

1 DUAE PATRIAE



1. PARTNERS IN EMPIRE

“Because the Romans mixed with themselves Etruscans, Latins, and Sabines and regard there to be one blood from all of these, they have made one body from these various parts and one people composed of all of them.”¹ In this way, the second-century A.D. Roman historian Florus describes the traditional ethnic composition of Rome at the beginning of his chapter on the Social War, Rome’s war with its Italian allies which began in 91 B.C. Although he would judge the actions of the rebels to be criminal, he goes on to criticize Rome for not sharing the citizenship with the deserving peoples of Italy sooner.² After all, as a contemporary of Florus would echo in his history, the Italian upper classes had only led the revolt because they had desired to be “partners in empire instead of subjects.”³ Implicit within these comments is that the Latins, Sabines, and Etruscans had dared to hope this before and had succeeded, and now they were the dominant groups within the Roman state. Their dominance, however, seemed to exclude men from dozens of other groups from a place in the state, notably Rome’s allies that had exerted so much on its behalf.

¹ *Epit.* 2.6.1: *quippe cum populus Romanus Etruscos, Latinos Sabinosque sibi miscuerit et unum ex omnibus sanguinem ducat, corpus fecit ex membris et ex omnibus unus est.*

² *Epit.* 2.6.2: *nec minore flagitio socii intra Italiam quam intra urbem cives rebellabant. itaque cum ius civitatis, quam viribus auxerant, socii iustissime posularent . . .*

³ App. *BC* 1.34: “when Fulvius Flaccus was consul [sc. 125 B.C.], he was the first and foremost to excite the Italians to covet Roman citizenship so that they could be partners in the Empire rather than subjects. . . . They did not think it right that they should be in the role of subjects instead of partners” (Φούλβιος Φλάκκος υπατεύων μάλιστα δὴ πρῶτος ὄδε ἐξ τὸ φανερώτατον ἠρέθιζε τοὺς Ἰταλιώτας ἐπιθυμῆν τῆς Ρωμαίων πολιτείας ὡς κοινωνοὺς τῆς ἡγεμονίας ἀντὶ ὑπηκόων ἔσομένων . . . οὔτε γὰρ ἤξιον ἐν ὑπηκόων ἀντὶ κοινωνῶν εἶναι μέρει). Also, upon hearing about the legislation in 91 B.C. that would confer citizenship on them, at 1.35 Appian says: “They especially desired this since by this one act they would become rulers instead of subjects” (τοῦτου γὰρ δὴ μάλιστα ἐπεθύμουν ὡς ἐνὶ τῷδε αὐτίκα ἡγεμόνες ἀντὶ ὑπηκόων ἔσομενοι).

2 ETHNIC IDENTITY AND ARISTOCRATIC COMPETITION

More than a century before, Velleius Paterculus, a descendant of a Campanian family that had collaborated with the Romans during the Social War, had also claimed that the Italian rebels, ethnic kin of the Romans, had reasons to complain:

Just as their fortune was terrible, so their cause was so very just: for they were seeking citizenship in that state whose empire they had protected by force of arms. Through all the years and in every war they had provided double the number of infantrymen and cavalrymen, but they had not received the same rights in that country which they had brought to such a point that it could despise men of the same ethnic origin and blood as though they were complete foreigners.⁴

It is very interesting that, just as Florus had described the Romans as a mix of Latin, Sabine, and Etruscan blood (*unum ex omnibus sanguinem*), Velleius regarded the rebels as “of the same ethnicity and blood” (*eiusdem et gentis et sanguinis*) as the Romans. One wonders how many Romans of the Republic would have agreed with these writers on these points. In fact, we may be suspicious of their attitudes altogether, because these men wrote in the more cosmopolitan periods of the Empire. They lived, after all, at a time when any Italian origin for an aristocrat was a sign of ancient familiarity with Rome. This may be why they saw Republican Italians in oversimplified terms as *unus sanguis* and *idem gens*,⁵ because they were a more cohesive ethnic unit when these

⁴ 2.15.2: *quorum ut fortuna atrox, ita causa fuit iustissima; petebant enim eam civitatem cuius imperium armis tuebantur: per omnes annos atque omnia bella duplici numero se militum equitumque fungi neque in eius civitatis ius recipi quae per eos in id ipsum pervenisset fastigium ex quo homines eiusdem et gentis et sanguinis ut externos alienosque fastidire posset.* For more on Velleius’s attitude to the war, see Ch. 5 §7.

