

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-00479-5 - Peasants and Slaves: The Rural Population of Roman Italy (200 BC to AD 100)

Alessandro Launaro

Excerpt

[More information](#)

INTRODUCTION

The demographic debate

Much of modern historiography debating the last two centuries of the Roman Republic – and beyond – rests on fundamental analyses which have developed since the 1960s, namely *Hannibal's Legacy* by Arnold Toynbee (1965) (who first came to outline a centuries-spanning process leading to the break-up of the Roman State) and *Italian Manpower* by Peter A. Brunt (1971) (who thoroughly researched the underlying demographic structure).¹ Such studies have developed a specific interpretive model which has accounted for the overall transformations of Roman politics, economy and society in Italy following the Hannibalic War. Along with other arguments, it was claimed that something had irreversibly changed in the relationship between the citizen-peasant-soldier and his landscape: the former being displaced by the overseas conflicts of the second and first centuries BC, the latter compromised because of the absence of their owners, entire territories were to become large properties of a rich aristocracy, employing scores of readily available slaves and taking the advantages deriving from a monopolised Mediterranean market. Although never accepted without emendations, refinements or even more substantial modifications, this became the dominant model, the theoretical framework accounting for the general pattern of Roman Italy.²

Lying at the forefront of this interpretation was the idea of a decline of the Italian free peasantry, being supplanted by huge numbers of imported slaves. It is therefore important to observe that at the very roots of such a traditional view there is a demographic argument, whose origin can be traced back to the ground-breaking study by Karl Julius Beloch (1886) and, specifically, to his treatment of the census figures of the first century BC. His reconstruction reckoned with a significant leap between the two censuses of 70/69 BC and 28 BC (910,000 and 4,063,000 *civium capita* respectively), holding it too wide to be explained in reasonable terms. He then proposed that whereas previous censuses were enumerating adult male citizens only, the Augustan ones (28 BC, 8 BC and AD 14) were including also women and children of citizen birth. Accordingly, resulting figures would point to a marked

¹ Although explicitly connected (e.g. Brunt 1971: viii), they are inherently different in their approach – and related interpretations. As a bare example of that, whereas Brunt's argument proceeds from the late third century BC until Augustus, Toynbee's analysis did not consider any event following the second century BC. For some recent re-appraisal of 'Toynbee's Legacy' see Curti 2001, Lo Cascio and Storch-Marino 2001.

² Indeed, such influence can hardly be overestimated. For example, stemming from this debate are *Conquerors and Slaves* by Keith Hopkins (1978) and the *Istituto Gramsci* volumes dealing with the *slave mode of production* (Giardina and Schiavone 1981). A brief review of this point in Lo Cascio 1999a: 217–18 (especially note 1).

INTRODUCTION

decline of the total free population of Italy. Given the significant number of towns and the urban development of the first century BC (i.e. high levels of urban dwellers), this process could only have implied the collapse of the free rural population and, consequently, a countryside filled with imported slaves (Hopkins 1978: 1–98).

However, such readings were not universally accepted. Tenney Frank (1924) and A. H. M. Jones (1948) had adopted different solutions in interpreting the census leap, while John Rich (1983) came to dispute the very premises of the ‘supposed Roman manpower shortage’. More recently, Elio Lo Cascio has cogently revived this topic in a series of papers, suggesting a global re-appraisal based primarily on demographic arguments and comparative evidence. His analysis has therefore challenged Beloch’s interpretation of Augustan census figures, pointing to its intrinsic weaknesses and even advocating for an increase of the Roman citizen population in both town and country.³ This renewed debate has come to involve other scholars as well (including Neville Morley, Walter Scheidel, Luuk de Ligt and Geoffrey Kron)⁴ arguing for or against the demographic roots of traditional explanations of what happened to Italy during the last two centuries of the Republic.

