecting his private homes, be torn down and demolished…[21]

matters. The difference in this case is that the Senate and the princeps had effectively been forced to reveal their trespass into an area that would have been a family matter during the Republic." What is perhaps more telling here is the centralization of control over both morals and the conduct and memories of aristocratic families.

[21] SCP (73-75): *ne quis luctus mortis eius causa a feminis quibus {e}is more maiorum, si hoc s(enatus) c(onsultum) factum non esset, lugendus esset, susciperetur*; SCP (75-82): *utiq(ue) statuae et imagines Cn. Pisonis patris, quae ubiq(ue) positae essent, tollerentur…si quis eius gentis aut quis eorum, qui cognatus adfinisue Calpurniae familiae fuisset, mortuos esset, lugendus esset, ne inter reliquas imagines, <quibus> exequias eorum funerum celebrare solent, imago Cn. Pisonis patris duceretur neve imaginibus familiae Calpurniae imago eius interponeretur*; SCP (82-84): *utiq(ue) nomen Cn. Pisonis patris tolleretur ex titulo statuae Germanici Caesaris, quam ei sodales Augustales in campo ad aram Providentiae posuissent*; SCP (84-85): *utiq(ue) bona Cn. Pisonis patris publicarentur excepto saltu, qui esset in Hillyrico*; SCP (106-108): *item placere, uti Cn. Pisopater supra portam Fontinalem quae inaedificasset iungendarum domu<u>m privatarum causa, ea curatores locorum publicorum iudicandorum tollenda dimolienda curarent.*

While Tiberius intervened to soften the effects of some of these penalties, their substance mirrors that of punishments imposed during the Republican period: erasure, destruction of the familial home, and the restriction of images in public. The destruction of Cicero's own house after his exile from Rome or the memory sanctions imposed on Marc Antony after his death were but a few of the Republican precedents that the Senate employed against Piso.[22] Piso's memory was sanctioned both privately and publicly, a punishment that demonstrates continuity between Republican values and aristocratic values of the early Principate.

The charges against Piso also described behavior reminiscent of the actions of many aristocrats during the last century or so of the turbulent Republican period. The SCP began by finding Piso guilty of inciting wars with Armenia and Parthia and inciting a civil war. It also accused him of corrupting the soldiery, rejoicing at the death of Germanicus, and violating the divinity of the divine Augustus. The types of crimes described in the SCP demonstrated that certain aristocratic behaviors preserved through the aristocratic institutions of memory still influential among Roman elite families were now deemed unacceptable in the early Principate.

The first crime listed in the SCP is that of inciting a foreign war: "thus he undertook everything as if it ought to be under his control and power, and when he was in the Syrian province, he waged war with Armenia and Parthia, to as great an extent as he was able."[23] The decree continues by giving the reason for Piso's overstepping his authority and blames his actions on his support for the deposed king of Parthia and later of Armenia, Vonones. Many scholars have passed this over and focused on what they consider the real crime at the beginning of this section where

---

[22] Flower (2006), 116-120.
[23] SCP (36-38): *tamquam ipsius arbitri et potestatis omnia esse deberent, <ita se> cum provincia Syria fuit, gesserit- bellum cum Armeniacum {e}t<um> Parthicum, quantum in ipso fu{er}it, moverit…*

Piso is said to have "neglected the divine sovereignty of the Augustan house."[24] While this is indeed

problematic, the main emphasis outside the ablative absolute remains on the fact that Piso ignored

his subordinate position to Germanicus and broke public law, and in doing so neglected the

maiestas domus Augustae, the sovereignty of the house of Augustus. Thus the real charge was that

of starting a foreign war, an action that was typical of a proconsul sent to a restive province, or a

province bordering an area ripe for conquest, as seen again and again in the Republic.[25] Piso's

attempt to involve himself in the political intrigues of neighboring client kings is the true aim of this

charge. Indeed, the charge of inciting a foreign war is reminiscent of behavior of many imperators

of the 1st century BCE. Piso, as legate of Syria, involved himself in the politics of the states

bordering his province as Pompey had after his defeat of Mithridates and as Caesar had during his

tenure in Gaul.

The second crime with which Piso is charged seems much more serious in light of not-so-

distant Roman history. The SCP stated that Piso "attempted to incite civil war, although all the

evils of civil wars have long since been buried by the will of divine Augustus and virtues of

Tiberius Caesar."[26] The notion that civil war could be extinguished by the upstanding moral

position taken by the imperial family tells us much about the imperial ideology promulgated by

---

[24] SCP (32-33): *neclecta maiestate domus Aug(ustae)*. Eck et al. (1996), 161, and Lott (2012), 272, have
determined this ablative absolute to be the real crime here and remark on its early placement within the
discussion of Piso's crime of inciting a civil war. However, it does not actually come first (despite Lott's
translation of it first) and the decision to translate *maiestate* as "greatness" is perhaps questionable here.
[25] When juxtapositioned with the extraordinary commands and the provincial governor's prerogative to
wage war in the late 1st century, the most famous examples being the commands of Pompey and the
Gallic Wars waged by Caesar, and the previous expectations of aristocrats to enhance their status and
reputation by conducting warfare in the middle Republic, Piso's actions look no different than those of his
ancestors.
[26] SCP (45-47) …*bellum etiam civile{m} excitare conatus sit, iam pridem numine divi Aug(usti)
virtutibusq(ue) Ti. Caesaris Aug(usti) omnibus civilis belli sepultis malis, repetendo provinciam post
mortem Germanici Caesaris…*

Tiberius, and has been the primary focus of historians.[27] At the same time, the charge of inciting

civil war again recalled the dark days at the end of the Republic. The document would have its

readers believe that Piso was a powerful enough threat to the stability of the government to

warrant his trial, but also suggests that the imperial system was the only bulwark against a return

to proscriptions, civil strife, and the devastation of war By explicitly mentioning the civil wars

Augustus had ended nearly fifty years earlier, the SCP compared Piso's actions with those of

Republican aristocrats who fomented civil strife, without explicitly mentioning the likes of

Pompey, Caesar, Brutus, Cassius, and Antony. As a result, Piso became the most dangerous

threat to civic stability since the end of the Republic. The message was clear: this kind of

behavior in the provinces was now unacceptable and would be punished.

The charge of fomenting civil war was only possible with the support of the military,

which was the substance of Piso's next criminal charge. According to the SCP, Piso

> corrupted the military discipline established by the divine Augustus and preserved
> by Tiberius Caesar, not only by indulging soldiers, who were not obeying the
> most ancient customs and who were in charge of others, but also by granting the
> soldiers a donative in his own name from the finances of our princeps. And by
> this deed he was happy that some soldiers were called Pisonians and others
> Caesarians, and he even honored those who, after the adoption of such a name,
> had obeyed him.[28]

In much the same way as before, the document made specific claims about the imperial program

as well as defining appropriate and inappropriate behaviors for imperial senators. The SCP

suggested that the imperial system ensured both military discipline and that the army remained

loyal to the state instead of to its commander. Without directly mentioning the habit of

---

[27] Eck et al. (1996) and Lott (2012).

[28] SCP (52-57) *qui militarem discipulinam a divo Aug(usto) institutam et servatum a Ti. Caesar(e)
Aug(usto) corrupisset, non solum indulgendo militibus, <ne> his, qui ipsis praesunt, more vetustissumo
parere<n>t, sed etiam donativa suo nomine ex fisco principis nostri dando, quo facto milites alios
Pisonianos, alios Caesarianos dici laetatus sit, honorando etiam eos, qui post talis nominis usurpationem
ipsi paruisse<n>t…*

cultivating personal armies commanders familiar to all members of the aristocracy fostered during the 1st century BCE, the SCP revised "the most ancient customs" into practices more hospitable to imperial rule. But by implicitly comparing Piso to imperators whose troops had taken up their names as partisans, including Sulla, Marius, Pompey, and Caesar, the SCP prevaricated between elevating Piso to the level of success and prestige that some of these generals had had and adding him to a group of individuals about whom historical opinion remained ambivalent. The accusation that Piso encouraged his soldiers to be called "Pisonians" placed him firmly in opposition to the imperial program where the emperor was the sole commander-in-chief and his chosen commanders were extensions of his own authority.

The final crime with which Piso was charged arose from his inappropriate behavior upon the news of Germanicus' death and seems to have pertained more to a violation of social norms than anything else. In addition to failing to mourn appropriately, Piso stood accused of sending an inappropriate and condemnatory letter to Germanicus' father, opening the temples of the gods closed in mourning, and throwing feasts as if in celebration around the time of Germanicus' death.[29] Opening a temple closed in mourning suggests an action inappropriate for a senator but hardly constitutes as dire a crime as those listed earlier in the decree. Here there is impiety, but no threat of civil war. In fact, this entire section seems to be aimed squarely at Piso's reputation as opposed to any danger he presented to the state. Thus, this charge is really quite different in tenor to the others and attempts to prescribe appropriate behavior for senators in the imperial period in direct contrast to behaviors that were acceptable in the Republic. Celebrating a

---

[29] SCP (57-68): *qui post mortem Germanici Caesaris…patri optumo et indulgentissumo libellum, quo eum accusaret, mittere ausus…et cuius mortem gavisum esse eum his argumentis senatui apparuerit: quod nefaria sacrificia ab eo facta, quod naves, quibus vehebatur, ornatae sint, quod recluserit deorum immortalium templa…quod <eum> dedisse{t} congiarium ei, qui nuntiaverit sibi de morte Germanici <Caesaris>, probatum sit frequenterq(ue) convivia habuisse eum his ipsis diebus, quibus de morte Germanici ei nuntiatum erat…*

political opponents' death was relatively commonplace in the late Republic, one need only look to Cicero for an example.[30] Some scholars have included as a final crime the charge that the "senators thought that the will of divine Augustus had been violated" by Piso.[31] This accusation focused far more on appropriate treatment of the imperial family than on the actions of Piso, but revealed one of the underlying purposes of the SCP.

The SCP was ultimately a demonstration of appropriate behavior toward the imperial *domus* not only for senators in Rome but also elites in the major cities of every province throughout the empire, where the inscriptions of the SCP were to be displayed. That political power now rested on the individual's relationship to the Princeps was made explicit in this document. When viewed in its historical context, this text demonstrates an additional step in the development of proper aristocratic identity in the early Principate. The SCP referred back to the Republic constantly, but with veiled references and attempts to rewrite history. It also revealed that some aristocrats did not understand that the opening up of the aristocratic class to municipal elites, first started by Augustus, was significantly changing what it meant to be a Roman aristocrat. Caught between the institutions of memory that dictated behavior in aristocratic families and the social and political changes instituted by Augustus, Gaius Calpurnius Piso found himself in mortal peril.

---

[30] Cic. *Phil.* 2.21: *P. Clodium meo consilio interfectum esse dixisti. Quidnam homines putarent, si tum occisus esset cum tu illum in foro spectante populo Romano gladio insecutus es negotiumque transegisses, nisi se ille in scalas tabernae librariae coniecisset iisque oppilatis impetum tuum compressisset? Quod quidem ego favisse me tibi fateor, suasisse ne tu quidem dicis. At Miloni ne favere quidem potui; prius enim rem transegit quam quisquam eum facturum id suspicaretur. At ego suasi. Scilicet is animus erat Milonis, ut prodesse rei publicae sine suasore non posset. At laetatus sum. Quid ergo? in tanta laetitia cunctae civitatis me unum tristem esse oportebat?* Here Cicero openly celebrates the death of his arch enemy, Clodius. On enmity in the Roman Republic, see Epstein (1987).

[31] SCP (68-69) *numen quoq(ue) divi Aug(usti) violatum esse ab eo arbitrari senatum omni honore, qui aut memoriae eius aut imaginibus, quae, antequam in deorum numerum re{f}fere{n}tur, <ei r[…]tae erant>, habeba{n}tur, detracto…*; see Lott (2012), 282, and Eck et al. (1996); contra see Potter and Damon (1999), 24-25.

To understand better how the history of his family's successes could have influenced Gnaeus Calpurnius Piso to come into conflict with Germanicus, I will first examine briefly the political success of various members of the *gens Calpurnia*, focusing specifically on the branch of the Pisones, from the beginning of the 3rd century BCE down to the end of the Republic (ca. 30 BCE).[32] At the end of this section, I will spend significant time examining the lives and careers of Lucius Calpurnius Piso Caesoninus, father-in-law of Julius Caesar, proconsul of Syria, and patron of the Epicurean philosopher, Philodemus, and his successful son, Lucius Calpurnius Piso. While these men belong to a different branch of the Calpurnii, their accomplishments, juxtaposed with Gnaeus Calpurnius Piso's own father's far less successful career, will show that there was much impetus for competition among the branches, particularly in light of aristocratic familial precedent. Articulating the history of this important family in Republican Rome will begin to illuminate the familial and social pressures that Gnaeus Calpurnius Piso probably felt during the first decades of the Principate to achieve more fame, a greater reputation, and higher

---

[32] The most complete and up-to-date treatment of the *gens Calpurnia* is *Die Calpurnii* written by Hofmann-Löbl (1996). Following the style of the *Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft* (*RE*), Hofmann-Löbl compiles information from the literary, epigraphic, and historical sources for each member of the Calpurnii Pisones. Her impetus behind the project is that "*Korrekturen der teilweise veralteten Angaben in RE, Drumann-Groebe und der Prosopographia Imperii Romani dringend nötig sind*:" thus her work is an update (4-5). Her general argument is that the state depended on noble families, and that dependence required the families to participate in politics even after the transformation of the government, but that families had to adapt to the new regime. At times she does offer some interpretation in addition to exposition, but it is fairly traditional (e.g., section 4.1.4.2 on page 241 entitled *Piso, Tiberius und die libertas Senatus*). Even in the most promising section, *Calpurnii unter Augustus und Tiberius: Verweigerung und Integration*, Hofmann-Löbl argues that the family survived the political transition by means of restraint, acknowledging that some members of the family did in fact fail at this. In her *Systematische Zusammenfassung*, Hofmann-Löbl focuses on the maintenance of the family in the transition from Republic to Principate by means of marriage alliances and adoptions (319-322), and how the family protected itself through restraint. Her sections on the political clients and friendships of the *gens* are particularly helpful, thanks to their division by province (327-337). Despite the problems which the *gens* faced in the 1st century, Hofmann-Löbl sees their longevity as the exceptional result of their general retreat from confrontation with the imperial family, and the support provided by their family traditions and networks of relationships (356-7). She concludes by saying: *Daher steht die Kontinuität der römischen Nobilität in unmittelbarem Zusammenhang mit der Erhaltung des römischen Staatswesens auch in der Kaiserzeit.*

office. These men's actions and political successes, in conjunction with the familial precedents from the previous two centuries, set the tone for how members of the *gens Calpurnii Pisones* would act over the next century in the political sphere.

The Gens Calpurnia

The *gens Calpurnia* probably originated in Etruria based on their involvement in the area during the 3rd century BCE and the likely Etruscan infix "-urn" in the gentilician name.[33] Additional support of the Etruscan connection, specifically that of the Pisones, is borne out by the fact that the two earliest attestations of the Pisonian name were found in Etruria and written in Etruscan letters.[34] According to Drumann, the *gens Calpurnia* was comprised of three families, the Pisones, the Bestia, and the Bibuli.[35] What became the old aristocratic family of the Pisones in the later Republic initially descended from an important plebeian family. The main focus of this inquiry is the most prominent family, the Pisones, whose members surpassed the other families in their continued political success over the centuries.

All attempts to reconstruct the lineages and relationships of an ancient Roman family are fraught with difficulty due to the lack of sources, the regular failure of the sources we do have to include familial information, and the confusion that results from the Roman practice of maintaining the same name from generation to generation. In the case of the Calpurnii Pisones, these problems are somewhat mitigated by their prominence and the fact that one of their own,

---

[33] See Rix (1963), 9 and 118; Holleman (1984); Forsythe (1990), 296-7; Forsythe (1994), 3-7; and Hofmann-Löbl (1996). These scholars agree on an Etruscan origin for the Calpurnii, and accept that they claimed Sabine descent at a later time with their promotion of Numa as an ancestor. Rix (1963) and Forsythe (1994) provide the most comprehensive linguistic argument and have convinced me. Writing against scholarly consensus, Farney (2007), 79 and 114, argued for a Sabine origin for the Calpurnii.
[34] See Schulze (1966) 137-8, 178, 211, 244 and 260; *CIE* 2016 from Clusium, and *CIL* XI 7722 from Caere.
[35] Drumann-Groebe (1902), 49.

Lucius Calpurnius Piso Frugi, was an annalistic historian in the late 2nd century BCE.[36]

Nevertheless, the work of many scholars has resulted in varying stemmata for the family, which

rarely come into complete agreement.[37] Most importantly for my purposes here, however, are

the enumeration of politically and militarily successful Calpurnii Pisones.[38] These men were

candidates for public funerals (and had funerals that publicly processed even if they were not

paid for by the state), had *imagines*, and celebrated triumphs, making them the exemplary

ancestors whom their descendants strove to emulate.

The earliest members of the Calpurnii Pisones securely known to us lived during the

second Punic war.[39] The first of these, Gnaeus Calpurnius Piso, was defeated by the

Carthaginian general Mago, probably in Spain, and subsequently captured or killed.[40] The other,

whose life is better documented, was Gaius Calpurnius Piso. Possibly a cousin to Gnaeus, he

was elected *praetor urbanus* in 211 BCE during the Hannibalic War and is credited with

reinstituting the *ludi Apollinares*, a fact advertised on coinage minted by the *gens*.[41] He also

served as *propraetor* in Etruria in 210-209, further suggesting the family's connection to the

---

[36] On this author, see Forsythe (1994).

[37] Syme has discussed the lineage of the Calpurnii Pisones at length in a variety of publications: see Bibliography. For other investigations of the stemma, see Bloch (1940); Shotter (1974); Forsythe (1990); and Milner and Eilers (2006). The most recent stemmata are found in Forsythe (1994) 2, and Hofmann-Löbl (1996), Appendix I. All of these sources have been used to inform my discussion of the prominent men of the Calpurnii Pisones.

[38] The discussion of Calpurnii Pisones below is in no way comprehensive because several times throughout the 2nd and 1st centuries BCE, the sources do not provide a complete picture of the lineages. The men I include in this chapter are well attested in the extant sources and should be considered to comprise the minimum number of successful Calpurnii Pisones rather than a complete reckoning of this family's success.

[39] Most stemmata assume an ancestor born circa 290 BCE, but on what evidence is unclear.

[40] Frontin. *Str*. 3.6.5: *Mago, dux Carthaginiensium, victo Cn. Pisone et in quadam turre circumsesso, suspicatus ventura ei subsidia perfugam misit, qui persuaderet appropinquantibus captum iam Pisonem: qua ratione deterritis eis reliqua victoriae consummavit*.

[41] On restoration of the *Ludi*, see Liv. 26.23.3. For coinage see Crawford (1974) *RRC* I.340-3 and II.408; *RE* 61/8; and Hofmann-Löbl (1996), 20-28. On the relationship to Gnaeus Calpurnius Piso, see Forsythe (1994), 1-2. On his being praetor urbanus, see Liv. 26.39, 26.20.2, 26.23.3, and Festus *Gloss. Lat.* 436.

area, and was later summoned to a brief command at Capua.[42]

The next century of Roman history was punctuated by the names of prominent members of the *gens* in its various branches in the lists of magistrates, including but not limited to the branches of the Pisones, Frugi, and Caesonini.[43] Probably the son of the Piso defeated by Mago, Gnaeus Calpurnius Piso was a moneyer in Rome during the decade of the 180s and is known to us only from his coinage.[44]   A son of the urban praetor of 211, Gaius Calpurnius Piso, held the position of the praetor of Hispania Ulterior in 186 BCE.[45] He celebrated a triumph in 184, granted for his victory at the Tagus River in Spain, and, in 181, helped found the colony of Gravisca in Etruria.[46] He died shortly after taking up the office of consul in 180 BCE.[47] His son and grandson, both named Lucius Calpurnius Piso Caesoninus, followed him into politics and were consuls in 148 and 112 BCE respectively.[48] The former served in Spain as governor, and was defeated by the Lusitanians.[49] However, his defeat did not interfere with later commands or prestige since we know he commanded troops in Africa during the Third Punic War in 148 BCE. The latter gained a proconsulship, but was later charged with extortion and eventually died fighting the Tigurini in 107, while serving as a legate in Gaul.[50] Quintus Calpurnius Piso, son of the consul of 180 and brother to Lucius, achieved the consulship in 135.[51] A certain Calpurnius

---

[42] Liv. 27.6.1; 21.6; 26.28.6; 27.7.10 and Liv. 27.6.1, respectively.

[43] There were several additional families branches in the *gens Calpurnia*: Some of the known family cognomina are Bestia, Bibulus, Flamma, Lanarius, Agricola, Atilanus, Aviola, Crassus Frugi Licinianus, Domitius Dexter, Fabatus, Flaccus, Galerianus, Longus, and Macer Caulius Rufus. None of these branches achieve the social and political success of the Pisones.

[44] Crawford, (1974) *RRC* I.222 no. 153.

[45] *RE* 62; Hofmann-Löbl (1996), 29-42; Livy 39.8.

[46] On the triumph, see Liv. 39.42.2-3 and Degrassi XIII.1 49; for his promagistracy, see Liv. 39.30.1, 39.31.4, and 39.42.2-3.

[47] Liv. 40.37.1.

[48] Degrassi XIII.1 53.

[49] Liv. *Per*. 47; App. *B Civ*. 16.56.

[50] *RE* 88; Hofmann-Löbl (1996), 84-89: Hofmann-Löbl discusses in detail the difficulty in knowing precisely the parentage of this Piso.

[51] RE 86; Hofmann-Löbl (1996), 84-89.

Piso Caesoninus, whose praenomen is unknown but may have been the son of the consul in 112, was quaestor in 103 or 100 and was in charge of weapons production during the Social War.[52] According to Cicero, this man married the daughter of a Gaul named Calventius, a topic that Cicero would exploit in his invective against his son, Lucius Calpurnius Piso Caesoninus, to whom we will return below.

The brother of the consul of 180, Lucius Calpurnius Piso, served as a an ambassador to the Achaean league in 198 when he traveled to their meeting at Sicyon to persuade the league to break with Philip V of Macedon in favor of an alliance with Rome.[53] He was the father of Lucius Calpurnius Piso Frugi, the annalist.[54] He also held the consulship in the turbulent year of 133, a year that saw both political upheaval in Rome and a serious slave revolt on the island of Sicily.[55] He became the first in his branch of the family to hold the censorship.[56] It was in this slave revolt that his son of the same name fought and became the first in his branch of the family to hold a censorship. Later he held the office of *praetor* in 112 BCE and fell in battle that same year in Hispania Ulterior.[57] The next son, also named Lucius Calpurnius Piso Frugi, would serve concurrently as tribune of the plebs and master of the mint in 90 BCE, during the Social War.[58] He proposed legislation to establish additional tribes for accommodating newly enfranchised municipal Italians as well as the grant of citizenship to soldiers.[59] After this, he prosecuted

---

[52] Hofmann-Löbl (1996), 84-89.

[53] Livy *Ab Urb. Cond.* 32.19.11; Forsythe (1994) is fairly confident that the two were brothers (p. 8-9), while Hofmann-Löbl (1996) is less sure (p. 56-60).

[54] *RE* 96; Hofmann-Löbl (1996), 68-84; Forsythe (1994) is the most complete treatment of the annalist, compiling the information we know about his career, education, and his work, which survives only in fragments. For the most up-to-date bibliography, see Cornell (2013) vol. 1, pgs. 230-239. Livy made extensive use of his annals while writing the *Ab Urbe Condita*.

[55] *CIL* 1^2.2.585; Cic. *Verr.* 2.4.1-8; *Att.* 1.19.4.

[56] Cic. *Fin.* 5.8.2; Val. Max. 7.1.1 and 8.5.1; Dio. Hal. 2.338.3 and 2.39.1; Plin. *HN* 13.87.

[57] Cic. *Ver.* 2.4.56; App. *B Civ.* 16.99; Forsythe (1990), 293.

[58] *RE* 98; Hofmann-Löbl (1996), 113-119.

[59] Sissena *Hist.* F17 and F 71 in Cornell (2013) vol. 2, pgs 626-7 and 638-9.

Gabinius and his long career included a praetorship in 74, placing him in direct conflict with the corrupt governor of Sicily, Verres.[60] Frugi's son, Gaius Calpurnius Piso Frugi was mint master in 67 BCE, became son-in-law to Cicero by marrying his daughter Tullia, and achieved the office of *quaestor* in 58 BCE.[61] He died shortly thereafter.

The Calpurnii Pisones were more successful in the 2nd century than the Pisones Frugi had been, and this continued into the 1st century BCE. Even so, the Pisones Frugi saw one of their members achieve the consulship in 61, Marcus Pupius Piso Frugi Calpernius.[62] Up to this time, however, roughly the middle of the 1st century BCE, the Calpurnii Pisones could include among its ancestors at least seven consuls (compared to two for the Pisones Frugi), with the majority of them having held the office in the closing decades of the 2nd century BCE. Their sons and their grandsons held them in esteem and sought to emulate their examples, which included the celebration of a triumph and probably several instances of public funerals.

In the middle of the first century, the Calpurnii Pisones comprised many powerful and influential members whose politics did not always align. Gnaeus Calpurnius Piso, quaestor of 65 and grandfather of the homonymously named target of the SCP, was a bitter enemy of Pompey's in the 70s and 60s.[63] This may have also been the man involved in some sort of subversive political conspiracy, but he may also have simply been a victim of political enmity.[64] The consul

---

[60] Cic. *Verr*. 2.1.119 and 4.56; Broughton, *MMR* 102.
[61] *RE* 93; Hofmann-Löbl (1996), 152-156.
[62] *RE* 10; Hofmann-Löbl (1996), 130-143.
[63] Tac. *Ann*. 2.43.2; *RE* 69; Hofmann-Löbl (1996), 144-151; Forsythe (1990), 294; Many, but not all, supported Pompey, e.g. C. Calpurnius Piso *cos*. 67 (see Syme (1939), 35). Despite the family's keen involvement in politics at this time, it is problematic to say all the Pisones were politically active on the same side. See Gruen (1968), esp. 169: "The Calpurnii Pisones formed no monolithic political bloc... Precise familial ties among the Pisones of this era are themselves incapable of reconstruction. The name held in common was no guarantee of like mindedness."
[64] The evidence for the first conspiracy of Catiline comes from a fragment of Cicero's *Corn*. preserved by Asconius (Asc. *Pis*. 62.15-16); Cic. *Cat*. 1.15, *Mur*. 81, *Sull*. 67; Plut. *Cic*. 9. 4-6; Sall. *Cat*. 18; and Dio 36. 44. 1-2. On the first conspiracy of Catiline, see Phillips (1973) and Gruen (1969). That there was a

of 67, Gaius Calpurnius Piso, was a supporter of Pompey while the consul of 58, Lucius Calpurnius Piso Caesoninus, supported Caesar and contracted a marriage alliance with him.[65] It was the latter of these two Calpurnii Pisones who would achieve more success in the political turmoil of the late Republic.

Following the traditions of his family, Lucius Calpurnius Piso Caesoninus excelled in his political career, achieving the consulship and respected position of censor, united his family with arguably the most powerful man in Rome, and sought public recognition for his actions on behalf of the state. But more importantly, his interactions with Cicero, his military success in Macedonia, and his patronage of the Epicurean Philodemus demonstrate the social context in which the Calpurnii Pisones found themselves immersed during the late Republic. This Piso's legacy would inform the successes and failures of his descendants as they negotiated a changing senatorial membership, civil wars, sole rule, and the modifications Augustus attempted to make to aristocratic identity.

Lucius Calpurnius Piso Caesoninus

Lucius Calpurnius Piso Caesoninus was born at some time before 100 BCE, and had some association with the area of Placentia, a municipality in Northern Italy situated on the banks of the River Po. His early career seems to have been more traditional in its adherence to the *cursus honorum*, unlike some of his political contemporaries: he was *quaestor* in 70 BCE,

---

first conspiracy of Catiline has been largely dismissed as being a fabrication, and I see no reason to disagree with this assessment.

[65] Syme (1960), 12; Forsythe (1990), 293; *RE* 90; Hofmann-Löbl (1996), 157-186. We do not know the parentage of Caius Calpurnius Piso, cos. of 67. He may have been the son (or more likely, the grandson) of Quintus Calpurnius Piso, cos. of 135, with a generation missing from our sources.

aedile in 64, and *praetor* in 61.[66] Shortly thereafter, Piso became father-in-law to Caesar by the latter's marriage to Calpurnia in 59, cementing an alliance with one of the most powerful men in the late Republic. An added benefit of the marriage alliance with Caesar and his partisan Clodius was the *Lex Clodia* of 58, which gave Piso an extended proconsulship in Macedonia.[67]

In 55 BCE, however, Piso found himself at the receiving end of Cicero's vicious invective *In Pisonem*, thanks to his involvement in Cicero's exile and alliance with Clodius, one of Cicero's worst enemies.[68] Cicero delivered the speech in the Senate, and Piso responded with

---

[66] *RE* 90; Hofmann-Löbl (1996), 157-186.

[67] Syme (1986), 7: At the same time when Clodius passed the *lex de capite civis Romani*, he proposed the assignment of Macedonia and Cilicia respectively to the two consuls of 58, Piso and Gabinius. Thus, from Cicero's perspective, the two actions were inextricably linked.

[68] The enmity between Cicero and Clodius has little relevance to the discussion here, but in short Cicero and Clodius had a long history of *inimicitia* resulting from various prosecutions of Clodius (and his sister) by Cicero, perhaps beginning with the incident of the *Bona Dea* when Cicero gave evidence that proved Clodius' alibi false. It is clear that Cicero could not confront either Pompey or Caesar; hence his rather interesting description of his relationships with the men as being supportive and positive.[68] Cicero's hatred of Clodius should have made the latter the target of his own invective but perhaps he was also too powerful to attack despite his falling out with both Caesar and Pompey. Clodius' promulgation of a new law as tribune enabled him to form *collegia*, which effectively became a band of armed criminals directed by Clodius. He was even successful in threatening Pompey, who had had second thoughts about Cicero's exile, enough to keep him out of politics for a good portion of the year. This left Piso the only available focus for Cicero's anger upon his return, whose appointment as proconsul of Macedonia was inextricably linked in Cicero's mind to the bill exiling him. Even so, however, Cicero did weave attacks on Clodius into his invective against Piso: As one example, see Cic. *Pis*. 28: *Sed ille tamen agebat aliquid: tuebatur auctoritatem summi viri. Erat ipse sceleratus, erat gladiator, cum scelerato tamen et cum pari gladiatore pugnabat…caverat enim sibi ille sororius adulter ut, si tibi provinciam, si exercitum, si pecuniam ereptam ex rei publicae visceribus dedisset, omnium suorum scelerum socium te adiutoremque praeberes. Itaque in illo tumultu fracti fasces, ictus ipse, cotidie tela, lapides, fugae, deprehensus denique cum ferro ad senatum is quem ad Cn. Pompeium interimendum conlocatum fuisse constabat.* "But that man (Clodius) also did do something: he upheld the authority of the best man. Clodius was himself a wicked man, but still he was fighting against one who was as wicked and as much a gladiator and ruffian as himself….For that fellow [Clodius], the adulterer with his own sister, had made this bargain for himself, that if he gave you [Piso] a province, if he gave you an army, if he gave you money torn from the very life-blood of the republic, you were to give yourself up to him as his partner and assistant in all his crimes. Therefore, in that tumult the *fasces* were broken; you yourself were wounded; every day there were weapons, stonings, and banishments and finally, a man, arrested near the Senate and armed with a sword, was placed there to assassinate Pompey." See Nisbet (1961), v-xvii, for a general overview of the historical context of *In Pisonem*. On violence in Roman politics at the end of the Republic, see Epstein (1987) and Lintott (1999).

150

a pamphlet against Cicero, demonstrating the seriousness with which he considered the slight.[69]

While the two men were originally friendly and politically aligned (Piso had supported Cicero

during the Catilinarian Conspiracy and his consulship), the relationship between the two men

rapidly deteriorated when Piso's alliance with Caesar, and by extension with Caesar's partisan

Clodius, required him to do nothing to prevent Cicero's exile. Despite Cicero's negative

characterization of the proconsulship, it seems to have been successful and immensely profitable

to Piso.[70] In the duration of his appointment, Piso probably profited from his province in ways

similar to other provincial administrators of the Republican period and he enjoyed the

acclamation of *Imperator* from his troops after a successful campaign in the east, erecting

triumphal monuments to celebrate his achievements.[71]

As one of our main sources for Piso's life, Cicero's speech presents a problematic

narrative on account of its rhetorical type.[72] Distinguishing between what is accurate and what is

purely rhetorical in this invective can be difficult, particularly when considered from the

perspective that enmity between political rivals was not only common but also highly effective.[73]

Despite the common occurrence of political invective in Roman politics, the level of vituperation

in Cicero's speech against Piso was astonishing and was perhaps a result of Cicero's inability to

attack the real forces behind his exile, Pompey and Caesar. But as importantly, this speech was

significant because it revealed the ways in which a Roman aristocrat could come under attack

---

[69] Lacey (1941), 49; Nisbet (1961), xiv.

[70] Piso received a large sum of money from Caesar (Cic. *Dom*. 23; *In Pis*. 28, 37, 57), a large army (Cic. *Pis*. 37, 57, *Prov*. *Cons*. 5) and some grant of greater than usual authority in the province (*dom*. 55).

[71] Cicero complains of Piso looting Greek temples and the city of Byzantium for statues and picures (Cic. *Prov*. *Cons*. 6-7; Cic. *Sest*. 94), and levying harsh taxes and large quantities of grain (*Pis*. 86). He is also the source for Piso's acclamation as Imperator (Cic. *Pis*. 38) and triumphal monuments (Cic. *Pis*. 92).

[72] For a general overview of invective in Roman politics during the 1st century, see Syme (1939), 149 ff; On invective in Cicero, see Merrill (1975); Corbeill (2002); and Powell (2007). On the invective *In Pisonem* in particular, see Nisbet (1961), 192-198.

[73] Epstein (1987).

from a *novus homo* in the late Republic. It signaled the social tensions between the old

aristocracy in the Roman Senate and became among the first salvos in social changes that would

intensify in the early imperial period.

In his speech, Cicero excoriated Piso by attacking many of the components of aristocratic

identity so valued by old Roman families: his family's ancestry, his appearance, and his political

career by impugning his conduct as proconsul of Macedonia. Piso was described in appearance

as a Syrian slave fresh off the boat: no more insulting a claim could be leveled at an aristocratic

Roman senator, particularly by a *novus homo* whose own ancestry was far less impressive than

Piso's. Cicero characterizes his family as Gauls, an accusation of barbarism, because of the

humbler origins of his mother rather than the noble lineage of his paternal ancestors.[74]

Additionally, Cicero attacked much about Piso specifically, including an anecdote about

finding Piso drunk at a tavern in the morning as Cicero was out walking with his son-in-law and

distant relation of Piso's, Gaius Calpurnius Piso Frugi.[75] On an individual level, Piso was called

a *belua* (monster), *scelus* (a criminal), *furcifer* (carrier of wooden frame slaves were tied to and

flogged), *barbarus* (barbarian), *vecors* (mad), *amens* (insane), *helluo* (glutton), and many other

---

[74] MacDowell (1964), 9 and Köster (2014), 66: More interesting than the other insults lobbed at him by Cicero was the attack on Piso's maternal family as preserved to us by Asconius. This seems to have been centered on his mother's family's provincial origins, specifically on Calventius, Piso's maternal grandfather: (fr. ix): *Insuberque quidam fuit, idem mercator et praeco. Is cum Romam cum filia venisset, adulescentem nobilem, Caesonini hominis furacissimi filium, ausus est appellare eique filiam conlocavit. Calventium aiunt eum appellatum;* (fr. xvi): *Te tua illa nescio quibus a terris apportata mater pecudem ex alvo, non hominem effuderit;* (fr. xi): *prius enim Gallus, dein Gallica(nus fuit ad) extremum Placentinus*; and (fr. xv): *Maiorem sibi Insuber ille avus adoptavit.* See Nisbet (1989), 51-52, for a discussion on the fragments of *In Pisonem*.

[75] Cic. *Pis.* 1: *Nemo queritur Syrum nescio quem de grege noviciorum factum esse consulem. Non enim nos color iste servilis, non pilosae genae, non dentes putridi deceperunt; oculi, supercilia, frons, voltus denique totus, qui sermo quidam tacitus mentis est, hic in fraudem homines impulit, hic eos quibus erat ignotus decepit, fefellit, induxit*; 53: *Romam vero ipsam, o familiae non dicam Calpurniae sed Calventiae, neque huius urbis sed Placentini municipi, neque paterni generis sed bracatae cognationis dedecus!*; and 13: *Meministine, caenum, cum ad te quinta fere hora cum C. Pisone venissem, nescio quo e gurgustio te prodire involuto capite soleatum, et, cum isto ore foetido taeterrimam nobis popinam inhalasses, excusatione te uti valetudinis, quod diceres vinulentis te quibusdam medicaminibus solere curari?*

derogatory and condescending terms.[76] These characterizations would have a lasting impact on Piso's descendants, with certain attributes following the family well into the Imperial period.[77]

While much of this sort of criticism was typical of invective, both in comedy and politics, there is cause to wonder how much worse this particular attack was since it came from the mouth of a *novus homo*.[78] As seen in Chapter Three, Cicero walked a fine line between emulating aristocratic values and attacking the closed institutions of the nobility. In this light, the hostility of the conclusion of the speech is especially remarkable:

> I have never demanded your blood, never sought that utmost punishment of the laws and judges which is able to exist commonly for the wicked and the upright, but I wished to see you cast down, despised, scorned by the rest, hopeless and abandoned by yourself, looking around at all things, fearing everything which rustles, diffident about your affairs, without a voice, without liberty, without authority, without any appearance of a consul, shaking, trembling, fawning on everyone; I have seen this.[79]

Was Piso simply a proxy for Cicero's anger? Or did Cicero envy Piso's political success in the highly competitive arena of late Republican governance? The answer is probably a combination of both. Piso was powerful enough to be the object of such an invective but not so powerful that he was unassailable. Additionally, the substance of this attack demonstrates that Cicero took aim

---

[76] Cic. *Pis*. 21; see Kubiak (1989), 239 and ff. for an extended discussion of *vecors* and its poetic influences, and Köster (2014), 67 for how Cicero used mythological references to centaurs and lapiths to characterize Piso as wild and uncontrollable, stereotypical characterizations of centaurs and lapiths.

[77] Descriptions of later Pisones (even of other branches of the Calpurnii Pisones), most notably of the Piso in the SCP and the Piso for whom the conspiracy against Nero was named, included *ferox*.

[78] Piso was certainly not the only aristocrat to come under fire from Cicero: in fact, Cicero's speeches were full of attacks on the old nobility. This speech, however, put Piso into the same category as Verres, Catiline, and Vatinius (whom he would later defend from the charge of bribery and exchange letters with (*Fam*. 5.10)). This seems an odd group for Piso, who was hardly as nefarious or scoundrelly a person as Verres and Catiline.

[79] Cic. *Pis*. 99: *Numquam ego sanguinem expetivi tuum, numquam illud extremum quod posset esse improbis et probis commune supplicium legis ac iudici, sed abiectum, contemptum, despectum a ceteris, a te ipso desperatum et relictum, circumspectantem omnia, quicquid increpuisset pertimescentem, diffidentem tuis rebus, sine voce, sine libertate, sine auctoritate, sine ulla specie consulari, horrentem, trementem, adulantem omnis videre te volui; vidi. Qua re si tibi evenerit quod metuis ne accidat, equidem non moleste feram; sin id tardius forte fiet, fruar tamen tua et indignitate et timiditate, nec te minus libenter metuentem videbo ne reus fias quam reum, nec minus laetabor cum te semper sordidum, quam si paulisper sordidatum viderem.*

at the very attributes that defined Roman aristocrats in this period, and this coming from a representative of a small portion of the Senate likely contributed to division, factionalism, and partisanship in the Senate.