⁵ Dench (2005) 120 n. 90 notes that the speech reported at *Rhet. Her.* 4.13 uses *propinquitus* and *societas* to describe the relationship between Rome and the rebels, terms she believes “begin to hint at the concept of kin.” The speech reported is often suspected to have been a Roman one delivered at the time of the war. If so, these terms show a discernable gap between the Roman view asserting political affiliation and “nearness” and the Italian one insisting upon a “blood” relationship.

historians operated in the Empire.⁶ It has been suggested, however, that their sentiments reflect the opinions of the Italian allies at the time of the Social War, “a relic of allied propaganda,” and not just the opinions of the writers in question.⁷ If so, then some of the slogans of the rebellious Italians contained an ethnic message, that Rome was mistreating its allies who were in fact the Romans’ kin and had earned the right to be “partners in empire,” just like the Latins, Sabines, and Etruscans.⁸

In fact, some of these perceptions – to whomever they may belong – can be understood by what we know about the myths and history of the Republican aristocracy. The legends of early Rome uniformly insist that the state was a multiethnic venture.⁹ Romulus and his Latins “took” Sabine wives and shared the state with their Sabine kinsmen, and Rome even had a dynasty with connections to Etruria ruling over it until the foundation of the Republic. The very city of Rome itself could be called to witness the pluralistic nature of this “original” Roman state: various neighborhoods were later thought to have been ethnic “quarters” originally, so there was the *vicus Tuscus* and Caelian Hill

⁶ Mouritsen (1998) has questioned the traditional view of the Social War, that the allies only wanted citizenship; rather, he reads into these passages and others hints that the “real” goal of the allies was freedom from Rome or at least some kind of empire sharing. The “citizenship tradition” then in the Imperial sources was mistaking the result of the war with its causes, particularly because the idea of an Italy wanting to be Roman was more palatable in later times.

⁷ Brunt (1988) 126.

⁸ Variations of “partners in empire instead of subjects” might have been among these. I have already noted several instances of this phrase in Appian, and there is also Trog. ap. Justin. 38.4.13: all of Italy rebelled “not seeking this time freedom, but rather a share of empire and the state/citizenship” (*non iam libertatem, sed consortium imperii civitatisque poscentem*). Similarly, Str. 5.4.2 says the rebels fought for two years “until they acquired the partnership for which they went to war” (μέχρι διεπράξαντο τὴν κοινωνίαν περὶ ἧς ἐπολέμουν). Therefore, Octavian’s famous use of the phrase *tota Italia* could be seen as a resumption or rather a vindication of Social War slogans. Horsfall (2001) 39–40, however, emphasizes that because the phrase *tota* (and *cuncta*) *Italia* was in use already in the time of Cicero, it certainly was not Octavian’s invention, as is often supposed.

⁹ The following exposition is more or less an expansion of Cic. *Balb.* 31 about Rome’s history of extending citizenship and with it the first criterion for pursuit of political office. For the multiethnic character of early Rome as presented by our sources, possibly indicative of the situation in Archaic central Italy, see, e.g., Ampolo (1981) and (1992b) 172–177. Now, for the idea of foreignness and plurality as an important aspect of Roman identity, see Dench (2005), esp. 93ff. and 117ff. on the extension of citizenship.