Indeed, it is worth remarking how the focal point from which every argument stems is the quite simple numerical evidence presented by Augustus himself in his *Res Gestae*.⁵ Currently there is absolutely no agreement about the exact significance of such figures as no scholar has been able to produce firm or undisputed evidence that could not be narrowly rebutted.⁶ It is quite justifiable to feel that this whole issue is just a matter of personal choice between the ‘low-counters’ (those supporting the Beloch–Brunt low estimates: i.e. Augustan censuses including women and children of citizen birth) and the ‘high-counters’ (those arguing for a higher figure: i.e. Augustan censuses reporting adult male citizens only).⁷ Recently, the whole issue has been further complicated as an intermediate scenario has been outlined by Robert Witcher (2005) and the proposal for a ‘middle count’ has been advanced by Saskia Hin (2008; 2009: 163–94).

But the most remarkable aspect is the fact that the full historical implications of such a debate have still to be thoroughly assessed. The only attempt to do so has been pursued by Neville Morley, who has nonetheless only sketched ‘some of the components of such alternative history, taking the higher population figure as its starting point’ (Morley 2001: 52). Indeed, high-counters – and supporters of intermediate solutions as well – have not as yet produced any historical narrative to

³ Lo Cascio 1994a, 1994b, 1996, 1999a, 1999b, 2001a, 2001c, 2004a, 2004b; Lo Cascio and Malanima 2005.

⁴ Morley 1996, 2001, 2008; Scheidel 1996, 2004, 2005, 2007a, 2007b, 2008; de Ligt 2004, 2006, 2007a, 2007b, 2007c, 2008; Kron 2005, 2008.

⁵ *Res Gestae Divi Augusti* 8.2–4.

⁶ This point has been clearly made by Scheidel (2004: 6): ‘Narrow rebuttals of this sort have long been a staple of historical scholarship. While they serve to highlight the weaknesses of rival claims, they do not pre-empt the subsequent restatement of adapted versions of such claims or the introduction of new objections.’

⁷ For the sake of argument, Walter Scheidel and Luuk de Ligt are low-counters, while Elio Lo Cascio and Geoffrey Kron are high-counters, a more blurred position being held by Neville Morley. Such broad categories could be rightly taken as trivial and, indeed, they cannot take into account all the peculiar aspects of the individual interpretations. This is especially true as views may evolve (e.g. Scheidel 2008: 29–30).

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-00479-5 - Peasants and Slaves: The Rural Population of Roman Italy (200 BC to AD 100)

Alessandro Launaro

Excerpt

[More information](#)

A POSSIBLE ROLE FOR LANDSCAPE ARCHAEOLOGY

counter the elaborate Beloch–Brunt orthodoxy.⁸ Anyway, it has been already made clear that such a re-appraisal would imply the writing of a very different Roman History (Scheidel 2004: 3).

A possible role for landscape archaeology

To what degree the contribution of archaeological survey to this debate could be fruitful (or even appropriate) is a matter of debate in itself and needs some introductory remarks. Such a cautious attitude can be better appreciated when considering that a very recent review of ‘demography in archaeology’ (Chamberlain 2006) completely omitted any involvement of field-survey and landscape archaeology.⁹ Nonetheless, surface scatters of potsherds all over the Italian countryside have produced a huge amount of data related to ancient settlement patterns and, in some cases, these sites have been interpreted as evidence for the persistence of small farms (i.e. free peasantry) during the Late Republic.¹⁰ However, survey data – and related interpretations – have created a diversified array of attitudes among historians dealing with Roman demography: from scepticism (Scheidel) to optimism (Brunt), from reasonable caution (Morley) to positive interest (Frier, Parkin) and trust (Lo Cascio, Jongman, Kron).¹¹

