

A Thesis Submitted for the Degree of PhD at the University of Warwick

Permanent WRAP URL:

<http://wrap.warwick.ac.uk/88295>

Copyright and reuse:

This thesis is made available online and is protected by original copyright.

Please scroll down to view the document itself.

Please refer to the repository record for this item for information to help you to cite it.

Our policy information is available from the repository home page.

For more information, please contact the WRAP Team at: wrap@warwick.ac.uk

Haec Patria Est

The Conceptualisation, Function and Nature of *Patria* in the Roman World

by

Alexander Gyford Peck

A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the
requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in
Classics and Ancient History

University of Warwick,
Department of Classics and Ancient
History

May 2016

Dedicated to the loving memory of
Geoffrey Gyford Peck,
a lover of Classics and a greatly missed grandfather.

Table of Contents

LIST OF FIGURES	4
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	5
ABSTRACT	8
ABBREVIATIONS	9
INTRODUCTION	11
1. THE POLITICAL DEFINITION OF <i>PATRIA</i>	12
2. CONSIDERING THE CONTEXT OF <i>DE LEGIBUS</i> 2.5	17
3. HOW CAN WE UNDERSTAND THE CONCEPT OF <i>PATRIA</i> IN THE ROMAN WORLD?	25
CHAPTER ONE: IDENTIFYING THE DEFINING THEMES OF <i>PATRIA</i>	31
INTRODUCTION	31
1.I. <i>PATRIA</i> AS A MARKER OF COLLECTIVE IDENTITY	35
1.I.i: <i>Patria, Mythology and the Sacred</i>	36
1.I.ii: <i>Ancestry and Ancestral Tradition</i>	42
1.I.iii: <i>Familial Imagery</i>	46
1.II. MEMBERSHIP OF <i>PATRIA</i>	49
1.III. <i>PATRIA</i> AS AN OBJECT OF SERVICE AND DEVOTION.....	57
1.IV. THE TERRITORIAL EXTENT OF <i>PATRIA</i>	67
SUMMARY	75
CHAPTER TWO: THE FUNCTION OF <i>PATRIA</i> IN THE POLITICAL AND ORATORICAL WORKS OF CICERO	78
INTRODUCTION	78
2.I. EARLY INDICATIONS OF <i>PATRIA</i> 'S RELATIONSHIP TO ROMAN REPUBLICAN POLITICS.....	80
2.II. THE FUNCTION OF <i>PATRIA</i> WITHIN CICERO'S <i>CATILINARIANS</i>	86
2.II.i. <i>The Dependence of Patria upon Individual Political Morality</i>	88
2.II.ii. <i>It's not Personal, it's Strictly Collective</i>	99
2.III. <i>PATRIA</i> AND CICERO'S PUBLIC IMAGE, 62 BC – 49 BC.....	107
2.III.i. <i>62-58 BC: Pre-Exile and Exile</i>	112
2.III.ii. <i>57-55 BC: Post-Exile</i>	120
2.III.iii. <i>49 BC: An Identity Crisis</i>	134
2.IV. <i>PATRIA</i> AND 'FACTIONAL' IDENTITY: 44-43 BC	143
SUMMARY	159
CHAPTER THREE: THE CULTURAL (RE)DEFINITION OF <i>PATRIA</i> IN THE AUGUSTAN PERIOD	161
INTRODUCTION	161
3.I. <i>AB URBE CONDITA</i> : EXPLORING THE SIGNIFICANCE OF <i>PATRIA</i> THROUGH MORAL MEMORIES	170
3.I.i: <i>Patria and Exempla</i>	172
3.I.ii: <i>Collective Trauma: 5.39-54</i>	188
3.II. VIRGIL'S <i>AENEID</i> : THE TALE OF AN ITALIAN <i>PATRIA</i>	208
3.II.i. 'Death'	211
3.II.ii. 'Rebirth'	223
3.II.iii. <i>An Italian Agenda</i>	234
SUMMARY	237
CHAPTER FOUR: THE SIGNIFICANCE OF <i>PATRIA</i> IN THE POLITICAL IDENTITY OF AUGUSTUS AND SEPTIMIUS SEVERUS	240

INTRODUCTION	240
4.I. PATRIA AND THE EXTERNAL CHARACTERISATION OF THE AUGUSTAN PRINCIPATE	242
4.I.i: Horace, <i>Epistulae</i> 1.3 and <i>Carmina</i> 3.6, 4.5.	249
4.I.ii: Propertius, <i>Elegiae</i> 4.6	260
4.I.iii: <i>The Exile Poetry of Ovid</i>	263
4.I.iv: <i>An Inherently Ambiguous Relationship</i>	273
4.II. THE DI PATRII COINAGE OF SEPTIMIUS SEVERUS: A TALE OF TWO IDENTITIES.....	275
4.II.i: <i>Lepcitan Iconography</i>	280
4.II.ii: <i>Deus Patrius: A Roman Religio-Cultural Expression</i>	290
4.II.iii: <i>Context and Purpose: A Visual Metaphor for Tradition and Innovation</i>	316
SUMMARY	319
CHAPTER FIVE: ROMA COMMUNIS NOSTRA PATRIA EST?	322
INTRODUCTION	322
5.I. THE EPIGRAPHIC EVIDENCE FROM THE HELLENIC PROVINCES.....	324
5.I.i. <i>Public Inscriptions</i>	325
5.I.ii. <i>Dedicatory inscriptions</i>	329
5.I.iii. <i>Funerary Inscriptions</i>	333
5.II. THE EPIGRAPHIC EVIDENCE FROM THE ROMAN PROVINCES OF SPAIN	336
5.II.i. <i>Funerary</i>	337
5.II.ii. <i>Honorific</i>	340
5.II.iii. <i>Public or Civic</i>	342
5.III. THE EPIGRAPHIC EVIDENCE FROM THE ROMAN PROVINCES OF NORTH AFRICA	344
SUMMARY	354
CONCLUSION.....	356
BIBLIOGRAPHY	363

List of Figures

Fig. 1: A Table Showing the Total Number of Occurrences of *Patria* in Ciceronian Literature and the Number of these that Relate to Cicero's Public Image.
Page 110-111.

Fig. 2: Denarius of Septimius Severus, AD 200-204. *RIC* IV.I.762.
Image from http://www.wildwinds.com/coins/ric/septimius_severus/RIC_762_denarius.jpg.
Last accessed 2nd May 2016.
Page 276.

Fig. 3: Bronze Coin from Lepcis Magna, 1st Century BC. *MAA* (III) 1, 2 and 6. Image from <https://www.numisbids.com/n.php?p=lot&sid=491&lot=241>.
Last accessed 2nd May 2016.
Page 282.

Fig. 4: Bronze Coin from Lepcis Magna, 1st Century BC. *MAA* (III) 4 and 7. Image from http://www.wildwinds.com/coins/greece/syrtica/leptis_magna/SNGC_op_006.jpg.
Last accessed 2nd May 2016.
Page 282.

Fig. 5: Bronze Coin from Lepcis Magna, 1st Century BC. *MAA* (III), 3. Image from <http://www.harvardartmuseums.org/art/170120>.
Last accessed 2nd May 2016.
Page 283.

Fig. 6: Bronze Coin from Lepcis Magna, 1st Century BC. *MAA* (III), 19. Image from http://www.wildwinds.com/coins/greece/syrtica/leptis_magna/RPC_851.jpg.
Last accessed 2nd May 2016.
Page 284.

Fig. 7: A Table Showing the number of *Di Patrii* Inscriptions that have been found in Roman Provinces.
Page 291.

Acknowledgements

The completion of this thesis has been a long and fulfilling journey, both personally and intellectually. Not that this journey has been all plain sailing. Its progress has faced some significant obstacles, including the death of my dear grandfather and the treatment of my mother for breast cancer, and has had to navigate its way around some significant moments in my life, most notably my wedding. Its successful completion is thus owing to the love, support and good humour of a number of people to all of whom, listed below, I extend my deepest, heartfelt gratitude.

Firstly, I thank the Arts and Humanities Research Council for funding my doctoral studies at the University of Warwick. I also thank the Bodleian Libraries for their access to what I believe is the best academic repository in the world.

Secondly, I thank my supervisor Professor Alison Cooley for her energetic, dedicated and insightful supervision. Her suggestions and comments on my work over the last three and a half years have always been invaluable.

Thirdly, I thank my examiners, Dr Ed Bispham and Dr Zahra Newby for agreeing to examine this thesis and for taking the time to do so.

Fourthly, thanks go to all my colleagues and peers in the Department of Classics and Ancient History for their intellectual

stimulation and down-right good sense of humour. In particular, I thank Dr Clare Rowan, Dr David Fearn, Dr Ersin Hussein, Dr Ghislaine van der Ploeg, (and the soon to be Drs) Becky Taylor, Joanna Kemp, Paul Grigsby, Nick Brown, Kathryn Thompson and Vicky Jewell. Their comments during work-in-progress seminars on my research have been most valuable and I have been able to enrich my understanding of a range of subjects of antiquity, both in general and in relation to my research. Just as importantly, their ability to lighten the mood from the rigours of thesis completion during trips to the Dirty Duck and Varsity should not and must not be forgotten.

Fifthly, I thank my parents (Jeremy and Belinda Peck), my sister (Jonquil Peck), my grandmothers (Isobel Bates and Jean Peck), my parents-in-law (Zdzisław and Elżbieta Gonera) and sister-in-law (Sylvie Gonera) and all the rest of my family and friends, including especially Valerie and Richard Tite, for their emotional, as well as financial, support throughout this process. My answers to “how is the thesis going?” have been terse at times and I have been very anti-social during long periods of time, yet their belief in me and interest in my research have been unwavering. Their support in my research has also had to be juggled with seismic events in their own lives, the biggest of which I have stated above. I look forward to repaying them tenfold in the years ahead.

Last but definitely not least, my deepest gratitude goes to my beautiful wife Izabela. She has been the rock upon which I have been

able to stay above the rising waters of stress, chaos and self-doubt. Out of everyone, she has been the most patient with me and my research, both when things have gone well and when things have gone badly. I look forward to spending much quality time with her now that this thesis is finally complete!

Alexander G. Peck

2nd May 2016

Abstract

It has been believed that *patria* was an inherently civic or political concept, being interpreted as indicating citizenship or the state in which citizenship was held. Thus, it has been regarded by some as synonymous with *res publica*. This thesis reevaluates our understanding of *patria* in the Roman world by examining its conceptualisation, function and nature in Latin literature and inscriptions.

This thesis reveals how *patria* was a complex and multifaceted conceptual embodiment of collective identity; that its membership was broad, pertaining to men and women, free and freed, as well as evidence that suggests it even may have extended to slaves; that it was territorially ambiguous, being interpreted contemporaneously as corresponding to urban or regional geographical spaces; that it commanded a significant degree of affection and loyalty from its members; that it was prominent in the presentation of individual moral and political character, and in the presentation of imperial regimes; and finally how there was no single, all-embracing concept for the Roman Empire as a whole. This thesis also shows how *patria* was not a static concept. Instead, its conceptualisation shifted according to changes in the wider political or cultural context.

In Chapter One, I consider how *patria* was understood, defined and recognised. In Chapter Two, I look at the function of *patria* in the writings of Cicero and its relationship to Roman republican politics. In Chapter Three, I examine the role of *patria* within the cultural context of the Augustan principate as a medium of Roman unity post-civil war. In Chapter Four, I consider how *patria* was used to define and understand the Augustan principate and the regime of Septimius Severus. Finally, in Chapter Five, I assess the truth behind the idea that there was a single all-embracing concept of *patria* for the peoples of the Roman Empire.

Abbreviations

- AE*
= *L'Année Épigraphique*, 1888-, Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
- BJ*
= *Bonner Jahrbücher*, 1842-, Bonn: A. Marcus und E. Weber.
- CIL*
= *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*, 1863-, Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- CLE*
= Bücheler, F. and Lommatzsch, E. (eds.) (1930) *Carmina Latina Epigraphica*, Leipzig: B.G. Teubner.
- CLEHisp*
= Cugusi, P., Sblendorio Cugusi, M.T. and Bücheler, F. (eds.) (2012) *Carmina Latina Epigraphica Hispanica post Buechelerianam collectionem editam reperta cognita*, Faenza: Fratelli lega editori.
- CPILCaceres*
= Hurtado de San Antonio, R. (ed.) (1977) *Corpus Provincial de Inscripciones Latinas de Cáceres*, Cáceres: Diputación Provincial de Cáceres, Servicios Culturales.
- DG*
= *Digesta Seu Pandectae*.
- IdAltava*
= Marcillet-Jaubert, J. (ed.) (1968) *Les Inscriptions d'Altava*, Aix-en-Provence: Gap, Éditions Ophrys.
- IHC*
= Hübner, E. (ed.) (1871) *Inscriptiones Hispaniae Christianae*, Berlin: G. Reimer.
- IK*
= *Inscripfen griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien*, 1973-, Bonn: Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH.
- ILD*
= Petolescu, C.C. (ed.) (2005) *Inscriptii latine din Dacia (ILD) – Inscriptions latine Daciae*, Bucharest: Editura Academiei Române.
- ILPGranada*
= Pastor Muñoz, M. and Mendoza Eguaras, A. (eds.) (1987) *Inscripciones Latinas de la Provincia de Granada*, Granada: Universidad de Granada.

IRT

= *Inscriptions of Roman Tripolitania* (online):
<http://inslib.kcl.ac.uk/irt2009/>.

MAA

= Alexandropoulos, J. (ed.) (2000) *Les monnaies de l'afrique antique*, Université de Toulouse: Le Mirail.

oed.com

= *Oxford English Dictionary* (online): <http://www.oed.com/>.

RGDA

= *Res Gestae Divi Augusti*.

RIC

= H. Mattingly et al. (eds.) (1923-1981) *Roman Imperial Coinage, Volumes 1-10*, London: Spink & Son Ltd.

RIU

= *Die römischen Inschriften Ungarns, 1972-*, Budapest: Akad.

RRC

= Crawford, M. (ed.) (1974) *Roman Republican Coinage*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

RSO

= Castritius, H., Clauss, M. and Hefner, L. (1977) 'Die römischen Steininschriften des Odenwaldes (RSO)', in W. Wackerfuß (ed.) *Beiträge zur Erforschung des Odenwaldes und seiner Randlandschaften II*, Breuberg-Neustadt: Breuberg-Bund. 237-308.

TLL

= *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*, 1894-, Leipzig: Walter de Gruyter.

ZPE

= *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, 1967-, Bonn: Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH.

Introduction

Nothing is so dangerous to the progress of the human mind than to assume that our views of science are ultimate, that there are no mysteries in nature, that our triumphs are complete and that there are no new worlds to conquer.

Humphry Davy

In terms of academic scholarship, there remain very few uncharted areas of the ancient world. However, the concept of *patria* is one aspect of the Roman world that, to all intents and purposes, continues to be shrouded in a degree of mystery. Despite its prominence in Latin literature, Latin inscriptions and in Roman Imperial titulature, comparatively little is known regarding *patria*'s conceptualisation (that is how it was contemporaneously defined) and its cultural and political function.¹ Until now, *patria* has been interpreted predominantly as being synonymous with or associated with Roman citizenship, or that it was a concept that was nothing more complicated than a simplified way for an individual to indicate his or her native origin. These current conclusions, however, have not been established via a detailed

¹ There are three exceptions to this. Firstly, Bonjour (1975a) provides a discussion of *patria* with regard to Roman patriotism. However, her study still regards *patria* in a civic or political context, a feature this study seeks to challenge. Bonjour also fails, in my view, to recognise fully the versatility of *patria*. Secondly, Gasser (1999), looks at *patria* through the lens of *Geburtsheimat* in the writings of Latin poets dating to the late republic and early empire. Once again, there is a strong civic or political dimension to the definition of *patria* in Gasser's study. Thirdly, MacCormack (2007), 101-136, discusses the evolution of *patria* in the context of medieval, renaissance and early-modern Spanish political and cultural thought. In this discussion she references passages from ancient texts that refer to *patria* but does so to illustrate ancient influences for Spanish medieval, renaissance and early-modern writers. She does not offer an analysis of the concept in the ancient world.

investigation of the concept in its own right as an independent entity, and thus I believe have limited rather than increased our understanding of what extant literary and epigraphic evidence reveals was a fundamental component of Roman cultural, political and social life. When the scholarly focus is placed squarely on *patria* for the first time it becomes apparent that the concept was anything but a simplified expression of native origin, and was a term that went beyond ideas of Roman citizenship or the Roman political state. This study will show how it was a complex, versatile and multi-faceted concept of collective identity equivalent in scale to modern day national identity. Its conceptualisation was dependent upon the Roman world's ever shifting political and cultural contexts and thus was consciously changed and adapted by political or cultural figures. The extant evidence we possess and the light that these data shed upon important aspects of Roman politics and culture demands that an independent study be dedicated to the examination and analysis of the conceptualisation, function and nature of *patria* in the Roman world. This is a task that has long been overdue and one which this study now seeks to commence.

1. The Political Definition of *Patria*

One of the most dominant and prevailing scholarly beliefs surrounding *patria* to date is that it was a component or feature of the civic and

political workings of the Roman state.² More precisely, the concept has been interpreted as having been synonymous with both the Roman notion of citizenship and *res publica* (defined as the Roman political sphere) in which citizenship was held. Whilst not entirely wrong, this definition does not provide us with the full picture of how *patria* was understood.

For the most part, the interpretation of *patria* as being closely aligned with Roman citizenship has come about owing to the fact that when *patria* has been discussed within the scholarship of the ancient world, this has occurred frequently within a political or civic context. The dominance of this political or civic definition has been compounded by the strong political thematic core that lies at the heart of what have been viewed as the salient primary literary sources. The predominantly political nature of Latin literary prose has affected the approach of Roman scholarship with regard to *patria*, seemingly encouraging a more political and legal focus. In many ways, this has been most strongly influenced by the writings of Cicero, the most prolific surviving Latin author of the Roman era. Put simply, Cicero's literary contributions to our understanding and analysis of a number of aspects of Roman life more often than not occur within a political or legal context. Indeed, Cicero's strong political influence upon modern

² See, for example, the treatments of *patria* in Spiegel (1541), esp 426; von Savigny (1869); Wharton (1872); Ruggiero (1921); Sherwin-White (1939 [1973]); Hammond (1951); Lesueur (1978); Thomas (1996); Moatti (1997); Pellizzari (2000); Ando (2000); Kriekhaus (2001 and 2004); and Mathisen (2012) as examples. See also the discussion of the reception of *patria* in medieval legal writings in Post (2015), esp. 435ff. Whilst these studies address *patria* they do not offer a comprehensive analysis of the concept.

investigations of Roman civilisation is especially clear when we consider previous discussions that have involved or touched upon *patria*.³

An example of this political interpretation of *patria* can be found in Sherwin-White. In *The Roman Citizenship*, a brilliant and highly insightful study that charts in detail the evolution of the Roman notion of citizenship alongside Rome's long road to Mediterranean supremacy, Sherwin-White infers that *patria* was a term that was associated contemporaneously with the notion of citizenship. Indeed, in his study, *patria* is associated with the evolving notion of the possession by Italian municipals of two citizenships:

[...] the experience of the Republic throughout its earlier course was summed up in Cicero's dictum [i.e. *Pro Balbo*] about the incompatibility of two citizenships. There is no shaking this solid testimony. Only in Cicero's own day was a theory of dual *patria* being worked out.⁴

Sherwin-White's civic interpretation of *patria* is further highlighted in later assertions that state all *cives Romani* possessed two *patria*:

Had municipal life been entirely limited to the due observance of certain religious ceremonies, doubtless the notion of dual *patria* possessed by all *cives Romani* would have remained merely latent, and the municipal system would have died of inanition.⁵

and that the phrase *patria iuris* is definable as the Roman state,

This is very different from the situation in Cicero's analysis of the dual *patria* in the *de Legibus*, in which public life and civil law are determined by the *patria iuris* – the Roman state –

³ On the use of Cicero as evidence for historical analysis see the excellent discussion of Lintott (2008).

⁴ Sherwin-White (1939 [1973]), 57-58.

⁵ Sherwin-White (1939 [1973]), 71.

and the municipality is merely one's *patria naturae* and has no legal claim.⁶

Sherwin-White attributes the development of this theory of dual *patria* to Cicero's *De Legibus* 2.5:

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

Marcus: *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 eam 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, quae genuit, quam illa, quae excepit. Itaque ego hanc meam esse patriam prorsus numquam negabo, dum illa sit maior, haec in ea contineatur...*⁷

⁶ Sherwin-White (1939 [1973]), 304.

⁷ **Atticus:** For my part I am glad to become acquainted with it. Yet, what is it, that you said a little while before, that this place, that I understand you to mean Arpinum, is your original *patria*? Is it possible that you have two *patriae*? Or is there one ordinary *patria*? If so, perhaps the *patria* of wise Cato was not Rome but Tusculum? **Marcus:** Surely I think that he and all municipal citizens have two *patriae*, one of nature and the other of citizenship. Thus Cato, although born in Tusculum was received into the citizenship of the Roman people. Thus, since he was a Tusculan by birth and a Roman by citizenship, he had one local *patria* and another of law. Just as your fellow people of Attica, before Theseus ordered all of them to leave the fields and to come together in the *astu*, as it is called, were both of their own places and of Attica, so we consider as *patria* where we were born and that place by which we have been adopted. But it is necessary that the *patria* in which the name of *res publica* signifies a shared citizenship must be first in our affection. For this we must give ourselves entirely and be ready to die, and for which we ought to place, even sacrifice all that we have. Moreover, the *patria* that begat us is not much less sweet than that which adopted us. As such, I will absolutely never deny that my *patria* is here, so long as that which is greater contains this one within it..." Unless otherwise stated, all translations are my own.

It is this passage that seems to influence Sherwin-White's interpretation the greatest as to the concept's political or legal nature.⁸

Sherwin-White interprets *De Legibus* 2.5 as illustrating Cicero's own natural conclusion to the unification of Italy under Roman hegemony, namely, the formation of a single civic system comprising multiple political communities, firstly in Latium and then subsequently in the wider Italian peninsula.⁹ According to this viewpoint, Roman attitudes had thus shifted from those expressed by Cicero previously in *Pro Balbo* 28, a passage in which Cicero states that Roman citizenship is incompatible with any other.¹⁰ *De Legibus* 2.5 is, therefore, identified by Sherwin-White as indicating an important turning point in the evolution of Roman citizenship. The passage is held up as, at the very least, marking the moment in which a political dialogue began to emerge that accepted the notion of an individual being enfranchised in his own community whilst simultaneously possessing a standard one-size-fits-all form of Roman citizenship. In essence, it is from this point onwards that Sherwin-White recognises the emergence and acceptance at Rome of a more streamlined notion of Roman citizenship.¹¹

⁸ This is also the case for Ando (2000), 10-11.

⁹ Sherwin-White (1939 [1973]), 134-149.

¹⁰ Cic. *Balb.* 28: *duarum civitatum civis noster esse iure civili nemo potest.* ("The civil law does not permit anyone of our state to be of two citizen bodies.")

¹¹ The interpretation of *duae patriae* as indicating a discussion of two citizenships is also recognised by Dyck (2004), 255-257. Cf. Knoche (1968), 59, who argues that Rome as the greater *patria* absorbs the smaller *patriae* of the Italian municipals it emancipates. On the theme of dual *patriae* see also Hammond (1951); Ando (1999); and Gasser (1999).

2. Considering the Context of *De Legibus* 2.5

Yet, is citizenship the only interpretation that can be gleaned from this important text? Sherwin-White highlights how Roman citizenship prior to the Social War of 91-87 BC was a form of enfranchisement which was distinguishable from that bestowed upon Rome's Italian and Latin allies. The exclusivity of Roman citizenship is attested to by Cicero in *Pro Balbo* 28: *duarum civitatum civis noster esse iure civili nemo potest*.¹² However, owing to an ever-greater degree of interdependence between Rome and her Italian allies as a direct result of the Social War, Sherwin-White explains how the Roman political and legal system cautiously began to develop a means by which the extension of Roman citizenship to Italian communities could theoretically be achieved whilst permitting these communities to retain the membership of their original municipalities.¹³ It is at this point in Sherwin-White's argument that *De Legibus* 2.5 first appears. Interpreting citizenship as an important element to *patria*, Sherwin-White uses this passage to indicate how the concept of dual citizenship had become, or was in the process of becoming, a legal reality in Roman Italy by the mid-40s BC.

Sherwin-White's argument hinges upon a thematic connection between *Pro Balbo* 28 on the one hand and *De Legibus* 2.5 on the

¹² See note 10 for translation. Sherwin-White (1939 [1973]), 302-304.

¹³ Sherwin-White (1939 [1973]), 134-149. Cf. Bispham (2007), 113-160 and 161-204.

other.¹⁴ In *Pro Balbo*, Cicero defends Lucius Cornelius Balbus the Elder against charges of having illegally acquired Roman citizenship. Balbus, originally a native of the city of Gades, had been granted Roman citizenship by Pompey in recognition of his services to Rome in the defeat of Quintus Sertorius in Spain. The language of Cicero's speech is highly legal in nature and references to Roman citizenship are common throughout the narrative. However, these references to citizenship do not corroborate Sherwin-White's interpretation of *patria*.¹⁵ Whereas the term *civitas* occurs more than one hundred times during the course of the speech, *patria* occurs only twice (Cic. *Balb.* 11 and 26) and in neither of these occurrences can the concept be interpreted as referring to citizenship. Both of these passages focus on the subject of military service in the name of the *patria*. At *Pro Balbo* 11, Cicero describes how, as a boy, he heard Quintus Metellus described as a man to whom the safety of his *patria* was more important to him than the sight of it, and at *Pro Balbo* 26, Cicero comments on the lack of men through history who have been willing to risk their lives to fight an enemy, even for a cause as noble as the defence of their *patria*.¹⁶ There is, therefore, no evidence in this particular work to support the notion that *patria* and *civitas* were

¹⁴ Barber (2004), xiv: "Historians tend to use the speech as a treasure trove of information on the citizenship issue while ignoring other aspects."

¹⁵ On the legal nature of *Pro Balbo* see Brunt (1982), 136-147. On the types of argument employed, the arrangement of these arguments and the style of the speech see Barber (2004).

¹⁶ Cic. *Balb.* 11: *audivi hoc de parente meo puer, cum Q. Metellus Luci filius causam de pecuniis repetundis diceret, ille, ille vir, cui patriae salus dulcior quam conspectus fuit*; Cic. *Balb.* 26: *Etenim, cum pro sua patria pauci post genus hominum natum reperti sint qui nullis praemiis propositis vitam suam hostium telis obiecerint.*

considered as being conceptually related terms. Rather, Cicero seems to regard them in this speech as distinct conceptual entities.

Whilst I believe there is little evidence to sustain a definition of *patria* as citizenship in *Pro Balbo*, there is more weight to the notion that this is the case in *De Legibus* 2.5. In this passage, Cicero deliberately distinguishes between the *patria* into which an individual is born (*patria naturae*) on the one hand and the *patria* into which Italian municipals have been adopted as a result of their political union with Rome (*patria civitatis* or *patria iuris*) on the other. Cicero provides two distinct interpretations of *patria*: one of birth and another of law. Cicero's interpretation of a legal or political *patria* obtained via Roman citizenship is one that is unique to him and this specific work. There is no other instance in Latin literature or epigraphy whereby *patria* is described as *patria iuris*. The observation that such a legal or civic definition of *patria* is unique to Cicero is important. It indicates that although Cicero believed that an interpretation of *patria* as citizenship was a theme worth exploring in this text and at this time in Roman political history, it is not the only interpretation that is available to us. How else, therefore, can *patria* be understood? What was the significance behind the notion of the *patria naturae*? Moreover, if alternative interpretations of *patria* are possible is *De Legibus* 2.5

solely a discussion of dual citizenship or is there more to this passage?

17

I believe that there might be more to this passage than first meets the eye, both in terms of *patria's* meaning and the message that Cicero is putting forward. I suggest that the subject of Cicero's passage is not just the feasibility of dual citizenship but also the question of what should be the primary object of an individual's sense of communal service during a time of great political uncertainty.¹⁸ In order to illustrate this additional interpretation it is necessary to place *De Legibus* 2.5 in context with what Cicero says about *patria* earlier in *De Legibus* 2.3.

In *De Legibus* 2.3, Cicero describes to Atticus why it is that Arpinum is so important to him and thus why he possesses such a powerful affection for it:

Marcus: *Ego vero, cum licet pluris dies abesse, praesertim hoc tempore anni, et amoenitatem hanc et salubritatem sequor; raro autem licet. Sed nimirum me alia quoque causa delectat, quae te non attingit ita.*

Atticus: *Quae tandem ista causa est?*

Marcus: *Quia, si verum dicimus, haec est mea et huius fratris mei germana patria. Hic enim orti stirpe antiquissima sumus, hic sacra, hic genus, hic maiorum multa vestigia. Quid plura? Hanc vides villam, ut nunc quidem est, lautius aedificatum 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 nescio quid et latet in animo ac sensu meo, quo me plus hic locus fortasse delectet, siquidem*

¹⁷ *In populi Romani civitatem susceptus est; civitate Romanus; sed necesse est caritate eam praestare, qua rei publicae nomen universae civitati est.* For a detailed discussion of the philological and historical aspects of *De Legibus* 2.5 see Dyck (2004), 255-260.

¹⁸ On the dating of *De Legibus* see Reitzentsein (1894); Robinson (1950); Schmidt, P.L. (1969), 282-289; Schmidt, P.L. (2001); and Dyck (2004), 5-7.

*etiam ille sapientissimus vir, Ithacam ut videret, immortalitatem scribitur repudiasse.*¹⁹

In this passage, *patria* is not presented as a political entity, nor is it possible for the concept to be interpreted as such. What is apparent in this passage is a strong connection between it and aspects that can be described as being of an ancestral, cultural or familial nature. Firstly, Cicero indicates an association between *patria* and the sacred rites that would have been at the heart of a family's religious life (*hic sacra*). Secondly, Cicero describes *patria* as being the seat of his ancestral origins (*hic genus, hic maiorum multa vestigia*). Such a statement clearly identifies *patria* with a strong sense of familial identity. Thirdly and finally, the relationship between *patria* and ancestry is emphasised further by the explanation that it is the physical location of the family home that was built by his father (*hanc vides villam, ut nunc quidem est, lautius aedificatum patris nostri studio*), and lived in by his paternal grandfather (*sed hoc ipso in loco, cum avos viveret et antiquo more parva esset villa, ut illa Curiana in Sabinis, me scito esse natum*). Rather than indicating a political or civic dimension, *De Legibus* 2.3 draws

¹⁹ “**Marcus:** In truth, when I can get away for a few days, especially at this time of year, I come to this delightful and salubrious place. However, it is rarely permitted. But, without doubt, there is another reason why this place delights me, one that does not affect you that is. **Atticus:** What reason is that? **Marcus:** Because, truthfully, this is the original *patria* of my brother and me. For it was here that we were born into a most ancient of ancestral lines. Here are the sacred rites. Here are our ancestral roots. Here are the many traces of our ancestors. Furthermore, see here the villa, indeed just as it is now, that was elegantly built under the supervision of our father; who being in a state of poor health spent most of his time here engaged in study. I would have you know that I was born in this very place when my father's father was living and when the villa was small according to ancient custom, like the villa of Curius who lived in Sabine territory. I cannot explain it, but there is some powerful feeling that lurks in my soul and senses in such a way that this place greatly enchants me. Indeed, it is written that even that wisest man renounced immortality so that he might see Ithaca.”

attention to *patria's* embodiment of and association with aspects that were considered fundamental to a sense of familial or kin identity, centered on the paternal line. As such, it can be interpreted as being recognised by Cicero as an expression of origin or belonging in an emotional rather than a legal sense.

A more complex picture of *patria* thus begins to emerge. Not only can it be understood as indicating citizenship, but also familial and cultural membership and belonging. *De Legibus* 2.3 thus shows us how a powerful emotional bond could be seen to exist between an individual and a *patria*.²⁰ This emotional bond and its consequences are not exclusive to *De Legibus* 2.3. This theme can also be found illustrated in two passages from *De Re Publica* I. In a fragment that has survived in Nonius Marcellus' *De Compendiosa Doctrina* Cicero states that *quoniam plura beneficia continet patria, et est antiquior parens quam is, qui creavit, maior ei profecto quam parenti debetur gratia*.²¹

These sentiments are reiterated and expanded upon at I.8:

Neque enim hac nos patria lege genuit aut educavit, ut nulla quasi alimenta expectaret a nobis, ac tantum modo nostris ipsa commodis serviens tutum perfugium otio nostro

²⁰ See Dyck (2004), 251-254. Cf. Ando (1999), 16-17, who refers to the emotional attachment between Greeks and their respective *πατρίδες*; and van der Val (2007), 61-65. Gasser (1999) explores the emotional reasons behind the continued attachment of Roman authors born outside Rome to their *patria naturae*, as she states in the introduction to her study, 11: "Das Hauptanliegen der Arbeit wird es hingegen sein herauszufinden, ob alle Autoren wie Cicero beim Gedanken an ihre *germana patria* ein unbestimmbares Gefühl, ein Nescio-Quid, empfunden haben. Darüber hinaus soll versucht werden, die Tiefe und vor allem die *qualitas* dieser Empfindung zu ergründen: Was verbindet einen Dichter in der Weltstadt Rom noch mit seiner Geburtsheimat? Verliebener Familienbesitz? Jungenderinnerungen? Eine vertraute Landschaft und ihre Menschen? Das Bewusstsein einer bestimmten Volkszugehörigkeit?"

²¹ Cic. *Rep.* Fr. 1a, ap. Nonius 426.8: "Since our *patria* provides more benefits and is a more ancient *parens* than that which begat us, we have a greater obligation to it than to our biological *parens*."

*suppeditaret et tranquillum ad quietem locum, sed ut plurimas et maximas nostri animi, ingenii, consilii partis ipsa sibi ad utilitatem suam pigneraretur tantumque nobis in nostrum privatum usum, quantum ipsi superesse posset, remitteret.*²²

Cicero's sentiments on this theme are not unique. An unassigned fragment from Lucilius predates them.²³ In a verse addressed to a certain Albinus, Lucilius lists the actions that define *virtus*. Concluding what is a long and varied list is the statement that virtue is most effectively demonstrated by placing the interests of one's *patria* ahead of those of one's parents and oneself: *commoda praeterea patriai prima putare, | deinde parentum, tertia iam postremaque nostra.*²⁴ Thus, in these passages of Cicero and Lucilius *patria* would appear to be a marker of identity and a concept towards which there is a strong obligation of service.²⁵

These observations have an important impact upon how we can interpret Cicero's message in *De Legibus* 2.5. In 2.5, Cicero describes to Atticus how all Italian municipals (*omnes municipes*) have two *patriae*. As stated above, Cicero proposes the idea that one has been obtained as a result of birth (*dulcis autem non multo secus est ea, quae genuit*), the other as a result of the ongoing process of ever-greater political union with Rome (*quam illa, quae excepit*). In Cicero's eyes the

²² "Our *patria* neither begat us nor reared us within the bounds of law without expecting obligation from us in return, nor providing, as though only serving our convenience, a place of secure refuge for our relaxation, and a quiet place to rest; but rather it did so on the understanding that it lays claim to the best part of our minds, talents and judgements for its own use, and leaves for our private use only that which could be surplus to her requirements."

²³ 1342-1354 (Krenkel).

²⁴ A more detailed discussion of this text can be found in Chapter Two.

²⁵ Cf. Ando (1999), 20, who argues that devotion and service towards one's *patria* was motivated and dictated by the citizenship that an individual possessed.

possession of two *patriae* raises the question as to which should be placed ahead of the other in terms of devotion and service.²⁶ Cicero's answer to this question is unequivocal: *sed necesse est caritate eam praestare, qua rei publicae nomen universae civitatis est*. Thus just as Rome has united Italy politically through citizenship, the Roman *patria* now binds Italy together in an emotional sense through a shared obligation of collective service. In the service of the Roman *patria* all should be ready to sacrifice everything they possess (*pro qua mori et cui nos totos dedere et in qua nostra omnia ponere et quasi consecrare debemus*).²⁷ Written at a time of deep political uncertainty and growing factionalism at Rome, Cicero's intentions with such a statement would appear to be obvious. By attaching the imagery of service, devotion and affection often previously associated with local *patriae* to the political function of *res publica*, Cicero attempts to foster a sense of universal emotional unity to hold Rome together and in turn inspire collective action. The obligation that an individual possesses towards their local *patria* is bound to the greater, politically unifying *patria* that is Rome. Thus, whilst it is clear that Cicero in *De Legibus* 2.5 illustrates the ways in which the relationship to Roman citizenship can help to distinguish between the two *patriae* that Italian

²⁶ Cf. Sherwin-White (1939 [1973]), 171-172; and Liv. 27.9.11.

²⁷ Dench (2013), 126-127: "Both the 'natural' and 'adopted' fatherlands should engender love and loyalty, but a hierarchy of allegiance is desirable." It is important to note, however, that Dench still appears to interpret the concept of *patria* as being associated with citizenship, 127: "Cicero's formulation represents one resolution of the complex political, social and cultural issues presented by mass incorporation of the peoples of peninsula Italy into the Roman citizenship in the decades following the Social War of 91-87 BC." On the subject of *patria* and the theme of loyalty in Cic. *Rep.* 2.5 see also Bonjour (1975a), 78-86.

municipals possessed, the passage as a whole would appear to function additionally as a rallying call for the *res publica* at a time of crisis.²⁸

3. How Can We Understand the Concept of *Patria* in the Roman World?

Whilst it is thus clear from Cicero's *De Legibus* that *patria* could be interpreted in a political or civic manner, this is not the only or indeed the primary way in which *patria* was understood. From the review of the previous academic treatment of the concept of *patria*, five important conclusions can be reached that help to influence the examination of *patria* in this study going forward. Firstly, it would seem that the concept functioned as a complex expression of collective identity, political, familial and cultural. Secondly, it would appear that the concept played a significant role within Roman politics, both within the context of the Late Republic as shown in the above discussion of *De Legibus* 2.5 and in the context of the emerging principate in its inclusion within imperial titulature. Thirdly, a powerful emotional bond was seen to exist between *patria* and its members. As such, fourthly, *patria* was seen as an object that was worthy of unconditional devotion and service, and which, according to Cicero and Lucilius, preceded an individual's family and the gods. Fifthly and finally, it would appear that there was not a single, universal concept of *patria* in existence, but rather a network of related concepts that were

²⁸ See Ando (1999), 20-21. For discussions on the definition and function of the *res publica* see Drexler (1957 and 1958); Stark (1967); Suerbaum (1977); Hölkeskamp (2010); Turcan (2011); and Hodgson (2013).

recognised as effective means by which to communicate an individual's sense of native origin, collective identity and collective action.

The aim of this study is to expand upon these preliminary findings in order to arrive at a detailed foundational understanding of the concept's definition and its role within Roman culture, politics and society that goes beyond simply a means by which to distinguish citizenship. The earliest source considered dates to the second century BC and the latest to the fourth century AD. It does not presume to be the final word on the subject. Rather, it is hoped that this study will become the catalyst for further more comprehensive and specialised studies into this significant concept, and raises a number of subsidiary questions along the way. In terms of its nature, the study will be historical rather than philological, and owing to the vast quantity of qualitative data must be representative rather than exhaustive in its scope. As such, it explores four primary themes through carefully selected case studies. Although each theme is considered independently from the others, they are all interrelated, and a full understanding of *patria* in the Roman world can thus only be attained via the bringing together of the various conclusions.

In Chapter One, I explore the question of conceptualisation, how *patria* was defined and understood within the Roman world. I do so in a general sense, identifying and illustrating the primary defining themes. By reversing the principles of Concept Formation theory, I

examine the Latin literary occurrences of *patria* in order to identify and subsequently analyse its defining themes. Four themes are discussed: its role as a marker of collective identity; its membership; its territorialisation; and its status as a significant object of political and military service and devotion. This chapter reveals how *patria* was recognised contemporaneously as a complex conceptual embodiment of collective identity in the Roman world toward which all its members were expected to display a high level of service and devotion. Its membership is revealed to be surprisingly wide-ranging and highly inclusive, whilst the subject of its territoriality appears to have been one over which a consensus was never reached.

Having identified the primary defining themes of *patria*, I begin to explore how these were deliberately and consciously changed, developed and implemented by prominent individuals within the wider political and cultural context of the Roman world. In Chapter Two, this investigation into the evolutionary nature of *patria* and its wider political and cultural function commences in the context of the Late Republic and the works of Cicero. Analysing the occurrences of *patria* in Ciceronian literature from the *Catilinarians* to the *Philippics*, this chapter identifies five distinct usages or characteristics. Firstly, the chapter highlights how the concept was used effectively by Cicero to characterise the public image of a range of political figures, including himself. Secondly, the chapter reveals how *patria* was utilised by Cicero as a method by which to reduce or counter moments of

political instability and chaos. Thirdly, Cicero's works demonstrate how *patria* was an effective means by which to reinforce a sense of collective political responsibility. Fourthly, despite Cicero's aims to establish a sense of unity via *patria*, his works show how the concept was a focus point for factional competition, especially during the civil wars. Fifthly and finally, the chapter as a whole draws our attention to the dependent nature of *patria* on Roman politics and the significant role that individuals could have in deliberately altering and reshaping its image and conceptualisation as and when they saw fit to do so.

The deliberate redefinition of *patria* by individuals and the conscious utilisation of its central themes to advance specific political or cultural (or both) intentions is a central concern of the discussion in Chapter Three. Here, I consider the utilisation and redefinition of the concept within the cultural context of the Augustan period by examining the concept's occurrence in Livy's *Ab Urbe Condita* and Virgil's *Aeneid*. Although both include *patria* as a significant component of their respective narratives, *Ab Urbe Condita* and the *Aeneid* offer very different presentations of the concept in relation to the collective memory of their audiences. Indeed, the difference between them implies the existence of a dynamic cultural dialogue during the Augustan period as to the concept's definition, significance and cultural function. In *Ab Urbe Condita*, the emphasis is placed on the subject of unity through the prioritisation of collective interest over private interest and in creating a collective historical memory of

service centred on *patria* through the literary themes of *exempla* and collective trauma. In contrast, the *Aeneid* uses *patria* to stress unity by redefining it territorially as Italy. Set within the context of a foundation mythological epic, Virgil attempts to recreate the collective memory associated with *patria*, indicating to an Italian readership a common mythological past. The discussion indicates how both works and their treatments of *patria* are influenced by contemporary political events.

In Chapter Four, the thematic focus switches back to *patria's* relationship with Roman politics. In the first half, I consider the significance that was attributed to *patria* by Augustus through its inclusion in the title *pater patriae*. I do so by evaluating how *patria* was used in Augustan literature to characterise Augustus and his principate. What emerges in this section is the degree to which there was clearly an on-going debate within Augustan society as to the way in which Augustus' regime should be evaluated and understood in relation to the concept of *patria*. In the second half of the chapter, the discussion skips forward chronologically to consider the significance of *patria* in the *DI PATRII* coin type that was issued by Septimius Severus between AD 200-204. Rejecting previous claims that the coin type stressed either Severus' African or Roman identity, I propose the theory that the coin in fact was a clever illustration of the emperor's dual identity. On the one hand I argue that there is a clear relationship between the coin's iconography and the representations of the tutelary deities of Lepcis Magna, whilst on the other hand the phrase

di patrii would appear to be a phrase that was predominantly associated in Latin literature and inscriptions with the deities of Rome. Since this particular coin type was issued within the context of the *Ludi Saeculares*, it can be seen to function as a visual metaphor for the way in which Severus intended his imperial subjects to characterise his dynasty along specific political and cultural lines.