4 ETHNIC IDENTITY AND ARISTOCRATIC COMPETITION

for the Etruscans, and the Quirinal Hill for the Sabines.¹⁰ Latin and Sabine (and possibly a few Etruscan) families made up the Republican aristocracy (the tradition continued), but the new plebeian *nobiles* of the fourth and later centuries included more Latin families in the Senate than just those in and right around Rome. “Real” Sabines came into the state with the full enfranchisement of Sabinum proper in the third century and Sabine *nobiles* show electoral success almost immediately. At nearly the same time, the rest of Latium and then the “Latinized” inhabitants of what was later known as *Latium adiectum*, formerly the land of the Hernici, Volsci, and Aurunci, began to take up the *civitas Romana* and the attendant right to run for political office in the capital. But now the aristocracy, and the citizen body as a whole, closed its ranks to men from other parts of Italy.¹¹ By the time of the Social War, the Roman senatorial class consisted primarily of Latins and Sabines, with a few of Etruscan and other origins. Justly or unjustly, the Italian allies had reason to see Rome’s attitude to them as chauvinistic. Following the Social War and its attendant conflicts, however, men from all parts of Italy would start to make up the gap between them and the Latin and Sabine Romans.

Of course, Rome would eventually come to embrace the idea of “partnership in empire” with Italy. In 70/69 B.C., on the occasion of the first censorship that actually enrolled many of the old allies as citizens, two Roman magistrates in charge of the mint struck commemorative coins that display Italia and Roma clasping hands with Italia holding a cornucopia between them. One of the magistrates was a Mucius Scaevola, from an old and distinguished Roman family; the other was Quintus Fufius Calenus, a man with ancestors from the lower ranks of

¹⁰ Var. *L* 5.46, 51.

¹¹ So Brunt (1988) 105: “But if promotions occurred in the second century, they must have raised hopes of enfranchisement elsewhere, which were frustrated only because Rome departed from that liberality with the citizenship which had earlier been a mark of her policy.”

the Senate whose *cognomen* betrays his origins from Cales in Auruncan Campania.¹² The handshake on their coins by representatives of their two worlds would seem to express hope for an accord between Italy and Rome brought about by the end of the war and the beginning of its resolution in 70/69 – that is, the census enrollment that would one day make partnership and prosperity possible.¹³

Thus, the traditional history of the aristocracy and the rolls of the magistrates themselves seem to confirm what the writers of the Empire thought about the ethnic composition of the Republic's political class. That is, it was composed of Latins and Sabines, but was more or less closed to other Italic aristocrats until the aftermath of the Social War and until Rome began in some way to adopt the ideas that the Italic allies had fought for. Eventually, aided by the increased pace of assimilation promoted by Caesar and Augustus, the Italians and Romans would be closer to one polity in reality, and this perception would later be such an accomplished fact that writers of the first and second centuries A.D. had trouble understanding the mind-set that made the Social War possible.

2. TWO HOMELANDS

With the later second century a notable exception, throughout its history the Roman citizenry was reinventing (or was thought to be reinventing) its ethnic identity by incorporating the municipal elite of Italy, the *domi nobiles* as they were politely called, beginning with

¹² The coin issue is RRC.403, with the heads of Honos and Virtus on the obverse and images of Roma and Italia on the reverse. As Crawford (1974) 413 notes, in addition to alluding to the myth of Scaevola's claimed ancestor, the would-be assassin of Lars Porsenna, the obverse types are particularly appropriate to the *novus homo* Calenus (later *cos.* 47). For more on the origin of Calenus, see Ch. 5 §2. Although the Italian rebels struck several with her image, this is the only Roman coin issue in the Republic to depict Italia. In fact, Italia does not reappear on issues until Trajan (for which see F. Canciani, *LIMC* s.v. "Italia" 806–810).

¹³ For the censorship of 70/69 B.C., see Wiseman (1969) citing in particular for the mass registration of Italians, Cic. *Ver.* 1.54: *haec frequentia totius Italiae . . . quae convenit uno tempore undique comitiorum ludorum censendique causa.*

the people immediately around the capital.¹⁴ Cicero – whose status and prejudices as a *novus homo* and a man of “Further Latium” must always be kept in mind – believed it was the single most important factor in explaining Rome’s greatness,¹⁵ and he was later echoed in these sentiments by the emperor Claudius, whose family was of Sabine and patrician origin.¹⁶ This process of inclusion, however, may not have been fast enough in the opinion of some contemporaries and later writers. Regardless, by the dawn of the Empire the senatorial classes would hail from the whole of the Italian peninsula and, as the centuries progressed, the entire Mediterranean. As a result, the multiethnic composition of the Republic’s political culture would not be unfamiliar to the modern statesman – as would the struggles (personal and civil) that such selective inclusion and exclusion precipitated for political power.