Whatever the case may be, the links between field-survey and historical demography were inherent in much recent methodological debate concerning the archaeology of Mediterranean landscapes. Specifically, the POPULUS Project endeavoured to show that landscape archaeology could provide ‘a wealth of new evidence on past settlement patterns . . . significantly to advance our knowledge of European human demography in pre-industrial times’ (Barker and Mattingly 1999: iii).¹² Consequently, a key issue was how to integrate surface evidence into historical-demographic research. Although strong doubts about it were raised by John Chapman (1999: 65–6), more positive attitudes were shown by both Kostas Sbonias (1999a: 8–18) and Simon Stoddart (1999: 130–1). Indeed it was clearly stated by the latter that although no straightforward, uncritical relation could be employed in estimating absolute population figures from numbers of sites, survey could still provide fairly good data for an outline of relative demographic changes

⁸ ‘. . . and so they have lost the wider argument by default. Historians have had to choose, not between two different narratives of the past, but between an elaborate and plausible narrative on the one hand and no more than a series of doubts and objections to it on the other’ (Morley 2001: 61).

⁹ No mention of field survey is to be found in the section devoted to estimating population numbers from archaeological data (Chamberlain 2006: 126–32), where only the size of (excavated) sites is considered (Chamberlain 2006: 127–8).

¹⁰ Frederiksen 1970–71: 356; Dyson 1992: 27–35. On this topic see also Evans 1980.

¹¹ Scheidel 2001: 65–6; 2008: 49–54; Brunt 1971: viii; Morley 1996: 95–6, 129–30; Frier 2001: 156–7; Parkin 1999: 159; Lo Cascio 1994a: 91–2; 1999a: 220; 1999b: 170; Jongman 2003: 111–12; 2009: 120–3; Kron 2005: 490–5. See also traditional comments in Gabba 1989: 282–3.

¹² The POPULUS Project contributions were gathered in five thematic volumes: Bintliff and Sbonias 1999 (demographic modelling), Leveau *et al.* 1999 (environmental reconstruction), Gillings, Mattingly and van Dalen 1999 (GIS applications), Pasquinucci and Trément 2000 (remote sensing) and Francovich, Patterson and Barker 2000 (field survey).

INTRODUCTION

(trends) over time (also Mattingly 2009). However, the critical point within the frame of such diachronic syntheses was – and still is (e.g. Given 2004) – represented by the specific character of each survey. Indeed, the quantity and quality of collected data – the so-called *ploughsoil assemblage* – are strongly dependent on a number of variables (e.g. environmental context, research techniques, etc.) that are generally research-specific.¹³ Consequently, inter-comparability between different study areas can be seriously hampered or even made impossible. Given that demographic patterns are best outlined against regional or inter-regional backgrounds, such issues came to constitute the primal focus of the debate and it was thought that a unified body of techniques could have definitely provided *homogeneous* sets of data to be compared throughout the whole of the Mediterranean basin.¹⁴

This rather optimistic stance seemed to accord well with John Cherry's twenty-year-old call for 'the stage when synthesis and comparison at a geographical scale considerably larger than that of the individual survey would be worthwhile' (Cherry 1983: 406). However, as noted by Cherry himself when reviewing the *POPULUS* volumes, one must conclude that the stage for establishing a series of common research goals and standards has not been reached in any coherent manner (Cherry 2002: 572). But there is more. The theoretical roots of such an endeavour were clearly argued by Martin Millett who stated that 'there is a danger in thinking that valid comparison depends on applying the same methods' and that 'careful and explicit explanation by each project is what we need to facilitate worthwhile comparisons' (Millett 2000b: 93).¹⁵

In my view this last orientation has come to signify a fundamental theoretical shift of focus from data retrieving (i.e. how to produce homogeneous data) to data processing (i.e. how to render existing data homogeneous), eventually stemming from the same 'old' awareness that a huge amount of information has already been collected.¹⁶ This attitude is better attested by a recent volume on comparative regional studies (Alcock and Cherry 2004a) and is perhaps best seen in the introduction by the editors themselves. Acknowledging the unprecedented quantity, quality and diversity of data from hundreds of individual projects, they were rather disappointed by the fact that there are 'no widely agreed procedures for juxtaposing, combining, or synthesising individual survey datasets' (Alcock and Cherry 2004b: 4). The reason behind this has been identified in the fact that 'one

¹³ '... the credibility of survey results has to be evaluated within each regional context on the basis of the problems and conditions posed by the specific survey area, the methodology followed and specific answers that can be given to a series of questions related to the recovery, dating and interpretation of the data' (Bintliff and Sbonias 2000: 253); 'Though they are all based on large quantities of evidence, they are basically the mental constructs of the researchers' (Yntema 2002: 3). See also Bintliff 2002.