The study is concluded in Chapter Five with an examination of the extent to which Cicero, Callistratus and Modestinus were right in their respective statements that Rome evolved to become a *communis patria*, a shared *patria* for all the inhabitants of the Roman Empire. It does so by considering the generic usage of *patria* in Latin inscriptions in three specific geographical areas of the Roman Empire: the Greek-speaking eastern provinces; North Africa; and Spain. This epigraphic information reveals that whilst there are occasions where *patria* can be understood as referring to Rome these are by far and away the minority of cases. Instead, it is clear that *patria* was understood to refer to a multitude of local communities, thus emphasising an empire-wide awareness of independence on the level of collective identity. What is also revealed is a degree of regionalisation in terms of the epigraphic contexts in which *patria* occurs, a degree of regionalisation that is also evident in the phrases and expressions that either incorporate the concept or are used alongside it.

Chapter One: Identifying the Defining themes of *Patria*

Introduction

Before more specific questions can be explored, it is first necessary to establish how the concept of *patria* was conceptualised by the inhabitants of the Roman world. By the term 'conceptualised', I refer to the way or ways in which the concept was understood, recognised and expressed. The simple act of labelling *patria* as a concept has a direct impact upon the way in which to conduct such an investigation. In the *Oxford English Dictionary* a 'concept' is defined as being:

I. Senses relating to thought or understanding. 1. Something conceived in the mind; a notion, idea, image, or thought. 2. Originally in *Philos.*: a general idea or notion, a universal; a mental representation of the essential or typical properties of something, considered without regard to the peculiar properties of any specific instance or example. Later often (frequently with *of*): the meaning that is realized by a word or expression. 3. An idea underlying or governing the design or content of a product, work of art, entertainment, etc. II. Senses relating to imagination, opinion, or disposition. 4. A person's capacity or faculty for imagining things; imagination. Also: a fancied or imagined thing; a conceit. 5. Personal opinion, judgement, or estimation; an instance of this. 6. Disposition, frame of mind.²⁹

All of these respective definitions impact upon how we approach the discussion and analysis of a concept. They indicate how a concept is a complex structure that represents or embodies specific ideas and is subject to an individual's thoughts and capacity for imagination. As such, concepts require close reading and analysis in order to be

²⁹ <http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/38130?rskey=5sOGgQ&result=1#eid>, last accessed 2nd May 2016.

properly appreciated. We need to look at them from a wide angle, considering a range of functions as well as a range of different forces operating behind them. Indeed, it is only by identifying these various functions, forces and the ideas which a concept embodies that a complete picture may emerge.

The notion that a concept is an embodiment and expression of a wider set of ideas or values is a primary feature in the theory of concept formation. This theory was pioneered by Rickert with the publication of *Grenzen der naturwissenschaftlichen Begriffsbildung: eine logische Einleitung in die historischen Wissenschaften*.³⁰ Rickert's study, which examined the definition and formation of concepts within the natural sciences, has been influential on the later works of sociologist Max Weber and continues to influence academic treatment of the topic as is evident in the more recent scholarship of Burger and Outhwaite.³¹ According to Rickert, concepts are inherently ambiguous and as such invite conflicting opinions as to what a 'concept' actually is. He states that "it allegedly designates not only the most primitive meanings of words that cannot be reduced by further analysis but also the ultimate consolidations of scientific theories".³² Burger defines a concept as "the reduction of the infinite number of concrete facts to

³⁰ Rickert's work is a vast study comprising more than seven hundred pages. It was originally published piecemeal in 1896 (first three chapters) and 1901 (chapters four and five), before being published as an entire work in 1902. Revised editions followed in 1913, 1921 and 1929. Citations from Rickert's monumental work above are taken from Guy Oakes' translated and abridged edition (1986).

³¹ Weber (1921); Burger (1976); and Outhwaite (2010).

³² Rickert (1926 [1986]), 32.

proportions which can be handled by the human mind".³³ Concepts can thus be understood as the resultant forms of a combination of smaller phenomena.³⁴ It is proposed that they provide a single mental image or notion through which multiple and complex phenomena can be easily recognised, understood and processed by the human mind.³⁵ As concepts comprise or embody multiple phenomena, it is these themes that imbue them with their meaning and thus provide them with their overall definition and indicate their intended function. An understanding of these defining phenomena is, therefore, crucial in any scholarly endeavour to identify how concepts were defined and understood.³⁶

The original purpose behind Rickert's and subsequently Weber's methodology and theory was to explore concept formulation as a means by which to address the problem of how knowledge could be scientifically communicated and analysed. Yet, concept formation also provides a methodological template by which it is possible to identify the definitions of concepts that have already been established. By simply reversing the theory of concept formation, and thus dissecting already formed concepts for their defining phenomena or themes, we should be able to arrive at a relatively clear picture of their

³³ Burger (1976), 19.

³⁴ Burger (1976), 26-27.

³⁵ Burger (1976), 27.

³⁶ Burger (1976), 27-29. On the subject of rationalisation there are many parallels that exist between the definition and function of concepts on the one hand and myth on the other. Myths, just like concepts, can be understood as methods by which to communicate complex ideas and themes via the narrative of a single event. On the meaning and function of myth see Kirk (1971) and Hawes (2014).

original conceptualisation and hence definition. Thus, one of the ways in which to understand what *patria* signified to the inhabitants of the Roman world is to analyse its occurrences in literature and inscriptions in order to identify and examine its defining themes.³⁷ I believe that it is only in this way that *patria* can be effectively interpreted and defined, and thus provide the solid footing required upon which the concept's role in Roman culture, politics and society can be subsequently discussed.

Thus, in the discussion that follows I identify and analyse the primary defining themes of *patria* that can be identified within Latin literature and epigraphy from the late second century BC to the third century AD. As with this study as a whole, this analysis is designed to be representative rather than exhaustive. As such, I have selected sources that enable me to discuss these defining themes in the most effective and enlightening way possible. Four defining themes are discussed. In section one I illustrate how *patria* was used as a marker of an individual's collective identity by highlighting his or her native and ancestral origins. Consequently, close associations are identified between the concept and the themes of collective mythology, ancestral tradition and familial imagery. As will be seen, this would appear to have been a particularly widely recognised function of the concept across the ancient Mediterranean world, a fact that reveals a

³⁷ A similar approach has been taken by previous scholarly investigations into other concepts of the ancient world. See, for example, the discussion of Wirszubski (1950) on the concept of *libertas*; McDonnell (2006) on the concept of *virtus*; and Hodgson (2013) on the concept of *res publica*.

widespread network of communities which defined themselves or were defined by others as *patria*. In section two, I explore the extent of membership of the concept of *patria*. The results are surprising. Men and women, free citizens, animals and even potentially slaves were all recognised as being valid members of a *patria*. In section three, I discuss the extent to which *patria* was widely viewed as an object of collective devotion and affection. On several occasions the concept is described in Latin literature as taking precedence over the welfare of an individual's family or their own personal affairs. As such, each and every member of a particular *patria* was expected to ensure its security, a duty that was fulfilled particularly via military or political means. Finally, in section four, I explore the complex question of territoriality. That is to say, I attempt to identify whether there existed a clearly identifiable territorial or geographical definition to the concept. As will be seen, whilst territorial or geographical definitions are at times identifiable these would appear to be rather ad hoc and lack any sense of uniformity or general consensus. What emerges from this varied discussion is an image of *patria* as a complex, multifaceted conceptual embodiment of collective identity toward which all members of a community (male and female, free and potentially slave) had a duty of service and devotion.

1.1. *Patria* as a Marker of Collective Identity

One of *patria*'s most common functions within Latin literature and inscriptions is to illustrate collective identity. In the case of *De Legibus*

2.3, this collective identity was centred firmly on the notion of the family. In the vast majority of cases, other Latin literary passages that use *patria* as an expression of collective identity do so on the level of the community. The function of *patria* as a means by which to express collective identity is a feature that has been identified by previous scholarship. However, as was illustrated in the introduction to this study, for the most part this has occurred within the wider context of Roman citizenship, and thus has imbued the concept with the appearance of exclusively possessing political overtones. The *patria* as an expression of collective identity is thus a theme that needs to be reconsidered. What was the true extent of the concept's role as an expression of collective identity? Was this role restricted to a deeply personal and intimate expression of collective identity that was centred on the unit of the family, as was argued by Cicero at *De Legibus* 2.3? Or alternatively, was *patria* the means by which notions of wider communal solidarity were expressed? Or was it a concept that could embody a range of collective identities and thus be used in a variety of different contexts?

1.1.i: *Patria*, Mythology and the Sacred

Our first indication of the extent to which *patria* was an expression of collective identity in the Roman world is provided via a consideration of the relationship that existed between it and kinship or foundation

mythology.³⁸ Jan Assmann has argued that foundation mythology, whereby the origins of a community were traced to a single mythological and often divine figure, was a central and universal means by which to establish a sense of collective identity within the context of the ancient world.³⁹ Patterson states that even for ‘rational’ minded members of the Greek world myth was not something to dismiss, and that its authority stemmed from its ability to shape meaning.⁴⁰ According to Galinsky and Dohrn, myth provided ancient communities with the means by which to condense an otherwise complex or even unknown early history into an easily communicable narrative.⁴¹ This narrative could be passed down through the generations with ease, being transmitted primarily via oral performances. Such a deliberate process of transmission would have helped in the creation and maintenance of a sense of communal continuity. This is because the deliberate action of tying the origins of a community to a single mythological figure or point of origin provides an easily identifiable sacred and ‘historical’ reference point through which the idea of a community as a unified body can be conceptualised by its members.⁴²

³⁸ For detailed discussions of the evolution and political functionality of kinship mythology in the ancient Greek world see Patterson (2010).

³⁹ Assmann, J. (2011), 59-62.

⁴⁰ Patterson (2010), 5.

⁴¹ Galinsky (1969 [2015]), 3: “It was the characteristic method of the ancient mythographers, poets, and even historians to have a single human prototype stand for the often varied and complex experience of a large group of people.” Dohrn (1964), 18: “one of the essential characteristics of ancient thinking is to make all events take on human form. Developments of a long duration are telescoped as it were into one human lifetime and transferred to one human being” (trans. Galinsky).

⁴² See Assmann, J. (2011), 59-69.

It is within the context of foundation mythology that the earliest extant occurrence of the concept in Latin literature can be found. Dated to 184 BC and covering Roman 'history' from the so-called regal period of Rome until the triumph of Marcus Fulvius Nobilior over the Aetolians in 189 BC, Ennius' *Annales* is the earliest historical account of Rome in Latin verse.⁴³ Amongst the surviving fragments is a passage that was preserved within the writings of Cicero. In this passage a group of Romans, their identity unknown, recall amongst themselves Romulus' patriotic guardianship of Rome: *O Romule, Romule die, | Qualem te patriae custodem di genuerunt! O pater, o genitor, o sanguen dis oriendum! | Tu produxisti nos intra luminis oras.*⁴⁴

Although *Annales* 1.105-109 is only a small fragment, it nevertheless provides us with a detailed early indication of a contemporary definition of *patria*. Firstly, the historical context of this passage serves to underline the concept's role as an expression of collective identity on a large scale. Within this passage specifically, there is no possible way in which *patria* can be understood as referring to anything other than the entire Roman community. Secondly, the interdependence between *patria* and Romulus within this passage reveals important and interesting details about the way in which

⁴³ Skutsch (1985), 5-6. For a discussion of the text as it stands and the sources from which the fragments are derived see Elliott (2013). See also the excellent discussion on Ennius' *Annales* by Goldschmidt (2013); and Gratwick (1982).

⁴⁴ Ennius, *Annales*, 1.105-109 (Skutsch, 1985): "O Romulus, divine Romulus, what a protector of the *patria* the gods begat in you! O father, o founder, o offspring of the gods! It was you who led us into the shores of light."

Ennius intended their respective characteristics to be understood. On the one hand, Romulus' divinely inspired guardianship of the *patria* merits the praise he receives from his fellow Romans and exemplifies his divine ancestry. On the other hand, the description of Romulus as *custos* suggests to the reader that the Roman *patria* is an ancient, even mythological object in its own right. Although *custos* can be understood in some contexts as a reference to the process and source of creation, in this instance the emphasis appears to be on leadership and protection.⁴⁵ The gods are clearly marked as a source of creation in this passage, being described as the force behind Romulus' conception and birth (*te...di genuerunt*). Indeed, had Ennius wanted Romulus to be recognised unquestionably as the creator or source of the Roman *patria* he could have used the phrase *genitor patriae*.⁴⁶ The stress on Romulus' role as leader rather than creator is also emphasised in the final statement. Here the phrase *produxisti nos intra luminis oras* emphasises a transition from one state of being to another, in this case the transition of the early Roman community from darkness (signifying poverty, insecurity, insignificance) to light (signifying prosperity, security, strength).

The relationship between the concept and the sacred is a theme that reoccurs within the Latin literature of the Late Republic. In Lucretius' *De Rerum Natura*, for example, *patria* is employed in the

⁴⁵ On the wide range of meanings of *custos* and its occurrences in Latin literature see *TLL* vol. IV, p. 1571.

⁴⁶ This phrase occurs in Ov. *Ars am.* 1.197 to refer to Augustus.

poet's discussion of the nature of *anima* to describe the experience of exile. He informs us how (3.48-53):

*extorres idem patria longeque fugati | conspectu ex hominum,
foedati crimine turpi, | omnibus aerumnis adfecti denique
vivunt, | et quo cumque tamen miseri venere parentant | et
nigras mactant pecudes et manibus divis | inferias mittunt
multoque in rebus acerbis | acrius advertunt animos ad
religionem.*⁴⁷

Once again, in the context of this passage *patria* refers exclusively to a large communal body. According to Lucretius, expulsion from a *patria* should not only be a process by which individuals are physically removed from a community but one by which all traces of a community are removed from an individual. Despite this, and one can sense Lucretius' own surprise and admiration at the fact, these exiles still manage to maintain a sense of their collective identity, their *patria*, by attempting to continue a rudimentary observation of the sacrifices owed to specific deities and the honour owing to their deceased ancestors.⁴⁸ Whilst this passage does not indicate the mythological nature of *patria* as was seen in *Annales* 1.105-109, it does further reinforce the impression of the concept as a means by which collective identity was expressed. Moreover, Lucretius' verse also indicates the concept's importance to the emotional state of an individual, a theme to which I will return in Section III of this chapter.

⁴⁷ "These exiles, driven from *patria* and far from the sight of men, marked by dishonourable accusations, and possessing every tribulation still live. And yet, despite their wretched pursuits, they make sacrifices to the ancestral gods, they slay black cattle, and they send offerings in honour of the dead, and in their grievous situation they turn their minds more eagerly toward religion."

⁴⁸ Cf. Colman (2012), 84.

The mythological character of *patria* re-emerges in the Augustan period, where Virgil presents the concept as a fundamental detail within his version of the Aeneas foundation myth. The centrality of *patria* to the poetic narrative is made clear in Hector's speech to Aeneas (2.291-295):

*sat patriae Priamoque datum: si Pergama dextra | defendi
possent, etiam hac defensa fuissent. | Sacra suosque tibi
commendat Troia Penates; | hos cape fatorum comites, his
moenia quaere | magna, pererrato statues quae denique
ponto.*⁴⁹

In the traditionally accepted Roman version of Aeneas' wanderings, the Trojan hero proceeds to lead a group of Trojan refugees across the Mediterranean to Italy in order to establish a new city.⁵⁰ Some scholars have mistakenly interpreted Aeneas' mission to found a new city in the Virgilian account of the myth as representing the establishment of a new *patria*.⁵¹ However, at 2.291-295 Hector does not instruct Aeneas to found a new *patria* but rather to establish a new physical location in which the existing Trojan *patria* can be re-housed and protected. It is Aeneas' actions in saving the sacred objects of Troy from destruction that thus enables a sense of Trojan collective identity to continue. This theme is also evident in the opening lines of the epic at 1.67-68. At a time that is chronologically ahead of 2.291-295, Juno declares that

⁴⁹ "Enough has been given to the *patria* and to Priam: if Troy could have been defended by any right hand, by this very right hand would she have been saved. Troy entrusts you with her sacred objects and the *penates*; take them as companions of your destiny, and search for a great walls to establish for them after a long journey at sea."

⁵⁰ For a discussion on the evolution of Aeneas' mythography see Horsfall (1987) and Gruen (1992), 12-21. The importance of 'refugee narratives' in Roman ideas of their early history is a theme that is discussed by Lee-Stecum (2008).

⁵¹ See for example Gruen (1992), 7. See also Armstrong, J. (1982), 93-102.

gens inimica mihi Tyrrhenum navigat aequor, Ilium in Italiam portans victosque Penates. Despite being a group of wandering refugees, it is their precious and sacred cargo that enable them still to be identified as Trojans.

Virgil's interpretation of *patria* would appear to echo Ennius' presentation of the concept as ancient and mythological. At *Annales* 1.105-109, *patria* was imbued with a mythical and ancient aura, an aspect that leads the reader to date its origins as preceding those of Rome. Virgil can be seen to continue, or at least resurrect this theme. Aeneas' depiction as a guardian and not as a founder of *patria* once again portrays the concept as an entity that is older than the salient mythological figures of Rome's past. By emulating Ennius in this way, Virgil can be seen as emphasising *patria's* position as a central factor in the establishment and maintenance of a sense of Roman collective identity. This is owing to the fact that Virgil's stress upon the concept's antiquity enables him to highlight it as an apparent constant in the lives of multiple Romans, thus enabling it to function as a psychological link between multiple generations.⁵²

1.1.ii: Ancestry and Ancestral Tradition

The concept of *patria* is also associated in Latin literature with the theme of ancestral tradition.⁵³ In *De Legibus* 2.3, this particular theme was fundamental to Cicero's interpretation of the concept. Within the

⁵² The unification of generations across a wide historical spectrum, a feature that helps to develop a strong sense of collective identity, is a subject to which I will return in the subsequent chapter.

⁵³ See Bonjour (1975a), 194ff.

passage, there are three references to the ancestral nature of Arpinum as Cicero's *patria*, as well as an additional reference to the ancestral tradition of the Roman people. An awareness of one's ancestral pedigree was an important aspect of Roman culture, particularly amongst the upper echelons of Roman society.⁵⁴ Members of the senatorial and equestrian classes were expected both to be aware of who their ancestors were and to be able to recall their individual deeds and political offices.⁵⁵ An awareness of ancestral pedigree served to reinforce a strong sense of family identity and thus the bonds between the various individuals that comprised a *familia*. This sense of attachment was strengthened further via the cultural practice of imitation. The attempts of Roman senators and equestrians to imitate the political and military achievements of their forebears resulted in their individual identities being fused with those of their ancestors. Put simply, future generations of Roman senatorial and equestrian orders were encouraged and expected to become the living extensions of their ancestors, and thus a medium through which the prestige of the family could continue and grow.⁵⁶

It is not surprising, therefore, to discover that ancestry and ancestral tradition play a prominent role in the presentation of *patria* in Latin literature as an expression of collective identity. Indeed, the first indication of this is evident from a consideration of the concept's

⁵⁴ For general discussions of ancestry and ancestral tradition within Roman culture see Flower (1996) and Pollini (2012), 13-56.

⁵⁵ See Baroin (2010), 19-48.

⁵⁶ Baroin (2010), 48.

etymology. Etymologically, it would appear that *patria* was derived from the term *pater*, and thus can be understood in what is arguably its most archaic sense as indicating aspects that pertained to an individual's paternal forebears.⁵⁷ Indeed, there appears to have been a close association between *patria* and *pater*. This is particularly evident in the plays of Plautus. In *Captivi*, the return of an individual to *patria* signifies the return of that individual to his father and hence his family. This is emphasised by the recurring phrase *in patriam ad patrem*.⁵⁸ The connection between father and *patria* is evident also in *Vidularia* fragment 20. In this case, it is the location of the individual's father that signifies the location of his or her *patria* (*immo id quod haec est nostra patria, et quod hic meus <est> pater*).

This etymological definition is supported by a number of other passages in Latin literature, including those that have been discussed previously. In the earlier considered example from Lucretius, 3.48-53, it was seen how individuals subjected to the torment of exile were able to maintain a sense of their *patria* or collective identity by continuing to execute their sacred duties. Yet, Lucretius makes it clear that this method of maintaining a sense of collective identity is dependent on a specific group of deities. The exiles make their sacrifices *manibus divis*, to the ancestral gods. Moreover, just as important to this process is the honouring of deceased ancestors. Thus, an individual's collective

⁵⁷ See *TLL* vol. X.1, p. 742. The connection between paternal forebears and concepts of 'national' collective identity is evident in other cultures, e.g. fatherland in English, *Vaterland* in German, *zǔguó* (land of ancestors) in Chinese, *eretz ha'avot* (the land of the forefathers) in Hebrew.

⁵⁸ Plaut. *Capt.* 383-384, 682-688 and 697-700.

identity would appear to be dependent upon the observance of sacred rites and a continuation of ancestral tradition and custom. Indeed, such a practice would have undoubtedly helped an exile to retain a psychological sense of continuity with his native and ancestral origins.

The relationship between *patria* and the continuation of ancestral tradition is echoed in Ennius 1.105-109 and Virgil *Aeneid* 2.291-295. As stated earlier, in Ennius' *Annales*, Romulus is not portrayed as the founder of the Roman *patria*, but rather its guardian at that specific time. Likewise, in the *Aeneid* Aeneas is characterised as one in a continuous line of guardians that ensure the welfare of the Trojan (and thus Roman) *patria*. Nor is this theme confined to Rome's mythical past. At *Fasti* 1.527-532 Ovid informs us how:

*iam pius Aeneas sacra et, sacra altera, patrem | adferet. Iliacos
accipe, Vesta, deos! | Tempus erit cum vos orbemque tuebitur
idem, | et fient ipso sacra colente deo, | et penes Augustos
patriae tutela manebit. | hanc fas imperii frena tenere
domum.*⁵⁹

In Ovid's view, Augustus and his successors have become the latest in a line of guardians of the Roman *patria*, a line that when combined with the writings of Ennius and Virgil stretches back into the mythical elements of Rome's cultural past. Most interestingly, this similarity between Augustus and Aeneas reflects the Julian claim to be direct descendants of Aeneas and Venus. As such, the image of Augustus as a continuation of Rome's Trojan founder would have undoubtedly

⁵⁹ "Soon pious Aeneas will bring the sacred emblems | and the sacred sire: receive Ilium's gods, Vesta. | Time will come when one gaze guards you and the world, | and the god himself conducts the rites. | The *patria's* tutelage will stay with the Augusti; | it is ordained that this house holds the empire's reins."

reinforced his political legitimacy, as well as the validity of his status as *pater patriae*.⁶⁰

1.1.iii: Familial Imagery

A final consideration of *patria* as a marker of collective identity concerns the usage of familial imagery and terminology. Rather than reinforce Cicero's image in *De Legibus* 2.3 of *patria* as an expression of familial collective identity, familial imagery and terminology function in Latin literature as a means by which to underline the solidarity of the Roman community. Indeed, one of the primary roles of familial imagery in Latin literature is to illustrate the familial nature of the attachment between *patria* and its members and to cement the theme of the concept as an expression of collective identity. The use of familial terminology to describe *patria* would appear very much to have been a trait of the Late Republic, and can be adequately highlighted through Catullus' *Carmina* 63, and two short passages from Cicero's *De Re Publica* I.

In Catullus 63, Attis, in a moment of madness that was induced by the goddess Cybele, unmans himself with a sharp piece of stone before proceeding to lead his followers in a frenzied procession through the woods where they then collapse in exhaustion. Whilst Attis' self-mutilation of his male genitalia is a clear and graphic rejection of his male identity, it is also, more significantly, a powerful

⁶⁰ On the significance of the title *pater patriae* to the external characterisation of the Augustan regime see Chapter Four.

metaphor for the abandonment of his collective identity.⁶¹ This is owing to the fact that the forceful and violent removal of his testes can be interpreted as the forceful dismissal of his paternal ancestry.⁶² The consequences of his actions to his sense of identity are reflected in Attis' lament once he realises what it is that he has done: *patria o mei creatrix, patria o mea genetrix [...] iam iam dolet quod egi, iam iamque paenitet.*⁶³ The use of the terms *creatrix* and *genetrix* create a parental image of *patria*. These terms were associated with the activities of a mother in the procreation and upbringing of her children.⁶⁴ This maternal imagery is stressed further by the significance of the cult of Venus Genetrix that focused upon the role of the goddess as a guardian of motherhood.⁶⁵

In Cicero's *De Re Publica*, the use of familial imagery and terminology also serves as a way of emphasising the emotional attachment that an individual feels towards his or her *patria*. In a fragment that survives from the opening to *De Re Publica* I, Cicero states how, *Quoniam plura beneficia continet patria, et est antiquior parens quam si qui creavit, maior ei profecto quam parenti debetur*

⁶¹ On Catull. 63 and the theme of identity see Harrison, S. (2004), 520-523; Nauta (2004), 596-628; Nauta and Harder (2005). See also Ellis (1889 [1988]), 251-278, esp. 269-270; and Godwin (1995), 121-131, esp. 128.

⁶² Ellis (1889 [1988]), 269: "He who castrated himself could not be a father, and so continue the succession of stocks which form the collective *patria*; to be a eunuch was therefore to play the parricide to one's country." Cf. Dio Cass. 56.4-9.

⁶³ Armstrong, R. (2013), 63-64, interprets Attis' lament as an indication of his nostalgia for "the civilised pleasures of his native Athens".

⁶⁴ See for example Lucr. 2.599.

⁶⁵ The maternal emphasis on the term *genetrix* is stressed by its use in Latin literature to illustrate the status of Venus as a mother: Lucr. 1.1; Suet. *Iul.* 61, 78, 84; Verg. *Aen.* 1.590, 1.689.

gratia.⁶⁶ At *De Re Publica* 1.8, Cicero reiterates this statement in more detail:

*Neque enim hac nos patria lege genuit aut educavit, ut nulla quasi alimenta exspectaret a nobis, ac tantum modo nostris ipsa commodis serviens tutum perfrugium otio nostro suppeditaret et tranquillum ad quietem locum, sed ut plurimas et maximas nostri animi, ingenii, consilii partis ipsa sibi ad utilitatem suam pigneraretur tantumque nobis in nostrum privatum usum, quantum ipsi superesse posset, remitteret.*⁶⁷

Within these two passages the depiction of *patria* is similar to Catullus 63.50. The concept is described by Cicero as being a *parens*, and is imbued with the roles that would normally be associated with the duties of a parent, namely *creare*, *educare* and *gignere*.⁶⁸ As in the case of Catullus 63, the presentation of *patria* in this manner serves to strengthen its image as a means by which to express collective identity. In this particular case, Cicero uses this theme to stress how all members of the Roman community have the same unifying *patria*, the same 'greater parent', and thus are kindred folk of the same 'supreme family'. Cicero's image of *patria* as *parens* thus reinforces the notion of Rome as a single cohesive and what we would today term 'national' family unit. This theme was undoubtedly inspired, as was also *De Legibus*, by the political instability and what can be termed national disunity that was rocking Rome at the time of *De Re Publica*'s composition. As such, these passages could be interpreted as an attempt by Cicero to encourage Rome's leading protagonists to lay

⁶⁶ Cic. *Rep.* Fr. 1a, ap. Nonius 426.8. See note 24 for translation.

⁶⁷ See note 25 for translation.

⁶⁸ On each of these terms see *TLL* vol. IV p. 1157, *TLL* vol. V.2 p. 113-116, and *TLL* vol. VI.2 p. 1975 respectively.

aside their private interests and redirect their energies and talents towards ensuring and protecting the overall stability of Rome.

1.II. Membership of *Patria*

Thus far the discussion has determined that *patria* was to one extent or another a conceptual embodiment of collective identity. Yet, which sections of society were recognised as possessing membership of a *patria*? Was the criterion of membership to *patria* similar to that of citizenship as has been suggested by Sherwin-White and others? Or was membership in fact much broader and more inclusive?

When these questions are considered in the light of literary evidence it appears that the *patria* was highly inclusive in terms of membership. That is to say, evidence suggests that membership was not exclusive and embraced all sectors of society: men, women, and, more surprisingly, both free, freed and even potentially slave. An illustration of this inclusivity can be seen within Justinian's *Digesta Seu Pandectae*.⁶⁹ *DG* 34.2.38.2 preserves a passage from Q. Mucius Scaevola that is datable to the early first century BC in which a woman's membership of *patria* is recorded:

*Seia testamento ita cavit: "si mihi per condicionem humanam contigerit, ipsa faciam: sin autem, ab heredibus meis fieri volo: iubeoque signum dei ex libris centum in illa sacra aede et in patria statui subscriptione nominis mei."*⁷⁰

⁶⁹ For passages that are henceforth cited from the *Digesta Seu Pandectae* the abbreviation *DG* will be used.

⁷⁰ "Seia has stipulated in her will that 'if it has fallen upon me to do in my lifetime, I shall do it; but if not, however, I wish it to be done by my heirs. And I instruct them to erect a statue of the god weighing one hundred *librae* in my name in that sacred temple and my *patria*.'"

In this short passage, we can see clearly the affection that this particular woman had for her *patria*. Just like her male counterparts, Seia is keen to have memorialised clear evidence of her devotion to her *patria*, the community to which she ascribed her collective identity.⁷¹ There is no indication in this passage, or within the rest of the *DG* that such a request by a woman is extraordinary. Rather, this passage indicates the equality that existed between the sexes regarding both membership of a *patria* and the devotion that an individual was expected to possess.⁷²

The affection that a woman should possess for her *patria* is an important theme in Ovid's account of Scylla, the daughter of king Nisus of Megara, in *Metamorphoses* 8. In the opening 150 lines of the book, Ovid effectively uses this theme to highlight the tension that could exist between private and collective interests. Gazing down at the forces besieging her city, Scylla questions whether she should feel grief or joy at the war being waged (44-45: '*laeter, ait 'doleamne geri lacrimabile bellum, in dubio est*'). Daydreaming of ways in which she could reveal her love to Minos, she considers the implications this could have for her *patria*. At first rejecting the notion of betraying her *patria* for the love of Minos (54-56: *tantum patrias ne posceret arces! nam pereant potius sperata cubilia, quam sim prodicione potens!*), she eventually persuades herself that by offering herself along with her

⁷¹ Cf. Talamanco (2009), 618-619.

⁷² For other literary examples of a direct relationship between women and *patria* see Prop. 2.32.31; 4.4.87; Ov. *Met.* 5.493-4; 6.310-311; 8.90-91; 8.108-109; 9.639-640; 13.399; 13.421; 13.489; Verg. *Aen.* 5.623-624.

patria she will not only attain the desires of her heart but peace for her people (47-48: *me tamen accepta poterat deponere bellum obside: me comitem, me pacis pignus haberet*). Sneaking out of Megara at night, Scylla enters the tent of Minos and offers him her *patria* and its sacred objects in return for his hand in marriage (90-92: *'suasit amor facinus: proles ego regia Nisi Scylla tibi trado patriaequae meosque penates; praemia nulla peto nisi te'*). Scylla's betrayal of her *patria* is an act, however, that Minos cannot tolerate and he spurns her affections. Scylla thus ends up alone, without membership of a *patria* and without the love of the man she desired. Ovid's message from this account is clear. An individual, whether man or woman, has a duty to ensure the welfare of the *patria* to which they belong. Pursuit of private interests over those of the collective can and will only end in disaster both for the *patria* and the individual concerned.

The *patria's* gender inclusivity can be further deduced from Plautus' *Persa*. In the following passage a slave girl, Lucris, is interrogated by Dordalus and Toxilus as they attempt to discover her identity:

Dordalus: *Nolo ego te mirari, si nos ex te percontabimur aut patriam tuam aut parentes.*

Lucris: *Quor ego id mirer, mi homo? Servitus mea mi interdixit, ne quid mirer meum malum.*

[...]

Dor: *Quid nomen tibi est?*

Toxilus: *Nunc metuo ne peccet.*

Luc: *Lucridi nomen in patria fuit.*

[...]

Dor: *Ubi tu nata est?*

Luc: *Ut mihi mater dixit, in culina, in angulo ad laevum manum.*

[...]

Dor: *At ego patriam te rogo quae sit tua.*

Luc: *Quae mihi sit, nisi haec ubi nunc sum?*
Dor: *At ego illam quaero quae fuit.*
Luc: *Omne ego pro nihilo esse duco quod fuit, quando fuit: tamquam hominem, quando animam eclavit, quid eum quaeras qui fuit?*
Tox: *Ita me di bene ament, sapientur. Atque equidem miserat tamen. Sed tamen, virgo, quae patriast tua, age mi actutum expedi. Quid taces?*
Luc: *Dico equidem: quando sic servio, haec patriast mea.*⁷³

In this passage, it appears as though Plautus may be depicting a slave as possessing membership of a *patria*. Firstly, the slave girl's original collective identity, that is to say *patria*, is originally stated as having been erased by her enslavement. This is not a problematic notion. Secondly, her membership to a new *patria* is presented as being dependent upon her being the property of a free member of the *patria* into which she is enslaved.⁷⁴ It is this second notion that is more problematic. On the one hand, it could be that Plautus is reflecting in his play official Roman practice whereby a slave took on the *patria* of their master and that the humour in this passage is inherent in the

⁷³ **Dor.:** Don't be surprised if we question you about your *patria* or your parents. **Vir.:** Ah, why should I be, my dear sir? My...servitude has forbidden my...being surprised at any...misfortune that befalls me. [...] **Dor.:** What is your name? **Tox.:** (*aside*) Now I am afraid she'll make a slip. **Vir.:** In my own...*patria* my name was...Lucris. [...] **Dor.:** Where were you born? **Vir.:** (*innocently*) In the...kitchen so my mother...told me, in the...left-hand corner. [...] **Dor.:** But I am asking you what your *patria* is. **Vir.:** What should it...be, if not the...one I'm in now? **Dor.:** But I want to know what it used to be. **Vir.:** Everything that...used to be is the same as...nothing to me, now that it is...no more. Like a...man who has...breathed his last, why not ask him who he...used to be? (*is shaken with sobs*) **Tox.:** (*To Dordalus, much stirred*) Lord love me, how she philosophizes! Upon my soul, I do pity her, though! (*to girl*) But come, though, young lady, inform me at once what your [*patria*] is. (*after a pause*) Why this silence? **Vir.:** Indeed I am...telling you – since I am in...slavery here, this is my...*patria*." (Trans. P. Nixon 1924. I have replaced Nixon's translations of *patria* with *patria* itself.)

⁷⁴ See also Plaut. *Bac.* 170-171, where the slave Chrysalus' membership to a *patria* is entirely dependent upon his master: *Erilis patria, salve, quam ego biennio, | postquam hinc in Ephesum abii conspicio lubens*. ("Greetings to the *patria* of my master, which I see again with joy after leaving for Ephesus two years ago."); and Plaut. *Stich.* 649-650: *Salvete, Athenae, quae nutrices Graeciae, | sperata erilis patria, te video libens*. ("Greetings Athens, nurse of Greece, *patria* of my master how glad am I to behold you.") For a discussion of the Lucris' character in *Persa* see Stewart (2012), 44-47.

notion that Lucris' *patria* is a kitchen. Alternatively, the humour in the passage could reside in the idea that a slave could have a *patria* at all. However, whilst the notion of slavery and membership of *patria* is not conclusive, the fact that slaves adopted the *patria* of their masters on receiving their freedom is clearly stated. Evidence to this effect is found in an excerpt taken from the jurist Ulpian, which is dated to the late-second or early-third century AD. In this passage, preserved in *DG* 50.1.27pr, it is stated that a slave on manumission will formally adopt the *patria* of his or her master:

*Eius, qui manumisit, municeps est manumissus, non domicilium eius, sed patriam secutus. Et si patronum habeat duarum civitatem municipem, per manumissionem earundem civitatum erit municeps.*⁷⁵

The overall impression that is acquired on the question of membership is that *patria* would appear to have been considered as a highly inclusive concept. It would appear to have (potentially) embraced all members of Roman society, and to have been open to the inclusion of new members through the process of manumission. The theme of inclusivity is reflected in Roman foundation mythology of the Augustan period. According to Virgil's version of the Aeneas myth, the Trojan hero Aeneas arrives in the kingdom of Latium in Italy. King Latinus of Latium permits the Trojan migrants to settle in the local

⁷⁵ "A man who is freed is a *municeps* of who freed him and takes that man's *patria* but not his place of domicile. And if he has a *patronus* of two municipalities, he will be a member of both on manumission". It could be argued that this passage reinforces Sherwin-White's interpretation of *patria* equals citizenship. However, such depends on reading *patria* in this context as being a concept that was synonymous with *civitas*, a reading that is not supported by any of the evidence thus far discussed.

area and fulfils a prophecy by marrying his daughter to their leader.⁷⁶ On the death of Latinus, Aeneas takes up the throne of Latium and unites the two Trojans and Latins into a single community. The Latins were thus traditionally recognised by the Romans as a composition of different 'ethnic' or cultural groups, which embraced a single *patria*. This image of the Roman *patria* emerging from an intermixing or inclusion of other groups is further reinforced when we consider that the *penates*, previously identified as a central religious component of the Roman concept of *patria*, were worshipped collectively at Lavinium by the various Latin tribes.⁷⁷

The intermixed nature of Rome as a cultural and political community occurs also within Livy's *Ab Urbe Condita*. At *Ab Urbe Condita* 1.8.4-6, Livy recalls how Romulus established an asylum during the early days of the foundation of Rome in order to help populate his new city. To this call, Livy states, flocked men of a base nature who seized the opportunity to start a new life and who formed the foundations for Rome's future strength.⁷⁸ Although differing accounts regarding the nature of the men who came to Romulus' asylum exist, the message of the asylum is clear. Rome is the product of integration and inclusivity. Integration and inclusivity are also

⁷⁶ Verg. *Aen.* 7.259-273.

⁷⁷ Cornell (1997), 67-68. Cornell even describes the gatherings of the Latin tribes at the Thirteen Altars at Lavinium a 'national festival' (71). See Moser and Hay (2013), 363-366, for a brief discussion of the multiple phases of construction of the altars that occurred from the sixth to the fourth century BC.

⁷⁸ cf. Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 2.15. Dench (2005), 96-99, draws an interesting comparison between Rome and Athens based on the phrase 'born from the earth'. For a wider discussion of the Romulus myth and its role in the formation of Roman identity see Dench (2005), 37-91.

evident in the anecdote of the Sabine women at *Ab Urbe Condita* 1.9-13. In this case, the conclusion of hostilities between Rome and the Sabines results in the merger of the two communities. Such an event is not unique. At *Ab Urbe Condita* 1.29, Alba is also absorbed into Rome following the conclusions of hostilities between the two communities.

Membership of *patria*, however, was not deemed to be permanent. Individuals could be forcibly removed from their *patriae* either by enslavement following conflict or by being exiled for political reasons. A few examples of this can be found in Plautus, Terence and Livy. In Plautus' *Poenulus*, the characters Adelphasium and Anterastilis are slaves who were forcibly removed from their *patria* Carthage. This removal illustrates the connection of *patria* with the concept of *libertas*.⁷⁹ The connection between *libertas* and *patria* is evident also at *Captivi* 297-301. In this passage, the slave Tyndarus, pretending to be his master Philocrates, who has been captured with his slave in a war against Aetolia, illustrates his status as a slave by emphasising his loss of *patria* and *libertas* (300-301: *nunc quando patriam et libertatem perdidit*).⁸⁰ The relationship between *patria* and exile is evident in Terence's *Heauton Timorumenos* via the phrase *patria careo*, and exile is an important theme in the writings of Ovid and Cicero as will be examined in the subsequent chapters of this study.⁸¹ Finally, individuals could also, as in the case of Scylla above, voluntarily abandon their membership. In Livy's *Ab Urbe Condita* 1.34.2, the

⁷⁹ See Plaut. *Poen.* 1187-1190 and 1243-1247.

⁸⁰ "Now that I have lost *patria* and freedom."

⁸¹ Ter. *Haut.* 256-263.

father of Lucumo (who would become king Tarquin of Rome) is shown voluntarily abandoning his membership of his *patria* Corinth owing to civil unrest (*Demarati Corinthii filius erat, qui ob seditiones domo profugus cum Tarquiniis forte consedisset*), and at 1.34.5 Tarquin's wife is described as giving up the membership of her *patria* Tarquinii in order to further her personal ambitions (*Spernentibus Etruscis Lucumonem exsule advena ortum, ferre indignitatem non potuit, oblitaque ingenitae erga patriam caritatis, dummodo virum honoratum videret, consilium migrandi ab Tarquiniis cepit*).

One final aspect of the theme of membership that is worthy of note is the Augustan poet Grattius' interesting extension of membership of *patria* to animals. At *Cynegetica* 154-155, Grattius states *mille canum patriae ductique ab origine mores quoique sua*.⁸² At 211, *metagontes*, a specific breed of dog is stated as possessing honourable origins (*at vestrum non vile genus, non patria*). Finally, at 502, the association of *patria* with animals is extended to horses where it is stated: *consule, Penei qualis perfunditur amne | Thessalus aut patriae quem conspexere Mycenae | glaucum*.⁸³ These passages are significant since they serve to stress *patria*'s function as a means by which to highlight identity and origin. Grattius employs a concept that was understood to illustrate and embody human collective identity so as to explain and highlight the collective origins and identities of the abovementioned animals. The employment of the

⁸² "Dogs are of a thousand *patriae* and are led in their characteristics by their origin."

⁸³ "Be mindful, which Thessalian horse bathes in the Penthean stream or which is the grey horse watched by its *patria* Mycenae?"

concept in this manner not only emphasises that it was an indicator of identity but that its success would undoubtedly have been dependent upon this being easily identified by Grattius' contemporary readership.

1.III. *Patria* as an Object of Service and Devotion

From the earliest extant occurrence of *patria* in Latin literature through to the late-imperial period and beyond, the concept is frequently presented as an object that demands service and devotion.⁸⁴ According to Cicero and Lucretius, *patria* was regarded as taking precedence over everything else. This theme, however, is not confined to Latin literature. Latin inscriptions from across the Roman Empire provide unique evidence of the desire of its inhabitants to record examples of their devotion toward their various *patriae*.⁸⁵ What we would today describe as expressions of patriotism are not only an important defining theme of *patria* in its own right but they also offer additional evidence that reinforces the overall definition of the concept as an expression of collective identity. These frequent expressions of devotion and affection toward the concept of *patria* serve to stress further the collective nature of various communities via

⁸⁴ The earliest example of this theme in a Latin literary context is Ennius 1.105-108. In this passage, Romulus is the subject of praise owing to his god-like guardianship of the Roman *patria* (*Qualem te patriae custodem di genuerunt*). Consider also the passages discussed above from Cicero's *De Republica*. The symbolism of *patria* as an object of devotion was most famously recognised by Wilfred Owen in his Great War poem *Dulce et Decorum est Pro Patria Mori*. Owen adapted this now immortalised phrase from the statement in Horace's *Carmina* 3.2.13. For a detailed discussion of *patria* and patriotism see Bonjour (1975a).

⁸⁵ Although such inscriptions are found across the empire, the Italian peninsula, North Africa and Spain are the areas that contain the greatest number of examples. The question as to which *patria* these inscriptions refer to is a question that will be answered in Chapter Five of this study.

the presentation of a single and universal primary focus; to illustrate the values that were regarded as being central to collective identity; and to highlight the existence, at least by the time of the Late Republic, of the conceptualisation of a reciprocal relationship between *patria* and its members.