At the time of Cicero's attack, Piso had achieved the higher office of proconsul, a position Cicero himself would eventually hold in 51 BCE. If Lucius Calpurnius Piso's election to the office of censor five years later in 50 BCE was any indication, the majority of Cicero's personal criticism of Piso was probably baseless, particularly those parts that question the morals of Piso.[80] As Rosenstein notes, "Consequently, competition grew more intense the farther one rose until at the very pinnacle, the censorship, whose two holders were elected only once every five years or so, only the most eminent and successful figures – former consuls who often had won triumphs – were able to vie for it."[81] The pinnacle, however, was no longer just the censorship. In light of the extraordinary commands of Pompey and Caesar, Piso might have expected greater commands.

During the civil war between Pompey and Caesar, Piso wisely remained neutral, having initially attempted to mediate the dispute between the two men as a legate envoy in 49.[82] He served as a legate envoy again in 43 BCE, this time between the Senate and Antony, who was besieging Decimus Brutus in Cisalpine Gaul. This is the last office he held, and debate continues about when he died. As is evidenced by his extensive career (in fact, it was more accomplished than any of his ancestors), Piso was a prominent figure in the late Republic. The tendency among historians, though, is to pass over him in favor of the victors and losers of the civil wars.

---

[80] Nisbet (1961), 172-180, sees little in Piso's Macedonian campaign that demonstrated the incompetence of which Cicero accused him.
[81] Rosenstein (2006), 371.
[82] Caes. *B Civ*. 1.3.6: *pollicetur L. Piso censor sese iturum ad Caesarem, item L. Roscius praetor, qui de his rebus eum doceant; sex dies ad eam rem conficiendam spatii postulant*. Cic. *Phil*. 12.1.1-3

In addition to his political career, Piso was a significant influence in the social fabric of elite life in the late Republic.

While all aristocrats vied with each other for political advancement, many also competed in alternative ways. One of the most visible for modern historians was the patronage of authors and their literature dedicated to their sponsors.[83] The most famous of these groups in the late Republic was that of the Neoterics, including the poet Catullus. Influenced by Hellenistic poetry, the Neoterics reflected a widespread interest among the Roman elite in literature and culture, an attentiveness to which Augustus would continue and expand during his reign. Lucius Calpurnius Piso Caesoninus was among those prominent aristocratic Roman families that engaged in the patronage of authors, and it is in the patronage of the Epicurean philosopher, Philodemus, where some very interesting ideas that may have informed aristocratic actions in the late Republic can be found.

Philodemus and Piso

Philodemus was born at Gadara in Syria and probably came to Rome circa 75 BCE.[84] Philodemus was well known in Rome and, through his connection with Piso, he assembled a group of students that included Virgil, Horace, and Varius.[85] These students likely met at a villa in Herculaneum, now known as the Villa dei Papiri because of its extensive papyri collection, owned by Piso. Most scholars have arrived at a consensus that Piso was Philodemus' patron based on the evidence provided by Cicero, the fact that the library of Piso's villa was filled with

---

[83] See White (1978) and Saller (1989).

[84] Janko (2000), 1-10.

[85] Cic. *Pis*. 28 and 68 makes reference to Philodemus' poetry, demonstrating that Philodemus was recognizable to his audience. On the connections between and allusion in the works of Virgil, Horace, and Philodemus, see Sider (1997)17-18, 20, 67, and 213, Armstrong (2004), and Gigante (1995), 26-27, 36-38, 44-47, 75-76, and 86-89.

Philodemus' works, and that Piso was the addressee of epigrams and at least one prose treatise.[86]

Cicero claimed to know so much about Piso's personal life and belief system through the poetry

of a Greek philosopher, who remains unnamed but has been firmly identified with Philodemus.[87]

Cicero refrained from criticizing Philodemus in this speech, reserving ridicule for Piso and

Epicureanism in general, and blaming the pupil Piso for besmirching Philodemus' otherwise

excellent reputation. Indeed, he gave the Epicurean philosopher high praise in his *De Finibus*,

where Cicero rated Philodemus a friend and as one of "the best and most learned men."[88]

Although little is actually known about the relationship between Piso and Philodemus, the

content of one of Philodemus' works in particular sheds light on the intellectual currents

surrounding Piso.

The most relevant work of Philodemus' for my discussion here was dedicated to Piso and

survives, albeit in fragmentary form   is the prose treatise entitled *On the Good King according*

to Homer.[89] While modern scholars tend to focus on how the work enhances our understanding

of the reception and study of the Homeric epics in antiquity, this treatise offers much useful

---

[86] Mommsen argued that Piso was not the owner of the Villa dei Papyri because of the lack of an epigraphic record in Herculaneum pertaining to Piso. He held that such an important man and member of a prominent *gens* would have left a record. Later historians have challenged this assumption, see Bloch (1940), Fish (1999, and forthcoming); Armstrong (2003); Gigante (1995); and Sider (2005), 7-8, who offers a thorough analysis of the likely candidates (who include Caesoninus' son Piso Frugi the Pontifex, Appius Claudius Pulcher, or a Marcus Octavius, whose name appears as owner at the end of two book-rolls and who was a curule aedile in 50 BCE).   Additional evidence of Piso's patronage of Philodemus is the existence of two epigrams (27 & 38) addressed to Piso in one of which Piso is "dearest Piso." On these epigrams, see Sider (2005), 152-160 and 199-202, respectively. I agree with the scholarly consensus that the Villa dei Papyri was in fact owned by Piso and Piso was the patron of Philodemus, despite the fact that for my current argument this does not actually matter all that much. As I will argue below, the idea that the treatise *On the Good King According to Homer* engaged with (good kingship) is interesting in light of the end of the Republic and the fact that Philodemus addressed Piso in this treatise makes clear its relationship to the Calpurnii Pisones.

[87] Cic. *Pis.* 72.

[88] Cic. *Fin.* 2.119:…*familiares nostros Sironem et Philodemum, cum optimos viros tum homines doctissimos…*

[89] περὶ τοῦ καθ᾽ Ὅμηρον ἀγαθοῦ βασιλέως, PHerc. 1507. The current scholarly edition is *Il Buon Re Secondo Omero*, by Tiziano Dorandi (1982). Jeff Fish is currently undertaking a new edition, whose unfinished text and translation I make use of here thanks to his great generosity.

information about political ideas swirling among the Roman elite on the cusp of what would be nearly 20 years of civil war. Indeed, the topic of Hellenistic kingship seems to have been in vogue among many Roman aristocrats at this time. The historian Timagenes wrote a treatise entitled *On Kings*, and had contacts with the likes of Faustus Cornelius Sulla (son of the dictator), Antony, Gabinius (Piso's co-consul), Asinius Pollio, and eventually even Augustus.[90] Thus Philodemus' work would have had immediate intellectual currency for Piso, and the discovery of a series of portrait busts of Hellenistic kings in the Villa dei Papiri further suggests that the Calpurnii Pisones of Herculaneum were interested in ideas about kingship.[91]

The date of the treatise remains controversial, as does the reason for its dedication to Piso.[92] Dates as early as 70 BCE are offered, based on a variety of evidence; however the suggestion that the work is an occasional piece dedicated to Piso in celebration of his appointment to the proconsulship of Macedon, on which Philodemus may have accompanied his patron, is attractive, particularly because of the treatise's immediate relevance to ruling a province.[93] Despite its fragmentary nature, there are enough passages of *On the Good King* preserved to make some general remarks about the content and nature of the work. The assumption is that Philodemus wrote it as a guide for Piso's own behavior, and while the model for Piso is a good king.[94] Categorized as a "Prince's Mirror," a literary genre in which political ideas are expressed as advice to a ruler, *On the Good King* offered Piso advice based on the behaviors of kings in Homer's *Iliad* and *Odyssey*.[95]

---

[90] FGrH 88; Gigante (1995), 65.
[91] Gigante (1995), 65.
[92] Bloch (1940), Fish (1999, 2003, and forthcoming); Gigante (1995); Sider (2005).
[93] This interesting and plausible suggestion was made to me by Michael McOsker, who recently defended his dissertation on Philodemus at the University of Michigan.
[94] Murray (1985), 157-160; Gigante (1990), 69.
[95] On this, see Dorandi (1982).

In the treatise, Philodemus examined the correct behaviors of kings by using Homeric examples, both positive and negative. He criticized Paris for his behavior toward Helen, making a point about a king and what constituted proper or improper relationships with women.[96] Later, he linked good kingship with terrestrial fertility, suggested that ruling by force and fear alone would not a good king make, and that kings must keep a watchful eye on their retainers.[97] Philodemus suggested that kings should rebuke their subjects who drink too much, spending quite a bit of time examining the drunkenness of the suitors of Penelope, a topic on which Cicero alleged that Piso needed much lecturing.[98]

Perhaps most helpfully for Piso as a Roman administrator, Philodemus outlined the good qualities of a king: "Departing from such topics, let us again recommend that which is good for a king, to be averse from a harsh, austere, and bitter character, and to practice gentleness, goodness and a king's mildness and leniency as much as possible, since these lead to a sound monarchy

---

[96] Fish (forthcoming): Philodemus, *On the Good King*, 1F: [ὁ δ' Ἕκτωρ λέγει Πάριν] γεγονέν[αι "μέγα πῆμα π]όλη[ΐ] τε παντ[ί τε δήμῳ, δυ]ς[μ]ενέςιν μὲν [χάρμα, κατηφείην δὲ [coì αὐτῷ"...

[97] Philodemus, *On the Good King*, 5: καὶ διὰ τουτ' αὐ[τῶι φέρε]ι δαψιλῶc ἡ γῆ "πυροὺς καὶ κριθὰc βρίθη`ι΄cι δὲ δένδρεα καρπῶι, τίκτηι δ' ἔνπεδα μῆ[λα, θάλαccα δὲ παρρέχηι ἰχθ[ὺς ἐξ εὐηγες[ί]ης, ἀρετῶcι δὲ λαο[ὶ ὑπ αὐτοῦ"; 6: ον ὁ γὰρ οἰ[ό]με[ν]οc βίαι καὶ] φόβωι μόνον [. . .]οι[]ε[]κ . πλ]ήθουc γ ἀρετὸ[c . . . . .]c κυριεύ[c]ειν; 23: ἐ-]πυνθάνεθ' ὁ Ὀδυccε[ύc ποιῶ]ν πεῖραν ἑκάcτω[ν . . . . τοὺc δὲ] ἐλευθέρο[υc . . . . ‖

[98] Philodemus, *On the Good King*, 26-30F: ἐπιτιμη[cάντων τῶν] βαcιλέων τ[ο]ῖ[c μεθ]υcκ[ο]μένοιc ἵνα μὴ δια…"πιεῖν" [φηcιν ὅτε θυμὸc ἀ]νώγο[ι".] μέθη δε.. καὶ παρακόπουc, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ παρὰ τούτοιc ἔμφαcιc οἰνοφλυγίαc ἀλλὰεῖc αὐτῶ[ν], καὶ ἐπιτιμῶν ὡc παρα[φ]ρονοῦντι τὸ οἱ νοποτάζειν λέγει βλάπτειν αὐτόν… οὐ γὰρ μόνον νη[φό]ντων ἄδειν "κλέα ἀνδρῶν" ἀλλὰ καὶ πινόντω[ν], οὐδὲ παρὰ μόνοιcτοῖc αὐcτηροτέροιc, ἀλλὰ καὶ παρὰ τοῖc τρυφεροβίοιc Φαίαξι. τὰ γὰρ ἐν Ἰλίωι cυμ‖[βεβηκότα. See also Cic. *Pis*. 13.

158

and not arbitrary rule based on fear of a despot."[99] He should be a lover of victory but not a lover of war or battle.[100]

According to Gigante, Philodemus' most effective warning to Piso comes in the next section where he condemns the ruler who thinks that fomenting discord is a good way to rule.[101] Here Gigante sees the most culturally relevant advice that Philodemus offers to Piso in the text: that Piso can "consolidate his supremacy with friendship and benevolence, without abuse or prevarication."[102] In the context of the late Republic, this seems sage advice if difficult to follow. The text breaks off with Philodemus directly addressing Piso, saying "of the points of departure, Piso, which it is possible to take from Homer for a corrected reading…"[103] Having spent the earlier portion of the treatise discussing *exempla* from Homer, Philodemus may have developed and contextualized the points specifically for his Roman patron.

While we may never know what specific advice Philodemus gave to Piso, the first portion does give some insight into intellectual currents about good leadership.[104] Philodemus himself was well known in Roman elite circles, even if he did not spend time in Rome. His relationship with Horace, Virgil, and other students in the literary circle he instructed in

---

[99] Philodemus, *On the Good King*, 24: ἀπὸ δὴ τῶν τοιούτω[ν ἀ]ναχωρήcαντεc, πάλι τ[ὸ] cπουδαῖον βαcιλεῖ παραι[νῶ]μεν· αὐcτ[ηρὸ]ν μὲν κα[ὶ] τραχύ τι ἦθοc καὶ πικρὸν ἐχθραίρει[ν καὶ] π{α}ραότητα διαcκεῖν κ[αὶ] ἐπιείκειαν καὶ τὸ βα[cιλέ]ωc ἥμερον καὶ cυ[γ]γν[ω]μονικόν, ἐφ' ὅcον πλεῖcτον, ὡc φοροῦ[ν]τα π[ρ]ὸc εὐcταθῆ μοναρχί[α]ν [καὶ] μὴ δεc[ποτικῶι φόβωι δυνα[c]τείαν.

[100] Philodemus, *On the Good King*, 27 χρὴ τοιγαροῦ[ν φιλό]νικον εἶναι τὸν ἀ[γαθὸ]ν δυνάcτην ἀλλ[ὰ μὴ φιλ]οπόλεμον μη[δὲ φιλόμ]αχον…

[101] Gigante (1990), 70; Philodemus, *On the Good King*, 28: παμπονηρεύεcθ[αι κ]αὶ βλακεύειν [μ]έντο[ι νο]μιcτέον εἰ νομίζει τὴν ἀρ[χ]ὴν οὕτωc ἀcφαλεcτέραν ἕξειν, ὡc καὶ τῶν ἰδιωτῶν τινεc εὐκταῖον ὑπογοοῦcιν "οἰκετῶν εἶναι cτάcιν", κακῶc εἰδότεc ἑκάτεροι διότι καὶ πρὸc ἀπώλειαν τῶν οἴκων καὶ τῶν δυνα[cτ]ειῶν κ[ατ]α[cτροφὴ]ν των υπεροι[.(.)]

[102] Gigante (1990), 70.

[103] Transl. by Fish; Philodemus, *On the Good King*, 43: τῶν ἀφο[ρ]μῶν, ὦ Πεί[cων, ἅc ἔcτι παρ' Ὁμήρου λαβεῖν εἰc ἐπανόρθωcιν, δυ-νατό[ν(.)].

[104] We may one day have more of this treatise in particular and of Philodemus' works in general if technology and motivation advance enough to read the scrolls preserved by the eruption of Mt. Vesuvius in 79 CE.

Herculaneum solidified Philodemus' influence not only on the Roman elite but also on the authors who would become so important to the creation of Augustus' new political system. In light of the content that can be discerned from Philodemus' treatise, what is most striking is the notion of kingship being an acceptable topic for discussion in elite Roman circles where the word *rex* has long been thought to have been taboo.

It is tempting to agree, especially if one knows what would eventually happen in the not so distant future with Julius Caesar and the transition from Republic to Empire with the victories of Augustus: a return to rule by one man. Julius Caesar, being Piso's son-in-law, certainly had contact with Philodemus and was likely aware of this philosophical treatise. It is impossible to know for certain whether or not Caesar's, and later Augustus', actions were influenced by this particular treatise or the intellectual currents surrounding it, but this treatise makes clear that ideas about kingship were circulating among the Roman elite just before the advent of one man rule. But perhaps more importantly, Philodemus' treatise to Piso informed Piso's son and probably other family members as well as a wider range of elite persons.

The Precedent of Lucius Calpurnius Piso Caesoninus

As seen in this examination of his life, Lucius Calpurnius Piso Caesoninus exemplified the values held by Roman aristocrats by attaining more offices than any of his ancestors had in his long political career, through his connection to the man who would emerge as victor in the civil war of the early 40s, and by means of his patronage of culture and the literary arts. The *gens Calpurnia* had many distinguished members, and this Piso was no exception. At his funeral procession, the *imagines* of many of those discussed above would have been paraded along with his own. His name lived on in the dedications of Philodemus, the triumphal monuments, and his

achievements in Roman political life. His name would have been inscribed on the *Fasti Capitolini* in the Forum Augustum for all to see.

This Piso's success in the political and social spheres of the Republic would serve as a guide every time a member of the *gens Calpurnia* was celebrated in a funeral procession or speech and whenever audiences were held in the atria of homes containing his *imago*. The legacy of Lucius Calpurnius Piso Caesoninus continued in the tremendously successful career of his son, the homonymous Lucius Calpurnius Piso, and in him the SCP's Gnaeus Calpurnius Piso had an even more contemporary precedent. While Gnaeus Calpurnius Piso belonged to the other branch of the family, Caesoninus would still have figured among his ancestors to emulate and imitate.

Despite their descent from its different branches, these relatives were linked through their *gens*, in competition with and trying to emulate one another, and through the aristocratic institutions of memory that continued to shape elite behavior into the Principate. These were in part the forces that drove Gnaeus Calpurnius Piso into his confrontation with Germanicus and ultimately with the imperial family. Additionally, it was probably around this time that the family began claiming descent from the Sabine Numa Pompilius, the second king of Rome, a fact that would further distinguish its members from other aristocratic families and newly enfranchised municipal senators and compel its descendants to achieve greatness.[105]

Calpurnii Pisones During the Civil Wars and in the Early Principate

Other members of the Calpurnii Pisones are elusive during this period, with one notable exception. The quaestor of 65 and grandfather of the homonymously named target of the SCP

---

[105] Plut. *Num*. 21. 2-3; Dion. Hal. 2.76. 5. Crawford (1974) *RRC* no. 446 (Cn. Calpurnius Piso, c. 49 B.C.); *Laus Pisonis* 5, 15; Hor. *AP* 292; Wiseman (1974), 155; Syme (1986), 76; and Forsythe (1990), 296-7.

was a bitter enemy of Pompey's, as mentioned above, but his role in the civil wars is unclear.[106]

His son was also against Pompey, initially, but later fought for him against Caesar for the sake of

preserving the Republic.[107] This Piso would later fight alongside Brutus and Cassius against the

forces of Octavian and Antony. After their defeat, he then withdrew from politics and was

granted clemency and a return to Rome. A certain Gnaeus Calpurnius Piso Frugi may have been

an officer under Sextus Pompey, but this is far from secure.[108]

As we saw in Chapter Three, Augustus generally excluded the nobility from political

power from 28 BCE to 18 BCE and seemed to prefer new men and aristocrats from decayed

families for promotion.[109] Eventually, however, circumstances provoked Augustus to change

policy. As Syme acknowledges, "The Fasti of Augustan Rome exhibit consular Pisones of two

branches, descendants of Cn. Piso and of L. Piso Caesoninus."[110] The second of these branches

was, on the surface, more politically successful and certainly less problematic during the reigns

of Augustus and Tiberius. Perhaps this was a result of their closer connection to the Imperial

family.

The son of Lucius Calpurnius Piso Caesoninus, the homonymous Lucius Calpurnius Piso,

would achieve the consulship in 15 BCE under Augustus.[111] He died at age 79 in 32 CE. As a

result, he had seen with his own eyes as a teenager both the results of the victory at Actium and

as an older man the first succession under the new political system, something that few other

aristocrats could claim. His political career is not completely clear to us but he was probably

quaestor in 23, *praetor* in 18, and was perhaps *praetor pro quaestor* of Sicily and Asia under

---

[106] Tac. *Ann*. 2.43.2; *RE* 69; Hofmann-Löbl (1996), 144-151.
[107] Syme (1986), 368: He realized that "Pompey was defender of the Republic, becoming his proquaestor in Spain in the year 49 BCE."
[108] This may be the same man as *RE* 95, a proquaestor in Spain under Pompey in 49 BCE.
[109] Syme (1986), 70, 96, 99, 158, 266, 282, 286, 313, 318, 323, 442-4.
[110] Syme (1960), 12.
[111] *RE* 99; Hofmann-Löbl (1996), 206-225.

Augustus in 17. In 15 BCE, Piso was consul and subsequently attained of office of proconsul of

Italia Transpadana, dispensing justice at Mediolanum perhaps in 14 BCE.[112] During 12-10 BCE,

Piso was the governor of Pamphylia and was brought to Thrace to deal with a rebellion of the

Belli tribe.[113] He was eventually successful and the Senate voted him *supplicationes* and the

ornamenta triumphalia, which served as a replacement for Republican triumphs.[114]

   During his campaigns, Piso was a *legatus Augusti* and received direct orders from

Augustus himself, which may indicate the closeness of the two men.[115] Piso was also governor of

Macedonia, the same province his father had been awarded some years before.[116] According to

evidence in an epigram by Antipater, Piso was possibly a governor of Asia circa 8 BCE and in

Syria circa 4 BCE – 1 BCE.[117] The city of Hierapolis in Cilicia Pedias honored him as their

patron, and several inscriptions on statue bases from the area confirm this Syrian appointment.[118]

After this illustrious career, nothing else was added until 13 CE when Piso became *praefectus*

urbis.[119]

   The fact that he was Calpurnia's much younger brother, and therefore related by marriage

to Caesar's heir, may have helped continue the relationship between the two families.   However,

Syme notes that the link between the two families was not strong enough to guarantee a

matrimonial connection with the family of Augustus itself: "His marriage to an Ignota produced

---

[112] Syme (1986), 332.
[113] Cass. Dio 34.6; for the date, see Syme (1986), 334.
[114] Cass. Dio 34.7, Liv. *Per*. Book CXL. Sources for Piso's Thracian war include Suetonius, Cassius Dio, Florus, Orosius, Livy's Epitomes, Seneca, and Antipater in the Palatine Anthology (*Anth. Pal.*) X.25. On triumphs and the *ornamenta triumphalia*, see Chapters Two and Three.
[115] Sen. *Ep*. 83.14.
[116] Milner and Eilers (2006), 66.
[117] Syme (1986), 340: "If the Tiburtine fragment is assigned to Piso, he acquires Syria in his career and duly joins the company of the aristocrats whom the high epoch of the renovated Republic saw not only holding the twelve *fasces* in Asia or Africa but even competing with *novi homines* in the charge of great armies"; *Anth. Pal.* X.25.
[118] Syme (1960), 17 fn. 68.
[119] Tac. *Ann*. VI.11.3.

a daughter, who married Nonius Asprenas (suff. A.D. 6)."[120] At the same time, however, this

Nonius Asprenas was the son of a man of the same name, who had married the sister of

Quinctius Varus, himself a friend of Augustus.[121] Thus there is a connection between the

families, albeit not directly. Despite Syme's assessment that this Piso "avoided entanglement,"

connection with the imperial family seems to have been precisely the aim of Augustus and

perhaps certain noble families in this period.[122]

    This Piso seems to have continued in his father's footsteps, both politically and

philosophically. As Bloch noted, "The villa [in Herculaneum] remained in the hands of the

Pisones after Caesoninus' death. His son L. Piso had a brilliant career and continued the tradition

of his house. He maintained relations not only with Philodemus, who had survived his protector,

but also with the circle of Roman poets who studied under Philodemus, his fellow-students."[123]

Additionally, he was the patron of Horace, who dedicated the *Ars Poetica* to him and his sons.[124]

---

[120] Syme (1980), 333.

[121] Syme (1986), 331: "The family, from Picenum, was newly ennobled- but the father of Asprenas had married one of the three sisters of Quinctilius Varus, and Varus stood in close propinquity to the dynasty, through several matrimonial alliances." This Varus, of Teutoburg forest fame, was married to Claudia Pulchra, the granddaughter of Octavia and daughter of Marcus Valerius Messalla Appianus, an adopted son of the patrician *gens Valeria*. The *gens Valeria* was one of the oldest and most famous of the old aristocracy.

[122] See also Chapter 3: The Claudii, Ahendobarbi, Aemilii Pauli, and Aemelii Lepidi all benefited from marriages into the imperial family. See Syme (1939) table III. The Aruntii were politically enfranchised during Augustus' reign (Syme (1939) table V). Syme (1986), 331 goes on to say, "Through that sister the Pontifex had a link, albeit tenuous, with Caesar's heir. There is no sign of any reinforcement when the season arrived for him to look for a wife, several nieces of the Princeps becoming available not long after the War of Actium. It would be no bad thing if a young man had sense enough to resist high birth in a bride, aware of discomforts, and of danger. Arrogant women or entanglement with the dynasty brought noble houses to calamity or extinction." I submit that it was not necessarily the marriages that brought these nobles to destruction, but rather their competition with the imperial family and their failure to recognize the changed values of the aristocracy.

[123] Bloch (1940), 493.

[124] For the dedication of the *Ars Poetica* to this Piso and the problem of his otherwise unattested sons, see Syme (1939), 460; Bloch (1940); Syme (1980), 340; Armstrong (1993); contra, see Frischer (1991). I agree with the consensus opinion that Piso the Pontifex was the dedicatee of the *Ars Poetica* and that he did have two sons. We know nothing of their careers (unless one son was the Lucius Calpurnius Piso

Sider links the authors patronized by the father and son, arguing "One could now close the circle by noting not only that the *Ars Poetica* draws upon literary theory found in Philodemus' treatises on poetry but also that Horace explicitly refers to, and sometimes seems to paraphrase, an epigram of Philodemus in one of his *Satires*."[125] The transmission of ideas between the authors suggests also a transmission of ideas between their patrons: how interesting indeed must Lucius Calpurnius Piso the son have found Philodemus' treatise on good kingship during his own successful career throughout the reigns of Augustus and Tiberius.

After his tenure of twenty years in the office of urban prefect, this Piso died in 32 CE, the recipient of a public funeral at which the many of the *gens Calpurnia*, the Roman Senate, and the citizens of Rome would be present.[126] The combination of his daughter's successful marriage into a family with close ties to the Princeps and his own highly successful career that imitated and even surpassed that of his father ensured that this Piso was no threat to imperial power. For this branch of the Calpurnii Pisones, little had changed in the transition between Republic and Imperial period. They could list consulars, parade their *imagines* in their own funeral

---

involved in the Pisonian Conspiracy of 65 CE, which is attractive for a number of reasons; Hofmann-Löbl (1996), 274-283 offers this suggestion tentatively). It is also possible they both may have died young.

[125] Sider (2005), 7: Piso also acted as a patron to an epigrammatist, Antipater of Thessalonica, who addressed several poems to him.

[126] Tacitus (*Ann.* 6.10.5-7) gives the following glowing assessment of Piso's life and tenure: *Per idem tempus L. Piso pontifex, rarum in tanta claritudine, fato obiit, nullius servilis sententiae sponte auctor et quoties necessitas ingrueret sapienter moderans. patrem ei censorium fuisse memoravi; aetas ad octogesimum annum processit; decus triumphale in Thraecia meruerat. sed praecipua ex eo gloria quod praefectus urbi recens continuam potestatem et insolentia parendi graviorem mire temperavit.* In 6.11.1-4, Tacitus gives a brief overview of the history of the office of urban prefect and provides the length of tenure for Piso: *Namque antea profectis domo regibus ac mox magistratibus, ne urbs sine imperio foret in tempus deligebatur qui ius redderet ac subitis mederetur;… primusque Messala Corvinus eam potestatem et paucos intra dies finem accepit quasi nescius exercendi; tum Taurus Statilius, quamquam provecta aetate, egregie toleravit; dein Piso viginti per annos pariter probatus publico funere ex decreto senatus celebratus est.* The twenty-year tenure was rejected by Fuchs (1946), Koestermann (1965), Sacher (*RE*), Crook (1955), Scheid; Syme (1986) and Groag (PIR2) think Tacitus was accurate. I do not see why Tacitus would misrepresent the tenure of Piso, and therefore agree with Syme and Groag.

processions, and display triumphal ornaments; they also enjoyed a positive connection to the imperial family.

Their contemporaries in the other branch of the Calpurnii Pisones had less extensive careers, but were still fairly successful. Gnaeus Calpurnius Piso, son of the *quaestor* of 65, initially adhered to his father's opposition to Pompey but later became his ally and proconsul in Spain during the civil war against Caesar in 49 BCE.[127] Despite having removed himself from politics after Actium, he attained the consulship in the year 23, when Augustus was faced with his own mortality, the first of many succession crises, and, in the next year, a plot against his regime. He may have thought that Augustus' relinquishing of the consulship heralded a return to Republican politics; or perhaps ambition, the restoration of his family's *dignitas*, or even the hope of political advancement for his sons impelled him.[128] The likely answer lies in the latter two motivations: Piso had the weight of his ancestor's accomplishments on his mind as well as the future reputation of his family. Little else is known about this Piso. His reputation was negative; according to Tacitus he had an arrogance (*ferocia*) that he passed on to his sons.[129] He married a Popilla, daughter of Marcus Popillus who himself is otherwise unknown. Together they had two infamous sons: Gnaeus Calpurnius Piso of SCP fame and his younger brother Lucius Calpurnius Piso, known as the Augur.

Gnaeus Calpurnius Piso did not achieve the same remarkable career as his cousin, Lucius Calpurnius Piso Caesoninus, had had. Regardless of how he actually behaved in Syria and with

---

[127] Val. Max 6.2.4; Crawford (1974), 463; Tac. *Ann*. 2.43.
[128] Syme (1986), 368.
[129] Tac. *Ann*. 2.43.2: In discussing his son's character, Tacitus tells us that "he was inborn with arrogance from his father Piso who aided the rebellious party against Caesar in Africa during the civil war and then, having followed the cause of Brutus and Cassius, when forced to return, he abstained from seeking office until finally he was solicited to accept the consulship by the offer of Augustus" (…*insita ferocia a patre Pisone qui civili bello resurgentis in Africa partis acerrimo ministerio adversus Caesarem iuvit, mox Brutum et Cassium secutus concesso reditu petitione honorum abstinuit, donec ultro ambiretur delatum ab Augusto consulatum accipere*).

Germanicus, something the SCP probably failed to capture accurately on account of its propagandistic nature, this Piso was characterized as having acted like an aristocrat of the Republic. Should this be ignored as only propaganda or could it reflect some truth? In light of the ways in which aristocratic institutions of memory had been appropriated and yet still remained vital components to traditional aristocratic identity (which was under threat from the advancement of Italian elites during this period), we can probably assume a little of both.

Knowing the history of his family and its many achievements, Gnaeus Calpurnius Piso sought the same distinctions, the same offices, and the same recognitions.[130] Familial memory passed down in the imagines lining the atria of Calpurnian households and paraded in the family's funereal processions preserved the memory of Piso's ancestor's deeds for him to imitate, and tradition impelled him to do so. It was this drive that caused him so much trouble in the end. For he failed to see the shifting tide of aristocratic values toward individual alliances with the imperial family away from those that emphasized loyalty to familial memory and history. Piso's crimes were those of the sort that drove aristocratic competition at Rome, while his punishments reflect the same system of values. At the same time, however, the SCP was particularly concerned with articulating which values and behaviors were not appropriate in the context of the imperial political system. Thus this was a document that looked forward and backward simultaneously. The SCP demonstrates that the early Principate was a period of transition in terms of social expectations for the senatorial class.

It is hard to imagine that the transition from venerable customs that had dictated aristocratic behavior for centuries was entirely without problems or challenges. This must have been true when the mark kept shifting, as it did during the entirety of the Julio-Claudian dynasty.

---

[130] *RE* 70; Hofmann-Löbl (1996), 234-268.

As Cooley observed, "In the s. c. de Pisone, Tiberius and his whole family show their *moderatio, modestia, humanitas, aequitas, patientia, pietas, clementia, iustitia, animi magnitudo*, and *liberalitas*. The list is seemingly endless, and certainly puts to shame the rather meagre list of virtues ascribed to Augustus on the *clipeus virtutis*!"[131] How Tiberius and his successors managed the *domus Augusta* shaped the institution later and continued to influence the social norms of the aristocratic classes of Rome. The Calpurnii Pisones were one of a few senatorial families whose members simultaneously excelled at and struggled with the changing values of the political regime.

This was most evident in the careers of Gnaeus Calpurnius Piso's brother and sons. His brother, Lucius, enjoyed a fairly successful career under Augustus, achieving the consulship in 1 BCE.[132] In the last decade of Augustus' life, Piso served as governor of Asia, where dedicatory inscriptions to him survive at Stratonikeia in Caria and at Mytilene.[133] This was the same area where his father had spent time with Brutus after the assassination of Caesar, as indicated in inscriptions alluding to the relationship between Stratonikeia, Mytilene, and Piso (cos. 23) probably dated to that time.[134] The Augur was characterized in a similar fashion to his father and elder throughout Tacitus' narrative and seems to have run into trouble only with Tiberius.[135] Indeed, Tacitus remarked on his independence and willingness to prosecute a close friend of the Empress, Urgulania.[136] This was after he served as a member of the defense for his brother

---

[131] Cooley (1998), 207.
[132] *RE* 74; Hofmann-Löbl (1996), 226-233.
[133] Milner and Eilers (2006), 68.
[134] Milner and Eilers (2006), 68.
[135] Tac. *Ann*. 4.21: *Actum dehinc de Calpurnio Pisone, nobili et feroci viro*.
[136] Tac. *Ann*. 2.34: *Inter quae L. Piso ambitum fori, corrupta iudicia, saevitiam oratorum accusationes minitantium increpans abire se et cedere urbe, victurum in aliquo abdito et longinquo rure testabatur; simul curiam relinquebat. commotus est Tiberius, et quamquam mitibus verbis Pisonem permulsisset, propinquos quoque eius impulit ut abeuntem auctoritate vel precibus tenerent. haud minus liberi doloris documentum idem Piso mox dedit vocata in ius Urgulania, quam supra leges amicitia Augustae extulerat.*

during the SCP trial, so perhaps his hostility to the imperial family could be understood.[137] Later

he would also find himself prosecuted for *maiestas* (treason), dying of natural causes before the

trial was completed.[138]

Despite the disgraces of their father and uncle, Gnaeus Calpurnius Piso's sons did not

suffer for his mistakes. His son Gnaeus, who was forced to change his name to Lucius, became

consul in 27 CE.[139] His other son, Marcus, disappears from sight after 20 CE but may have had a

career despite his father's trial.[140] The success of Gnaeus turned Lucius is evidence that the

relationship between Princeps and senator trumped that between family members. The

realization that aristocratic life was to be significantly different in this new political system only

happened after the death of Augustus, when the memory of ancestors' accomplishments and

aristocratic competition still served to drive behavior. The generation of Gnaeus Calpurnius Piso

was the first to confront this new reality and he, along with many of his contemporaries,

struggled and failed to negotiate the times successfully.

Tacitus, Gnaeus Calpurnius Piso, and the SCP

But what of the evidence from Tacitus? The vast majority of scholars take the SCP and

Tacitus together to try to understand the events of the feud between Germanicus and Piso,

Germanicus' death, and Piso's trial or even to "prove" a number of assertions about the

historian.[141] This is problematic for a number of reasons, the most important of which is that

---

[137] Tac. *Ann*. 3.11.2.
[138] Tac. *Ann*. 4.21; Syme (1986), 376.
[139] *RE* 71/76; Hofmann-Löbl (1996), 269-273.
[140] *RE* 85; Hofmann-Löbl (1996), 269-273; Flower (1998), 174.
[141] These assertions range from evaluating Tacitus' accuracy to attempting to reconstruct whether or not he was using the *acta senatus* as source material (for a just a few examples, see Flower (1996), Cooley (1998), Talbert (1999), and Damon (1999)).

Tacitus wrote his account nearly one hundred years later. His work preserves for us the way in which Tacitus (and perhaps his contemporaries) thought about the Senate and emperor during the reigns of the Julio-Claudians, in addition to outlining the historical events of the period. This is potentially a very different perspective from how things actually were. Thus, of primary concern is what Tacitus' presentation of the Piso's behavior suggests about aristocratic actions under the Principate and how Tacitus interprets that behavior (obsequiousness and pandering for some senators, careless or mindless opposition for others).[142]

For a long time historians have agreed that "The high aristocrats did not need to compete any more. Birth was enough for title and claim, more potent now than in the closing age of the Republic. And, although triumphs were soon abolished, *nobiles* could still win military glory commanding armies under the mandate of Caesar."[143] Underpinning these kinds of statements is the assumption that the political situation that faced the Roman elite had completely changed, based in part on the reconstruction of the period by Tacitus. In his opening chapters of the *Annales*, Tacitus painted a very specific portrait of the early Principate:

> The state had, therefore, been transformed and there was nothing of the original and pure customs. Equality had gone and all looked to the orders of the princeps. Therefore, with the status of the state changed, nothing at all of the ancient ways was untouched and, since equality had been cast aside, all looked to the orders of the princeps with no fear for the present day, while Augustus strong in his old age sustained himself and his family in peace. Afterward, when his already advanced old age was wearied also by bodily illness, and his end and new hopes were approaching, in vain few spoke of the good of freedom, more feared war, and others desired it.[144]

---

[142] Livy did this for early history of Rome; why should Tacitus be any different?

[143] Syme (1986), 444.

[144] Tac. *Ann*. 1.4.1-2: *Igitur verso civitatis statu nihil usquam prisci et integri moris: omnes exuta aequalitate iussa principis aspectare, nulla in praesens formidine, dum Augustus aetate validus seque et domum in pacem sustentavit. postquam provecta iam senectus aegro et corpore fatigabatur, aderatque finis et spes novae, pauci bona libertatis in cassum disserere, plures bellum pavescere, alii cupere.*

As we saw in Chapter Two, this was simply not true. Augustus did implement change, but also maintained much continuity.

Additionally, while there were certainly few alive at the death of Augustus who had seen the Republic, Tacitus neglects the very real memory that aristocratic families under the Julio-Claudians had of the Republic and their ancestors within it. These ancestors looked down at them every time they entered or left their houses in the form of the *imagines* lining the walls of the atrium. Their successes were enumerated in the *tituli* underneath their facsimiles. Their names were the same as those passing them by on their way to the Senate house. Tacitus was not born to an old aristocratic Roman family and as such he did not have the same familial knowledge that guided the likes of the Calpurnii Pisones. Furthermore, his situation under the Flavians and Antonines was significantly different from that of senators living under the Julio-Claudians.[145]

Another important reason to use caution in using Tacitus' account to talk about the events surrounding Gnaeus Calpurnius Piso and Germanicus is the recognition of the literary qualities of his work. Tacitus, like all Roman historians, wrote to be didactic and provide *exempla* to guide the behavior of his readers. Apart from invented speeches, Tacitus wrote the Piso-Germanicus episode in similar fashion as Sallust and Livy had written about the Catilinarian and

---

[145] This view has begun to take hold: Gowing (2009), 23: "In some respects, it could be argued, Tacitus does for early imperial history what Livy had done for the history of the Republic- he interprets the past in terms of the present;" and Alston (2008), 154: "Tacitus 's attitude toward the republican past is in some ways very clear. The past was gone. Nevertheless, it would seem that the conservatism of form in the *Annales* and *Histories* could be read not as ironic comment on the decease of history but as a claim to historiographical continuity. The historian retained value by providing understanding and *exempla* for the new age. It was only through the correct understanding of the Roman past that the present could be understood. Although times had changed, the function of history had not. Tacitus provided his audience with a new history for the new age, new role models, and a new way of constructing their identity in relation to imperial power and the Roman past."

Bacchanalian conspiracies, respectively.[146] For these reasons, Tacitus' account of the trial of Gnaeus Calpurnius Piso should be used cautiously and with the caveats listed here in mind.

Conclusions

There is no reason to assume that competition died out with the advent of the imperial period. Aristocrats remembered the achievements of their ancestors and sought to attain similar honors themselves. The *imagines* in their atria, the public funeral processions, and their very names forbade them from forgetting the past and urged them toward competition for public recognition in service to the state. Augustus himself encouraged this when he made senators more visible through their clothing, census rating, and seating arrangements. It was this memory that led aristocratic families to compete for the same ideals that their ancestors held and led either to their political advancement and incorporation into the family of the princeps or to their death, exile, and condemnation.