¹⁴ Such scientific outcome was to be gathered in a *Manual of Best Practice* (Barker and Mattingly 1999: ix) which, according to Cherry, 'may not now appear' (2002: 572 n. 33).

¹⁵ A similar point had already been made by David J. Mattingly (1993: 360) who claimed that 'a "critical apparatus" of a good survey report ought to assist others in drawing out valid comparisons or reinterpretations'.

¹⁶ 'A vast data bank has been built up willy-nilly, containing information of very variable quality, patchily distributed, and generally published in ways that impede the direct comparison of one survey with another. Nonetheless, information is pouring in at an unprecedented rate. What are we to do with it all?' (Cherry 1983: 406). This tendency is well-exemplified by a renovated interest in 'legacy data' (e.g. Witcher 2008b).

TOWARDS AN EFFECTIVE SYNTHESIS

does not want to be accused of making invalid comparisons' (Alcock and Cherry 2004b: 4). And even if such hesitancy is both understandable and well supported (e.g. Osborne 2004), they account for 'a growing interest and willingness to attempt intra- and inter-regional studies encompassing multiple sets of survey data' (Alcock and Cherry 2004b: 4).

Ancient Italy as a research area seems to be at the forefront of such a comparative ambition. One recent – although preliminary – attempt in this direction is represented by a study by David Mattingly and Robert Witcher, who have tried 'to map the results of Italian surveys at a macro-regional scale emphasising the similarities and differences in regional settlement' (Mattingly and Witcher 2004: 178). As acknowledged by the authors themselves, a comparative attitude towards synthesis had already been stressed (both implicitly and explicitly) by previous works,¹⁷ but 'despite the wealth of evidence and the awareness of its potential to illustrate significant patterning, attempts at comparing and mapping at a macro-regional scale have been limited' (Mattingly and Witcher 2004: 177).¹⁸

Nevertheless, formal syntheses of survey data specifically devoted to the demographic debate outlined above are still lacking. One possible exception, a paper on Rome's *suburbium* by Witcher (2005), did touch on the topic but did not specifically reckon with its premises and implications.¹⁹ This means that, until very recently, the specific involvement of archaeology has been passive, marginal at best:²⁰ even those who employed survey-derived evidence to argue against the decline of the Roman free peasantry did not reckon with the formal demographic roots of the Beloch–Brunt argument.²¹

Towards an effective synthesis

In light of these premises the present study aims at developing a formal synthesis of survey evidence to be fully integrated within the debate on the population of Roman Italy (including *Transpadana*) and its landscape from Late Republic to Early Empire (200 BC–AD 100). The choice of such a chronological framework stemmed from the awareness that it was compatible with (a) the questions being originally posed by the demographic debate and (b) the quality of the evidence field survey could manage to contribute. As such this analysis has built upon a wide (statistical) population of twenty-seven field surveys – i.e. about five thousand sites – whose characteristics (e.g. site typology, periodisation) were found

¹⁷ Celuzza and Regoli 1982; Patterson 1987; see also Curti, Dench and Patterson 1996; Dyson 1992; Potter 1989.

¹⁸ Such syntheses necessarily include the Regional Pathways to Complexity Project (by the Groningen Archaeological Institute and the Archaeological Institute of the Vrije Universiteit of Amsterdam; a general overview in Burgers 2002) and the Tiber Valley Project (by the British School at Rome: presented in Patterson and Millett 1998).