The theme of devotion to *patria* and its significance is effectively demonstrated in Nepos' biographical *Liber de Excellentibus Ducibus Exterarum Gentium*, in which it is used to highlight the attainment and demonstration of individual *virtus*.⁸⁶ A good initial illustration of this is provided by his account of the life of Thrasybulus. In the opening paragraph, Nepos states that he believes Thrasybulus should be placed first amongst men owing to his *virtus sine fortuna*, that is *virtus* based on its own merits without any consideration of the effects or influence of fortune (1.1: *si per se virtus sine fortuna ponderanda est, dubito, an hunc primum omnium ponam*). This judgement rests on four qualities: his sense of honour (*fides*), his steadfastness (*constantia*), his greatness of spirit (*magnitudo animi*) and his love of *patria* (*in patriam amor*). It is this last quality, love of *patria*,

⁸⁶ *Patria* occurs in a total of sixteen of the twenty-three *Lives* of foreign generals. It also occurs in the biographical account of Atticus from Nepos' *Atticus*. For the connection between *patria* and *virtus* see Lucilius, unassigned fragment, 1342-1354 (Krenkel). Recent changes in attitude towards ancient biography have shifted scholarly debate away from historical accuracies and stylistic problems towards the interest that existed in antiquity in the development of character and the bearing that this had upon the actions of individuals. For the varied debate of the function, genre and value of Nepos' writings see Horsfall (1982); Geiger (1985), 66-115; Wiseman (1987), 250; Dionisotti (1988), 36, 48-49; Moles (1989), 230-233; Schepens (1989), 214-216; von Albrecht (1997), 479-480; Tuplin (2000), 151; Titchener (2003); Stadter (2007), 524-540; Beneker (2009); Przywansky (2009), 101-102; Stem (2012). The theme of *patria* in relation to individual character is a theme that is explored in further detail in Chapter Three.

which arguably carries the most weight with regard to Nepos' assessment of Thrasybulus' *virtus*. This is owing to the fact that it is described as being the directing force behind his greatest achievement and thus characterises him as one of the greatest of all non-Roman political leaders:

*Nam quod multi voluerunt paucique potuerunt ab uno tyranno patriam liberare, huic contigit, ut a triginta oppressam tyrannis e servitute in libertatem vindicaret.*⁸⁷

*Quare illud magnificentissimum factum proprium est Thrasybuli. Nam cum triginta tyranni, praepositi a Lacedaemoniis, servitute oppressas tenerent Athenas, plurimos civis, quibus in bello parcerat fortuna, partim patria expulissent, partim interfecissent, plurimorum bona publicata inter se divisissent, non solum princeps, sed etiam solus initio bellum iis indixit.*⁸⁸

Devotion to *patria* as a means by which to attain and display individual *virtus* is a theme that is evident within the lives of Alcibiades and Epaminondas. It is within the context of Alcibiades' first exile from Athens that Nepos introduces the importance of *patria* to Alcibiades' character and its influence in directing his actions. Having been driven from his *patria* on a charge of sacrilege by his political enemies, Alcibiades takes refuge with the Spartans, going so far as to aid them in their war against his fellow countrymen. Nepos argues, however, that although Alcibiades offers his assistance to the Spartans he does

⁸⁷ Nep. *Thras.* 1.2: "For while many have wished, and a few have been able to free their *patria* from a single tyrant, it was his good fortune to restore his *patria* from slavery to freedom when it was under the heel of the thirty tyrants."

⁸⁸ Nep. *Thras.* 1.5: "This most noble action, then, is entirely Thrasybulus'; for when the Thirty Tyrants, appointed by the Lacedaemonians, kept Athens oppressed in a state of slavery, and had partly banished from their *patria*, and partly put to death a great number of the citizens whom fortune had spared in war, and had divided their confiscated property amongst themselves, he was not only the first, but the only man at the commencement, to declare war against them."

not wage war *against* his *patria* but rather *in its interests* (4.5-4.6): *Lacedaemonem demigravit. Ibi, ut ipse praedicare consuerat, non adversus patriam, sed inimicos suos bellum gessit, qui eidem hostes essent civitati.*⁸⁹ Nepos' explanation for this apparent paradox is personal antagonism. Nepos states that the driving force behind Alcibiades' exile was the threat that his political and military competence posed to his political rivals (4.6): *Nam cum intellegerent se plurimum prodesse posse rei publicae, ex ea eiecisse plusque irae suae quam utilitati communi paruisse.*⁹⁰ Alcibiades' political enemies are thus presented as being motivated by personal gain rather than by an interest in the affairs and general welfare of the collective. As such, these individuals can only be identified as a direct threat to the security of their *patria*. It is for this reason that Alcibiades' personal alliance with Sparta is to be understood as patriotic, as having been directed by his love of *patria*.

Alcibiades' domestic political enemies are not the only ones to be threatened by his patriotic fervour. Although he provides the Spartans with the upper hand in the war against Athens, Alcibiades is distanced from his temporary allies by *timor* (5.1): *Neque vero his rebus tam amici Alcibiadi sunt facti quam timore ab eo alienati.*⁹¹ This

⁸⁹ "There, as he was accustomed to declare, he carried on a war, not against his *patria*, but against his enemies, because the same persons were enemies to their own city."

⁹⁰ "For though they knew that he could be of the greatest service to the *res publica*, they had expelled him from it, and consulted their own animosity more than the common advantage." For a discussion of the political context surrounding Alcibiades' exile see Smith, S.D. (2007), 38-40.

⁹¹ "Yet by these proceedings they were not so much rendered friends to Alcibiades, as alienated from him by fear."

timor is a direct consequence of Alcibiades' unpredictable nature, an unpredictability that stems from his love of *patria* (5.1): *Nam cum acerrimi viri praestantem prudentiam in omnibus rebus cognoscerent, pertimuerunt, ne caritate patriae ductus aliquando ab ipsis descisceret et cum suis in gratiam rediret.*⁹² Whilst their interests align, Alcibiades' patriotic fervour is an instrument that helps Sparta to attain military superiority. However, should Alcibiades succeed in his personal struggle against his domestic political enemies his love of *patria* would direct him to reconcile himself with his home and thus to devote himself to its cause against Sparta. That the thought of such an eventuality is enough to cause *timor* on the part of the Spartans implies that Alcibiades' patriotism alone would be enough to make Athens a more difficult and dangerous opponent.

The potential danger that Alcibiades' patriotism poses to the Spartans is revealed in a third illustration in Nepos' biographical account of how 'love of *patria*' was a primary force behind his military actions. Having been forcibly estranged from his *patria* for a second time, Alcibiades uses his military skills to his own advantage, acquiring three fortresses and a private army (7.4: *tria castella communiit, Ornos, Bizanthen, Neontichos, manaque collecta*). Rather than use this private army to extract revenge upon his political rivals at Athens, Alcibiades advances into Thrace and enriches himself through plunder (7.4): *primus Graecae civitatis in Thraeciam introiit, gloriosius existimans*

⁹² "For when they saw the singular intelligence of this most active-minded man in every way, they were afraid that, being motivated by love for his *patria*, he might at some time revolt from them, and return into favour with his countrymen."

barbarorum praeda locupletari quam Graiorum. It could be argued from this statement that Alcibiades abandons any concern for the welfare of the collective, and instead focuses his energies upon furthering his personal interests. Nepos states, however, that this is not the case. Despite attaining a vast amount of personal wealth and power (7.5: *Qua ex re creverat cum fama tum opibus, magnamque amicitiam sibi cum quibusdam regibus Thraeciae pepererat*) Alcibiades is not satisfied. This is owing to the fact that his loyalty to Athens as a result of his love of *patria* remains undiminished (8.1): *Neque tamen a caritate patriae potuit recedere.* Alcibiades' continuing loyalty to Athens is, however, presented by Nepos as extraordinary in an exchange between Alcibiades and the Athenian general Philocles. Acting on his enduring love of *patria*, Alcibiades approaches Philocles and suggests a strategy by which the war against Sparta can be ended in Athens' favour.⁹³ Alcibiades' offer of assistance is rejected by Philocles on the grounds that it might result in a dramatic reduction in personal glory (8.4):

*Id etsi vere dictum Philocles animadvertibat, tamen postulata facere noluit, quod sentiebat se Alcibiade recepto nullius momenti apud exercitum futurum et, si quid secundi evenisset, nullam in ea re suam partem fore, contra ea, si quid adversi accidisset, se unum eius delicti futurum reum.*⁹⁴

⁹³ Nepos, *Alcibiades*, 8.2-3.

⁹⁴ "Although Philocles noticed that what was said was true, he was unwilling, however, to do what was requested, since he felt that if Alcibiades received command he himself would be of no importance in the presence of the army, and that if any success occurred his part in it would be nothing, whilst alternatively if anything adverse were to befall he only would be guilty of having failed."

Philocles is thus characterised by Nepos in the same light as Alcibiades' domestic personal enemies. He is more motivated by personal gain than by the interests of the collective. Consequently, as a reader we are immediately aware that Philocles poses as great a threat to his *patria* as do the Spartans. By rejecting Alcibiades' offer, Philocles is accused of hindering his *patria's* chance of success (8.5: *victoriae patriae repugnas*), an accusation that is proven valid with Lysander's subsequent victory at Aegospotmoi.⁹⁵ Nepos' message throughout this account is clear. It is implied that had Philocles accepted Alcibiades' plan, a plan that was inspired and controlled by Alcibiades' strong sense of patriotism, Athens would have been saved from defeat and thus Sparta's *timor* of 5.1 would have been entirely justified.

The final example of Alcibiades' devotion to *patria* occurs in the context of the immediate aftermath of the Peloponnesian War. Fleeing Greece, Alcibiades offers his services to Pharnabazus and rapidly finds himself in an advantageous position.⁹⁶ Further gains in personal wealth and influence, however, are still not enough to distract Alcibiades from his primary motivation, namely the welfare of his *patria* (9.4): *Qua fortuna Alcibiades non erat contentus neque Athenas victas Lacedaemoniis servire poterat pati. Itaque ad patriam liberandam omniferebatur cogitatione*. Thus, Alcibiades continues to put all his energy into ensuring that the concerns of his *patria* are met, despite the personal consequence to himself. Determined to free Athens from

⁹⁵ Nepos, *Alcibiades*, 8.6.

⁹⁶ Nepos, *Alcibiades*, 9.3.

Spartan domination, Alcibiades attempts to obtain the assistance of the Persians.⁹⁷ By now, however, the danger that Alcibiades poses as a result of his extreme patriotism is well recognised by the Spartans and they arrange his eventual murder.⁹⁸ Thus, even at his end, Alcibiades is made to stand as the perfect example of the Roman notion of an individual forsaking everything else in favour of his *patria*. Indeed, this quality is arguably *the* defining aspect that Nepos uses to enable the Roman reader to understand the character and actions of Alcibiades.

Love of *patria* is also presented by Nepos as an important feature of the character, and hence actions, of Epaminondas.⁹⁹ Two examples are identifiable. In the first (4.1-2), Nepos uses Epaminondas' *caritas patriae* to explain his incorruptibility and general indifference towards material wealth. In the passage, Diomedes of Cyzicus attempts to bribe Epaminondas with both a sum of gold and the affection that Epaminondas possesses for a certain Micythus (4.1): *Hic magno cum pondere auri Thebas venit et Micythum adulescentulum quinque talentis ad suam perduxit voluntatem, quem tum Epaminondas plurimum diligebat*. Epaminondas, however, is not moved. In response to Diomedes' offer Epaminondas states that only service in the name of the collective is strong enough to stir him into action (4.2): *Nihil [...] opus pecunia est; nam si rex ea vult quae Thebanis sunt utilia*). Neither wealth nor personal connections are adequate substitutes.

⁹⁷ Nepos, *Alcibiades*, 9.5.

⁹⁸ Nepos, *Alcibiades*, 10.2.

⁹⁹ For a discussion on the parallels between the moral messages of Nepos' *Epaminondas* and *Atticus* see Stem (2009).

Epaminondas' concern for the collective is further highlighted by his lack of concern for personal advancement. Not only is his patriotism not for sale (4.2: *Namque orbis terrarum divitias accipere nolo pro patriae caritate*), but even when he undertakes services on behalf of his *patria* he does so without expecting any personal reward in return (4.2: *gratiis facere sum paratus*).¹⁰⁰

The precedence that Epaminondas gives *patria* over his own interests is highlighted further at 7.1-2:

*Fuisse patientem suorumque iniurias ferentem civium, quod se patriae irasci nefas esse duceret, haec sunt testimonia. Cum eum propter invidiam cives sui praeficere exercitui noluisent duxque esset delectus belli imperitus, cuius errore eo esset deducta illa multitudo militum, ut omnes de salute pertimescerent, quod locorum angustiis clausi ab hostibus obsidebantur, desiderari coepta est Epaminondae diligentia; erat enim ibi privatus numero militis. A quo cum peterent opem, nullam adhibuit memoriam contumeliae et exercitum obsidione liberatum domum reduxit incolumem. Nec vero hoc semel fecit, sed saepius.*¹⁰¹

In being passed over for the command of the Theban army, Epaminondas suffers a moment of public humiliation. Although taking a knock to his personal standing in the community, he does nothing to retaliate, either against the community as a whole or the orchestrating

¹⁰⁰ Stem (2012), 168, also identified the role of *caritas patriae* in this passage of the life of Epaminondas: "The scene is imagined to have occurred privately, among three men, but it demonstrates Epaminondas' patriotism as well as any public act could. The direct speech and face-to-face confrontation (*coram*) add drama whilst numerous characterizing details intensify the overt exemplarity of the scene".

¹⁰¹ "That he was patient and endured the injustice of his fellow citizens, because he felt that it was wrong to be angry towards his *patria*, is proven. The citizens of Thebes had not wanted to place him in command of the army on account of their jealousy and had chosen a commander who was unfamiliar with war, whose error resulted in that great number of soldiers being led so that all of them were afraid for their safety, since they were hemmed in by the enemy in a narrow, enclosed space. They began to wish for the diligence of Epaminondas, who was there privately as one of the soldiers. And when they sought help from him, he did not hold onto any recollection of injury and freed the army from the blockade and led it back home safe. And truly he did not do this a single time, but often."

faction of his misfortune. The lack of retaliation is directed by a single factor, his *caritas patriae*. Not only would such a course of action be impious, as stated above in the passage, but it would also go against his character and personal philosophy of service. That his patriotism is central to his personal philosophy is evident in his actions in the subsequent crisis. Having accompanied the army as a regular soldier, the army turn to Epaminondas to take command when the army finds itself cornered by the enemy. Acquiescing their request, Epaminondas preserves the Theban army and in turn ensures the security of his *patria*.

Although these biographical accounts recall the achievements and lives of non-Romans, the fact that they were written by a Roman writer specifically for a Roman audience leads us to the conclusion that either Nepos is addressing pre-existing and strongly enshrined Roman cultural ideas of service towards *patria* or attempting to develop them on Greek literary foundations. Although there are clear thematic links between *patria* and the Greek concept of *πατρίς*, the prevalence of the theme of service to *patria* in Latin writings that pre-date Nepos make the former more likely to be the case.¹⁰² Thus, although the *patriae* referred to in Nepos' writings of foreign generals are likewise foreign, the themes attached to them can be interpreted as being inherently Roman and could be interpreted as having been intended to

¹⁰² For a discussion of *πατρίς* see Sebillotte (1999).

inspire Rome's political and moral leadership to emulate and eclipse the patriotic fervour of their Greek historical equivalents.

1.IV. The Territorial Extent of *Patria*

In English translations of Latin literature, the term *patria* is frequently translated as 'fatherland', 'nation', or 'country'. Owing to our modern-day ideas of these three particular concepts, these terms imply a specific geographical or territorial dimension.¹⁰³ Imagining the concept of *patria* as having been geographically or territorially defined in the Roman world is not a farfetched idea. Multiple literary passages indicate a moving away from or moving towards a respective *patria*. In Propertius' *Elegiae* 2.32.31, Helen is described as physically leaving her *patria* for love (*Tyndaris externo patriam mutavit amore*) and in Ovid's *Metamorphoses* 2.323-324, Phaethon is stated as being geographically distant from his *patria* (*quem procul a patria diverso maximus orbe | excipit*). Other passages assign physical features to the concept, either natural or man-made. In Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, 11.546, the poet describes how Ceyx desires to cast his gaze upon the shores of his *patria* (*patriae quoque vellet ad oras*), and in Propertius' *Elegiae* 4.1B.122 the poet asks whether he has touched on the physical borders of his *patria* (*an patriae tangitur ora tuae*).¹⁰⁴

Territoriality would thus appear to be a factor that requires careful

¹⁰³ On the territoriality of 'nations' see the excellent discussion by Penrose (2002). See also Smith, A.D. (1986), 134-138.

¹⁰⁴ See Sellar (1892 [2010]), 270-273, regarding the definition of the physical boundaries of *patria* in this passage and the significance this has for understanding the poet's verse.

investigation. However, as the discussion that follows illustrates, there is no simple answer to this question, since there does not appear to have existed a single and universally accepted territorial definition of the concept.

One of the most commonly asserted territorial definitions of the concept of *patria* is achieved by creating a connection between it and an urban environment. Examples of this urban territoriality are obtained from sources that date from the late-second century BC to the early-third century AD. An early example of this can be found in Plautus' *Bacchides*. Towards the comic climax of the play, the cunning slave Chrysalus is in the process of making off with his master's gold. As the slave prepares to launch his cunning assault upon his master's home he compares his plan to the Greeks' final assault on Troy (925-934):

*Atridae duo fratres cluent fecisse facinus maxumum, | quom
Priami patriam Pergamum divina moenitum manu | armis,
equis exercitu atque eximiis bellatoribus | mille cum numero
navium decumo anno post subegerunt. | non pedibus
termento fuit praeut ego erum expugnabo meum | sine classe
sineque exercitu et tanto numero militum. | [cepi expugnaui
amanti erili filio aurum ab suo patre.] | nunc prius quam huc
senex venit, libet lamentari dum exeat. | o Troia, o patria, o
Pergamum, o Priame periisti senex, | qui misere male
mulcabere quadrigentis Philippis aureis.¹⁰⁵*

¹⁰⁵ "The sons of Atreus, two brothers, are reputed to have done great deeds when they conquered Pergamum, the *patria* of Priam, fortified by divine hands, after ten years with arms, horses, and army, and with chosen warriors, and with ships numbering a thousand. That was not a torment for one's feet compared with how I will conquer my master without a fleet and without an army and such a great number of soldiers. I took by force the gold for the master's loved-up son from his father. Now before that old man comes here, I want to lament until he comes out. O Troy! O *patria*! O Pergamum! O old Priam who has passed away! You will be badly and pitifully beaten up for four hundred gold Philippics." For a detailed discussion of this passage see Jocelyn (1969); and Lefèvre (1988).

The physical connection between *patria* and the environment of the city is clear. Firstly, the term *patria* is directly associated with the walls of the city of Pergamum. This association of *patria* with the physical boundary that divides the urban environment from the world around it simultaneously highlights the urban territorial definition of *patria*. Secondly, in Chrysalus' overly dramatic dirge, the term *patria* is sandwiched between the names Troy and Pergamum, a line that Karakasis argues is a parody of *o pater, o patria, o Priami domus* from Ennius' *Andromache*.¹⁰⁶ This sandwiching is an indication of the way in which *patria* can be interpreted in this particular context as referring to both cities, a connection that a contemporary audience was clearly meant to make. Additionally, Chrysalus' attack on his master's home can be seen to function as a metaphorical attack on his master's *patria*. The violation of his master's home is a clear reference to the physical act of breaching a city's defences, and thus the boundaries that mark the territorial extent of *patria*. Jocelyn states that Chrysalus' dirge identifies him "with some Trojan lamenting the imminent doom of Troy."¹⁰⁷ This observation is interesting since it ties the identity of Chrysalus in this passage to that of his master. Both are connected in some way to a metaphorical Troy, a statement that once again raises the question as to whether or not slaves were reliant on their masters for an identity expressed via *patria*.

¹⁰⁶ Karakasis (2003), 60.

¹⁰⁷ Jocelyn (1969), 145.

Further evidence that suggests an urban definition of *patria* is found within the *DG*. At *DG* 32.41.6, a passage of Scaevola is preserved in which an individual is recorded as having left a legacy to the Maevii family by *fideicommissum* stating “*et quidquid in patria Gadibus possideo*”.¹⁰⁸ The testator’s statement clearly implies that he regarded the territoriality of *patria* as comprising the urban environment of the city of Gades. More significant is the fact that this statement was recorded within a legal document, since this indicates that the urban definition of *patria* was both legally recognised and accepted. Indeed, such legal recognition is evident in two other examples from the *DG*.

At *DG* 33.1.21.3 it is recorded how a certain Lucius Titus left a sum of aurei “*patriae suae civitati sebastenorum*”,¹⁰⁹ in order that the interest garnered from this sum could be used to put on games in his name. In this particular example, it is the clear reference to Sebaste’s citizen body that creates the link between *patria* and the wider urban environment.

At *DG* 50.1.30 we learn how “*qui ex vico ortus est eam patriam intellegitur habere cui rei publicae vicus ille respondet*”.¹¹⁰ Legally, therefore, rural communities were not recognised as *patriae* in their own right. Instead, a *vicus* could only be recognised as a *patria* through

¹⁰⁸ “And everything I possess in Gades.”

¹⁰⁹ “To the citizen body of his *patria* of Sebaste.”

¹¹⁰ An extract from Ulpian: “whoever originates from a village is understood to have as his *patria* that of the *res publica* to which the village in question answers.”

its connection to a city.¹¹¹ This is unsurprising for two reasons. Firstly, most rural communities were regarded as being extensions of a city. This is owing to the fact that they were the primary means by which an urban population was fed. Secondly, it would have been through association with a city that a rural community would have had access to the sacred cultural aspects that were regarded by the Romans as being fundamental to the conceptualisation of *patria*. As we have seen in the discussion thus far, *patria* was a complex entity that comprised a number of significant cultural elements. These elements could not necessarily have existed within rural communities where collectivity and cohesion may have been more limited.

If territorial descriptions of *patria* had been restricted to the urban environment, a discussion of *patria's* territoriality would have been relatively straightforward. However, as with so many other aspects regarding *patria*, the concept's geographical conceptualisation is slightly more complex in that entire geographical regions were also directly associated with it. The evident lack of consensus with regard to *patria* as an urban or regional concept could indicate that territoriality was a problematic aspect of the Roman notion of *patria* in particular, potentially as a result of Rome's increasing expansionism and integration of neighbouring communities. One of the clearest examples of a lack of consensus as to what *patria* signifies territorially as well as culturally and historically is the different treatments of the

¹¹¹ On the relationship between urban centres and their peripheral territories, as well as the relationship of *vici* to religious practices, see Millett (1991); Potter, T.W. (1991); Tarpin (2002), 244; and Stek (2009), 112-121.

concept in Livy's *Ab Urbe Condita* and Virgil's *Aeneid*, a subject that I consider in detail in Chapter Three owing to its significance.

For the time being, evidence of the regional definition of *patria* is found in Plautus' *Menaechmi*. At the climax to the play (1069), the two Menaechmi finally discover that they are in fact brothers. During an exchange of features that indicate a shared identity, one Menaechmus exclaims "*Siculus sum Syracusanus*" to which the other Menaechmus replies "*Ea urbs et patria est mihi*". Two interpretations are possible here. The first is that *ea*, being feminine accusative singular, could indicate that *patria* and *urbs* are one and the same thing. This interpretation can be reinforced by the existence of a singular verb. In this case, only Syracuse could be interpreted as both *patria* and *urbs*, thus reinforcing the previous urban definitions considered above. However, this interpretation leaves *Siculus* as a term that refers exclusively to the first Menaechmus, a feature that weakens the sense of shared identity between them. Alternatively, *ea* could refer to both *urbs* and *patria* individually, as could the verb *est*, and thus indicate the presence of two separate concepts. This interpretation would enable the response of the second Menaechmus to perfectly mirror that of the first and thus emphasise effectively the shared and identical origins and identity of the two brothers. In this case, the adjective *Siculus* (of Sicily) can be interpreted as *patria* since the adjective *Syracusanus* (of Syracuse) can only be recognised as referring to *urbs*.

The notion that *patria* referred to a geographical region or area is more effectively illustrated in an inscription that was discovered during the preliminary excavations of Falacrinae (modern-day Pallottini, Italy) in 2004.¹¹²

Side A

[*Quom insolens iniusteis] aarmeis Italia indiexit urbi bella
imp[ī]a et
scelerata violato iure sancto diu]om atque dearum
[acie sua instructa ultores R]omaani
[.....magna quo]m virtute
[.....u]nicaeque pat[ri]ae
inter cives receptos simul] contu[lere]*

Side B

*Omnes fusseis fug[ateis hostibus laetantur]
liberatast Italia [a pericleis magnis]
auctast praeda [facta rerum pecorumque]
maxsuma quom [copia auri argentique]
hisc(e) rebus bene ac[tis in proelis multis
ex v]oto tuo tibi s[ignum merito decretum
magist]i ipsi iub[ent in hoc loco poni]¹¹³*

Whilst there is some disagreement regarding the dating of the inscription, and thus its interpretation, the presentation of *Italia* as a *unica patria* would seem to be undisputable.¹¹⁴ Italy is clearly the geographical stage upon which a seemingly violent conflict has been waged, and is the only candidate within the inscription that the phrase

¹¹² For discussions of this inscription see Coarelli, Kay and Patterson (2008), and Coarelli (2008), 79-85.

¹¹³ The reconstruction of the inscription is that of Coarelli (2008), 82-83. Side A: "When Italy, with unjust arms, called for an impious and wicked war against our city, disrespecting the sacred law of the gods and of men, drew up its army, the avenging Romans, with great courage, defeated the Italians and incorporated them into a single *patria* and granted them citizenship." Side B: "All were glad at the defeat and flight of the enemy, and Italy was freed from great danger. The booty of objects and animals was augmented by a great amount of gold and silver. For such an undertaking, achieved through many battles and as a result of your sacred promise, the civic leaders decreed that a well-deserved statue be erected in this place."

¹¹⁴ Coarelli has dated the inscription to the time of the Social War. In contrast, Ed Bispham has proposed the hypothesis that the inscription may instead refer to the events of the Cimbrian Wars of 113-101 BC. Bispham's argument was presented at an Oxford Epigraphy Workshop, 12th November 2012. See also Bispham

unica patria can refer to. The propositions that the inscription was erected to commemorate either the Cimbrian Wars (Bispham) or Social War (Coarelli) further reinforce the interpretation of *patria* in this context as referring to Italy. On the one hand, the Social War of 91-87 BC resulted in a more politically unified Italy, and thus this inscription could be interpreted as a medium through which such a process of unification was culturally expressed and reinforced. Moreover, in this context the inscription would have emphasised the image of Italy as Rome's principal sphere of political and cultural influence. On the other hand, the ejection of the Cimbrian tribes from the Italian peninsula in 101 BC, was a collective effort on the part of all the various peoples of Italy to expel a Gallic invader from their lands. Describing Italy as a *unica patria* in an inscription to commemorate such an event could thus be interpreted as a conceptual metaphor by which to emphasise the collective nature of this military achievement.¹¹⁵

A final theme regarding *patria's* territoriality that remains to be discussed is that of territorial transferability. On what literary evidence remains, the theme of territorial transferability would appear to occur for the first time in Virgil's *Aeneid*. Initially, a clear connection is made in the epic poem between the concept and the urban environment. This is achieved by linking *patria* to the term *moenia*:

*O patria, o divum domum Ilium et incluta bello moenia
Dardanidum.*¹¹⁶

¹¹⁵ The theme of Italy as *patria* is also a prominent theme within Virgil's *Aeneid*. This is discussed in detail in Chapter Three.

¹¹⁶ "O *patria*, o Troy, home of the gods and the walls of the sons of Dardanus, renowned in war."

*Sat patriae Priamoque datum [...] sacra suosque tibi
commendat Troia Penates; | hos cape fatorum comites, his
moenia quaere, | magna pererrato statues quae denique
ponto.*¹¹⁷

This urban territoriality of *patria* is, however, short-lived. The city of Troy is destroyed by the Greeks and the spiritual essence of the Trojan *patria* (the *Penates* and the flame of Vesta) are placed into the protective care of Aeneas in order to be re-housed in a new urban location. Thus, Virgil proposes the notion that the core elements of *patria* are unalterable whilst its physical area may change owing to a shift in circumstances. This is an important message when one considers the politico-cultural context of the *Aeneid's* composition. The changes experienced by *patria* appear to mirror the political changes experienced by Rome under the principate. Under Augustus the core elements of Rome's political system may have remained unaltered, but the physical embodiment of this system had shifted from a collegiate governing body to the political guardianship of a single individual.¹¹⁸

Summary

This chapter has attempted to illustrate the primary defining themes of *patria* in order to arrive at as clear an idea as possible regarding how the concept was understood within the context of the Roman world, and how this understanding may have shifted over time. The

¹¹⁷ See note 52 for translation.

¹¹⁸ The theme of transferability and the significance of *patria* in the context of the Augustan period are discussed in detail in Chapter Three and Chapter Four.

discussion above has illustrated how *patria* was a complex and multifaceted concept. It functioned as an important marker of collective identity, embodying a number of significant cultural aspects. It had a close association with familial imagery and features of the Roman family and was highly inclusive in terms of its membership. Moreover, it commanded and received a strong obligation of service and devotion from its members and possessed a degree of territoriality, although this was not, as it would appear from the sources discussed above, a feature that commanded a clear contemporary consensus in terms of its nature. There are clear indications that such a definition was not clear cut, and different notions were advocated at different times.

Thus, whilst the identification of these themes is an important step forward, it is important to consider them in the context of specific and significant periods of Roman history. A number of questions require answering. To what degree do these themes remain constant or change over time? Were thematic changes dictated by the wider context or the aims and ambitions of contemporary writers? What themes occur in a cultural context? Which occur in a political context? What do these themes and their occurrences tell us about the role and relationship of *patria* to Roman politics at different periods? What does the existence of multiple concepts of *patriae* have upon our understanding of the concept and its role within Roman life? These questions form the thematic core of the chapters that follow, the first

of which considers the function, role and relationship of the concept in the context of the Late Republic.

Chapter Two: The Function of *Patria* in the Political and Oratorical Works of Cicero

Introduction

Having identified the defining themes of *patria*, this chapter switches the focus from the question of definition to the question of the concept's role and relationship to Roman republican politics. My examination of *patria* in this chapter is concerned with the question of how it was used by Cicero to describe contemporary events and to forward his specific political messages. This is not to say that such an analysis will not further impact upon our understanding of *patria*'s contemporary definition. It is just that any such evidence will be a by-product of the investigation in hand. The discussion that follows is dictated by the extant evidence. Since Cicero is by far and away the most prolific source for such an investigation, analysis is centered upon his political and oratorical writings and upon the twenty-year time period of 63-43 BC.

Firstly, I touch upon the early indications of *patria*'s relationship to the Roman political world. I do so by considering a fragment of Lucilius and the occurrences of *patria* in Cicero's *Verrines*. I then consider the utility of *patria* in detail through three interrelated yet specific themes. In sub-section 2.II, discussion focuses exclusively upon the use of *patria* in Cicero's *Catilinarian* orations. These speeches

mark a dramatic change in the frequency and function of *patria* in Ciceronian literature. They indicate the dependence of *patria* upon the political actions of individuals, as has been seen in the discussion above, and illustrate the way in which the concept functioned as an effective tool to legitimise Cicero's controversial political arguments and actions during the conspiracy and in its immediate aftermath. Indeed, the use of *patria* within these speeches can be seen to have a lasting impact upon Cicero's presentation of his political character.

The role of *patria* in the creation of Cicero's public image is the subject of discussion in sub-section 2.III. Cicero's public image has been recently discussed by Hall, who has argued that slogans such as *parens patriae* were an essential means by which an individual could successfully navigate the volatile political context of the time. Pulling upon the evidence from a wider range of Ciceronian literature than that considered by Hall, the discussion in this section will indicate how the creation of Cicero's public image via *patria* did not occur only in moments of political volatility but was instead a gradual on-going process that commenced in the aftermath of the Catilinarian conspiracy and reached its zenith in the years prior to his death. The evidence that is considered strongly suggests that this was a deliberate process designed to disguise Cicero's increasing political impotence.

The significance of *patria* with regard to public image is then developed further in sub-section 2.IV. By analysing the concept within the context of Rome's civil wars between 49 BC to 43 BC, this final

section illustrates how *patria* was recognised as an important political objective for the various factions involved, since it offered them a means by which to legitimise their actions and to present themselves as the true defenders of Rome. It is also within the context of the civil wars during this period that Cicero attempts to align the concepts of *patria* and *res publica* as a last ditch attempt to preserve the political traditions that he held so dear.

To reiterate, the primary concern of this chapter is to develop an understanding of the relationship between *patria* and Roman politics of the Late Republic, and the role that the concept played within Ciceronian literature from 63 BC onwards. Such an analysis does shed more light upon *patria's* conceptualisation and importantly on the nature of this conceptualisation, but this is, as previously stated, a byproduct of the main discussion.

2.1. Early Indications of *Patria's* Relationship to Roman Republican Politics

In the introduction to this study I discussed how *patria* has been interpreted previously as being synonymous with Roman citizenship, an interpretation advocated amongst others by Sherwin-White from his reading of Cicero's *De Legibus* 2.5. Despite these previous discussions, the question remains as to what *patria's* significance was, both practical and symbolic, within the realm of Roman politics. Such an investigation, however, has to be restricted to the final decades of the Late Republic. This is owing to the fact that extant literary data

giving us any indication of the relationship between *patria* and the workings of *res publica* is limited to the years c.120-32 BC and to a handful of authors.¹¹⁹ Whilst these limitations prevent the possibility of conducting a survey of *patria* within a political context across the entire lifespan of the Roman Republic, what evidence we do have offers us a fascinating glimpse into its salience at a time of significant political uncertainty and upheaval. A brief discussion of the earliest extant passages in which the term *patria* occurs within a political literary context (a fragment of Lucilius 1342-1354 (Krenkel); Cic. *Inv. rhet.* 1.1; Cic. *Verr.* 2.3.46, 2.3.54, 2.3.161 2.4.11, 2.4.17-18, 2.4.94, 2.4.151, 2.5.125 2.5.128, 2.5.170) provides a good starting point.

In an unassigned fragment from his satires (1342-1354, Krenkel), Lucilius provides a detailed list of the various means by which a Roman can both attain and demonstrate *virtus*, a concept that was considered fundamental with regard to Roman masculine character.¹²⁰ Whilst the concept was primarily associated with martial conduct, it developed political connotations during the Late Republic.¹²¹ Displaying clear Greek influences,¹²² Lucilius ignores the theme of martial prowess and focuses instead upon what can be termed as

¹¹⁹ These authors are, in order of importance, Cicero, Caesar, Sallust, Nepos and Lucilius.

¹²⁰ For a detailed study of the definition and development of *virtus* in the Roman republic see McDonnell (2006). In contrast see Earl (1960; 1961, 18-40; 1962; 1967, 11-43), who identifies *virtus* as a traditional Roman political value, although, as McDonnell, 135-136, points out, there is little evidence to sustain such an argument.

¹²¹ McDonnell (2006), 134-139.

¹²² For discussions of this passage, especially regarding its Greek influences see van Acker (1964); Görler (1984); Miralles Maldonado (1997); McDonnell (2006), 123-128. For an opposite view see Earl (1962). For a discussion of the philosophical significance of this text see Raschke (1990), 352-369.

everyday features, including business ((1342-1343) “*virtus...est pretium persolvere verum, | quis in versamur, quis vivimus rebus potesse*”; (1348) “*virtus divitiis pretium persolvere posse*”); rationality ((1347) “*virtus quaerendae finem re scire modumque*”; (1344) “*virtus est homini scire id quod quaeque habeat res*”); morality ((1349-1352) “*virtus id dare quod re ipsa debetur honori, | hostem esse atque inimicum hominum morumque malorum, | contra defensorem hominum morumque bonorum, | hos magni facere, his bene velle, his vivere amicum*”); and selflessness toward one’s *parentes* and *patria* ((1353-1354) “*commoda praeterea patriai prima putare, deinde parentum*”).¹²³

Lucilius’ presentation of *patria* in this verse is significant for two reasons. Firstly, Lucilius’ inclusion of selflessness towards *patria* in a list of everyday activities functions to imbue such behaviour with a sense of normality. Putting *patria* first is not an action that is to be expected only in times of crisis or in particular moments of need. Instead, it should be displayed on a day-to-day basis and in the context of the comings and goings of normal life. Secondly, Lucilius’ use of *praeterea* stresses the way in which *virtus*, attained or demonstrated by placing *patria* first, takes precedence over all the other avenues listed. The fragment states that whilst business, rationality, moral uprightness and a display of deference to the concerns of one’s *parentes* are important, an individual is only truly virtuous if he places the concerns of *patria*

¹²³ In this final quality (selflessness towards *patria*) Lucilius echoes themes of other Latin writers considered within this study, including Cicero (see Chapter Two), Livy (see Chapter Three), and Virgil (see Chapter Three).

first and foremost. Since politics can be recognised as an everyday activity of Rome's social elite that in principle dealt with the concerns of the collective, it is possible, therefore, to infer the means by which service toward *patria* could function as an indirect measurement of political character.

The relationship between *patria* and political character is a theme that is more clearly identifiable in the opening section to *De Inventione* I. In the introduction to his handbook on the function and utility of oratory within Roman public life, Cicero stresses that it is important for a man to develop an all-rounded character, possessing an education in oratorical eloquence alongside one in philosophy and moral conduct (1.1):

Ac me quidem diu cogitantem ratio ipsa in hanc potissimum sententiam ducit, ut existimem sapientiam sine eloquentia parum prodesse civitatibus, eloquentiam vero sine sapientia nimium obesse plerumque, prodesse numquam. Quare si quis omissis rectissimis atque honestissimis studiis rationis et officii consumit omnem operam in exercitatione dicendi, is inutilis sibi, perniciosus patriae civis alitur; qui vero ita sese armat eloquentia, ut non oppugnare commoda patriae, sed pro his propugnare possit, is mihi vir et suis et publicis rationibus utilissimus atque amicissimus civis fore videtur.¹²⁴

Yet, the theme of character is not the primary message within this brief passage. Rather, Cicero's statement that a man should possess an all-rounded education in the skills that are central to Roman public life

¹²⁴ "And indeed to me, thinking about it for a long while, reason itself has led me to this principal judgement: that considered wisdom without eloquence is of little use for states, but eloquence without wisdom truly does too much harm in general and is never useful. For this reason, if anyone omits the most honest and honourable study of rational thinking and moral conduct, and spends all his labours practising what is to be said, his citizenship is developed into something useless to himself and dangerous to his *patria*. Yet, the man who arms himself with eloquence, not so as to be able to attack the interests of his *patria* but to be able to defend it, is considered by me to be a citizen who will be a most useful and friendly man to himself and public debate."

is intended to draw the reader's attention to the dependence of *patria* upon the activities of Roman political life. An ignorance of *sapientia* and *officium* will result in oratory that lacks true motivation and will hence be both a nuisance to an individual and a detriment to his *patria's* welfare. In contrast, oratory that is influenced by wisdom and a sense of duty is motivated by the concerns and needs of the collective, and as such becomes a tool by which the security and stability of one's *patria* can be effectively defended.¹²⁵

The theme of political character and the dependence of *patria* upon it are central to the discussion within Cicero's *Verrines*, the last of the Latin texts prior to 63 BC to contain politically orientated occurrences of the concept. Intending to highlight Verres' extreme political immorality, Cicero provides several examples of offences he has committed against both the Roman *patria* and its Sicilian equivalents. Verres and his cronies are accused of forcibly removing people from their *patria*e (2.3.46; 2.5.125; 2.5.128); the seizure and ransom of objects that are sacred to communities (2.3.54; 2.4.11; 2.4.17-18; 2.4.94; 2.4.151); and, worst of all, the murder of a Roman citizen by crucifying him in sight of his *patria*, an action which in multiple ways is a direct assault upon the fundamental Roman principle of *libertas* (2.5.170). This impious and immoral nature of Verres in relation to various *patria*e is made more acute by its deliberate

¹²⁵ For a general discussion on the political power of oratory at Rome see Morstein-Marx (2008). See also the edited volume of Steel and van der Blom (2013), particularly the contributions of Arena, Dugan, Holkeskamp, and Morstein-Marx, on the dynamic and important relationship between oratory and Roman republican politics.

juxtaposition with examples of dedication and service. Thus, at 2.4.11, a Sicilian by the name of Heius refuses to ransom his *patria* to alleviate his state of poverty. At 2.4.17-18, the Messenians who are prosecuting Verres are described as seeking the restoration of the images of their *di patrii* that Verres had removed from their sacred places, rather than recovering lost personal wealth. Finally, at 2.4.94, Cicero describes how the Agrigentines ran to seize what weapons they could in order to defend central elements of their collective identity during an attempt by Verres to remove the images of the *di patrii* of Agrigentum.

Verres is thus depicted as a morally corrupt individual, motivated solely by personal gain at the expense of the welfare of the collective. Cicero illustrates Verres' detrimental behaviour towards the Roman *patria* most effectively through a reference to Verres' son (2.3.161). Having taken him to Sicily and exposed him to his debaucheries, Verres has failed to provide his son with the moral education and example expected of a father.¹²⁶ By denying his son in this manner Verres has not only wronged him but also the Roman *patria*. Children, Cicero argues, are not simply begot for the pleasure of parents, but to be of utility to the community when they come of age. Yet, in order for this to be possible they have to have been guided in the matters of ancestral tradition and civic responsibility.¹²⁷ Since

¹²⁶ Cic. *Verr.* 2.3.159-160.

¹²⁷ Cic. *Verr.* 2.3.161.

Verres has failed in this duty his son cannot but stand to become a future detriment to the Roman community.

According to these few early occurrences of *patria* within a political context, the concept was a means by which to portray individual political character. These sources also illustrate how *patria's* welfare or security could be directly impacted by political action, both to its advantage and to its disadvantage. The discussion that follows concerns itself with examining this relationship between *patria* and the Roman politics of the Late Republic, and the way in which this relationship in turn affected the way in which *patria* was defined. It does so by offering a chronological analysis of Ciceronian literature, the main source of literary data on *patria* during this period, starting with the *Catilinarians* of 63 BC.

2.II. The Function of *Patria* within Cicero's *Catilinarians*

Cicero's *Catilinarians* mark a dramatic change regarding the frequency and function of *patria* within Ciceronian literature. In the majority of cases when *patria* does occur in Cicero's writings prior to 63 BC (with the exceptions of *Inv. rhet.* 1.1 and *Verr.* 2.1.7, 2.3.46, 2.3.54, 2.3.161, 2.4.11, 2.4.17-18, 2.4.94, 2.4.151, 2.5.125, 2.5.128 and 2.5.170) its usage can be classified as generic, simply reflecting the defining characteristics that were identified in Chapter One.¹²⁸ Containing almost as many occurrences of *patria* within the four orations as all

¹²⁸ Generic occurrences of *patria* are to be found in Cic. *Inv. rhet.* 1.35, 1.37, 2.66, 2.161, 2.177; Cic. *Verr.* 2.3.81, 2.4.7, 2.4.61, 2.4.77, 2.4.132; Cic. *Caecin.* 88; Cic. *Clu.* 66, 129; Cic. *Leg. agr.* 2.86; Cic. *Att.* 5.1.9.

other Ciceronian works that pre-date it (twenty-two to twenty-eight respectively), the *Catilinarians* emphasise the existence of a significant relationship between the concept and Roman politics not previously seen in extant Latin literature.¹²⁹ In the orations, Cicero draws attention to two primary themes. Whilst there is no clear dividing line between these two themes within the narrative, it is necessary to treat them separately for the sake of clarity. Consequently, in the first instance I consider the theme of *patria's* dependence upon Roman politics in terms of its general welfare. Cicero illustrates this theme by highlighting the positive and negative impact that individual political action can have upon *patria's* stability and security. By illustrating the direct impact that an individual can have upon the health of the collective, Cicero demonstrates what he believes is the correct level of political morality to be expected from members of Rome's political elite. Secondly, I consider how *patria* functions as a means by which Cicero adds weight to and increases the legitimacy of his decisions whilst consul. I discuss how this enables Cicero to shift the focus away from the personal and toward the collective. Cicero's use of *patria* as a means by which to legitimise his consulship illustrates a deliberate attempt to negate the political attacks that he faced once he left

¹²⁹ *Patria* occurs in all four orations: 1.17, 19, 23, 27, 33; 2.1, 27, 28.; 3.10; 4.2, 3, 11, 12, 13, 16, 18, 22. Whilst the political nature of *patria* within the *Catilinarians* is clear from the context of the speeches as a whole, their salience regarding senatorial conduct is evident in the fact that seventeen out of the twenty-two occurrences are made in speeches directed to the senate.

office. Indeed, this adds further evidence to support the arguments that the orations were revised and rewritten after the event.¹³⁰

2.II.i. The Dependence of *Patria* upon Individual Political Morality

Our first indication of the direct impact that an individual's actions can have upon the security and stability of the Roman *patria* occurs at 1.17-19.¹³¹ Rather than present this fact in his own words, Cicero employs the powerful rhetorical device of *prosopopoeia*, and has *patria* confront Catiline, the source of its terror (*metus*).¹³² *Patria's* short yet significant speech commences by listing Catiline's many crimes against Rome and her allies. Catiline is guilty of murder (1.18: *tibi uni multorum civium neces*), corruption (1.18: *tu non solum ad neglegendas leges et quaestiones verum etiam ad evertendas perfringendasque valuisti*), and the sacrilegious oppression and plunder of communities allied to Rome (1.18: *tibi vexatio direptioque sociorum impunita fuit ac libera*).¹³³ Catiline's past depravities are presented as having had a direct emotional and psychological effect upon *patria*. Although *patria* states that it has previously tolerated Catiline's immorality, this has not been an easy thing for it to do. *Ut potui tuli*

¹³⁰ See Settle (1962), 60-67 and 127-146; Nisbet (1964), 62-63; Syme (1964), 105-111; Rawson, E. (1975), 75 and 81-83; Cape (1995), 257-259; Dyck (2008), 10-12; Harrison, I. (2008), 98, note 15; Lintott (2008), 17-18 and 142-148; and Kananack (2012), 16-17 for arguments in favour of a revision of the *Catilinarians*. For an alternative argument see McDermott (1972), 283-284 and Craig (1993), 256-258.