It follows then that Roman aristocrats of all periods would recognize the fact that they had two homelands, Rome and their actual *origo*, be the latter Latin, Sabine, or other. Cicero articulated this idea in the late Republic in his philosophical treatise, the *Laws*:

I do indeed think that all municipal men have two homelands [duae patriae], one by nature and the other by citizenship. Just so Cato, though he was born at Tusculum, took Roman citizenship. Thus, though he was Tusculan by birth, he was a Roman by citizenship: the one was his homeland by place, the other by law. In a likewise manner, your people of Attica, before Theseus ordered them to leave their fields and come into the city, still they regarded themselves as people of Attica. So we too regard that place where we were born and that place where we have

¹⁴ The term *domi nobilis* appears at Cic. *Clu.* 23 describing the elites of Italian Larinum. It has been made popular in modern scholarship particularly from the masterful study of their arrival in Rome by Wiseman (1971).

¹⁵ E.g., *Balb.* 31: *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.*

¹⁶ For Claudius’s attitude toward the induction of the *primores Galliae* into the Senate, see Ch. 6 §1.

been enfranchised as our homeland. But it is necessary for the latter to stand first in our affection, to which the name “Republic” has attached itself to us all. For this we must die, for this we must give ourselves entirely, and for this we must give all of our possessions as though for sacrifice. But that homeland which raised us is not much less sweet than that which has adopted us. Thus I shall never say that this is not my homeland, though that one is greater and this is contained in it. [In this way every municipal man] has [two] states, but thinks of them as one.¹⁷

Although Cicero here specifies the *municipes* for this peculiar situation of *duae patriae*, he may only have regarded this situation as particularly acute for men like himself. After all, they had come to the capital from their Italian subject communities within historical memory.

To use an example outside the senatorial class, Quintus Ennius, a Messapian poet and teacher who acquired Roman citizenship in 184 B.C., expressed something similar when he said that he had “three hearts” (*tria cordia*), one Greek, one Oscan, and one Latin. This was interpreted by Aulus Gellius to mean that Ennius spoke three languages. In light of the “nested” nature of Roman (and indeed Italian) identity, however, perhaps we should see his self-description as both literary *and* cultural-ethnic, not dissimilar to Cicero’s. To account for this tripartite self-identification, one would note that Ennius was a Roman citizen from a locally powerful family of Messapian Rudiae who possessed a Hellenic

¹⁷ *Leg. 2.5: ego mehercule et illi et omnibus municipibus duas esse censeo patrias, unam naturae, alteram civitatis, ut ille Cato, cum esset Tusculi natus, in populi Romani civitatem susceptus est; ita, cum ortu Tusculanus esset, civitate Romanus, habuit alteram loci patriam, alteram iuris; ut vestri Attici, prius quam Theseus eos demigrare ex agris et in astu, quod appellatur, omnis se conferre iussit, et sui erant iidem et Attici, sic nos et eam patriam ducimus, ubi nati, et illam, a qua excepti sumus. sed necesse est caritate praestare, qua rei publicae nomen universae civitatis est; pro qua mori et cui nos totos dedere et in qua nostra omnia ponere et quasi consecrare debemus. dulcis autem non multo secus est ea, qua genuit, quam illa, quae exceptit. itaque ego hanc meam esse patriam prorsus numquam negabo, dum illa sit maior, haec in ea contineatur. [. . .] habet civitates set unam illas civitatem putat.* The text has many corruptions and I have followed the reconstructions of Vahlen.