In light of the myriad treason trials, conspiracies, and strained relationships between the imperial family and nobility, coupled with the evidence for the intentional change in aristocratic institutions of memory begun by Augustus and continued by Tiberius, it seems clear that the early Principate was rather turbulent. The conflict here was not martial, but rather over social *mores* and the dictation of new standards of behavior for the Roman elite. Memory of ancestral accomplishments preserved and transmitted by aristocratic families goaded sons to contend not only with their fathers but also their colleagues to achieve glory. To channel that into productive courses, the Princeps sought out marriage alliances, granted political offices, and attempted to

---

[146] Even if the *acta senatus* to which Tacitus had access contained short summaries of the speeches given in the senate, the degree of embellishment makes them particularly suspect. Additionally, Tacitus' characterization of the Pisones as arrogant and cruel seems to be influenced by Seneca's *De Ira* (which will be examined in Chapter 5). On the conspiracy narratives of Roman Historians, see Pagán (2004), and more specifically on the SCP and Piso's trial, pages 7 and 68-72.

replace the old values with new ones, rooted in the new institution of the *domus Augusta*. But this took time. And not everyone understood the message; several members of the *Calpurnii Pisones* were among those who did not.

Gnaeus Calpurnius Piso's descendants would continue to have difficulty in their relationships to the imperial regime and would ultimately find themselves joining forces with some of the very people who initiated and supported the changes in aristocratic values during the early Principate: the newly incorporated municipal senators. These municipal senators, and their attempts at negotiating the path between old aristocracy and imperial family, are the subject of the next chapter.

Chapter Five: Senators from the Fringes

In the following reminder that the power of the Roman people resided in their extension

of citizenship, Cicero made yet another plea for acceptance into the social world of the Roman

Senate. Cicero argued:

> But that which without any doubt laid the foundation for our power and
> augmented the name of the Roman people most of all, which that leader, the
> founder of this city, Romulus, taught us with the Sabine treaty, that it is fitting for
> this state to be increased by the acceptance of its enemies; by whose authority and
> example the giving freely and the making common of citizenship was never
> neglected by our ancestors. And so, many were received from Latium, just as the
> people of Tusculum, of Lanuvium, and people from other places were received
> into the state, just as the Sabines the Volsci and the Hernicii had been; and those
> from these places were not compelled to change their affiliation, unless they
> preferred to, nor did it seem that their treaties had been violated, if they obtained
> our citizenship by the kindness of the Roman people.[1]

Indeed the relationship between Italians and Romans from the 3rd century onward had largely

been one of mutual interest and intimacy. Fighting alongside one another century after century

had brought the different peoples of Italy into close contact, and with conquest came networks of

trade and social ties between the elites of Italian towns and Roman senators.[2] However, these

links did not necessarily translate into a shared culture and full social integration into the Roman

---

[1] Cic. *Balb*. 31.3-4: *Illud vero sine ulla dubitatione maxime nostrum fundavit imperium et populi Romani nomen auxit, quod princeps ille creator huius urbis, Romulus, foedere Sabino docuit etiam hostibus recipiendis augeri hanc civitatem oportere; cuius auctoritate et exemplo numquam est intermissa a maioribus nostris largitio et communicatio civitatis. Itaque et ex Latio multi, ut Tusculani, ut Lanuvini, et ex ceteris generibus gentes universae in civitatem sunt receptae, ut Sabinorum, Volscorum, Hernicorum; quibus ex civitatibus nec coacti essent civitate mutari, si qui noluissent, nec, si qui essent civitatem nostram beneficio populi Romani consecuti, violatum foedus eorum videretur.*
[2] Roselaar (2012), 141-158; Roth (2012), 17-35; Lomas (2012), 197-214.

state: the different legal rights of allies and the outbreak of the Social War were indications of fractures within the Italian peninsula despite centuries of contact.[3]

As demonstrated in Chapter Three, even the status of citizen, a successful political career, excellence in the law courts, and a prominent role in governing the Roman state were not enough for Cicero to overcome the prejudices harbored by the old Roman aristocracy. Despite the long relationship to Rome that both his native town of Arpinum and his family enjoyed, he remained a *novus homo* in the eyes of the old aristocracy throughout his tenure in the Senate. Even after the admission into the Senate of many more Italian elites by Augustus and Tiberius, and despite being much diminished in numbers by civil wars, proscriptions, and renunciation of political activity, the old aristocracy still enjoyed a privileged position in the Roman Senate. Their family names could be found in the records of the Senate and in the histories of Rome, their ancestors were celebrated publicly in the Forum Augustum and in the funeral processions that still wound their way through the center of the city, and one of them had become the imperial family. The accession of the Claudii to the imperial throne through the adoption of Tiberius reawakened the possibility, if indeed it had ever gone to sleep, of gaining the highest position in Roman political life for any number of the old aristocratic families still in the Senate.

Thus the beginning of the first century CE should be characterized as one in which the political struggle took place not between plebeians and patricians or Italian *novi homines* and the

---

[3] In her application of social network theory to Republican Italy, Lomas (2012) concludes "the weak tie network is potentially a useful model for understanding personal interactions in Italy. It may also help to explain the paradox that a set of social networks which are apparently close do not always result in integration and cohesion, but can lead to the outbreak of a conflict like the Social War, while others which appear much looser seem to have had a significant role in linking Italian communities and individuals together" (p. 213). She relies particularly on a study by the sociologist Mark Granovetter (1974), and argues for the "important role of weak ties in creating effective social networks…Weak ties, however, have the capacity to create effective links both within and between networks. They act as bridges, providing shorter routes between points on a network and therefore quicker and more effective transmission of goods, information, or influence" (p. 211).

old aristocracy, but rather between the old aristocracy of Rome and men from recently enfranchised municipalities and others from provincial origins. In this changing elite context within Rome, it makes sense to try to understand these new members of the Senate as inhabitants of multiple cultural identities, trying to negotiate participation in an ancient institution alongside senators whose families had been senators for centuries. Also, in the midst of this shift in elite membership of the Senate, memory played a paramount role, particularly in the quest for legitimacy and the formation of a Roman identity. Many of these newly empowered senators sought paradigms from the Roman past upon which they could build their identity, while the surviving members of Roman aristocratic families sought to maintain their family's position and prestige through the traditional Republican means: competition for the highest office and the remembrance of their most distinguished members. These three groups of senators all appealed to memory in an attempt to negotiate the political system founded by Augustus and continuing, albeit with many difficulties of succession, under the Claudians.

Senators and imperial advisors, who found admission to the Senate and influence with the Princeps despite their unsavory origins from the province of Spain and the area of northeast Italy, are the focus my inquiry. Lumped together and often labeled the Stoic opposition to Nero, Seneca, Lucan, and Thrasea Paetus were examples of a relatively new wave of entry into the political circles in Rome during the reigns of Claudius and Nero. These individuals have primarily been examined by modern historians through the narrow lens of their philosophical views, which has concentrated attention on ideas of *libertas* and the memory of the Republic.[4]

[4] *Libertas* is a complicated term. In his authoritative monograph, Wirszubski (1950) acknowledges "it is by no means clear what was the nature of the conflict [between the Principate and *libertas*]…*Libertas* means either personal and civic rights, or republicanism, or both, and while under each of these fall several cognate but distinct notions, it is not always easy to ascertain exactly what *libertas* means in each particular instance," 125. For more recent treatments, see Kapust (2011) and Arena (2012). For Arena's conception of political liberty see 46-8: "The ability to avoid this fall [into slavery], and to preserve the

This focus provides only a limited understanding of the socio-political currents swirling around the Senate and Princeps during the tumultuous tenures of the last of the Claudian emperors. This chapter seeks to expand our understanding of these men in terms of their positions in the Senate and at the Emperor's side, their origins, and the ways in which memory helped to shape their identities alongside Italians from municipalities long tied to Rome and members of the traditional aristocracy.

In this chapter, I argue that Seneca, Lucan, and Thrasea Paetus employed the memory of Cato Uticensis as their paradigmatic predecessor in order to adapt themselves better into the complex social and political fabric of the Senate and imperial court. Understanding the origins of these politicians will demonstrate the pressures they faced in Rome as outsiders, and offer new interpretations of their use of and preoccupation with Cato Uticensis above and beyond their Stoic philosophical stances. The works of Seneca and Lucan have long been troublesome to modern historians because they do not completely adhere to Stoic philosophy and elude tidy interpretation. Thinking about Cato as a creation of these writers, rather than a continuation of tradition, grants these men an agency that has long been denied them and contributes an explanation for some of the more difficult problems historians have had with these men, most notably the difference between Seneca's philosophical position and his political actions and Lucan's strange epic poem.

Lucan and Seneca's supposed involvement in the Pisonian Conspiracy, which also embroiled members of the old aristocracy and Italian elites, brought these provincials in concert with those who might not have worked with them otherwise. The conspiracy ultimately demonstrated the strength of the nobility despite the changed membership of the Roman political

status of political *libertas*, was dependent on two very important conditions: (a) the civic status of the individual Roman citizen, and (b) the constitutional arrangements of the commonwealth in which he lived and where varying levels of liberty corresponded to different sections of society" (47).

class. Our main evidence for the Julio-Claudian period comes from Tacitus' account, which may reflect more about his own contemporary political situation than the intricacies of political life at the time. In the end, this chapter will offer alternative interpretations of these politicians by placing them in the historical context of a changing political elite in Rome and examining the role of memory in the creation of a new Roman identity.

The Stoic Opposition to Nero: Seneca, Lucan, and Thrasea Paetus

Scholarly attention toward the so-called Stoic opposition has determined its primary members as Lucius Annaeus Seneca, known as Seneca the Younger, his nephew and famous poet Marcus Annaeus Lucan, and the Patavian consul Publius Clodius Thrasea Paetus. Little is known about Seneca's early life. His equestrian father was born in Spain, although of Italian descent, and his mother, Helvia, was probably Spanish.[5] The basic outline of Seneca's life is as follows: he was born in Cordoba, Spain, moved to Rome when he was still a child, and was elected *quaestor* and joined the Senate sometime between 33 and 39 CE.[6] He was exiled by Claudius in 41 for reasons that remain uncertain, but was recalled in 49 to serve as tutor and close advisor to the twelve year old Lucius Domitius Ahenobarbus, son of the former emperor Caligula's sister, Agrippina, and Gnaeus Domitius Ahenobarbus, a prominent senator from an old aristocratic family and former consul who had died in 40. One year after Seneca became his tutor, Lucius was adopted by the emperor Claudius after his marriage to Agrippina and took the name Nero Claudius Caesar Augustus Germanicus. In 54, Nero obtained the imperial throne.

---

[5] Griffin (1976), 32: Much of Griffin's analysis of Seneca is based on evidence in his own works- the broad strokes of Seneca's life as outlined by Griffin are reliable enough for my purposes here.
[6] On Seneca's senatorial career, see Sen. *Helv*. 19.2 and Cass. Dio 59.19; on the date of his moving to Rome, see Griffin (1976), 35-37 for a discussion of the ancient evidence.

Nero and Seneca remained close for much of his reign, with Seneca acting as his advisor and gaining the position of suffect consul in 56.[7]

Seneca's nephew, Lucan, was also born in Cordoba, Spain and came to Rome at a very young age.[8] He was educated in Rome and went to Athens to continue his training until he was recalled by Nero to take up the position of quaestor for 60 CE.[9] This was a particular honor because Lucan was probably younger than the minimum age of 25 for the office. He was also given an augurate before his and his uncle's relationships with Nero soured. In addition to his conflict with the emperor, he was most famous for his poetry. Of his many works, only the *Bellum Civile* survives and it will be the subject of examination below. Both Seneca and Lucan were implicated in the Pisonian Conspiracy of 65 CE, although many think Seneca was innocent of any participation, and they committed suicide separately in April of that year.[10]

In the same year when Seneca served as suffect consul (56 CE), Publius Clodius Thrasea Paetus also attained the suffect consulship albeit only from November 5th to December 18th.[11] Thrasea was from Patavium, modern day Padua in northeastern Italy, a town that had enjoyed long ties to Rome. By 42, he had married Caecina Arria, the daughter of Caecinus Paetus, suffect consul of 37, and his wife Arria. His in-laws famously committed suicide after being implicated in a revolt led by the imperial legate of Dalmatia, Lucius Arruntius Camillus Scribonianus in 41 CE. Unusually, Thrasea took the surname of his in-laws after their deaths, an action that may have impeded his career until the accession of Nero but remains only conjectural,

---

[7] *Fasti Consulares* in Smallwood (1967), 4.
[8] The main sources for Lucan's life include Suetonius' short biography, a biography of Lucan by the 6th century grammarian Vacca, a poem by Statius dedicated to Lucan's widow (*Sil*. 2.7), and brief mentions by Tacitus and Dio.
[9] Most scholars agree that Lucan's quaestorship was in in 60 (for support, see Rostagni (1944), Griffin (1976), and Fantham (2011); however, Rose (1966) offers 63 as the date).
[10] Tac. *Ann*. 15.53 and 60.4; Griffin (1976), 367.
[11] *CIL*, iv, 3340, xxii, xxiv-xxvii; *Fasti Consulares* in Smallwood (1967), 4.

since we have no information about his early career.[12] In a separate incident a year after the

Pisonian Conspiracy, he too would fall afoul of Nero, and committed suicide in 66 after a trial in

the Senate and conviction for barbative behavior.[13]

In addition to their modes of death, other common threads that run through the lives of

these men include their opposition to Nero, Stoicism, and their emulation of Cato Uticensis.

Seneca and Paetus were committed Stoics, and Lucan, whether or not a Stoic himself, was well

versed in Stoic philosophy as a result of his familial connection to Seneca.[14] Seneca's

philosophical treatises and letters were littered with references to Cato Uticensis. Cato was the

main character in Lucan's account of the civil war between Pompey and Caesar, and Thrasea

Paetus wrote a biography of Cato, as is known to us from Plutarch, who based his own biography

of Cato upon it. Focus on Stoicism and Cato has dominated interpretations of this historical

period and the lives of these men to the detriment of other considerations. The emulation of Cato

Uticensis by these senators shaped modern opinion about a Stoic opposition.[15] The consensus,

based almost entirely on the study of the works of Seneca and Lucan, is that Cato's Stoicism and

stand against tyranny made him a perfect paradigm for these senators in the face of a thoroughly

despotic Nero.[16] Despite good counterarguments by Brunt and Griffin, this interpretation has

---

[12] For scholars who characterize Thrasea as an uncompromising idealist, see Baldwin (1974), 70–81; Furneaux (1907), 293–94; Ginsburg (1986), 539; Murray (1965), 59 n. 105; Oakley (2009) 190–91; Ogilvie and Richmond (1967), 296–97; Rutledge (1993), 118; Sailor (2008), 10–35; and Shotter (1991), 3270–71, 3315, 3325. For Thrasea as the defender of libertas, see Benario (1975), 115–16; Heldmann 1991), 211–30; Percival (1980), 124–25; Martin (1981) 176–77, 186–87; Rudich (1993), 52–54; Syme (1958) 558–62; and Wirszubski (1950) 138–43.

[13] Tac. *Ann*. 16.27-9 and 16.33: Tacitus tells us that, in a letter read to the Senate, Nero accused unnamed senior senators of shirking their public duties, but any more specific understanding of the charges eludes us.

[14] Inwood (2003), 57; Fantham (2011), 6.

[15] A selection of scholars in favor of a Stoic opposition include: MacMullen (1966); Syme (1986); and Turpin (2008).

[16] Seo (2013); Tipping (2013); Fantham (2013). The majority of the scholars who speak of a Stoic opposition are focusing on the literary or philosophical works of these men.

enjoyed remarkable staying power over the last forty years, most especially in various literary analyses of early Imperial authors.[17]

More problematic for this claim is the evidence that it was not solely Stoics who suffered at the hands of Nero. For every Stoic that was exiled or forced to commit suicide, there were others sentenced to the same punishments who had no known affiliation with Stoicism.[18] The easiest explanation for the prevalence of Cato in the works of Seneca and Lucan and their emulation of his example is their Stoic connection.[19] Typically, however, it rests on the idea that Cato was, by this time, already regarded as a Stoic martyr and saint.[20] However, this conception of Cato was not actually the result of a long-standing tradition dating back to his death, but, as we will see below, rather the outcome of his treatment at the hands of Seneca and Lucan themselves. The narrative of Cato as a Stoic saint is not borne out by the sources and narrows unnecessarily the possible interpretations of these men's choice of Cato.[21]

---

[17] Those who question a Stoic opposition include: Griffin (1989), Brunt (1975), and Whitton (2012), 353 ff.. As the historian Marc Bloch (1964), 195, wrote, "When it is a question of ascertaining whether or not some human act has really taken place, they [historians] cannot be too painstaking. If they proceed to the reasons for that act, they are content with the merest appearance, ordinarily founded upon one of those maxims of common-place psychology which are neither more nor less true than their opposites."

[18] Most of the senatorial and equestrian agents of the Pisonian Conspiracy, including Gaius Calpurnius Piso himself, had no known connection to Stoicism.

[19] Tac. *Ann*. 14.57: In the speech of Tigellinus to Nero, links imitation of "old Romans" with the Stoics.

[20] See most recently Seo (2013) "…By the time of Lucan's composition, Cato Uticensis had achieved a martyr-saint status in Roman culture as a Republican hero and Stoic sage" (199-200). Also Clarke (1981): "The suicide of Cato, unbending to the last in his opposition to despotism and supported by his philosophy, made a strong impression on the ancient world and caused him to be canonized as a kind of saint of Stoicism" (27). Ormsby (diss. 1997) examines Cato's treatment in Lucan but concludes, "Lucan's characterization of Cato is in accord with the ideal of Catonism which persisted through the Roman empire. After his suicide and the transition of the Roman state to monarchic control, Cato's name became synonymous with republicanism and *libertas*" (125). Fehrle (1983), whose biography of Cato Uticensis remains the most comprehensive to date, presented a mixed perspective on this issue. He offered a partial challenge to this stance when he concluded that Cato's characterization by modern historians as a "*Don Quichotte der Aristokratie*" was fundamentally flawed, but did not fully address the changing attitudes in later sources as a result of his focus on Cato's life (i.e., his treatment of Cato on page ix versus pages 276-8).

[21] Goar (1987), 9: "Although he was a failure as politician and statesman, after his death Cato became a pattern of moral perfection for Roman stoics. He also became a symbol of heroic Republicanism and

Why else could these men have chosen Cato? Arguably, in their attempts to find their

social and political place in the political system of Rome, Seneca, Lucan, and Thrasea Paetus

may have sought out Cato Uticensis as an exemplum for a variety of reasons that go beyond his

Stoic philosophy. As senators born outside Rome working alongside members of old aristocratic

families, it seems likely that these men turned to Cato not only as a fellow Stoic but also as an

unimpeachably Roman figure that could lend them legitimacy. During the reigns of the

Claudians, incorporation of municipal and provincial elites into the Imperial Senate and court

continued and these newcomers were treated as outsiders. In an attempt to explore this

alternative explanation, we will first turn to an investigation of the social and historical context

of the Roman Senate and imperial court and to the birthplaces of Seneca, Lucan, and Thrasea

Paetus. Understanding the situation in which these senators found themselves will contribute a

great deal to our interpretation of their literature and actions under Nero.

Senators from the Edges: Northern Italy and Spain

In his posthumously published analysis of provincials at Rome, Syme started from the

position that "Whatever his origin, a senator quietly took on the colour and traditions of his new

environment: Rome and the changing posts and provinces of his administrative career would

engross his time and perhaps his interests; a generation or two of service would loosen the links

that bound a family to the town or province of its origin; and for provincials, convenience might

---

resistance to tyranny for Roman men and women who were compelled to live under the constraints
imposed by the Imperial system of government. This was especially true in the Julio-Claudian and
Flavian eras, but even in the happier times of the second century A.D., Plutarch wrote a biography of
Cato." Goar primarily collects the evidence, without offering much interpretation of it (the entire
monograph, which discusses authors ranging chronologically from Cicero to Dante, is 114 pages in
length).

counsel, if law had not enjoined, the possession of an estate in Italy."[22] This was largely true;

however, there is considerable evidence that the first generation (at least) of senators from areas

outside the traditional pools of Roman senators maintained significant ties to their homes and

families. And, more importantly for our purposes here, admission to the Senate did not

necessarily mean their acceptance into the social and cultural circles of the Senate and imperial

court in Rome, no matter how hard new members might try.

The institution of the Senate had undergone significant changes from the end of the

Republic through Augustus' reign, as we have seen. With the accession of Tiberius, the Senate

enjoyed a restoration of power with the abolition of the *consilium* and the right to elect all

magistrates, excepting the consulship.[23] The consular *fasti* of Tiberius, Gaius, Claudius, and

Nero were replete with the names of Italian elites who were the first in their families to reach this

high status.[24] These men served, often as suffect consuls and in the Senate more generally, side

by side with members from aristocratic families who had consular ancestors stretching back

hundreds of years.[25] The prejudice against perceived outsiders was as old as the Republic itself,

in part because of the strength of the aristocratic system and its slow acceptance of new

members, as we saw in Chapters Three and Four.[26] Regardless of the prominence of the

individual, place of birth and lineage still mattered in the political circles of Rome well into the

---

[22] Syme (1999), 4.

[23] Tac. *Ann*. 1.6. Talbert (1984a), 61- 62; Talbert (1984 b), 14.

[24] A small sample of these included Titus Statilius Taurus (cos. 11), Gnaeus Acerronius Proculus (cos. 37), and Gnaeus Domitius Corbulo (cos. 39).

[25] Such men included Lucius Domitius Ahenobarbus (cos. 16), Gaius Sulpicius Galba (cos. 22), Faustus Cornelius Sulla Lucullus (cos. 31), Marcus Junius Silanus (cos. 46), Faustus Cornelius Sulla Felix (cos. 52), Lucius Calpurnius Piso (cos. 57), and Marcus Valerius Messalla Corvinus (cos. 58).

[26] Farney (2007), 8-9: "…Bluer-blooded aristocrats lorded their "aboriginal" status over *municipes*. They taunted the municipal men by calling them foreigners, they cast doubt on their citizen status and free birth, and often they considered matrimonial ties with them a thing to be despised."

first century CE. The old aristocracy, seeking to differentiate themselves from their new colleagues, and their continued customs ensured it.

There is much evidence that demonstrates prejudice in the Senate. In 48 CE, the emperor held the office of censor and advocated entry into the Senate for tribal chieftains from *Gallia Comata*. His speech is preserved for us in fragmentary form on the bronze Tablet of Lyon and raises questions about Roman citizenship and eligibility for membership to the Roman Senate in the early Principate. As Syme correctly pointed out, however, rather than providing reliable information about these matters the oration was actually designed to persuade an unwilling Senate to accept new members from outside the traditional bounds of geography and society regardless of the question of citizenship.[27] That membership in the Roman Senate was still only for certain members of elite society is born out by the content of Claudius' oration.

The most important aspect of the speech for my purposes is at the beginning of the second column, where Claudius made a famous claim about the policies of his predecessors. He argued: "Certainly, it was a new custom when both the divine Augustus, my great-uncle, and my uncle, Tiberius Caesar, wished that the flower of the colonies and the municipalities everywhere, to be sure [only] the good and wealthy men, be in this *curia*. What then? Is not an Italian senator preferable to a provincial? … But indeed I do not think that provincials should be rejected, if they could honor the *curia* in any way."[28] The vitally important aspect of this speech is that it revealed prejudices that existed in the Senate after the admission of municipal elites by Augustus and Tiberius: provincial was obviously less desirable than Italian, unless an individual was exceptional. And, if the epigraphic evidence is any indication, Claudius' adlection did not

---

[27] Syme (1999), 10.

[28] *CIL* xiii 1668 = *ILS* 212: . . .*[po]test. sane novo more et divus Aug[ustus av]onc[ulus m]eus et patruus Ti. Caesar omnem florem ubique coloniarum et municipiorum, bonorum scilicet virorum et locupletium, in hac curia esse voluit. Quid ergo? Non Italicus senator provinciali potior est? … Sed ne provinciales quidem, si modo ornare curiam poterint, reiciendos puto.*

lead to the subsequent admission of large numbers of Gauls with origins beyond Narbonensis

until the 3rd century CE, probably reflecting prejudices at work in Rome.[29] The distinction was

between an Italian and a Gallic provincial, but the region of Italy had only recently been defined

under Augustus.

In many ways, the region of northern Italy had historically been lumped together with

Gaul, and for good reason. Despite Roman alliances in the area predating the second century,

northern Italy had long been home to a variety of Gallic tribes, who had repeatedly caused

trouble for the Romans beginning with the Gallic sack of 390 BCE.[30] The region saw a series of

battles between a variety of Gallic tribes and Roman forces between 240 BCE, the most

threatening of which, the Boii, suffered a defeat at Telemon in 225 BCE.[31] The establishment of

a number of citizen colonies followed in the subsequent century, along with road building

projects and increased commercial ties with Rome.[32] As in most colonies, the inhabitants

probably mixed with local populations. Despite this link, the area did not formally become a

province until 89 BCE. Indeed, the very name of the province of northern Italy demonstrated the

link between the region and the Gauls: *Gallia Cisalpina* (Gaul on this side of the Alps) had its

first Roman governor in the form of Marcus Fonteius in 74 BCE.[33] In the Roman mind, *Gallia*

Cisalpina was further divided into *Gallia Transpadana* (Gaul across the river Po) and *Gallia*

Cispadana (Gaul on the Italian side of the Po). In 89 BCE, Gnaeus Pompeius Strabo, father of

---

[29] Burnand (1982), 435-6; Talbert (1984 b), 16; The practice of adlection, however, would only become regular from Domitian's reign onward and never resulted in the princeps crowding the house with his own selections, see Talbert (1984 b), 15.

[30] Polyb. *Hist*. 2.14.2-23.

[31] Polyb. *Hist*. 2.27-31.

[32] Aquileia was founded in 181/0, the *Via Aemilia* "*Altinate*" was constructed to connect Aquileia with Bononia (modern Bologna) in 175 BCE (although some think it was constructed in Lepidus' first consulship in 187, but this seems unlikely). About 30 years later the *Via Postumia* was constructed (circa 148 BCE) and connected Genua on the Tyrrhenian Sea with Aquileia on the Adriatic.

[33] Sallust, *Hist*. fr. 98M.

Pompey the Great, granted Latin rights to the existing inhabitants, which allowed local elites

who held office to obtain Roman citizenship.[34] Despite agitating for full citizenship in the 60s,

the inhabitants were refused by the censors Marcus Licinius Crassus and Quintus Lutatius

Catulus in 65-64 BCE. The two censors were aristocrats from important *gentes* with many

consular ancestors and their actions suggest an underlying uneasiness, perhaps shared by many

Roman elites, at the prospect of admitting these men to the citizenship.[35] Full citizenship was

finally granted to the entire region and municipalization of the cities and towns commenced,

which began well after that of the rest of Italy, in 49 BCE.[36] In 41 BCE under Octavian, Gallia

Cispadana was divided into *regiones*, finally bringing the former province into Italy proper.[37]

This interaction and connection did little to combat centuries of prejudice against

northern Italians, regardless of the fact that many cities in the region had always been allied with

Rome. The numerous conflicts between Romans and the people of this region played a large

role in Roman history and memory. From the perspective of senators from old aristocratic

families, these men were considered barbarians despite Rome's long colonial presence in the

region. Recall the allegation that the *novus homo*, Cicero, made against Lucius Calpurnius Piso

Caesoninus' maternal grandfather, namely that his ancestor was a Gaul and therefore he was of

---

[34] Asc. *Pis*. 3 (89 BCE in Pompeius Strabo's consulship): *neque illud dici potest, sic eam coloniam esse deductam quemadmodum post plures aetates Cn. Pompeius Strabo, pater Cn. Pompei Magni, Transpadanas colonias deduxerit. Pompeius enim non novis colonis eas constituit sed veteribus incolis manentibus ius dedit Latii, ut possent habere ius quod ceterae Latinae coloniae, id est ut petendi magistratus civitatem Romanam adipiscerentur*.

[35] Cass. Dio, 37.9.3-4: ταῦτά τε ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ ἔτει συνέβη, καὶ οἱ τιμηταὶ περὶ τῶν ὑπὲρ τὸν Ἠριδανὸν οἰκούντων διενεχθέντες (τῷ μὲν γὰρ ἐς τὴν πολιτείαν αὐτοὺς ἐσάγειν ἐδόκει, τῷ δὲ οὔ) οὐδὲν οὐδὲ τῶν ἄλλων ἔπραξαν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν ἀρχὴν ἀπεῖπον. καὶ διὰ τοῦτο καὶ οἱ διάδοχοι αὐτῶν ἐν τῷ ὑστέρῳ ἔτει <οὐδὲν> ἐποίησαν, ἐμποδισάντων σφᾶς τῶν δημάρχων πρὸς τὸν τῆς βουλῆς κατάλογον δέει τοῦ μὴ τῆς γερουσίας αὐτοὺς ἐκπεσεῖν.

[36] App. *B Civ*. 5.12; Polverini (2010), 119, remarks that urbanization of northern Italy after Pompeius Strabo's grant of Latin rights increased significantly. This makes sense, but it is not until the reorganization of the cities and towns into *municipia* and the grant of full citizenship that inhabitants are completely brought into the Roman system.

[37] Crawford, (1974), no. 28 and Bispham (2006), 14; Thomsen (1947), 126-138.

humble origins rather than aristocratic.[38] Clearly a gradation in status was present in the late

Republic that Italians were superior to northern Italians, and this judgment was unlikely to

dissipate simply because those in the region achieved citizenship and were officially made a part

of Italy as *regiones* IX, X, and XI. Even after this, however, Augustus waged a number of

campaigns in the north across the mountainous region between the Adriatic and the Tyrrhenian

seas, culminating in the defeat of forty-five tribes listed on a commemorative monument and

described by Pliny the Elder.[39] This monument, the *Tropaeum Alpium*, was erected in the

Augustan colony of *Augusta Praetoria Salassorum* (modern Aosta) in 25 BCE and was within

the boundary of *regio* XI.[40] This imperial action, while largely undertaken against Gallic tribes

in the foothills of the Alps, combined with general geographical ignorance of northern Italy,

probably lessened distinctions between all inhabitants of the region in aristocratic eyes.[41] In

addition to the *Tropaeum Alpium*, Roman superiority over the Gallic barbarians continued to be

celebrated on monuments constructed in Gallic areas throughout the Imperial period.[42] Fear of

---

[38] Cic. *Pis*. Frag. ix and xi, 53, 62; and *Red*. *sen*. 15.

[39] Plin. *HN* 3.24 details the *Tropeum Alpum* (or Augusti); see also Strabo 4.6.7.

[40] Most of the scholarship on northern Italy, its incorporation into Italy, and Augustus' campaigns is in French, Italian, or German, and typically dates to the middle of the 20th century. Christ's *Zur römischen Okkupation der Zentralalpen und des nördlichen Alpenvorlandes* (1957) provides a good overview of late Republican and early imperial operations in the foothills of the Alps. Degrassi (1954) examined the shifting frontier of northeastern Italy during the early Principate arguing that the area was Romanized and ethnically homogenous, despite the fact that these kind of border shifts typically result from barbarian incursions. This, in addition to the more complex understanding of Romanization that has emerged over the last two decades, suggests that we should perhaps rethink this characterization of the area. Eck (forthcoming) takes a broader view of the entire area and concludes that it was not until 193 CE that the Roman Senate was truly cosmopolitan in that it contained members from all the provinces.   On the *Tropaeum Alpium*, see Canter (1934) and Formigé (1949). Most recently, Lehmann (2004) sees the monument as a continuation of Republican commemorative practices.

[41] For example, geographers of the 1st century CE, including Pomponius Mela (ii 62), provide the barest of details while Strabo focused only on Verona, Brixia, and Mantua (213). Pliny the Elder's description of the *regiones* of Italy, their boundaries, and town lists are notoriously difficult to map. On the description in Pliny book III, the most comprehensive treatment remains Thomsen (1947), 55-144.

[42] On the image of Gauls in the Rome empire, see Williams (2001), 68-99; Isaac (2004) 411-426; and Ferris (2011), 190: "Despite the fact that Gallia Narbonensis was a pacified area and a Roman province when this group of monuments was constructed, the former barbarian status of the area was nevertheless

the Gauls (*metus Gallicus*) pervaded the commentaries of Caesar, the Republican histories of

Dionysius of Halicarnassus and Livy (himself a Patavian), and played an important part in the

later works of Plutarch, Appian, and Cassius Dio.[43] Just before Tacitus' account of Claudius'

speech, the senators were bitterly complaining about the fact that northern Italians had been

admitted into the Senate: they remembered their Roman character which was preserved by their

ancient customs that valued virtue and glory, and regretted that Veneti and Insubres had burst

into the curia.[44] These Veneti and Insubres were those residents of northern Italy, who were

already in the Senate. Tacitus' Claudius attempted to make the link between Italy, northern Italy,

and Gaul in order to assuage their concerns:

> For I am not unaware that the Julii were summoned into the Senate from Alba, the
> Coruncani from Camerium, the Porcii from Tusculum, and let us not scrutinize
> the ancient past futher, others from Etruria, Lucania, and all Italy, and finally Italy
> herself was extended to the Alps so that not only individual men, but entire lands
> and peoples should unite under the name of Romans. At that time of stable quiet
> at home and victory abroad, we flourished when the Transpadani were admitted to
> citizenship, when at the sight of our legions being led through the known world
> the addition of the strongest provincials came to the rescue of our tired empire.[45]

emphasized on the monuments as a means of celebrating its transformation into a civilized state by the
power of Rome." On the depiction of barbarians more generally, see Ferris (2000) and (2009), and
Bradley (2004).

[43] Syme (1983), 118; Briquel (2008). Briquel's monograph *La Prise de Rome par les Gaulois* examines
not only the episode of the Gallic sack but also its legacy in later writers, finding in its cultural importance
and transmission a stereotypical myth common to many Indo-European groups. Interestingly, Livy
promotes Patavium repeatedly throughout his narrative, perhaps as a means of combating negative
stereotypes in addition to expressing his own pride in his hometown.

[44] Tac. *Ann*. 11.23.2-3: *quin adhuc memorari exempla quae priscis moribus ad virtutem et gloriam
Romana indoles prodiderit. an parum quod Veneti et Insubres curiam inruperint, nisi coetus alieni
genarum velut captivitas inferatur? quem ultra honorem residuis nobilium, aut si quis pauper e Latio
senator foret?*

[45] Tac. *Ann*. 11.24. 2-3: *neque enim ignoro Iulios Alba, Coruncanios Camerio, Porcios Tusculo, et ne
vetera scrutemur, Etruria Lucaniaque et omni Italia in senatum accitos, postremo ipsam ad Alpis
promotam ut non modo singuli viritim, sed terrae, gentes in nomen nostrum coalescerent. tunc solida
domi quies; et adversus externa floruimus, cum Transpadani in civitatem recepti, cum specie deductarum
per orbem terrae legionum additis provincialium validissimis fesso imperio subventum est.*

Although Claudius' plea worked and the Senate voted to extend the citizenship, that objections were registered to begin with and that the Veneti and Insubres, northern Italian tribes with whom Roman had long had contact, were lumped in with the Gauls was telling.

Perhaps as a result of this prejudice, senators from north of the Po did not gain real traction in admission to the senate until the reign of Nero, when they appeared in greater numbers than before. In his exhaustive survey, Alföldy compiled epigraphic evidence from roughly the start of the 1st century BCE to the end of the 2nd century CE pertaining to northern Italians who were senators by city, region, and time period (when possible).[46] From the sources we learned that the earliest senator was Gnaeus Octavius Ruso, a *quaestor* of Gaius Marius in 106 BCE.[47] He was followed by a Quintus Titius Mutto around 100 BCE.[48] These early northern Italian senators hailed from the Roman colony of Aquileia, so their inclusion in the Senate is not terribly surprising. Thirteen more senators took advantage of Caesar's generosity and the chaos of civil wars to enter the Senate during the 40s and 30s.[49] Certainly there were earlier north Italian senators whose careers have been lost to us, but even still the numbers are relatively low for the early Principate. Even more senators from Alföldy's survey reached the Senate under the Flavians.[50]

---

[46] Alföldy (1999), 259-341: This was an update of his earlier publication (Alföldy (1982), 309–68). In both he surveyed evidence for elites, including elite north Italian women. Many of the entries list date of birth or the date when the individual held office, if a date can be ascribed. Operating under the assumption that minimum age requirements were generally followed for the office of *quaestor* (30 years of age), which was the first office that gave membership to the Senate, I found that of the 305 senators he lists roughly130 entered the Senate from 100 BCE to the beginning of the Flavian regime.

[47] On Ruso, see Alföldy (1999), 261.

[48] Alföldy (1999), 261.

[49] These senators primarily came from Verona (a Roman colony from 89 BCE onward), Brixia (also under Roman control from 89 BCE), and Aquileia. Verona and Brixia were granted Roman citizenship in 41 BCE.

[50] Alföldy (1999), 259-341.

Figure 1: Attested senators (individuals) from the regions of Italy from the 1st century BCE to the end of the 2nd century CE.[51]

Time Period (across)[52] / *Regio* (down)	Republ.	Trium.	Aug.	Claud.	Flav.	Ant.
I (Latium, Campania, Capua, & Cales)	157	28	50	39	19	61
II (Apulia & Calabria)	8	3	3	7	5	13
III (Lucania & Bruttii)	4	7	5	3	1	2
IV (Samnium)	4	9	12	11	10	2
V (Picenum)	17	8	5	5	4	2
VI (Umbria)	7	10	12	12	6	17
VII (Etruria)[53]	28	8	13	10	5	8
VIII (Aemilia)	2	3	1	3	3	6
IX (Venetia & Histria)	--	--	--	2	4	19
X (Transpadana)	4	13	11	23	24	56
XI (Liguria)	--	--	1	7	17	22

[51] For regions I-VII, this chart is based on the appearance of senators in the epigraphic record, compiled in *Atti del Colloquio internazionale AIEGL su epigrafia e ordine senatorio, Roma, 14-20 maggio 1981*. Roma: Edizioni di storia e letteratura (1982). For regions IX-XI, this chart is based on the epigraphic information provided by Alföldy (1999). This chart shows some interesting trends that make sense when taken in conjunction with the literary and historical evidence presented in this chapter. Those regions with the longest and closest ties to Rome have the most senators in the Senate during the Republican period. The northern Italian senators (from *regiones* IX, X, and XI) were in the minority of the Senate during the Julio-Claudian period and likely felt significant pressure to assimilate or legitimize their positions there.

[52] In this chart, the Republican period refers to the period from 100 BCE to 60 BCE. The Triumviral Period refers to 60 BCE to 31 BCE, in part because the alliance of Pompey, Caesar and Crassus allowed their partisans entrance to the Senate in greater numbers than before. The Augustan column covers the time after Augustus' victory at Actium to his death in 14 CE. The Claudian period begins with Tiberius' accession in 14 CE and continues until Nero's death in 68. The Flavian period spans 69 to 96 CE. The Antonine period spans 96 to Commodus' death in 196 CE. The senator were categorized according to whatever dates were provided by the inscriptions and may not necessarily reflect when the senators entered the Senate. Senators without a date were excluded.

[53] There were at least 23 senators from Etruria who had entered the Senate prior to the Social War; see Torelli (1995), 44-45.

Thus, there was a gradual increase in the numbers of senators from northern Italy as the Imperial period progressed. When Thrasea Paetus entered the Senate, probably under Tiberius, he would have been one of very few northern Italians in the 600-person body. Even this access, however, did not necessarily equate to social acceptance and the majority of northern Italians entered the Senate during the reigns of the Antonines in the 2nd century CE.[54]

These senators likely stood out from their aristocratic colleagues in other ways as well. First generation senators from the periphery of northern Italy often maintained close ties to their hometown. Additionally, they regularly maintained their indigenous names, inserting them into the typical Roman formulation of the *tria nomina*.[55] But there is also evidence to suggest that the city maintained its own traditions, some of its own customs and linguistic preferences, and celebrated its own local history.[56] For example, Thrasea Paetus famously attended a festival and performed in the accompanying games (the *ludi cetasti*) in Patavium that were a celebration of local heritage.[57] This brief history of the region sets the scene for the emergence of Thrasea Paetus and his role in the Senate.