¹³¹ For detailed analyses of the rhetorical impact of this passage see Nisbet (1964), 62-63; Batstone (1994); and Tzounakas (2006).

¹³² On the use of *prosopopoeia* in Latin literature see Dufallo (2001); Osgood (2005); Dufallo (2007), 7-11, 16-19, and 74-78; and Hine (2010). Tzounakas (2006), 222, states that this personification of *patria* "contributes to the dramatization of the speech and creates an intense atmosphere of *pathos*".

¹³³ Tzounakas (2006), 225, rightly argues that the similarities that exist between Cicero's and *patria's* presentation of Catiline's character establish a sense of thematic and textual unity.

indicates the strain that such behaviour has had upon it. The verb *fero* signifies that whilst *patria* may have turned a blind eye to Catiline, such toleration has been accompanied by a degree of suffering. Thus, the reader is led to the conclusion that, owing to his inherently immoral nature, Catiline was always destined to become a threat to *patria's* future security. Indeed, as *patria's* stress gives way to terror at the climax to the speech, the reader's sense of inevitability is justified (*nunc vero me totam esse in metu propter unum te, quicquid increpauerit, Catilinam timeri, nullum videri contra me consilium iniri posse quod a tuo scelere abhorreat, non est ferendum*).

Cicero is only one of two Latin writers to employ a literary personification of *patria* in his writing.¹³⁴ The lack of occurrences of this literary technique in relation to *patria* in Latin literature is surprising, since it is a highly effective means by which to draw attention to the state of the collective at a time of crisis. By being directly involved in senatorial proceedings, the Roman *patria* is depicted both as a witness to and a victim of Catiline's crimes against the state. As such, a standard senatorial gathering is transformed into a political trial. Violated and traumatised, *patria* looks for relief from its current plight and echoes Cicero's appeal to Catiline to leave Rome voluntarily. The resultant image of *patria's* vulnerability, however, is extraordinary and deliberately so. Before *patria* 'speaks' Cicero introduces it as highly influential, being a source of authority

¹³⁴ Cic. *Cat.* 1.17-19 is not the only occurrence of a literary personification of *patria* in Cicero's writings. It can also be seen at Cic. *Cat.* 1.27-30 and 4.18. A graphic literary personification of *patria* also occurs at Luc. 1.186.

(*auctoritas*), judgement (*iudicium*) and power (*vis*) that is comparable to that found within the sphere of the Roman family.¹³⁵ Cicero's dramatic reduction of *patria* from a figure of authority and power to a victim as a result of Catiline's immorality stresses the unprecedented nature of the threat that Catiline poses to Rome. Such a strategy could have been intended to provoke a strong feeling of indignation and anger from the audience, and in turn inspire them to act. Tzounakas states that the plight of *patria* is designed to stir a sense of *miseratio* in the hearts of Cicero's senatorial audience.¹³⁶ I feel that pity, however, is not a strong enough emotional interpretation for this passage. Since *patria* was a highly emotive concept in Roman culture, Catiline's actions and *patria's* vulnerability cannot but have created a sense of anger, especially since anger is more likely to elicit an active response than pity.

The stress that is placed upon the collective at 1.17-18 emphasises the degree to which Catiline is viewed as a stranger in the eyes of his own *patria*. As a result of his disregard for his *patria's* welfare, his desire to overthrow Rome's political system, his murder of

¹³⁵ Cic. *Cat.* 1.17: *Si te parentes timerent atque odissent tui neque eos ratione ulla placare posses, ut opinor, ab eorum oculis aliquo concederes. Nunc te patria, quae communis est parens omnium nostrum, odit ac metuit et iam diu nihil te iudicat nisi de parricidio suo cogitare: huius tu neque auctoritatem verebere nec iudicium sequere nec vim pertimesces?* ("If your *parentes* feared and hated you, and it were not possible to reconcile you with them in any way, I suppose that you would withdraw somewhere from their eyes. Now the *patria*, which is the common *parens* of us all, hates and fears you and, for a long time, has judged already that you are thinking of nothing but its death. Will you not respect *patria's* authority, acquiesce to its judgement, or fear its power?") On the power and authority of the *pater familias* associated with *patria potestas* see Crook (1967); Harris (1986); Lacey (1986); Saller (1994), 114-130; and Gardner (1998), esp. 117-118, 121-123, 182-184 and 270-271.

¹³⁶ Tzounakas (2006), 226-227.

Roman citizens and his maltreatment of Rome's allies, the audience is inclined to take this depiction of Catiline as an outsider a degree further and to view him as a *hostis*.¹³⁷ This is particularly stressed at 1.17 by the phrase "*iam diu nihil te iudicat nisi de parricidio suo cogitare*". The image of Catiline as a hostile outsider is reinforced at 1.23. Increasing the pressure on Catiline to quit Rome, Cicero offers Catiline two courses of action. On the one hand, he can voluntarily head into exile, thus obeying the command of the consul, relieving himself of suspicion and placing Cicero under political pressure.¹³⁸ On the other hand, Catiline can reveal to all his intention to wage war upon the Roman *patria* by joining forces with Manlius (1.23: *infer patriae bellum*). If he decides to undertake the latter, Catiline will be unable to claim that he was forcefully driven away from his community into the arms of strangers, since he will, of his own accord, have joined his own kind (1.23: *ut a me non eiectus ad alienos, sed invitatus ad tuos isse videaris*). Since Cicero describes Manlius and the other supporters of Catiline as being of the same immoral mindset, it is clear that the orator wished all involved in the conspiracy to be considered by his audience as *hostes patriae*. Indeed, this is the exact description that Cicero applies to Catiline's co-conspirators at 1.33, the concluding paragraph to *In Catilinam* 1, as a means by which to justify his invoking

¹³⁷ On the notion of *hostis*, particularly in Ciceronian literature, see Jal (1963); Opelt (1965), 130ff; Habicht (1990), 37ff; and Drummond (1995), 97-102. On Cicero's characterisation of Catiline being outside of the Roman community, and thus being open to extreme punishment, see Vasaly (1993), 52; Konstan (1993), 16; and Tzounakas (2006), 225-226.

¹³⁸ Cic. *Cat.* 1.23.

of Jupiter's divine punishment upon the conspiracy (*Tu, Iuppiter, [...] homines bonorum inimicos, hostis patriae, latrones Italiae scelerum foedere inter se ac nefaria societate coniunctos aeternis suppliciis vivos mortuosque mactabis*).¹³⁹

Thus, Catiline's conspiracy is not simply a manipulation of Rome's political system, but also an event that is akin to an act of foreign aggression that threatens the general security of the entire community of Rome (*patria*). Cicero stresses the truly collective nature of the threat posed by Catiline and his fellow conspirators in the introduction to *In Catilinam* 2, which is addressed to the Roman people. Here Catiline's threat to *patria* is not presented as exclusively political in nature. Instead, Cicero describes the conspiracy as posing a direct danger to the ordinary people of Rome (2.1: *vobis atque huic urbi ferro flammaque*). The universal nature of the risk posed by Catiline is emphasised further when Cicero states that, with Catiline now gone, fear can be lifted from the Campus Martius, the Forum, the senate house and the homes of each and every Roman (2.1: *non in campo, non in foro, non in curia, non denique intra domesticos parietes pertimescemus*). Indicating ways in which the lives of ordinary Romans stand to be directly affected by the conspiracy, Cicero shifts the focus from the political to the domestic sphere, and hence increases the emotional magnitude of the situation he is attempting to

¹³⁹ Cicero's depiction of the conspirators as *hostis patriae* is also evident at 4.16.

deal with. The attack on *patria* thus makes the conspiracy more than simply a political crisis.

Catiline is not Cicero's only example of an individual whose actions negatively impact upon the welfare of the Roman *patria*. At 3.10, the audience is confronted with the example of Publius Cornelius Lentulus Sura. Lentulus is one of several members of Rome's political establishment found guilty of complicity in Catiline's schemes. Cicero highlights Lentulus' lack of patriotism to the Roman people by comparing his actions to those of his grandfather, Publius Cornelius Lentulus, the suffect consul of 162 BC. Showing Lentulus the letter that condemns him, Cicero asks whether he recognises the seal. When Lentulus admits that he does, Cicero informs the audience that the seal contains an image of Lentulus' grandfather, a man described as being above all other men in love for his *patria* and his fellow citizens (*Est vero [...] notum quidem signum, imago avi tui, clarissimi viri, qui amavit unice patriam et civis suos*). Simply gazing at this seal, Cicero states, should have been enough to stir Lentulus' patriotic spirit and thus turn him aside from the crimes he was about to commit (*quae quidem te a tanto scelere etiam muta revocare debuit*). It is clear that Cicero's message to Lentulus was intended to strike a powerful chord with his contemporary readership when the importance of *imagines* within Roman culture, especially amongst Rome's leading families, is taken into account.¹⁴⁰ Lentulus had the honour of being able to gaze

¹⁴⁰ On the *imagines* see Dupont (1987); Flower (1996), esp. 1-59; and Bettini (2005).

upon the image of an illustrious ancestor and consequently to remember and take pride in this ancestor's patriotic service. In failing to do so, and more importantly in emulating his grandfather's supreme example, Lentulus has not only dishonoured his *patria* but also his family, offences that would have been unforgivable in the eyes of most Romans.

The juxtaposition of positive action against negative action with regard to *patria* is repeated elsewhere within the *Catilinarians*. At 2.27-28, Cicero contrasts his actions and responsibilities as consul with those of Catiline and his co-conspirators. Concluding his first speech to the Roman people, Cicero addresses the members of the conspiracy that remain in the city. Whereas these individuals serve the ambitions of a hostile individual (2.27: *Nunc illos qui in urbe remanserunt atque adeo qui contra urbis salutem omniumque vestrum in urbe a Catilina relictis sunt*), Cicero's duty, as consul, is to the well-being of the collective, both political (*res publica*) and non-political (*patria*). Paradoxically, however, this sense of duty toward the collective includes the conspirators themselves. Contradicting his earlier depiction of them as *hostes patriae*, Cicero states how as consul it is his duty not only to safeguard the Roman *patria* but also to respect the rights of all Roman citizens. Since the conspirators were born citizens (2.27: *nati sunt cives*) he must either live with them or die for them (2.27: *mihi aut cum his vivendum aut pro his esse moriendum*). Cicero's clemency draws a deliberate contrast to the crimes of Catiline

listed at 1.17-19. Whereas Catiline's violations of Roman tradition and custom depict him as an outsider, Cicero's respect for the rights of Roman citizens depicts him as a true champion of the collective and thus endows his subsequent political actions in defence of *patria* with credibility:¹⁴¹

*Nullus est portis custos, nullus insidiator viae: si qui exire volunt, conivere possum; qui vero se in urbe commoverit cuius ego non modo factum sed vel inceptum ullum conatumve contra patriam deprehendero, sentiet in hac urbe esse consules vigilantis, esse egregios magistratus, esse fortem senatum, esse arma, esse carcerem quem vindicem nefariorum ac manifestorum scelerum maiores nostri esse voluerunt.*¹⁴²

*Sed si vis manifestae audaciae, si impendens patriae periculum me necessario de hac animi lenitate deduxerit, illud profecto perficiam quod in tanto et tam insidioso bello vix optandum videtur, ut neque bonus quisquam intereat paucorumque poena vos omnes salvi esse possitis.*¹⁴³

Yet, the *Catilinarians* clearly emphasise that it is not by Cicero's effort alone that *patria* can, and indeed will, be successfully defended. By addressing the final speech to the senate, Cicero urges his senatorial colleagues to follow the correct political and moral course and take the necessary action to ensure the preservation of their *patria* (4.3: *Qua re, patres conscripti, consulite vobis, prospicite*

¹⁴¹ This is an excellent example of a way in which the orations were revised following the conspiracy, since it directly counters the accusations of Cicero's political enemies that his actions in executing the Roman citizens were a violation of Roman rights. This is discussed in more detail below.

¹⁴² Cic. *Cat.* 2.27: "No gate is guarded, no road watched: if they want to leave, I can turn a blind eye. Yet, if anyone stirs in the city, of which I detect not only a deed but even a plan or any attempt against the *patria*, he will notice that, in this city, there are watchful consuls, distinguished magistrates, a strong senate, arms, and a jail in which awaits the punishment of our ancestors for nefarious and unequivocal crimes."

¹⁴³ Cic. *Cat.* 2.28: "Yet, if the strength of this audacious plan, if the danger threatening the *patria* will lead me inevitably to withdraw from this gentle character, a course of action will be chosen, something that seems assuredly difficult in such a hazardous war, so that no good man is ruined by anything and that by punishment of the few you may all be able to be saved." See also Cic. *Cat.* 4.2-3 as another example of where Cicero depicts himself as *patria's* champion.

patriae).¹⁴⁴ Central to Cicero's attempt to inspire, and indeed potentially to shame, the senate into action is his declaration that all the other *ordines* of Rome are proactively rallying to *patria's* cause.¹⁴⁵ One of the *ordines* that Cicero draws the senate's attention to is that of the *libertini* of Rome. These freedmen are not native members of the Roman community, yet despite this they are portrayed as displaying an equal if not greater degree of affection toward the Roman *patria* they have adopted than their native counterparts.¹⁴⁶ Cicero's message to the senate regarding the *libertini* is clear. If previously foreign peoples feel it is their duty to direct their energies toward the defence of the Roman *patria* then it is shameful for a native not to do likewise.

Cicero's use of emotion to direct the senate toward the correct political moral path is particularly evident at 4.18:

*Quae cum ita sint, patres conscripti, vobis populi Romani praesidia non desunt: vos ne populo Romano desse videamini providete. Habetis consulem ex plurimis periculis et insidiis atque ex media morte non ad vitam suam sed ad salutem vestram reservatum. Omnes ordines ad conservandam rem publicam mente, voluntate, voce consentiunt. Obsessa facibus et telis impiae coniurationis vobis supplex manus tendit patria communis, vobis se, vobis vitam omnium civium, vobis arcem et Capitolium, vobis aras Penatium, vobis illum ignem Vestae sempiternum, vobis omnium deorum templa atque delubra, vobis muros atque urbis tecta commendat.*¹⁴⁷

¹⁴⁴ Although Cicero states that his intention is not to stir the senate into action (IV.19: "atque haec, non ut vos qui mihi studio paene praecurreris excitarem, locutus sum, sed ut mea vox quae debet esse in re publica principes officio functa consulari videretur") the manner of his speech through most of *In Catilinam* IV indicates otherwise, a fact that can be seen in the discussion below.

¹⁴⁵ Cic. *Cat.* 4.15-17. Cf. Harrison, I. (2008), 98-99, who questions the degree of unity evident in Rome during the conspiracy as portrayed by Cicero in the *Catilinarians*.

¹⁴⁶ Cic. *Cat.* 4.16.

¹⁴⁷ "With this thus being so, *patres conscripti*, the assistance of the Roman people is not found wanting by you: see to it that you are not seen to fail the Roman people.

This passage highlights the senate's position as the *patria's* last and primary bastion of defence. Coming at the climax to *In Catilinam* 4 as well as to the orations as a whole, this passage stresses more strongly than any other the necessity of Rome's political system in ensuring the stability and security of the Roman *patria*. Firstly, Cicero makes it clear that whilst Rome is socially unified against the conspiracy, this inter-*ordines* cooperation to preserve the *res publica*, and implicitly *patria* in turn, is futile without the support and leadership of the Senate (*vobis populi Romani praesidia non desunt: vos ne populo Romano desse videamini providete*). Secondly, by once again directly involving *patria* in proceedings, Cicero reiterates that it is the responsibility of the senate to take into its care unreservedly the community that it is meant to safeguard and lead.¹⁴⁸ On this occasion, the literary personification markedly differs from that which occurred at 1.17-19. Whilst *patria* was clearly a victim of Catiline's crimes at 1.17-19, it was not depicted as an entirely helpless entity. Instead, it was characterized as a figure that still retained a degree of authority, power and judgement, looking to its own influence as the means by which to relieve itself from the situation. At 4.18, however, the image of *patria*

You have a consul reserved from very many dangers and plots and from the clutches of death not for his life but for your welfare. All the *ordines* are united in mind, will and voice to preserve the *res publica*. Our common *patria*, besieged by the torches and weapons of this wicked conspiracy, stretches out its suppliant hands to you. To you it entrusts itself, the life of all citizens, the citadel and Capitol, the *arae Penates*, the eternal fire of Vesta over there, the temples and shrines of all the gods, the walls and roofed buildings of the city."

¹⁴⁸ This is actually the third occasion in the *Catilinarians* where *patria* is a participant in the action. The second, which has yet to be discussed, is at 1.27-30. The significance of this second occasion is discussed below.

could not be more different. Here *patria* is devoid of all influence and authority, and is, to all intents and purposes, nothing more than a shell of what it was. Presented as a suppliant, *patria* beseeches the senate to protect the aspects of Roman cultural life that it embodies. Cicero reinforces this helplessness further by making *patria*, on this occasion, mute and by employing the powerful image of it stretching out its hands. The pitiful image of these outstretched hands draws the audience's attention to the senate as the supreme body of authority, power and judgement at Rome. When *patria's* natural influence over its members fails, it is up to Rome's political system to reinforce the fundamental value of dedicated collective service.¹⁴⁹

Patria can thus be considered as one of the significant ways in which Cicero presents his views on the salience of political action with regard to the welfare of the wider community. Individualistic ambition as epitomised by Catiline and his co-conspirators risks destabilising Rome's political system and in turn negatively impacting on the community (*patria*) that it should, in theory, be there to serve. Only by directing political energy toward the needs of the community can the security of *patria* be ensured.¹⁵⁰

¹⁴⁹ The passage is also an extremely effective means by which Cicero is able to emphasise the threat that Catiline poses to Rome. Indeed, 4.18 increases the sense of indignation and anger that was stirred by *patria's* participation at 1.17-19. See Cape (2002), 152.

¹⁵⁰ In the conclusion to *In Catilinam* 4, Cicero states that there can be no winners in the event of civil war since it is a most destructive form of conflict. This is owing to the fact that no means exist whereby individuals who have turned against their *patria* can be brought back into the collective fold. See Cic. *Cat.* 4.22. *Patria* within the context of civil war is discussed in more detail in the discussion below.

2.II.ii. It's not Personal, it's Strictly Collective

Patria's role in the *Catilinarians* is not limited to the exploration of Roman political conduct and its effects upon the collective. The concept is also an effective tool by which Cicero legitimises his actions as consul and 'de-personalises' the orations to the extent that they become less about the orator's personal feud with Catiline and his controversial decisions, and more about Rome's collective struggle against an internal conspiracy.

Tzounakas has previously discussed this usage of *patria*. Turning our attention once again to the two personifications of *patria* that occur in *In Catilinam* 1 (1.17-19 and 1.27-38), Tzounakas argues that Cicero

On the one hand succeeds in ensuring his credibility and reinforcing his view with a second opinion which supports his own position, while meanwhile underlining his patriotic stance by drawing an indirect parallel between himself and the Fatherland. On the other hand he expands the available margins for criticism, thus honing the ground for other suggestions to be put forth as to punishment, making his own appear as more lenient and therefore more easily acceptable.¹⁵¹

Whilst rightly highlighting some of the benefits that arise from this rhetorical technique (which will be illustrated in detail below), Tzounakas is nonetheless critical of Cicero's use of *prosopopoeia*. He states that the two moments in which *patria* directly participates in the narrative of *In Catilinam* 1 are highly inconsistent, and thus demonstrate Cicero's "weak handling of the figure of *prosopopoeia*"¹⁵².

¹⁵¹ Tzounakas (2006), 222.

¹⁵² Tzounakas (2006), 229.

By considering and building upon the key points of Tzounakas' argument, I contend that the role of *patria* as a means to legitimise Cicero's actions is not confined to the *In Catilinam* 1. Instead, it is a theme that recurs throughout the orations. Moreover, the acknowledgement that Cicero intended the four orations to be read as a complete work and not in isolation renders Tzounakas' criticism of Cicero's handling of *prosopopoeia* as unfair. Indeed, the discussion that follows demonstrates how what Tzounakas considers to be evidence of inconsistency is actually quite the opposite.

In the first occurrence of *prosopopoeia* at 1.17-19, Tzounakas is right to state that *patria* directly supports Cicero's depiction of Catiline and his arguments for him to leave Rome.¹⁵³ There are three reasons for this. Firstly, *patria's* assault upon Catiline's character at 1.18 is clearly an echo of Cicero's own that occurred earlier in the narrative at 1.13-15. Secondly, *patria's* fear and tolerance of Catiline's actions mirrors that of the Roman people, which was described by Cicero at 1.13¹⁵⁴ and at 1.1.¹⁵⁵ Thirdly, both *patria* and Cicero agree that Catiline's departure from Rome offers the best solution to the current crisis.¹⁵⁶ The similarities between the perspectives of Cicero and *patria* provide Cicero's arguments with an aura of *auctoritas* and

¹⁵³ Tzounakas (2006), 222-223.

¹⁵⁴ Cic. *Cat.* 1.13: *In qua nemo est extra istam coniurationem perditorum hominum qui te non metuat, nemo qui non oderit.* ("Here there is no one outside of that conspiracy of ruined men who does not fear you, no one who does not hate you.")

¹⁵⁵ Cic. *Cat.* 1.1: *Quo usque tandem abutere, Catilina, patientia nostra?* ("For how long, Cataline, will you exhaust our patience?")

¹⁵⁶ Compare Cic. *Cat.* 1.18 (*patria's* perspective) with Cic. *Cat.* 1.10 and 1.13 (Cicero's perspective).

hence can be interpreted as having been consciously designed to illustrate the degree to which Cicero speaks for the collective and acts in a non-despotic manner.¹⁵⁷

The narrative of 1.27-28 reinforces Cicero's *auctoritas*, legitimacy and non-despotic nature. On this occasion, *patria* addresses Cicero and enquires as to why he does not insist on a more drastic course of action.¹⁵⁸ Intensifying further the threat that is posed by Catiline to Rome, *patria* decides to dismiss the idea of exile and instead calls upon Catiline to face capital punishment. It argues that execution would not be a violation of Catiline's rights as a Roman citizen, since what rights he had have been nullified by his actions.¹⁵⁹ Not only does *patria* now favour an alternative course of action to that advocated by Cicero at 1.13 and 1.19-24, but the manner in which it addresses Cicero differs from how it addressed Catiline. Tzounakas argues that it appears to treat Cicero much more harshly, seeming to berate the consul with a series of rhetorical questions, a beration that betrays a closeness between the orator and the *patria* he looks to protect.¹⁶⁰

Whilst *patria's* involvement at 1.27-28 differs from that at 1.18, it is still consistent with regard to Cicero's overall message both in *In Catilinam* 1 and the orations as a whole.¹⁶¹ Both 1.18 and 1.27-28

¹⁵⁷ Tzounakas (2006), 222-223, and Batstone (1994), 245. This argument is reinforced by Cicero's statement at 1.17 that *patria* is the supreme source of *auctoritas*, *vis* and *iudicium*. On the question of Cicero's deliberate attempt to provide himself with *auctoritas* see Cape (2002), 142.

¹⁵⁸ Cic. *Cat.* 1.27.

¹⁵⁹ Cic. *Cat.* 1.28.

¹⁶⁰ Tzounakas (2006), 223-224 and 226-227. Cic. *Cat.* 1.28.

¹⁶¹ Cf. Tzounakas (2006), 226-229.

function to illustrate Cicero's non-despotic nature and to legitimise his decision to exile Catiline, the former by echoing Cicero's own arguments and the latter by making his proposal appear more lenient and hence more attractive.¹⁶² If execution is seemingly a justified course of action for Cicero to take, then exile, a much less severe punishment, must be entirely reasonable. Yet, 1.27-28 does not only legitimise and support Cicero's actions in *In Catilinam* 1. It also provides an important foundation for the future events of *In Catilinam* 4. At 4.11-13, Cicero urges the senate to support Silvanus' proposal that the conspirators should be executed. In doing so, Cicero deliberately imitates the arguments of *patria* from 1.27-28. He states that execution is a justifiable course of action owing to the enormity of the crime that has been committed; the fact that the conspirators, by their actions, have made themselves strangers in their own community; and that not to act in a decisive manner would endanger the very existence of the Roman collective and hence be an act of severe cruelty.¹⁶³ By supporting the motion to execute the conspirators, Cicero provides further evidence of his non-despotic and compassionate nature. Whereas this compassion was directed toward Catiline in *In Catilinam* 1, at 4.12-14 it is now directed toward the Roman community. This should not be viewed as a contradiction, since in *In Catilinam* 1 Catiline, despite his presentation as a *hostis* and as a stranger to the community, is still legally identifiable as part of the

¹⁶² Tzounakas (2006), 227.

¹⁶³ For all three statements compare Cic. *Cat.* 1.27-28 with Cic. *Cat.* 4.12-14.

Roman citizen body. By rejecting *patria's* call to execute him there and then Cicero depicts himself as defending the rights of Roman citizenship. Thus, 1.27-28 and 4.12-14 can be seen to function as a unifying bridge between the first and last orations. Both passages stress the legitimacy of execution as punishment and, consequently, encourage the audience to recognise Cicero's actions as being and having been authorised by the collective interest of the community. By legitimising execution in *In Catilinam* 1 and not acting upon it until *In Catilinam* 4, Cicero is able to portray himself as a man displaying restraint and superior moral character in the face of extreme collective as well as personal danger. This behaviour contrasts dramatically with the lack of hesitation on the part of the conspirators.

The degree of intimacy evident in *patria's* address to Cicero at 1.27-28 increases the exemplary image of Cicero as an ideal Roman public servant.¹⁶⁴ The use of Cicero's *praenomen* and *nomen*,¹⁶⁵ the inclusion of multiple rhetorical questions and the reference to personal details regarding Cicero's status as a *novus homo* all endow this exchange with the image of a private audience between the orator and the *patria*. Representing Rome's political system as its leading member, Cicero takes into consideration the concerns of the collective and reaches a decision that he believes is in its best interests at that time.¹⁶⁶ Yet, whilst Price and Tzounakas have argued that Cicero's

¹⁶⁴ Tzounakas (2006), 223-224: "The similarity of the two speakers indicates the close relationship and familiarity that exist between them".

¹⁶⁵ Tzounakas (2006), 227.

¹⁶⁶ Cic. *Cat.* 1.30.

failure to follow *patria's* direction at this point in the narrative weakens his credibility, such criticism is easily countered.¹⁶⁷ Cicero's rejection of a powerful argument in favour of execution does not damage his credibility. Instead, it reinforces it, adding yet more weight to the orator's image as a champion of Roman political and civic rights. The fact that it is not until the last minute, when the threat to Rome appears to be most severe, that Cicero decides to pursue a more drastic course of action, reinforces this image. Cicero is, therefore, careful to present an image of himself that is both patriotic and rational. He shows himself to be a political figure who neither takes rash and sudden decisions, nor sticks stubbornly to a single response. Rather, Cicero is presented as adaptable and always seeking the most effective legitimate way by which to ensure the safety of the Roman *res publica* and in turn the Roman *patria*.¹⁶⁸

It is the deliberate emphasis upon the collective via *patria* within the orations that illustrates Cicero's effort to de-personalise them. This is because such an emphasis draws the audience's attention away from his personal feud with Catiline and his controversial actions as consul. This is not to state that the *Catilinarians* are devoid of any personal references to Cicero. Many examples exist where Cicero is keen to place strong emphasis upon his involvement in events and to stress the importance of his individual service to the Roman state and

¹⁶⁷ Price (1998) 124ff; Tzounakas (2006), 227.

¹⁶⁸ The stress that Cicero places upon his patriotically motivated clemency is also evident at 2.27-28. On the moral rather than political basis of Cicero's argument see Gould and Whiteley (1982), 65-66; Konstan (1993); and Tzounakas (2006), 226.

community.¹⁶⁹ However, I argue that Cicero's use of *patria* is an attempt to neutralise such moments and thus to counteract the personal political attacks he received after the event. Indeed, many of the examples that have been considered thus far provide strong evidence to this effect. The direct involvement of *patria* at 1.18, 1.27-28 and 4.18 all function to stress the threat posed by Catiline's conspiracy toward Rome as a whole. This is then reinforced at 2.1 where Cicero stresses to the Roman people the direct threat Catiline poses to their livelihoods, as well as at 4.14-17, where Cicero describes to the senate the unified spirit of Rome in tackling the crisis. These examples provide political cover for Cicero's involvement. 1.8 and 1.27-28 both provide a façade of legitimacy for Cicero's decisions both to exile Catiline and to execute the conspirators; 2.1 stresses the degree to which Cicero is motivated by the safety of Rome and its people rather than by his political rivalry with Catiline; and 4.18 states that the ultimate conclusion to the crisis rested in the hands of the senate.

The idea that Cicero is concerned within the orations of downplaying the personal in favour of the collective is particularly well illustrated at 1.11-12. In this passage, Cicero dismisses any personal motivation in his dealings with the conspiracy. He informs the audience that despite Catiline's indiscretions against him when he was awaiting the start of his consulship he did not undertake any official

¹⁶⁹ See for example Cic. *Cat.* 1.11-12; 2.6-7; 2.14-15; 2.19; 2.27; 3.1-5; 3.16; 3.18; 3.25 4.2-3; and 4.11.

action, despite clearly implying that it would have been his right to do so.¹⁷⁰ Rather, being a personal affair, Cicero states that he dealt with it in a private manner. However, now that Catiline's criminal activities are directed towards the Roman state, and hence the general welfare of Rome, Cicero declares that he will not hesitate to tackle the threat head on and to use any means at his disposal to do so.¹⁷¹ Thus, Cicero is motivated to direct decisive action not by an on-going personal vendetta, but by the affront directed towards the community he has been elected to serve.¹⁷²

We can see that *Patria* thus fulfils a variety of functions within the *Catilinarians*. Firstly, it enables Cicero to argue the case for the necessity of a correct political code of conduct amongst Rome's political elite at a time when corruption and the ambitions of powerful individuals were rapidly on the rise. Secondly, it provides Cicero with a means by which he is able to legitimise his arguments for action against Catiline and his co-conspirators. Thirdly and finally, it assists in the 'de-personalisation' of the orations in order to try to safeguard the orator from personal attack. These factors would appear to point towards a deliberate and careful revision of the orations that were originally delivered in the presence of the Roman senate and people in 63 BC, since they can be identified as direct literary responses to the criticism that he received once he left office.¹⁷³ These orations also

¹⁷⁰ Cic. *Cat.* 1.11.

¹⁷¹ Cic. *Cat.* 1.12.

¹⁷² Tzounakas (2006), 228.

¹⁷³ Hall (2013), 216-217.

provide us with an important indication of the political nature of the concept at this time. In the narrative, Cicero treats *patria* and *res publica* as two distinct entities, but emphasises through the context of the conspiracy the high degree of dependence between them. This is a theme that is repeated frequently in his later works.

2.III. *Patria* and Cicero's Public Image, 62 BC – 49 BC

Despite Cicero's 'de-personalisation' of the *Catilinarians* to counter the political and personal criticisms he received after 62 BC, it cannot be disputed that the orations help in the establishment of a specific and carefully crafted public image.¹⁷⁴ Within his presentation of the conspiracy, Cicero depicts himself in direct contrast to Catiline and the other conspirators. Whereas they are identifiable as *hostes patriae*, he characterises himself as the champion of the collective in his simultaneous defence of *res publica* and *patria*. In essence, the *Catilinarians* present Cicero as the supreme example of a Roman public servant, selflessly placing himself second to the concerns and interests of the community he serves. It is unsurprising to find that the concept of *patria* is central to the creation and maintenance of this image.¹⁷⁵

In a contribution to the recent *Cambridge Companion to Cicero*, Hall has discussed how Cicero responded to the concerted efforts to depict his actions when consul as despotic by formulating a

¹⁷⁴ On the relationship between Cicero's public image and his time as consul see the study by Beretta (1996). On the development of Cicero's public image in his speeches over time see the discussion of Dugan (2005).

¹⁷⁵ Cape (2002), 145.

distinct public image that worked in his favour.¹⁷⁶ The deliberate creation of a public image was a well-established Roman political custom and Cicero was thus following in the footsteps of many renowned peers and predecessors.¹⁷⁷ Three particular slogans are identified as being employed by Cicero to create his public image or, as Hall terms it in relation to today's consumer culture, brand.¹⁷⁸ These slogans are *pater* or *parens patriae*; the saviour of the *res publica*; and *dux togatus*.¹⁷⁹ Hall argues that these slogans were particularly important in the immediate aftermath of the Catilinarian conspiracy, but that they then soon became obsolete. However, during the civil wars, firstly of 49-45 BC and then of 44-43 BC, Hall states that Cicero resurrected these slogans so as to present himself as an active participant in political events, as a peacemaker and as the leader of Republican resistance. Most importantly, Hall argues that the use of such slogans often results in a distortion of reality and that it is often hard to disentangle reality from political 'spin'.¹⁸⁰ Whilst I agree with Hall regarding the political utility in formulating a set public image and that such images are often manipulations of reality I see a few problems with Hall's argument. Firstly, I question the extent to which

¹⁷⁶ Hall (2013).

¹⁷⁷ Hall (2013), 217-219.

¹⁷⁸ Hall (2013), 219.

¹⁷⁹ Hall (2013), 216-219. The passages that Hall cites for these slogans are, for *pater patriae*: Cic. *Pis.* 6, Plut. *Cic.* 23.2-3, Cic. *Flac.* 102; for *dux togatus*: Cic. *Cat.* 3.23, Cic. *Cat.* 3.15, Cic. *Pis.* 74; and for Cicero as the saviour of the *res publica*: Cic. *Pis.* 6, Cic. *Att.* 2.1.3, Cic. *Sest.* 129. With regard to this last passage, Hall confuses *patria* with *res publica* and defines it as the 'state'.

¹⁸⁰ Hall (2013), 219. Indeed, the inherently and necessarily deceptive nature of these slogans is stressed by Hall in his concluding sentence, 229: "These slogans are fundamentally misleading; but in a political environment characterized by aggressive personal attack and distorting rhetoric, that was precisely their point."

Cicero developed a definitive ‘brand’ that remained constant throughout his political career from 62-43 BC. Secondly, I disagree with the argument that there was only a single motivation behind its creation. Thirdly and finally, I re-evaluate the accuracy of Hall’s presentation of *patria* in relation to Cicero’s public image.¹⁸¹

Hall’s discussion of *patria* within the context of Cicero’s public image focuses squarely upon the honorific title of *pater patriae*. This is problematic for three reasons. Firstly, there is no consensus in the two primary sources that mention the bestowal of such a title, either as to its exact wording or as to its origins. Drawing attention to his great achievements as consul in the early stages of *In Pisonem*, Cicero informs us that the influential Quintus Catulus hailed him *parens patriae* in front of a crowded senate (6: “*me Q. Catulus, princeps huius ordinis et auctor publici consilii, frequentissimo senatu parentem patriae nominavit*”).¹⁸² In contrast, Plutarch states that Cicero was hailed by the Roman people as *πατέρα πατρίδος* at a political rally in 62 BC at the instigation of Cato the Younger.¹⁸³ Secondly, apart from the occurrence of *parens patriae* at *In Pisonem* 6 no other definitive mention of any such title exists within the large extant corpus of Cicero’s writings. As such, this must call into question the extent to

¹⁸¹ Whilst Hall discusses other concepts including *res publica* and *dux togatus* with regard to Cicero’s public image the scope of this study limits analysis to the concept of *patria* alone. Reference to the other concepts will be made when and where it is necessary to do so.

¹⁸² Hall (2013), 216, rightly draws attention to Cicero’s careful use of the verb *nomino* in this statement. The title is not indicated as being officially bestowed, instead “he notes that a leading member of the senate spoke of his achievement in glowing terms”. See also Kaster (2006), 353-354.

¹⁸³ Plut. *Cic.* 23.2-3.

which Cicero himself viewed his acclamation as *parens* or *pater patriae* as possessing any particular utility regarding the creation of his public image. Thirdly and finally, this lack of utility is compounded by the lack of legitimacy surrounding the supposed title. Within his writings Cicero is keen to stress his devotion to the *res publica* and his respect for Roman law, yet this would have been contradicted had Cicero openly flaunted an unofficially recognised title. Consequently, any stress placed on an unofficially bestowed title would have limited, rather than aided, the potential influence of his subsequent public image.

Whilst I feel it is better to steer away from *pater* or *parens patriae* owing to these problems, this is not to state that *patria* played no part what so ever in the creation of Cicero's public image. As can be seen in Figure 1 below, of the four hundred and twenty-eight occurrences of *patria* within Ciceronian literature between 62 and 43 BC, one hundred and fifty-two of them can be identified as functioning either directly or indirectly to create and draw attention to Cicero's public image.

1) Year (BC)	2) Total number of <i>patria</i> occurrences in Ciceronian literature	3) Total number of <i>patria</i> occurrences in 2) that refer directly or indirectly to Cicero's public image.
62	18	11
61	2	2
60	14	1
59	3	2

58	3	(3) ¹⁸⁴
57	46	36
56	54	30
55	33	10
54	6	0
53	0	0
52	19	8
51	0	0
50	1	0
49	17	11
48	0	0
47	0	0
46	26	11
45	50	3
44	95	13
43	24	7
* <i>De Legibus</i> ¹⁸⁵	17	4
TOTAL	428	152

Fig. 1: A Table Showing the Total Number of Occurrences of *Patria* in Ciceronian Literature and the Number of these that Relate to Cicero's Public Image.

The spread of the occurrences of *patria* in Ciceronian literature that relate to Cicero's public image is not even, nor does it reveal any gradual or dominating trend. Rather, there are six peaks in usage: 62 BC, 57-55 BC, 52 BC, 49 BC, 46 BC and 44-43 BC. These peaks are emphasised by the six years in which *patria* was not employed by Cicero for this purpose (54 BC, 53 BC, 51 BC, 50 BC, 48 BC and 47 BC). The usage of *patria* by Cicero in the creation and promotion of his

¹⁸⁴ The three occurrences in 58 BC provide a more private dimension to his identity or image in stark contrast to the occurrences both before and after.

¹⁸⁵ *De Legibus* is included in the table separately owing to the uncertainty that surrounds its compositional date. See note 21 for the arguments regarding the dating of *De Legibus*.

public image would not appear, therefore, to be carefully planned but rather erratic. Not only does this data appear to support Hall's argument that Cicero was reacting to events rather than dictating them, but it indicates that he was doing so to a greater extent than Hall had realised. Yet to what events was Cicero responding? Was Cicero, as argued by Hall,¹⁸⁶ simply responding to attacks conducted by his political opponents or were there other motivations? What was the message that he wished to convey with *patria* regarding his public image? Is the resultant message consistent or does it vary depending on audience and circumstances?

2.III.i. 62-58 BC: Pre-Exile and Exile

These questions are best tackled via a chronological analysis. Thus, I begin my discussion of these questions by considering first the nineteen occurrences of *patria* in Cicero's writings between the years 62-58 BC. Whilst Cicero may present his actions as consul in the *Catilinarians* and other texts as having been essential to the preservation of the *res publica* and *patria*, as well as having adhered to Roman political traditions it is clear that not all of his political contemporaries shared these views. Cicero's controversial decision to order the execution of the conspirators was seen by several members of Rome's political elite as a serious infringement on the rights of Roman citizens.¹⁸⁷ Consequently, Cicero and his consulship became

¹⁸⁶ Hall (2013).

¹⁸⁷ Cicero was accused of being a *tyrannos* and *rex* (Cic. *Att.* 16 (1.16); Cic. *Fam.* 2 (5.2) and 260 (7.24); Cic. *Sest.* 11; Cic. *Vat.* 23, 29) by his contemporaries, but most

the focus of sustained public criticism as his actions were frequently depicted by his political opponents as violent and despotic. Hall argues that “these persistent and damaging criticisms called for vigorous countermeasures”,¹⁸⁸ and that it was thus in response to such criticisms that Cicero took the decision to develop themes that would enable him to present a more favourable self-image.

Initially, the occurrences of *patria* in Cicero’s writings during this period support Hall’s argument that Cicero deliberately developed his public image as a reaction to personal political attack. In 62 BC, eleven such occurrences are identifiable and all of these refer, either directly or indirectly, to his actions as consul. In *Ad Familiares* 3 (5.7),¹⁸⁹ Cicero writes to Pompey and expresses disappointment at the fact that Pompey failed to congratulate him on his achievements as consul, congratulations that Cicero states he expected to receive out of friendship and regard for the *res publica*.¹⁹⁰ The disappointment that Cicero openly declares indicates the strong degree to which he believes that his actions in preserving the *res publica* for the benefit of the *patria* should reflect positively upon him.¹⁹¹ According to Cicero, he should be acknowledged and respected by the leading members of Roman society. Indeed, from this letter it would appear that the

especially by Clodius. For a discussion on the fallout of Cicero’s consulship in the years immediately following 63 BC, and especially his feud with Clodius see van der Blom (2014).

¹⁸⁸ Hall (2013), 216.

¹⁸⁹ For Cicero’s letters I use the numbering system provided in Shackleton Bailey’s editions in the Loeb series. Shackleton Bailey’s numbering system is followed by its vulgate equivalent in brackets.

¹⁹⁰ Cic. *Fam.* 3.3 (5.7.3).

¹⁹¹ Ramsey (2007), 167.

criticism that his actions have received is having an effect. This is because Cicero acknowledges that it is probably the criticism he has received that prevents Pompey from praising him.¹⁹² Consequently, he feels that it is necessary to address this head on and states that his actions, which were taken *pro salute patriae*, are approved of not just by Rome but also the entire world.¹⁹³ Cicero's earlier vanity in expecting praise is thus offset by a clear sense of insecurity. He hopes that by highlighting and exaggerating his patriotic service he will be able to secure the political support of Pompey. This in turn implies that Cicero suffered from a lack of open support amongst Rome's leading political figures.

The remaining ten occurrences of *patria* in Cicero's writings of 62 BC are found in *Pro Sulla*. Written and delivered after Cicero's letter to Pompey, the speech further indicates Cicero's insecurity in the face of public political criticism and provides the first evidence of a direct public response. This speech is a particularly apt vehicle for exploring the fallout of Cicero's consulship, the impact on Cicero's public image and the role of *patria*, since Sulla's connections with the conspiracy formed part of Torquatus' prosecution. Indeed, Torquatus accuses Cicero of inconsistency in defending Sulla but not Autronius, another individual associated with the conspiracy. The attack on Sulla's character is indirectly an assault on Cicero's, as can be seen from the

¹⁹² Cic. *Fam.* 3.3 (5.7.3). Mitchell, T. (1975), 621.