legendary genealogy and presumably south Italian, Greek tastes and interests.¹⁸

One might be tempted to see Ennius's and Cicero's professions and anxieties of a plural identity to be unique to their "outsider" status. Yet it is clear that even Roman nobles of the most antique origin celebrated their family's arrival from Latin or Sabine locations just outside of Rome. In the late Republic, such remote origins were remembered in their august-sounding personal names, in their families' legendary genealogies, and even in the monuments and place-names around the city. Just as Cicero attended to his family's *sacra* at Arpinum, so too did patrician Romans perform familial rites at locations in the environs of the city, some on the sites of defunct Latin villages thought to have coalesced into Rome itself.¹⁹ With this in mind, it is demonstrative that Aulus Postumius Albinus, a patrician whose house supposedly existed even before the Republic, felt it worthy to note his own dual origin: in the beginning of his *Histories*, he introduces himself to his Greek audience as not just "a Roman," but as "a Roman born in Latium."²⁰ Obviously, Albinus's parochial attachments to Latium are different than those of Cicero: they emphasize his ancient and highly aristocratic origins and are not just elements of a greater devotion to the Roman commonwealth.

Although all Romans had a dual origin, this does not mean that municipal men – even Latin ones – were let off the hook for their "newness" to the Roman political scene or for their innate duality. Quite the contrary, bluer-blooded aristocrats lorded their "aboriginal"

¹⁸ Enn. ap. Gell. 17.17 = *Op. Inc. Frag.* 1 Sk. See Dench (2005) 167ff. that Ennius might have meant more than just his literary "self-positioning." See Ch. 5 §4 for the known genealogies of various Messapian families, including Ennius's from the Boeotian hero Messapus, son of Poseidon/Neptune.

¹⁹ For the extra-urban origins of patrician *gentes*, see the beginnings of Chs. 2 §1 and 3 §1. For the *sacra* of the Tullii at Arpinum, see Cic. *Leg.* 2.3.

²⁰ A. Albinus (*cos.* 151) ap. Gell. 11.8 = *FRH* 4F1b, cited and discussed more fully in Ch. 2 §1. Cf. Enn. ap. Porphy. ad. Hor. *S* 1.2.37 = *Ann.* 494–495 Sk. who also linked Rome's empire and Latium together: *audire est operae pretium, procedere recte qui rem Romanam Latiumque augescere vultis.*

status over *municipes*. They taunted the municipal men by calling them foreigners,²¹ they cast doubt on their citizen status and free birth,²² and often they considered matrimonial ties with them a thing to be despised.²³ We hear about these attacks against *municipales* (the derivative term for the *municipes*) in the lawcourts and from the rostrum (the expected venues), as well as when the *nobilissimi* were attacking their fellows who cultivated connections with the *domi nobiles* of Italy. In reality, the bulk of the Roman aristocracy was intimately bound up by ties of marriage with the elite of Italy, having made a practice of it throughout its history.²⁴ But like aristocrats of other ages, the traditional Roman *nobiles* found it useful upon occasion to act like their *gentes* were ancient and pure, though most assuredly they knew in their hearts that the reality was quite different.²⁵

²¹ Cic. *Sul.* 22 on an attack that he was a “foreigner” from the patrician L. Manlius Torquatus (*cos.* 65): *at hic etiam, id quod tibi necesse minime fuit, facetus esse voluisti, cum Tarquinium et Numam et me tertium peregrinum regem esse dixisti. mitto iam de rege quaerere; illud quaero peregrinum cur me esse dixeris. . . . “hoc dico,” inquit, “te esse ex municipio.”* See the comments that Antony made about Octavian’s mother in note 23.

²² Helvius Mancina of Formiae insulted Pompey for starting civil war, and Pompey in turn charged him with being *municipali homini, servitutem paternam redolenti* (*V. Max.* 6.2.8). For attacks on the citizen status of two Etruscan noblemen and on the Spaniard Cornelius Balbus, see Chs. 4 §8 and 6 §2.