Thrasea Paetus' birthplace, the *municipium* Patavium, had enjoyed long ties with Rome, but was never conquered by Rome. Indeed, the city across the Po had only become an official

---

[54] Eck (forthcoming) determines that even in the Flavian period, authors still treated northern Italy as a place apart from Italy.

[55] Alföldy 1982, 312: Mutto, Ruso, Tappo, Tuticanus, and Viscus. See Haeussler (2008), 199 and following, for discussion of the flexibility of these elites in accepting, modifying, or rejecting Roman cultural conventions in their hometowns.

[56] Eleven inscriptions discuss local history, the first of which dates to the reign of Claudius and they preserve similar spelling preferences as the Patavian historian Livy. For a discussion of the evidence, see Harris (1977). There is also mention of Patavium's famous morals (Plin. *Ep*. 1.14.6 and Mart. 11) and evidence (not uncontroversial) of cities in northern Italy maintaining their own dating systems well into the period of Roman control.

[57] A dedicatory inscription (CIL V 2787) from 86 CE mentions the *ludi*; Tac. *Ann*. 16.21 and Cass. Dio 62.26.3-4 discuss Paetus' earlier participation in the *ludi* in 56 CE.

part of Italy during the triumviral period.[58] At about the same time comes evidence of prominent

Patavinians in Roman politics. The first, Publius Sepullius Macer, served as *triumvir monetales*

in 44 BCE.[59] Strabo tells us that the Augustan census registered five hundred equestrians at

Patavium, while the first attested senator, Sextus Papinius Allenius, followed much later.[60] His

admission to the Senate came sometime before 14 CE and he served as *consul ordinus* in 36

CE.[61] Sextus' two homonymous sons and another Patavinian, Lucius Arruntius Stella, followed

him into the Senate but did not achieve the consulship.[62] Thrasea Paetus, the fifth man from

Patavium attested in the Senate, attained the suffect consulship in 56 CE. Thirteen senators

accompanied and followed Paetus from Patavium into the Senate from the middle of the first

century CE to the middle of the 2nd century CE, with eight entering under Nero and the Flavians

and five more rising to prominence under the Antonines.[63] In a Senate of over 600 members,

---

[58] Syme (1983), 118: "The crop of consuls from 36 to 101 (eight, or perhaps close on a dozen) is a proper response to the solid renown of an opulent and conservative city. Ancient allies of Rome against the Gauls, the Veneti never faltered in allegiance, and their inner stability was disturbed once only, when in 174 b.c. Patavium had to request a consul to intervene. Along with sound morality, social harmony prevailed in the sequel. It was manifested during the Civil Wars. Not only was Patavium held strong for the cause of the Republic. When in 41/40 Asinius Pollio, governing Cisalpina, imposed exactions and the rich went into hiding, no slave betrayed his master." See also W.V Harris (1977), Brunt (1961); and Liu (2007) who asks, "Would it be possible that the instant fame of Livy's works and the way he related the history of Patavium served as a catalyst in the inauguration of the local era?" (288).

[59] Alföldy (1999), 294.

[60] Strabo 5.1.7 and Alföldy (1999), 294. It is entirely possible and likely that there were earlier Patavian senators whose names and careers are not preserved for us. However, the link between the formal grant of citizenship, municipalization, and appearance in the Roman Senate seems somewhat comparable to that period after the Social War.

[61] Alföldy (1999), 294.

[62] Alföldy (1999), 294-5.

[63] Alföldy (1999), 294-299; Alföldy (1999) counts 21 senators from Patavium and Syme (1983) discussed eight of these men who achieved the consulship. Haeussler (2008) lists 20 senators from Patavium, 44 from Verona, and 39 from Brixia up to the end of the 2nd century CE (p. 235), but he did not use Alföldy (1999) and relied instead on the numbers from Alföldy (1982). At first glance these numbers seem impressive, but in reality the large chronological span of time produced relatively few senators in the context of the Roman Senate. More important for the argument here is the fact that their membership in the Julio-Claudian period was fairly restricted. Eck (forthcoming) arrives at similar conclusions that north Italians advanced to the Senate with greater frequency in the 2nd century CE, and offers a broader survey of north Italian senators noting that an otherwise unknown Mutto from Aquileia was a quaestor

even if we double or triple the number to account for the selectiveness of our evidence, there were relatively few Patavinians in the Senate at any given time and the evidence demonstrates that their admission to the Senate became more successful as time passed.[64]

The historical context of senators of Spanish origin, including Seneca and Lucan, was in some ways remarkably similar to that of the northern Italians. Literary sources reveal much interaction between Romans and native Iberians from the middle Republic onward. Beginning in the late 3rd century, Roman armies were regularly in *Hispania*, initially to displace the Carthaginians who had preceded them there after the conclusion of the 1st Punic war. In 197 BCE, Hispania was divided into the provinces of *Hispania Citerior* (Nearer Spain) and *Hispania Ulterior* (Further Spain) governed by praetors.[65] From military strongholds primarily in the southern part of the peninsula, Roman troops sought to repel Lusitanian raids from the north and west in 194 BCE, 190 BCE, and throughout the mid part of the century.[66]

Recent archaeological work has found evidence of Roman and Italian immigrants in the peninsula, but we are still heavily reliant on the narrative found in the ancient sources.[67] The earliest Roman settlement in the area came during the Second Punic war, when Scipio

---

under Marius in 106 BCE (p.132). Alföldy (1999) argued that Quintus Titus Mutto was in fact the first northern senator (p. 261).

[64] Haeussler (2008), 235, notes that "the number of senators in the Northwest [of Italy] appears relatively low. Yet it is significant that we find senators and equestrians in virtually every major city in our area of study." Again, his survey examines the first two centuries taken as a whole without examining the more restrictive tendencies of the Julio-Claudian period. Haeussler also focuses on the impact of Roman culture on the region of northwest Italy, rather than their position in Rome.

[65] Sumner (1977) makes the case that Hispania was not formally divided into the two provinces of *Citerior* and *Ulterior* until after the campaigns that spanned 154-133 BCE.

[66] Liv. 35.1 and 37.46.7: The Lusitanians inhabited the Atlantic coast of the Iberian peninsula in roughly modern day Portugal. On the raids, see Alarcão (1988).

[67] The question of urbanization in Hispania remains a contentious one. See Keay (1988), Fear (1996), Keay (2003), and Curchin (2004) for good overviews of Roman involvement in the region based on the available archaeological evidence. Lowe (2009), 54-85, analyzes the presence of Roman and Italian immigrants as reflected by archaeological evidence from Valentia (founded with a grid layout and baths in 138 BCE), Saguntum (with a capitolium), Cabezo de Alcalá (with its early 1st century bath complex), Roman road building projects in the late 2nd century BCE, the transition to viticulture during the 1st century BCE, and the appearance of villas at the end of the 1st century BCE.

established the town of Italica in 206 BCE.[68] Livy tells us about a Latin colony established at the

town of Carteia in 171 BCE in response to a petition made to the Senate made by 4000 sons of

Roman fathers and native mothers.[69] This was the only community granted Roman status at the

time. Marcus Claudius Marcellus helped create a settlement at Corduba in 152 BCE and

Decimus Iunius Brutus founded Valentia in 138 BCE.[70] Informal communities of Roman and

Italians (*conventus civium Romanorum*) lived alongside native populations who did not have

citizenship for long periods of time: Corduba and Hispalis are clear examples.[71] In 114 BCE,

Marius put down banditry in Hispania *Ulterior*, a "province…still uncivilized and savage in its

ways."[72]

The end of the 2nd century CE saw a series of military campaigns waged against the

Lusitanians, and we know that Marcus Licinius Crassus triumphed over part of Spain in 98 BCE,

probably *Ulterior*.[73] In 79/8, Sertorius waged civil war across the provinces, defeating the

governor of *Ulterior* near the River Baetis, and later his legate Hirtuleius was routed by Metellus

near Italica in 76 BCE.[74] Caesar took a strong interest in Gades while praetor in Hispania Ulterior

in 60 BCE and may have instituted a version of the Roman legal system there.[75] In 55, Pompey

gained control of the province through the *Lex Trebonia* and ruled through his proxies, the

---

[68] App. *Hisp*. 38: I use the term settlement here on purpose. Our understanding of the urbanization of Spain is controversial and uncertain at best. On the problems, see Fear (1996) 1-62.

[69] Liv. 43.3.1-4.

[70] Strabo 3.2.1 and Liv. *Epit*. 55, respectively.

[71] Fear (1996), 41, posits the existence of a *conventus civium Romanorum* at Gades, composed of both native Gaditani and Italian immigrants. On Hispalis, see Caes. *B Civ*. 2.20.5. On Corduba, see Caes. *B Civ*. 2.19.2 and Ps. Caes. *B Alex*. 57.5.

[72] Plut. *Mar*. 6.

[73] App. *Hisp*. 99; Eutropius 4.27; App. *Hisp*. 100; Julius Obsequens 99 and 101; and Asc. *Pis*. 58: *Diximus hanc orationem esse dictam Cn. Pompeio Magno II M. Crasso II coss. Pompeii pater bello Italico de Picentibus, M. Crassi pater P. Crassus ante bellum Italicum de Hispanis triumphavit.*

[74] Plut. *Sert*. 12; Liv. *Epit*. 90; Orosius 5.23.10.

[75] Cic. *Balb*. 43.

legates Lucius Afranius and Marcus Petreius.[76] The region saw another Roman civil war as the

conflict between Caesar and the remaining supporters of Pompey fought in *Ulterior*.[77] As one

scholar succinctly put it, "the province [Further Spain] was essentially an arena for triumph- and

ovation-hunting Roman governors and lieutenants in the period from 133 to c. 80 BC and again

in the triumviral era; and it was the setting of Roman civil conflict between c. 80 and 45 B.C."[78]

Caesar also began a policy of colonization and municipalization that would be continued

by his adopted son.[79] *Hispania Citerior* and *Ulterior* were finally brought fully under Roman

control during the reign of Augustus, who restructured the two provinces into three: Lusitania,

Tarraconensis, and Baetica.[80] These provinces also saw the imposition of the *conventus* system

(the imposition into juridical assize districts).[81] These districts had a capital city from which the

governor would administer justice, and Corduba was one of them for the province of Baetica.

Some time between 5 and 3 BCE, the inhabitants of Conobaria, a small town in southern Baetica

swore an oath of fealty to Augustus, his sons (Gaius and Lucius), and his grandson, Agrippa.[82]

This historical narrative runs counter to the typical conception of Spain as a thoroughly

Romanized province by the end of the Republican period that many scholars have accepted.[83]

---

[76] Broughton *MRR* 2: 261.

[77] Ps. Caesar *B Hisp*.

[78] Haley (2003), 15.

[79] Suet. *Iul*. 42.1; see also Keay (2003), and Lowe (2009), 87. Gades was probably given municipal status in 49 (see Brunt (1971), 602) or shortly thereafter (see Richardson (1996), 119, for Gades' acquisition of municipal status either in 49 or within the following six years). For an overview of the colonies founded by Caesar, see Haley (2003), 16-7.

[80] Cassius Dio (53.12.4-5) tells us that Augustus organized the region into three provinces in 27 BCE, but we know that all of *Hispania* was then under the control of one imperial legate, suggesting that Dio has the date wrong. See the epigraphic evidence presented by Alföldy (1969), 131–133. Alföldy (1969), 224, and Syme (1969), 126, argue for the division occurring between 16-13 BCE, arguing against Albertini (1923), 25–32, who follows Dio. I adhere to the scholarly consensus, the position of Alföldy and Syme.

[81] On the *conventus* in Spain, see Keay (1988), 61, and Haley (2003), 32-3.

[82] González 1988; *AE* 1984.508 (*tabula Siarensis*); Eck, Caballos, and Fernández 1996.

[83] For the view that the provinces of Spain were largely Romanized by the end of the Republic, see Wilson (1966), Gabba (1954), and Freijeiro (1989); Scholars who question this assumption include Fear (1996) and Haley (2003).

This view is largely based on Strabo's statement that the inhabitants of southern Spain, the Turdetani, "had turned their ways entirely toward those of the Romans, not even remembering their own language any more."[84] However, other evidence offers a different opinion of the inhabitants of the region: Cicero received complaints about bandits in the area, the author of the *Bellum Hispaniense* called the inhabitants barbarians, and archaeological evidence demonstrates the continued inhabitation of fortified hilltop towns with defensive towers, hardly indications that the province was Romanized.[85] Horace called the region "stubborn" and "wild," saying that some inhabitants were ignorant of bearing the Roman yoke.[86] Pliny the Elder's *Natural History* was full of misinformation, errors, and omissions about Baetican towns and in direct conflict with Agrippa and Augustus' map of the empire, perhaps reflecting contemporary elite indifference about the province.[87] Even later the poet Martial, a native of the Iberian peninsula, portrayed the region in various positive and negative lights.[88]

Recent scholarship has recognized that there was much contact between Romans and Iberians, along with considerable mingling and merging of populations, but this probably began in earnest under Caesar and Augustus.[89] The rural countryside of the Spanish provinces seems to have remained underdeveloped and outside of Roman influence until the Julio-Claudians, when

---

[84] Strabo 3.2.15: οἱ μέντοι Τουρδητανοὶ καὶ μάλιστα οἱ περὶ τὸν Βαῖτιν τελέως εἰς τὸν Ῥωμαίων μεταβέβληνται τρόπον οὐδὲ τῆς διαλέκτου τῆς σφετέρας ἔτι μεμνημένοι.

[85] On the inhabitants, see Cic. *Fam.* 10.31 and Ps. Caesar *B Hisp.* 8; on the fortified towns, see Ps. Caesar *B Hisp.* 8, Fear (1996), 33-4, and Keay (2003), 156-7. Keay (2003) provides the most recent overview of recent archaeological work in the peninsula, remarking on the lack of archaeological evidence for many of the Roman campaigns that appear in the literary sources. The geographic and topographical difficulties of work and locating sites in this mountainous area contribute to the problem of finding evidence.

[86] Hor. *Carm.* 4.14.50 (*durae Hiberiae*) and 4.5.28 (*ferae Hiberiae*), and 2.6.1 (*Cantabrum indoctum iuga ferre nostra et barbaras Syrtis*).

[87] See Hoyos (1979) for an exhaustive discussion of the evidence in Pliny.

[88] See Stanley (2014). Martial seems to focus much of his criticism on the dancing girls of Gades.

[89] Downs (2000), 204–206; Haley (2003) disagrees with her "conclusion that the "greater part" of the population of southern Spain in the last two centuries b.c. was of mixed ethnic ancestry, and although she may be right to state that "up to the period of Caesarian colonization . . . there were few Romans" (p.208), the widespread presence of Italians in Ulterior goes unmentioned in her study."

the appearance of villas in the countryside suggests an increase in Roman settlers or an adoption

of Roman culture.[90] However, the rural landscape in Baetica, particularly, changes drastically in

the Flavian period with the foundation of many new rural settlements and a sharp increase in

villa construction.[91]

Finally under the Flavians there would be an increase in the number of Spanish senators,

owed in large part to the grant of Latin rights and the municipalization of the entire peninsula.[92]

Vespasian made the grant either before or during his censorship in 75 CE, while the charters we

have were issued under Domitian. The delay probably reflected the huge task of drafting

charters for all of the towns and cities in the three provinces.[93] As *cives Latini*, the inhabitants of

the Spanish provinces enjoyed a number of rights, including that of *commercium*, access to

Roman law, and suffrage at Rome, but they could not hold office there.[94] Also, they could not

---

[90] Haley (1996), 286-7.

[91] Haley (1996), 288-9.

[92] The Flavian municipal laws comprise the *Lex Irnitana*, the *Lex Salpensana*, and the *Lex Malacitana*, which are in fact fragments of bronze tablets containing the town charters from Irni, Salpensa, and Malaca, respectively. Other fragments from charters have been discovered, but none so complete as these three. The similarities between these charters demonstrate that there was one municipal law for the whole area, modified as necessary to reflect local needs. These laws do not tell us exactly why Vespasian granted the *ius Latii* to the inhabitants of the three Spanish provinces nor when the process of municipalization began. For the text of the *Lex Irnitana* and complimentary fragments of the *Lex Malacitana*, see González and Crawford (1986). On the laws generally, see González (1984a) and (1984b), Fear (1996), and Burton (1996). On jurisdictional limits in the *Lex Irnitana*, see Rodger (1996), who draws conclusions about the *Lex de Gallia Cisalpina* from it.   Scholars have made a link between the municipalization of Spain and the *Lex de Imperio Vespasiani*. For the text of the *Lex de Imperio Vespasiani*, see Crawford (1996), 549-553, and Crawford (2008), where he offers some corrections to the text, but not a new edition.   On this law, see Brunt (1977); González (1986); and Fear (1996). There is much controversy about whether or not the law gave Vespasian additional powers and if it was the beginning of imperial influence over Roman law. Brunt (1977) analyzes the law in detail concluding that the law reflects a decree of the Senate made in 69 that recognized Vespasian as emperor, that the law is largely tralatician in nature, and that it does indeed mark the basis of juristic doctrines that justify the emperor's right to make law and not be bound by existing law.

[93] Sherwin-White (1973), 361.

[94] *Lex Irnitani* 93: There is much debate about whether or not the *ius Latii* at this point was very different from full Roman citizenship. Sherwin-White (1973), 360-367, follows von Braunert (1966) in seeing the grant of Latin rights as reflecting only the status of individuals and as a precursor to municipalization. González and Crawford (1986) see chapters 21 and 22 of the *Lex Irnitani* as containing references to

marry Roman citizens except in special cases, a point which the end of the *Lex Irnitana* seems to bear out.[95] Thus the majority of inhabitants of Spain were not on equal footing with their Roman citizen neighbors and, as proconsular provinces, Roman senators governed the non-citizen inhabitants.[96] These municipal laws demonstrate that the provinces of *Hispania* and the cities, towns, and inhabitants were conceived of in the same ways in which the Romans had thought of their Italian allies in the previous century at Rome.[97] The reality of the extent to which the province was "Romanized" hardly mattered to those in the capital, and, when senators went out to govern the Spanish provinces, they probably did not think of their subjects as their equals in much the same way they had not considered their Italian allies equals before (and after) the Social War.

Despite Rome's continuous contact with Spain from the end of the 3rd century BCE onward, slow municipalization and rarity of grants of citizenship prevented the majority of local elite from entering the Roman Senate until well after Roman involvement in the peninsula

Roman legal concepts and argue that this along with provisions about *tutela* (chap. 28-9) demonstrate a higher degree of Romanization than previously thought. Furthermore, they argue that the enrollment of *iudices* in the town (chap. 86) shows that the citizens with Latin rights were enrolled in the tribes at Rome and had the *tria nomina*, concluding "the position of the *civis Latinus* was in many respects close to that of a *civis Romanus*." (p.149).

[95] The letter of Domitian appended to the end of the *Lex Irnitani* acknowledges that some marriages were considered illegal; see also González and Crawford (1986), 148-9, and Fear (1996), 133-4.

[96] The province remained a senatorial province throughout the imperial period, with three notable exceptions: In 122-3 CE, Hadrian seems to have installed his friend Gaius Iulius Proculus as an imperial legate, in the 170s Gaius Aufidius Victorinus was made legate over a unified province to deal with hostile incursions, and the mid 3rd century saw imperial legates of praetorian rank in power. See Haley (2006), 35-7 for an overview.

[97] As we saw in Chapter Three, it was this sort of law that started the process of municipalization and led to the structures and institutions that were truly Roman in form. Recall Bispham (2007), 245: "The emergence of local families onto the broader Italian state, as *equites* or senators, is thus bound up with promotion and/or the acquisition of a *lex*; the *lex* presses for recognition of the collective as a Roman community in much the same way as the local elites press for acceptance by their peers at Rome, and the former can in one sense be interpreted as a function of the latter." In no way does the promulgation of this sort of law lead to immediate equality in the Roman Senate though.

began.[98] We know of one exceptional case, Lucius Cornelius Balbus, who was granted Roman

citizenship by Pompey for his aid during the war against Sertorius. After serving as a lieutenant

for Caesar and Octavian, Balbus became the first non-Italian consul in 40 BCE.[99] His nephew

also enjoyed senatorial status under Augustus.[100] By Claudius' reign, there were ten more

senators from the Spanish provinces in the Senate, among whom was Seneca.[101] Lucan, his

nephew, was granted a *quaestorship* by Nero when only twenty years of age and entered the

Senate when far younger than most of his colleagues.[102] Again, given that the Senate under Nero

had more than six hundred members, the number of Spanish, and indeed provincial, senators was

very small and many of these men would never have achieved the consulship, which still gave

senatorial members a different standing in the eyes of their colleagues.[103]

---

[98] Castillo (1982) lists the following Republican senators of Spanish origin: Aelius Marullinus, L. Cornelius Balbus (maior), L. Cornelius Balbus (minor), Titius Hispanus (I), and Titius Hispanus (II).

[99] We know of three other potential senators from outside Italy prior to Balbus: L. Fabius Hispanensis, Q. Caecilius Niger, and Q. Varius Severus. None, however, are securely attested. See Birley (1999), 19-31.

[100] Des Boscs-Plateaux (2001), 212: In his chapter, Des Boscs-Plateaux follows Castillo (1982) in offering a breakdown of senators in terms of both where they come from and under whose reign they entered the Senate, but does not give information on individuals as Castillo did. He counts four senators from Hispania under Tiberius, four under Caligula, and nine under Claudius. Nero's reign stands out in terms of senators admitted to the Senate from all provinces, including Hispania with 23. The trend of incorporating more provincial elites into the Senate continues in the reigns of the Flavians and reaches an apex under the Antonines. Des Boscs-Plateaux (p. 215) offers an interesting chart determining the percentage of provincial senatorial membership in the Senate from Augustus to Trajan: the percentage increases over time, but the number of known senators (i.e., senators whose origins are securely attested) does too, which raises the question of whether or not they are useful.

[101] Caballos Rufino (1990), 304.

[102] Castillo (1982) lists the following as senators in the Julio-Claudian period: M. Annaeus Lucanus, Lucius Annaeus Seneca, M. Annius Afrinus, Annius Vrus, (M) Aponius Saturninus, M. Aponius Saturninus, L. Cornelius Pusio Annius Messala, C. Dillius Aponianus, C. Dillius Vocula, L. Helvidius Agrippa, P. Herennius Pollio, Iunius Gallio, Iunius Gallio Annaeanus, M. Manilius Vopiscus, Cn. Pinarius Cornelius Clemens, and Pompeius Aelianus. Caballos Rufino (1999) does not name the senators individually, but counts approximately fifty (some of which are uncertain) senators with the vast majority (forty) gaining admission to the Senate under Claudius and Nero. Syme (1999), 31 fn. 31, suggests two, including an Umbonius Silo, but Caballos Rufino (1999) reports an improved reading of the *CIL* ii 3839 (Saguntum inscription) and suggests a name ofAntonius Silo, who was likely an Italian.

[103] Syme (1999), 36-37.

In many ways, then, northern Italy and the provinces of Spain were similar. Both had long standing political, military, and commercial ties to Rome. Both were eventually granted enfranchisement in the Roman system, albeit to different degrees in the Julio-Claudian period: northern Italians were formally part of Italy while *Hispania* remained provincial and non-citizen. Both regions saw increased admission of their elites into the Roman Senate, especially during the reigns of Claudius and Nero. As the origins of Thrasea Paetus, Seneca, and Lucan, the cities of Patavium and Corduba shared many of the same characteristics. When Thrasea Paetus entered the Senate, Patavium was a city that enjoyed full citizenship, had municipal status, and belonged to Italy proper.[104] Seneca and Lucan hailed from Corduba, a town founded in the mid 2nd century and one that served as provincial capital in the Augustan period.[105] The city may have finally been given the status of a Roman colony in the last half of the 1st century BCE, perhaps as part of the Caesarian program of municipalization or by Augustus as a means of exerting control over the region.[106] Thus, the hometowns of Thrasea Paetus, Seneca, and Lucan had only recently been formally brought into the administrative structures of the Roman empire. Each city could claim a handful of senators as their native sons.

Despite the increase in northern Italian and Spanish senators in the Julio-Claudian period, Thrasea Paetus, Seneca, and Lucan found themselves in a Roman Senate dominated by Italian

---

[104] For an analysis of Patavium's history and archaeology, see Hiller and Zampieri (2002).

[105] Keay (2003), 164, argues "While new research has shown that centres like Emporiae, Tarraco, Carthago Nova, and Corduba were probably towns in the Roman sense by the later second century B.C., only a few indigenous communities in Iberia began to embrace a Roman urban-based way of life prior to the mid- to later first century B.C." On the Roman structures of Corduba, see P. Sillieres (2001), 173-85. This would have significant impacts on how Seneca (and possibly his fellow Spanish senators) viewed themselves in the context of Rome. On the status of Corduba, see Stylow (1990), 299-318 and Stylow (1996), 77-85. For an overview of the recent archaeological evidence from Corduba, see Keay (2003), 173.

[106] Haley (2003), 52, suggests "the policy of Caesar and Augustus seems to have favored the juridical promotion of lowland cities in the valley of the Baetis and Singilis, such as Hispalis, Urso, Astigi, Corduba, Ucubi, Obulco, and Tucci, as a means of defining and maintaining Rome's political and military control over the core areas of the province."

elites from south of the Po River and aristocratic Romans from the old families. Some of the

ancestors of these other Roman senators had waged campaigns in northern Italy and Spain,

which may have colored how these new senators were perceived. General perceptions of

northern Italy and Spain could easily have been colored by misinformation, historical memory of

wars and barbarians, and negative portrayals in Roman literature. It seems reasonable that these

new senators faced prejudice from their peers. Did Thrasea, Seneca, or Lucan have an accent?

We cannot know. Did any of them look differently from their peers? Perhaps, but again, we

cannot know. What we do know, however, is that none of these men had ancestors listed in the

fasti consulares or *triumphales*, displayed *imagines* in their atria, or hailed from hometowns that

could claim citizenship before the late Republic. The memory of these accomplishments had

defined the traditional Roman aristocracy in the Republican period and continued to define those

who had survived into the early Principate. Part of a new wave of new men, these senators from

northern Italy and Spain probably encountered prejudices similar to those about which Cicero

had complained roughly a century earlier.

Indeed, elites born of prominent families outside certain towns and cities of Italy were

considered outsiders in the first century CE, as contemporary sources suggest, precisely because

many of the institutions of aristocratic memory had been adopted by Italians and maintained by

old Roman families throughout this period. As we saw in his speech, Claudius suggested that a

senatorial descendant of the Allobroges should not be ashamed to see that name among his

ancestral masks, with the dual implications that some people thought it was shameful and that

newly enfranchised elites would adopt this Roman custom regardless of their place of origin.[107]

---

[107] The Lyon Tablet, *CIL* 13.1668.2.25: *Tot ecce insignes iuvenes, quot intueor, non magis sunt
paenitendi senatores, quam paenitet Persicum, nobilissimum virum, amicum meum, inter imagines
maiorum suorum Allobrogici nomen legere.* This in itself is very interesting because it suggests that these
aristocrats have adopted a significant cultural component of being a Roman aristocrat, the ancestral masks

Slightly later, the Spanish rhetorician, Quintilian, advised his fellow provincials: "if possible, our voice and all our words should be redolent of an inhabitant of this city, so that our speech may seem to be of genuine Roman origin, and not merely to have been presented with Roman citizenship."[108] Even later, Pliny famously relates the question addressed to none other than the greatest Roman historian, himself, Tacitus, which Tacitus artfully dodged: *'Italicus es an provincialis?'*[109] If these attitudes were still prevalent in the time of Quintilian and Tacitus, surely Seneca, Thrasea Paetus, and Lucan, as some of the first senators from their respective regions, faced similar questions. While we now know that "Romanization" happened at different rates and with far more negotiation, bricolage, and creolization in the provinces than previously thought, statements like these suggest there was intense pressure in the center for newly arrived senators to conform to traditional standards of Roman culture.

Aristocratic Institutions of Memory and the Changing Nobility

That Seneca specifically felt different from his senatorial colleagues from old aristocratic families is borne out by his complaint about their ancestral advertisement in the atria of senatorial homes: "An atrium full of smoky *imagines* does not make a man noble; no one has lived for our glory and that which came before us is not ours: the soul alone makes a man noble, and it is permitted to rise beyond fortune from whatever condition."[110] In his *De Beneficiis*, Seneca maintained that "there is the same origin and source for all men; no one is more noble

---

(*imagines*). What senators from old aristocratic families thought of this is impossible to know, but I imagine it could not have been a welcome development in the first half of the 1st century CE.

[108] Quint. *Inst*. 8.1.3: *Quare, si fieri potest, et verba omnia et vox huius alumnum urbis oleant, ut oratio Romana plane videatur, non civitate donata.* Quintilian himself was from Spain.

[109] Plin. *Ep*. 9.23.2.

[110] Sen. *Ep*. 44.5: *Non facit nobilem atrium plenum fumosis imaginibus; nemo in nostram gloriam vixit nec quod ante nos fuit nostrum est: animus facit nobilem, cui ex quacumque condicione supra fortunam licet surgere.*

than another, except for him who is more upright in his nature and more adept at the fine arts.

Those who exhibit their *imagines* in the atrium and place in the front of their houses the names of

their ancestors surrounded by a lengthy rank and the many curves of their genealogical trees, are

they not more notable than noble?"[111] Seneca made a similar argument elsewhere:

> If any man is bad, he will, I suppose, be regarded with disapproval; if good, I suppose he will be regarded with approval. Therefore, that attribute of man whereby he is approved or disapproved is his chief and only good. You do not doubt whether this is a good; you merely doubt whether it is the sole good. If any man possesses all other things, such as health, riches, pedigree, a crowded atrium, but is confessedly bad, you will disapprove of him. Likewise, if a man possess none of the things which I have mentioned, and lacks money, or an escort of clients, or rank and a line of grandfathers and great- grandfathers, but is confessedly good, you will approve of him. Therefore, this is man's one peculiar good, and the possessor of it is to be praised even if be lacks other things; but he who does not possess it, though he possess everything else in abundance, is condemned and rejected."[112]

In these words, there are echoes of Cicero's attempts to redefine what it meant to be part of the

Roman nobility, this time uttered by a different kind of new man.[113] Much of Seneca's focus in

---

[111] Sen. *Ben*. 3.28.2-3: *Eadem omnibus principia eademque origo; nemo altero nobilior, nisi cui rectius ingenium et artibus bonis aptius. Qui imagines in atrio exponunt et nomina familiae suae longo ordine ac multis stemmatum inligata flexuris in parte prima aedium conlocant, non noti magis quam nobiles sunt?*
[112] Sen. *Ep*. 76.11-12: *Id itaque unum bonum est in homine quod unum hominis est; nunc enim non quaerimus quid sit bonum, sed quid sit hominis bonum. Si nullum aliud est hominis quam ratio, haec erit unum eius bonum, sed pensandum cum omnibus. Si sit aliquis malus, puto inprobabitur; si bonus, puto probabitur. Id ergo in homine primum solumque est quo et probatur et inprobatur. Non dubitas an hoc sit bonum; dubitas an solum bonum sit. Si quis omnia alia habeat, valetudinem, divitias, imagines multas, frequens atrium, sed malus ex confesso sit, inprobabis illum; item si quis nihil quidem eorum quae rettuli habeat, deficiatur pecunia, clientium turba, nobilitate et avorum proavorumque serie, sed ex confesso bonus sit, probabis illum. Ergo hoc unum est bonum hominis, quod qui habet, etiam si aliis destituitur, laudandus est, quod qui non habet in omnium aliorum copia damnatur ac reicitur.*
[113] Cicero appears prominently in Seneca's writings, but discussion of these men generally focuses on their philosophical similarities and differences: see Gambet (1970), Griffin (1976) and (1987), Inwood (1995), Edwards (1997), and Mannering (2013). Seneca usually appeals to Cicero as an example to illustrate a philosophical point or as a model to follow, as in the following passages: *De Ira* 2.2.3 and 3.37.5; *De Brev. Vit*. 10; *De cons. ad mar*. 20.5; *Tranq*. 9.11 and 9.16-7; *Ben*. 4.30.1-4; and *Ep*. 21, 40, 49, 58, 97, 100, 102, 107, 108, 111, 114, 118, and 120. It would be interesting to think about these references in the context of Cicero as a *novus homo* and Seneca as a *novitas*, but this is beyond the scope of this dissertation. Dondi-Payre (1982), 105-136, observed *novitas* became the preferred term in imperial epigraphy in the 2nd and 3rd centuries; used by Italians and provincials primarily from Asia, the term was positive as opposed to the pejorative *novus homo*.

this passage is on the attributes that defined the traditional Roman aristocracy, which demonstrates their continued influence and presence in the social and political fabric of the Roman Senate.

At the same time, other aristocratic institutions of memory that had so defined elite Roman identity in the Republic and that Augustus had sought to modify and appropriate, seemed to come under further attack during the reigns of the Claudian emperors. Pliny the Elder reported the public funeral procession of a talking crow that had greeted Tiberius from his perch on the rostrum.[114] Seneca went so far as to mock aristocratic lineages by accusing them of inventing divine ancestors when their actual ancestors had not achieved careers as impressive as their descendants might have liked.[115] In one of his letters, Seneca laments that Rome has convinced the world that sacrilege is a good thing, complaining, "minor sacrileges are punished, but great sacrileges are carried in triumphs."[116] Written at a time when Augustus' *Fasti Triumphales* still stood in his forum listing the famous Romans who had triumphed during the Republic and imperial family members still celebrated triumphs, Seneca's characterization of triumphs as a celebration of sacrilege is rather shocking. It certainly signaled a transition away from values long held in the echelons of the traditional aristocracy and Senate. Recall also the mockery of Claudius' funeral that Seneca wrote in his *Apocolocyntosis*.[117]

Perhaps even more significant was Seneca's complete rejection of the core identity of Roman aristocrats. He argued,

---

[114] Plin. *HN* 10.122; Bodel (1999), 262-3, discusses the early imperial phenomenon of mock funerals in literature and in real life, concluding that the funerals served as social rituals and popular spectacles. I would add that they signal a significant change in Roman culture and mark a popular rejection of the old values that were upheld by the traditional aristocracy throughout the Republic.
[115] Sen. *Ben*. 3.28.2: *Non est, quod te isti decipiant, qui, cum maiores suos saepe recensent, ubimcumque nomen iliustre defecit, illo deum infulciunt.*
[116] Sen. *Ep*. 87.23: *nam sacrilegia minuta puniuntur, magna in triumphis feruntur.*
[117] See Sen. *Apocol*. 12.1-2; Petron. 77-78; Juv. 1.146.

How much greater joy does a man derive who looks without concern, not merely upon praetorian or consular elections, but upon those huge struggles in which some seek yearly honors, others eternal power, others the prosperous outcome of war and the triumph, others riches, others marriage and offspring, or the welfare of themselves and their relatives! It is the action of the greatest soul to seek nothing, to offer prayers to no man, and to say: "Fortune, I have nothing to do with you. I do not make my resources available to you. I know that the Catos were spurned by you, and men like Vatinius were made by you. I ask for nothing.[118]

Office holding, marriage connections, military prowess, public recognition, and family relations had formed the core of aristocratic identity for Romans for generations. What more thorough rejection of this traditional form of aristocratic identity could Seneca have given? At the same time, Seneca's jibes reveal the longevity of these institutions of memory: they were still being used to define aristocratic identity at a time when their public impact had diminished considerably from the Republican period.

Finally, Seneca was concerned with making an argument similar to those that Cicero had made a century before about the value the assimilation of foreigners had for the Roman imperial project. In his *De Ira*, Seneca asked "What more faithful allies does the Roman people have than those who were her most implacable enemies: what would the empire be today if a beneficial providence had not mixed together victors with the conquered?"[119] And yet elsewhere, through the mouth of Clotho, one of the Fates, Seneca bemoaned the extension of citizenship to "all Greeks, Gauls, Spaniards, and Britons."[120] It is clear that Seneca did not rate himself among

---

[118] Sen. *Ep*. 118.4: *Quanto hic maiore gaudio fruitur qui non praetoria aut consularia comitia securus intuetur, sed magna illa in quibus alii honores anniuersarios petunt, alii perpetuas potestates, alii bellorum euentus prosperos triumphosque, alii diuitias, alii matrimonia ac liberos, alii salutem suam suorumque! Quanti animi res est solum nihil petere, nulli supplicare, et dicere, 'nihil mihi tecum, fortuna; non facio mei tibi copiam. Scio apud te Catones repelli, Vatinios fieri. Nihil rogo.'*

[119] Sen. *De Ira*, 2. 34. 4: *Quos populus Romanus fideliores habet socios quam quos habuit pertinacissimos hostes? Quod hodie esset imperium, nisi salubris prouidentia uictos permiscuisset uictoribus?*

[120] Sen. *Apocol*. 3: *Sed Clotho "ego mehercules" inquit "pusillum temporis adicere illi volebam, dum hos pauculos, qui supersunt, civitate donaret (constituerat enim omnes Graecos, Gallos, Hispanos, Britannos togatos videre), sed quoniam placet aliquos peregrinos in semen relinqui et tu ita iubes fieri, fiat."*

those Spaniards granted citizenship by Claudius, but he also did not belong to the group of senators whose lineage stretched back into the Republic and whose traditions were inaccessible to him as a result.

Seneca's works reveal the tensions that municipal and provincial senators felt in the context of the Roman Senate during the reigns of Claudius and Nero, when greater numbers of "outsiders" sat next to and debated with scions of the old Roman aristocracy like the Calpurnii Pisones, the Domitii Ahenobarbi, and the Valerii. How, then, could Seneca, Thrasea Paetus, and Lucan establish their right to be members of that venerable body? It is in this context that I think we can suggest a supplementary answer to the question raised earlier about why these men chose to make Cato Uticensis their hero. At this point in time, members of the aristocracy (old and newly enfranchised) were trying to work out their relationship to the new imperial power, often using Republican precedents as guides for their own behavior. The negotiation of this relationship was relatively easy under Augustus, whose moderation and long tenure allowed for some consistency in the dealings between emperor and senators. However, with the accessions of Tiberius, Caligula, Claudius, and Nero, the terms of negotiation seemed to change, at times rather dramatically.

Cato was not an uncomplicated choice. He had opposed Caesar but his suicide at Utica in 46 BCE ensured that he would never come into direct conflict with the new imperial regime. He was famous for his virtue, belonged to a aristocratic family of great age and fame, and became the champion of the Republic in the eyes of those who would go on to assassinate Caesar. He was certainly chosen by these men for his adherence to Stoicism, although his commitment to that system of belief never seemed to overcome his participation in the turbulent and philosophy challenging Roman political scene. His stubbornness was notorious and his

obstructionist policies hindered the solution to many of the Republic's problems. Finally, his support of Pompey was justified by his later supporters as the lesser of the two evils, but in reality reflected Cato's life-long consistency in support of the traditional Roman aristocracy's positions, institutions, and values.