¹⁹ The main focus of Witcher's analysis rested on the *suburbium* area and his treatment of the demography of Roman Italy was accordingly derived.

²⁰ Despite the contribution of archaeological survey being largely advocated by the historian Elio Lo Cascio (1994a: 91–2; 1999a: 220; 1999b: 170).

²¹ E.g. Frederiksen 1970–71, Rathbone 1981 and Dyson 1992. On this aspect see Lo Cascio 1999a: 218, n. 2.

INTRODUCTION

to be consistent with the questions raised so far. Furthermore they were considered capable of producing a rather representative picture to be framed against a regional background: since syntheses tend to generalise, the specific character of archaeological evidence would have allowed a more locally aware consideration. Such regional frameworks whose importance has been increasingly stressed within current research,²² have therefore helped to tackle the diversified implications of more general demographic trends.

The process outlined so far, however, is not a straightforward one: survey data cannot be tuned to the other involved sources (e.g. narrative history, demographic models, comparative evidence) without taking into account their specific epistemological character. Indeed, site numbers are no evidence by themselves and need to be correctly framed against both the research background that produced them and the questions they were meant to be applied to. Such a critical approach requires all the sources involved to be framed within a common and coherent view as well as research questions to be structured and stated accordingly. In other words, the historical-demographic framework has to be explored in *all* its implications as for the archaeological landscape (e.g. settlement patterns) if survey evidence is to be effectively used in verifying them.

Indeed this research entails an integration of (archaeological) survey-derived data within a (historical) text-driven debate. Although hinting at the same underlying process (i.e. the demographic trends across Roman Italy), material and documentary evidence largely diverge as to the kind of information they may provide: whereas the former draws on long-term settlement patterns (e.g. dispersed/nucleated), the latter preserves a series of chronologically circumscribed enumerations of specific groups of individuals (e.g. adult male citizens, casualties in a given battle). Taken as they are, such independent sources do not seem comparable at all.²³

Nevertheless, however different according to their epistemological significance, such sets of data are inherently tied inasmuch as they reflect different aspects of the same historical process. Therefore any general interpretation based on one set of data clearly entails significant implications as to possible readings of the other (e.g. excluding or suggesting possible solutions). Although archaeological and documentary 'raw data' may not match (and indeed they do not have to),²⁴ it is fair to expect that their respective interpretations ought not to differ so profoundly as to contradict each other. Any possible reconstruction has to prove its value

²² E.g. Lloyd 1991: 235; Lo Cascio 2001b: 8–11; Mattingly and Witcher 2004: 177–83; Patterson 1987: 134–44; 2006: 5–9; Potter 1989: 14–27; Terrenato 2001a: 2–3; Yntema 2002: 3–4. Regional differences and local variations within Roman Italy are an integral part of the historiography of Emilio Gabba (e.g. 1994a) and were acutely approached by Andrea Giardina (1997: 3–116) through the notion of *identità incompiuta* ('uncompleted identity').

²³ A similar view (although in more general terms) has been authoritatively endorsed by Emilio Gabba (1989: 282–3) (some brief comments in Cambi and Terrenato 1994: 33). However, it seems to me that Gabba's arguments may be tempered as they were mainly accounting for early syntheses by Martin Frederiksen (1970–71) and John Rich (1983), whose straightforward inference from survey evidence might have sounded too reckless.

²⁴ 'If we uncritically ask the same questions of different kinds of evidence we will get silly answers' (Foxhall 2004: 83). See also more general comments by different contributors in Sauer 2004.