²³ Cic. *Phil.* 3.15–17 notes the attacks by Antony upon Octavian’s Arician mother; but later Cicero counters with the fact that Antony’s own mother was from Fregellae. Tac. *Ann.* 6.27.1 says it was regretted that the imperial princess, Julia, daughter of Drusus, married C. Rubellius Blandus, *cos. suff.* A.D. 18, a *novus homo* from Latin Tibur. Cf. Tac. *Ann.* 4.3.4 who says that another imperial princess, Livilla, shamed herself, her ancestors, and her descendants with “municipal adultery” (*municipali adultera*) by her affair with the equestrian and Etruscan Sejanus.

²⁴ For marriages between the traditional elite and the Italian *domi nobiles* in the late Republic, see, e.g., Wiseman (1971) 53–64. Also, note Ch. 5 §2 for ties between Roman and Campanian *gentes* before the Hannibalic War.

²⁵ Dewald (1996) 17–19, on the early modern European nobility: “Far from being a compact conquering race, noble families were continually dying out and being replaced by new ones. There was a steady process of movement into the nobility – and contemporaries knew it. They could see it happening all around them . . . With old families disappearing and new ones appearing, only the rigidly self-deluded could cling to an idea of the nobility as a pure-bred caste. Even defenders of the idea knew of alternative interpretations and knew that the caste model was in some degree a myth – that is, an occasionally useful way of thinking about the world, but in no sense an absolute truth.”

Such superficialities aside, the perception was that most Romans had a dual origin, two homelands, often one from a *municipium*.²⁶ “How many of us are not of such an origin,” Cicero could ask his fellow senators in 44 B.C.²⁷ Being a Roman and a prospective politician meant having two homelands to consider, and oftentimes two attendant identities, particularly if his *municipium* was not Latin or Sabine. Sometimes these were places familiar and close to Rome. At other times, they were far away, and bespoke of an *origo* alien and even recently hostile to the Roman state. Such a situation was not always to be regretted or hidden from public view. Honorable origins, or at least origins that could be turned into something honorable, could be quite useful for a Roman with the ambition and the political savvy to use them to his advantage. In no instance could a Roman aristocrat ignore his origins completely, though he could try to hide them. Of course, the situation was more acute to the new nobility or those striving to break into it. Accordingly, Quintus Cicero exhorted his famous brother to recite three things to himself in his daily meditations while he was on the campaign trail for the consulship of 63 B.C.: “I am a *novus*. I seek the consulship. There is a third thing to remember. ‘This is Rome,’ a state formed by a gathering of nations.”²⁸ One could interpret Quintus’s words as a warning to his

²⁶ Sherwin-White (1973) 73: “Where communities of a different kind were incorporated, Rome was so far from destroying what little already existed of a *res publica* that she sought to amplify it. At the same time, it is necessary to insist upon the importance of the process *feri Romani*. Beside the *res publica populi Romani* there remained always some residue of a secondary *res publica*.”

²⁷ *Phi l.* 3.15: *videte quam despiciamur omnes qui sumus e municipiis id est, omnes plane: quotus enim quisque nostrum non est?*

²⁸ Q. Cic. *Pet.* 54: *haec veniebant mihi in mentem de duabus illis commentationibus matutinis, quod tibi cottidie ad forum descendenti meditandum esse dixeram: “novus sum, consulatum peto.” tertium restat: “Roma est,” civitas ex nationum conventu constituta . . . (cf. *Pet.* 2). Kajanto (1980) 83–84 took *civitas* . . . *constituta* to mean Italic people. *Contra* Noy (2000) 33 who believes it may refer to non-Italians, too. For the authenticity of the *Commentariolus Petitionis* by Q. Cicero, see Morstein-Marx (1998) 260–261 and Yakobson (1999) 24 n. 9 and 74–75. Yakobson, rightly I think, cautiously accepts the arguments of David et al. (1973) that Q. Cicero is the author. Both Morstein-Marx and Yakobson note that most scholars, even those who doubt the authenticity of the work, accept that the author is well-versed in the political conditions of the late Republic.*