Another reason likely led to Cato's selection as well. When Seneca returned from exile in 49 CE, he served as tutor to Lucius Domitius Ahenobarbus, the future emperor Nero. He was well versed in the history of his young pupil's biological family, writing of the attempted suicide of his great-great-great-great grandfather, also named Lucius Domitius Ahenobarbus (cos. 54 BCE), during the siege of Corfinium in the civil war between Pompey and Caesar.[121] It was this Lucius Domitius Ahenobarbus who was married to Porcia, the elder sister of Cato Uticensis.[122] Thus, Cato Uticensis was an ancestor of Nero and this made him a very suitable choice for emulation by the young emperor's tutor and imperial advisor.[123] Seneca's nephew, Lucan, doubtlessly knew of the relationship as well, since Nero did not hide his biological origins after his accession to the throne. Britannicus, son of Claudius, reportedly greeted Nero as Domitius or

---

[121] Sen. *De. Ben.* 3.24: *Corfinium Caesar obsidebat, tenebatur inclusus Domitius; imperauit medico eidemque seruo suo, ut sibi uenenum daret. Cum tergiuersantem uideret: 'Quid cunctaris' inquit, 'tamquam in tua potestate totum istud sit? mortem rogo armatus.' Tum ille promisit et medicamentum innoxium bibendum illi dedit; quo cum sopitus esset, accessit ad filium eius et: 'Iube' inquit 'me adseruari, dum ex euentu intellegas, an uenenum patri tuo dederim.' Vixit Domitius et seruatus a Caesare est; prior tamen illum seruus seruauerat.* "When Caesar was besieging Corfinium, Domitius was confined, he ordered one of his slaves and likewise his physician, to give him poison. Observing his reluctance, he said: "Why do you hesitate, as though this matter were wholly in your own power; I am asking for death, but I have my sword." Whereupon the slave assented, and gave him a concoction to drink that was harmless. When Domitius had fallen asleep because of it, the slave went to his master's son, and said: "Have me put under guard until you discover from the outcome whether I have given your father poison." Domitius survived and was spared by Caesar, but first a slave saved him."
[122] Cicero wrote a speech delivered by Lucius Domitius Ahenobarbus on the occasion of his young son's death in 54 BCE (Cic. *Q. fr.* 3.8.5). He also wrote a *laudatio funebris* for his wife, Porcia (Cic. *Att.* 13.48.2). On L. Domitius and Porcia, see Münzer (1920), 329-330, and Carleson (2006), 56 and 67-69; On the entire *gens* of the Domitiii Ahenobarbi, see Carleson (2006).
[123] It is unsurprising that Tacitus primarily emphasized Nero's Julian ancestry, although he regularly refered to Nero as Domitius (Tac. *Ann.* 11.11; 12.3; 12.9; and 12.25-26).

Ahenobarbus.[124] Additionally, there are, in fact, some indications that Nero sought to emphasize

his biological over his imperial lineage in the second half of his reign.[125] Thus, Cato the Stoic

and ancestor to their patron would have been a logical example for Seneca and Lucan to

champion. Thrasea Paetus seems to have seized on their characterization of Cato and modeled

his behavior on that Stoic Cato more than the historical Cato. How was this Cato portrayed by

Seneca and Lucan? Did he differ from earlier portrayals or, as many scholars have argued, was

he already a Stoic saint ready for emulation?

Seneca and Cato[126]

To a great extent Seneca's Cato served as a moral *exemplum*, often stripped of his

historical context.[127] Cato was increasingly important in Seneca's works, especially if one

adheres to the chronological table of Seneca's extant works offered by Griffin.[128] In his early

---

[124] Tac. *Ann*. 12.41.

[125] Carleson (2006), 92-3, sees Nero's celebration of the games in Antium in 63 CE in honor of the Claudian and Domitian houses (Tac. *Ann*. 15.23), Nero's appearance on coins with a beard (which he grants may be an allusion to his original cognomen or, as he suggests, more likely part of his Greek image), and Nero's response to Vindex calling him Ahenobarbus in 68 CE as advertisments of his birth lineage (Suet. *Ner*. 41). Additionally, Carleson (p. 93) notes that Nero committed suicide at a house belonging to a freedman of the Domitii Ahenobarbi and was buried in the family tomb of the Domitii Ahenobarbi instead of the mausoleum of Augustus (which had been forbidden by Galba).

[126] Studies of Seneca have largely been philosophical and literary in nature. Recent monographs include: Veyne (2003) *Seneca: the Life of a Stoic*; a collection of philosophical and literary analyses edited by Fitch (2008), certain chapters of the *Blackwell Companion to the Neronian Age* edited by Dinter (2013), and the recent *Cambridge Companion* edited by Bartsch and Schiesaro (2015). The most comprehensive analyses of Seneca's life remain Motto (1973) and Griffin (1976).

[127] Cato appears in the majority of Seneca's works. On occasion, Cato simply serves as a name in a grammatical example (*Ep*. 58 and 108). At other junctures, Seneca reports proverbs attributed to Cato (*Ben*. 5.7.5 and *Ep*. 94 and 119). On Seneca's philosophical and moral use of Cato, see Alexander (1941), p. 15-28; Kühnen (1962), p. 61-8; Griffin (1976), p 182-184; Pecchiura (1965). On Seneca's errors and biases in his use of historical material see Kühnen (1962), *Seneca und die römische Geschichte*, p. 18-28, 49-51, 54 and 59.

[128] Griffin (1976), 395-411: Griffin offers an extensive defense of her chronological dating in the appendices and offers the following dates for his works: *Consolatio ad Marciam* was written under Caligula; *Consolatio ad Polybium* and *ad Helviam Matrem* were written during his exile (from 41-49

works offering consolation, Cato was an example of someone who had suffered mightily for his beliefs in an unjust time. In his *De Consolatione de Marcia,* Seneca went so far as to suggest that had Cato died in a shipwreck on his return from Cyprus, he would have been spared civil wars and the choice of Pompey.[129] Seneca, in his *De Ira*, celebrated Cato's Stoic inclinations in restraining his anger when he was run into at the baths by a careless bather and when he was insulted while arguing a case in court.[130] Finally, in the *De Constantia*, Seneca explored Cato's Stoicism as a central theme and model for behavior when he discussed Cato's wisdom and his virtue in a time when he was not appreciated.[131] At the opening of the text, Seneca described Cato in the following way:

> I said that you should be unconcerned about Cato himself. For it is impossible that a wise man can receive either injury or insult. But I also said that the immortal gods had given Cato to us as a truer example of than Ulysses and Hercules in earlier ages. For we Stoics have declared that these were wise men, because they were unconquered by struggles, were despisers of pleasure, and victors over all terrors. Cato did not grapple with wild beasts…he did not pursue monsters with fire and sword, nor did he chance to live in the times when it was possible to believe that the heavens rested on the shoulders of one man…he fought with ambition…and with the immense greed for power which the whole world divided among three men could not satiate. He stood alone against the vices of a declining and sinking state, dragged down by its own weight and he checked the falling republic as much as it was able to be drawn back by one man's hand, until at last he was himself withdrawn and shared the downfall which he had so long averted, and the two whom heaven willed should never part were blotted out together. For Cato did not live after freedom nor freedom after Cato. Do you think

---

CE); under Claudius or Nero, Seneca wrote his *De Brevitate Vitae* (between 48-55 CE), and his *De Constantia Sapientis*, *De Tranquilitate Animi* and *De Otio* (by 64 CE); by 62, Seneca wrote the *Apolocolocyntosis*, *De Clementia*, *De Vita Beata*, and *De Beneficiis*; after 62, he wrote *Naturales Qaestiones* and the *Epistulae Morales*. Griffin dates the *De Providentia* to some point after Tiberius' death in 37 CE. I will adhere to her chronology in this dissertation because the chronology of the works does not impact my argument.

[129] Sen. *Ad Marc*. 20.6: *M. Catonem si a Cypro et hereditatis regiae dispensatione redeuntem mare deuorasset uel cum illa ipsa pecunia quam adferebat ciuili bello stipendium, nonne illi bene actum foret? Hoc certe secum tulisset, neminem ausurum coram Catone peccare: nunc annorum adiectio paucissimorum uirum libertati non suae tantum sed publicae natum coegit Caesarem fugere, Pompeium sequi.*

[130] Sen. *De Ira* 2.32 and 3.38.

[131] Sen. *Constant*. 1.3, 2.1-2, 7.1, 14.3.

that he could suffer an injury by the people, because they tore from him either his praetorship or his toga? Because they spattered that sacred head with filth from their mouths? The wise man is safe, and no injury or insult is able to affect him.[132]

As in most of Seneca's characterizations of Cato, this one recasts Cato's participation in the events of the 50s and 40s BCE as moral interventions in a corrupt and broken system rather than as a participant seeking to preserve the power of the Senate. Seneca's focus on Cato's Stoic reaction to the political turmoil of the time marginalized the role that Cato played in that same turmoil. This conception of Cato continued in Seneca's *De Tranquilitate* where Cato was a good Stoic, born into a bad time, and achieved immortality through his philosophical death.[133] There was only one place where Seneca seems to disapprove of Cato's involvement with the civil war between Pompey and Caesar.[134]

The suicide of Cato became ever more an important reference in Seneca's works.[135] In the *De Providentia*, Seneca commended Cato's bravery, stubbornness, and constancy in his opposition to Caesar and choice of suicide over surrendering to Caesar.[136] But it was in the *Epistulae Morales* that Seneca returned to Cato's suicide over and over again, praising how it had made Cato famous, offering descriptions of the act, and arguing that Cato served as an

---

[132] Sen. *Constant*. 2.1-3: *pro ipso quidem Catone securum te esse iussi; nullam enim sapientem nec iniuriam accipere nec contumeliam posse, Catonem autem certius exemplar sapientis uiri nobis deos inmortalis dedisse quam Vlixem et Herculem prioribus saeculis. Hos enim Stoici nostri sapientes pronuntiauerunt, inuictos laboribus et 'contemptores uoluptatis et uictores omnium terrorum. Cato non cum feris manus contulit… nec monstra igne ac ferro persecutus est, nec in ea tempora incidit quibus credi posset caelum umeris unius inniti: …cum ambitu congressus, et cum potentiae inmensa cupiditate, quam totus orbis in tres diuisus satiare non poterat, aduersus uitia ciuitatis degenerantis et pessum sua mole sidentis stetit solus et cadentem rem publicam, quantum modo una retrahi manu poterat, tenuit, donec abstractus comitem se diu sustentatae ruinae dedit simulque extincta sunt quae nefas erat diuidi; neque enim Cato post libertatem uixit nec libertas post Catonem. Huic tu putas iniuriam fieri potuisse a populo quod aut praeturam illi detraxit aut togam, quod sacrum illud caput purgamentis oris adspersit? Tutus est sapiens nec ulla adfici aut iniuria aut contumelia potest.*
[133] Sen. *Tranq*. 7.3, 16.1-4, 17.4-9 (in this last section, Seneca offers a defense against the charge that Cato was a drunk, probably first made by Caesar in his AntiCato, see below).
[134] Sen. *Ep*. 14. For a discussion of this epistle, see Griffin (1968).
[135] On Seneca's preoccupation with death and immortality more generally, see Motto (1955).
[136] Sen. *Prov*. 2.10-12.

example for any man seeking escape through death.[137] Also in his *Letters*, Seneca advocated the choice of Cato, or Laelius if Cato was too severe, as an example to guide one's own actions, arguing that living as if Cato were watching every action a person took would help regulate their character.[138] In another *Epistle*, Seneca argued that setting Cato as a guard over oneself would help check bad impulses.[139] Finally, Seneca admitted that Cato ranked among his own teachers:

> The reverence, which I owe to my own teachers, is the same that I owe to those teachers of the human race, from whom the beginnings of such goodness have flowed. If I should see a consul or a praetor, I would do everything for those whom honor of the office customarily grants: I shall dismount my horse, uncover my head, and yield the road. What, then? Shall I admit into my soul without greatest respect Marcus Cato, the Elder and the Younger, Laelius the Wise, Socrates and Plato, Zeno and Cleanthes? Truly, I worship them and always rise to such great names.[140]

Here Cato Uticensis (and his ancestor) are elevated to the ranks of the founders of Stoic philosophy themselves, Zeno and Cleanthes. There is, however, no good historical reason to do so. Cato was not famous for being a philosopher. However, as we have seen, in his writings Seneca generally regarded Cato as a Stoic, a great man, wise, and moral. It is with Seneca, then,

---

[137] On the fame Cato's suicide brought him after death, see Sen. *Ep*. 13, 79, and 82. For descriptions of the suicide, see Sen. *Ep*. 24, 71, 95, and 98. On Cato's suicide as a template for any man to follow, see Sen. *Ep*. 70.

[138] Sen. *Ep*. 11.9-10: *Hoc, mi Lucili, Epicurus praecepit; custodem nobis et paedagogum dedit, nec immerito: magna pars peccatorum tollitur, si peccaturis testis assistit. Aliquem habeat animus quem vereatur, cuius auctoritate etiam secretum suum sanctius faciat. O felicem illum qui non praesens tantum sed etiam cogitatus emendat! O felicem qui sic aliquem vereri potest ut ad memoriam quoque eius se componat atque ordinet! Qui sic aliquem vereri potest cito erit verendus. Elige itaque Catonem; si hic tibi videtur nimis rigidus, elige remissioris animi virum Laelium. Elige eum cuius tibi placuit et vita et oratio et ipse animum ante se ferens vultus; illum tibi semper ostende vel custodem vel exemplum. Opus est, inquam, aliquo ad quem mores nostri se ipsi exigant: nisi ad regulam prava non corriges.*

[139] Sen. *Ep*. 25.6: *Cum iam profeceris tantum ut sit tibi etiam tui reverentia, licebit dimittas paedagogum: interim aliquorum te auctoritate custodi - aut Cato ille sit aut Scipio aut Laelius aut alius cuius interventu perditi quoque homines vitia supprimerent, dum te efficis eum cum quo peccare non audeas. Cum hoc effeceris et aliqua coeperit apud te tui esse dignatio, incipiam tibi permittere quod idem suadet Epicurus: 'tunc praecipue in te ipse secede cum esse cogeris in turba'.*

[140] Sen. *Ep*. 64.9-10: *Quam venerationem praeceptoribus meis debeo, eandem illis praeceptoribus generis humani, a quibus tanti boni initia fluxerunt. Si consulem videro aut praetorem, omnia quibus honor haberi honori solet faciam: equo desiliam, caput adaperiam, semita cedam. Quid ergo? Marcum Catonem utrumque et Laelium Sapientem et Socraten cum Platone et Zenonem Cleanthenque in animum meum sine dignatione summa recipiam? Ego vero illos veneror et tantis nominibus semper assurgo.*

that the memory of Cato Uticensis changes into something that resembles more clearly the

inspiration for Thrasea Paetus' biography and for Lucan in his composition of the *Bellum Civile*.

At the same time, Lucan made the character of Cato and other protagonists different as well. As

Griffin notes, "He [Seneca] did not admire Pompey or the tyrannicides, and, even in thinking

about Cato, he never approached the degree of interest in the political struggles and ideas of the

late Republic that was felt by his nephew Lucan or by Thrasea Paetus and his friends."[141]

Indeed, Lucan took the figure of Cato beyond where his uncle had, and it is to Lucan that we turn

next.

Cato and Lucan[142]

The Cato that appears in Lucan's Bellum Civile is markedly different from Seneca's Cato

in some ways. In book 2, Cato is the antithesis of the Stoic sage, a depiction that is contrary to

the expectations set up by Brutus' speech. He is resigned to rule by one man, decides that the

lesser of the two evils is Pompey, and has hope that, with his presence, Pompey will recall that

he is fighting on behalf of the State and not only for himself.[143] Perhaps this Cato is not so

strange in his care for the city and its people with his rejection of that most Stoic of principles,

---

[141] Griffin (1976), 194.

[142] Studies of Lucan are typically literary in nature, see Bartsch (1997) *Ideology in Cold Blood*; Leigh (2000) on the geography of book nine; Hömke (2010), *Lucan's Bellum Civile: Between Epic Tradition and Aesthetic Innovation*, the *Brill Companion to Lucan* edited by Asso (2011), and certain chapters of the *Blackwell Companion to the Neronian Age* edited by Dinter (2013). One of the few more historical analyses comes from Lintott (1971), where he tries to articulate the historicity of the *Bellum Civile* and Lucan's own understanding of the outbreak of war and its consequences. The dissertations of Ormsby (1970) and Thorne (2010) offer the only comprehensive studies of Cato in the *Bellum Civile*, but both from a literary rather than a historical perspective.

[143] Luc. 2.319-23: *quin publica signa ducemque / Pompeium sequimur? nec, si fortuna fauebit, / hunc quoque totius sibi ius promittere mundi / non bene conpertum est: ideo me milite uincat / ne sibi se uicisse putet.*

indifference.[144] This is the Cato of the Republic, choosing a side and participating in politics regardless of the danger.

Lucan's further characterization of Cato in Book Two also sounds familiar in its attention to traditional Roman *mores*. Moderation and self-restraint are prominent in this passage, with Lucan linking Cato to ancient Roman traditions through the use of the term '*Quirites*.'[145] Tapping into these virtues long hallowed by the Roman elite throughout the Republic, Lucan firmly located Cato in a Republican context. While the Stoics valued many of these traditionally Roman qualities, in book 2 Lucan's Cato rouses Brutus' heart to war, is eager for conflict, embroils himself in politics, and rejects the idea of retirement. This Cato is most reflective of the literary tradition preceding Lucan's own work and which was shaped over the decades following Cato's suicide at Utica in 46 BCE.

However, in Book Nine Lucan's Cato undergoes a marked change. During the march across the Libyan sands, Lucan presents a Cato preoccupied with morality and virtue, apathetic toward the suffering around him, and sagely Stoic.[146] After his death, Cato speaks of Pompey in terms of hatred and failure, but at least as a defender of a *ficta libertatis* (façade of liberty) rather than as a lesser of two evils.[147] The transformation of Cato is complete when Lucan describes

---

[144] On Stoic doctrine, see Inwood (1995).

[145] Luc. 2.384-391: *hi mores, haec duri inmota Catonis / secta fuit, seruare modum finemque tenere / naturamque sequi patriaeque inpendere uitam /nec sibi sed toti genitum se credere mundo./ huic epulae uicisse famem, magnique penates / summouisse hiemem tecto, pretiosaque uestis / hirtam membra super Romani more Quiritis / induxisse togam, Venerisque hic maximus usus, / progenies: urbi pater est urbique maritus, / iustitiae cultor, rigidi seruator honesti, / in commune bonus; nullosque Catonis in actus / subrepsit partemque tulit sibi nata uoluptas.*

[146] Luc. 9.620-950.

[147] Luc. 9.15-30: *hinc super Emathiae campos et signa cruenti / Caesaris ac sparsas uolitauit in aequore classes, / et scelerum uindex in sancto pectore Bruti / sedit et inuicti posuit se mente Catonis. / ille, ubi pendebant casus dubiumque manebat / quem dominum mundi facerent ciuilia bella, / oderat et Magnum, quamuis comes isset in arma / auspiciis raptus patriae ductuque senatus; / at post Thessalicas clades iam pectore toto / Pompeianus erat. patriam tutore carentem / excepit, populi trepidantia membra refouit, / ignauis manibus proiectos reddidit enses, / nec regnum cupiens gessit ciuilia bella / nec seruire timens. nil causa fecit in armis/ ille sua: totae post Magni funera partes / libertatis erant;* and Lucan 9.186-214:

him as a sort of new Plato, "filled with the god whom he carried in his silent mind" just before he exhorts his troops prior to their death march across the serpent filled Libyan sands.[148]

Lucan's Cato undergoes a significant transformation, from a defender of recognizably Republican *mores* and a supporter of partisan civil war in Book Two to a Stoic sage concerned with providing the proper moral education to his army.[149] Lucan's Cato is similar in his harshness to the Catos of Sallust, Velleius, and the Augustan poets, but the likeness ends there. And in few ways do the remembered Catos resemble the historical Cato. The emphasis on his Stoic perspective and his ever more fervent opposition to Caesar even mark a departure from the writings of his uncle.

The Memory of Cato Uticensis

Cato's legacy was immediately complicated by the victory of his archrival Caesar, the subsequent civil wars led by partisans of Caesar and Cato, and the victory of Caesar's heir Octavian. In the period after Cato's suicide at Utica in 46 BCE, there was actually a tremendous

---

non tamen ad Magni peruenit gratius umbras / omne quod in superos audet conuicia uolgus / Pompeiumque deis obicit, quam pauca Catonis / uerba sed a pleno uenientia pectore ueri. / 'ciuis obit' inquit 'multum maioribus inpar / nosse modum iuris, sed in hoc tamen utilis aeuo, / cui non ulla fuit iusti reuerentia; salua / libertate potens, et solus plebe parata / priuatus seruire sibi, rectorque senatus, / sed regnantis, erat. nil belli iure poposcit, / quaeque dari uoluit uoluit sibi posse negari. / inmodicas possedit opes, sed plura retentis / intulit. inuasit ferrum, sed ponere norat. / praetulit arma togae, sed pacem armatus amauit. / iuuit sumpta ducem, iuuit dimissa potestas. / casta domus luxuque carens corruptaque numquam / fortuna domini. clarum et uenerabile nomen / gentibus et multum nostrae quod proderat urbi. / olim uera fides Sulla Marioque receptis / libertatis obit: Pompeio rebus adempto / nunc et ficta perit. non iam regnare pudebit, / nec color imperii nec frons erit ulla senatus. / o felix, cui summa dies fuit obuia uicto / et cui quaerendos Pharium scelus obtulit enses. / forsitan in soceri potuisses uiuere regno. / scire mori sors prima uiris, set proxima cogi. / et mihi, si fatis aliena in iura uenimus, / fac talem, Fortuna, Iubam; non deprecor hosti / seruari, dum me seruet ceruice recisa.'

[148] Luc. 9.564-5: *ille deo plenus tacita quem mente gerebat / effudit dignas adytis e pectore uoces*.

[149] On the transformation of Cato, see Ormsby (1970), 19-40; and George (1991), 257: " Indeed throughout the remainder of the ninth book, Cato, by his own example, teaches the new Republican army virtue…"

battle over his memory, not simply a universal acclamation of his excellence. The victor, Caesar, immediately began a campaign to control Cato's memory, which was in turn answered by admirers and allies of Cato. To those founding a new government, which sought to address many of the persistent problems plaguing the Republic, Cato's memory was something that needed to be controlled, lest his resistance to change be transmitted to later generations. Surprisingly, however, his memory did not undergo sanctions as those of Cassius and Brutus did. Cato's *inimicitia* was perhaps overshadowed by his virtues and his famous ancestry, while Caesar's own program of amnesty had no accommodation for sanctions of memory. It is also possible that, in comparison to the deeds of Brutus, Cassius, and Marc Antony, Cato did not seem threatening enough to the fledgling Principate to warrant sanctions.[150] Certainly, however, Cato would become a much more controversial figure in the 1st century CE.

On the one hand, many in the aristocracy saw Cato's opposition to Caesar as the final attempt at the preservation of Republicanism while the populists viewed Cato's actions as one of the main reasons why civil war broke out in the first place. In the immediate aftermath of the civil war between Pompey and Caesar, it was only the aristocracy, who perceived more keenly the end of their control of Roman politics and attributed it to Caesar instead of the populist trends of previous century, who could hold Cato in the highest esteem. From the perspective of the so-called *populares*, Cato was indeed an enemy and continued to be regarded as such in the eyes of Caesar's successors.[151] However, as we shall see, this designation never stuck to the memory of Cato: he remained influential and paradigmatic.

---

[150] On the memory sanctions imposed on Antony, and subsequently removed, see Flower (2006), 116-121. For memory sanctions that remained in place against Cassius and Brutus, see Tacitus *Ann*. 3.76.
[151] c.f. Syme (1939); Taylor (1949); Gruen (1974), 50; Wiseman (2009), 5-32.

Cicero, despite his earlier frustration with the man and reservations about his policies,

took up the torch of Catonian support in aftermath of the civil wars.[152] The battle of memory is

perhaps best illustrated by the existence of both the *Anticato* of Caesar and the *Catones* of Cicero

and Brutus. Within months of Cato's death and at the behest of his nephew and ally, Brutus,

Cicero wrote his *Cato*, what was probably a laudatory account of his life, complete with

reference to Cato's famous ancestor.[153] The three extant fragments shed little light on the other

contents; only one of the fragments suggest it had a laudatory tone.[154] Thus there is some reason

to think that the text was not entirely positive, but it is impossible to be sure.[155] The proof most

relied upon by modern historians is found in Tacitus, when Cremutius Cordus, in a speech before

the Senate, reports on "the book of Marcus Cicero in which he equated Cato with the sky.[156]

---

[152] The best treatment of Cato in the works of Cicero is the dissertation by Rex Stem entitled *Cicero and the Legacy of Cato Uticensis*. In his introductory chapter, Stem thoroughly summarizes Cato's legacy from his suicide at Utica through his effect on Seneca and Lucan to his treatment in later writers, including the history of Cassius Dio and Plutarch's biography. Stem then carefully examines Cicero's treatment of Cato's Stoicism in the *Pro Murena* (Chap. 2), concluding that Cicero sought to undermine Cato's influential *auctoritas* in order to win the court case on behalf of Murena (p. 140). Next Stem scrutinizes Cicero's portrait of Cato's politics in the turbulent and eventful decades of the 60s and 50s BCE through an analysis of Cicero's correspondence and various law court speeches. In chapter 3, Stem argues that Cicero's complex attitude toward Cato acknowledges Cato's influence on the conservative Optimate position, his mixed political success, and, in spite of a number of political failures, Cato's maintenance of his principled position as "most righteous man of his generation" (p. 146-7). Stem argues that the political outcomes of the early 40s made Cicero more sympathetic to Cato's virtuous criticism of the actions of the so-called first Triumvirate (p. 203-4). Finally, in chapter 4, Stem evaluates Cicero's treatment of Cato in his philosophical treatise *De Finibus*. He argues that Cicero was uninterested in undercutting Cato's *auctoritas*, as he had done in the *Pro Murena*, in part because of the nobility with which Cato had faced Caesar and his own suicide (p. 301). Despite his attack on Stoicism, Stem maintains that Cicero does not criticize Cato's moral achievement but rather the philosophy of the Stoics, because it was this that ultimately kept Cato from success in his political ambitions (p 304). This separation of Cato's virtue and his Stoicism is particularly helpful to the present dissertation.
[153] Jones (1970), 189.
[154] Macrobius, *Sat*. 6.2.33: *In Catone Ciceronis - contingebat in eo quod plerisque contra solet, ut maiora omnia re quam fama uiderentur, id quod non saepe euenit, ut expectatio <a> cognitione, aures ab oculis uincerentur* [In the Cato of Cicero- Unlike the majority of men, performance surpassed reputation in him, so that knowledge bettered expectation, which does not happen often, and ears were conquered by what was seen with the eyes].
[155] Jones (1970), 193.
[156] Tac. *Ann*. 4.34.8: it is entirely possible that Corvus was seeking political advancement or an advantageous marriage in his proclamations of Republicanism. Augustus and Tiberius had readily

This is thin evidence to go on, but regardless, Cicero likely made the attempt to control Cato's memory in a positive fashion after his suicide in hopes of influencing others to question the wisdom of a sole ruler.

However, the *Anticato* of Caesar was also circulating at this time, probably along with other competing narratives and estimations of Cato's character that do not survive. Caesar's *Anticato* was labeled as *vituperatio* (censorious) by Cicero, who also tells us that Caesar focused on the *vitia Catonis* (the vices of Cato), without naming what they were.[157] One can perhaps imagine something as critical as the *Philippics* that Cicero would later write against Antony; this is not a stretch of the imagination as the Anti-Cato clearly informed some of the less flattering sections of Plutarch's much later biography.[158]

In books three and four of his *De Finibus*, Cicero and his fellow guests at Cumae analyze the merits of several philosophical schools, including Stoicism. None other than Cato Uticensis presented the case for Stoicism, but his persona in the dialogue leaves much to be desired. Terse and tactless, Cicero's Cato presented a pedantic exposition of some of the main principles of Stoic thought in an unsophisticated manner in Book Three.[159] Yet Cicero's Cato was clearly well versed in Stoic philosophy, taking great pains to explain the Greek terms in Latin and present the ideas in a clear style. Rather than offering any sort of personal testimony about his philosophy, Cato was simply articulating the basic tenets of Stoicism.[160] In Book Four, the protagonist Cicero rejects the philosophy and Cato is left little room to speak. Indeed, Cato defers to Cicero

---

rewarded others with these prizes. Perhaps, however, Cremutius attempted this after one too many conspiracies and committed suicide in 25 CE after being prosecuted by Sejanus.

[157] Cic. *Att.* 12.40.1 and 12.41.4.
[158] Plut. *Cat. Min.* 11, 52, and 54.
[159] Woolf (2001), 9l.
[160] Stem (1999), 244.

when asked to defend his beliefs.[161] Despite being labeled the "model of every virtue," Cato's

philosophy is challenged and Cato himself given no opportunity for a serious defense.[162]

This battle over Cato's memory raged mainly between the elites. However, one extant

source from a non-elite perspective provides an alternative voice. The only mentions of Cato in

the *Bellum Africum* are respectful, which suggests at least a relatively positive view of Cato from

one non-elite perspective.[163] This text too provides the most contemporary account of Cato's

suicide at Utica, describing how he retired to his room, stabbed himself with his sword

unsuccessfully, and then removed the bandages applied to hasten his death.[164] The Uticans,

impressed by his "exceptional integrity, because he had conducted his leadership unlike the

others and because he had fortified Utica with extraordinary siege works and augmented their

towers" built him a tomb.[165] This account is much elaborated upon by later writers, and it is

difficult to know how wide spread it was in the aftermath of the civil war. It seems likely that

the manner in which Cato chose to die was common knowledge, which may have been aided by

this account. Thus, a brief but graphic account of Cato's suicide, Brutus' and Cicero's treatises

on behalf of Cato, and Caesar's against the man were circulating shortly after his death.

---

[161] Cic. *Fin*. 4.62: [Cato] *Rogarem te, inquit, ut diceres pro me tu idem, qui illis orationem dictavisses, vel potius paulum loci mihi, ut iis responderem, dares, nisi et te audire nunc mallem et istis tamen alio tempore responsurus essem, tum scilicet, cum tibi.*

[162] Cic. *Fin.* 4.45: *Quid enim mihi potest esse optatius quam cum Catone, omnium virtutum auctore, de virtutibus disputare?*

[163] Ps. Caes. *B Afr*. 22.1-5, 36.1, 88.5; on the non-elite perspective of the *Bellum Africum* see Cluett (2009) 192-205. The positive portrayal is preceded by an account of how Cato had lost control of the situation in Utica thanks to a band of 300 marauding Roman *equites* (chap. 87). In many ways, the account suggests there was no other alternative for Cato than suicide.

[164] Ps. Caes. *B Afr*. 88.3-4: *Ipse omnibus rebus diligentissime constitutis, liberis suis L. Caesari qui tum ei pro quaestore fuerat commendatis, et sine suspicione, vultu atque sermone quo superiore tempore usus fuerat dum dormitum isset, ferrum intro clam in cubiculum tulit atque ita se traiecit. Qui cum anima nondum exspirata concidisset, [et] impetu facto in cubiculum ex suspicione medicus familiaresque continere atque volnus obligare coepissent, ipse suis manibus vulnus crudelissime divellit atque animo praesenti se interemit.*

[165] Ps. Caes. *B Afr*. 88.5: *…singularem integritatem et quod dissimillimus reliquorum ducum ferat quodque Uticam mirificis operibus munierat turribusque auxerat…*

Indeed, the next source in which Cato appeared was Sallust's *Bellum Catilinae*, where Stoicism is conspicuously absent. Sallust's account of the speeches in the midst of the *Bellum Catilinae* has long provided much fodder for historians to ponder. When considered in their historical context, these speeches, along with Sallust's interjection about both the characters of Caesar and Cato, make much sense. Probably written between 44 and 40, the *Bellum Catilinae* gives equal weight to Sallust's own patron, Caesar, and his patron's worst political enemy, Cato. Both men were dead and their political adherents were continuing to fight for control of the Republic. The outcome of the pending civil strife was as yet uncertain, and once Brutus and Cassius were defeated at Philippi in 42, there were other threats to peace in the form of the feuding triumvirs and Pompey's sons who had yet to be overcome. Perhaps with the uncertain outcome in mind, Sallust chose the middle ground. Needless to say, there was room to write in this way about each man. The manner in which these men would be remembered had not yet been set and Sallust must have been keenly aware of the potential consequences of choosing the losing side. In such an uncertain world, Sallust not only wrote positively of each man, but also began to reshape the memory of each, based on recent events and his own quest for survival.

Sallust's Cato is characterized not as the intransigent optimate opposed to any reduction in the power of the ancient *nobiles* of Rome, but rather as the embodiment of Republican values and defender against *ambitus* (bribery). He additionally stood as a representation of a particular kind of government, that of the Senate with a different vision of the Republic from Caesar's. According to Sallust, "For Cato there was a zeal for moderation, propriety, but most of all, seriousness; he did not combat wealth by means of wealth, nor factions with factionalism, but

with strong excellence, with moderate shame, and with innocent self-restraint…"[166] The portrayal of Cato as an anti-corruption crusader and as champion of traditional Roman values like self-restraint and *virtus* fails to include any specific reference to his Stoic philosophical position. Furthermore, Sallust's Cato was very much involved in political life, and was determined, like the living Cato, to preserve the power of the Senate in the face of the threat of one-man rule. Sallust focused on the values that seemed most appropriate to his particular time, during the civil war that broke out after Caesar's assassination.

In Horace and Virgil, Cato was presented in similar terms, although without reference to his political and philosophical perspectives and not always positively. In these authors, Cato is at times conflated with his ancestor Cato the Censor, and characterized as harsh, great, and virtuous; his death is described as noble (*nobile letum*).[167] The struggle that ensued over his memory apparently continued, with the ultimate victor, Augustus, compelled to enter the arena with his own *Anticato* when he was advanced in age.[168] In addition, Augustus exerted other controls of Cato's memory. Although he included Cato the Elder among his *summi viri* in his *Forum Augustum*, Cato Uticensis was probably omitted.[169] Perhaps due to his references to and intertexts with Republican writers, including Sallust, Velleius preserved Cato in many of the

[166] Sall. *Cat*. 54.8: *Catoni studium modestiae, decoris, sed maxume severitatis erat; non divitiis cum divite neque factione cum factioso, sed cum strenuo virtute, cum modesto pudore, cum innocente abstinentia certabat.*

[167] See Connolly (2012) for the possible conflation of Cato the Censor with Cato Uticensis in the *Disticha Catonis*: She notes that Virgil (*Aen*. 6.841) refers to Cato the Censor (*magne Cato*) in the underworld and later (*Aen*. 8.663-670) refers to Cato Uticensis (*his dantem iura Catonem*) as part of the description of the shield of Aeneas. She sees other references to Cato the Censor that include Horace (*Carm*. 1.12.33-6 *Catonis / nobile letum*) and explores Suetonius' *Aug*. and Sallust's *Cat*. in this context as well.

[168] Suet. *Aug*. 85.1: *Multa varii generis prosa oratione composuit, ex quibus nonnulla in coetu familiarium velut in auditorio recitavit, sicut "Rescripta Bruto de Catone," quae volumina cum iam senior ex magna parte legisset, fatigatus Tiberio tradidit perlegenda…*"

[169] Geiger (2008), 190-1 and Shaya (2013), 89.

same terms as Sallust had half a century before, emphasizing his just nature, moderation, and self-restraint, with little to no mention of his Stoic persuasion.[170]

Thus the picture of Cato through the Republican and early Imperial authors is starkly different from that celebrated by Seneca, Lucan and, probably, Thrasea Paetus, with one notable exception. The only place where Cato's Stoicism was on clear display was in the *De Finibus* of Cicero, and this seems to be the Cato upon which these 1st century CE "outsiders" based their own. Whether this Cato in any way reflected the historical Cato, apart from sharing a philosophical view of life, cannot be known. However, it seems that Seneca in particular drew heavily on the *De Finibus* for his portrait of Cato, and his conception of the man likely influenced that of Lucan and Thrasea Paetus. This would have allowed Seneca largely to dispense with the actions of the historical Cato, which often ran counter to what Seneca advocated.[171] When Cicero and Brutus finally turn to the discussion of Stoicism itself, Cicero characterized Cato as divine, which in turn was echoed by Seneca and Lucan throughout their works.[172]

---

[170] Vell. Pat. 2.35.2: *homo Virtuti simillimus et per omnia ingenio diis quam hominibus propior, qui numquam recte fecit, ut facere videretur, sed quia aliter facere non potuerat, cuique id solum visum est rationem habere, quod haberet iustitiam, omnibus humanis vitiis immunis semper fortunam in sua potestate habuit*; 2.49.4-5: *Nihil relictum a Caesare, quod servandae pacis causa temptari posset, nihil receptum a Pompeianis, cum alter consul iusto esset ferocior, Lentulus vero salva re publica salvus esse non posset, M. autem Cato moriendum ante, quam ullam condicionem civis accipiendam rei publicae contenderet. Vir antiquus et gravis Pompei partes laudaret magis, prudens sequeretur Caesaris, et illa gloriosiora, haec terribiliora duceret.* These virtues were indeed part of Stoic philosophy, but the authors of the late Republic and early Principate did not speak of them in the context of Stoicism.
[171] The historical Cato operated within the framework of the dying Republic where one's *dignitas* was traditionally kept in check by political enmity and what had been relatively equal opportunity for advancement. His fervent support for optimate values and violent opposition to those who threatened these values reveal the fact that Cato was a Republican first, and Stoic a distant second.
[172] Cic. *Fin.* 3.6: *attendes igitur, ut soles, diligenter eamque controversiam diiudicabis, quae mihi fuit cum avunculo tuo, divino ac singulari viro.* Cicero figured in the works of Seneca nearly as much as Cato did and often in the same sections and works. For an overview of Cicero in Seneca's works, see Gambet (1970). Griffin (1976), passim, also discusses Cicero in Seneca but does not address the possible influence of Cicero's *De Finibus* on Seneca. For references to Cicero's noble death, see *De Ira* 2.23; *De Brev. Vit.* 10; *De Cons. Ad Marc.* 20.6; and *Tranq.* 16.1. Seneca's letters reveal that he was familiar with

By drawing on the historical *exempla* of both Cicero and Cato, these men achieved links

with a similarly placed political outsider of the 1ˢᵗ century BCE and a member of the Roman

nobility, ancestor of the emperor, and philosopher with whom they shared a system of belief.

This means of connection was apparently successful with their fellow senators and Nero, to a

degree. They enjoyed influential and successful careers: Seneca reached the consulship in 56

and Thrasea Paetus gained that position later in the same year. Lucan was brought into the

Senate when he was not yet of the necessary age. Nevertheless, both Seneca and Lucan were

embroiled in the Pisonian Conspiracy of 65 CE alongside Gaius Calpurnius Piso, another

member of that famous and important aristocratic *gens*, the Calpurnii Pisones.

The Pisonian Conspiracy of 65 CE

The most complete version of the Pisonian Conspiracy is preserved in Tacitus, whose

penchant for secretive events and conspiracies challenges even the most trusting of readers.[173]

Pagán has noted that the difficulty Roman historians faced in writing about conspiracy was the

uncertainty surrounding the events themselves: secrecy and rumor surrounded conspiracy at

Rome and the historian, often writing decades or centuries after the fact, had to determine

methods to write about the event without much information to go on.[174] As a result, Tacitus'

Cicero's works, with occasional quotations (*Ep*. 58, 97, 100, 102, 108, 111, 114, and118). Thus it is not difficult to conclude that Seneca's Cato drew heavily on Cicero's Cato.

[173] On conspiracy in the Roman historians and the development of a framework for understanding conspiracy theories in Rome, see Pagán (2004) and (2008), respectively. On the sources for Tacitus' account of the Pisonian Conspiracy see Questa (1967), 199 and 207; on Tacitus' sources in general, see Potter (2012). Earlier conspiracies ended with the suicides of Libo Drusus in 16 CE, Gaius Calpurnius Piso in 20 CE, Scaurus in 34 CE, and L. Arruntius in 37 CE; all were members of families with direct descent from Sulla or Pompey.

[174] Pagán (2004), 72-90.

account of the Pisonian Conspiracy can be only somewhat helpful to this inquiry. It can offer a rough outline of the events and Tacitus' contemporary perspective on its actors, but little more.