¹⁹³ Cic. *Fam.* 3.3 (5.7.3): *Sed scito ea quae nos pro salute patriae gessimus orbis terrae iudicio ac testimonio comprobari.*

orator's strong defence of himself.¹⁹⁴ Thus, very early on, Cicero defends his actions as a consul and as a Roman. He states first that no Roman would defend a friend who was guilty of treason to his *patria*, indirectly distancing himself and Sulla from such accusations.¹⁹⁵ Soon after, Cicero directly addresses the criticisms levelled at him regarding the execution of the conspirators. He states that whilst nature intended him to be clement, *patria* demanded he be firm on account of his role as consul.¹⁹⁶ He implies that had he been a private citizen he would have had the luxury of favouring a more merciful course of action. In reality, however, his responsibilities as Rome's political leader meant that he had to do everything necessary to ensure the *res publica's* and in turn *patria's* welfare. Yet, whilst he admits that a temporary change in his character was necessary in order for him to defend and preserve Rome's *res publica* successfully, neither nature nor *patria* wished him to be cruel.¹⁹⁷ *Patria* is thus used both to defend and justify Cicero's actions. Since the interests and expectations of *patria* demand strict adherence from its members, the orator had a duty to be steadfast but no reason to be cruel. This passage also further underlines the interdependence between *patria* and *res publica*, a theme that I discuss in more detail below.

¹⁹⁴ Cic. *Sull.* 2. See Berry (2004) 131-149. Lintott (2008), 151, states that "Torquatus is perhaps the first orator to oppose Cicero who can be seen to have got under his skin."

¹⁹⁵ Cic. *Sull.* 6.

¹⁹⁶ Cic. *Sull.* 8.

¹⁹⁷ Cic. *Sull.* 8. Berry (2004), 146, states that the inversion of *natura* and *patria* is an indication that the natural order was upset by the magnitude of the conspiracy.

The necessity and justifiability of Cicero's actions in dealing with the Catilinarian conspiracy is a theme that recurs throughout the speech. At section 19, Cicero responds to the question as to why he was unwilling to defend Autronius who was an old acquaintance, but is happy to defend Sulla to whom Cicero had no personal obligation. Once again, this response is centred on *patria*. Cicero states that although he finds it hard to deny defence to a friend in need, the violent threat that Autronius posed to the *patria* as part of the conspiracy makes his decision easier. This is a highly emotive passage, highlighting many crimes against *patria* which evoke parallels with parricide and thus it is intended to legitimise Cicero's actions.¹⁹⁸ Cicero's act of reflection also encourages the audience to think back and remember the uncertainty and fear of the final months of 63 BC. In many regards, Cic. *Sull.* 19 is a direct echo of the arguments made at Cic. *Sull.* 6. Cicero's defence of Sulla and himself via *patria* occurs again at the end of the speech at Cic. *Sull.* 86. Attempting to imbue his character with further credibility, Cicero calls upon the *di patrii* to witness that his conscience is clean with regard to his defence of Sulla. He states that since he preserved the *patria* from the clutches of Catiline's conspiracy at great personal risk, being prepared in the process to execute those guilty despite this being against his natural inclinations, he could not have agreed to represent an individual he knew to have been involved.

¹⁹⁸ Berry (2004), 170-171.

The defence of Sulla provided Cicero with a public opportunity to address the criticisms of his consulship head on. Challenging the claims that he acted in an irrational and violent manner, Cicero declares that he was guided entirely by the interests and expectations of the *patria*. Although admitting that he was not afraid to act in a firm and decisive manner, Cicero states that he only did so as his consular duties towards *patria* demanded it. Indeed, this behaviour forced him to go against his natural inclinations to be clement and gentle. Cicero thus depicts himself as a devout patriot and an inherently clement individual, only acting in ways that ensure the interest of the *patria*. Cicero's image is supported by his statements as to why he can defend Sulla but not defend Autronius. Cicero declares that had he been the sole target of Autronius' violence he would have been swayed to defend him, a clear indication of the civic and social obligation associated with the notion of *amicitia*.¹⁹⁹ Yet, Autronius also threatened the *patria* with violence, and it is this recollection that causes Cicero to reject his pleas for assistance. Thus, Cicero informs his audience of how *patria* is a more sacred and important concern than personal security, a message that casts the orator in the guise of an individual who is concerned only with the welfare of the collective.

It seems apparent that Cicero was conscious of the need to address the criticism levelled towards him and thus used *patria* to paint himself and his consulship in a favourable light. However, *patria* was

¹⁹⁹ Cic. *Sull.* 18. On the potency of *amicitia* and the complex social and civic rules that lay behind it see the discussions of Brunt (1988), 351-381; Konstan (1997), 122-134; and Verboven (2002 and 2011).

not presented via slogans, and the strong emphasis placed on the concept regarding Cicero's public image suddenly declines from 61 BC. Between 61 and 59 BC only five occurrences of *patria* in this context are identifiable, with no more than two occurrences in any one year.²⁰⁰ This sudden decline suggests that there was a much smaller degree of urgency on Cicero's part to respond to political criticism, and that he did not sense that his political position at Rome was at any great risk. This is not to say that there was no criticism of Cicero during this time or that the orator did not address criticism directed towards him by alluding to his important service to the *patria*. All of the five occurrences refer to Cicero's character and *patria* in relation to the conspiracy, but of these, four are found in private letters sent to Atticus, and the fifth is a very indirect reference from *Pro Flacco*.²⁰¹

Cicero's lack of urgency and emphasis is even more marked by the three occurrences of *patria* that relate to his public image and which are datable to the year 58 BC. The political attacks on Cicero had escalated to the extent that in this year he was exiled to Northern Greece. If any moment were to be expected to contain a large number

²⁰⁰ The supposed revision of the *Catilinarians* in 60 BC (see note 133) would be the only other evidence of *patria* being used in this period in relation to Cicero's image, the purpose of which was to justify his actions as consul. However, this, tied with the other evidence for this time period, does not indicate the creation of a specific public image that Cicero deliberately recycles in his writings.

²⁰¹ It could be argued that *Pro Flacco* uniquely functions during the years 61-59 BC as a subtle defence and promotion of Cicero's character and service. Cicero's references to Flaccus' patriotism could easily be read as references to his own (consider *Cic. Flac.* 1; 2; 25; 99; 103; 104), but such a discussion goes beyond the limits of this particular study. The subtlety indicates, from Cicero's perspective, a lack of a need to respond openly and directly to any criticism and instead offers implications that could easily be overlooked or ignored unless one was looking for them. Indeed, the lack of any openly public presentation of Cicero's image that involves *patria* is quite striking evidence to this effect. Cf. Seager (1965), 530-531.

of references to his public image it would be this one. However, during his year in exile not a single reference to *patria* in relation to Cicero's public image is identifiable. Rather, we find three occurrences that have a much more personal and private focus. In letters addressed to his brother Quintus (Cic. *QFr.* 3.1 (1.3.1) and 3.10 (1.3.10)) and his good friend Atticus (Cic. *Att.* 60.4 (3.15.4)), Cicero laments his pitiful condition in exile. He highlights the great personal cost to himself of his consulship, having lost his family and his *patria*, in essence all that he personally holds dear. No bravado is evident nor any of the exaggeration that can be perceived from Cicero elsewhere. In these letters he does not present himself as the civilian champion of Rome or as *patria*'s most willing and loyal servant. Instead, we are confronted by an image of a broken man, one who in many ways does not display the selflessness that he professed at *Pro Sulla* 57.²⁰²

The literary evidence of 62-58 BC does not provide an image of a proactive Cicero carefully and energetically crafting a favourable public image around the concept of *patria* with which to counteract his political opponents. He responds to the accusations of his opponents in *Pro Sulla*, and his letters clearly indicate that he was aware of being the subject of strong political criticism. However, this alone is not enough to be recognised as a concerted or structured effort on Cicero's part to establish a specific brand with which to resist and deflect such attacks as has been argued by Hall.

²⁰² The personal importance of *patria* to Cicero is also evident at Cic. *Att.* 71.1 (3.26.1), dated to 57 BC.

2.III.ii. 57-55 BC: Post-Exile

The lack of evidence to suggest a concerted effort on Cicero's part to utilise his relationship to *patria* to promote his political character would appear to change following his return from exile in September 57 BC. This is seen in Figure 1 above. Of the one hundred and fifty-two occurrences of *patria* in relation to Cicero's public image, sixty-seven of them occur during the three-year period of 57-55 BC. Three speeches made by Cicero in September 57 BC are of particular interest: *Post Reditum in Senatu*, *Post Reditum ad Quirites* and *De Domo Sua*. Considered together, these three speeches offer the first glimpse of a conscientious effort by Cicero to use *patria* to establish a public image. In these speeches, Cicero presents himself as being amongst an elite and exclusive group of Romans which is renowned for its supreme public services in the name of the *patria*. Such an image strengthens the picture of *patria* as an object of service and devotion, and highlights its prominence in Roman private and public life. Cicero's patriotic image is developed in reaction to the specific political context of 57 BC. As such, it can be seen to enable Cicero simultaneously to counter the accusations of Publius Clodius and to establish a sense (or rather façade) of political importance.

As in the previous writings that have already been considered, Cicero stresses the importance of *patria* to his personal ethos, both emotionally and politically. This is evident in the first references to *patria* in *Post Reditum in Senatu* and *Post Reditum ad Quirites*. At *Post*

Reditum in Senatu 1, Cicero expresses his gratitude to the senate for recalling him from exile. He states that they have returned to him what he believes is the greatest of all human possessions (*qua nihil potest esse iucundius*). The reunion with *patria* coupled with that to his family equates to the recovery of Cicero's and his family's identity, their very sense of existence (*Qui denique nosmet ipsos nobis reddistis*). The personal significance of *patria* to Cicero is echoed at *Post Reditum ad Quirites* 4. Addressing the Roman people, Cicero declares that *patria* is the supreme inspiration of love and joy (*dici vix potest quid caritatis, quid voluptatis habeat*). However, rather than simply echoing other examples that have been discussed earlier in this study, Cicero states that the love and joy that *patria* (defined by Cicero in this passage as Italy) inspires can never adequately be expressed nor is it fully appreciated until it is lost (*sic haec omnia desiderata magnis quam adsidue percepta delectant*).

Cicero expands upon these themes in *De Domo Sua*. At section 98, Cicero emphasises the pain that he suffered at being forcibly wrenched from his *patria*.²⁰³ This pain, however, was suffered voluntarily. By offering no resistance to the machinations of Clodius, Gabinius and Piso, Cicero makes it clear that he decided to forfeit his

²⁰³ Cic. *Dom.* 98: *Suscipere tantos animi dolores atque ea, quae capta urbe accidunt victis, stante urbe, unum perpeti et iam se videre distrahi a complexu suorum, disturbari tecta, diripi fortunas, patriae denique causa patriam ipsam amittere.* ("To bear such great pain of mind and to endure alone, with the city standing, those things that befall the conquered with a captured city. To see oneself forcibly separated from the embrace of one's loved ones, house destroyed, possessions looted, and finally *patria* lost for the sake of *patria* itself.")

patria (in this context clearly Rome and not Arpinum) for its sake.²⁰⁴

Consequently, his exile is interpreted by the reader as an act of sacrifice. By placing the welfare of the collective before his own, Cicero willingly abandons what is dear to him in order to save the lives of his fellow compatriots, and, as seen in the other writings discussed above, consciously depicts himself as one whose political actions are motivated by a concern for the welfare of *patria* (Cic. *Dom.* 98):

*Haec omnia subire conservandorum civium causa atque id, cum dolenter adsis non tam sapiens quam ii, qui nihil curant, sed tam amans tuorum ac tui quam communis humanitas postulat, ea laus praeclara atque divina est. Nam qui ea, quae numquam cara ac iucunda duxit, animo aequo rei publicae causa deserit, nullam benevolentiam insignem in rem publicam declarat: qui autem ea relinquit rei publicae causa, a quibus cum summo dolore divellitur, ei cara patria est, cuius salutem caritati anteponeit suorum.*²⁰⁵

The reference to *patria* in relation to Cicero's consulship in *De Domo Sua* further emphasises the orator's patriotic image. Through the repeated use of the terms *conservatus*, *servatus* and *salus*, Cicero highlights that it was under his leadership and guidance that the Roman *patria* was preserved and protected. Seven such passages are

²⁰⁴ The contrast in territorial interpretations of *patria* in Cic. *Dom.* 98 with Cic. *Red. pop.* 4 further highlights the ambiguity or lack of agreement regarding the territoriality of the concept during the Late Republic.

²⁰⁵ "To go through all of this for the sake of preserving the citizens, and this with the pain of absence, not having wisdom as those who care for nothing, but having deep affection for those you love and for yourself as a common humanity demands. This is a glorious and divine fame. For anyone who gives up with a calm mind that which he has never considered dear or delightful for the sake of the *res publica* indicates no remarkable kindness for the *res publica*. However, anyone who abandons those things for the sake of *res publica*, from which with the greatest pain he is torn apart, to him is *patria* dear, whose welfare he places ahead of personal affection." Cicero's decision to submit willingly to Clodius' desire to send him into exile in order to save his fellow compatriots and the Roman *patria* is echoed at Cic. *Red. sen.* 4 and Cic. *Dom.* 122.

identifiable in the text (Cic. *Dom.* 72, 75, 76, 93, 94, 122 and 145), which can be divided into three distinct yet related thematic groups.

In the first group, which comprises passages 72, 75 and 76, Cicero rejects Clodius' accusation that his exile from Rome was the result of political transgressions and despotic behaviour.²⁰⁶ In passage 72, Cicero states that exile is only a disgrace if it is just retribution for an individual's transgressions against the collective. However, Cicero argues that since no Roman is able to define his actions as consul as transgressions, and since only an *inimicus* would fail to recognise that it was by his *consilia* that *patria* was preserved (*conservata*), his exile must be seen as a moment of misfortune brought about by the political machinations of others. Cicero thus tries to reverse Clodius' accusations.²⁰⁷ It was not his consulship that was an action of despotism, but rather the personally motivated agenda of Clodius in his role as Tribune of the Plebs.²⁰⁸ Cicero further attempts to negate the charge of tyrannical or despotic behaviour in *De Domo Sua* 75. In this passage, Cicero describes the welcome he received from the Roman *patria* on his return to Rome. He states that, instead of welcoming him as a ruthless despot (*crudelis tyrannus*), the *patria* greeted him as the source of its salvation (*lux et salusque [...] sibi*).²⁰⁹ *De Domo Sua* 76 expands yet further on this image of Cicero as sole

²⁰⁶ On Clodius' accusations see Stroh (2004), 335-336.

²⁰⁷ Riggsby (2002), 165-166, states that Cicero presents Clodius as the Catiline Conspiracy reborn.

²⁰⁸ On the political life and character of Clodius, especially in relation to Cicero, see Tatum (2014).

²⁰⁹ Cole (2014), 12, states that Cicero viewed his return from exile in 58 BC as an apotheosis. See Cole's discussion at 65-68.

preserver of the Roman *patria*, stating that even Clodius cannot avoid admitting that it was Cicero who preserved the *patria* not once but twice, and on both occasions at great risk to his own life (*Uno enim maledicto bis a me patriam servatam esse concedis*). Indeed, Cicero describes Roman public opinion towards his achievements in the first of these two occasions (62 BC) as being of such importance that they are worthy of immortalisation in history (*semel, cum id feci, quod omnes non negent immortalitati, si fieri potest*).²¹⁰

With such statements as this, it is easy to understand why Cicero is so often accused of egotism.²¹¹ According to *De Domo Sua*, it is a charge that Cicero was acutely aware of and his refutation of it forms the second thematic grouping of *patria* occurrences (passages 93 and 94). Cicero's defence of his character in these passages is two dimensional, and further emphasises his image as an individual whose actions and decisions are motivated by collective (that is those of the Roman *patria*) rather than private interests. In the first instance, he declares that recollections of his achievements as consul are only undertaken out of a necessity to defend himself against the false political accusations of his opponents.²¹² By declaring that he is unmotivated by personal glory, Cicero presents himself as an honourable member of the Roman political establishment, an image that is further reinforced by his statement that he only responds to the

²¹⁰ See also Cic. *Dom.* 95 where Cicero seems to imply that his actions in saving the *patria* was the grandest deed in history. Cf. Cole (2014), 67, who interprets the object of this greatest deed as being the preservation of the Roman *res publica*.

²¹¹ See for example Mommsen (1899), 724-725; and Habicht (1990), 34 and 44.

²¹² Cic. *Dom.* 93.

accusations of his opponents with his head bowed.²¹³ Secondly, Cicero depicts such a necessary recollection of his achievements as a patriotic act.²¹⁴ He does so by declaring that his preservation of *patria* was only made possible by ensuring the political unity of Rome and the undivided support of the senate.²¹⁵ Such a statement further reinforces the idea that *patria* was dependent in terms of security and stability upon the Roman political world.

In the third and final thematic grouping of *patria* occurrences (passages 122 and 145), Cicero attempts to entangle his political past with the sacred and religious life of Rome. This theme also reinforces the connection between *patria* and religion that was touched upon in Chapter One. At *De Domo Sua* 122, Cicero refers to the manner in which the site of his *domus* at Rome was consecrated by Clodius and his supporters. Clodius' decision to consecrate the site of Cicero's house at Rome is an act that is depicted as being simultaneously unpatriotic and impious. Firstly, Cicero states that the site being consecrated is not one that had been previously owned by a criminal, but rather one that was willingly sacrificed by an individual whose sole concern was the continued preservation of the Roman *patria* (*qui patriam a se servatam perire suo nomine nolisset*). Secondly, the act of consecration is stated to be a deliberate misapplication of Roman religious formulae, using it to lend authority to the unjust persecution of a citizen rather than for the intended purpose of religious

²¹³ Cic. *Dom.* 93.

²¹⁴ Cic. *Dom.* 94.

²¹⁵ Cic. *Dom.* 94.

reputation.²¹⁶ The stress on impiety in this passage in relation to Clodius' vendetta against Cicero has two significant functions. On the one hand, it helps to emphasise Cicero's negative image of Clodius. His determination to attain personal goals not only threatens the welfare of the Roman *patria* but also the integrity of Roman religious tradition, a threat to religion that in turn undermines Roman political freedom. On the other hand, and more significantly, the theme of impiety serves to highlight Cicero's cultural and political importance. Owing to his significant achievements in protecting the Roman *patria*, and consequently the religious elements that it embodies, Cicero implies that his very person, *domus* and political achievements are themselves quasi-sacred, and thus should instead be the object of reverence and protection.

Yet, Cicero does not only look towards Rome's priests for religious endorsement of his political activities. At *De Domo Sua* 145, Cicero addresses Rome's primary deities. Firstly, he declares how it was by his hand that they were preserved from political violence. Secondly, he calls on them to recall a vow, offered to them both during and after the Catilinarian conspiracy, in which he commended himself to the service and preservation of Rome's religion, political state and, consequently, *patria*. Cicero's statement at the time of this oath that he should suffer the pains of exile should he fail to honour it further

²¹⁶ Cic. *Dom.* 122. See Lennon (2010) for an insightful and detailed discussion of Cicero's argument regarding ritual impurity in relation to Clodius' shrine to Liberty. On the subject of Cicero's home and Clodius' shrine to Liberty see also Allen (1944) and Berg (1997).

highlights his self-sacrificial image (*sin autem mea consilia patriae non profuissent, ut perpetuum dolorem avulsus a meis sustinerem*). Although having only just been recalled from a relatively short period in exile, an action that in itself indicates the fulfilment of the vow, Cicero states that he will never view it as having been truly accepted by the gods unless he finds himself restored to his home. Thus, the return of his *domus* is presented as more than simply a righting of wrongs in Cicero's eyes. It is the physical representation of the universal acceptance of the benevolent nature of his consulship, and thus the unquestionable negation of Clodius' unpatriotic and impious accusations. It thus once again stands to become a memorial to the defence of Roman political *libertas*, the defence of which is presented as central to the continued prosperity and security of the Roman *patria* and all that it embodies. Indeed, Cicero describes the destruction of his home at Cic. *Dom.* 146 as being a physical wound of the *patria*, a wound that is witnessed by the majority of the city and which can only be healed by its return to him (*Urbis enim celeberrimae et maximae partes adversum illud non monumetum, sed vulnus patriae contuentur*). Such a statement functions to tie Cicero to the urban physical fabric of the Roman *patria*.

The three speeches that Cicero made on his return to Rome do not only aim to answer the charges made against him by Clodius. They also look to emphasise his continued political importance and utility. Indeed, the deliberate and careful recollections of the benefits arising

from his patriotic service toward *patria* as consul served to remind his Roman audiences of this very fact. The comparison of Cicero's political behaviour with that of others is also employed as a means by which to negate the criticisms of Clodius whilst contextualising Cicero within Rome's political spectrum. Since this is a highly political theme it is unsurprising that it is identifiable primarily within *Post Reditum in Senatu* and *De Domo Sua*. Cicero's comparison of himself with his political contemporaries can be separated into two categories: those who share the same patriotic ethos centred on *patria* and those that do not.

I start with the second of these two groups: the individuals whose characters are in opposition to Cicero's patriotic ethos. This group is comprised of his political opponents, namely the consuls Aulus Gabinius and Lucius Calpurnius Piso Caesoninus, and of course Cicero's primary nemesis Clodius, whose unpatriotic presentation has already been well highlighted in the passages discussed above.²¹⁷ At *Post Reditum in Senatu* 12, when the Roman people and senate approach Gabinius in a state of mourning for Cicero's plight (*sordidatus*), a powerful visual statement of feeling according to Naiden, the consul is described as not only ignoring their supplications but openly repudiating the prayers of the *patria* (*verum etiam patriae preces repudiavit*).²¹⁸ When we consider that mourning garb would

²¹⁷ For other examples of Cicero's negative presentation of Clodius' character in relation to *patria* see Cic. *Dom.* 102, 133, 137, Cic. *Sest.* 26 and Cic. *Vat.* 33.

²¹⁸ Cicero's criticism of Gabinius is echoed at Cic. *Red. sen.* 14; Cic. *Sest.* 25, 29 and 30. On the imagery of mourning attire in the context of supplication see Naiden

have been worn by a Roman citizen and his family and friends to elicit the support of the courts if they were being tried, Cicero's imagery in this passage serves to stress the position of power Gabinius possesses. The final decision, and thus the fate of the Roman people and *patria* as much as that of Cicero rests in his hands. Gabinius' lack of interest whilst consul in the concerns of the collective in this passage stands in stark contrast to that seen in the case of Cicero in the *Catilinarians* when he possessed the same political office. Cicero thus portrays Gabinius as being the polar opposite to the rest of Rome, both morally and in physical appearance (*ille unguentis oblitus, cum toga praetexta, quam omnes praetors aedilesque tum abiecerant*). This polarisation between Gabinius and the Roman community helps Cicero to reverse the charges of despotism back onto one of his accusers.

Calpurnius Piso's lack of concern for *patria*, and thus alienation from the Roman community, is demonstrated at *Post Reditum in Senatu* 17. In this passage, he is condemned by Cicero for criticising the eradication of Catiline and the other conspirators. Whereas Piso labels the senate as cruel (*crudeles demonstrabas fuisse*), Cicero describes them as good natured (*boni*) for having removed a plague from their *patria* (*quum a patria pestem depellerent*).²¹⁹ The negative portrayal of the individuals who orchestrated Cicero's unjust exile is used to undermine the validity and authority of their political

(2006), 58-62, esp. 60. See also Kaster (2006), 111. On the political significance of mourning dress in Cicero, especially in relation to *Cic. Red. sen.* 12, see Hessel (2001), 141-143.

²¹⁹ Cicero's criticism of Calpurnius Piso is repeated at *Cic. Prov. cons.* 13; *Cic. Sest.* 23 and 25.

accusations and in turn to increase the significance of Cicero's own patriotic ethos, not only in the past but more importantly for the present and in the future. This is especially noticeable in moments where a negative presentation of Gabinius, Piso or Clodius is juxtaposed with one that highlights Cicero's invaluable services to *patria* as well as to *res publica*.²²⁰

The significance of Cicero to Rome's political future is further emphasised by the comparison between himself and two other Romans that are depicted as sharing his patriotic ethos toward *patria*: Gaius Marius and Quintus Caecilius Metellus Numidicus.²²¹ In both cases, Cicero is keen to illustrate directly the close connections that exist between them and his own political character and experiences. This helps to place him on an equal political standing alongside some of Rome's greatest and most influential characters. Marius is described by Cicero as having confronted destructive forces only to be ultimately deprived of *patria*, family and home, an experience that causes him to feel intense misery (*Quem egomet dicere audivi, tum se fuisse*

²²⁰ Consider Cic. *Sest.* 23 (Piso contrasted to Cicero); Cic. *Sest.* 29-30 (violence of Gabinius) vs. Cic. *Sest.* 33 (patriotism of Cicero); Cic. *Sest.* 42 (violence of Gabinius, Piso and Clodius contrasted with self-sacrificial and patriotic nature of Cicero); and Cic. *Dom.* 72 (Clodius contrasted to Cicero).

²²¹ The drawing of complementary parallels between himself and other prominent Roman political figures is not confined to *Post Reditum in Senatu*, *Post Reditum ad Quirites* and *De Domo Sua*, nor is the exercise restricted to the three individuals mentioned above. This recurrence indicates the importance of this strategy to Cicero in relation to his public image. Such a theme can also be identified at Cic. *Sest.* 37 and 78 regarding the character of Marius, and Cic. *Sest.* 60 and 61 regarding the character of Cato. Metellus is also frequently mentioned in other texts, Cic. *Cael.* 54 and 59; and Cic. *Balb.* 11 where he is described by Cicero as being an important influence upon his own patriotic outlook.

miserum, cum careret patria).²²² That this is a first-hand account encourages the audience to view Marius as a direct inspiration to Cicero in terms of the affection a Roman politician should have for his *patria*. It is also an indication of the degree to which the relationship between *patria* and Roman politics pre-dates the time of Cicero. At *Post Reditum in Senatu* 25, Cicero describes how the departure of Metellus Numidicus from his *patria* was viewed by Rome as a collective disaster (*cuius quondam de patria discessus honestus omnibus, sed luctuosus tamen visus est*), a reaction that appears almost identical to that expressed by Rome toward Cicero's exile.²²³ These comparisons function to increase the magnitude of Cicero's political achievements, and stress the degree to which Cicero wished to be recognised not simply as a Roman returned from exile but as an influential and indispensable member of Rome's political system.²²⁴

The use of *patria* to highlight the influential and indispensable dimension of Cicero's public image is reiterated particularly effectively with the emphatic nature of his recall. Whereas other exiles have been granted leave to return to Rome following supplications from family members or groups of influential friends, he was restored to *patria* as a result of the united efforts of all sections of Roman and Italian

²²² Cic. *Red. pop.* 20. Cf. Cic. *Dom.* 98.

²²³ Cf. Cic. *Red. sen.* 17.

²²⁴ In both the cases of Marius (Cic. *Red. pop.* 20) and Metellus (Cic. *Red. sen.* 25) *patria* seems to be definable territorially as Rome, although there is some scope in the case of Marius to argue for Italy. Such ambiguity and uncertainty further illustrates the lack of a clear contemporary physical notion of *patria*.

society.²²⁵ At *Post Reditum in Senatu* 27-28, for example, Cicero describes how, during the popular ballot to decide whether or not he should be recalled, every citizen registered a vote in his favour out of a sense of civic duty. This description of the unanimous voting process is embellished at *De Domo Sua* 75, where we are informed that the Campus Martius had never before been so packed with citizens casting their votes, citizens who came to Rome from all over Italy. The strength of this collective force behind Cicero's recall has important implications for how his political actions are viewed. At *Post Reditum in Senatu* 5 it is described how the vote to recall Cicero from exile resulted in the full restoration of political influence despite his physical absence (*tantus vester consensus de salute mea fuit, ut corpus abesset meum, dignitas iam in patriam revertisset*), and at *De Domo Sua* 75 how the popular support behind Cicero created a means by which his actions and person were conveyed to heaven, and hence commended to, or even possibly ranked alongside, the gods (*quibus tamquam gradibus mihi videor in caelum ascendisse, non solum in patriam revertisse*). Cicero's recall to Rome is thus a powerful endorsement of his consulship and hence his patriotic character. Yet, this endorsement is not restricted simply to Rome and Italy. Rather, Cicero states that it extends to the entire world, a statement that impacts upon our conceptions as to the geographical influence of the Roman *patria*.²²⁶

²²⁵ Cic. *Red. pop.* 6-10. At Cic. *Red. pop.* 10 *patria* is definable as Italy (*at me in patriam ter suis decretis Italia cuncta revocavit*). Unprecedented of Cicero's return from exile is also stressed at Cic. *Dom.* 75.

²²⁶ Cic. *Dom.* 75.

Taken together, the three speeches examined would appear to consciously employ *patria* so as to create an image of Cicero as a supreme example of Roman patriotism, and consequently as a prominent and influential member of the Roman political elite. They draw on the themes of service and devotion to illustrate how Cicero's private affection for the Roman *patria* was deeply manifested in his political activities. They also reinforce the notion that *patria* was dependent upon *res publica* for its general welfare whilst further complicating the territorial image associated with the concept. His possession of public office and his efforts to ensure the integrity of the *res publica* are presented not, therefore, as a means to provide himself with personal political advancement, but as fundamental tools by which to ensure the *patria's* defence and preservation. In such an endeavour, Cicero is keen to contextualise his achievements, comparing himself directly to the behaviour of his political contemporaries and as numbering amongst Rome's great public figures. Combined with this seemingly overwhelming public support, *patria* enables the speeches to paint a picture of Cicero as a central, if not an essential player, in the political affairs of Rome, a theme that Cicero was keen to exploit in his subsequent writings.²²⁷

²²⁷ Cicero's service to *patria* as a vehicle to forward his political agenda and to aggrandise his political standing and that of his supporters, whilst denigrating that of his opponents, can be found in Cic. *Har. resp.* 7, 41, 45, 58, 60; Cic. *Cael.* 70; Cic. *Prov. cons.* 13, 23-24, 29, 35; Cic. *Sest.* 23, 25-26, 29-30, 33, 37-38, 45, 47-49 53, 60-61, 64, 121, 129, 131, 141, 143, 145; Cic. *Vat.* 7, 24, 33, 35; Cic. *Planc.* 70, 79-80, 101; Cic. *Pis.* 6, 15, 17, 20-21, 23, 33-34, 49, 52, 95; Cic. *Mil.* 3, 63, 65, 68, 72, 93-94, 102-104. In the case of *Pro Caelio*, *Pro Sestio*, *In Pisonem* and *In Vatinius* Cicero uses the theme of an individual's relationship to *patria*, especially his own, to undermine and counter the opposing case. Cf. May (1988), 90-105; Graff (1963),

2.III.iii. 49 BC: An Identity Crisis

In a series of letters written to Atticus between January and May 49 BC, Cicero indicates an agonising degree of indecision.²²⁸ This indecision is caused by the threat posed to *patria* by the ensuing events of the civil war, and Cicero's inability to align his belief in public service acting in the interests of the *patria* with the intentions and actions of either the Pompeian or Caesarian factions. The conflict and its impact upon *patria* are identifiable in two early letters of this period, being dated to January and February 49 BC respectively. In *Ad Atticum* 134.1 (7.11.1), Cicero effectively employs *patria* to reject Caesar's claims that his march upon Rome is an honourable undertaking. Caesar's actions have no legal or moral basis, Cicero argues, since they are in part focused upon the forceful seizure of the Roman *patria*. In *Ad Atticum* 136.1 (7.13.1), he describes Caesar as an individual who is both unpredictable and dangerous. This is because, despite being a Roman, Caesar views Rome's homes and temples not as important elements that the concept of *patria* embodies and which should be revered, but simply as objects fit only for plunder and personal enrichment. Parallels thus can be drawn between the characterisation of Caesar in these letters and that of Catiline in the

34-35; and Habicht (1990), 50, who consider the use of *res publica* rather than *patria* to do the same thing in *Pro Sestio*. This does not indicate interchangeability between the concepts.

²²⁸ These letters follow a marked absence in the occurrence of *patria* in relation to Cicero's public image between August 55 and February 49 BC, these dates being, respectively, those of the publication of *In Pisonem* and *Ad Atticum* 153 (8.3). For the argument which dates *In Pisonem* to August of 55 BC see Marshall (1975). The only exception to this absence of *patria* is *Pro Milone* in 52 BC, where the usage of the concept is similar to that seen in *Pro Caelio* and *Pro Sestio*.

Catilinarians. Like Catiline, Caesar is not a Roman patriot who should be supported, but a *hostis*, an outsider who poses a grave risk to the survival of the Roman *patria*, and who should and must be feared and opposed by all.²²⁹

Problematically for Cicero, however, is the fact that Caesar's is not the only faction that is seemingly uninterested in serving the interests of the *patria*. In *Ad Atticum* 152 (8.2), written in February, Cicero takes great exception at Pompey's decision to abandon Rome in the face of Caesar's advance. According to Cicero, it is the duty of a leading Roman magistrate to defend the *patria* at all costs (152.2 (8.2.2)). *Patria* is thus recognised by Cicero as a fundamental concern for senior political figures, just as it was for him during his consulship. The image of *patria* being physically abandoned in this letter is also an additional indication of a sense of urban territoriality associated with the concept (*qui urbem reliquit, id est patriam*). The necessity for senior Roman magistrates to defend the *patria* is emphasised by the statement that even the statesmen and generals of tribal peoples (*nationes*), groups that cannot expect to match Roman political, ethical or moral superiority, would not contemplate behaving in such a disgraceful manner. The abandonment of *patria* is an event that can be seen to weigh heavily on Cicero throughout his correspondence with Atticus between January and May, and is one of the most important

²²⁹ Cf. Cic. *Cat.* 2.1.

reasons that he gives for being unwilling to support Pompey actively.²³⁰

With *patria* threatened and ignored by both sides, Cicero hesitates and refuses to commit himself to a definitive course of action. However, his correspondence with Atticus clearly reveals a strong degree of discomfort regarding his lack of involvement in Pompey's faction at this time. Concerned about the political implications that may arise concerning his absence from the legally endorsed opposition to Caesar, Cicero searches for a means by which to justify his inactivity. Evidence of this is found in *Ad Atticum* 153 (8.3) and 155 (8.7). Indicating for the first time in his writings the possibility of a slight tension between his duties as a senator and his affections for the Roman *patria*, Cicero validates his political inactivity with a moral argument, stating that only a course of action that is directed by the interests of the *patria* can and should be pursued. It is clear that this message is directed to all who have a position of political responsibility. Thus, it is clear that from Cicero's perspective that Pompey's abandonment of *patria* significantly implies a weakening of the validity of his moral standing and consequently his personal *auctoritas*.²³¹ This in turn has an impact on the legality of the faction that he leads. Cicero thus rejects any claim Pompey may have of acting in the interests of Rome by claiming that Pompey directly contributes to the peril threatening to engulf the Roman *patria*. Indeed, Cicero's

²³⁰ See for example Cic. *Att.* 153 (8.3) and Cic. *Att.* 155 (8.7) both of which are discussed below. On Cic. *Att.* 152 (8.2) see McConnell (2014), 90-91.

²³¹ Cic. *Att.* 153.3 (8.3.3).

use of the verb *relinquo* at *In Atticum* 155.2 (8.7.2) indicates a voluntary abandonment of *patria* on Pompey's part, rather than his being forced from it by superior forces. In essence, since Pompey appears not to be fulfilling the standard that Cicero expects of a leading figure of Rome's political establishment, it can be inferred that his commitment to the cause of *patria*, the cause of the collective, should be questioned.²³²

Whilst taking the back seat may have offered Cicero a means by which to satisfy his own patriotic ethos, it threatened to leave him politically isolated and open to the same criticism of self-interest that he had levelled at Pompey. That he was aware of such factors is evident in three letters written between 11th and 18th March.²³³ In *Ad Atticum* 172 (9.6), Cicero recognises that his dithering has left him isolated. Exhibiting a degree of discomfort at his actions to date, Cicero uses his relationship with *patria* to justify them (172.2 (9.6.2): *dum urbem, id est patriam, amamus dumque rem conventuram putamus*). Such a statement is arguably more for Cicero's own peace of mind than for Atticus' benefit. It indicates that his decisions during this latest crisis have been dictated by the consideration of what will best ensure the *patria's* welfare. Rather than having committed himself to either side and hence contributed to its destruction, Cicero presents himself as having sought to identify a means by which a peaceful solution can be obtained and offer himself as the 'middle ground', as

²³² Cic. *Att.* 155 (8.7). See Holliday (1969), 66-67.

²³³ Hariman (1989), 148-149, discusses the presence of angst in Cicero's letters to Atticus, a feeling he states peaks in 49-48 BC.

the man through whom an end to hostilities may be negotiated and peace for the *patria* can be obtained. The innocuousness of Cicero's neutrality is emphasised by the apparent counter-productiveness that the orator sees in Pompey's strategies.

In *Ad Atticum* 176.2 (9.9.2), Cicero concurs with Atticus' praise for the spirit (*animus*) of the opposition to Caesar, but questions the utility of its current strategy (*consilium reprehendo*). The abandonment of Italy, he argues, has greatly reduced the ability for a peace treaty to be negotiated between the two sides, and has in turn increased the likelihood of a destructive conflict. This destructiveness is evident in part by plans that the Pompeian faction have to sever Italy from its vital supplies of grain. Whilst this would undoubtedly have the advantage of placing Caesar under intense political pressure at Rome it would also cause immense suffering amongst the peoples of Italy. Cicero stresses this suffering by drawing a parallel between the treatment of one's *parentes* and one's *patria*. It would be an abominable enough act to starve one's *parentes*, yet Rome's *principes* are surprisingly willing to consider this with regard to the *patria*, which is a more ancient and venerable *parens* to all its members.²³⁴ This is yet another example in Latin literature that connects the notion of parricide with *patria*. It is thus better, Cicero declares, to die inactive within one's *patria* than to contribute to its destruction through

²³⁴ Cic. Att. 176.2 (9.9.2): *In quo tanta vis sceleris futura est ut, cum parentis non alere nefarium sit, nostri principes antiquissimam et sanctissimam parentem, patriam, fame necandam putent.* ("A war in which villainy is about to be of such violence that, although it is abominable not to feed one's *parentes*, our leading men will consider starving to death *patria*, that most ancient and holiest of *parentes*.")

external service, no matter how noble intentions may be (*qua dempta perire melius esset in patria quam patriam servando evertere*).

Cicero's function as the beneficial 'middle ground' is a subject that occurs in *Ad Atticum* 178A (9.11A). In this letter Cicero, responding to a summons for him to come to Rome, takes the opportunity of being back in the political limelight to persuade Caesar to consider reconciliation with Pompey. However, when the contents of this letter were made public, his intervention seems to have exposed him to severe criticism rather than praise. As is evident from Cicero's response to Atticus in *Ad Atticum* 188 (8.9), this criticism appears to stem from his excessive use of flattery to bring Caesar round to his point of view and his seemingly weak political morality in offering him his services.²³⁵ Indeed, despite what Cicero states to the contrary, the publication of *Ad Atticum* 178A (9.11A) would undoubtedly have been an embarrassing and sticky situation for him from the perspective of his image as the supreme servant of the *patria*. This is owing to the fact that it shows him not only openly communicating with an individual who has been cast as a *hostis patriae* in previous letters in a collegial manner but also exhibiting a degree of concern and affection for him, although White's comments on Cicero's use of the term *amicus* in his letters encourage us to take such sentiment with a pinch of salt.²³⁶ Indeed, many contemporaries may have drawn a stark contrast between Cicero's treatment of Caesar in

²³⁵ See for example Cic. *Att.* 178A.3 (9.11A.3).

²³⁶ Cic. *Att.* 178A.2 (9.11A.2). See White (2010), 123, on *amicitia* and Cicero's letters. On this exchange between Cicero and Caesar see White (2010), 124-125.

this instance and his non-negotiable attitude towards Catiline, the other great *hostis patriae*. Unsurprisingly, it is *patria* once again that is called upon to justify and validate Cicero's actions. Rather than attempt to deny or retract his description of Caesar as admirable, Cicero places a patriotic spin upon it and states that he chose to characterise him in this manner solely to help promote the *patria's* welfare (178A.1 (9.11A.1): *Eam si admirabilem dixi cum eum ad salutem patriae hortabar, non sum veritus ne viderer adsentari*). So as to make his explanation more convincing, the orator declares melodramatically that he would even gladly go so far as to prostrate himself at Caesar's feet, thus exposing himself to yet further personal humiliation, if it would but help to further *patria's* interests (178A.1 (9.11A.1): *cui tali in re libenter me ad pedes abiecissem*).

Ad Atticum 188 (8.9) marks the end of Cicero's indecision. Making a dramatic u-turn, Cicero aligns himself with the Pompeian faction he had previously criticised as being unpatriotic. Unsurprisingly, Cicero does not present this move as a u-turn and manages to present it as yet a further demonstration of his unmatched dedication to the *patria*.²³⁷ However Cicero might use *patria* to depict this change in political strategy, *Ad Atticum* 188 (8.9) is a clear contradiction of the message contained in previous letters. In *Ad Atticum* 153 (8.3), 155

²³⁷ Cicero also avoids any mention of the failed peace proposal. Instead, he states that his decision to side with Pompey is owing to the thuggish make-up of Caesar's supporters (Cic. *Att.* 189.1 (9.19.1): *cave autem putes quemquam hominem in Italia turpem esse qui hinc absit*). This is not an entirely convincing argument since the undesirable nature of Caesar's supporters cannot have only just come to Cicero's attention.

(8.7), 172 (9.6), 176 (9.9) and 177 (9.10), the abandonment of Rome and Italy, and the conducting of operations in the provinces were condemned as having been both unpatriotic and having posed a direct threat to the stability of the *patria*. In *Ad Atticum* 189 (8.19), they are now described as being the actions of a true and loyal Roman patriot.²³⁸ Even acts of piracy are now viewed by Cicero as being a valid and patriotic strategy if the situation demands it (*Boni cives amantes patriae mare infestum habebimus. Aliam rationem huius belli gerendi nullam video*).²³⁹ Since the overall strategy of the Pompeian faction has not altered, this dramatic change in outlook can only be accounted for by Cicero's participation. It is thus implied that it is his presence within the Pompeian faction that transforms its image from being anti-*patria* in outlook to pro-*patria*. This transformative role reinforces Cicero's image as a, if not the, supreme example of Roman patriotism. Not that this is an image that Cicero is willing to flaunt openly in front of his enemies, despite his previous declarations that he is willing to die for a patriotic cause. Caught trying to leave Rome by Antony, Cicero tries to justify his movements by arguing for his continued neutrality.²⁴⁰ Clearly unconvinced by this argument, and correctly interpreting Cicero's movement as indicating an alternative motive, Antony responds by using one of the orator's earlier arguments against him: true neutrality can only be illustrated by an

²³⁸ Cic. *Att.* 189.3 (9.19.3).

²³⁹ Cic. *Att.* 189.3 (9.19.3): "As good citizens that love the *patria* we will preside over a hostile sea. I see no other way of waging this war."

²⁴⁰ Cic. *Att.* 201.1 (10.10.1).

individual remaining in the *patria* (*nam qui se medium esse vult, in patria manet*).²⁴¹

It is clear from Cicero's letters during the early months of 49 BC that the orator struggled to accommodate his ethos of public service centered on the interests of *patria* in the context of civil war. Rather than take the initiative, his concern regarding the patriotic motivations of Pompey caused a crippling indecisiveness that left him politically isolated. This isolation gives us a glimpse as to the reality of his situation: namely his lack of influence on the political stage. This lack of political influence was an aspect that Cicero failed to camouflage in his letters to Atticus. Clearly concerned as to the impact that such inactivity had for his public image, Cicero was keen to illustrate how each and every course of action that he followed was undertaken in order to ensure the welfare and security of the *patria*, just as he had in 62 and 58-57 BC. What is defined as service in the interest of the *patria* thus shifts and changes with Cicero. What was perhaps an unpatriotic policy in an earlier letter is suddenly patriotic in a later one, solely for the reason that it is Cicero that is now pursuing it. As such, Cicero's presentation of himself, as well as the notion of service to the *patria* during this period is far from consistent, weakening his arguments and exposing him to accusations of hypocrisy and naivety. More seriously, however, Cicero's inconsistency threatens to dilute the potency and credibility of his personal patriotic ethos that he so often

²⁴¹ Cic. *Att.* 201.2 (10.10.2).

uses as the standard against which to judge the public service of his peers.