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-00479-5 - Peasants and Slaves: The Rural Population of Roman Italy (200 BC to AD 100)

Alessandro Launaro

Excerpt

[More information](#)

TOWARDS AN EFFECTIVE SYNTHESIS

by corresponding to available data as well as by accounting for other relevant reconstructions that have been based on independent evidence. This is precisely what makes an interpretation more plausible – that is, more coherent according to available knowledge.²⁵

Indeed, the historical demography of Roman Italy has been traditionally based on a set of – only apparently – straightforward numerical data whose readings have differed in radical ways. As mentioned, such diverse interpretations logically entailed some major implications for our modern understanding of the ancient Italian countryside. On the other hand archaeology has thoroughly explored that very landscape: by identifying settlement structures (e.g. regarding hierarchy and function) it has in turn implied underlying patterns of rural population. It is clear that, although starting from separate and absolutely independent sources, historical and archaeological interpretations have to meet ‘somewhere’ within the rural landscape of Roman Italy.²⁶

In accordance with such a methodological premise, Chapter 1 will present the core evidence behind the demographic debate on Roman Italy and will review the different readings proposed so far (i.e. low, middle and high count). Chapter 2 will analyse and contrast the diversified implications of competing views and will show how the whole argument developed by low-, middle- and high-counters can be reduced to a simple question pertaining to the dynamics of the free rural population between 200 BC and AD 100. Stemming from such a formulation, Chapter 3 will explore the ways through which landscape archaeology has contributed to the debate so far and will argue in favour of a move from *absolute figures* to *relative trends*. The great potential of such an approach will be the subject of Chapter 4 which – by way of a critical review of comparative issues – will eventually derive an operational methodology to be consistently applied to survey evidence. Accordingly, it will be argued that a comparison between patterns of relative change over time from different survey projects is feasible inasmuch as it produces *comparable* numerical figures – as presented in Chapter 5. Such rural settlement evidence will then be composed into a demographic synthesis in Chapter 6 and will constitute the base for Chapter 7, where a (possibly) renewed narrative of the rural landscape of Roman Italy will be presented and interpreted through its everyday protagonists: peasants and slaves.

²⁵ Such an approach, which is the core of interdisciplinarity, is indeed very close to the *compatibility theory of truth* followed by Keith Hopkins (1978: 2–3, n. 4).

²⁶ On the necessary relationship between historical and archaeological sources see Moreland 2001 and Sauer 2004.

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-00479-5 - Peasants and Slaves: The Rural Population of Roman Italy (200 BC to AD 100)

Alessandro Launaro

Excerpt

[More information](#)

PART I

AN OUTLINE OF THE HISTORICAL DEMOGRAPHY
OF ROMAN ITALY

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-00479-5 - Peasants and Slaves: The Rural Population of Roman Italy (200 BC to AD 100)

Alessandro Launaro

Excerpt

[More information](#)

I

THE ITALIAN POPULATION UNDER AUGUSTUS

(28 BC – AD 100)

1.1 The meaning of the Augustan account

We know from Suetonius (*Augustus* 101) that the *Princeps* had entrusted the Vestal Virgins with his last will along with another three rolls (*tria volumina*) to be made public upon his death. These three documents provided (a) instructions for his funeral (*mandata de funere suo*), (b) a summarised report of the whole Empire (*breuiarium totius imperii*) and (c) a list of his own achievements (*indicem rerum a se gestarum*) which was specifically meant to be engraved on bronze tablets to be set up in front of his mausoleum in the Campus Martius. Despite the fact that no such bronze inscription was ever found (being probably stripped off, at some moment in time, to be melted down), the Latin text (along with its Greek translation) has been largely well-preserved as inscribed on the walls of the Temple of Rome and Augustus at *Ancyra* (modern-day Ankara, Turkey; hence *Monumentum Ancyranum*).¹ The thirty-five chapters of the *Res Gestae Divi Augusti* were composed by Augustus himself towards the end of his life and provided an official retrospect of his own deeds:² his offices and honours (*honores*: *RG* 1–14, 34–35), his own expenditures on behalf of the people and the state (*impensae*: *RG* 15–24) and his acts in peace and war (*res gestae*: *RG* 25–33). In many respects this document reported an ideological narrative involving intentional omissions, partisan accounts and even ‘lies’ (Ridley 2003: 234–41),³ whose probable purpose was to instruct a specific audience on the political situation Augustus had brought about (Ramage 1987: 111–16; Ridley 2003: 231–2).⁴