Tacitus tells us that senators, equestrians, and soldiers, alike, joined forces to assassinate Nero and install Gaius Calpurnius Piso on the imperial throne.[175] He says that Lucan was among the conspirators; his involvement typically characterized as exacting revenge for a slight he received from Nero.[176] He begins his narrative with an introduction of the conspiracy's namesake:

> Born from Calpurnian stock and embracing many, eminent families through his paternal nobility, he was famous among the common people for his virtue or appearances similar to virtues. For he exercised his eloquence for the protection of citizens, largesse toward his friends, and to strangers he also was kind in his speech and his encounters. For he also had the fortune of a handsome appearance and tall stature; but gravity of mores or moderation in pleasure was far from his: he indulged in levity and grandeur and sometimes luxury. And this was approved of by many, who in such sweetness of vices did not wish the height of power restricted or ended.[177]

---

[175] Tac. *Ann*. 15. 48.1: *Ineunt deinde consulatum Silius Nerva et Atticus Vestinus, coepta simul et aucta coniuratione, in quam certatim nomina dederant senatores eques miles, feminae etiam, cum odio Neronis, tum favore in C. Pisonem.* On the identity of Gaius Calpurnius Piso, see *RE* 65; Syme (1956); Champlin (1989); Hofmann-Löbl (1996), 274-283. Champlin argues convincingly that this Piso was a son of Piso the Pontifex and that his family's past accomplishments weighed heavily on him because of his own period of exile under Caligula and unimpressive political career. Hofmann-Löbl is unwilling to commit to this identification, arguing instead that the conflicting evidence (which points not only to Piso the Pontifex, but also to Piso the Augur, Marcus Piso (*RE* 85) or Gnaeus Piso (*RE* 70) makes it impossible to do anything but speculate. Champlin's argument is very attractive for my argument here, but in reality this Piso's exact lineage does not matter. The *Laus Pisonis*, which was written for the conspirator, emphasizes that the Calpurnii Pisones had a long history of successful political and military men. Regardless of who the conspirator's father was, the memory of this lineage would have influenced all descendents (even, arguably, those not from the same branch).

[176] Many scholars have concluded that Lucan participated in the conspiracy as a result of an insult Nero gave him over poetry based on later evidence in Suet. *Vita Luc*. 2, Cass. Dio 62.29, and Vacca (46-47). For an overview of the scholarly positions on the insult (whether it was political or literary), see Fantham (2011), 13-14.

[177] Tac. *Ann*. 15.48.2-3: *is Calpurnio genere ortus ac multas insignesque familias paterna nobilitate complexus, claro apud vulgum rumore erat per virtutem aut species virtutibus similes. namque facundiam tuendis civibus exercebat, largitionem adversum amicos, et ignotis quoque comi sermone et congressu; aderant etiam fortuita, corpus procerum, decora facies; sed procul gravitas morum aut voluptatum persimonia: levitati ac magnificentiae et aliquando luxu indulgebat. idque pluribus probabatur, qui in tanta vitiorum dulcedine summum imperium non restrictum nec praeseverum volunt.*

Tacitus' characterization focuses first on Piso's lineage and connections, still clearly important

aspects of aristocratic identity even in Tacitus' day. He then lists Piso's values, framing the

entire account around the conspirators' chosen replacement for Nero. This seems a justification,

of a sort, for selecting Piso as the successor; his aristocratic standing was similar to Nero's (who

came from two old familes, the Claudii and Ahenobarbi).

After a convoluted and lengthy account of the dithering and indecisiveness of the

conspirators, near betrayal, and then actual betrayal, Tacitus seemed to delight in the carnage of

the conspiracy's aftermath. Piso was the first to commit suicide, Seneca followed, and Lucan

was among the last. The death of Piso was handled in one short sentence and his fitness as leader

of the conspiracy was simultaneously called into question: "He died with the veins of his arms

opened. He left a will, with its disgusting adulations toward Nero, out of love of his wife, whom,

lowborn and commendable only in her physical attractiveness, he had stolen from a friend. The

name of the woman was Satria Galla, that of her earlier husband Domitius Silus: they spread

Piso's disgrace, he by his submission, she by her immodesty."[178] Lucan's suicide was also short;

he died reciting a poem.[179] Seneca's suicide, along with his wife's, is detailed carefully and in a

positive light.[180] Tacitus questioned Seneca's involvement, suggesting he was involved as an

intermediary or that instead he was conveniently scapegoated by Nero, who sought to rid himself

of his long-serving advisor.[181]

---

[178] Tac. *Ann*. 15.59.9-11: *obiit abruptis brachiorum venis. testamentum foedis adversus Neronem adulationibus amori uxoris dedit, quam degenerem et sola corporis forma commendatam amici matrimonio abstulerat. nomen mulieri Satria Galla, priori marito Domitius Silus: hic patientia, illa impudica Pisonis infamiam propagavere.*

[179] Tac. *Ann*. 15.70.

[180] Tac. *Ann*. 15.63-64.

[181] Tac. *Ann*. 15.56.2. On Seneca's involvement, see Griffin (1976) 365 and (1984), 166f.; Rudich (1993), 106ff. doubts that Seneca had a role based on his earlier arguments against tyrannicide. Ker (2003), 306, analyzes how Tacitus characterizes Nero's exploitation of the conspiracy in order to force Seneca to

Whether any of Tacitus' carefully crafted narrative reflected the actual events and deaths of the conspirators remains impossible to know. The most important aspect of the Pisonian Conspiracy, however, lay not in Tacitus' accuracy or the conspiracy's failure but in its alliance between different groups in the Senate and the fact that senators of all types were still engaged in competition for the highest office. Piso clearly had designs on the imperial throne, but Tacitus alluded to yet another plot that might have seen Seneca advanced over Piso.[182] Out of all of this conjecture and uncertainty, what remains is the willingness on the part of the old aristocracy to do anything in order to achieve their own personal advancement, a strategy employed throughout the Republican period, and the desire of senators of municipal and provincial origins to participate. In many ways, this episode demonstrated the maintenance of the types of aristocratic institutions of memory (lineage, competition, moral values) that still shaped identity among senators from old Roman families and compelled senators without recourse to them to create their own. Under Nero, one member of the aristocratic family of the Calpurnii Pisones joined with municipal senators against the regime. Over the course of a few generations, this noble family had members who had gone from reviling *novi homines* to pursuing political power with *novitates* of diverse origins.

Cato and Thrasea Paetus

Significantly, the Pisonian Conspiracy did not ensnare Thrasea Paetus, demonstrating that there were at least a variety of modes of opposition to Nero. However, there is little doubt that Cato served as an exemplum for Paetus as he had for Seneca and Lucan. The refashioning of Cato by Seneca and Lucan perhaps became the inspiration for Thrasea Paetus' own actions as a

suicide. On Seneca's use of exempla and self-conscious effort to turn himself into one, see Mayer (1991) and Habinek (2000), 264-5.
[182] Tac. *Ann*. 15.65.

senator under Nero and for his biography of Cato Uticensis, which unfortunately does not survive.[183] As a result, to observe Paetus' emulation of Cato we are forced to rely on Tacitus' account of Paetus' life written nearly fifty years afterward.

In Plutarch's account, Paetus is explicitly credited as his source in two chapters. The first discusses the odd situation surrounding the marriages of Cato and Marcia. According to Thrasea, who was himself using as a source Munatius, a close friend of Cato's who had written a biography, they were married and then divorced at the request of Cato's friend Hortensius, so that Marcia could give him children.[184] Plutarch's next mention of Thrasea's account occurs when he describes a row between Cato and his friend, Munatius in Cyprus. When Munatius arrived in Cyprus and Cato was otherwise occupied, Munatius flew into a rage that was only assuaged after some time had passed and Marcia had intervened on his behalf.[185] Neither of these instances reveals a particularly Stoic man or someone who might be a good example to follow, unlike the vast majority of portrayals in Seneca. These passages do not reveal Thrasea's perspective on Cato with much clarity.

The scenes to which most modern historians point when making the connection between Cato and Paetus are his final appearances in the *Annales*, despite the different manners of their deaths (Cato stabs himself in the stomach, while Thrasea opened his veins in the manner of

---

[183] Plut. *Cat. Min.* 25 and 37.

[184] Plut. *Cat. Min.* 25.1-2: Ἔτι δ' αὐτοῦ περὶ τὴν στρατείαν ὄντος, ὁ ἀδελφὸς εἰς τὴν Ἀσίαν βαδίζων ἐνόσησε περὶ Θρᾴκην ἐν Αἴνῳ. καὶ γράμματα μὲν εὐθὺς ἧκε πρὸς τὸν Κάτωνα. Εἶτ' ἔγημε θυγατέρα Φιλίππου Μαρκίαν, ἐπειὴ δοκοῦσαν εἶναι γυναῖκα. περὶ ἧς ὁ πλεῖστος λόγος· καθάπερ <γὰρ> ἐν δράματι τῷ βίῳ τοῦτο τὸ μέρος προβληματῶδες γέγονε καὶ ἄπορον. ἐπράχθη δὲ τοῦτον τὸν τρόπον, ὡς ἱστορεῖ Θρασέας, εἰς Μουνάτιον, ἄνδρα Κάτωνος ἑταῖρον καὶ συμβιωτήν, ἀναφέρων τὴν πίστιν.

[185] Plut. *Cat. Min.* 37.1-2: Ὁ μέντοι Μουνάτιος οὐκ ἀπιστίᾳ τοῦ Κάτωνος, ἀλλ' ἐκείνου μὲν ὀλιγωρίᾳ πρὸς αὐτόν, αὐτοῦ δέ τινι ζηλοτυπίᾳ πρὸς τὸν Κανίδιον ἱστορεῖ γενέσθαι τὴν ὀργήν. καὶ γὰρ αὐτὸς σύγγραμμα περὶ τοῦ Κάτωνος ἐξέδωκεν, ᾧ μάλιστα Θρασέας ἐπηκολούθησε. λέγει δ' ὕστερος μὲν εἰς Κύπρον ἀφικέσθαι καὶ λαβεῖν παρημελημένην ξενίαν, ἐλθὼν δ' ἐπὶ θύρας ἀπωσθῆναι, σκευωρουμένου τι τοῦ Κάτωνος οἴκοι σὺν τῷ Κανιδίῳ·

Seneca and Lucan). Tacitus himself made the parallel between Cato and Paetus when he had

Cossutianus, one of Paetus' enemies, say, "just as once of Caesar and Cato, now the state, eager

for examples of disunion, speaks of you, Nero, and Thrasea.[186] After enumerating a long list of

reasons, Cossutianus, with the support of Nero, gained an eloquent ally in Eprius Marcellus for

the prosecution of Thrasea Paetus before the Senate. Tacitus' narrative takes several turns to

examine the downfall of others who opposed Nero before returning to Paetus, who, when the

news of the Senate's vote arrived, was engaged in philosophical debate with a number of

prominent men and women. After sending those present away, Thrasea warned his wife not to

follow the example of her mother Arria, who had committed suicide after her husband's death.

Tacitus reports:

> Then entering into the portico in which he was sought by the
> quaestor, Priscus was nearer to happiness because he had learned
> that Helvidius, his own son-in-law, had only been barred from
> Italy. Once the decree of the senate was heard there, he led
> Helvidius and Demetrius into the bedroom. With the veins of both
> his arms offered, he poured out gore, sprinkling it over the ground,
> and having called the quaestor nearer, he said "Look young man,
> we are pouring a libation to Jove the Liberator; and indeed (may
> the gods prohibit the omen), you are born into a time when it is
> helpful to strengthen your mind with steadfast examples." After
> this, tortured by the slow progression of his painful death, turning
> to Demetrius…)[187]

After this point, Tacitus' narrative is lost to us, leaving many questions about Paetus' last

moments unanswered. Despite their distance in time, it is to these scenes that modern scholars

have turned to examine the link between Cato and Paetus because of the similarities of their

---

[186] Tac. *Ann.* 16.22.2: *ut quondam C. Caesarem' inquit 'et M. Catonem, ita nunc te, Nero, et Thraseam avida discordiarum civitas loquitur.*

[187] Tac. *Ann.* 16.22: *Tum progressus in porticum illic a quaestore reperitur, laetitiae propior, quia Helvidium generum suum Italia tantum arceri cognoverat. accepto dehinc senatus consulto Helvidium et Demetrium in cubiculum inducit; porrectisque utriusque brachii venis, postquam cruorem effudit, humum super spargens, propius vocato quaestore 'libamus' inquit 'Iovi liberatori specta, invenis; et omen quidem dii prohibeant, ceterum in ea tempora natus es quibus firmare animum expediat constantibus exemplis.' post lentitudine exitus gravis cruciatus adferente, obversis in Demetrium…*

deaths, their philosophical positions, and their refusal to submit to tyrannical powers.[188]

However, there was probably more to Thrasea Paetus' emulation of Cato than simply having

Stoicism in common, particularly because Cato was hardly the same kind of Stoic as Paetus.

However, Cato could have served as a legitimating figure for a senator from a newly

enfranchised region serving alongside members of old aristocratic families.

Conclusions

In negotiating the cultural context of the Roman Senate and imperial court as men from

rising provinces and Italian *municipia*, these elites sought out a historical figure, accepted by the

old aristocracy, to emulate. One of the most enduring paradigms was that of Cato Uticensis. As

a member of one of Rome's ancient aristocratic families, with a long history of eminent

politicians, Cato's own principled actions at the end of his life ensured his place in Roman

history. The different interpretations of Seneca and Lucan, and Thrasea Paetus' choice of Cato,

not only as a Stoic but also as a link to the Roman past, make sense in light of the administrative

statuses and recent histories of their places of origin. Northern Italy and Spain shared a number

of similar features, including later dates of municipalization and of the extension of citizenship,

suffering from Roman prejudice, Roman military action into the reign of Augustus and so forth.

These realities on the ground shaped the senators from those places and the old aristocracy's

opinions of them. These are the complex social conditions that need to be considered in any

interpretation of opposition in the Julio-Claudian period.

Being a Roman senator had now begun to mean something different with the

incorporation of municipal and provincial senators. Exempla from Roman history served new

---

[188] For detailed interpretations of Thrasea's appearances in the Annals see Devillers (1999), Galtier (2002) and Ronning (2006).

purposes, in that they allowed men without access to the aristocratic institutions of memory that had long dictated identity to forge links with Romans who were not their ancestors and whose legacies could be molded to advance the interests of these newcomers. During his tenure in the Senate, Cicero had begun this cooption of Roman historical figures, and people like Seneca, Lucan, and Thrasea Paetus continued it. They advanced values that did not rely on ancestral traditions and challenged the primacy of those that did. Furthermore, the changing fabric of Roman political life, where senators no longer constantly acted in service to the state but rather to the emperor, enabled elites to choose other paths, including that of philosophy.[189]

At the same time, members of old aristocratic families maintained their traditional identities in the face of change while simultaneously forming alliances with these "outsiders" to advance their own agendas. The best example during this period is that of Gaius Calpurnius Piso, whose failed conspiracy heralded the end of the Claudian tenure and the coming of an Italian emperor. Another relative of his would come close to achieving the imperial throne, second to a man who also could claim famous ancestors, atria full of *imagines*, and a truly Roman lineage. It is to the crisis of the year of the four emperors that I now turn to conclude.

---

[189] Inwood (1995), 66: "Seneca grew up in an environment where a philosophical life was coming to be taken for granted as a realistic option for young Roman men of wealth and standing. It is not that his was the first generation of committed Roman philosophers working in Latin-for Fabianus himself obviously qualifies for that description (in a way that Cicero and Lucretius, and perhaps even Brutus, do not). Rather, Seneca's generation was the first to grow up with such committed philosophers, working in Latin, available as role models. To choose the philosophical way of life was still a struggle, as Seneca's own life shows-but at least he had Roman role models to guide him."

Chapter Six: Conclusion

"At home the state was quiet, the names of the magistracies were the same; the young had been born after Actium, and even the majority of the elders had been born between the civil wars: how many of those remaining had seen the Republic?"[1]   With these words, Tacitus began his examination of the transition from the reign of Augustus to that of Tiberius near the start of his *Annales*. Who *had* seen the Republic? Very few people indeed. But seeing was not the same as remembering, and, in this section, what Tacitus did not consider was the way in which memory carried traditions, identities, and behavioral guides in aristocratic institutions that spanned the transition from Republic to Principate.

Memory was so vital to Romans that it figured among the most important qualities that were articulated in the famous *Somnium Scipionis*, from the sixth book of Cicero's *De re publica*. Scipio Aemilianus describes the dream he had in which he discussed the philosophy of life with his deceased grandfather (by adoption), Scipio Africanus, who advised Aemilianus on how to live his life. At one point, Africanus tells Aemilianus, "therefore, know that you are a god, if indeed there is a god, who is strong, who is sensible, who remembers, who takes care for the future, who rules, guides, and instructs that body, over which he is given charge."[2] This passage demonstrates what values Cicero, as a *novus homo* trying to fit into the hostile context of the Republican Roman Senate in the mid 1st century BCE, held highest in his attempt to grapple

---

[1] Tac. *Ann*. 1.3.7: *domi res tranquillae, eadem magistratuum vocabula; iuniores post Actiacam victoriam, etiam senes plerique inter bella civium nati: quotus quisque reliquus qui rem publicam vidisset?*

[2] Cic. *Rep*. 6.26: *Deum te igitur scito esse, si quidem est deus, qui viget, qui sentit, qui meminit, qui providet, qui tam regit et moderatur et movet id corpus, cui praepositus est.*

with how best to live one's life. One of the fundamental components for Cicero was the ability to remember, and while the other components seem logical in terms of a philosophical discussion of the soul, the addition of remembering (*meminit*) signals the important role memory played in the circles of the Roman elite in the form of institutions that informed elite identity.

Assuredly, Italian municipal and provincial outsiders, who had little access to these institutions, challenged their legitimacy, sought to change them, and even coopted them when it served their political or social purposes. In the works of Cicero, early challenges to aristocratic values and the importance of the *gens* appeared alongside his attempts to participate in political life, pass his *imago* down to his descendants, and preserve the senatorial prerogatives of ruling the *res publica*. Augustus, despite being from the Italian elite, was in the unique position after his adoption by Julius Caesar to effect change from within the aristocratic circle and did so in order to promote a new class of men like himself. At the same time, Augustus mollified the old aristocracy with political successes and marriage connections to the imperial family under the veneer of the preservation of their traditions, thereby ensuring their peaceful participation in his new system. Still, the traditions of the *gens*, the public declarations of aristocratic identity made by public processions, the values that defined and legitimized the traditional aristocracy, and the institution of the Senate itself all survived the "Roman Revolution" in some form.

The accession of Tiberius placed on the throne a member of an old aristocratic family, whose only claim to be superior to other aristocratic senators was that of adoption. This transfer of power made clear the permanence of the new system, perhaps for the first time, although challenges for the throne itself would continue from within the Claudian *gens* and outside it. The promotion of senators from Italian municipalities and the provinces continued, but still remained a trickle. Senators from the old aristocratic families, along with those Augustan additions,

enjoyed more political freedom in both the workings of the Senate and in the governance of Rome.[3] It was only under Claudius and Nero that senators from the periphery of the Roman center would gain entrance to the Senate in greater numbers and try to effect significant change in its social fabric.

Senators from old aristocratic families had varied reactions to the incorporation of these "outsiders," as their way of life became less and less similar to that of their ancestors. Some, like the son of Lucius Calpurnius Piso Caesoninus, found little to complain of because they enjoyed careers as prestigious and successful as their father's had been despite the presence of more competitors with less distinguished claims. Others, most notably Gnaeus Calpurnius Piso in his confrontation with Germanicus, ran into trouble over the changing values and appropriation of traditional components of aristocratic identity that Augustus started and Tiberius continued. Still others joined with their new colleagues in attempts to bring down the Claudian rulers, whose claim to the throne may never have been convincing enough to people like Gaius Calpurnius Piso. The memory of how successful and powerful the *Calpurnii Pisones* had been since the 3rd century BCE, as preserved in family lore and funeral processions, was now painfully juxtaposed with the success and power of the Claudii, a family that had no better claim to the throne than adoption.

---

[3] Most modern historians approach the accounts of Tiberius' reign that Tacitus and other ancient authors provide with a healthy dose of skepticism. Their negative portrayals do not do justice to Tiberius' early reign, during which he seems to have been competent and positively viewed by the Senate. On Tiberius's relationship to the Senate, see Syme (1958) and (1970); Shotter (1974); Talbert (1984a), passim; Levick (1999); Cowan (2009a), 469 and 476; Cowan (2009b). Tiberius removed the *consilium* entirely, as noted in Chapter 3, retired to Capri in 26 CE, entrusted the grain supply to the Senate in his later years, and showed favor to some aristocrats (including Piso the Pontifex, who served as *praefectus urbi* from 13 CE until his death in 32 CE). Although Tiberius has not appeared often in this study, his reign could be seen as a period when the old aristocracy enjoyed much success (at least until his later years). Tiberius, like Augustus, granted public funerals and consulted the Senate regularly in his early reign.

The impact that these institutions of memory still had on aristocratic families becomes clear in Tacitus' discussion of a conspiracy early in Tiberius' reign. In his discussion of the conspiracy of Marcus Scribonius Libo Drusus in 16 CE, Tacitus tells his readers about one such aristocrat, who was clearly influenced by his ancestral lineage:

> Firmius Catus, a senator from the inner circle of Libo's friendship, impelled the young man, and he pointed out that his great-grandfather was Pompey, his father's sister was Scribonia, who was once wife of Augustus, his home which was full of *imagines*, and he urged him toward luxury and debt, as an ally in his lusts and obligations by which he might be bound up with the most charges as possible.[4]

Clearly the weight of the past could and did impact the actions of these aristocratic senators. Yet the emperor could not rule without them, and this probably explains why, for example, after the Pisonian Conspiracy of 65, Nero served as co-consul with Lucius Calpurnius Piso in 67 CE.

In the period after the conspiracy, tensions between the imperial family and other aristocratic families grew, culminating in Nero's suicide in June of 68 CE. It is telling that the next emperor was not an Italian or a provincial, but a senator from a branch of the ancient and famous aristocratic *gens Sulpicia*, Servius Sulpicius Galba.[5] His main claim to power consisted of his ancient and famous lineage, celebrated with a family tree in his atrium, and claims to divine ancestors.[6] His reign began after Nero's death and lasted until January 15th, 69 CE. A few days earlier, in part due to reports of insurrection on the German frontier, he chose as his

---

[4] Tac. *Ann*. 2.27.2: *Firmius Catus senator, ex intima Libonis amicitia, invenem… impulit…proavom Pompeium, amitam Scriboniam, quae quondam Augusti coniunx fuerat, consobrinos Caesares, plenam imaginibus domum ostentat, hortaturque ad luxum et aes alienum, socius libidinum et necessitatum, quo pluribus indiciis inligaret*.

[5] The evidence for the Year of the Four Emperors (which in reality describes the 18 months between the suicide of Nero and Galba's accession in June 68 CE and the final victory of Vespasian in December of 69 CE) comes from Tacitus' fragmentary *Histories*. On the events of 68/9 and the reliability of Tacitus as a source the best monographs remain Greenhalgh (1975) and Wellesley (1975). Greenhalgh considered Tacitus an eminently reliable source while Wellesley trusted him too little. Most recently, Morgan (2006) offers a middle ground between Greenhalgh and Wellesley on Tacitus and incorporates a good deal more numismatic, epigraphic, and archaeological evidence than either of the two earlier authors.

[6] Suet. *Galb*. 2-3; Cass. Dio, 64.1; Tac. *Hist*. 1.49; Plut. *Galb*. 3.1.

deputy emperor Lucius Calpurnius Piso Frugi Licinianus, whose lineage linked him to two important aristocratic *gentes*, the Calpurnii Pisones and the Licinii Crassi.[7] The adoption did not lend the security to Galba's position that he had hoped for and Galba was decapitated in the Forum Romanum, while Piso was sacrilegiously murdered at the door of the Temple of Vesta.[8]

The next emperor, Otho, encountered nearly immediate rejection from the troops at the northern frontier and ruled for only three months. He too was from an illustrious family, Etruscan in origin, but perhaps not of the caliber of either Galba or Piso.[9] The lineage of his successor, Vitellius, was uncertain to later writers and, as Suetonius tells us, was either ancient and noble or new and obscure.[10] His rule lasted from April to December of 69 CE, when he was executed by Vespasian's soldiers in Rome after his army's defeat at Bedriacum. Vespasian, whose family had risen to senatorial status under the Julio-Claudians, became emperor and established the Flavian dynasty of hereditary rulers, who reigned for the next twenty-seven years.

It was only at this point, the accession to the throne of another Italian elite in the mold of Augustus, that the power of the old aristocracy was broken for good. In a telling anecdote, Suetonius tells us that:

> When certain men tried to trace the origin of the Flavian family to the founders of Reate and a companion of Hercules, whose tomb still stands on the Via Salaria, he laughed at their proposition. Without desire, he sought nothing of ornaments so far that, on the day of his triumph, fatigued by the slowness and tediousness of the procession he did not remain silent [saying that] an old man, punished by his own service, so absurdly desired a triumph, as if it were owed to his ancestors or hoped for by him at any time. He did not even assume the tribunician power or the title of Father of his Country until late.[11]

---

[7] On the adoption, see Tac. *Hist*. 1.14-1.19; 1.88; Suetonius, *Galba* 12. On Lucius Calpurnius Piso Frugi Licinianus, see *RE* 100; Hofmann-Löbl (1996), 302 on the deputy emperor and 289-302 on the issue of adoption between the Licinii Crassi and Calpurnii Pisones more generally.

[8] Tac. *Hist*. 1.41-43.

[9] On his ancestry, see Suet. *Otho* 1-2; on his character and ancestry, see Tac. *Hist*. 1.14; 1.21-22.

[10] Suet. *Vit*. 1-2.

[11] Suet. *Vesp*. 12.2-4: *Quin et conantis quosdam originem Flavii generis ad conditores Reatinos comitemque Herculis, cuius monimentum exstat Salaria via, referre irrisit ultro. Adeoque nihil*

Whether or not this reflected Vespasian's actual attitude, the fact remained that in reality he did not have an atrium full of *imagines* whose exploits dated back to the Republic. He represented those Italian elites who, given citizenship in the previous century, had finally risen above senators from old aristocratic families. In this context, we have further grounds to question our later sources of the period, which may or may not have understood this dynamic change under way in the early years of the Principate. Despite his earlier discussion of how ancestry could drive Marcus Scribonius Libo Drusus to conspire against Tiberius, Tacitus seems sometimes to miss the impact that memory had on aristocrats. Another passage of Tacitus illustrates this perfectly. In a diatribe against luxury, Tacitus notes:

> Once wealthy members of families of aristocratic or outstanding distinction fell into ruin by a zeal for lavishness. For it was still permitted to cultivate favor with the populace, by the provincials, by dependent princes or be courted by them; so that each, resplendent in his wealth, his house, and his preparation, was considered more illustrious by his name and clients. After the savage executions and the greatness of one's fame meant death, the rest turned to wiser paths. At the same time, new men, repeatedly brought into the senate from the municipalities and the colonies, and even from the provinces, introduced domestic frugality and, although by good fortune or assiduity, very many arrived at a wealthy old age, nevertheless their prior attitude remained. But the principal author of the stricter morals was Vespasian, himself old-fashioned in his culture and way of life. From then on, deference to the princeps and the love of emulating him were more powerful than legal punishments and fear.[12]

The description of these aristocratic families focuses on their wealth, and attributes the success

---

ornamentorum extrinsecus cupide appetivit, ut triumphi die fatigatus tarditate et taedio pompae non reticuerit, merito se plecti, qui triumphum, quasi aut debitum maioribus suis aut speratum umquam sibi, tam inepte senex concupisset. Ac ne tribuniciam quidem potestatem et patris patriae appellationem nisi sero recepit.

[12] Tac. *Ann.* 3.55.2-5: *dites olim familiae nobilium aut claritudine insignes studio magnificentiae prolabebantur. nam etiam tum plebem socios regna colere et coli licitum; ut quisque opibus domo paratu speciosus per nomen et clientelas inlustrior habebatur. postquam caedibus saevitum et magnitudo famae exitio erat, ceteri ad sapientiora convertere. simul novi homines e municipiis et coloniis atque etiam provinciis in senatum crebro adsumpti domesticam parsimoniam intulerunt, et quamquam fortuna vel industria plerique pecuniosam ad senectam pervenirent, mansit tamen prior animus. sed praecipuus adstricti moris auctor Vespasianus fuit, antiquo ipse cultu victuque. obsequium inde in principem et aemulandi amor validior quam poena ex legibus et metus.*

of the new entrants in the Senate to their superior morals unadulterated by luxury. However, this is a familiar trope of the virtuous rustic and the depraved urbanite that pervaded much of Latin literature. It is hard not to suspect that Tacitus is overlaying this literary device onto a far more complicated picture. This raises the questions of whether his own provincial origins or the cosmopolitan composition of the Senate influenced his understanding of these tensions in the Julio-Claudian period.

With the adlections and admission to the Senate of men from Italian *municipia*, and former and current provinces, old aristocratic senators felt pressure from new ideas about what it meant to be Roman while simultaneously confronting emperors cut from their own cloth. These newly incorporated groups were caught between their own conceptions of being Roman, in part due to the grant of citizenship or the municipalization of their towns so that they looked administratively like Rome.   However, when they arrived in the Senate, they were thwarted by different conceptions of aristocratic Romanness, in part because the institutions of memory that formed these identities were inaccessible to them. Prejudices about their places of origin held by Romans and preserved in Roman histories also called into question the possibility of social acceptance for men from outside the traditional circles of Roman power. In this period, through civil wars, discovered conspiracies, forced suicide, increases in senatorial membership, adlections, and fatal competition, members of old aristocratic families slowly relinquished their majority. During the Flavian period and into the second century CE, the number of senators who hailed from Italian and provincial origins far outstripped those of aristocratic descent.[13]

---

[13] Caballos Rufino (1990) and (1999), 136-7, traces the increase in Spanish senators beginning in the Flavian period- under Claudius and Nero, Caballos Rufino counts 15 and 25, respectively. Under Vespasian that number jumps to 45, under Domitian it rises to 55. Under Trajan, Caballos Rufino counts nearly 70 senators from Spain. The chart that Caballos Rufino produces may include the same senators serving under different emperors, but nowhere does he make that clear. For Gallic senators, see Burnand (1982), 387-437, who identifies 23 senators from Gallia Narbonensis in the 1st century CE and 16 in the

As a result, many of the institutions of memory that had defined the aristocracy began to be taken up by its new members, albeit often in different forms. The aristocratic *gentes*, long dominant in Roman political life, faded and were replaced by new *gentes* sporting ethnically influenced *tria nomina*.[14] The first generation of these new Roman senators yielded to the next and, as Claudius had foreseen, *imagines* began to accumulate in the atria of senatorial households whose fortunes had risen under the Julio-Claudians.[15] *Triumphalia ornamenta* continued to be awarded until Hadrian's reign, although they were clearly not the same as the triumphs of the Republic.[16]

By this point in the Imperial period, however, Rome had crowned its first emperor from outside of Italy and instituted a policy of succession that depended not on family ties, but on adoption of the most qualified. Emperors and senators boasted names that reflected their diverse origins, from around the imperial world. Recall that in his eighth Satire, Juvenal snarkily asked what the point of a pedigree was and why anyone would decorate their atrium with "old wax portraits" when what really mattered was personal virtue.[17] Tellingly, toward the end of the piece he offered a number of examples of Roman who embodied better values than those

---

2nd century; three senators from Tres Galliae in the 1st cent. CE as compared to 8 in the 2nd cent. CE and 5 in the 3rd cent CE. On northern Italy, see Syme (1991), 635-646 and Alföldy (1999). See also Chastagnol, André (1982), 167-194.

[14] On senators with ethnic *tria nomina*, see Alföldy (1982), (1985), and (1999); Caballos Rufino (1990) and (1999); González and Crawford (1986). On the *gens*, see Smith (2006), 64: "It is also striking how little the gens mattered to later historians and antiquarians. Tacitus hardly mentions the *gens* and Macrobius and the Servian commentators have little to say about it as well. Even the Digest is silent, despite the early legal definitions. Gaius' statement that the *gens* seems to have fallen into obscurity seems to be borne out by this evidence and is of course the case that the age-old perogatives of the early patricians fade in the face of the new co-options under Julius Caesar and Augustus (the first since the sixth century BCE)." Smith's observation is astute, but I think too early. It seems that the true demise of the aristocratic *gens* began in the Flavian period.

[15] The Lyon Tablet, *CIL* 13.1668.2.25: *Tot ecce insignes iuvenes, quot intueor, non magis sunt paenitendi senatores, quam paenitet Persicum, nobilissimum virum, amicum meum, inter imagines maiorum suorum Allobrogici nomen legere*. On *imagines* in the high Roman empire, see Flower (1996), 256-269.

[16] Beard (2007), 291.

[17] Juv.8.19-20: *tota licet ueteres exornent undique cerae / atria, nobilitas sola est atque unica uirtus*; see also my discussion of this passage in Chapter 2.

celebrated by the traditional aristocracy. He asked, "If free votes were granted to the people, who is there so depraved as to doubt that they would prefer Seneca to Nero?"[18] After disparaging Nero, Juvenal turns to the crimes committed by the noblemen, Catiline and Cethegus, whose treasonous acts were defeated by Cicero. Juvenal celebrated Cicero's role in dealing with the conspiracy, describing Cicero as "a new man, of Arpinum, non-noble and just arrived at Rome as a municipal knight" who "posted helmeted soldiers everywhere among the terrified citizens and took care for every hill."[19] Interestingly, Juvenal even elevated Cicero over Augustus: "Thus, within the walls, the toga conveyed to him [Cicero] a name and title as great as Octavian acquired by force at Leucas and on the plains of Thessaly with his sword wetted by continual slaughter; but Rome was free when she called Cicero her parent and father of his country."[20] Indeed, Cicero, Augustus, and Seneca had fought, for different reasons perhaps, to change what it meant to be a Roman aristocrat in order to better achieve political and social success themselves.

Although this study examines only a handful of individuals belonging to each group, its main purpose is to complicate our understanding of the social and political fabric of the Roman Senate during the Julio-Claudian period, when that institution had long been considered marginalized, ineffective, and somewhat irrelevant. By attempting to address what happened when new groups of formerly disenfranchised elites entered the Senate alongside members of old aristocratic families, the Senate becomes a dynamic center for the negotiation of Roman

---

[18] Juv. 8.211-212: *libera si dentur populo suffragia, quis tam / perditus ut dubitet Senecam praeferre Neroni?*

[19] Juv. *Sat.* 8.237-239: *hic nouus Arpinas, ignobilis et modo Romae / municipalis eques, galeatum ponit ubique / praesidium attonitis et in omni monte laborat.*

[20] Juv. *Sat.* 8.240-244: *tantum igitur muros intra toga contulit illi / nominis ac tituli, quantum vi Leucade, quantum / Thessaliae campis Octauius abstulit udo / caedibus adsiduis gladio; sed Roma parentem, / Roma patrem patriae Ciceronem libera dixit.*

memory, identity, and history during a period when its membership was radically changing.

Bibliography

Afzelius, A. "Zur Definition der römischen Nobilität vor der Zeit Ciceros." *Classica et mediaevalia : revue danoise de philologie et d'histoire*. Copenhagen : Museum Tusculanum Pr 7 (1945): 150ff.

Afzelius, A. "Zur Definition der römischen Nobilität in der Zeit Ciceros." Classica et mediaevalia : revue danoise de philologie et d'histoire. Copenhagen : Museum Tusculanum Pr 7 (1983): 40ff.

Alcock, Susan E. 2002. *Archaeologies of the Greek past: landscape, monuments, and memories*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Alföldy, Géza. "Senatoren aus Norditalien. Regiones IX, X und XI." In *Epigrafia e ordine senatorio, Atti del Colloquio Internazionale AIGL, Roma 14–20 maggio* 1981, edited by AAVV, vol. II, 309–68. *Roma: di Storia e Letteratura*, 1982.

Alföldy, Géza. 1977. *Konsulat und Senatorenstand unter den Antoninen: prosopograph. Unters. zur senator. Führungsschicht*. Bonn: Habelt.

Alföldy, Géza. 1999. *Städte, Eliten und Gesellschaft in der Gallia Cisalpina: Epigraphisch-historische Untersuchungen*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner.

Alföldy Géza. "Epigraphica Hispanica VIII. Eine kaiserliche Widmung in der Stadt Tucci." *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, 59 (1985): 189-199.

Allen, Walter and Phillip H. Delacy. "The Patrons of Philodemus." *Classical Philology*, 34, No. 1 (Jan., 1939): 59-65.

Allen de Ford, Miriam. "Latin Literature as Related to Roman Birth." *The Classical Journal*, 7, No. 4 (Jan., 1912): 147-157.

Alston, Richard. "History and Memory in the Construction of Identity in Early Second-Century Rome." *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome. Supplementary Volumes, Vol. 7, Role Models in the Roman World: Identity and Assimilation*, (2008): 147-159.

Anderson, James C. 1984. *The historical topography of the imperial fora*. Bruxelles: Latomus.

Anguissola, Anna. "Remembering with Greek Masterpieces: observations on Memory and Roman Copies." In *Memoria romana: memory in Rome and Rome in memory*, edited by Karl Galinsky, 117-135. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2014.

Arena, Valentina. 2012. *Libertas and the practice of politics in the late Roman Republic*. Cambridge [England]: Cambridge University Press.

Arkenberg, Jerome S. "Licinii Murenae, Terentii Varrones, and Varrones Murenae: I. A Prosopographical Study of Three Roman Families." *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte*, Bd. 42, H. 3 (3rd Qtr., 1993a): 326-351.

Arkenberg, Jerome S. "Licinii Murenae Terentii Varrones, and Varrones Murenae: II. The Enigma of Varro Murena." *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte*, Bd. 42, H. 4 (4th Qtr., 1993b): 471-491.

Armstrong, David. "The Addressees of the Ars poetica: Herculaneum, the Pisones and Epicurean Protreptic." *Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici*, No. 31, Mega nepios: Il destinatario nell'epos didascalico (1993): 185-230.

Armstrong, David. 2004. *Vergil, Philodemus, and the Augustans*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

Arno, C. Inga R. "How Romans Became "Roman": Creating Identity in an Expanding World." PhD diss., University of Michigan, 2012. ProQuest (Order No. 3519516).

Asmis, Elizabeth. "Philodemus's Poetic Theory and "On the Good King According to Homer." *Classical Antiquity*, Vol. 10, No. 1 (Apr., 1991): 1-45.

Assmann, J., & Czaplicka, J.. (1995). "Collective Memory and Cultural Identity." *New German Critique*, (65): 125–133.

Assmann, Jan. 1997. *Moses the Egyptian the memory of Egypt in western monotheism*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.

Assmann, Jan. 2011. *Cultural memory and early civilization: writing, remembrance, and political imagination*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Asso, Paolo. 2011. *Brill's companion to Lucan*. Leiden: Brill.

Badian, E. 1967. *Foreign clientelae, 264-70 B.C*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Baldwin, B. "Themes, Personalities, and Distortions in Tacitus." *Athenaeum* 52 (1974): 70–81.

Baroin, Caroline. "Remembering one's Ancestors, following in their Footsteps, being like them: The Role and Forms of Family Memory in the Building of Identity." In *Children, memory, and family identity in Roman culture*, edited by Véronique Dasen and Thomas Späth, 19-48. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.

Barrandon, Nathalie. "Le Sénat, les gouverneurs et les cités pérégrines d'Hispanie citérieure aux

deux derniers siècles de la République." *In Les gouverneurs et les provinciaux sous la République e romaine*. Edited by Nathalie Barrandon and Francois Kirbihler, 101-130. Rennes: Presses universitaires de Rennes, 2011.

Bartoli, Alfonso. 1963. *Curia Senatus: lo scavo e il restauro*. [Roma]: Istituto di Studi Romani.

Bartman, Elizabeth. "Ethnicity in Roman Portraiture." In *Cultural identity in the ancient Mediterranean*, edited by Erich S. Gruen, 222-254. Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute, 2011.

Bartsch, Shadi. 1997. *Ideology in cold blood: a reading of Lucan's Civil War*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.

Bartsch, Shadi, and Alessandro Schiesaro. 2015. *The Cambridge companion to Seneca*.

Beard, M, John North, and Simon Price. 1998. *Religions of Rome*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Beard, Mary. "Picturing the Roman triumph: putting the Fasti Capitolini in context." *Apollo*, 158.497 (July 2003): 23-28.