2.IV. *Patria* and 'Factional' Identity: 44-43 BC

The last significant usage of *patria* by Cicero occurs in a selection of letters and speeches composed between 44 and 43 BC.²⁴² This usage is focused on two aspects. Firstly, *patria* remains a means by which Cicero depicts, promotes or denigrates the public standing of individuals. Secondly, the concept is employed effectively by Cicero to depict the factional identity of the republican faction during this period.

My discussion in this section starts with the former, namely Cicero's personal political relationship with *patria*. During this latest political crisis, Cicero uses his service to *patria* as a means by which to present himself as reoccupying a prominent role on the Roman political stage. In essence, *patria's* relationship with Cicero's public image in 44-43 BC becomes a foundation for decisive action rather than a cause for hesitation as was the case in his writings of 49 BC. This relationship between *patria* and Cicero enables the orator to undermine the public standing of Antony whilst legitimising and promoting that of his own and the republican opposition to Antony of

²⁴² Cic. *Att.* 415 (16.7); Cic. *Fam.* 340 (10.1), 345 (12.3), 348 (11.27), 349 (11.28), 359 (10.5), 371 (10.8), 373 (12.25), 375 (10.10), 379 (10.9), 387 (12.12), 391 (10.21), 393 (10.19), 398 (10.17), 414 (10.23), 418 (11.13a), 419 (12.13); Cic. *Phil.* 1.6, 2.2, 2.12, 2.17, 2.24, 2.26-27, 2.31, 2.53, 2.60, 2.72, 2.75, 4.5, 5.6, 5.23, 6.18, 8.8, 8.18, 10.8, 11.1, 11.9, 11.10, 11.23, 11.27, 11.29, 11.39, 12.8, 12.14, 12.15, 12.19, 12.30, 13.16, 13.23, 13.25, 13.29, 13.39, 13.46-47, 13.49, 14.4, 14.20; Cic. *Ad Brut.* 1 (2.1), 7 (1.3), 22 (1.14), 26 (1.17).

which he is a part. In many ways, this strategy is similar to that identified earlier in the *Catilinarians* and the speeches that denounced Clodius. Whilst *patria* is used to depict Cicero as a supreme example of Roman patriotism, it portrays Antony as an individual who is highly dangerous and unpredictable to the Roman people, as a *hostis patriae*.

Patria is first used by Cicero as a way to spin the circumstances of his sudden and unexpected return to Rome in the autumn of 44 BC in his favour.²⁴³ Dismissing Atticus' criticisms, Cicero uses this event as the springboard for his subsequent public opposition to Antony.²⁴⁴ Rejecting claims that he was fleeing Rome for his own safety and that his return was dictated by unfavourable weather, Cicero echoes the well-worn argument that his primary concern has always been the stability of *res publica* and in turn the security of *patria*. It was this, the orator declares, that summoned him back in order to oppose actively the political ambitions of Antony.²⁴⁵ In thus echoing his strategy of 49 BC, namely of adapting the definition of service to *patria* in order to play down and to counter criticism of his peers, Cicero uses the concept to reinvent this event as the opening salvo of a decisive and deliberate patriotic oratorical offensive against Antony.

Cicero's underlying strategy throughout this oratorical offensive is to present himself as the *patria's* champion, that is to say as the patriotic and moral leader of Rome's opposition to Antony's personal aggrandisement. This strategy juxtaposes Antony with Catiline and

²⁴³ On this event see Mitchell, T. (1991), 273ff; and Tempest (2011), 188-191.

²⁴⁴ Cic. *Att.* 415 (14.7).

²⁴⁵ Cic. *Fam.* 340.1 (10.1.1) and 373.3-4 (12.25.3-4); Cic. *Ad Brut.* 1.1 (2.1.1).

Clodius, and consequently augments the degree of threat that he poses to Rome in terms of its political liberty, an aspect which is considered to be fundamental in relation to *patria*.²⁴⁶ In *Philippic 2*, Cicero places particular emphasis upon his political importance by describing a remarkably close bond that exists between himself and *patria*. At 2.1-2, Cicero counters Antony's invective against him of 19th September by arguing that it publicly unveils Antony's hostile intentions.²⁴⁷ Since there had been no political enemy of Rome in the previous twenty years that had not simultaneously also commenced hostilities against him – a clear reference to Cicero's previous attacks on Catiline, Clodius and Caesar – Cicero proceeds to argue that Antony's unprovoked hostility towards him can only be considered as a means to validate his status as *hostis patriae*.²⁴⁸ It is *patria* that is deliberately used to justify this statement. In order to stress the image of himself as always being on the look out for opportunities to safeguard the concept, Cicero reminds the audience that it was he who successfully defended it from the threat posed by Catiline, and he who sought to find a peaceful solution to the civil war of 49 BC.²⁴⁹ These past actions are characterised as having imbued his person with a sacred quality equal to that of the concept itself.

²⁴⁶ On the similarities between Antony, Catiline and Clodius in the *Philippics* see Stockton (1971), 300; Cerutti (1996), 160-163; May (1996); and Manuwald (2007), 323. On similarities between the *Philippics* and *Catilinarians* in terms of Cicero's presentation of himself see Hall (2002), 293.

²⁴⁷ Hall (2002), 275.

²⁴⁸ This theme is echoed at Cic. *Leg.* 2.43. See Cerutti (1996), 165-166; and Ramsey (2003), 164. On Cicero's interpretation of Antony as the latest Catiline or Clodius see Hall (2002), 287.

²⁴⁹ Cic. *Phil.* 2.17, 24, 60.

Cicero's status as a revered patriotic leader for the opponents of Antony is emphasised in subsequent *Philippics*. At 4.17-18, Cicero uses his unique and extensive experience in opposing disloyal citizens (*impii cives*) to give his offer of *consilia* to Antony's opponents in the upcoming struggle a greater sense of credibility. At 11.23, Cicero takes a more direct line, and urges the senate to follow his example in placing *patria* before private political advantage so that they may as effectively extinguish the threat of Antony as Cicero was able to do in the case of Catiline and Clodius. Finally, at 14.20, the orator informs the senate that through his correspondence up to that point (21st April 43 BC) he had been acting as a patriotic agent, urging and encouraging Romans actively to participate in the defence of their *patria*.

Whilst these examples shed yet further light upon the influential role of *patria* in the continued promotion of Cicero's public image, they also indicate the concept's importance with regard to the public image of the republican faction. Not only do they emphasise Cicero's patriotic spirit but also in turn that of the general and wider opposition to Antony of which he is a part. Evidence for this wider function of *patria* to promote or discredit factional activity can be found in a number of letters written by Cicero and several of his peers during 44-43 BC, as well as in passages from Cicero's *Philippics*. This epistolary and oratorical evidence is divided into two groups in the discussion that follows. Firstly, I consider that evidence which advocates the patriotic motivations of the republican faction, and

secondly, I discuss that evidence which shows the use of *patria* to demonise the behaviour of Antony and his supporters.

As stated, my discussion begins with the first of these data sets; that in which *patria* is employed to promote and legitimise the image and actions of the republican faction through the patriotic presentation of its protagonists. This data set comprises four distinct yet closely related and intertwined themes. These themes must be separated and considered in isolation for the sake of clarity. In the first of these themes Cicero contextualises, equates and binds the aims and motivations of the political opposition to Antony with those of Brutus and Cassius in the assassination of Caesar. At *Philippic* 1.6, 2.26-27, 11.9 and *Ad Familiares* 345.2, Brutus, Cassius, Trebonius and the other members of the plot are described by Cicero as *conservatores* or *liberatores patriae*. Since *libertas* was an important political concept during the Late Republic the use of these phrases is significant.²⁵⁰ It enables Cicero to draw the reader's attention to the fact that the conspiracy's goal was the restoration of Roman political freedom, upon which it is emphasised that the security of *patria* depends.²⁵¹ Indeed, this is a theme that resonates strongly with those contained within much of Cicero's earlier, patriotically focused political writings that have been considered above.

The fundamental importance of *patria* to the political objectives, and hence image, of Brutus and Cassius is emphasised elsewhere in

²⁵⁰ Regarding the political significance of *libertas* see Wirszubski (1950); and Arena (2014).

²⁵¹ See also Cic. *Phil.* 10.20.

the *Philippics*. At 11.27, its defence is described as being a sacred duty for them (*Nec enim nunc primum aut Brutus aut Cassius salutem libertatemque patriae legem sanctissimam et morem optimum iudicabit*),²⁵² a statement that Cicero employs effectively to depict Brutus as the ideological and moral opposite to Antony.²⁵³ Through this description, Cassius and Brutus are presented as key personalities of the republican faction that direct and define its overall mission. This aspect is particularly evident in the last such thematic occurrence of *patria*. At *Ad Brut.* 22.2 (1.14.2), Cicero writes to Brutus and urges him to return from exile and to lead his army to Rome. In so doing, he declares that Brutus' potentially direct involvement and leadership in the military campaign against Antony and Lepidus will be an equally notable service to *patria* as the events of the Ides of March 44 BC (*Subveni igitur, per deos, idque quam primum, tibi que persuade non te Idibus Martiis, quibus servitutem a tuis civibus depulisti, plus profuisse patriae quam, si mature veneris, profuturum*).²⁵⁴ This letter illustrates how Cicero views the war against Antony not as an isolated event, but as a collective continuation by the republican faction of the struggle started by Brutus and Cassius to free Rome and its *patria* from political tyranny, a perspective that further reinforces the notion of *patria's* dependence upon the *res publica*.

²⁵² "For now will not be the first time either Brutus or Cassius have determined that the welfare and freedom of the *patria* as the most sacred law and best moral course."

²⁵³ See also the presentation of Brutus versus Antony at Cic. *Phil.* 10.8.

²⁵⁴ "Therefore, by the gods, come to the rescue! And do so straight away. Be sure that you did no greater service to the *patria*, when you removed slavery from your fellow citizens, than you will do should you come early."

Brutus and Cassius are not the only political personalities whose relationship with *patria* is utilised by Cicero to legitimise the republican faction. On three occasions in the orations (2.23, 13.46, 14.4), Cicero achieves this by making effective reference to the actions of Octavian, whom he publicly praises in the senate for joining the opposition against Antony and committing himself without hesitation and on his own initiative to the defence of the *patria*.²⁵⁵ The legitimacy in this case arises from the remarkable nature of Octavian's commitment to the collective cause. At 13.46, Cicero quotes from a letter sent by Antony, in which he states that his aim in besieging Mutina is to avenge Caesar's death. Since Octavian was Caesar's heir Cicero implies that it would have been entirely natural for him to have sought vengeance for the death of Caesar, and hence to have sided with Antony to achieve this.²⁵⁶ That Octavian chooses not to do so is thus significant. Firstly, Octavian's endorsement of the republican faction strengthens its message of operating in the collective interest and enables Cicero to present *patria* as being more important than 'familial' revenge. This thus consequently negates the position of Antony. If avenging the death of Caesar was truly in the interests of the collective, surely his successor would be involved? Secondly, and most importantly, Octavian's decision to support Antony's opponents

²⁵⁵ Since it has already been established in this chapter that Cicero wished to be recognised as a supreme example of Roman patriotic political service, his statement that he endorsed such an initiative functions to endow Octavian's patriotic presentation with much added significance and credibility in the eyes of the reader.

²⁵⁶ Cic. *Phil.* 13.46. See also Cic. *Phil.* 14.4. On the status of Octavian see Lindersky (1984); and Levick (2010), 23-62.

enables Cicero to steer the political rhetoric away from a message of civil war towards one of a collective struggle against a single, common enemy, a similar strategy to that employed in the *Catilinarians*.

The conceptualisation of the conflict of 44-43 BC as a unified struggle against a *hostis patriae*, rather than a repetition of the devastating faction conflict of 49-45 BC, is an important theme that Cicero stresses via *patria* elsewhere in the *Philippics*. At 8.8, Cicero states, paradoxically, that the conflict of 44-43 BC is the first time in his lifetime that a *bellum civile* was not characterised by division or discord but rather by consensus and unity (*primum non modo non in dissensione et discordia civium sed in maxima consensione incredibilique concordia*).²⁵⁷ The reason behind this unity and consensus is the shared desire of all Romans to defend the *patria* and all that it embodies.²⁵⁸ In contrast, those Romans not involved in such a collective endeavour cannot be described as being members of the Roman community, politically or otherwise. Instead, they are depicted as outsiders, individuals who have no sense of loyalty and affection for the Roman *patria*, and who view it solely as a source of plunder and thus private material gain.²⁵⁹ This oxymoronic description of a moment of civil war is highly reminiscent of the way in which Cicero depicted the Catilinarian conspiracy in the *Catilinarians*.²⁶⁰ By presenting the conflict as one between Antony and a unified Rome, Cicero is able to

²⁵⁷ "For the first time the citizen body is not only not in disagreement or discord but is rather in the greatest agreement and the most unbelievable harmony."

²⁵⁸ Cic. *Phil.* 8.8.

²⁵⁹ Cic. *Phil.* 8.8.

²⁶⁰ Cf. Cic. *Cat.* 1.17, 1.23, and 2.27.

claim the patriotic centre ground for the republican faction. The repetition of successful themes from the *Catilinarians* enables Cicero to legitimise the actions of Antony's opponents whilst simultaneously further limiting the manner in which Antony can present himself as acting in the collective interest.

Further evidence of the influence of the *Catilinarians* upon Cicero's presentation of the war against Antony as a collective struggle can be found at 11.39 and 12.8. In both of these sections, Cicero uses the theme of unity motivated by *patria's* welfare to urge the senate to take decisive action. At 11.39, Cicero states that their influence will be judged by all of Italy (*quid cuncta Italia de vestra gravitate sentiat*), and that the war that is being waged is supported by all *gentes* (*id enim bellum gerunt quod ab omnibus gentibus comprobatur*).²⁶¹ Moreover, at 12.8, Cicero describes how the Roman legions support the collective effort to defeat Antony, as illustrated by the defection of the Martian and Fourth legions to the republican cause, a move that highlights the senate as the legitimate source of military authority.

For Cicero's message of unity via *patria* to have been truly effective and credible, and thus for the republican faction's patriotic ethos to maintain its sense of legitimacy, it was fundamental that both were echoed and emulated in the actions of key individuals. Indeed, extant epistolary evidence indicates that this was a central concern for Cicero, Plancus and Cassius. Letters sent by Cicero indicate that he

²⁶¹ Cf. Cic. *Cat.* 4.18 (*omnes ordines*).

was concerned with ensuring that individuals such as Plancus remain committed to the collective, patriotic cause. Cicero looks to cement this commitment by appealing to Plancus' high degree of patriotism and by emphasising its essential role in ensuring the successful defence of *patria* in the ongoing conflict. This is evident in three letters. In *Ad Familiares* 359.1 (10.5.1), Cicero opens his letter to Plancus by complimenting him on the strength of this *caritas patriae*. He then builds upon this concern and affection for the Roman collective by urging Plancus, on behalf of the *patria*, to commit all his energy to the service of the *res publica*.²⁶² This exhortation yet further echoes the theme that *patria* is reliant on Roman republican politics for its safety. The message of *Ad Familiares* 359 (10.5) is echoed to a degree in *Ad Familiares* 375.2 (10.10.2). In this passage Plancus is further encouraged by Cicero to keep his focus on the task in hand by once again ensuring that all his energies are directed towards serving the *patria*.²⁶³ At *Ad Familiares* 393.2 (10.19), Cicero resorts to flattery in order to exhort Plancus to yet greater efforts, stating that his respect for Plancus' achievements is almost equal to his zeal for *patria*.²⁶⁴

²⁶² Cic. *Fam.* 359.2-3 (10.5.2-3).

²⁶³ *Quam ob rem, mi Plance, incumbere toto pectore ad laudem, subveni patriae, opitulare collegae, omnium gentium consensum et incredibilem conspirationem adiuvare.* ("That being so, my dear Plancus, press on with your whole heart, assist the *patria*, relieve your colleague, and support all the people united in unbelievable harmony.")

²⁶⁴ *Sed, mi Plance, incumbere ut belli extrema perficias. In hoc erit summa et gratia et gloria. Cupio omnia rei publicae causa; sed mehercules in ea conservanda iam defatigatus non multo plus patriae faveo quam tuae gloriae.* ("But, my dear Plancus, press on to finish this war that is at its end. In this there will be the highest thanks and glory. In every way I care for the sake of the *res publica*; but, heaven knows, in

For his part, Plancus' letters reveal that he was himself highly aware of the importance of being seen to be adhering to the republican faction's *patria*-centric message. At *Ad Familiares* 371.3-4 (10.8.3-4), for example, Plancus stresses the extreme lengths to which he has gone in order effectively to come to the *patria*'s aid. Having made necessary preparations, Plancus declares that he is now eager and ready to commit himself and his forces to the defence of the collective interest and if necessary take upon himself the full force of the conflict if it would relieve the *patria* from the danger posed by Antony.²⁶⁵ Such letters could indicate that Cicero's messages of action focused on the welfare of *patria* had hit home. Indeed, Plancus' letters to Cicero also seem to indicate a genuine concern that the impact of his actions and those of his close relatives upon *patria* may negatively impact on the credibility of the opposition to Antony. This is particularly evident at *Ad Familiares* 398.2-3 (10.17.2-3), where Plancus attempts to qualify his brother's sudden and unexpected return to Rome as a patriotic act.

Plancus is not the only key member of the republican faction who is conscious to ensure that his actions are seen to adhere to the faction's patriotic ethos. At *Ad Familiares* 387.2 (12.12.2), Cassius writes to Cicero and states that in the service to the *patria* he has not neglected any labour nor turned away from any danger (*nullum neque*

its preservation I am now exhausted. I support the *patria* not much more than your glory.")

²⁶⁵ Cic. *Fam.* 371.6 (10.8.6). See also Cic. *Fam.* 379.2 (10.9.2), 414.1 (10.23.1) and 414.5-6 (10.32.5-6).

periculum neque laborem patriae denegasse). For this reason, he feels it appropriate to entrust his public standing to Cicero's care, a statement that highlights the effectiveness of Cicero's attempts to depict himself as a supreme example of Roman patriotism.

Patria thus appears to have been a fundamental theme for the republican faction, providing it with a powerful source of legitimacy for its actions. However, equally important during the conflict of 44-43 BC, was Cicero's use of *patria* to denigrate the public image of Antony and his supporters. Evidence for this can be found in five of the orations that comprise the *Philippics* (2, 4, 10, 11, 13), and in several of these instances further similarities to the use of *patria* in the *Catilinarians* can be identified.

Cicero's first line of attack upon Antony's public standing occurs in *Philippic 2*. In two passages, 2.53 and 2.72, he attempts to portray Antony as an individual who has a history of threatening the stability and security of the Roman *patria*. He does so by referring back to the causes of the civil war of 49 BC. At 2.53, Cicero argues that full responsibility for what he terms the most terrible of conflicts (*perniciosissimum bellum*) lies exclusively with Antony. This is owing to the fact that he provided Caesar with a pretext for hostilities against the *patria* by falsely claiming that his tribunician veto had been suppressed. At 2.72, Cicero goes further and depicts Antony not only acknowledging his responsibility to this effect, but being proud of it, believing that he should even be rewarded for having brought about

civil war and having borne arms against the *patria*. Cicero's message in these two passages is clear. The threat that Antony posed in 44 BC was nothing unusual and should not be viewed as surprising. He had already shown his lack of loyalty and devotion to the collective, recognising it solely as a source of personal enrichment, and thus violence against the *patria* was inevitable. Indeed, this use of past aggression toward the *patria* to explain and contextualise contemporary events is reminiscent of *In Catilinam* 1.18, where Cicero recalls Catiline's previous criminal actions to introduce and illustrate the threat that he posed to the *patria*.

A letter written by Gaius Matius to Cicero (*Ad Familiares* 349 (11.28)) around the time of *Philippic* 2 highlights an acute awareness and concern of how such an attack on Antony could affect the public standing of other Romans simply through association. In this letter, Matius seeks to counter criticism that he has received, firstly (349.2 (11.28.2)) for having supported Caesar during the civil war of 49-45 BC, and secondly (349.7 (11.28.7)) for having paid his respects to Antony. Both actions, he states, have been used to question his loyalty and dedication to the Roman *patria* (349.2 (11.28.2): *aiunt enim patriam amicitiae praeponendam esse*; 349.7 (11.28.7): *me parum patriae amantem*). Indeed, Matius implies at 349.7 (11.28.7) that such a characterisation of him is clearly politically motivated, since those criticising him are themselves guilty of engaging with Antony over political business. It is also particularly interesting to note Matius' clear

indignation at such treatment. He states that ties of *amicitia* should never be used to question an individual's patriotic loyalties, and that such behaviour questions the claims by the assassins of Caesar to have freed Rome from tyranny, since Caesar never tried to prevent Matius from associating with whoever he pleased. This is as yet another example of a clash between behaviour associated with *amicitia* and behaviour associated with *patria*. 349.7 (11.28.7) is of particular interest to the current discussion. In this instance, it is Matius' involvement with Antony during this period that has resulted in his description as an individual who possesses too little affection for the *patria*. This clearly illustrates the potency behind the characterisation of Antony as a *hostis patriae*, since any who attempted to associate themselves with Antony, no matter how innocently, were themselves tarred with the same brush by their political peers. Thus, not only should Cicero's use of *patria* be seen exclusively to denigrate the character and public standing of Antony, but also that of any individual who was associated with him and hence ultimately the faction that he led. *Patria* can be seen, therefore, to have been an effective way to achieve the political isolation of one's opponents.

The characterisation of Antony as a threat to *patria* is stepped up by Cicero in later *Philippics*. At *Philippic* 4.5, 10.8 and 11.1 Cicero continues to draw parallels between the character of Antony and that of Catiline, depicting him in relation to *patria* as immoral, selfish and highly dangerous. At 4.5, Antony is described as an enemy, bandit and

traitor to the *patria*, traits that cause the abovementioned Martian legion to abandon him in favour of the republican opposition (*hostem illum et latronem et parricidam patriae reliquerunt*).²⁶⁶ At 10.8, a passage also discussed above, Antony is directly compared with Brutus. Whereas Brutus is entitled as the *patria's* saviour (*patriae servator*), Antony is described as attempting to bring about its ruin (*patriae perditor*).²⁶⁷ Finally, at 11.1, Antony and Dolabella are described as criminals who have taken up against the *patria* the very arms that should instead be used in its defence (*contra patriam scelerata arma ceperunt*).²⁶⁸

All of these descriptions compound the image of Antony as an outsider, and hence strengthens the message that the conflict against him is an united effort against a hostile external threat. Three such thematic passages from *Philippic* 13 are worthy of discussion here. At 13.16, Cicero describes the nature of the struggle facing the republican faction. He states that the aim for the armies of Octavian, Hirtius, Pansa and Plancus is to ensure the survival of Decimus Brutus. Opposing them, however, is not a Roman faction but a group of bandits whose desire is the destruction of the *patria* and all that it embodies (*unus furiosus gladiator cum taeterrimorum latronum manu contra patriam, contra deos penatis, contra aras et focos, contra*

²⁶⁶ Publius Dolabella, a key supporter of Antony, is also described as a traitor to the *patria* at Cic. *Phil.* 11.29. For parallels to Catiline see Cic. *Cat.* 1.33 and 4.22 (*hostis patriae*); 1.33 (*latrones Italiae*); 1.17 (*parricidium patriae*).

²⁶⁷ Cf. Cic. *Cat.* 2.1 (*pestem patriae*).

²⁶⁸ Cf. Cic. *Cat.* 2.27.

quattuor consules gerit bellum).²⁶⁹ Indeed, the use of the term *latrones* would have conjured images of a slave revolt, hardly an image of a civil war.²⁷⁰ At 13.39, Cicero dismisses Antony's claims that the conflict is factional on the grounds that he is assaulting the *patria* and that the opposition to him comprises all of Italy (*cuncta contra te Italia armata est*). Antony and his supporters are thus described as defectors, as a revolt against the collective (*Istas tu partis potius quam a populo Romano defectionem vocas?*).²⁷¹ This rejection of Antony's insistence that the war is a factional struggle is echoed at 13.47. Here Cicero contrasts the aims of both sides. One side is stated to be fighting for the authority of the Roman senate and the preservation of *libertas*. The other is stated to be motivated by the death of good citizens and the division of Rome and Italy amongst themselves (*Hae vero quae sunt partes, cum alteris senatus auctoritas, populi Romani libertas, rei publicae salus proposita sit, alteris caedes bonorum, urbis Italiaeque partitio?*).²⁷² Antony, Cicero states, is not fighting in the public interest, but against it (*patria cui igni ferroque minitatur*), yet another image that

²⁶⁹ "One raging gladiator, with a host of the most offensive bandits, wages war against the *patria*, against the *di penates*, against the altars and hearths, against four consuls." On the description of Antony as a gladiator see Ramsey (2003), 171; and Manuwald (2007), 387.

²⁷⁰ On the association between the term *latrones* and slave revolts see Grünwald (2004), 57-71, and in its use in relation to political figures 72-90.

²⁷¹ "Do you call that thing of yours a faction rather than defection from the Roman people?"

²⁷² "Truly, what are these factions, when on the one hand is set forth the authority of the senate, the freedom of the Roman people, the welfare of the *res publica*, and on the other hand is the murder of honest men, the division of city and Italy."

resonates with the *Catilinarians* and which portrays the opposition to Antony as both legitimate and essential.²⁷³

Summary

The aim of this chapter was to investigate the function, role and relationship that *patria* had in relation to Roman politics of the Late-Republic. This discussion has focused on the extensive writings of Cicero, works which provide us with a large proportion of the extant Latin literary occurrences of the concept under examination. From this discussion, six primary conclusions can be reached. Firstly, it is clear that *patria* played a fundamental role with regard to the public and political image of key personages at this time. This has been seen to be the case with Cicero himself, who uses the concept to highlight his patriotic personality and to emphasise a high degree of political and moral importance where in reality there was little or none at all. Secondly, it is clear from the sudden surge in usage of *patria* within Ciceronian political and oratorical writings that Cicero was deliberately using the concept as a means by which to react and combat the political instability and chaos that was engulfing the Roman world. At a time when appeals to the traditional notions of the *res publica* appear to have lost influence and prominence, Cicero falls on *patria* as a concept that could unify individuals on opposite sides of the political battles being waged. *Patria* was, therefore, recognised by Cicero as being a rare example of common ground at this time, a shared focal

²⁷³ “*Patria* which he threatens with fire and sword.” Cf. Cic. *Cat.* 2.1.

point of identity and loyalty to rally around. This attempt to use *patria* to reinforce a sense of collective political responsibility is the third key finding of this chapter. Fourthly, as the political rivalries evolved into open civic warfare, *patria* appears to have become an area of contention for the factions involved, being utilised to legitimise their respective causes by illustrating and emphasising their intention to preserve the public welfare of Rome. Fifthly, through the discussion that revolved around these various themes it became clear that *patria* was not in itself a political concept. Rather, it shared with the Roman political system an interdependence. On the one hand, the security and prosperity of *patria* was presented as being dependent upon the smooth functioning of the *res publica*. On the other hand, the *res publica* was dependent upon the concept of *patria* in order to maintain its sense of collective purpose and ultimately its survival. Finally, the use of both Rome and Italy to define *patria* within Cicero's writings reinforce the notion that there was a lack of consensus regarding its territorial associations. There still remains much potential here to consider further the political function of *patria* during this time and it is hoped that this preliminary case study of *patria* in Ciceronian literature will inspire such endeavours going forward.

Chapter Three: The Cultural (Re)Definition of *Patria* in the Augustan Period

Introduction

The Augustan period marks another peak in the Latin literary occurrences of *patria*. Whilst this peak is not as great as that of the Ciceronian occurrences considered in the previous chapter, it is still significant. Virgil's *Aeneid* and Livy's *Ab Urbe Condita* provide us with the two greatest literary concentrations of the concept during this period, with both texts placing *patria* prominently within their respective narratives. The concept is one of the most important 'characters' of the *Aeneid*, providing the narrative with its thematic core and directing the actions of the core protagonists. In *Ab Urbe Condita*, *patria* frequently sits at the heart of Livy's message regarding the correct moral conduct of Roman men and women. The concept enables Livy to refocus the minds of his contemporary readership, stressing the themes of unity and collectivity inherent in the *pax Augusta* over the individualism and division of the years that preceded it.

The use of *patria* in these texts indicates that the Augustan period was witness to a dynamic discussion as to the cultural significance of the concept, both in terms of its definition and in terms of its role in Roman cultural life. Considering that these texts were

composed in living memory of civil war, it is unsurprising that the *Aeneid* and *Ab Urbe Condita* use *patria* to emphasise unity.²⁷⁴ Yet the approaches of Livy and Virgil to this shared aim are widely different. In Livy, unity is stressed through the depiction of *patria* as a common or shared focus, a reiteration of the widely used theme of *patria* as the primary object of collective service and obligation. In Virgil, unity is stressed through the redefinition of *patria's* territorial and cultural relevance as embodying a unified Italy, an aspect that complements the many previous arguments regarding the *Italianità* of Virgil's *Aeneid*.²⁷⁵ In essence, Livy can be seen to take up a more traditional or conservative position in relation to *patria*, whilst Virgil can be seen to be more innovative. Both of these differing approaches indicate the presence of three important factors. These factors are communication, collective memory and the dependence of concepts of cultural identity on the machinations of prominent cultural individuals.

Let me consider the first factor: communication. In order for a concept and its defining themes to be successfully disseminated to an audience, effective modes of communication are required.²⁷⁶ Modes of communication are themselves dependent upon the technology

²⁷⁴ Cf. Connolly (2009), 192, who states “the never-ending threats to Roman unity that punctuate Livy’s history, which signal his concern with the fragility of the Roman collective – not just its vulnerability to external attack by the Samnites or the Gauls, but the precarious balance of competing interests of the rich and the poor – mean that at the core of his text is a triumphal narrative affirming the values of collective identity.”

²⁷⁵ See Syme (1939), 465-466; Bonjour (1975a), 475; Toll (1991 and 1997); Ando (2002); and Pogorzelski (2007), 99-138.

²⁷⁶ One theoretical school of thought that stresses the importance of communication with regard to concepts of collective identity is Ethnosymbolism, a school of thought pioneered by Smith, A.D. (1986 [1993]). In particular, Ethnosymbolism emphasises the importance of a collective historical memory.

available at a given time and the extent of the intended audience. Benedict Anderson, for example, rightly argues that the modern day concept of the nation was entirely dependent upon forms of 'mass' communication, such as the mass press, for the communication of its core themes.²⁷⁷ These mass forms of communication enabled a nationalist agenda to be perceived or imagined by the majority of a given society in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries and thus transformed nationalism from a preserve of the ruling and middle classes to a fully populist movement. In the case of *patria* in the Roman world, the most effective extant forms of communication available to promote messages regarding collective identity were literature and inscriptions. However, neither literature nor inscriptions can be classified as 'mass' modes of communication, and hence we must be cautious as to the extent of their impact upon Roman society. There remains a great level of uncertainty as to the degree of literacy in the Roman world, and the tendency to present oral performances of works should not be taken as meaning such performances were intended to be or indeed were accessed by all sectors of society.²⁷⁸ As Habinek is right to indicate: "Many of the characteristics of Latin literature can be attributed to its production by and for an elite that sought to maintain and expand its dominance over other sectors of the

²⁷⁷ Anderson (1983 [2006]), 24-37 and 39ff.

²⁷⁸ On the question of literacy in the ancient world see Harris (1989), 3-42; Bowman and Woolf (1994), 1-16; Woolf (1994); Bowman (1994); Habinek (1998), 3-14; and Di Renzo (2000).

population through reference to an authorizing past”.²⁷⁹ Thus, whilst literature and inscriptions can be regarded as effective modes of communication for ideas associated with concepts, it is ultimately only via a consideration of the limitations of audience that the true nature and aims of *patria*'s conceptualisation can be understood.

The second factor that is important in the consideration of the *Aeneid* and *Ab Urbe Condita* in terms of their respective presentations of *patria* is that of memory. The dissemination of a specific idea relating to an important cultural concept is entirely dependent upon the effectiveness of the mode of communication employed to stir emotions, and to connect a concept and its defining themes to the past experiences of its audience.²⁸⁰ Ethnosymbolism and scholarship that comprises what can be termed Collective Memory Studies indicate the potency of memory with regards to the cultural presentation of concepts of identity.²⁸¹

²⁷⁹ Habinek (1998), 3.

²⁸⁰ Over the last two decades there has been a rapidly growing interest in examining memory within the context of the ancient world, both individual and collective, and particularly within the field of literature. See Bettini (1997); Mackay (2008); Hardie (2013); Kirichenko (2013); and Seider (2013).

²⁸¹ Ethnosymbolism's utility with regard to antiquity is illustrated by a) Ethnosymbolism itself since Smith, A.D. (1986 [1993]) argues that the cultural apparatus employed to create and develop the modern-day concept of the nation is inherited from the pre-modern 'ethnic' past, what we would term antiquity, and b) by Garman (2007), a short pioneering application of the theory to examine the development of collective identity in antiquity with a focus on Greece. The umbrella term Collective Memory Studies refers to all scholarship that has to one extent or another examined the notion of Collective Memory, a term coined by Maurice Halbwachs in the 1920s. For a collation of scholarship on the topic of Collective Memory see Olick, Vinitzky-Seroussi & Levy (2011). Although Collective Memory has become the standard term to refer to communal modes of remembering or commemoration, other terms have been employed to describe the same process. These include 'Bodily Memory' (Young, A. (1996)), 'Cultural Memory' (Assmann, J. (1992 and 2011); and Berliner (2005)), 'Historical Consciousness' (Seixas (2004)), 'Historical Memory' (Pennebraker & Gonzales (2009)), 'Public Memory' (Bodnar (1992)) and 'Social Memory' (Burke (1989); and Connerton (1989)).

Ethnosymbolism argues that units of collective identity are the products of a deliberate process of creation, re-creation and manipulation of a group's collective historical memory via mythological epic and history.²⁸² Anthony D. Smith uses the phrase 'collective historical memory' to signify the presented accumulation of events and experiences of any given group that has occurred over time. It is neither set in stone nor is it free from subjectivity. Rather, its form is entirely dependent upon the decisions made by individual writers as they react to changes in political, cultural or social contexts. Such a deliberate change to a group's collective historical memory is required in order to provide a source of legitimacy for contemporary political, cultural and social change, and/or to control the pace of change being experienced. Within this process of change, mythological epic and history have specific roles. Mythological epic, Anthony D. Smith argues, is employed when changes to the origins of a group are required. It thus acts as a narrative of beginnings, providing a collective group with a clear if not necessarily permanent sense of ancestral pedigree.²⁸³ This is the case with regard to Virgil's *Aeneid*, since one of the central themes of the epic poem is the Italian origins of the Roman race. Historical texts, on the other hand, are employed when it is necessary to alter which events or experiences are to be remembered by the membership of a collective group.²⁸⁴ History and myth,

²⁸² Smith, A.D. (1986 [1993]), 24-26; and Smith, A.D. (1999), 61-62.

²⁸³ Smith, A.D. (1991), 14ff.

²⁸⁴ On the deliberate forgetting of facts relating to Collective Memory see Assmann, A. (2008).

therefore, function as narratives of development, charting the ways in which the collective character of the group has developed over time, a function which can, as in the case of the *Aeneid*, have a decisive impact on how this collective character should be defined.²⁸⁵

Collective Memory Studies examine the deliberate and conscious storage, remembrance and commemoration of a specific set of communal events and experiences. Collective Memory enables a group to develop a distinct sense of communal beginning and the notion that its members belong to a continuous linear narrative. This process can have the effect of uniting psychologically generations past, present and future.²⁸⁶ Collective Memory thus establishes the belief that any given group is a community of fate that shares a common mission and pre-ordained destiny.²⁸⁷ This theme is particularly evident in Virgil's *Aeneid* where great emphasis is placed upon a pan-Italian involvement in the creation of Rome. To all intents and purposes, Collective Memory functions as the blueprint for a group's internally created image and provides the means by which to begin to establish this image psychologically and potentially to maintain it into the future.²⁸⁸

²⁸⁵ Smith, A.D. (1986 [1993]), 25-26. Cf. Anderson (1983 [1991]).

²⁸⁶ See Halbwachs (1925 and 1950); Assmann, J. (2011); Zerubavel (1995), 237-8; and Nora (1978, 1984a and 1984b).

²⁸⁷ See Lambert, Scherer, Rodgers & Jacoby (2009).

²⁸⁸ Assmann, J. and Czaplicka, J. (1995), 126: "According to Nietzsche, while in the world of animals genetic patterns guarantee the survival of the species, humans must find a means by which to maintain their nature consistently through the generations. The solution to this problem is offered by cultural memory, a collective concept for all knowledge that directs behaviour and experience in the interactive framework of a society and one that obtains through generations in repeated societal practice and innovation."

Since such memories are not biologically transmitted, their survival is reliant on cultural mnemotechnics.²⁸⁹ This process is controlled and directed by individuals or small sub-groups, which is the third factor that is evident from an analysis of the *Aeneid* and *Ab Urbe Condita*. The conceptualisation of concepts of collective identity such as *patria* is a deliberate process. It is based on the conscious decision-making of influential cultural individuals, and is often directed by the specific aims or intentions of these individuals. At the heart of this deliberate process lies communally orientated literature, including mythology, epic, history, geography, religious texts and to a lesser degree philosophy.²⁹⁰ As in the case of Ethnosymbolism, Collective Memory Studies stress the function of literature as a medium by which to communicate and chart the origins and historical development of the group. The use of literature also reinforces the dependence of Collective Memory upon the cognitive abilities of individuals and shifts in political, cultural and social currents.

Cultural Memory Studies, however, go further and highlight specific literary strategies that affect the development of culturally orientated concepts of identity such as *patria*. Two such strategies employed in the writing of history are particularly worthy of note within the context of this study as they are both identifiable in Livy.

²⁸⁹ Assmann, J. (2011), 72.

²⁹⁰ Leroi-Gourhan (1993), 258-265. Other modes of storage and expression that are central to cultural mnemotechnics but which are not relevant for the purposes of this chapter are ritual (see Assmann, J (2011), 70ff; Leroi-Gourhan (1993), 258-265; and Goody (1998)) and monuments and topography (see Koselleck (2002), 285-326; and Young, J.E. (2002), 90-96).

The first is history's conscious composition as a means by which to educate. Through the use of specific examples, history is able to provide an account of an event or deed that is easy for the audience to remember. This event consequently acts as a template for the audience as to what are to be considered the accepted and expected communal values and characteristics. Education by example is a feature that is particularly identifiable in Roman culture, and most notably in Livy's history. The cultural use of *exempla* was widespread, particularly within the higher echelons of society.²⁹¹ In Latin history, the use of *exempla* is especially noticeable in Livy's *Ab Urbe*. Here it is employed, amongst other things, to cement within the minds of his audience the values and characteristics that are associated with *patria*.²⁹² By using such examples, Livy's history functioned to create unifying memories for its audience, central to which were values, characteristics and notions regarding Roman collective identity.

The second strategy employed in the writing of history is the recollection of moments of collective trauma. Collective trauma refers to moments of seismic change within a community that are experienced by multiple individuals. These include natural disasters, war and political and social upheaval.²⁹³ Since collective trauma often has a powerful psychological impact upon the minds of both contemporary generations and future generations, it is fundamental in the creation and development of ideas or concepts of collective

²⁹¹ See van der Blom (2010); and Urban (2011).

²⁹² For a detailed analysis of Livy's use of *exempla* see Chaplin (2000 and 2014).

²⁹³ Neal (2005), 3-7.

identity.²⁹⁴ The salience of collective trauma in the development of collective identity is a feature that is also discernable in Livy. Livy uses the theme of collective trauma to create powerful memories for his audience upon which he then attaches the defining themes and characteristics associated with *patria*. Thus, through the theme of trauma, Livy's history takes pre-existing memories and utilises their enduring psychological impact to advance its specific cultural and political message of Roman unity in the face of adversity.

This chapter thus looks at the utility and development of *patria* in Virgil's *Aeneid* and Livy's *Ab Urbe Condita* through the lens of collective memory. This investigation enables me to consider the degree to which ideas of *patria* were discussed during a watershed moment in Roman history. In section 3.1, I discuss the use of *patria* in *Ab Urbe Condita* to consider the role of history in this process. In the first instance, I examine the relationship between *patria* and *exempla* (3.1.i), and in the second that between *patria* and moments of collective trauma (3.1.ii). In section 3.2, my discussion is centred on how Virgil's *Aeneid* functions as a vehicle of deliberate redefinition of *patria*'s territoriality as Italy. I do so by considering two distinct yet related themes: 'death' (3.2.i) and 'rebirth' (3.2.ii).

²⁹⁴ Neal (2005), 21.

3.1. *Ab Urbe Condita*: Exploring the Significance of *Patria* through Moral Memories

What is now termed Collective Memory was an important feature of

Livy's *Ab Urbe Condita*. As Livy states in the preface to his work:

*ad illa mihi pro se quisque acriter intendat animum, quae vita, qui mores fuerint, per quos viros quibusque artibus domi militiaeque et partum et auctum imperium sit; labente deinde paulatim disciplina velut desidentis primo mores sequatur animo, deinde ut magis magisque lapsi sint, tum ire coeperint praecipites, donec ad haec tempora quibus nec vitia nostra nec remedia pati possumus perventum est. Hoc illud est praecipue in cognitione rerum salubre ac frugiferum, omnis te exempli documenta in inlustri posita monumento intueri; inde tibi tuaeque rei publicae quod imitere capias, inde foedum inceptu, foedum exitu, quod vites.*²⁹⁵

Livy hopes that through reading his history an audience will undergo a psychological journey. He states that he wishes his audience to identify the central themes of the work, store them in their minds and mentally follow their progression over time. This process is made possible owing to history's ability and nature to function as a memorial, which allows individuals to identify moments of past civic morality that will then inspire them towards emulation.²⁹⁶ Yet, although this process of discovery and emulation is the domain of the individual the memories that they are asked to form are entirely collective, since they

²⁹⁵ Liv. 1.pr.9-10: "With me every reader should focus their mind strongly on these things: what life and morals were like; through what men and by what skills at home and in warfare *imperium* was acquired and enlarged; thereafter, how gradually, with slipping discipline, first morals followed by the mind settled down, so to speak, then sank lower and lower, then began to go headlong, until it reached these times in which we can endure neither our vices nor their remedies. Give attention to the lessons of all the *exempla* placed in a distinguished memorial; from these you may seize what to imitate for you and for your *res publica*, from these what you may avoid that is disgraceful to begin, and that is a disgraceful result. It is this that makes history especially wholesome and fruitful."

²⁹⁶ On the theme of morality in Livy see Walsh (1961 [1963]), 46-109; Ogilvie (1965); Solodow (1979), 251; Kraus and Woodman (1997), 55; and Forsythe (1999), 65-73.

are concerned with the development of Rome and the collective journey of its people through time.²⁹⁷

Adding further emphasis to the collective nature of Livy's history is the prominence of the term *patria* throughout the text, occurring two hundred and thirty-seven times, and referring for the most part to Rome.²⁹⁸ The high occurrence of *patria* throughout the narrative indicates its importance with regard to Livy's thematic messages and that it was itself a key subject of discussion and exploration at the time of the text's composition. *Ab Urbe Condita's* highly moral agenda provides the context for exploring the development of and emphasis on the concept's defining characteristics of devotion, duty and loyalty. In the first sub-section, discussion considers the occurrence and function of the concept and these defining characteristics in the context of Livy's historical moral

²⁹⁷ Liv. 1.pr.1-3.