¹ Hereinafter any quote from the *Res Gestae Divi Augusti* (*RG*) refers to a ‘composite’ text (i.e. as derived from an integration of different extant copies: see below) as edited by Alison E. Cooley (2009: 66–7); see also Scheid 2007. The superscription on the Ankara copy makes an explicit statement as to its own nature: *rerum gestarum divi Augusti. . . incisarum in duabus athenis pilis, quae su[n]t Romae positae, exemplar sub[i]jectum* (such bronze pillars were probably set on either side of the entrance to the mausoleum: Coarelli 1995: 347; also Cooley 2009: 3–6). While the inscription has been known to European scholars since the sixteenth century, other fragments have been recovered at Apollonia of Phrygia (Greek version) and at Antioch of Pisidia (Latin version) during the last two centuries (Cooley 2009: 7–18). Remarkably, all extant copies are from Asia Minor. For a full account of the recovery process see Ridley 2003: 3–24.

² Both the Latin and Greek texts are rather explicit in providing a date: [*cum scri*]psi haec, annum agebam septuagensu[m] sextum] and ὅτε ἔγραφον ταῦτα, ἦγον ἔτος ἑβδομηκοστὸν ἕκτον (*RG* 35.2), that is between Augustus’ last birthday (23 September AD 13) and the day of his death (19 August AD 14). By considering other chronological references within the text (e.g. *lustrum* in AD 14: *RG* 8.4) it has been suggested that the whole composition should be dated to summer AD 14 (Ramage 1988: 82). Other readings have entailed various stages of composition and an earlier date (e.g. before AD 13), thus assuming later additions by Tiberius. For summary and critique see Ramage 1988.

³ Detailed commentary is provided by Cooley 2009: 102–278. Also Ridley 2003, particularly 67–141 (omissions) and 159–227 (‘lies’).

⁴ Ancient evidence seems to support the idea that Augustus ‘was genuinely interested in establishing a stable form of government and in having this continue after his death’ (Ramage 1987: 114 with references), therefore

I THE ITALIAN POPULATION UNDER AUGUSTUS

More specifically, the eighth chapter (*RG* 8) accounted for a series of acts broadly associated with the prerogatives of traditional *censura*: the *lectio senatus* (reform of the list of Senators), the *census* (the enumeration of the citizen body) and the *lustrum* (the purification ritual to conclude the *census*). The text in itself is rather clear and explicit in reporting citizen population figures for the years 28 BC, 8 BC and AD 14:⁵

1. *patriciorum numerum auxi consul quintum iussu populi et senatus.* **2.** *senatum ter legi, et in consulatu sexto census populi conlega M(arco) Agrippa egi lustrum post annum alterum et quadragesimum fec[i], quo lustrum civium Romanorum censa sunt capita quadragens centum millia et sexag[i]nta tria millia.* **3.** *tum [iteru]m consulari cum imperio lustrum [s]olus feci C(aio) Censorino [et C(aio)] Asinio co(n)s(ulibus), quo lustrum censa sunt civium Romanorum [capit]a quadragens centum millia et ducenta triginta tria m[illia].* **4.** *et te]rtium consulari cum imperio lustrum conlega Tib(erio) Cae[sare filio] m[eo feci], Sex(to) Pompeio et Sex(to) Appuleio co(n)s(ulibus), quo lustrum ce[nsa sunt] civ[ium Ro]manorum capitum quadragens centum mill[ia et n]ong[e]nta tr[iginta et septem] millia.* **5.** *legibus novi[s] m[e auctore] l[at]is m[ulta e]xempla maiorum exolescentia iam ex nostro [saeculo] red[uxi et ipse] multarum rer[um exe]mpla imitanda pos[teris tradidi].*