Beard, Mary. 2007. *The Roman Triumph*. Cambridge, Mass: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

Becker, Jeffrey A., and Nicola Terrenato. 2012. *Roman republican villas: architecture, context, and ideology*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Beloch, K. J. 1926. *Römische Geschichte bis zum Beginn der Punischen Kriege*. Berlin: DeGruyter.

Beltrán Lloris, Fransisco. "Les colonies latines d'Hispanie (IIᵉ siè av. n. È): émigration italique et intègration politique." *In Les gouverneurs et les provinciaux sous la République e romaine*. Edited by Nathalie Barrandon and Francois Kirbihler, 131-144. Rennes: Presses universitaires de Rennes, 2011.

Benario, Herbert W. 1975. *An Introduction to Tacitus*. Athens: University of Georgia Press.

Benelli, Enrico. "The Romanization of Italy through the epigraphic record." In *Italy and the West: Comparative Issues in Romanization*, edited by Simon Keay and Nicola Terrenato: 7-16. Oxford: Oxbow Books, 2001.

Benoist, Stéphane, and Anne Daguet-Gagey. 2007. *Mémoire et histoire: les procédures de condamnation dans l'antiquité romaine*. Metz: Centre de recherche histoire et civilisation.

Benoist, Stéphane, and Anne Daguet-Gagey. 2008. *Un discours en images de la condammation de mémoire*. Metz: Centre régional universitaire lorrain d'histoire, Site de Metz.

Benoist, Stéphane. 2009. *Mémoires partagées, mémoires disputées: écriture et réécriture de l'histoire*. Metz: Centre Régional Universitaire Lorrain d'Histoire, Site de Metz.

de Bernardo Stempel, Patrizia. "Personal names in the western Roman world." *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie*. Volume 61, Issue 1 (2012): 266–278.

Bernecker, Sven. 2010. *Memory: a philosophical study*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bhabha, Homi K. 1994. *The location of culture*. London: Routledge.

Bispham, Edward. 2007. *From Asculum to Actium: the municipalization of Italy from the Social War to Augustus*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bleicken, Jochen. 1975. *Die Verfassung der römischen Republik: Grundlagen und Entwicklung*. Paderborn: F. Schöningh.

Bleicken, Jochen. 1972. Staatliche Ordnung und Freiheit in der römischen Republik. Kallmünz: Opf., M. Lassleben.

Bleicken, J. "Die Nobilität der römischen Republik." *Gymnasium* 88 (1981): 236-253.

Blits, Jan H. 2014. *The heart of Rome: ancient Rome's political culture*. Lanham: Lexington Books.

Bloch, Herbert. "L. Calpurnius Piso Caesoninus in Samothrace and Herculaneum." *American Journal of Archaeology*, Vol. 44, No. 4 (Oct. - Dec., 1940): 485-493.

Bloch, Marc. 1953. *The historian's craft*. New York: Knopf.

Blom, Henriette van der. 2010. *Cicero's role models: the political strategy of a newcomer*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bodel, John. "Punishing Piso." *The American Journal of Philology*, Vol. 120, No. 1, Special Issue: The "Senatus Consultum de Cn. Pisone Patre": Text, Translation, Discussion (Spring, 1999): 43-63.

Bodel, John. "Death on display: looking at Roman funerals." In *The art of ancient spectacle*, edited by Bettina Bergmann and Christine Kondoleon: 259-281. London: Yale University Press, 1999.

Bonnefond-Coudry, Marianne. "Le senat republicain et les conflits de generations." *Mélanges de l'École française de Rome*, 94 (1982): 175-225.
Bonnefond-Coudry, Marianne. "Calendrier des séances et lieux de réunion du Sénat républicain: la contribution de l'épigraphie." In *In Epigrafia e ordine senatorio, Atti del Colloquio Internazionale AIGL, Roma 14–20 maggio* 1981, edited by AAVV, vol. I, 55-77. *Roma: di Storia e Letteratura*, 1982.

Bonnefond- Coudry, Marianne. 1989. *Le Sénat de la République romaine: de la guerre d'Hannibal à Auguste: pratiques délibératives et prise de décision*. [Rome]: Ecole française de Rome.

Booth, Joan. 2007. *Cicero on the attack: invective and subversion in the orations and beyond*. Swansea: The Classical Press of Wales.

Booth, Joan. 2006. *What's in a name?: the significance of proper names in classical Latin literature*. Swansea, Wales: Classical Press of Wales.

Boyce, A. Abaecherli. "The origin of ornamenta triumphalia." *Classical Philology* 37 (1942): 130–41.

Boyle, A. J. (2003). *Flavian Rome: culture, image, text*. Leiden: Brill.

Boyle, A. J., and William J. Dominik. 2003. *Flavian Rome: culture, image, text*. Leiden: Brill.

Bradley, Keith. "On Captives under the Principate." *Phoenix*, Vol. 58, No. 3/4 (Autumn - Winter, 2004): 298-318.

Braund, Sussanna. 1992. *Civil war*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Braund, David, Christopher Gill, and T. P. Wiseman. 2003. *Myth, history and culture in republican Rome: studies in honour of T.P. Wiseman*. Exeter: University of Exeter Press.

Brilliant, Richard. "'Let the trumpets roar!' The Roman triumph." In *The art of ancient spectacle*, edited by Bettina Bergmann and Christine Kondoleon: 221-229. London: Yale University Press, 1999.

Briquel, Dominique. 2008. *La prise de Rome par les Gaulois: lecture mythique d'un événement historique*. Paris: PUPS.

Brodersen, Kai. 1995. *Terra cognita: Studien zur römischen Raumerfassung*. Hildesheim: G. Olms Verlag.

Brodka, Dariusz, Joanna Janik, and Sławomir Sprawski. 2003. *Freedom and its limits in the ancient world: proceedings of a colloquium held at the Jagiellonian University, Kraków, September 2003*. Kraków: Jagiellonian University Press.

Broughton, T. Robert S. 1951. *The magistrates of the Roman Republic*. New York: American Philological Association.

Broughton, T. Robert S. 1968. *The Romanization of Africa proconsularis*. New York: Greenwood Press.

Brunt, P.A. "The Lex Valeria Cornelia." *The Journal of Roman Studies*, Vol. 51, Parts 1 and 2

(1961): 71-83.

Brunt, P. A. 1971. *Italian manpower, 225 B.C.-A.D. 14*. London: Oxford University Press.

Brunt, P.A. "Stoicism and the Principate." *Papers of the British School at Rome*, Vol. 43 (1975): 7-35.

Brunt, P. A. "Lex de Imperio Vespasiani." *The Journal of Roman Studies*, Vol. 67 (1977): 95-116.

Brunt, P. A. "Nobilitas and Novitas." *The Journal of Roman Studies*, Vol. 72 (1982): 1-17.

Brunt, P.A. "The Role of the Senate in the Augustan Regime." *The Classical Quarterly*, New Series, Vol. 34, No. 2 (1984): 423-444.

Brunt, P.A. 1990. *Roman imperial themes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Burckhardt, Leonhard Alexander. 1988. *Politische Strategien der Optimaten in der Späten Römischen Republik*. Stuttgart: F. Steiner Wiesbaden.

Burckhardt, Leonhard Alexander. "The Political Elite of the Roman Republic: Comments on Recent Discussion of the Concepts 'Nobilitas and Homo Novus.'" *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte*, Bd. 39, H. 1 (1990): 77-99.

Burke, Peter. 1997. *Varieties of cultural history*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press.

Burke, Peter. "History as Social Memory" in *The collective memory reader*, edited by Jeffrey Olick, Vered Vinitzky-Seroussi, and Daniel Levy, 188-192. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Burton, G. P. "The Lex Irnitana, ch. 84, the Promise of Vadimonium and the Jurisdiction of Proconsuls." *The Classical Quarterly*, Vol. 46, No. 1 (1996): 217-221.

Butler, Thomas. (1989). *Memory: history, culture, and the mind*. Oxford, UK: B. Blackwell.

Burnand, Yves. "*Senatores Romani ex Provinciis Galliarum*." *In Epigrafia e ordine senatorio, Atti del Colloquio Internazionale AIGL, Roma 14–20 maggio* 1981, edited by AAVV, vol. II, 387-437. *Roma: di Storia e Letteratura*, 1982.

Caballos Rufino, Antonio. 1990. *Los senadores hispanorromanos y la romanización de Hispania: siglos I al III p.C*. Ecija [Spain]: Editorial Gráficas Sol.

Caballos Rufino, Antonio. "Los Caballeros romanos originarios de las provincias de Hispania. Un avance." In *L'Ordre equestre. Histoire d'une aristocratie (IP sicle av. J.-C.-IIIe sicle ap. J.-C.)*, edited by Ségolène Demougin, Hubert Devijver, and Marie-Thérèse Raepsaet-Charlier, 463-51. Rome: École française de Rome, 1999.

Camodeca, Giuseppe. "Ascesa al senato e rapporti con I territori d'origine Italia: Regio I (Campania, esclusa la zona di Capua e Cales), II (Apulia et Calabria), III (Lucania et Bruttii)." In *Epigrafia e ordine senatorio, Atti del Colloquio Internazionale AIGL, Roma 14–20 maggio* 1981, edited by AAVV, vol. II, 101-163. Roma: Edizioni di storia e letteratura, 1982.

Cancik-Lindemaier Hildegard,. "Der Diskurs Religion im Senatsbeschluß über die Bacchanalia von 186 v. Chr. und bei Livius (B.XXXIX)." In *Geschichte - Tradition - Reflexion: Festschrift für Martin Hengel zum 70. Geburtstag*, edited by Hubert Cancik, Martin Hengel, and Hermann Lichtenberger, 77-96. Tübingen: Mohr, 1996.

Canter, H. V. "Roman Remains in Southern France." *The Classical Journal*, Vol. 30, No. 1 (Oct., 1934): 5-18.

Carlsen, Jesper. 2006. *The rise and fall of a Roman noble family: the Domitii Ahenobarbi 196 BC-AD 68*. Odense: University Press of Southern Denmark.

Cary, M. "A Roman Arbitration of the Second Century B.C." *The Journal of Roman Studies*, Vol. 16 (1926): 194-200.

Cassola, F. "Lo scontro fra patrizi e plebe e la formazione della "nobilitas." In *Storia di Roma*, edited by Momigliano, Arnaldo, Aldo Schiavone, and Carmine Ampolo, 451-81. Torino: Giulio Einaudi, 1988.

Castillo, C. (1982) "*Los Senadores Beticos Relaciones Familiare y Sociales*." In *Epigrafia e ordine senatorio, Atti del Colloquio Internazionale AIGL, Roma 14–20 maggio* 1981, edited by AAVV, vol. II, 465-519. Roma: Edizioni di storia e letteratura, 1982.

Champlin, Edward. 2003. *Nero*. Cambridge, MA.

Chastagnol André. "Latus clavus et Adlectio. L'accès des hommes nouveaux au sénat romain sous le haut empire." *Revue historique de droit français et étranger*, LIII (1975): 375-394.

Chilver, Guy Edward Farquhar. 1941. *Cisalpine Gaul; social and economic history from 49 B.C. to the death of Trajan*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Christ, Karl. "Zur römischen Okkupation der Zentralalpen und des nördlichen Alpenvorlandes." *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte*, Bd. 6, H. 4 (Oct., 1957): 416-428.

Clarke, M. L. 1981. *The noblest Roman: Marcus Brutus and his reputation*. London: Thames and Hudson.

Classen, Joachim. (1986) "Virtutes Romanorum nach dem Zeugnis der Münzen republikanischer Zeit." *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Römische Abteilung* 93: 257-79.

Classen, Joachim. "Virtutes Imperatoriae." *Arctos*. Acta Philologica Fennica; Jan 1, 1991, 19-

39.

Climo, Jacob, and Maria G. Cattell. 2002. *Social memory and history: anthropological perspectives*. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.

Coarelli, Filippo. "La Porta Trionfale e la Via dei Trionfi." *Dialoghi di Archeologia: rivista quadrimestrale diretta da Rannuccio Bianchi Baninelli. Sommario dell'anno* 2 (1968): 55–103.

Connolly, Serena. "Disticha Catonis Uticensis." *Classical Philology*, Vol. 107, No. 2 (April 2012):119-130.

Cooley, Alison. "The Moralizing Message of the 'Senatus Consultum de Cn. Pisone Patre.' *Greece & Rome*, Second Series, Vol. 45, No. 2 (Oct., 1998): 199-212.

Cooley, Allison. 2012. *The Cambridge manual of Latin epigraphy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Connerton, Paul. 1989. *How societies remember*. Cambridge [England]: Cambridge University Press.

Corbeill, Anthony. "Ciceronian invective." In *Brill's companion to Cicero: oratory and rhetoric*, Edited by J. M. May, 97-217. Leiden: Brill, 2002.

Cornell, Timothy J. "The value of the literary tradition concerning archaic Rome." In *Social struggles in archaic Rome: new perspectives on the conflict of the orders*, edited by K. A. Raaflaub, 52-76. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986.

Cornell, Timothy J. 2013. *The fragments of the Roman historians*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Coşkun, Altay. 2008. *Freundschaft und Gefolgschaft in den auswärtigen Beziehungen der Römer: (2. Jahrhundert v.Chr.-1. Jahrhundert n.Chr.)*. Frankfurt am Main: Lang.

Courtney, E. 1980. *A commentary on the satires of Juvenal*. London: Athlone Press.

Cowan, Eleanor. "Tiberius and Augustus in Tiberian Sources." *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte*, Bd. 58, H. 4 (2009): 468-485.

Crawford, Michael H. 1974. *Roman Republican coinage*. London: Cambridge University Press.

Crawford, Michael. H. 1996. *Roman statutes*. London: Institute of Classical Studies, School of Advanced Study, University of London.

Crook, J. A. 1955. *Consilium principis: imperial councils and counsellors from Augustus to Diocletian*. Cambridge: University Press.

Culham, Phyllis. "Archives and Alternatives in Republican Rome." *Classical Philology*, Vol. 84, No. 2 (Apr., 1989): 100-115.

Cunnignham, H. J. "Claudius and the Primores Galliae." *The Classical Quarterly*, Vol. 9, No. 1 (Jan., 1915): 57-60.

Curchin, Leonard A. 1991. *Roman Spain: conquest and assimilation*. New York: Routledge.

Curti, Emmanuele. "Toynbee's Legacy: discussing aspects of the Romanization of Italy." In *Italy and the West: Comparative Issues in Romanization*, edited by Simon Keay and Nicola Terrenato, 17-26. Oxford: Oxbow Books, 2001.

Daly, Lawrence J. "Varro Murena, cos 23 B.C.: ["magistratu motus] est". *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte*, Bd. 27, H. 1 (1st Qtr., 1978): 83-94.

Damon, Cynthia and Sarolta Takács. "Introduction." *The American Journal of Philology*, Vol. 120, No. 1, Special Issue: The "Senatus Consultum de Cn. Pisone Patre": Text, Translation, Discussion (Spring, 1999): 1-12.

Damon, Cynthia. "The Trial of Cn. Piso in Tacitus' Annals and the "Senatus Consultum de Cn. Pisone Patre": New Light on Narrative Technique." *The American Journal of Philology*, Vol. 120, No. 1, Special Issue: The "Senatus Consultum de Cn. Pisone Patre": Text, Translation, Discussion (Spring, 1999): 143-162.

D'Arms, John. H. 1981. *Commerce and social standing in ancient Rome*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.

Degrassi, Attilio. 1954. *Fasti Capitolini*. [Torino]: [G.B. Paravia].

Degrassi, Attilio. 1945-46. "L'edificio dei Fasti Consolari." *RendPontAcc*. 21, 57-104.

Degrassi, Attilo. 1954. *Il confinen ord-orientadlee ll'Italia romana*. *Ricerche storico-topografico*. (Dissertationes Bernenses, i. 6.) Bern: Francke.

DeLacy, Phillip. "Cicero's Invective against Piso." *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*, Vol. 72 (1941), pp. 49-58.

Demougin, Ségolène, Hubert Devijver, and Marie-Thérèse Raepsaet-Charlier, eds. 1999. *L'Ordre equestre. Histoire d'une aristocratie (IP sicle av. J.-C.-IIIe sicle ap. J.-C.)*. Rome: École française de Rome.

Demougin, Ségolène. "Quo descendat in campo petitor. Élections et électeurs à la fin de la république et au début de l'empire." In: L'Urbs : espace urbain et histoire (Ier siècle av. J.-C. - IIIe siècle ap. J.-C.). Actes du colloque international de Rome (8-12 mai 1985) Rome : École Française de Rome, 1987. pp. 305-317. (*Publications de l'École française de Rome*, 98).

Dench, Emma. 2005. *Romulus' asylum: Roman identities from the age of Alexander to the age of Hadrian*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dench, Emma. 1995. *From Barbarians to New Men: Greek, Roman, and Modern Perceptions of Peoples of the Central Apennines*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Des Boscs-Plateaux, Françoise. 2005. *Un parti hispanique à Rome ?: ascension des élites hispaniques et pouvoir politique d'Auguste à Hadrien : 27 av. J.-C. - 138 ap. J.-C*. Madrid: Casa de Velázquez.

DeTreville, Debra Jost. 1988. *Senatus et religio: aspects of the Roman senate's role in the state religion during the Republic*. Ann Arbor MI: University Microfilm International.

Devillers, Olivier. "Néron se réconcilie avec Thrasea Paetus : à propos de Tacite « An. » XV 23, 4." *Acta classica Universitatis Scientiarum Debreceniensis* 37 (2001): 39-51.

Devillers, Olivier. "Le rôle des passages relatifs à Thrasea Paetus dans les « Annales » de Tacite." *Neronia VI* (1999): 296-311.

Dilke, O.A.W. 1985. *Greek and Roman Maps*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press.

Dinter, M. T. 2013. *A companion to the Neronian age*. Chichester, West Sussex, U.K.: Wiley-Blackwell.

Dondin-Payre, Monique. "'Homo nouus:' Un slogan de Caton à César?" *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte*, Bd. 30, H. 1 (1st Qtr., 1981): 22-81.

Dorandi, T. 1982. *Il buon re secondo Omero*. Napoli: Bibliopolis.

Downs, Mary. "Refiguring colonial categories on the Roman frontier in southern Spain." In *Romanization and the city: creations, transformations, and failures : proceedings of a conference held at the American Academy in Rome to celebrate the 50th anniversary of the excavations at Cosa, 14-16 May, 1998*, Edited by Elizabeth Fentress, 197-210. Rhode Island: Portsmouth (Journal of Roman Archaeology, Supplemental 38), 2000.

Drogula, Fred K. "Imperium, Potestas, and the Pomerium in the Roman Republic." *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte*, Bd. 56, H. 4 (2007): 419-452.

Drumann, Wilhelm Karl August, and Paul Groebe. 1964. *Geschichte Roms in seinem Übergange von der republikanischen zur monarchischen Verfassung; oder, Pompeius, Caesar, Cicero und ihre Zeitgenossen nach Geschlechtern und mit genealogischen Tabellen*. Hildesheim: G. Olms.

Drummond, A. "Rome in the fifth century 1: the social and economic framework; 2: the citizen community." In *The Cambridge Ancient History*, edited by F. W. Walbank et al, 113-204. VII 2 Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

Drummond, Andrew. "The Ban on Gentiles Holding the Same Priesthood and Sulla's Augurate." *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte*, Bd. 57, H. 4 (2008): 367-407.

Dugan, John. 2005. *Making a New Man: Ciceronian Self-Fashioning in the Rhetorical Works*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dugan, John. "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 (April 2001): 35-77.

Dyck, Andrew R. 2004. *A commentary on Cicero, De legibus*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Dyck, Andrew R. "Rivals into Partners: Hortensius and Cicero." *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte*, Bd. 57, H. 2 (2008):142-173.

Dyer, R. R. "Rhetoric and Intention in Cicero's Pro Marcello." *The Journal of Roman Studies*, Vol. 80 (1990): 17-30.

Eck, Werner. 1970. *Senatoren von Vespasian bis Hadrian: Prosopographische Untersuchungen mit Einschluss d. Jahres u. Provinzialfasten d. Statthalter*. München: Beck.

Eck, Werner. "Senatorial self-representation: developments in the Augustan period." In *Caesar Augustus: seven aspects*, edited by F. Millar and E. Segal, 129-167. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984.

Eck, Werner and Antonio Caballos Rufino. 1996. *Das Senatus consultum de Cn. Pisone patre*. München: Beck.

Eck, Werner. "Rome and the Outside World: Senatorial Families and the World They Lived In." In *The Roman family in Italy: status, sentiment, space*, edited by Beryl Rawson and Paul Weaver, 73-100. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997.

Eck, Werner. "Kaiserliche Imperatorenakklamation und ornamenta triumphalia." *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, 124(1999), 223–7.

Eck, Werner. "Senatoren und Ritter aus den Sädten italiens nördlich des Po: der Weg der Integration." In *Trans Padum…Usque ad Alpes. Roma tra il Po e le Alpi: dalla romanizzazione alla romanità, Atti del Convegno Venezia 13-15 maggio 2014*, edited by Gino Bandelli and Monika Verzár-Bass, 129-139. Rome: Edizioni Quasar di Severino Tognon, forthcoming.

Eckstein, Arthur Myron. 1987. *Senate and general: individual decision-making and Roman foreign relations, 264-194 B.C*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Edwards, Catharine. "Self-Scrutiny and Self-Transformation in Seneca's Letters." *Greece & Rome*, Second Series, Vol. 44, No. 1 (Apr., 1997): 23-38.

Eilers, C. "C. Sentius Saturninus, Piso Pontifex, and the Titulus Tiburtinus: a reply." *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, 110 (1996): 207-26.

Elliott, Jackie. 2013. *Ennius and the architecture of the Annales*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Elsner, Jás. "The Itinerarium Burdigalense: Politics and Salvation in the Geography of Constantine's Empire." *The Journal of Roman Studies*, Vol. 90 (2000): 181-195.

Epstein, David F. 1987. *Personal Enmity in Roman Politics 218-43 BC*. London: Croom Helm.

Erll, Astrid. 2011. *Memory in culture*. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.

Evenepoel, Willy. "Cicero's « Laelius » and Seneca's letters on friendship." *L'Antiquité classique*, 76 (2007): 177-183.

Everitt, Anthony. 2001. *Cicero: the life and times of Rome's greatest politician*. New York: Random House.

Fantham, Elaine. 2013. *Cicero's Pro L. Murena oratio*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Fantham, Elaine. "A Controversial Life." In *Brill's companion to Lucan,* edited by Paolo Asso, 3-20. Leiden: Brill, 2011.

Farney, Gary D. 2007. *Ethnic identity and aristocratic competition in Republican Rome*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Favro, Diane. "The street triumphant: the urban impact of Roman triumphal parades." In *Streets: critical perspectives on public space*, edited by Zeynep Çelik, Diane Favro, and Richard Ingersoll, 151-164. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994.

Favro, Diane. "Moving events: Curating the Memory of the Roman Triumph." In *Memoria romana: memory in Rome and Rome in memory*, edited by Karl Galinsky, 85-102. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2014.

Fear, A. T. 1996. *Rome and Baetica: urbanization in southern Spain c. 50 BC-AD 150*. Oxford [England]: [New York].

Fehrle, Rudolf. 1983. *Cato uticensis*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

Fentress, James, and Chris Wickham. 1992. *Social memory*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Ferrary, J.L.: "Le idee politiche a Roma nell'età repubblicana" In *Storia delle idee politiche, economiche e sociali*, edited by L. Firpo, vol. I, 723-804, Torino, 1982.

Ferris, Iain. "The Pity of War: Representations of Gauls and Germans in Roman art." In *Cultural identity in the ancient Mediterranean*, edited by Erich S. Gruen, 185-221. Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute, 2011.

Fish, Brian J. *Philodemus, De bono rege secundum Homerum: a critical text with commentary (cols. 21-39)*. PhD Diss. University of Texas, 1999.

Fish, J. Brian., Philodemus. (forthcoming). *Philodemus, De bono rege secundum Homerum: a critical text with commentary*.

Fishwick, Duncan. "Cn. Piso Pater and the Numen Divi Augusti." *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, Bd. 159 (2007): 297-300.

Fitch, John G. 2008. *Seneca*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Flower, Harriet I. "Rethinking 'Damnatio Memoriae': The Case of Cn. Calpurnius Piso Pater in AD 20." *Classical Antiquity*, Vol. 17, No. 2 (Oct., 1998): 155-187.

Flower, Harriet I. 1996. *Ancestor Masks and Aristocratic Power in Roman Culture*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Flower, Harriet I. "The Tradition of the Spolia Opima: M. Claudius Marcellus and Augustus." *Classical Antiquity*, Vol. 19, No. 1 (Apr., 2000): 34-64.

Flower, Harriet I. 2004. *The Cambridge Companion to the Roman Republic*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Flower, Harriet. I. 2006. *The art of forgetting: disgrace & oblivion in Roman political culture*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Formigé, Jules. 1949. *Le Trophée des Alpes (La Turbie)*. Fouilles et Monuments Archéologiques en France Métropolitaine (Supplément à "Gallia" II), Paris.

Forsythe, Gary. "The Tribal Membership of the Calpurnii Pisones." *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, Bd. 83 (1990): 293-298.

Forsythe, Gary. 1994. *The historian, L. Calpurnius Piso Frugi, and the Roman annalistic tradition*. Lanham, Md.: University Press of America.

Foxhall, Lin and John Salmon. 1998. *When men were men: masculinity, power and identity in classical antiquity*. London: Routledge.

Francisci, Pietro de. 1941. *Genesi e struttura del principato Augusteo*. Atti Della Reale Accademia D'Italia. Memorie Della Classe Di Scienze Morali, Storiche E Filologiche. Roma: Reale Accademia d'Italia.

Frazel, Thomas D. "The Composition and Circulation of Cicero's 'In Verrem.'" *The Classical Quarterly*, 2, Vol. 54, No. 1 (May, 2004): 128-142.

Frei-Stolba, Regula. 1967 *Untersuchungen zu den Wahlen in der römischen Kaiserzeit*. Zürich: Juris-Verlag.

Frézouls, Edmond. 1983. *Crise et redressement dans les provinces européennes de l'Empire (milieu du IIIe-milieu du IVe siècle ap. J.-C.): actes du colloque de Strasbourg, décembre 1981*. Strasbourg: AECR.

Frier, Bruce W. 1999. *Libri annales pontificum maximorum: the origins of the annalistic tradition*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Frischer, Bernard. 1991. *Shifting paradigms: new approaches to Horace's Ars poetica*. Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press.

Furneaux, Henry. 1907. *The Annals of Tacitus*. 2 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gaggiotti, Marcello and Luigi Sensi. "Ascesa al senato e rapporti con i territori d'origine Italia: Regio VI (Umbria)." In *Epigrafia e ordine senatorio, Atti del Colloquio Internazionale AIGL, Roma 14–20 maggio* 1981, edited by AAVV, vol. II, 245-274. Roma: Edizioni di storia e letteratura, 1982.

Gale, Bill. "Counting the numbers: the concept of a quorum in the functioning of the Roman Republican Senate." *Ancient History* 33(2), 2003: 93-106.

Galinsky, Karl. 1996. *Augustan culture: an interpretive introduction*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Galinski, Karl, ed. 2014. *Memoria romana: memory in Rome and Rome in memory*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Gallia, Andrew B. 2012. *Remembering the Roman republic: culture, politics, and history under the Principate*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Galtier, F. (2002) "L'opposition symbolique des figures de Néron et Thrasea Paetus (*Annales* XVI, 21-35)," *Neronia VI*: 312-21.

Gambet, Daniel G. "Cicero in the Works of Seneca Philosophus." *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*, Vol. 101 (1970): 171-183.

Gardner, Andrew, Edward Herring, and Kathryn Lomas (eds.). 2013. *Creating Ethnicities and Identities in the Roman World*. *BICS supplement, 120*. London: Institute of Classical Studies, School of Advanced Study, University of London.

Garnsey, Peter. 1970. *Social status and legal privilege in the Roman Empire*. Oxford: Clarendon.

Gasperini, Lidio and Gianfranco Paci. "Ascesa al senato e rapporti con i territori d'origine Italia: Regio V (Picenum)." In *Epigrafia e ordine senatorio, Atti del Colloquio Internazionale AIGL, Roma 14–20 maggio* 1981, edited by AAVV, vol. II, 201-244. Roma: Edizioni di storia e letteratura, 1982.

Gazzetti, Gianfranco. 2013. *Le province romane*. Roma: Quasar.

Geiger, Joseph. 2008. *The first hall of fame: a study of the statues in the Forum Augustum*. Leiden: Brill.

Gelzer, Matthias. 1969. *The Roman nobility*. Oxford: Blackwell.

George, David B. 1991 "Lucan's Cato and Stoic Attitudes to the Republic." *Classical Antiquity*, Vol. 10, No. 2: 237-258.

George, Michele. 2005. *The Roman family in the empire: Rome, Italy, and beyond*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gigante, Marcello. 1995. *Philodemus in Italy: the books from Herculaneum*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Ginsburg, J. "Speech and Allusion in Tacitus, Annals 3.49–51 and 14.48–49." *American Journal of Philology*, 107 (1986): 525–41.

Goar, R. Jefferson. 1987. *The legend of Cato Uticensis from the first century B.C. to the fifth century A.D.: with an appendix on Dante and Cato*. Bruxelles: Latomus revue d'études latines.

Golden, Gregory K. 2013. *Crisis management during the Roman Republic: the role of political institutions in emergencies*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univesity Press.

González, Julián. "Tacitus, Germanicus, Piso, and the Tabula Siarensis." *The American Journal of Philology*, Vol. 120, No. 1, Special Issue: The "Senatus Consultum de Cn. Pisone Patre": Text, Translation, Discussion (Spring, 1999): 123-142.

González, Julián and Michael H. Crawford. "The Lex Irnitana: A New Copy of the Flavian Municipal Law." *The Journal of Roman Studies*, Vol. 76 (1986): 147-243.

González, Julián. "The First Oath Pro Salvte Augusti Found in Baetica." *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, Bd. 72 (1988), pp. 113-127.

Gordon, Richard and Joyce Reynolds. "Roman Inscriptions 1995-2000." *The Journal of Roman Studies*, Vol. 93 (2003), pp. 212-294.

Gowing, Alain M. 1992. *The triumviral narratives of Appian and Cassius Dio*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Gowing, Alain M. 2005. *Empire and memory: the representation of the Roman Republic in imperial culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Green, Peter, and Wendell Clausen. 1967. *The sixteen satires*. Baltimore: Penguin Books.

Griffin, Miriam. "Seneca on Cato's Politics: Epistle 14. 12-13." *The Classical Quarterly*, New Series, Vol. 18, No. 2 (Nov., 1968): 373-375.

Griffin, Miriam. "The Lyons Tablet and Tacitean Hindsight." *The Classical Quarterly*, New Series, Vol. 32, No. 2 (1982): 404-418.

Griffin, Miriam. 1984. *Nero: the end of a dynasty*. London: Routledge.

Griffin, Miriam. "Philosophy, Cato, and Roman Suicide: I." *Greece & Rome*, Second Series, Vol. 33, No. 1 (Apr., 1986): 64-77.

Griffin, Miriam. "Philosophy, Cato, and Roman Suicide: II." *Greece & Rome*, Second Series, Vol. 33, No. 2 (Oct., 1986): 192-202.

Griffin, Miriam. "Philosophy for Statesmen: Cicero and Seneca," In *Antikes Denken- Moderne Schule* , edited by H. W. Schmidt and P. Wtilfing, 133-150. Heidelberg: Gymnasium Beiheft 9, 1987.

Griffin, Miriam. "Claudius in Tacitus." *The Classical Quarterly*, New Series, Vol. 40, No. 2 (1990): 482-501.

Griffin, Miriam. "Tacitus as a Historian." In *The Cambridge companion to Tacitus*, edited by A. J. Woodman, 168-183. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

Gruen, Erich. "Pompey and the Pisones." *California Studies in Classical Antiquity*, Vol. 1 (1968): 155-170.

Gruen, Erich. "Notes on the 'First Catilinarian Conspiracy." *Classical Philology* 64 (1969): 23.

Gruen, Erich. 1992. *Culture and National Identity in Republican Rome*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Gruen, Erich. 1995. *The last generation of the Roman Republic*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Gruen, Erich. 2011. *Cultural identity in the ancient Mediterranean*. Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute.

Hackl, Urula. 1982. *Senat und Magistratur in Rom von der Mitte des 2. Jahrhunderts v. Chr. bis zur Diktatur Sullas*. Kallmünz: M. Lassleben

Haeussler, Ralph. 2013. *Becoming Roman?: diverging identities and experiences in ancient northwest Italy*. Walnut Creek, California: Left Coast Press.

Haley, Evan. "Suetonius 'Claudius' 24.1 and the Sons of Freedmen." *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte*, Bd. 35, H. 1 (1st Qtr., 1986): 115-121.

Haley, Evan. "Rural Settlement in the "Conventus Astigitanus" (Baetica) under the Flavians." *Phoenix*, Vol. 50, No. 3/4 (Autumn - Winter, 1996): 283-303.

Haley, Evan. 2003. *Baetica felix: people and prosperity in southern Spain from Caesar to Septimius Severus*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Halfmann, Hermann. 1979. *Die Senatoren aus dem östlichen Teil des Imperium Romanum bis zum Ende des 2. Jahrhunderts n. Chr.*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht.

Hanchey, Dan. "Cicero, Exchange, and the Epicureans." *Phoenix*, Vol. 67, No. 1/2 (Spring-Summer 2013): 119-134.

Harris, William. 1971. *Rome in Etruria and Umbria*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Harris, William. "The Era of Patavium." *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, Bd. 27 (1977): 283-293.

Haverfield, F. and George MacDonald. 1912. *The Romanization of Roman Britain*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Hawthorn, J. R. "The Senate after Sulla." *Greece & Rome*, Second Series, Vol. 9, No. 1 (Mar., 1962): 53-60.

Hedrick, Charles W. (2000). *History and silence: purge and rehabilitation of memory in late antiquity*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Hekster, O. "Descendants of Gods: Legendary Geneaologies in the Roman Empire." In *The Impact of Imperial Rome on Religions, Ritual and Religious Life in the Roman Empire. Proceedings of the Fifth Workshop of the International Network Impact of Empire (Roman Empire, 200 B.C. – A.D. 476)*, edited by L. de Blois, P. Funke & J. Hahn, 24-35. Leiden/ Boston: Brill. 2009.

Hekster, O. 2015. *Emperors and ancestors: Roman rulers and the constraints of tradition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Heldmann, K. "Libertas raseae servitium aliorum rupit. Uberlegungen zur Geschichtsauassung im Spätwerk des Tacitus." *Gymnasium* 98 (1991): 207–31.

Herring, Edward. 2000. *The Emergence of state identities in Italy in the first millennium BC*. London: Accordia Research Institute, University of London.

Herrmann, Peter. 1968. *Der romische Kaisereid: untersuchungen zu seiner Herkunft und Entwicklung*. Gottingen: Vandenhoeck u. Ruprecht.

Hickson, F. V. "Augustus Triumphator: manipulation of the triumphal theme in the political program of Augustus." *Latomus*, 50 (1991): 124–38.

Hill, H. "Sulla's New Senators in 81 B. C." *The Classical Quarterly*, Vol. 26, No. 3/4 (Jul. - Oct., 1932): 170-177.

Hiller, H. 2002. *Römisches Padua: Ausstellungskatalog*. Rubano: Grafiche Turano.

Hirstein, William. 2009. *Confabulation: views from neuroscience, psychiatry, psychology, and philosophy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hobsbawm, E. J. (1992). *The Invention of tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hölkeskamp, Karl-Joachim. 1987. *Die Entstehung der Nobilität: Studien zur sozialen und politischen Geschichte der Römischen Republik im 4. Jhdt. v. Chr*. Stuttgart: F. Steiner Verlag Wiesbaden.

Hölkeskamp, Karl-Joachim, and Henry Heitmann-Gordon. 2010. *Reconstructing the Roman republic: an ancient political culture and modern research*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Holliday, Peter J. 2002. *The Origins of Roman Historical Commemoration*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hölscher, Toni. 'Die Anfänge römischer Repräsentationskunst,' *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Römische Abteilung* 85 (1978): 315-75.

Hooff, Anton J. L. van. 1990. *From autothanasia to suicide: self-killing in classical antiquity*. London: Routledge.

Hope, Valerie. M. and Janet Hukinson, eds. 2011. *Memory and mourning: studies on Roman death*. Oxford, UK: Oxbow Books.

Hopkins, Keith. 1983. *Death and renewal*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hopkins, Keith. "From Violence to Blessing: Symbols and Rituals in Ancient Rome." In *City states in classical antiquity and medieval Italy: Athens and Rome, Florence and Venice*. edited by Anthony Mohlo, Kurt Raaflaub, Julia Emlen, 479-498. Stuttgart: F. Steiner, 1991.

Hoyos, B.D. "Pliny the Elder's Titled Baetican Towns: Obscurities, Errors and Origins."

Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte, Bd. 28, H. 4 (4th Qtr., 1979: 439-471.

Hughes, Jessica. "Memory and the Roman Viewer: Looking at the Arch of Constantine." In *Memoria romana: memory in Rome and Rome in memory*, edited by Karl Galinsky, 103-116. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2014.

Hughes, Joseph J.   "Piso's Eyebrows." *Mnemosyne*, Fourth Series, Vol. 45, Fasc. 2 (1992): 234-237.

Inwood, Brad. 2003. *The Cambridge companion to the Stoics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Inwood, Brad. "Seneca in His Philosophical Milieu." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, Vol. 97, Greece in Rome: Influence, Integration, Resistance (1995): 63-76.

Isaac, Benjamin. "Attitudes toward Provincial Intellectuals in the Roman Empire." In *Cultural identity in the ancient Mediterranean*, edited by Erich S. Gruen, 491-518. Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute, 2011.

Isayev, E. "Italian perspectives in the period of Gracchan land reforms and the Social War." In *Creating Ethnicities and Identities in the Roman World*, edited by A. Gardner, E. Herring, and K. Lomas, 9-32. BICS Supp. 120. London: Institute of Classical Studies, University London, 2013

Habinek, Thomas. "Imago suae vitae: Seneca's Life and Career." In *Brill's companion to Seneca: philosopher and dramatist*, edited by G. Damschen, 3-32. Leiden: Brill, 2013.

Hofmann-Löbl, Iris. 1996. *Die Calpurnii. Politisches Wirken und familiäre Kontinuität*. Frankfurt am Main: Verlag Peter Lang.

Jacobson, Howard. "Notes on Catullus." *Mnemosyne*, Fourth Series, Vol. 55, Fasc. 1 (2002): 92-94.

Jaeger, Mary. 1997. *Livy's written Rome*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Janko, Richard and Philodemus. 2000. *On poems*. Oxford [England]: Oxford University Press.

Jones, A. H. M. "The Elections under Augustus." *Journal of Roman Studies*, 45(1955).

Jones, A. H. M. 1970. *Augustus*. New York: Norton.

Jones, C. P. 1970. *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie Neue Folge*, 113. Bd., H. 2/3, 189ff.

Jonkers, Engbert Jan. 1963. *Social and economic commentary on Cicero's De lege agraria orationes tres*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.

Joyce, James. 1961. *Ulysses*. New York: Random House.

Kapust, Daniel J. 2011. *Republicanism, rhetoric, and Roman political thought: Sallust, Livy, and Tacitus*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Kaster, Robert A. 2006. *Speech on behalf of Publius Sestius*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Keaveney, Arthur. 1987. *Rome and the unification of Italy*. London: Croom Helm.

Keay, S. J. and Nicola Terrenato. 2001. *Italy and the west: comparative issues in Romanization*. Oxford: Oxbow.

Keay, S. J. 1988. *Roman Spain*. London: British Museum.

Kelly, Douglas. "Publishing the Philippics, 44-43 BC." In *Cicero's Philippics: history, rhetoric and ideology*, edited by Tom Stevenson and Marcus Wilson, 22-38. Auckland, N.Z.: Polygraphia, 2008.

Kendall, Seth. "Appian, Allied Ambassadors, and the Rejection of 91: Why the Romans Chose to Fight the Bellum Sociale." In *Processes of integration and identity formation in the Roman Republic*, edited by Saskia T. Roselaar, 105-122. Leiden: Brill, 2012.