²⁹⁸ Book 1: 1.8, 7.10, 9.15, 24.2, 25.1, 25.4, 26.5, 31.3, 32.7, 32.10, 34.5, 34.7, 35.5, 39.6, 47.4, 48.9. Book 2: 5.7, 6.3, 6.7, 7.8 (two occurrences), 12.14, 19.10, 24.5, 28.7, 35.6, 40.8, 40.9, 49.8. Book 3: 15.9, 19.9, 50.16, 54.8, 58.1, 66.4, 67.10, 69.5. Book 4: 2.13, 3.3, 9.10, 15.3, 45.8, 60.1. Book 5: 4.9, 6.15, 7.12, 15.10, 16.11, 19.2, 24.10, 24.11 (two occurrences), 30.2, 30.3, 30.5, 39.13, 41.3, 42.4, 42.5, 44.2, 46.5, 49.3 (two occurrences), 49.7 (two occurrences), 49.8, 51.2 (three occurrences), 51.10, 53.5, 54.2 (two occurrences), 54.3. Book 6: 7.4, 11.4, 14.8, 17.5, 17.7, 28.9. Book 7: 1.9, 1.10, 10.4, 13.5, 32.13, 38.5, 40.2, 40.3 (two occurrences), 40.6, 40.9, 40.14. Book 8: 5.6, 7.15, 10.4, 11.1, 12.5, 19.11 (two occurrences), 25.11. Book 9: 4.10, 4.11, 4.14 (two occurrences), 4.15, 5.9, 7.10, 34.3, 38.12. Book 21: 8.8, 41.8, 41.13, 44.2, 53.4. Book 22: 3.10, 9.6, 39.13, 59.11, 59.12, 59.18, 60.13, 60.14, 60.15 (two occurrences), 60.18, 60.19, 60.27. Book 23: 5.10, 9.11, 9.10, 9.12, 15.7, 29.7 (two occurrences), 31.11, 49.3. Book 24: 21.10, 22.15, 22.16, 24.3, 25.5, 26.6, 26.7, 32.4, 32.5, 33.6. Book 25: 1.8, 6.17, 18.10, 30.3, 38.4. Book 26: 1.9, 8.8, 9.6, 12.9, 13.15, 14.4, 15.14, 25.14, 29.3, 32.4 (two occurrences), 38.11, 50.2. Book 27: 9.3, 9.5, 9.12, 34.14 (two occurrences). Book 28: 27.4, 27.12, 27.13, 28.8, 28.15 (two occurrences), 29.1, 29.2, 32.7, 39.8, 39.11, 42.11, 42.16, 43.19. Book 29: 1.24, 6.7, 23.10, 34.2. Book 30: 7.6, 7.9, 12.6, 15.6, 19.4, 20.7, 30.10, 30.17, 32.10, 33.11, 38.9. Book 31: 45.8. Book 32: 22.10, 22.11, 23.5. Book 33: 48.3, 49.5. Book 34: 26.13, 31.19 (two occurrences), 48.6, 60.2. Book 35: 17.6 (two occurrences), 19.4 (two occurrences), 34.7, 38.2, 42.12. Book 37: 10.3, 10.4, 10.6. Book 38: 53.9, 53.11. Book 39: 16.10, 27.10, 35.8, 36.15, 37.4, 51.2, 52.8. Book 40: 8.13, 39.9. Book 41: 25.3. Book 43: 7.7. Book 44: 39.5. Book 45: 26.7, 26.8 (two occurrences).

exempla. Whilst the usage of *exempla* in Livy has been the subject of detailed scholarship particularly by Chaplin, the relationship between *exempla* and *patria* remains, fundamentally, underexplored.²⁹⁹ Four well-known *exempla* are considered in detail: that of the Horatii from Book One, and those of Brutus, Veturia and the Fabii from Book Two. In the second sub-section, discussion focuses upon Livy's utilisation of the psychological power that is inherent in a moment of collective trauma to affect aspects relating to *patria* as a concept of collective identity by examining Livy's account of the Gallic sack of Rome (5.39-54). These case studies from books 1-5 are intended to be a comprehensive introduction to the theme of *patria* in Livy. They are not the only examples, and I have provided references to other occurrences of *patria* in relation to the themes of *exempla* and trauma from the text in the footnotes as and where necessary.

3.1.i: *Patria and Exempla*

The earliest *exemplum* in Livy that relates directly to *patria* is the duel between the Horatii and the Curatii (1.24-26) that decides the war between Rome and Alba.³⁰⁰ Livy uses this example to illustrate early in the narrative the dependency of the collective on the individual, and in turn the selfless devotion that a Roman should possess for the *patria*.

²⁹⁹ See note 295. The only discussion of *patria* in Livy is Feldherr (1998), 112-154.

³⁰⁰ For previous discussions of the Horatii *exemplum* see Ogilvie (1965) 107-117 and Solodow (1979). These discussions overlook the role of *patria* within the narrative. Solodow, 254, does at least recognise the collective message of Livy's passage. In contrast see Feldherr (1998), 123-143 who does engage with *patria* in relation to this episode.

Both of these themes are foregrounded in the beginning of the episode (1.24.2):

*Forte in duobus tum exercitibus erant trigemini fratres nec aetate nec viribus dispares. [...] Cum trigeminis agunt reges, ut pro sua quisque patria dimicent ferro: ibi imperium fore unde victoria fuerit. Nihil recusatur; tempus et locus convenit.*³⁰¹

The passage stresses that, despite the personal dimension of the duel, the incentive for the triplets to take up arms in this case is not the quest for personal glory or the defence of personal honour. Rather, they are motivated by the glory and supremacy that their respective *patriae* stand to gain should they be victorious. However, the passage makes it clear that such selflessness must not and should not be taken for granted. The verb *agere* indicates the effort that the kings have had to expend to ensure that their chosen champions willingly undertake the task allotted to them. Service to *patria* is not guaranteed, and it is probable that such a message is an indicator of the influence that years of civil war have had upon Livy. Despite the uncertainty, the Horatii and Curatii selflessly agree to shoulder the destiny of their *patriae* as individuals, knowing that it is only by attaining victory on behalf of their *patria* that they may in turn acquire personal fame.

The dependence of *patria* on the actions of the individual is a theme that extends into the next chapter of the episode (1.25.1):

³⁰¹ “By chance, in the two armies at the time were triplet brothers neither unequal in age or strength. [...] The kings deliberated with the triplets that they would each fight with swords for their *patria: imperium* thereafter being for whoever would be victorious. There was no objection. A time and place was agreed.”

*Foedere icto trigemini, sicut convenerat, arma capiunt. Cum sui utrosque adhortarentur, deos patrios, patriam ac parentes, quicquid civium domi, quicquid in exercitu sit, illorum tunc arma, illorum intueri manus, feroces et suoapte ingenio et pleni adhortantium vocibus in medium inter duas acies procedunt.*³⁰²

The behaviour of the internal audience, that is the spectating armies, further emphasises the voluntary nature of the selfless actions of the triplets.³⁰³ It would seem as though the triplets appear to have good unconditional reasons for taking up arms: the defence of their ancestral gods, their families, their fellow countrymen and their *patria*. Yet, the image of *patria* being transfixed by the sight of the weapons in the hands of the six youths, and the fact that the respective armies vocally remind the combatants of what is at stake reiterate to the external audience how individual service cannot be taken for granted. The opposing armies, along with *patria*, *di patrii* and families, thus psychologically reinforce the seriousness of the outcome of the impending bout. The six combatants are not simply risking their own lives, but also the very existence of the collective to which they belong (1.25.3-4):

Datur signum infestisque armis velut acies terni iuvenes magnorum exercituum animos gerentes concurrunt. Nec his

³⁰² “With the treaty struck, the triplets took up arms, as agreed. With those on either side encouraging them, with their *di patrii*, their *patria* and *parentes*, with their citizens, whether being at home or in the army, wondering at their weapons at that time in their hands, with ferocity and with their natural character and filled with the encouraging voices they advanced into the middle between the two lines.” See also Liv. 9.4.10-15.

³⁰³ From this point onwards I use the phrase ‘internal audience’ to indicate an audience set within the narrative and ‘external audience’ to indicate those either reading or listening to the narrative. Feldherr (1998), 123-133 is a valuable discussion on the function of the audience in the narrative of the Horatii/Curatii bout, arguing that they emphasise the division of two closely linked communities.

*nec illis periculum suum, publicum imperium servitiumque
obversatur animo futuraque ea deinde patriae fortuna quam
ipsi fecissent.*³⁰⁴

It is also important to note that in 1.25.1 *patria* is present in the accusative singular case, and not accusative plural. Indeed, *patria* in its singular form occurs throughout the narrative of this anecdote. This observation raises the question as to what *patria* refers. Is the singular presentation of *patria* intended to encourage the audience to focus on the individual patriotic concerns of the six combatants? Or is Livy, as Feldherr believes, using *patria* to focus on Alba as the single, communal native *patria* of both sides?³⁰⁵ Alternatively, since Livy's history is an account of Rome, it could also be argued that *patria* refers to Rome as the communal *patria* of the parties involved, especially since Alba and the other Latin peoples are eventually absorbed into the Roman community. Whatever the truth regarding Livy's definition of *patria* in this anecdote, its dependence upon individual action and the lack of certainty regarding this is undisputable.

If there were any doubt in the minds of the external audience regarding the prominence of *patria* over the individual, this is removed by Livy via a tragic climax to the anecdote (1.26.2-5) with the murder

³⁰⁴ "The signal being given, the six youths ran forward, just as a battle line, bearing the spirit of the great armies and with drawn weapons. They heeded the danger to themselves neither from this side nor from that side, but they paid attention to the *imperium* or servitude of the state and how from then onwards, and by their future courage, they themselves would fashion the destiny for the *patria*." Cf. Feldherr (1998), 127, who interprets the patriotic actions of the Horatii as being increasingly isolating.

³⁰⁵ Feldherr (1998), 124. Konstan (1986), 210, sees in the character of the surviving Horatius a visual representation of the unity between Rome and Alba.

of Horatia.³⁰⁶ This tragedy deliberately contrasts the themes of public and private interest in order to stress the importance of collective unity.³⁰⁷ Unlike her brothers, Horatia is characterised as having failed to put her personal cares aside and thus devote herself to her *patria*. In direct contrast to the public celebrations going on around her, Horatia openly mourns for her betrothed. The surviving Horatius takes this nonconformity on the part of his sister as an affront to the *patria* he has sacrificed so much to serve. Not only does it bring into question her loyalties to *patria*, but also her loyalties to her family.³⁰⁸ The insult that Horatius feels simultaneously towards himself, his brothers and *patria* provides a concluding illustration of the interdependence between individual and collective. The personal victory that Horatius has attained is a public celebration. His actions have delivered the Roman *patria* from the risk of submission to another, actions that have resulted in the attainment of personal glory. Indeed, Horatius' disgust at his sister's grief is as much owing to the fact that she does not recognise the exemplary service of her brothers as to the fact that she disregards *patria*. Livy's message with this event is clear. Both the internal and external audience must learn the lessons that arise from her tragic death. As Horatius himself states: *Sic eat quaecumque Romana lugebit hostem.*³⁰⁹ This last line is directed at the female members of both the internal and external audiences. Horatius' words

³⁰⁶ On this tragic episode see Watson (1979).

³⁰⁷ See Jaeger (1997), 59 note 6.

³⁰⁸ See Welch (2012), 188.

³⁰⁹ "Thus let it come to pass for any woman who will lament an enemy."

urge them to remember, an exhortation that is visually reinforced by the violence that immediately follows it. Although primarily addressed to Roman women this statement would have been just as relevant to the male members of Roman society: put your *patria* first or be willing to accept the consequences.³¹⁰

The tale of the Horatii is, therefore, an apt *exemplum* by which to showcase the notion that *patria*'s security is dependent upon the selfless, voluntary devotion of individuals. Yet, how does this *exemplum* ensure that these themes associated with *patria* are remembered by Livy's external audience? Whilst the tale is heroic in nature and thus will inspire some of the external audience to retain its messages, Livy directly connects it to physical objects both within and outside the city to ensure as great a mental retention as possible.³¹¹ In the first instance, Livy draws attention to the memorials that were erected for the combatants outside Rome following the conclusion of the duel.³¹² Then concluding the final, violent episode of the *exemplum* he indicates the memorials that exist within the city to the death of Horatia and the subsequent punishment of her brother.³¹³ These contemporary extant memorials function to connect the historical narrative of the past to the urban environment of the

³¹⁰ The tension between personal and collective is recognised by Feldherr (1998), 132-143. See also Solodow (1979), 260, who places emphasis on audience participation in order for the moral messages contained within the narrative to be understood. See Liv. 8.12.5 for a further example of the theme of private interest with regard to *patria*.

³¹¹ Cf. Chaplin (2000), 4, states that there is no guarantee that the audience, both internal and external, will learn from the *exempla* presented in Livy's history and if they do, multiple interpretations are possible.

³¹² Liv. 1.25.13-14

³¹³ Liv. 1.26.13-14.

present.³¹⁴ Indeed, Ogilvie states that the episode is entirely reliant on these monuments since it is these that gave rise to the story in the first place.³¹⁵ Livy's strategy imbues the *exemplum* of the Horatii with a sense of contemporary relevance, or, from Ogilvie's perspective, gives contemporary monuments an historical relevance. The contemporary relevance is stressed by the fact that the beam under which Horatius passed has been periodically restored up to and during Livy's day. From Livy's perspective these memorials provide physical visual points of recollection with regard to some of the defining qualities associated with *patria*. Each time a member of the audience is faced with any of these memorials they will recall the story and the associated conceptualisation of *patria*. Interestingly, the presentation of the Sister's beam and that of Horatia's tomb are strikingly different. Whereas Livy goes to great lengths to stress the collective importance of the Sister's beam and to ensure that his contemporary audience can locate it, details of Horatia's tomb are relatively obscure. This, I believe, is deliberate since it stresses Horatia as the antithesis of what is expected of a Roman, an individual selflessly devoted to *patria*.³¹⁶ These memorials, therefore, act as the mortar Livy requires to ensure that the image of *patria* as a concept which is reliant on the selfless

³¹⁴ See Jaeger (2014). For a discussion of the etiology behind the connection between the anecdote and extant contemporary memorials in Rome see Fox (2014), 292-293.

³¹⁵ Ogilvie (1965), 117. See also Solodow (1979), 261-262.

³¹⁶ Welch (2012), 188: "Her tomb, placed at Rome's gate, is a *monumentum* to her position between communities."

devotion of its members is psychologically cemented in the minds of his external audience.

The themes seen in the *exemplum* of the Horatii are echoed in that of the Fabii at 2.49.1-8.³¹⁷ Once again, Livy emphasises a degree of interdependence between individual and collective, or to put it another way between private and public. As in the previous *exemplum* a small group willingly elects to shoulder the burdens of the collective at the expense of personal concerns. From the perspective of the internal audience, however, the lines between private and public in this case are more definitively blurred. The decision of the Fabii to undertake the war against Veii alone on behalf of the Roman state results in its transformation from a public to a private enterprise (2.49.1: *familiam unam subisse civitatis onus, Veiens bellum in privatam curam, in privata arma versum*). This blurring of private and public with regards to *patria* enables Livy to illustrate further the argument that small groups can make a big difference if they are motivated to serve the interests of the collective rather than their personal concerns.

The interest on the part of the internal audience in the actions and fate of the Fabii illustrates their status as an *exemplum* for the rest of Roman society. According to the spectators that watch the departure of the Fabii for war, no previous army of Rome matches them in terms of distinction or respect (2.49.3: *Nunquam exercitus*

³¹⁷ On the question of the historical or mythological nature of this anecdote see Holleman (1976); and Pais (2014).

neque minor numero neque clarior fama et admiratione hominum per urbem incessit). The simple willingness of the Fabii to undertake the mission is enough to merit the status of being an example for their political contemporaries. It is surmised that if two additional Roman clans (*gentes*) took up the same mantel then Rome's external threats would be removed, a statement that appears to indicate the supremacy of *patria* over *gens* in the hierarchy of concepts of collective identity.³¹⁸ It could be argued, however, that such thoughts indicate the negative effects of *exempla* like that of the Fabii. This because the internal audience do not think about ways in which they as individuals can emulate the Fabii, but how other powerful Roman families could.³¹⁹ Yet, as Livy's narrative reveals, the citizens of Rome cannot relax entirely, and it is this that negates such an argument. Following the Fabii out of the city the accompanying Romans are wracked with emotions. These emotions, however, are as equally collective as they are personal, centring on the possible outcomes of the mission (2.49.5: *Sequebatur turba, propria alia cognatorum sodaliumque, nihil medium, nec spem nec curam, sed immensa omnia volventium animo, alia publica sollicitudine excitata, favore et admiratione stupens*).³²⁰ The concern of the internal audience,

³¹⁸ On the subject of the Roman *gens* see Smith, C.J. (2006).

³¹⁹ O'Sullivan (2011), 75-76, argues that the procession through Rome of the Fabii is a nod to the republican tradition of the sharing of power by a small number of elite Roman families.

³²⁰ "They were followed by a crowd, partly of their own kinsmen and friends with minds caused to revolve around nothing ordinary, neither hope nor cares, but around all things immeasurable; partly summoned forth by anxiety for the state, stupefied by goodwill and admiration."

therefore, is with the fate of *patria*, and in turn with that of the Fabii, since it is implied that should the Fabian *gens* fail in their mission, then the *patria* itself will be placed in danger (2.49.7-8: *Praetereuntibus Capitolium arcemque et alia templa, quidquid deorum oculis, quidquid animo occurrit, precantur ut illud agmen faustum atque felix mittant, sospites brevi in patriam ad parentes restituant. In cassum missae preces*).³²¹

As the external audience knows all too well, the mission of the Fabii is not to succeed, a fact that is emphasised by the phrases *infelix via*, *in cassum missae preces*, and *opportunos visus locus*.³²² Becoming over-confident the Fabii are ambushed by the Veiians and are massacred.³²³ Only one remains to carry on the Fabian line, and more importantly becomes a living memorial to the deeds of his kin for the internal audience. His potential importance to *patria* is illustrated by the deeds of his *gens* and, as Livy states to the external audience, this surviving Fabius will be essential in the future successes of the Roman *patria*. The survival of this individual Fabius and the impact that he will have upon Rome imbues this anecdote with what today we would understand as the Dunkirk analogy, namely the transformation of a tale of defeat into a tale of victory. Whilst the living Fabius acts as a living memorial for his contemporaries, the Carmental gate acts as a

³²¹ "Passing by the Capitol and the citadel and the other temples, they beseech whichever of the gods meets their eyes, whichever come into their minds that they would despatch that urged on group lucky and fortunate, and that they would restore them unharmed to *patria* and *parentes*. O Prayers sent off in vain."

³²² All these phrases occur at Liv. 2.49.8. Levene (1993), 159-160.

³²³ Liv. 2.50.1-11.

physical memorial for the external audience of Livy's narrative. As in the case of the Horatii, this monument connects the events of Rome's past to the urban experience of Livy's external audience. Indeed, this anecdote could be interpreted as offering 'historical' justification for the gateway's reputation as a bad omen.³²⁴ Despite the aura of bad luck, the gate serves as a visual mnemonic device, triggering in the minds of Livy's external audience a recollection of the tale of the Fabii's selfless devotion to *patria*.

The theme of selflessness with regard to *patria* in Livy is not exclusive to military contexts. Within Livy's narrative such selflessness is equally salient with regard to *exempla* concerning Roman politics. A potent example of this is the punishment that Lucius Junius Brutus willingly exacts upon his sons following their involvement in an attempted coup against Rome's young republic (2.5.5-8). In order to preserve the political freedom that the security of *patria* relies upon, Brutus must put aside his cares as a father and focus on his role as the leading figure of Rome's political elite.³²⁵ This passage further emphasises the political dependence of *patria*, since the concept is the object of political liberation and thus the subject of Rome's political system in terms of its welfare (2.5.7: *anno patriam liberatam, patrem*

³²⁴ See Ogilvie (1965), 362-366 who argues that before Livy's account the ill fortune associated with the gateway was not connected to the actions of the Fabii; Coarelli (1996), 324-325; Madejski (2012), 81-82; and Östenberg (2014), 258. See also references to the Carmental Gate as a monument of bad omen in Ov. *Fast.* 2.201-204 and Serv. ad *Aen.* 8.337.

³²⁵ Liv. 2.5.5. Cf. Thomas (1984), 518.

liberatorem).³²⁶ The precedence of the collective in the case of the Brutii *exemplum* is compounded by the dynamic relationship between the loyalties and affections owing to both family and *patria*, a theme that was also strongly evident in the case of the Horatii and to a lesser extent that of the Fabii. In an episode that is reminiscent of the tragic murder of Horatia, the Brutii brothers focus their energies on a private enterprise – securing the position of a tyrannical individual – rather than engage in the collective enterprise of political freedom under the new *res publica*. It is interesting how these private actions render the internal audience sad rather than angry.³²⁷

The disrespect and lack of concern for the welfare of the collective on the part of the Brutii brothers is strengthened by their simultaneous disrespect for their father, the *pater familias*.³²⁸ It is he who, like the victorious Horatius, takes on himself the anger caused by the affront to family loyalty and the lack of devotion owing to *patria* in his role as the concept's political liberator. Thus, through the eyes of Brutus we see the crimes of his sons as a double-edged, personal attack as well as an affront to collective solidarity: they transgress the authority of Brutus as *pater familias* and as *liberator patriae*. The effect of this on Brutus is stressed by the powerful imagery created by the final section of the passage. Focusing the attention of the internal and external audience on Brutus' face, Livy highlights the pain and sense of

³²⁶ Cf. Liv. 1.48.9.

³²⁷ Liv. 2.5.6.

³²⁸ Lushkov (2015), 59, highlights the interplay between *parens*, *pater* and *patria* in this passage, especially in the phrase *patriam liberatam, patres liberatorem*.

loss that Brutus experiences as he undertakes his dutiful action toward the collective (2.5.8: *cum inter omne tempus pater voltusque et os eius spectaculo esset eminente animo patrio inter publicae poenae ministerum*).³²⁹ As the audience we are forced by Livy once again to confront directly the sacrifices that individuals must make to ensure the security of the *patria*.

In the case of the Bruti, the concepts of familial loyalty and affection function as a framework upon which the concept of selfless devotion and loyalty to *patria* can be attached. Indeed, the failure of Brutus' sons to respect the duty that they owe towards their *pater familias* acts as a potent metaphor of service towards the *patria* as a 'national' family. The contemporary external audience would have thus reflected upon the devotion that they themselves owed to their respective *patres familias*, the supreme object of loyalty within the familial sphere. In so doing, they would have been reminded of the duty that they also owe their *patria*, the supreme concept of collective loyalty and which, as we saw in previous chapters, took precedence in terms of loyalty and devotion.³³⁰ Yet, Livy's message goes further than simply reillustrating the selfless devotion toward *patria* he believes is to be expected of Romans. In serving the *patria*, Livy implies that an

³²⁹ "While during the entire time the father and his face and appearance were a spectacle, with paternal feeling projected during the administration of public punishment." Ogilvie (1965), 246: "*emineo* is used only where an emotion or the like is conspicuous and the pendant ablative absolute characteristically conveys a detail of substance." On the subject of Brutus as a spectacle for the audience see Feldherr (1997), 155-156.

³³⁰ See the discussion of Cicero in Chapters One and Two and of Lucilius on *virtus* in Chapter Two.

individual must be willing to experience personal loss. Loss was also illustrated in the *exempla* of the Horatii (the death of two of the brothers and Horatia) and the Fabii (the entire clan bar one individual). It is this willingness not only to put one's personal concerns last but also to be willing to suffer personal loss that is the true mark of an individual who truly has the concerns of *patria*, the concerns of the collective at heart.

The themes associated with *patria* in the *exempla* that have been considered above are bolstered in the final example of this section. In the case that follows, namely Veturia's chastisement of her son (2.40.5-9), there is one significant difference. In the three *exempla* considered above the characters used to highlight actions worth emulating have been male. Horatia in the first example was the only woman to be placed under the spotlight by Livy and the historian did so in order to identify her as the antithesis of the selfless actions of her brothers. In the *exemplum* of Coriolanus and his mother Livy reverses these roles and the opposite is the case. With the Roman *patria* under threat from an army led by Coriolanus, the women of Rome urge his mother Veturia to take action against her son.³³¹ Advancing upon her son, Livy does not have Veturia hold back in a devastating verbal attack:

"Sine, priusquam complexum accipio, sciam," inquit, "ad hostem an ad filium venerim, captiva materne in castris tuis sim. In hoc me longa vita et infelix senecta traxit, ut exsulem te, deinde hostem viderem? Potuisti populari hanc terram,

³³¹ Liv. 2.40.1-3. See Bonjour (1975b) for a discussion of the relationship between women and *patria* in this episode.

quae te genuit atque aluit? Non tibi quamvis infesto animo et minaci perveneras, ingredienti fines ira cecidit? Non, cum in conspectu Roma fuit, succurrit 'Intra illa moenia domus ac penates mei sunt, mater coniunx liberique?' Ergo ego nisi peperissem, Roma non oppugnaretur; nisi filium haberem, libera in libera patria mortua essem. Sed ego nihil iam pati nec tibi turpius nec mihi miserius possum nec, ut sum miserima, diu futura sum: de his videris, quos, si pergis, aut immatura mors aut longa servitus manet".³³²

In order to appeal to Coriolanus' sense of collective duty, Veturia resorts to reminding him of the personal attachments he has to *patria*. Pulling on the emotional power of *patria*, Veturia stresses the impact of his actions. Coriolanus threatens his *patria* with war, the *patria* in which are situated his family and his home, in which he grew up, and in which lies the heart of his childhood memories. The familial nature of the collective is emphasised by the maternal attributes (*gignere* and *alere*) that are assigned to *terra* and which can be implied as being associated in turn to *patria*.³³³ Livy's familial presentation of *patria* in this passage is reminiscent of Cicero's presentation of the concept in *De Legibus* 2.3, and is arguably intended to encourage his external audience to reflect on their own emotional relationships to their *patria*

³³² "Permit me to understand, before I accept an embrace, whether I approach an enemy or a son, whether I am a mother to you or a captive in your camp. Have a long life and unhappy old age dragged me to this, that I would see you an exile and thereafter an enemy? Could you lay waste to this land, which begat and nourished you? However much with a hostile and threatening spirit you had arrived, did anger not fall away on entering the borders? When Rome was in sight, did it not come to mind "within these walls are my home and *penates*, mother, wife and children?" Therefore, if I had not given birth to you, Rome would not be besieged; if I had not had a son, I would have died free in a free *patria*. But now I can suffer nothing more dishonourable to you nor more wretched to me. As I am the most wretched woman, I am about to be for so long. Concerning these people you see: if you press on a premature death or a long time in servitude awaits them." Ogilvie (1965), 334, notices similarities between this speech and Greek tragedy. Parallels have also been drawn by Hallett (2004) and McAuley (2015), 324-327, between Veturia's speech and a letter written by Cornelia to the Gracchi preserved in Cornelius Nepos fr. 59 (Marshall).

³³³ Fantham, Foley, Kampen, Pomeroy and Shapiro (1995), 222. See also Hallett (2004), 34.

or *patria*.³³⁴ The emotional involvement of the external audience would have served to heighten the tension associated with this episode: will Coriolanus be forced by his emotional attachment to *patria* to turn back or will he, like the Brutii brothers, disregard both the tie of family and *patria*?

In her actions, Veturia is deliberately characterised as abandoning her concerns as an individual and focusing her energy, loyalty and affection upon the collective. In her case, she does so by forsaking her role as a mother. The hypothetical rejection or wishing away at 2.40.8 of her parental responsibility and the emotional attachment she has to her son emphasises the emotional prominence of *patria*. As in the case of Brutus, Veturia has been forced to choose between the deep feelings she has for her son and those to her *patria*. Livy thus reinforces the image that the two emotional realms of family and *patria* are not unconditionally compatible. Only when family members fulfil their duty to *patria* can there be no conflict of emotional loyalty. Rejection of service to *patria* symbolises in turn a rejection of familial bonds.

Ultimately Veturia's actions are successful. The sight of his mother, his wife and his children, coupled with the memories that Veturia stirred within him, forces Coriolanus to think again and to remove his forces from the walls of Rome (2.40.10-11):

³³⁴ On the alignment of family and *patria* in this anecdote see McAuley (2015), 325-326. See also Liv. 8.10.4 for another example of *patria* being brought to the memory of participants.

*Uxor deinde ac liberi amplexi, fletusque ab omni turba mulierum ortus et comploratio sui patriaeque fregere tandem virum. Complexus inde suos dimittit: ipse retro ab urbe castra movit. Abductis deinde legionibus ex agro Romano invidia rei oppressum perisse tradunt alii alio leto.*³³⁵

That the actions of Veturia should be collectively commemorated is stated at the end of the episode (2.40.12):

*Non inviderunt laude sua mulieribus viri Romani—adeo sine obtrectatione gloriae alienae vivebatur,—monumentoque quod esset, templum Fortunae muliebri aedificatum dedicatumque est.*³³⁶

Thus once again, Livy's deliberate use of a physical memorial connects the events from a moment of Rome's earliest history to the lives and experiences of his contemporary audience, in this case a female one.³³⁷ As in the cases of the Sister's Beam and the Carmental Gate, Livy intends the temple of Fortuna Muliebris to function as a mnemonic device, triggering in the minds of Livy's audience the tale of Veturia and the example that she sets.³³⁸

3.1.ii: Collective Trauma: 5.39-54

Exempla and their associated memorials, however, are not the only strategies that Livy employs to develop themes and characteristics that he associates with *patria*. Just as effective is the use of episodes of

³³⁵ "Thereafter, the embraces of wife and children, and the tears and loud wailing of the whole the crowd of women for themselves and for the *patria* in the end broke the man. Embracing he sent them away: he withdrew his camp from the city. Having then led away his legions from the arable land of Rome he passed away pressed down by ill-feeling of this act, a death which is described in various ways."

³³⁶ "The Roman men did not scorn from praise for their women – they used to live so much without the detraction of the glory belonging to another – since it was preserved by a memorial: the temple to *Fortuna Muliebris* was built and dedicated."

³³⁷ Forsythe (2006), 192, "the tale of Coriolanus concludes with a patriotic model of behaviour for Roman women." On the relationship between Livy's narrative of the Coriolanus episode and the temple of *Fortuna Muliebris* see Ogilvie (1965), 336.

³³⁸ McAuley (2015), 325. Forsythe (2006), 192, states that the Veturia-Coriolanus tale was used by Livy to explain the origins of the cult.

collective trauma. An episode of collective trauma is one that results in a moment of extreme stress for a community, and is thus particularly associated with disasters both natural and man-made.³³⁹ These events are vividly retained in the minds of those directly involved and have the potency to stir the emotions of generations yet to come.³⁴⁰ This cross-generational relevance has a binding effect. As Zertal states “a remembering collective that recollects and recounts itself through the unifying memory of catastrophes and suffering...binding its members together by instilling in them a common sense of common mission and destiny”.³⁴¹ Pennebaker and Gonzales argue that moments of collective trauma are particularly important for the development of both the collective and its accompanying concepts. They provide four categories by which moments of collective trauma are to be judged.³⁴² Firstly, it should have a significant effect upon the long-term history of the collective and how it is viewed. Secondly, it should influence what are termed as the people of a critical age in a community, namely those between the ages of 13-30. Thirdly, the community should possess an “active dialogue about the event”.³⁴³ Fourthly and finally, there should be an assumption that the traumatic event “reflects well upon the culture”³⁴⁴ of the community.

³³⁹ Pennebaker & Gonzales (2009), 175.

³⁴⁰ Pennebaker & Gonzales (2009), 172; Lambert, Scherer, Rogers & Jacoby (2009), 194-5.

³⁴¹ Zertal (2005), 2.

³⁴² Pennebaker & Gonzales (2009), 185.

³⁴³ Pennebaker & Gonzales (2009), 185.

³⁴⁴ Pennebaker & Gonzales (2009), 185.

A particularly apt example of an event of collective trauma, based on the criteria above of Pennebaker and Gonzales, which is fundamental in the development and presentation of *patria* in Livy's history is the Gallic sack of Rome in 390 BC (5.39-54).³⁴⁵ Presented as a moment of severe crisis for the Roman community, Livy explores the theme of *patria's* survival and what this survival in the face of trauma signifies both for the concept and the community it represents.³⁴⁶ The episode itself can be split into three phases: firstly, the immediate moment of crisis (5.39-43); secondly, what can be termed as a moment of containment (5.44-49); and thirdly, the moment of post-crisis as the Romans evaluate the significance of their success (5.50-54). By examining the role and image of *patria* via a consideration of these three phases, this discussion demonstrates how Livy uses this traumatic event in Rome's history to indicate the moment at which the Roman community and its concept of *patria* came of age.

In the first phase (the immediate moment of crisis) Livy explores the actions that can be taken to preserve a *patria* in crisis, and in doing so highlights the origins of the Roman 'national' character in the face of adversity. Two courses of action are described in Livy's narrative. Firstly, Livy returns to the previously considered theme of the

³⁴⁵ For an overall discussion of this significant episode in Livy's history see Ogilvie (1965), 721-730. On the structure of the narrative see Luce (1971). It has been generally agreed that this episode of Roman history left a lasting impression upon Rome both politically and militarily. See Bellen (1985); Forsythe (2006), 253; and Golden (2013), 13-22. In contrast see Rosenberger (2003). Two other examples of trauma in relation to *patria* within Livy's history are Liv. 7.40.2-14 and Liv. 22.60.13-27.

³⁴⁶ A discussion of Roman identity in relation to this episode and its various themes is provided by Oakley (2014), 235-241.

collective taking precedent over the individual. On first hearing news of the disaster at the Allia, the Romans, believing all have perished, enter into a moment of mourning for their loved ones. However, this private grief soon gives way to fear for the security of the collective (5.39.5):

*complorati omnes pariter vivi mortuique totam prope urbem
lamentis impleverunt. Privatos deinde luctus stupefecit
publicus pavor, postquam hostes adesse nuntiatum est.*³⁴⁷

This fear forces the Romans actively to seek out ways in which they can defend their *patria*. Central in this defence is the theme of selfless devotion to the cause of the collective. Realising that they cannot defend the full extent of the city nor save the remaining population in its entirety the Romans decide upon the preservation of the Capitol, containing the most important and symbolic collective buildings.³⁴⁸ Should Rome's youth be successful and repel the Gaul then the foundations remain in place upon which the Roman *patria* can be resurrected. It is this potential survival of Rome that makes the selfless sacrifice of Rome's more elderly members bearable.³⁴⁹ Livy's message is clear. There is no situation in which defence of the *patria* can be neglected and private grief should be and ultimately will be subsumed by the need to defend the collective. No matter how helpless the situation seems it remains the duty of all Romans to ensure the defence of their *patria*. In some ways this message must be read with a

³⁴⁷ "Lamenting all equally, the living and the dead, they almost filled the whole city with weeping. Then, after the arrival of the enemy was announced, public fear made numb private grief."

³⁴⁸ Liv. 5.39.9-13.

³⁴⁹ Liv. 5.39.13.

degree of irony, seeing as the greatest threat that was faced by the *patria* in Livy's lifetime was that posed by Romans themselves. The emphasis placed by Livy on the decision to defend the Capitol in this section of the narrative also reinforces the link between *patria* and the urban territory of Rome.

The selfless example that is set by Rome's elders is particularly striking. Livy consciously portrays them as making no protest as to their fate. Instead they are shown as realising that by willingly sacrificing themselves they are rendering a service to Rome. Escorting Rome's youth to the Capitol, Rome's elders urge them to remember Rome's glorious past so as to inspire them to further greatness in the name of Rome. In essence, Rome's elders function as beacons of inspiration for service to *patria*, both for the internal as well as the external audience, and thus in their actions echo the overall goal of Livy's history to inspire present and future generations of Romans via memories of the past. The recollections of past greatness, however, do not remove the emotional trauma of the event. Despite the willingness of Rome's elders to lay down their lives, their plight is one worth pitying and the pain felt by both sides is clearly indicated, heightening the emotional impact of the narrative and its messages on the external audience.³⁵⁰

³⁵⁰ Liv. 5.40.2-4. The humanity surrounding the event is stressed further by the fact that those defending the Capitol cannot bring themselves to turn away those that have snuck in with them, despite the degree to which this would aid their future defence. Liv. 5.40.4: *Magna pars tamen earum in arcem suos persecutae sunt nec prohibente ullo nec vocante, quia quod utile obsessis ad minuendam imbellem multitudinem id parum humanum erat.* ("The great part of them followed their sons

The image of Rome's elders as a sacrifice for the greater safety of Rome presents them in a quasi-religious light. This is especially highlighted at 5.41.3 where Livy states that other Roman writers recall the role of Marcus Folius, the Pontifex Maximus, as directing their oath of service to the collective: *Sunt qui M. Folio pontifice maximo praefante carmen devovisse eos se pro patria Quiritibusque Romanis tradant.*³⁵¹ Livy's inclusion of the Marcus Folius anecdote is significant for the fact that it indirectly indicates the importance other Roman writers placed on the Gallic Sack in relation to *patria*. It also elevates defence of the *patria* to being equal to a sacred or religious act. In contrast to the religious or sacred interpretation offered here, Ogilvie argues that the action of Rome's elders in this episode is not a religious act but rather "an example of Roman *virtus*".³⁵² Whatever the truth of the matter, the episode impacts upon the prominence of *patria* in relation to Roman collective identity and the values inherent in it.

The actions of Rome's elite families are contrasted to those of Rome's plebeians. This contrast provides a stark and interesting social dimension to the theme of service to *patria* within Livy's narrative of the event. Rather than remain to be slaughtered within the city or offer some form of armed resistance the plebeians concentrate on

into the capitol, neither prevented nor summoned by anyone, because what was useful to the besieged to lessen the numerousness of the non-combatants was insufficient in relation to humanity.")

³⁵¹ "There are those who recount that, with Marcus Folius, Pontifex Maximus, leading the ritual, they devoted themselves for the *patria* and the Roman citizens."

³⁵² Ogilvie (1965), 725.

their own self-preservation and abandon the city.³⁵³ The plebeians' rejection of *patria* in favour of self-preservation is further emphasised by Livy in the reactions of the Gauls on entering Rome when they discover the homes of plebeian families bolted shut, whilst those of Rome's leading families are open.³⁵⁴ There is only one example of selflessness on the part of Rome's plebeians in Livy's account of the Gallic sack of the city. As the plebeians leave the city a certain Lucius Albinus witnesses the *flamen Quirinalis* and the Vestals making their way out on foot. Appalled at what he sees, Albinus resolves to place the honour owing to the priests of the *patria* above the safety and flight of his own family.³⁵⁵

The lack of devotion and duty to *patria* on the part of Rome's plebeians in the narrative of this episode is an important indication of the intended audience of Livy's history and his moral messages. According to Livy the sources of inspiration for the theme of service to *patria* come exclusively from the leading families of Rome. Indeed, in the *exempla* considered in the earlier section we saw examples of devoted service to *patria* from the Horatii, the Fabii, the Brutii and the Veturii. The narrative thus appears to favour Livy's socially elite audience and seems to look to flatter them with regard to being the primary source of security for Rome, both physically and morally. The apparent dominance of Rome's elite over Rome's plebeians in terms of service to *patria* in Livy's narrative also calls into question the social

³⁵³ Liv. 5.40.5-6

³⁵⁴ Liv. 5.41.6-7.

³⁵⁵ Liv. 5.40.9-10.

dimension of such a duty. Was it the case that Livy considered service to *patria* to be the preserve of the upper echelons of Roman society? Or was he employing two different strategies for the various sectors of Roman society to encourage future service across the board, shame for the plebeians and inspiration for the elite? Additionally, could it be possible that since the leading families of Rome were the driving forces behind the civil wars Livy's focus on elite patriotic service is an attempt to direct them towards more collective and collaborative tasks in the future?

Selfless devotion to *patria* is evident in the second half of Rome's preservation strategy. Not only do the Romans decide upon the physical defence of the symbolic heart of their city, crowned with many salient collective religious buildings, but also the preservation of Rome's important religious artefacts (5.39.11): *flaminem sacerdotesque Vestales sacra publica a caede, ab incendiis procul auferre, nec ante deseri cultum eorum quam non superessent qui colerent*.³⁵⁶ It is presented as imperative for the *flamen* and Vestals to remove such artefacts from the danger of pollution at the hands of the enemy and the general detrimental effects of war, since the destruction of religious artefacts and buildings is the ultimate moment of eradication of a *patria* as is illustrated earlier in Livy's narrative in the case of Rome's capture and destruction of Alba (1.29.2-4).³⁵⁷

³⁵⁶ "The *flamen* and the priestesses of Vesta were to bear the sacred objects of the state far away from the bloodshed and from the flames, and their cult should not be abandoned until there were none surviving who would honour them."

³⁵⁷ Feldherr (1998), 124, note 34. See also Liv. 1.31.3.

Whilst the removal of sacred objects from the ravages of war is important, so too is the continuation of traditional ritual. In Chapter One the continuation and observance of religious rites was identified as a central factor in the conceptualisation of *patria*. With this in mind, Livy's statement that Rome's cults should continue to receive the honour owing to them as long as there were those alive to perform them is a clear indication that *patria* in such contexts should endure in a spiritual sense.³⁵⁸

The theme of service continues to be a salient theme towards the end of this first phase (immediate moment of crisis) and into the opening sections of the second phase (moment of containment, 5.44-49). In order to force a conclusion to events, the Gauls attempt to encourage the Roman defenders to come to the defence of the private over the collective by setting fire to the city.³⁵⁹ Although being forced to witness the attempted destruction of their *patria*, Rome's defenders are stated to have remained steadfast to their mission of defending the Capitol.³⁶⁰ Once again the emotion of the moment is brought to the fore for the external audience in order to strengthen the connection between them and the participants of the narrative based on the subject of *patria* (5.42.4-5):

paventes ad omnia animos oraque et oculos flectebant velut ad spectaculum a fortuna positi occidentis patriae nec ullius rerum suarum relictis praeterquam corporum vindices, tanto ante alios miserandi magis qui unquam obsessi sunt quod

³⁵⁸ Liv. 5.40.7-9.

³⁵⁹ Liv. 5.42.1-2.

³⁶⁰ Liv. 5.42.8.

*interclusi a patria obsidebantur, omnia sua cernentes in hostium potestate.*³⁶¹

The failure of the Gauls to capture Rome definitively marks the transition between the immediate moment of crisis and the moment when Rome and her allies begin to contain it. Realising a long siege is now in prospect and needing supplies, the Gauls embark upon raids of Rome's neighbours. Fortune brings them to Ardea where Camillus is residing in exile, the man who will go on to liberate *patria* from the jaws of destruction.³⁶² Livy depicts Camillus, despite his status as an exile, as an individual who continues to retain great affection for the community that he has left behind (5.43.7-8):

*ubi Camillus exsulabat... qui maestior ibi fortuna publica quam sua cum dis hominibusque accusandis senesceret, indignando mirandoque ubi illi viri essent qui secum Veios Faleriosque cepissent, qui alia bella fortius semper quam felicius gessissent.*³⁶³

Camillus thus joins Livy's ever increasing list of examples of the selfless. Rather than be emotionally affected by his own personal situation in exile, Camillus is devastated by the fate that has befallen

³⁶¹ "They turned eyes and face and minds to everything, trembling with fear, as if placed by fortune for the spectacle of a perishing *patria*. None of their possessions remained except their bodies to protect. Much more pitiable than any others who were besieged at any time before, they were beset from *patria*, seeing all of their things under the control of the enemy." Cf. Jaeger (1997), 61, who sees in this passage a weakening of the hold Rome has on its past. I find this interpretation strange seeing as the Romans are occupying the symbolic heart of the city and thus the seat of their past.

³⁶² Much work has been done on the prominence of Camillus in Livy's narrative of the Gallic sack and with regard to Roman historical imagination. In particular, see Brunn (2000); von Ungern-Sternberg (2001); Piel and Mineo (2010); and Vasaly (2015), 77-79. Oakley (2014), 239, states that Livy wishes to lead his readers to the conclusion that one strong individual is better than a collegiate governing body in a time of crisis.