1. τῶν [πατρ]ικίων τὸν ἀριθμὸν εὗξησα πέμπτον ὑπατ[ο]ς ἐπιτ[α]γῆι τοῦ τε δήμου καὶ τῆς συνκλήτου. **2.** [τ]ῆ[ν σύ]νκλητον τρίς ἐπέλεξα. ἕκτον ὑπατος τὴν ἀπ[ο]τείμησιν τοῦ δήμου συνάρχου[τ]α ἔχων Μάρκον Ἀγρίππαν ἔλαβον, ἥτις ἀπο[τείμη]σις μετὰ [δύο καὶ] τεσσαρακοστὸν ἔνιαυτὸν [σ]υνε[κ]λείσθη. ἐν ἧι ἀποτειμήσει Ῥωμαίων ἐτει[μῆ]σ[α]ντο κεφαλὰι τετρακόσια[ι] ἐξήκοντα μυρ[ι]άδες [καὶ] τρισχίλια. **3.** [εἶτα] δεῦτερον ὑπατικῆι ἐξ[ου]σία μόνος Γαίωι Κηνησορίω καὶ Γαίωι [Α]σινίω ὑπάτοις τὴν ἀποτειμήσιν ἔλαβον· ἐν [ἧ]ι ἀπ[ο]τειμήσει ἐτειμήσαντο Ῥωμαίων τετ[ρα]κόσια εἴκοσι τρεῖς μυριάδες καὶ τρι[σ]χίλιοι. **4.** καὶ τρίτον ὑπατικῆι ἐξουσία τὰς ἀποτειμή[σε]ι[ς] ἔλαβον, [ἔχων]ν [συνάρχοντα] Τιβέριον Καίσαρα τὸν υἱὸν μοῦν Σέξτωι Πομπηῖω καὶ Σέξτωι Ἀππουληῖω ὑπάτοις, ἐν ἧι ἀποτειμήσει ἐτειμήσαντο Ῥωμαίων τετρακόσια ἑνενήκοντα τρεῖς μυριάδες καὶ ἑπτακισχίλιοι. **5.** εἰσαγαγὼν καίνους νόμους πολλὰ ἤδη τῶν ἀρχαίων ἐθῶν καταλυόμενα διωρθωσάμην καὶ αὐτὸς πολλῶν πραγμάτων μείμημα ἑμαυτὸν τοῖς μετέπειτα παρέδωκα.⁶

1. I increased the number of patricians by command of the people and senate when consul for the fifth time [29 BC]. **2.** I revised the membership of the Senate three times, and in my sixth consulship [28 BC] I conducted a census of the population with Marcus Agrippa as my colleague. I performed the ceremony of purification forty-two years after the last one; in this census 4,063,000 individual Roman citizens were registered. **3.** Then for a second time I conducted a census on my own with consular power in the consulship of Gaius Censorinus and Gaius Asinius [8 BC]; in this census were registered 4,233,000 individual Roman citizens. **4.** And for a third time I conducted a census with consular power with Tiberius Caesar my son as colleague in the consulship of Sextus Pompeius and Sextus Appuleius [AD 14]; in this census were registered 4,937,000 individual Roman citizens. **5.** By means of new laws brought in under my sponsorship I revived many exemplary ancestral practices which were by then dying out in our generation, and I myself handed down to later generations exemplary practices for them to imitate.

implying a general concern with the younger generation as well as a more specific one with his successor Tiberius (Ramage 1987: 115). See also Cooley 2009: 30–41.

⁵ The Greek, Latin and English versions reproduced here are taken from Cooley 2009: 66–7. Note that the English version is a translation of the Latin text.

⁶ The Greek translation shows a misunderstanding of the three census totals: ‘the Latin sequence proudly shows a steady population increase (4,063,000 then 4,233,000 finally 4,937,000), but the version confounds the propaganda effect with a mistranslation of the first figure as 4,603,000’ (Wigtill 1982:192). In general on the Greek translation of the *Res Gestae* see Vanotti 1975 and Cooley 2009: 26–30.