Kendall, Seth. *The Struggle for Roman Citizenship: Romans, Allies, and the Wars of 91-77 BCE. Gorgias Studies in Classical and Late Antiquity 2*. Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2013.

Ker, James. "Seneca in Tacitus." In *A companion to Tacitus*, edited by Victoria Emma Pagán, 305-329. Malden, Mass: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012.

Kienast, Dietmar. 1990. *Römische Kaisertabelle: Grundzüge einer römischen Kaiserchronologie*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

Koortbojan, M. 'A painted exemplum at Rome's Temple of Liberty.' *Journal of Roman Studies*, 92 (2002): 33-48.

Köster, Isabel K.. "Feasting Centaurs and Destructive Consuls in Cicero's *In Pisonem*." *Illinois Classical Studies*, No. 39 (2014): 63-79.

Kragelund, P. 'The Emperors, the Licinii Crassi and Pompey.' In *Images of Ancestors*, edited by J.M. Højte, 188-193. Aarhus: Aarhus University Press, 2002.

Kraus, Christina. "The Tiberian hexad." In *The Cambridge companion to Tacitus*, edited by A. J. Woodman, 100-115. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

Krebbs, Christopher B. "Borealism: Caesar, Seneca, Tacitus, and the Roman discourse about the Germanic North." In *Cultural identity in the ancient Mediterranean*, edited by Erich S. Gruen, 202-221. Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute, 2011.

Kubiak, David P. "Piso's Madness (Cic. in Pis. 21 and 47)." *The American Journal of Philology*, Vol. 110, No. 2 (Summer, 1989): 237-245.

Lacey, W.K. "Octavian in the Senate, January 27 B.C." *The Journal of Roman Studies*, Vol. 64 (1974): 176-184.

Laneri, Nicola. 2007. *Performing death: social analyses of funerary traditions in the ancient Near East and Mediterranean*. Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago.

Latham, Jacob Abraham. (Forthcoming). *Performance, Memory, and Processions in Ancient Rome: The Pompa Circensis from the Late Republic to Late Antiquity*. Cambride: Cambridge University Press.

Lavan, Myles. 2013. *Slaves to Rome: paradigms of empire in Roman culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lawrence, Ray and Joanne Berry. 1998. *Cultural Identity in the Roman Empire*. London: Routledge.

Lehmann Gustav Adolf. "Der Beginn der res gestae des Augustus und das politische exemplum des Cn. Pompeius Magnus." *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, Bd. 148 (2004): 151-162.

Levick, Barbara. "Antiquarian or Revolutionary? Claudius Caesar's Conception of His Principate." *The American Journal of Philology*, Vol. 99, No. 1 (Spring, 1978): 79-105.

Levick, Barbara. "A note on the latus clavus." *Athenaeum* 79 (1991): 239-245.

Levick, Barbara. "Imperial Control of the Elections under the Early Principate: Commendatio, Suffragatio, and "Nominatio." *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte*, Bd. 16, H. 2 (Apr., 1967): 207-230.

Liccordari, Antonio. "Ascesca al senato e rapporti con I territori d'origine Italia: Regio I (Latium)." In *Epigrafia e ordine senatorio, Atti del Colloquio Internazionale AIGL, Roma 14–20 maggio 1981*, edited by AAVV, vol. II, 16-57. Roma: Edizioni di storia e letteratura, 1982.

Linderski, Jerzy. "The Libri Reconditi." *HSCP* 89 (1995): 207-34.

Linderski, Jerzy. "*Si vis pacem, para bellum*. Concepts of defensive imperialism." In *The imperialism of Mid-Republican Rome. The proceedings of a conference held at the American Academy in Rome, November 5–6, 1982*. (Rome 1984) 133-164.

Linke, Bernhard, and Michael Stemmler. 2000. *Mos maiorum: Untersuchungen zu den Formen der Identitätsstiftung und Stabilisierung in der Römischen Republik*. Stuttgart: F. Steiner.

Lintott, Andrew W. 1999. *The constitution of the Roman Republic*. Oxford [England]: Clarendon Press.

Lintott, Andrew W. 1993. *Imperium Romanum: politics and administration*. London: Routledge.

Liu, Jinyu. "The Era of Patavium Again." *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, Bd. 162 (2007): 281-289.

Lo Cascio, E. (1994). "The Size of the Roman population: Beloch and the meaning of the Augustan Census Figures." *Journal of Roman Studies,* 84: 23-40.

Lomas, Kathryn. 2003. *Bread and circuses: euergetism and municipal patronage in Roman Italy*. London: Routledge.

Lomas, Kathryn. "Elite Social Networks in Republican Italy." In *Processes of integration and identity formation in the Roman Republic*, edited by Saskia T. Roselaar, 197-214. Leiden: Brill, 2012.

Lott, J. Bert. 2012. *Death and dynasty in early imperial Rome: key sources, with text, translation, and commentary*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lowe, Benedict. 2009. *Roman Iberia: economy, society and culture*. London: Duckworth.

Luke, Trevor S. 2014. *Ushering in a new Republic: theologies of arrival at Rome in the first century BCE*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.

MacDowell, D. M.. "Piso's Face." *The Classical Review*, New Series, Vol. 14, No. 1 (Mar., 1964): 9-10.

MacIntyre, Alasdair C. 1984. *After virtue: a study in moral theory*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.

MacMullen, Ramsay. 1966. *Enemies of the Roman order: treason, unrest, and alienation in the Empire*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.

MacMullen, Ramsay. 2000. *Romanization in the time of Augustus*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Mannering, Jonathan. "Seneca's Philosophical Writings: Naturales Quaestiones, Dialogi, Epistulae Morales." In *A Companion to the Neronian Age*, edited by Emma Buckley and Martin T. Dinter, 188-203. Blackwell, 2013.

Marshall, Bruce A. "The Lex Calpurnia of 149 BC." *Antichthon* 2013 47: 39-60.

Marshall, Bruce. "The Vote of a Bodyguard for the Consuls of 65." *Classical Philology*, Vol.

72, No. 4 (Oct., 1977): 318-320.

Martin, J. 1965. *Die Popularen in der Geschichte der spaten Republik*. Diss. Freiburg.

Martin, R. 1981. *Tacitus*. London: B.T. Batsford.

Mason, George Graham. "Senacula and meeting places of the Roman Senate." *Classical Journal*. 1987 LXXXIII: 39-50.

Mattingly, David J. 1997. *Dialogues in Roman imperialism: power, discourse, and discrepant experience in the Roman Empire*. Portsmouth, R.I.: JRA.

Mattingly, David J. "Being Roman: expressing identity in a provincial setting." *Journal of Roman Archaeology*, 17 (2004): 5-25.

Mattingly, David J. 2013. *Imperialism, Power, and Identity: Experiencing the Roman Empire*. Princeton University Press; Princeton.

Mayer, Roland G. "Persona Problems. The Literary Persona in Antiquity Revisited." *Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici*, No. 50 (2003): 55-80.

McAlindon, D. "Claudius and the Senators." *The American Journal of Philology*, Vol. 78, No. 3 (1957): 279-286.

McCrum, M. and A.G. Woodhead. 1961. *Select documents of the principates of the Flavian emperors: including the year of revolution, A.D. 68-96*. Cambridge [Eng.]: Cambridge University Press.

McCulloch, Harold Y. "The Ill-Omened Murder of Piso (Tac. Hist. 1, 43)." *Hermes*, 110. Bd., H. 3 (1982): 380-384.

McDermott, William C. "Varro Murena." *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*, Vol. 72 (1941): 255-265.

McDonnell, M. Anthony. 2006. *Roman manliness: virtus and the Roman Republic*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Meadows, Andrew and Jonathan Williams. "Moneta and the Monuments: Coinage and Politics in Republican Rome." *The Journal of Roman Studies*, Vol. 91 (2001): 27-49.

Meban, David. "Virgil's Eclogues and Social Memory." *American Journal of Philology*, Volume 130, Number 1 (Whole Number 517), Spring 2009: 99-130.

Meier, Christian. 1980. *Res publica amissa. Eine Studie zur Verfassung und Geschichte der spaten romischen Republik*. Wiesbaden: Steiner.

Melmoux, J. "C. Helvidius Priscus. Disciple Et Héritier De Thrasea." *La Parola Del Passato, 30,* 1975.

Merrill N. W. 1975. *Cicero and early Roman invective*. Cincinnati: University of Cincinnati Press.

Miano, Daniele. 2011. *Monimenta: aspetti storico-culturali della memoria nella Roma medio-repubblicana*. Roma: Bulzoni.

Milagros Navarro, C. and S. Demougin. 2001. *Elites Hispaniques*. Bordeaux: Ausonius Publications.

Miles, Gary. B. 1995. *Livy: reconstructing early Rome*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Millar, Fergus. "The Emperor, the Senate and the Provinces." *The Journal of Roman Studies*, Vol. 56, Parts 1 and 2 (1966): 156-166.

Millar, Fergus. "The Political Character of the Classical Roman Republic, 200-151 B.C." *The Journal of Roman Studies*, Vol. 74 (1984): 1-19.

Millar, Fergus. 1998. *The crowd in Rome in the late Republic*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Millar, Fergus. 1984. *Caesar Augustus: seven aspects*. Oxford [Oxfordshire]: Clarendon Press.

Millar, Fergus. 1977. *The emperor in the Roman world (31 BC-AD 337)*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press.

Millett, Martin. 1990. *The Romanization of Britain: an essay in archaeological interpretation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Milner, N. P. and C. F. Eilers. "L. Calpurnius Piso, Moles Son of Moles, and Emperor Worship: Statue Bases from the Upper Agora at Oinoanda." *Anatolian Studies*, Vol. 56 (2006): 61-76.

Momigliano, Arnaldo. 1961. *Claudius: the emperor, and his achievement*. New York: Barnes & Noble.

Mommsen, Theodore. 1854-5. *Römische Geschichte*. Leipzig.

Morgan, Gwyn. 2006. *69 A.D.: the year of four emperors*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Motto, A. Lydia. 1973. *Seneca*. New York: Twayne Publishers.

Mouritsen, Henrik. 1998. *Italian unification: a study in ancient and modern historiography*. London: Institute of Classical Studies, School of Advanced Study, University of London.

Münzer, Friedrich. 1999. *Roman aristocratic parties and families*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Munzi, Massimiliano. "Strategies and forms of political Romanization in central-southern Etruria (third century BC)." In *Italy and the West: Comparative Issues in Romanization*, edited by Simon Keay and Nicola Terrenato, 39-54. Oxford: Oxbow Books, 2001.

Murray, Oswyn. "Symposium and Genre in the Poetry of Horace." *The Journal of Roman Studies*, Vol. 75 (1985): 39-50.

Murray, Oswyn. "The 'quinquennium Neronis' and the Stoics." *Historia*, 14 (1965): 41–61.

Nadig, Peter. "Der jüngere Cato und ambitus." In *Ardet Ambitus, Untersuchungen zum Phänomen der Wahlbestechungen in der römischen Republik*, edited by Peter Lang, 85-94. Frankfurt am Main: Prismata VI, 1997.

Nappa, Christopher. "Place Settings: Convivium, Contrast, and Persona in Catullus 12 and 13." *The American Journal of Philology*, Vol. 119, No. 3 (Autumn, 1998): 385-397.

Malitz, Jürgen. 2003. *Leben des Kaisers Augustus*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

Nicolet, Claude. "Prosopographie et histoire sociale: Rome et l'Italie à l'époque républicaine." *Annales*. Histoire, Sciences Sociales, 25e Année, No. 5 (Sep. - Oct., 1970): 1209-1228.

Nicolet, Claude. 1966. *L'Ordre équestre à l'époque républicaine (312-43 av. J.-C.)*. Paris: E. de Boccard.

Nicolet, Claude. 1976. *Le Métier de citoyen dans la Rome républicaine*. [Paris]: Gallimard.

Nicolet, Claude. "*Le Cens Senatorial sous la Republique et sous Auguste.*" *The Journal of Roman Studies*, Vol. 66 (1976): 20-38.

Nicolet, Claude. "Les classes dirigeantes romaines sous la republique. Ordre senatorial et ordre equester," *Annales* (ESC) 32 (1977): 726ff.

Nicolet, Claude. "*Le Stipendium Des Allies Italiens Avant La Guerre Sociale.*" *Papers of the British School at Rome*, Vol. 46 (1978): 1-11.

Nisbet, R. G. M. 1961. *In L. Calpurnium Pisonem: Oration*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Nora, Pierre. 1989. "Between Memory and History: Les Lieux de Mémoire." *Representations*, No. 26, Special Issue: Memory and Counter-Memory (Spring, 1989): 7-24.

Nora, Pierre. 1984. *Les Lieux de mémoire*. [Paris]: Gallimard.

Noreña, Carlos F. 2011. *Imperial ideals in the Roman West: representation, circulation, power*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Noy, David. 2000. *Foreigners at Rome: citizens and strangers*. London: Duckworth.

Oakley, S. P. 1997. *A commentary on Livy Books VI–X, Vol. 1: Introduction and Book VI*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Oakley, S. P. "Res olim dissociablies : Emperors, Senators and Liberty." In *The Cambridge Companion to Tacitus*, edited by A. J. Woodman, 184–94. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

Ogilvie, R. M. and I. A. Richmond, eds. 1967. *Tacitus: Agricola*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Olick, Jeffrey K., Vered Vinitzky-Seroussi, and Daniel Levy. 2011. *The collective memory reader*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Ormsby, Robert J. *The literary portrait of Cato Uticensis in Lucan's Bellum civile*. PhD Diss. University of Washington, 1970.

Osgood, Josiah. 2006. *Caesar's legacy: civil war and the emergence of the Roman Empire*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Osgood, Josiah. 2011. *Claudius Caesar: image and power in the early Roman empire*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Östenberg, Ida. 2009. *Staging the world: spoils, captives, and representations in the Roman triumphal procession*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Östenberg, Ida, Simon Malmberg, and Jonas Bjørnebye. 2015. *The moving city: processions, passages and promenades in ancient Rome*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.

Östenberg, Ida. Bryn Mawr Classical Review 2015.08.43 on Trevor S. Luke, *Ushering in a New Republic: Theologies of Arrival at Rome in the First Century BCE*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2014.

Pagán, Victoria Emma. 2004. *Conspiracy narratives in Roman history*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Pagán, Victoria Emma. 2012. *A Companion to Tacitus*. Wiley-Blackwell.

Pagán, Victoria Emma. "Toward a Model of Conspiracy Theory for Ancient Rome." *New German Critique*, No. 103, Dark Powers: Conspiracies and Conspiracy Theory in History and Literature (Winter, 2008): 27-49.

Pecchiura (1965), *La figura di Catone Uticense nella letteratura latina*

Percival, J. "Tacitus and the Principate." *Greece & Rome*, 27 (1980): 119–33.

Perelli, L. 1982. *Il Movimento Popolare nell'Ultimo Secolo della Repubblica*. Turin, Paravia.

Pina Polo, Francisco. "Die nützliche Erinnerung: Geschichtsschreibung, "mos maiorum" und die römische Identität." *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte, Bd*. 53, H. 2 (2004): 147-172.

Pitcher, Roger. "The Second Philippic as a source of aristocratic values." In *Cicero's Philippics: history, rhetoric and ideology*, edited by Tom Stevenson and Marcus Wilson, 131-139. Auckland, N.Z.: Polygraphia, 2008.

Phillips, "Asconius' Magni Homines." *RhM*, 116 (1973): 353-57.

Phillips, Daryl A. "The Conspiracy of Egnatius Rufus and the Election of Suffect Consuls under Augustus." *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte*, Bd. 46, H. 1 (1st Qtr., 1997: 103-112.

Plantinga, Theodore. 1992. *How memory shapes narratives: a philosophical essay on redeeming the past*. Lewiston: E. Mellen Press.

Platner, S. Ball, and Ashby, T. 1929. *A topographical dictionary of ancient Rome*. London: Oxford University Press.

Pollini, John. "Ritualizing Death in Republican Rome: Memory, Religion, Class Struggle, and the Wax Ancestral Mask Tradition's Origin and Influence." In *Performing Death: Social Analyses of Funerary Traditions in the Ancient Near East and Mediterranean*, Edited byNicola Laneri, 237-286. Chicago: The Oriental Institute, 2007.

Polvernini, Leandro. "L'estensione del nome « Italia » fino alle Alpi e la provincia 'Gallia Cisalpina.'" *Geographia antiqua*: 19 (2010): 115-121.

Pogorzelski, R. J. 2009. "The 'Reassurance of Fratricide' in the Aeneid." *American Journal of Philology*, 130: 261-289.

Porter, James. I.. 1999. *Constructions of the classical body*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Potter, David S. "The Tabula Siarensis, Tiberius, the Senate, and the eastern boundary of the Roman empire." *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* LXIX(1987): 269-276.

Potter, David S. and Cynthia Damon. "The Senatus Consultum de Cn. Pisone Patre." In *The American Journal of Philology*, Vol. 120, No. 1, Special Issue: The "Senatus Consultum de Cn. Pisone Patre": Text, Translation, Discussion (Spring, 1999: 13-42.

Potter, David S. "Political Theory in the "Senatus Consultum Pisonianum." *The American Journal of Philology*, Vol. 120, No. 1, Special Issue: The "Senatus Consultum de Cn. Pisone Patre": Text, Translation, Discussion (Spring, 1999): 65-88.

Powell, Jonathan G. F. "Invective and the orator: Ciceronian theory and practice." In *Cicero on the Attack,* edited by J. Booth, 1-23. Swansea: Classical Press of Wales, 2007.

Price, Simon. "From noble funerals to divine cult: the consecration of Roman emperors." In *Rituals of royalty: power and ceremonial in traditional societies,* edited by David Cannadine and Simon Price, 56-105. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Raepsaet-Charlier, Marie-Thérèse. "Matrones equestres. La parenté fémine de l'orde equestre." In *L'Ordre equestre. Histoire d'une aristocratie (IP sicle av. J.-C.-IIIe sicle ap. J.-C.),* edited by Ségolène Demougin, Hubert Devijver, and Marie-Thérèse Raepsaet-Charlier, 215-236. Rome: École française de Rome, 1999.

Ramage, Edwin S. "Cicero on Extra-Roman Speech." *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*, Vol. 92 (1961): 481-494.

Rawson, Beryl. 1997. *The Roman family in Italy: status, sentiment, space.* Canberra: Humanities Research Centre.

Rawson, Elizabeth. 1975. *Cicero: a portrait.* London: Allen Lane.

Rawson, Elizabeth. 1985. *Intellectual life in the late Roman Republic.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Rea, Jennifer A. 2007. *Legendary Rome: myth, monuments and memory on the Palatine and Capitoline.* London: Duckworth.

Reed, Joseph D. 2007. *Virgil's gaze: nation and poetry in the Aeneid.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Reed, Joseph D. "The Bellum Civile as a Roman Epic." In *Brill's companion to Lucan,* edited by Paolo Asso, 21-32. Leiden: Brill, 2011.

Reiss, Werner. "Die Rede des Claudius uber das ius honorum der Gallischen Notablen." In *Revue des études anciennes.* Paris: Societé d'Edition "Les belles lettres" Vol. 105, 2003(1): 211-249.

Ricœur, Paul. 2004. *Memory, history, forgetting.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Rich, J. "Augustus' Parthian honours, the temple of Mars Ultor and the arch in the Forum Romanum." *PBSR* 56 (1988): 71-128.

Richardson, J.S. "The Triumph, the Praetors and the Senate in the Early Second Century B.C."

The Journal of Roman Studies, Vol. 65 (1975), pp. 50-63.

Richardson, J.S. " Imperium Romanum: empire and the language of power." *Journal of Roman Studies*, (1991) 81, 1–9.

Richlin, Amy. "Cicero's Head." In *Constructions of the classical body*, edited by James I. Porter, 190-211. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1999.

Rix, Helmut. 1963. *Das etruskische Cognomen: Untersuchungen zu System, Morphologie und Verwendung der Personennamen auf den jüngeren Inschriften Nordetruriens*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Rix, H. 1995. "Römische," in Ernst Eichler et al., *Namenforschung*. *Name Studies*. *Les Noms Propres*. *Ein internationales Handbuch zur Onomastik*. Berlin and New York, 724–32.

Rodger, Alan. "Jurisdictional Limits in the Lex Irnitana and the Lex de Gallia Cisalpina." *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, Bd. 110 (1996): 189-206.

Ronning, Christian. "Der Konflikt zwischen Kaiser Nero und P. Clodius Thrasea Paetus: Rituelle Strategien in der frühen Römischen Kaiserzeit." *Chiron* 36 (2006): 329–355.

Rosati, Gianpiero. "Memory, Myth, and Power in Statius's *Silvae*." In *Memoria romana: memory in Rome and Rome in memory*, edited by Karl Galinsky, 71-83. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2014.

Roselaar, Saskia T. 2012. *Processes of integration and identity formation in the Roman Republic*. Leiden: Brill.

Roselaar, Saskia T. 2015. *Processes of cultural change and integration in the Roman world*. Leiden: Brill.

Rosenstein, Nathan Stewart. 1990. *Imperatores victi: military defeat and aristocratic competition in the middle and late Republic*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Rosenstein, Nathan Stewart. 2006. *A companion to the Roman Republic*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Pub..

Roth, Roman. "Varrò's pieta Italia (RR I. ii. 1) and the Odology of Roman Italy." *Hermes*, 135. Jahrg., H. 3 (2007): 286-300.

Rowe, G. 2002. *Princes and political cultures: the new Tiberian senatorial decrees*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Rowell, Henry T. "The Forum and Funeral "Imagines" of Augustus." *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome*, Vol. 17 (1940): 131-143.

Rowland, Robert J. "The Conspiracy of Varro Murena." *Classical Journal*, Vol. 62, No. 8 (May, 1967): 362-363.

Rudich, Vasily. 1993. *Political Dissidence under Nero: The Price of Dissimulation*. London: Routledge.

Ruoff-Väänänen E. "The Roman Senate and criminal jurisdiction during the Roman republic." *Arctos,* 1978 XII: 125-133.

Russo, Federico. "The beginning of the First Punic War and the Concept of Italia." In *Processes of integration and identity formation in the Roman Republic*, edited by Saskia T. Roselaar, 35-50. Leiden: Brill, 2012.

Rutledge, S. H. 1993. *Imperial Inquisitions: Prosecutors and Informants from Tiberius to Domitian*. London: Routledge.

Ryan, F. X. "The Origin of the Phrase, ius sententiae dicendae." *Hermes*, 121. Bd., H. 2 (1993), pp. 206-210.

Ryan, F. X. "Some Observations on the Censorship of Claudius and Vitellius, A.D. 47-48." *The American Journal of Philology*, Vol. 114, No. 4 (Winter, 1993), pp. 611-618.

Ryberg, Inez Scott. "Clipeus Virtutis." In *The Classical Tradition: Literary and Historical Studies in Honor of Harry Caplan*, edited by Luitpold Wallach, 232-38. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1966.

Saddington, D. B. "The relationship between holding office in a municipium or colonia and the militia equestris in the early principate." *Athenaeum, 84* (1996), 137ff.

Sailor, D. 2008. *Writing and Empire in Tacitus*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Saller, Richard. "Patronage and friendship in Early Imperial Rome." In *Patronage in ancient society,* edited by Andrew Wallace-Hadrill, 49-62. London: Routledge, 1989.

Salmon, E. Togo. 1982. *The making of Roman Italy*. London: Thames and Hudson.

Sanpaolo, Antonacci. "Landscape changes: Romanization and new settlement patterns at Tiati." In *Italy and the West: Comparative Issues in Romanization*, edited by Simon Keay and Nicola Terrenato, 27-38. Oxford: Oxbow Books, 2001.

Sattler, Peter. 1960. *Augustus und der Senat: Untersuchungen zur römischen Innenpolitik zwischen 30 und 17 v. Christus*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Saumagne, C. "La 'Passion' de Thrasea." *REL* 33(1995): 241-257.

Schacter, D. L. 1999. *The cognitive neuropsychology of false memories*. Hove: Psychology Press.

Schacter, D. L. and Elaine Scarry. 2000. *Memory, brain, and belief*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Schillinger-Häfele, Ute. "Claudius und Tacitus über die Aufnahme von Galliern in den Senat." *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte*, Bd. 14, H. 4 (Oct., 1965): 443-454.

Schneider R. 1834. *De Servio Sulpicio Rufo*. Leipzig.

Schuller, Wolfgang. 2013. *Cicero oder der letzte Kampf um die Republik: eine Biographie*. München: C.H. Beck.

Schultz, Celia E. "Juno Sospita and Roman insecurity in the Social War." *YClS*, 2006 33: 207-277.

Schulze, Wilhelm. 1966. *Zur Geschichte lateinischer Eigennamen*. Berlin: Weidmann.

Schumacher, Leonhard. "Staatsdienst und Kooptation. Zur Sozialen Struktur Römischer Priesterkollegien im Prinzipat." In *Epigrafia e ordine senatorio, Atti del Colloquio Internazionale AIGL, Roma 14–20 maggio* 1981, edited by AAVV, vol. I, 251-269. Roma: Edizioni di storia e letteratura, 1982.

Scott, Kenneth C. "The Political Propaganda of 44-30 BC." *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome*, Vol. 11 (1933), pp. 7-49.

Scullard, H. H. 1973. *Roman politics, 220-150 B.C.*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Seo, Mira. (2011). "Lucan's Cato and the Poetics of Exemplarity." In *Brill's companion to Lucan,* edited by Paolo Asso, 199-222. Leiden: Brill, 2011.

Seider, Aaron. M. 2013. *Memory in Vergil's Aeneid: creating the past*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sevey, Beth. "Family and State in the Early Imperial Monarchy: The Senatus Consultum de Pisone Patre, Tabula Siarensis, and Tabula Hebana." *Classical Philology*, Vol. 95, No. 3 (Jul., 2000): 318-337.

Shatzman, I. 1975. *Senatorial wealth and Roman politics*. Bruxelles: Latomus.

Shaw, Brent D. "Among the Believers" [article-length critique of K. Hopkins, *Death and Renewal: Sociological Studies in Roman History, 2*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1983] [in] *Classical Views/Echos du Monde Classique*, vol. 28, n.s. 3 (1984): 453-79.

Shaya, Josephine. "The Public Life of Monuments: The Summi Viri of the Forum of Augustus."

American Journal of Archaeology, Vol. 117, No. 1 (January 2013): 83-110.

Sherwin-White A. N. "Roman involvement in Anatolia, 167-168 B.C." *Journal of Roman Studies*, 67 (1977): 62-75.

Sherwin-White, A. N. 1973. *The Roman citizenship*. 2d. ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Sherwin- White, A. N. 1978. "Amicitia." *Journal of Roman Studies*, 68(1978): 86-91.

Sider, David. 1997. *The epigrams of Philodemos*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Sizoo, A. "Paetus Thrasea et le Stoïcisme," *REL* 4 (1926): 231-232.

Shotter, D. C. A.. "Cnaeus Calpurnius Piso, of Syria." *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte*, Bd. 23, H. 2 (2nd Qtr., 1974): 229-245.

Sillieres, P. "La maison aristocratique a l'epoque republicaine, principalement dans la vallee de l'Ebre." In *Elites hispaniques*, edited by M. Navarro Caballero and S. Demougin, 173-185. Ausonius Publications: Etudes 6, 2001.

Smallwood, E. Mary. 1967. *Documents illustrating the principates of Gaius, Claudius and Nero*. London: Cambridge University Press.

Smith, Christopher John. 2006. *The Roman clan: the gens from ancient ideology to modern anthropology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Smith, Christopher John. 2011. *Praise and blame in Roman republican rhetoric*. Swansea: Classical Press of Wales.

Smith, R. Edwin. 1966. *Cicero the statesman*. London: Cambridge U.P..

Spannagel, M. 1999. *Exemplaria principis: Untersuchungen zu Entstehung und Ausstattung des Augustusforums*. Heidelberg: Archäologie und Geschichte.

Squire, L. R. and Daniel Schacter eds. 2002. *Neuropsychology of memory*. New York: Guilford.

Stanley Jr, Farland H. "Observations on Martial's imagery of Provincial Spain." *Glotta*, Bd. 90 (2014): 192-215.

Stem, Rex S. *Cicero and the legacy of Cato Uticensis*. PhD Diss. University of Michigan, 1999.

Stevenson, Tom. 2008. *Cicero's Philippics: history, rhetoric and ideology*. Auckland, N.Z.: Polygraphia.

Stockton, David. "Primus and Murena." *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte*, Bd. 14, H. 1 (Jan., 1965): 18-40.

Stockton, D. L. 1971. *Cicero: a political biography*. London: Oxford University Press.

Stover, T. (2008). "Cato and the Intended Scope of Lucan's BC." *Classical Quarterly*, 58: 571-580.

Strasburger, *RE XVIII* (1939) 773ff. s. v. optimates;

Strasburger, *REXVII* (1937) 785ff. s. v. nobiles

Strunk, Thomas E. "Saving the Life of a Foolish Poet: Tacitus on Marcus Lepidus, Thrasea Paetus, and Political Action under the Principate." *Syllecta Classica*, Volume 21 (2010): 119-139.

Stylow, A. "Apuntes sobre el urbanismo de la Corduba romana." In *Stadtbild und Ideologie. Die Monumentaliserung hispanischer Stadte zwischen Republik und Kaiserzeit*, edited by Trillmich and Zanker, 299-318. Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften, philosphisch-historiosche Klasse, Abhandlungen, n.F. ciii. Munich, 1990.

Stylow, A. "De Corduba a Colonia Patricia. La fundacion de la Corduba romana." In *Colonia Patricia Corduba. Una reflexión arqueologica. Coloquio internacional*, edited by P. Leon Alonso, 77-85. Cordoba, 1996.

Sumi, Geoffrey. S. 2005. *Ceremony and power: performing politics in Rome between Republic and Empire*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Sumi, Geoffrey S. "Topography and Ideology: Caesar's Monument and the Aedes Divi Ivlii in Augustan Rome." *The Classical Quarterly*, 61 (2011): 205-229.

Sumner, G. V. "Notes on Provinciae in Spain (197-133 B.C.)." *Classical Philology*, Vol. 72, No. 2 (Apr., 1977): 126-130.

Swan, P. Michael. "Προβάλλεσθαι in Dio's Account of Elections under Augustus." *The Classical Quarterly*, Vol. 32, No. 2 (1982): 436-440.

Sydenham, Edward. Allen. 1952. *The coinage of the Roman Republic*. London: Spink.

Syme, Ronald. "Galatia and Pamphylia under Augustus: the governorships of Piso, Quirinius and Silvanus." *Klio* 27 (1934): 122-48.

Syme, Ronald. 1939. *The Roman Revolution*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Syme Ronald. "Marcus Lepidus, Capax Imperii ." *Journal of Roman Studies*, 45 (1955): 22–33.

Syme, Ronald. "Missing Senators." *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte*, Bd. 4, H. 1 (1955): 52-71.

Syme, Ronald. 1958. *Tacitus*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Syme, Ronald. "Piso Frugi and Crassus Frugi." *The Journal of Roman Studies*, Vol. 50, Parts 1 and 2 (1960): 12-20.

Syme, Ronald. "The Historian Servilius Nonianus." *Hermes*, 92. Bd., H. 4 (1964): 408-424.

Syme, Ronald. 1970. *Ten studies in Tacitus*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Syme, Ronald, and Badian, E. 1979. *Roman papers*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Syme, Ronald. "The Sons of Piso the Pontifex." *The American Journal of Philology*, Vol. 101, No. 3 (Autumn, 1980): 333-341.

Syme, Ronald. "Clues to Testamentary Adoptions." In *Epigrafia e ordine senatorio, Atti del Colloquio Internazionale AIGL, Roma 14–20 maggio* 1981, edited by AAVV, vol. I, 397-410. Roma: Edizioni di storia e letteratura, 1982.

Syme, Ronald. "Eight Consuls from Patavium." *Papers of the British School at Rome*, Vol. 51 (1983): 102-124.

Syme, Ronald. "Antistius rusticus. A Consular from Corduba." *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte*, Bd. 32, H. 3 (3rd Qtr., 1983): 359-374.

Syme, Ronald. "More Narbonensian Senators." *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, Bd. 65 (1986): 1-24.

Syme, Ronald. (1986). *The Augustan Aristocracy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Syme, Ronald, and A. Birley (ed.) 1999. *Roman papers*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Syme, Ronald. 1999. *The provincial at Rome: and, Rome and the Balkans 80BC-AD14*. Ed A. Des Boscs-Plateaux. Exeter: University of Exeter Press.

Takács, Sarolta. A.. 2000. "Politics and Religion in the Bacchanalian Affair of 186 B.C.E." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, 100: 301–310.

Talbert, Richard. "Augustus and the Senate." *Greece & Rome*, Second Series, Vol. 31, No. 1 (Apr., 1984): 55-63.

Talbert, Richard. "Tacitus and the "Senatus Consultum de Cn. Pisone Patre." In *The American Journal of Philology*, Vol. 120, No. 1, Special Issue: The "Senatus Consultum de Cn. Pisone Patre": Text, Translation, Discussion (Spring, 1999): 89-97.

Talbert, Richrd. 1984. *The Senate of Imperial Rome*. Princeton, Princeton University Press.

Taylor L. R. and Scott R. T. "Seating space in the Roman senate and the senatores pedarii." *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, 1969 C: 529-582.

Taylor, L. Ross. 1960. *The voting districts of the Roman Republic: the thirty-five urban and rural tribes*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Taylor, L. Ross. 1971. *Party politics in the age of Caesar*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Terrenato, Nicola. "Introduction." In *Italy and the West: Comparative Issues in Romanization*, edited by Simon Keay and Nicola Terrenato, 1-6. Oxford: Oxbow Books, 2001.

Tesoriero, C. 2010. *Lucan*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Tibiletti, G. 1953. *Principe e magistrati repubblicani, ricerca di storia Augustea e Tiberiana*. Roma: A. Signorelli.

Tipping, Ben (2011). "Terrible Manliness?: Lucan's Cato." In *Brill's companion to Lucan*, edited by Paolo Asso, 223-236. Leiden: Brill, 2011.

Torelli, Mario. "Ascesa al senato e rapporti con I territori d'origine Italia: Regio VII (Etruria)." In *Epigrafia e ordine senatorio, Atti del Colloquio Internazionale AIGL, Roma 14–20 maggio 1981*, edited by AAVV, vol. I, 275-299. Roma: Edizioni di storia e letteratura, 1982.

Torelli, Mario. 1995. *Studies in the Romanization of Italy*. Edmonton: University of Alberta Press.

Torelli, Mario. 1999. *Tota Italia: essays in the cultural formation of Roman Italy*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Toynbee, Jocelyn. "Dictators and Philosophers in the First Century A. D." *Greece & Rome*, Vol. 13, No. 38/39 (Jun., 1944): 43-58.

Tress, Heather van. 2004. *Poetic memory: allusion in the poetry of Callimachus and the Metamorphoses of Ovid*. Leiden: Brill.

Tsakiropoulou-Summers, Anastasia. "Horace, Philodemus and the Epicureans at Herculaneum." *Mnemosyne*, Fourth Series, Vol. 51, Fasc. 1 (Feb., 1998): 20-29.

Turpin, William. "Tacitus, Stoic *exempla*, and the *praecipuum munus annalium*." *Classical Antiquity*, Vol. 27, No. 2 (October 2008): 359-404.

Tweedie, Fiona C. "The *Lex Licinia Mucia* and the *Bellum Italicum*." In *Processes of integration and identity formation in the Roman Republic*, edited by Saskia T. Roselaar, 123-140. Leiden: Brill, 2012.

Vallat, Jean-Pierre. 1995. *L'Italie et Rome: 218-31 av. J.-C.*. Paris: A. Colin.

Dommelen, Peter Alexander René van, Nicola Terrenato, and Benjamí Costa. 2007. *Articulating local cultures: power and identity under the expanding Roman republic*. Portsmouth, R.I.: Journal of Roman Archaeology.

Várhelyi, Z. 2010. *The religion of senators in the Roman Empire: power and the beyond*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Versnel, H. S. 1970. *Triumphus: an inquiry into the origin, development and meaning of the Roman triumph*. Leiden: Brill.

Veyne, P. 2003. *Seneca: the life of a stoic*. New York: Routledge.

Vittinghoff, F. 1936. *Der staatsfeind in der römischen kaiserzeit: untersuchungen zur "damnatio memoriae"*. Berlin: Junker und Dünnhaupt

Vollmer, F. 1891. *Laudationum funebrium Romanorum historia et reliquirum editio*. Lipsiae: [s.n.].;

Vollmer, F. 1892. *De funere publico Romanorum*. Lipsiae: [s.n.].

Wallace-Hadrill, Andrew. 2008. *Rome's cultural revolution*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Wallace-Hadrill, Andrew. "Pompeian Identities: Between Oscan, Samnite, Greek, Roman, and Punic." In *Cultural identity in the ancient Mediterranean*, edited by Erich S. Gruen, 415-427. Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute, 2011.

Walter, Uwe. 2004. *Memoria und res publica: zur Geschichtskultur im republikanischen Rom*. Frankfurt am Main: Verlag Antike.

Watts, W. J. "The Birthplaces of Latin Writers." *Greece & Rome*, Vol. 18, No. 1 (Apr., 1971): 91-101.

Weinstock, S. 1971. *Divus Julius*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Wellesley, K. "Can You Trust Tacitus?" *Greece & Rome*, Second Series, Vol. 1, No. 1 (Feb., 1954): 13-33.

Wells, Jack C. "Impiety in the Middle Republic: the Roman response to temple plundering in Southern Italy." *Classical Journal*, 2009-2010 105 (3): 229-243.

Wesch-Klein, Gabriele. 1993. *Funus Publicum. Eine Studie zur öffentlichen Beisetzung und Gewährung von Ehrengräbern in Rom und den Westprovinzen*. Heidelberger Althistorische Beiträge und Epigraphische Studien (HABES), Band 14. Stuttgart, F. Steiner.

Whitton, Christopher. "'Let us tread our path together' : Tacitus and the Younger Pliny." In *A companion to Tacitus*, edited by Victoria Emma Pagán, 345-368. Malden, Mass: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012.

Wilkinson, Sam. 2012. *Republicanism during the early Roman Empire*. London: Continuum.

Wirszubski, Chaim. 1950. *Libertas as a political idea at Rome during the late republic and early principate*. Cambridge: University Press.

Wiseman, T. P.. "The Census in the First Century B.C." The Journal of Roman Studies, Vol. 59, No. 1/2 (1969): 59-75.

Wiseman, T. P. 1971. *New men in the Roman senate, 139 B.C. - A.D. 14*. London: Oxford University Press.

Wiseman, T. P. "Legendary Genealogies in Late-Republican Rome." *Greece & Rome*, Vol. 21, No. 2 (Oct., 1974): 153-164.

Wiseman, T. P. "Satyrs in Rome? The Background to Horace's Ars Poetica." *The Journal of Roman Studies*, Vol. 78 (1988): 1-13.

Wiseman, T.P. 1995. *Remus: a Roman myth*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wiseman, T. P. 2002. *Classics in progress: essays on ancient Greece and Rome*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wiseman, T. P. 2009. *Remembering the Roman people: essays on late-Republican politics and literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wittchow, Frank. "Vater und Onkel: Julius Caesar und das Finale der Aeneis." *Gymnasium*, 112 2005: 45-69.

Woodman, A. J. 1988. *Rhetoric in classical historiography: four studies*. Portland: Areopagitica Press.

Woodman, A. J. 1996. *The annals of Tacitus*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Woolf, Greg. "Saving the Barbarian." In *Cultural identity in the ancient Mediterranean*, edited by Erich S. Gruen, 255-272. Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute, 2011.

Zanker, Paul. 1988. *The power of images in the Age of Augustus*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Zanker, Paul. (1984). *Il foro di Augusto*. Roma: Fratelli Palombi editori.

Zinserling, G. 'Studien zu den Historiendarstellungender römischen Republik.' *Wissenschaftlich Zeitschriftder*. Friedrich-Schiller-Universität Jena 9 (1959/60), 403-48.