³⁶³ "Where Camillus was in exile...who, more dejected in that place by the fortune of the state than by his own, while he was wasting away in bitter accusations against gods and men, resenting and wondering where were those men who had captured Veii and Falerii with him, and who had always waged other wars with more strength than luck."

Rome. Determined to be of use to his *patria* and to demonstrate his devotion for it, Camillus delivers a speech to the people of Ardea that argues all, no matter what their personal situation, are essential to the security and future of their *patriae* (5.44.1-3):

*"Ardeates" inquit, "veteres amici, novi etiam cives mei, quando et vestrum beneficium ita tulit et fortuna hoc eguit mea, nemo vestrum condicionis meae oblitum me huc processisse putet; sed res ac periculum commune cogit quod quisque possit in re trepida praesidii in medium conferre. Et quando ego vobis pro tantis vestris in me meritis gratiam referam, si nunc cessavero? Aut ubi usus erit mei vobis, si in bello non fuerit? Hac arte in patria steti et invictus bello, in pace ab ingratis civibus pulsus sum.*³⁶⁴

Camillus' speech would seem to indicate that in practice individuals in exile do not have any obligation, or indeed possibly the right, to defend their old *patriae*. Yet, for Camillus the unique quality of the danger threatening Rome enables him to override all previous custom. Illustrating his previous successful devotion to the welfare of the collective, Camillus urges the Ardeans to take up arms and to vote him their leader so that he may serve the *patria* from which he has been forcibly separated. From an external audience's perspective, Livy continues to use these examples to stress the message that there is no situation in which an individual is exempt from service to his or her *patria*.

³⁶⁴ "Ardeans" he said, "old friends and also my new citizens, because your kindness has supported it so and because my fortune has needed it, may not one of you suspect me to have appeared forgetful of my condition, but things and a universal danger compel each person to apply himself, however he may be able, to the midst of defence in a perilous matter. And when will I thank you for your many services to me if I stop now? Or where will there be a use for me to you if it should not be in war? By this skill I stood in my *patria* and, unconquerable in war, I was driven out in peace by ungrateful citizens."

This passage also hints towards an extension of service to the Roman *patria* outside the immediate confines of Rome. Camillus in this case is urging the Ardeans to assist him in his mission to save the Roman *patria*. Although this could be argued to indicate an expansion of *patria's* relevance to cover the Latin and Italian peoples there is no sign of concern or affection on the part of the Ardeans for the Roman *patria*. Rather, they are inspired not by patriotic service to Rome but by the oratorical skills of Camillus.

Whilst Camillus' selflessness is important to Livy's overall narrative of the event, it is the theme of honouring Rome's ancestral traditions, both religious and political, that Livy presents as being most essential to the eventual liberation of the Roman *patria* from the Gauls. This theme is evident in the episode's second phase (containment, 5.44-49). An example of this theme is that of Gaius Fabius Dorsuo who ensures the continuation of the regular religious rite of the Fabii on the Capitol. Leaving the safety of the Capitol, Gaius Fabius makes his way through the heart of the enemy to the Quirinal hill, clad in a particular fashion and possessing the necessary tools for sacrifice.³⁶⁵ Completing the ceremony Gaius Fabius returns the way he came, retaining, as Livy states, his composure all the way as a result of the confidence that he places in the gods.³⁶⁶ What is particularly noticeable in this passage is the respect and admiration that Livy states Fabius acquires from both sides. Both the remaining Romans and the

³⁶⁵ Liv. 5.46.2-3.

³⁶⁶ Liv. 5.46.3.

besieging Gauls are presented as recognising the significance of Fabius' actions.³⁶⁷ According to Livy, both the Romans and the Gauls understand the significance of ancestral tradition and the importance that this pertains to family as well as collective identity.

Not long later in the narrative, Livy presents an account of the way in which the Romans are careful to ensure that respect is paid also to ancestral political tradition. With the Romans at Veii having come to a decision to elect Camillus as dictator they send an emissary to the senate besieged on the Capitol in order to secure the blessing of the senate.³⁶⁸ This is quite an extraordinary episode in Livy's narrative. As the external audience, we are in no doubt at this point as to the desperate situation of the Romans and consequently would not be surprised or shocked to learn that political niceties were for the time being bypassed. Yet, Livy's message is clear. Under no circumstances can Roman political tradition be bypassed, no matter how desperate a situation may seem. Livy's presentation of this episode thus serves to reinforce the importance of ancestral tradition to Roman character and, in the context of the situation, implies that it is a central component with regard to the Roman *patria's* ability to survive the most desperate crisis it has until that point faced.³⁶⁹ When one considers that it was in Livy's lifetime that a breakdown of ancestral political tradition had brought about another desperate crisis

³⁶⁷ Liv. 5.46.1-2.

³⁶⁸ Liv. 5.46.7-8.

³⁶⁹ Jaeger (1997), 63, states that the observation of Roman political custom in this manner serves to give the Romans a sense of cohesion despite their territorially fragmented nature in the narrative.

for the Roman *patria* it is easy to identify how civil war could have been the motivation behind such a message. Indeed, the thought that Romans themselves will threaten the very nature of their *patria* three hundred years or so later forces the external audience to recall Livy's words from the preface to his history: *labente deinde paulatim disciplina velut desidentis primo mores sequatur animo, deinde ut magis magisque lapsi sint, tum ire coeperint praecipites, donec ad haec tempora quibus nec vitia nostra nec remedia pati possumus perventum est.*³⁷⁰

The full significance of honouring ancestral tradition and in placing the collective before the private becomes apparent in the third and final phase of the episode (moment of post-crisis, 5.50-54). With the Gauls defeated, the internal and external audience are given the means by which to reflect upon *patria's* preservation and the significance this has upon Rome's future. However, the collective preservation of *patria* is not accompanied by a collective approach as to the way forward. Whilst the senate favours remaining in the shattered city, the plebeians argue for a migration to Veii. Such an argument indicates the dependence of *patria* upon wider contexts and situations. It is not cemented to a particular area and can be the object of significant change if it is deemed necessary to do so. Rome's internal division causes the *patria* to experience collective trauma for

³⁷⁰ See note 298 for translation.

the second time, and Camillus is once again called upon to relieve it (5.49.8):

*Servatam deinde bello patriam iterum in pace haud dubie servavit cum prohibuit migrari Veios, et tribunis rem intentius agentibus post incensam urbem et per se inclinata magis plebe ad id consilium.*³⁷¹

The disconnect between plebeians and Rome's elite had been one of Livy's most important themes prior to his account of the Gallic sack.³⁷² *Patria* features heavily in such episodes, often helping to reinforce the growing sense of division at Rome as each side attempts to usurp the concept in order to attain its ultimate aims. At 2.28.7, plebeian demands to the senate for *libertas* are focussed on their desire to fight for their *patria* as freemen. At 3.15.9, Herdonius starts an armed uprising in part so that he may return unjustly exiled individuals to their *patria*. The various plebeian secessions are portrayed as a severe threat to the existence of the Roman *patria* as is revealed by the senate's statement to the plebs at 3.19.9 that they have formed their own *patria*, and at 3.66.4 that Rome is no longer a shared *patria* for all of sectors of Roman society. Indeed, it would appear that Livy's usage of the phrase *communis patria* at 3.67.10 and 3.69.5 describes a *patria* that is shared and enjoyed by all members of the Roman community regardless of social rank or political position. It is in the light of these previous moments of social discord that

³⁷¹ "Thereafter, it is by no means uncertain that he preserved for the second time in peace the *patria* liberated from war when he prevented the migration to Veii: the tribunes being eager to put the matter in motion after the city had been burned and the plebs for their part being more inclined towards this plan."

³⁷² On the theme of inter-order strife in Livy's history see Raaflaub (1986a and 1986b); Kapust (2011), 93-95; and Vasaly (2015), 96-121.

Camillus' actions following the sack of Rome must be understood with regard to *patria*. Camillus asserts to the people of Rome at 5.51.2 that the debate about whether to migrate to Veii or to remain at Rome will have a significant impact upon the existence of *patria* (5.51.2-3):

*Nec nunc me ut redirem mea voluntas mutata sed vestra fortuna perpulit; quippe ut in sua sede maneret patria, id agebatur, non ut ego utique in patria essem. Et nunc quiescerem ac tacerem libenter, nisi haec quoque pro patria dimicatio esset; cui deesse, quoad vita suppetat, aliis turpe, Camillo etiam nefas est. Quid enim repetiimus, quid obsessam ex hostium manibus eripuimus, si reciperatam ipsi deserimus?*³⁷³

Camillus thus takes it on himself to ensure that Rome remains the physical home for the Roman *patria* into the future.

Camillus' solution to this new crisis is to illustrate Rome's new status, and hence that of *patria*, as a community that is chosen by the gods. Addressing the plebeians, Camillus underscores the psychological effect that the event has had upon the Roman collective psyche. The seizure of the city by the Gauls and the subsequent violence is described as being a "terrible time" (5.50.4: *in re trepida*), Rome's "darkest hour" (5.51.9: *res adversae*), and the Roman community as being akin to a shipwreck (5.52.2: *naufragiis prioris culpa cladisque emergentes paremus nefas*). This traumatic moment in Rome's history, however, was not unavoidable. Rather, Camillus

³⁷³ "I was compelled to return now not by a change in my desire but in your fortune; as you see, my action was driven by the fact that *patria* might remain in its place, not that I, at any rate, might again be in my *patria*. And now I would have ceased and would have held my tongue willingly, if this were not also a contest for the *patria*; whom to abandon, while life is present, is a shameful thing for other men, is also impious to Camillus. Truly, for what did we return, for what did we snatch the besieged *patria* away from the hands of the enemy, if we ourselves abandon it now that it is regained?"

presents it as being self-inflicted owing to Rome's neglect of the gods. Not only did they ignore the divine warnings they had received of the Gallic advance into Italy and the threat they posed to Rome, but also the sacred status of foreign envoys.³⁷⁴ Since the cause of the crisis was Rome's disregard for religious tradition and a neglect of their gods, its solution can be found in a return to the pious ways of their ancestors. Only neglecting their concern for personal possessions and putting their faith in the gods in their hour of need have the Romans been able to save their *patria* from calamity (5.51.9-10):

*Adversae deinde res admonuerunt religionum. Confugimus in Capitolium ad deos, ad sedem Iovis optimi maximi; sacra in ruina rerum nostrarum alia terra celavimus, alia avecta in finitimas urbes amovimus ab hostium oculis; deorum cultum deserti ab dis hominibusque tamen non intermisimus. Reddidere igitur patriam.*³⁷⁵

The divine preservation of *patria* has important implications for the ways in which the concept and its associated community are to be defined from this point on in Livy's history.³⁷⁶ Camillus' speech indicates the interdependence that now exists between *patria* and the gods (5.51.4-6):

Equidem si nobis cum urbe simul positae traditaeque per manus religiones nullae essent, tamen tam evidens numen hac tempestate rebus adfuit Romanis ut omnem negligentiam divini cultus exemptam hominibus putem. Intuemini enim horum deinceps annorum vel secundas res vel adversas;

³⁷⁴ Liv. 5.51.7-8.

³⁷⁵ "Thereafter, adverse affairs brought to mind religion. We fled to the gods on the Capitol, to the seat of Jupiter Optimus Maximus; in the ruin of our possessions we concealed in the earth some sacred objects, others we removed from the eyes of the enemy, carried away to bordering cities; deserted by gods and men, we did not stop the worship of the gods. They, therefore, restored the *patria*."

³⁷⁶ Levene (1993), 175, states that Livy has deliberately repackaged the anecdote in order to emphasise the religious elements within it. See also Vasaly (2015), 77-78.

*invenietis omnia prospera evenisse sequentibus deos, adversa spernentibus.*³⁷⁷

The divine quality of *patria* should not come as a surprise to the Romans. After all, as Camillus reminds them, was not the city of Rome founded by augury and under divine auspices (5.52.2: *Urbem auspicato inauguratoque conditam habemus*)? Any migration to Veii would, therefore, be an abandonment of their *patria* rather than a redefinition of it, and as a consequence of its new sacred status, indicated and approved by the gods, it would also be an act of blasphemy.

Paradoxically, Livy has Camillus present his collective argument for Rome's future partly via an appeal to personal, individual memory. At 5.54.3, Camillus further plays on the theme of Roman collective identity founded on *patria* in his speech by referring to the irreplaceable salience that Rome and its landscape have had upon his personal development:

*Et quidem – fatebor vobis, etsi minus iniuriae vestrae meminisse iuvat – cum abessem, quotienscumque patria in mentem veniret, haec omnia occurrebant, colles campique et Tiberis et adsueta oculis regio et hoc caelum sub quo natus educatusque essem.*³⁷⁸

³⁷⁷ “Indeed, if the strict religious observances ordained and handed down at the same time as the city were nothing to us, nevertheless at this time a visible divine power is present in Roman affairs to such an extent that I may consider all neglect of the gods banished by men. For, hereafter, pay attention to either the successful or adverse things of these years; you will find that all things propitious occurred from following the gods, and adverse things from rejecting them.”

³⁷⁸ “And indeed, when I was absent - I will admit it to you, even if this minor thing helps to bring to mind your injustices - whenever *patria* came to mind, all of these things presented themselves: the hills and fields and the Tiber and the region customary to the eyes and this sky beneath which I was born and raised.”

Camillus appears to echo the familial sentiments of *patria* that were utilised within Veturia's speech to Coriolanus (2.40.1-3). *Patria* is the place where one is born (*natus*) and raised (*educatus*). It is also where an individual is moulded into the person they will become. As such, Livy emphasises through Camillus how individual identity is inherently tied to collective identity, to the *patria* of which an individual is a member. By thus recounting the importance that *patria* plays with regard to the sense of collective and personal identity of Camillus, as well as the personal memories that he has attached to it, Livy invites the internal and external audiences to do the same, and in so doing to stir their own memories and affection for their *patria*.³⁷⁹

Camillus' speech thus seeks to redefine Rome and its *patria* as a chosen people, specifically selected by the gods as the centre of religious worship and as the object for their divine protection.³⁸⁰ Yet, this is not the only new definition of Rome acquired as a result of their recent experience of collective trauma that would be altered if a migration to Veii were to occur. The seemingly miraculous victory over the Gallic army has resulted in the transformation of a moment of collective trauma into one of collective triumph. A migration to Veii would only serve to jeopardise their new and hard won status (5.53.4-5):

*Quippe tum causa nobis in urbem captam migrandi victoria
esset, gloriosa nobis ac posteris nostris; nunc haec migratio*

³⁷⁹ On Camillus' use of landscape to influence his audience see Jaeger (1997), 89; and Feldherr (1998), 17-20.

³⁸⁰ Camillus has been identified by von Ungern-Sternberg (2001) as a second Romulus.

*nobis misera ac turpis, Gallis gloriosa est. Non enim reliquisse victores sed amisisse victi patriam videbimur: hoc ad Alliam fuga, hoc capta urbs, hoc circumsessum Capitolium necessitatis imposuisse, ut desereremus penates nostros exsiliumque ac fugam nobis ex eo loco conscisceremus quem tueri non possemus.*³⁸¹

In every way, therefore, a move to Veii is presented as offering a negative and irreversible change to the Roman conceptualisation of their collective identity and in turn that of *patria*, which embodies it.

Overall, the Gallic Sack of Rome functions as an episode to highlight the moment in which Rome comes of age. By being able to defend itself against overwhelming odds the special status granted it by the gods is made clear and it can now march on towards achieving its imperial destiny.³⁸² As illustrated above, this affects the way in which *patria* is recognised. Whereas the concept had already been identified as embodying salient aspects of Roman religious tradition in the previous chapter it is now re-defined by Livy as a sacred object in its own right. This has great implications as to its reception in Roman culture. By re-defining it in this way, Livy is presenting the failure on the part of the Romans to devote themselves to *patria* as an act of blasphemy, in turn underlining the threat that this can then have upon the stability and security of the collective. Religious tradition being a unifying force, the narrative of the third final phase of the episode

³⁸¹ "Indeed, at that time victory might have been a reason for us to migrate to a conquered city, a glorious thing to us and to our descendents; now this migration is a shameful and tragic thing for us, and a glorious thing for the Gauls. For we will not be considered to have relinquished *patria* as victors but to have lost it as conquered men: that the flight from the Allia, the captured city, the surrounded Capitol forced us to abandon our *penates* and bring upon ourselves exile and flight from this place which we were not able to protect."

³⁸² Liv. 5.54.4-7.

functions as a narrative of collective healing, a narrative that would have resonated greatly with Livy's contemporary audiences. Having only recently come out of a moment of collective trauma, that of the various civil wars, Livy's narrative would have struck a chord with the emotions and memories of his external audience. Indeed, it is probable that Livy's stress on the service to *patria* on the part of Rome's social elite has much to do with them being the lead protagonists in the civil war. He thus uses patriotic examples from their illustrious past to refocus their minds and energies towards the security of Rome rather than individual political success. By feeding on the emotions and memories associated with this event, Livy is able to connect a moment of collective trauma that occurred in Rome's distant past to his contemporary audience and hence successfully disseminate his presentation of *patria*. As the Romans following the siege reflected on events in order to move forward collectively, so too is his contemporary audience trying to find a collective way forward after years of internal division. Livy's narrative offers a solution. Where politics may have divided, ancestral tradition and devotion to *patria* can unite.³⁸³

3.II. Virgil's *Aeneid*: The Tale of an Italian *Patria*

Whereas Livy's narrative sought to stress Roman unity via the theme of service to *patria*, Virgil's *Aeneid* aims to emphasise unity on an

³⁸³ Indeed, in this regard Livy can be seen to reflect the religious reforms of Augustus, who encouraged a return to ancestral practices arguably to return a sense of unity to a war torn community. This topic is discussed in the following chapter.

Italian level via a re-conceptualisation of the concept's territoriality and mythological relevance. Although much attention has been paid to the central personalities of Virgil's *Aeneid*, *patria*, one of the epic's most important 'characters', has to all intents and purposes passed under the radar.³⁸⁴ This lack of attention to *patria* in the *Aeneid* is surprising, especially owing to the emphasis that has been placed by some scholars on the epic's role as a 'national epic'.³⁸⁵ Running through the heart of the epic narrative is a biographical account of the establishment of *patria*, functioning both to provide meaning to Aeneas' trials and tribulations, and to endow the *Aeneid* with its function as an instrument of collective memory. As the audience, we follow the experience of *patria*, from its physical 'death' (predominantly Books 1-5) with the sack of Troy to its physical 'rebirth' (predominantly Books 7-12) once Aeneas and his fellow Trojan refugees have finally arrived in Italy.³⁸⁶ Despite the various obstacles that are placed in the path of the Trojans, this physical 'rebirth' is not in doubt. Connecting these two opposing themes of 'death' and 'rebirth' is a theme of 'divine

³⁸⁴ For the sole in depth discussion of *patria* in the *Aeneid* see Bonjour (1975a), 464ff. For discussions on the significance of the primary characters within the epic see the following. *AENEAS*: Glover (1903); Glover (1923), 192-214; Howe (1930); Knapp (1930); Hritzu (1944); Hritzu (1945); McLeish (1972); Feeney (1983); Galinsky (1988); Fuhrer (1989); Michels (1997); Syed (2005) esp. 54-227; and Reed (2009), 173ff. *DIDO*: Glover (1923), 160-191; Ogle (1925); Pease (1927); McLeish (1972); Syed (2005), passim.; Reed (2009), 73-100; and Seider (2013), esp. 96-123. *ANCHISES*: Lloyd (1957a). *ASCANIUS/IULUS*: Feldman (1953).

³⁸⁵ For descriptions of the *Aeneid* as a national epic see Miller, F.J. (1908), 142-143; Weiss (1974); Panoussi (2002), 96-97; Syed (2005); and Bell (2008). For other scholars that have argued for the *Aeneid* as central to the creation of Roman or Italian identity: Cairns (1977); Toll (1991); Gruen (1992); Toll (1997); Schmidt, E.A. (2001); Ando (2002); Pogorzelski (2007); Bell (2008); Reed (2009); and Ferriss-Hill (2011).

³⁸⁶ Reed (2009) is the most comprehensive study to exist on the theme of collective identity in the *Aeneid*.

destiny'. This theme of 'divine destiny' not only serves to create a sense of continuity from the transition of 'death' to 'rebirth' but also to establish a psychological bridge between the mythological past and the contemporary audience. By acting as a foundation narrative, the *Aeneid* can be interpreted as an instrument of collective memory, providing its contemporary audience with an account of their communal origins. Reed has argued that the *Aeneid* does not provide its audience with a clearly defined ethnic identity, but instead shows a patchwork of different ethnic identities to which Virgil gives form.³⁸⁷ Whilst the epic poem does indeed include a range of different ethnic groups, its focus on *patria* throughout the narrative keeps the audience's mind focused on the development of a specific collective group. Yet, Virgil's emphasis is not on Rome as *patria*. The prominence that Virgil gives Italy throughout the epic narrative indicates the role of the *Aeneid* consciously to redefine *patria* as an embodiment of Romano-Italian collective identity and to provide it with an accompanying collective memory in order to realign it with 'contemporary' social, cultural and political contexts.³⁸⁸

³⁸⁷ Reed (2009), 3.

³⁸⁸ See Toll (1991), 3: "the *Aeneid* was not made to express any simple partisanship, but precisely to deter partisan splintering from hindering its dream of ideological unity and ethical endeavour for the whole of Italy." See also Bonjour (1975a). On the process of development with regard to the Aeneas myth see Galinsky (1969 [2015]); Horsfall (1986); and Casali (2014).

3.II.i. 'Death'

A core theme to the first six books of the *Aeneid* is the physical 'death' of *patria* as a result of the Greek sack of the city of Troy.³⁸⁹ As will become apparent in the discussion below, this theme is a salient component in the *Aeneid's* role as an instrument of collective memory. Through the use of metaphor and powerful imagery, Virgil uses the loss of Troy and the psychological results of this upon the characters within the narrative to draw the audience's attention towards the complex and multifaceted mythological origins of *patria*. Virgil uses these mythological origins to endow the *patria* and its respective community with a sense of pedigree, emphasising its ancient heritage and prestige. By using this theme of 'death' to indicate the closing of one chapter in the collective life of a community, Virgil encourages his contemporary audiences to look forward toward the second and more important half of his foundation narrative, that of *patria's* recreation and 'rebirth' (3.II.iii).

An audience's first encounter with the theme of the physical 'death' of *patria* occurs early on in the epic narrative. Thrown into the middle of the action in Book 1, we are confronted with an image of Aeneas and his fellow Trojan refugees as a people in limbo. Having fled Troy, they are yet to arrive at their intended destination of Italy, and as such remain a people without a physical home in which they can house their remaining symbols of collective identity – the *penates*

³⁸⁹ Previous discussions on the theme of 'death' in the *Aeneid* include Genovese (1975); O'Hara (1990), *passim.*; Nicoll (2001); and O'Sullivan (2009). These do not discuss death, however, in relation to *patria*.

and the flame of Vesta.³⁹⁰ These symbols are regarded in the poem as the spiritual essence of the Trojan *patria*. Hounded by Juno, Aeneas and his followers are forced to divert from their intended course and make landfall in Libya (1.65-158). Whilst out scouting the surrounding area for signs of life Aeneas encounters his mother Venus in the disguise of a Spartan girl out hunting (1.314-324).³⁹¹ In response to Venus' questions as to where he has come from and to where he is heading Aeneas replies as follows (1.375-380):

nos Troia antiqua, si vestras forte per auris 375
Troia nomen iit, diversa per aequora vectos
forte sua Libycis tempestas appulit oris.
Sum pius Aeneas, raptos qui ex hoste penates
classe veho mecum, fama super aethera notus;
Italiam quaero patriam 380³⁹²

Aeneas describes himself and his fellow Trojans through direct references to the physical 'death' of Troy. Aeneas informs his mother that he and his companions have come from Troy, that Troy as a physical entity is no more, and that consequently the city of Troy is no longer the territorial dimensions of the Trojan *patria*.³⁹³ Having been forced to flee their original home, the Trojans are in the process of transporting the remaining essence of *patria* to Italy, their intended destination and the future destined territorial dimension of their *patria*.

³⁹⁰ Verg. *Aen.* 1.66-67. Juno identifies the Aeneas and his followers as Trojans owing to their continued possession of Troy's sacred objects (*penates* and the flame of Vesta).

³⁹¹ On the exchange between Aeneas and his mother see Thome (1986a and 1986b). See also the observation of Dobbin (2002) regarding the irony present in Aeneas' description of his journey to his mother at Verg. *Aen.* 1.374.

³⁹² "We are of ancient Troy, if perhaps the name Troy has reached your ears. Having been driven across many seas, a wind has brought us to your Libyan shores. I am pious Aeneas. I carry with me by ship the *penates* seized from the enemy, my fame known to the heavens above. I am searching for Italy, my *patria*."

³⁹³ On the number of years following the sack of Troy and Aeneas' arrival in Carthage see Potter, F.J. (1926), 615-624.

Having yet to arrive in Italy and hence to provide their *patria* with a new sense of territoriality, it is their lack of a physical *patria* that ultimately defines Aeneas and his Trojan followers. They are still Trojans but without a place to call home.³⁹⁴

Aeneas and his Trojans are not the only group who are defined by the ‘death’ of one *patria* and the ‘birth’ of another. Within the *Aeneid*, Dido, Teucer, Helenus and Andromache, Antenor and Diomedes are all defined by the various ‘deaths’ of their respective *patriae*, both metaphorically and literally. The past experiences of these other characters ‘mirror’ the limbo-like status of Aeneas and visually indicate to him and to the audience that a new beginning, a new identity is possible.³⁹⁵ Preceding Aeneas’ description of himself and his followers Venus tells us the tale of the events behind Dido’s arrival in Libya (1.338-359):

<i>Punica regna vides, Tyrios et Agenoris urbem;</i>	338
<i>sed fines Libyci, genus intractabile bello.</i>	
<i>Imperium Dido Tyria regit urbe profecta,</i>	340
<i>germanum fugiens. [...]</i>	
[...]	
<i>Ipsa sed in somnis inhumati venit imago</i>	
<i>coniugis; ora modis attollens pallida miris</i>	
<i>crudelis aras traiectaque pectora ferro</i>	355
<i>nudavit, caecumque domus scelus omne retexit.</i>	
<i>Tum celerare fugam patriaque excedere suadet</i>	
<i>auxiliumque viae veteres tellure recludit</i>	
<i>thesauros, ignotum argenti pondus et auri.</i> ³⁹⁶	

³⁹⁴ Cf. Mira Seo (2013), 37, who identifies Aeneas as exhibiting a sudden loss of identity in this exchange with Venus.

³⁹⁵ On the theme of mirroring in the *Aeneid* see von Albrecht (1999). See also Lloyd (1957b). Quint (1982), 36, states “There is an evident analogy to be drawn between the war-weary Trojan remnant in search of a new beginning and Virgil’s contemporary readers, the survivors of civil wars, who are offered a fresh start in the new Augustan state.”

³⁹⁶ “You see the Punic kingdoms, the city of Agenor and the people of Tyre. Dido controls *imperium* having departed from the city of Tyre, fleeing her brother. [...] But, coming in a dream, the ghost of her unburied husband; lifting up with wonderful

Unlike the Trojans', the 'death' of Dido's *patria* is more metaphorical than physical, and personal rather than collective. In its intransitive sense, the verb *excedere* implies a departure from life, a concrete severing of a physical connection. Dido's physical act of leaving her *patria* is thus likened by Virgil to a moment of death: by this act Dido will never return to her *patria* of Tyre. This metaphorical 'death' of Dido's *patria* draws direct parallels to Aeneas, forcing Aeneas, as well as the audience, to reflect on his own situation and to contrast his future to Dido's present. Like Aeneas, Dido has heeded the commands of a ghost bearing hideous wounds and has abandoned her original *patria* in order to escape violence. However, whereas Aeneas carries with him the sacred objects of Troy, Dido carries precious objects of a different nature, namely the gold and silver with which she will purchase the land for her new city. Thus, there is a clear contrast here between the fact that Dido has had to purchase her future *patria* whilst Aeneas' rehousing of the Trojan *patria* has been preordained and is thus portrayed as a gift from the gods. Dido's lack of spiritual objects means that, unlike Aeneas, she is unable to retain a spiritual essence of her original *patria*, an element that further stresses the severing of ties between her and Tyre. Dido can thus be interpreted as being dually defined: she is the ruler of her new city but she is also predominantly an exile from her native *patria*.

measure his pale face, turned towards the cruel altars, he exposed his chest pierced with iron wounds, and he revealed all the invisible crime of the house. He then urges her to hasten flight and to depart from *patria*, and he reveals help for the journey: ancient treasures from the ground, an unknown quantity of gold and silver."

Like Dido, Teucer and Diomedes can be understood to have experienced a 'death' of their respective *patriae* in a psychological sense through their status as exiles. At 1.619-622, Dido recalls to Aeneas how she remembers the Greek Teucer coming to Sidon having been forcibly ejected or expelled (*expulsus*) from his *patria* Salamis. Since Dido does not reveal to us where it is that Teucer finally settles he remains entirely defined in the context of the poem by the severance from, and thus loss of, his original *patria*. Diomedes is another Greek who we learn has experienced the loss of his *patria*. Responding to the embassy sent from king Latinus, Diomedes states (11.269-270): '*Invidisse deos, patriis ut redditus aris | coniugium optatum et pulchram Calydonam viderem?*'³⁹⁷ Diomedes informs the embassy that he cannot take part in the war against Aeneas since he has already suffered enough as a result of the original Trojan War. Like other Greeks who participated in the war – Menelaus, Atreus, Ulixes, Neoptolemus, Idomeneus, and the Locrians (11.261-268) – Diomedes has suffered by losing his *patria*, an ironic conclusion to the war as he shares the fate of his Trojan foes. It is not as the leader of his new *patria*, Arpi, that he defines himself to the embassy, but as a member of the original *patria* that he has lost, Calydon.

Antenor, Helenus and Andromache are other Trojans who suffer from both the physical and symbolic 'death' of their *patria*. Unlike Aeneas and his followers, they have not retained possession of

³⁹⁷ "Returned to the altars of my ancestors, did the gods refuse that I might see my desired wife and beautiful Calydon?"

the Penates and the flame of Vesta and consequently have not been able to retain the spiritual essence of their original *patria*. Instead they have all been forced to start from scratch and create an entirely new *patria* for themselves. In the case of Antenor, we are informed by Venus that (1.242-248):

*Antenor potuit, mediis elapsus Achivis,
 Illyricos penetrare sinus atque intima tutus
 regna Liburnorum et fontem superare Timavi,
 unde per ora novem vasto cum murmure montis 245
 it mare proruptum et pelago premit arva sonanti.
 Hic tamen ille urbem Patavi sedesque locavit
 Teucrorum et genti nomen dedit³⁹⁸*

Having escaped from Troy, Antenor finds a new city and provides his fellow Trojans with a new name. Antenor is forced to give them an entirely new collective identity, an entirely new *patria*, but once again they are still to an extent defined by the loss of their original *patria*, Troy. In the case of Helenus and Andromache the 'death' of their original *patria* is emphasised by their very attempt to create a new *patria*, a miniature clone of Troy, which is a feature among many in this episode that illustrates a deep and problematic nostalgia.³⁹⁹ The accuracy of this *parva Troia* to the original is clear from the emotional impact it has upon Aeneas and his followers (3.349-352):

*Procedo et parvam Troiam simulataque magnis
 Pergama et arentem Xanthi cognomina rivum 350*

³⁹⁸ "Escaping from the midst of the Greeks, Antenor was able to pass through the Illyrian Gulf and even to the inmost kingdom of the Liburnians and go beyond the origin of the Timavus, where, a flood of water comes bursting forth through nine mouths with the immense grumbling of the mountain and covers the fields with a sounding sea. Here, however, he established the seat and city of Patavium and gave a new name to the people of Teucer."

³⁹⁹ On the strong sense of nostalgia in this episode see Otis (1964), 260-261; Grimm (1967); West, G.S. (1983); and Bettini (1997). On the problems associated with this plunge into the past for Aeneas see Quint (1982), 32-34; and Gale (2003), 339-340.

*agnosco, Scaeeaeque amplector limina portae.
Nec non et Teucris socia simul urbe fruuntur.*⁴⁰⁰

However, despite their attempt to recreate Troy the city that Helenus and Andromache have established resembles the replica tomb that Andromache has created for Hector or the bone-dry replica Xanthus in its lack of substance. The new *patria* of Helenus and Andromache is nothing more than an empty shell as it lacks the spiritual heart of the community that Aeneas and his followers bear with them. As a consequence, *parva Troia* serves only to heighten the Trojans' sense of loss of their old *patria* and Helenus and Andromache's status as ex-Trojans. Indeed, as Saylor has noted, the pain and grief suffered by Aeneas and his followers as a result of experiencing *parva Troia* works as a catalyst to spur them on in their journey to Italy and a new future.⁴⁰¹

In all of these cases, these lost *patriae* stress the, now unattainable, origins of the respective characters, and highlight the ancient pedigrees of the communities that claim these individuals as founders. Within the epic, these personages act as metaphors for the early history of their respective communities.⁴⁰² The loss of Troy by Aeneas underlines the Trojan origins of the communities that Aeneas establishes during the course of his journey. The cities of Aeneadae

⁴⁰⁰ "I advance and I discern a little Troy, with an imitated great Pergamum and a drying stream with the name of Xanthus. And I embrace the portals of the Scaean Gate. Nor did my Trojan companions not derive pleasure from the city at the same time."

⁴⁰¹ Saylor (1970). See also Smith, R.A. (2005), 70ff. See also Bonjour (1975a), 287 and 502.

⁴⁰² See note 44.

(Aineia, Thrace: 3.13-18), Pergamea (Crete: 3.129-134), Ilium (Sicily: 5.755-756) and Lavinium (Italy: 6.84-85) all share Aeneas as founder and as such all possess an equal share of his Trojan origins and experiences.⁴⁰³ That is to say, the experiences and memories of Aeneas and the Trojans in the *Aeneid* become the experiences and memories of the contemporary audience. Thus, for example, just as Aeneas remembers the events of the Trojan War whilst he gazes at the Temple of Juno in Carthage (1.446-493), and just as Aeneas recalls the sack of Troy in Book 2, so does the contemporary audience 'remember' moments of their mythical past.⁴⁰⁴ Hence, the Trojan origin of the aforementioned communities becomes an essential element in the collective memory of these communities, and as such is influential upon their sense of collective identity. Indeed, this is illustrated in the appearance of Aeneas on the coin designs of Aineia.⁴⁰⁵ This not only illustrates the *Aeneid's* role in aiding the formulation of collective memory but also highlights the links that can exist between the collective memories of different communities.⁴⁰⁶ In accepting that

⁴⁰³ On the subject of the Aeneas legend and Aineia see *FGrH* 4 F31 and 45 F7; Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 1.49.4; and Egan (1974). On the subject of Aeneas in Sicily see Galinsky (1969 [2015]), 63-102.

⁴⁰⁴ On the theme of memory and the temples in the *Aeneid* see the excellent discussion by Kirichenko (2013). On the subject of Juno's temple specifically see Williams, R.D. (1960), on how the images emphasise the wider themes of the poem and the emotional impact that they have on Aeneas; and Lowenstam (1993), on the subject of the temple's imagery and its relationship to the wider epic narrative. See also Smith, R.A. (1997), 25ff, on the theme of Aeneas as an audience to his own past in the ecphrasis.

⁴⁰⁵ Head and Poole (1879 [1963]), 41ff; Head (1911), 214; Price and Waggoner (1975), pl. B, note 194.

⁴⁰⁶ On the connecting power of kinship mythology see Patterson (2010). Links between different collective groups is an aspect that Virgil himself openly draws attention to at Verg. *Aen.* 3.13-18 (Aineia), Verg. *Aen.* 3.500-505 (Epirus); and at Verg. *Aen.* 8.134-142 (Pallantium).

Aeneas establishes more than one community on his voyage, Virgil is stressing early on in his epic that several communities may share the same mythological origins and consequently may possess overlapping elements in their collective memories. There are many layers to the *patria* in question and these layers need to be understood in order to recognise its true significance. This is an important message for Virgil to convey since multiplicity is key to the subsequent theme of 'rebirth'.

In the case of Aeneas himself, however, ancient mythological origins are not clear-cut. Wishing to know where to settle, Aeneas heads to Delos to consult the oracle of Apollo. Being told to seek the land that was the *patria* of their original founder, their *antiqua mater*, Anchises instructs the Trojans to set sail to Crete, the home of Teucer, the first of the Trojan line (3.102-117).⁴⁰⁷ But Anchises is mistaken. Having established their settlement Pergamea, the Trojans are beset by plague and famine. Light is then shed upon the cause of the Trojans' sufferings by the Penates who link the Trojans' Italian past to their Italian future. Appearing to Aeneas in a dream, they inform him that Apollo had not instructed them to head for Crete but to Italy since (3.167-168): '*Hae nobis propriae sedes, hinc Dardanus ortus | lasiusque pater, genus a quo principe nostrum*'.⁴⁰⁸ The external and internal audiences thus discover that there is yet another layer to the

⁴⁰⁷ For the oracle see Verg. *Aen.* 3.94-98. Quint (1982), 31-32, argues that Anchises' choice of Crete is owing to his desire for something familiar for his past. Hardy (1996), 3ff, argues that Anchises is influenced by the phrase *antiqua mater* and seeks the matrilineal genealogy for the Trojans. On the genealogical reasons behind Anchises' decision see also Nakata (2012), 337-339.

⁴⁰⁸ "This is our own seat, Dardanus originated here, and father Iasius, from whom first was our race."

mythological origins of Aeneas, and through him of *patria* and its respective communities. Not only is Aeneas a descendent of Troy, but also of Italy through the figure of Dardanus. This Italian dimension to the identity of the Trojans and the communities they establish further increases the crossovers that exist between different communities and their collective memories. An indication of this is apparent in the narrative. As the Trojans depart from *parva Troia* Aeneas states (3.500-505):

Si quando Thybrim vicinaque Thybridis arva 500
intraro gentique meae data moenia cernam,
cognatas urbes olim populosque propinquos,
Epiro Hesperiam, quibus idem Dardanus auctor
atque idem casus, unam faciemus utramque
*Troiam animis; maneat nostros ea cura nepotes.*⁴⁰⁹ 505

Here Aeneas, looking at the bigger picture, stresses the links that will exist between Hesperia, his intended destination, and Epirus, the region in which *parva Troia* is now located, as a result of their shared Trojan and Italian blood. These shared early origins, Aeneas stresses, are enough of a factor upon which to base a sense of unity. This unity is both political and cultural as this passage forces the reader to look forward to their own time and the unity of regions that has come about as a result of Rome's *imperium*.⁴¹⁰

⁴⁰⁹ "If I will ever enter the Thybris and Thybris' neighbouring fields and see the walls gifted to my people, at some future time, Epirus and Hesperia, kindred cities and related peoples, for whom Dardanus is the same founder and for whom the same misfortunes, we will make these two Troys one in spirit; may this concern await our grandchildren." See Dainotti (2015), 155, on the theme of synaloepha and juxtaposition emphasising fusion of Epirus and Heperia in this passage.

⁴¹⁰ West, D. (1994), 59, interprets Verg. *Aen.* 3.500-505 as a reference to Augustus' bringing together Epirote communities.

Whilst the stress upon mythological origins is important in the *Aeneid* and consequently for the collective memory of a community, Virgil makes it clear to his reader that this should not be our primary concern. Instead, keeping these origins in mind, the reader is encouraged to look forward toward the primary theme of the narrative, the *patria's* rebirth. This encouragement to look forward to the *patria's* rebirth is achieved by the use of powerful emotive imagery and through the use of metaphor. During his journey from Troy to Italy Aeneas suffers the loss of important members of his family. Firstly, as he is fleeing the city of Troy, Aeneas loses his wife Creusa. Returning to look for her he comes across her shade (2.792-794):

*Ter conatus ibi collo dare bracchia circum;
ter frustra comprehensa manus effugit imago,
par levibus ventis volucrique simillima somno.*⁴¹¹

The ethereal image of Creusa is a symbol of Aeneas' Trojan past. Like the city of Troy, it no longer exists and Aeneas' inability to grasp Creusa' shade reflects his inability to return once again to the old city, the old urban physical dimensions of *patria*, no matter how much he may wish to. It forces Aeneas to look forward, and as the audience we follow his example. This is echoed in Books 6 and 7. In Book 6 Aeneas attempts to grasp the shade of his father Anchises (6.700-702) and in Book 7 Aeneas suffers the death of his nurse Caieta (7.1-7).⁴¹² As each

⁴¹¹ "Thrice there I tried to put my arms around her neck; thrice the apparition, deceptively grasped, escaped my hands, as light as the winds and most like a winged dream."

⁴¹² Dinter (2005), 160: "Finally Caieta's death demonstrates that Aeneas has truly grown to adulthood (*nekyia* as transition), and found his mission and

key figure in Aeneas' life is lost, his physical reminders of the old city of Troy reduce. In turn, Aeneas is reminded of his mission and looks forward to the housing of *patria* in Italy.⁴¹³ As in the case of Creusa, we follow Aeneas' lead and look forward to the rebirth of *patria*. A final metaphor encourages the audience, and Aeneas, to look forward. During Aeneas' visit to the underworld Anchises draws our attention to the souls who will be reborn (6.703-751).⁴¹⁴ These individuals might be regarded as reflecting the state of *patria* within the narrative. Having lost their previous existence, they stand on the verge of being reborn and taking on new dimensions. Yet, unlike the *patria* these individuals are compelled to forget their past, their origins. In the case of the *patria* we are not encouraged to forget. We are instead encouraged to remember, but not to let this remembrance get in the way of the future.⁴¹⁵

Sendungsbewußtsein. The alien coast has become *litoribus nostris*, a homeland (*Italia nutrix*). Aeneas has 'come home'; he will need his nurse no more."

⁴¹³ On the emotional impact which episodes like Verg. *Aen.* 2.792-794 and 6.700-702 have on Aeneas see Belfiore (1984). Cf. Gale (2003), 338ff, who argues that such episodes illustrate the strong hold of the past over Aeneas. Aeneas' looking forward is contrasted directly by the actions of the Trojan women. For them, the commemoration of Anchises' death sparks memories of Troy that draw into question their journey to Italy (Verg. *Aen.* 5.614-618). Taking advantage of this, Juno stirs them into such a state of frenzy that they set fire to their ships (Verg. *Aen.* 5.623-656). Although this makes Aeneas hesitate (Verg. *Aen.* 5.700-703), it ultimately does not break his determination to look forward rather than dwell in the past (Verg. *Aen.* 5.722ff). On the subject of gender conflict in this passage see Keith (2006). Zarker (1978), 17, also draws attention to the theme of the ordered world versus chaos that is evident in this episode.

⁴¹⁴ For further discussion of memory in the context of this passage see Seider (2013), 34-36.

⁴¹⁵ Seider (2013), 35: "Forgetting plays an essential role in reincarnation." Virgil himself illustrates that remembrance is not a hindrance to identity. Acestes is aware of his Trojan origins, but this does not shadow the importance that Sicily holds for his future (Verg. *Aen.* 5.38-39). On the theme of forgetting in the *Aeneid* see Quint (1982), 35-38.

3.II.ii. 'Rebirth'

Having landed on the shores of Italy and having sat down to eat a meagre meal, Ascanius declares to his fellow Trojans as they begin to eat the wheaten cakes that they were using as plates, "*heus, etiam mensas consumimus?*"⁴¹⁶ Ascanius' declaration fulfils the prophecy that the Harpies made to Aeneas in 3.254-257 and finally marks the end of the Trojans' journey to Italy. With the end of their journey comes a change in theme for *patria*. Whereas it was its physical 'death' that was centre stage in the narrative of Books 1-6, it is now its 'rebirth' that takes over. *Patria's* past gives way to its future but is never truly forgotten.⁴¹⁷ For Virgil, the events contained within the second half of the *Aeneid* (Books 7-12) that surround this 'rebirth' are the primary focus of his entire narrative. At the climax to his evocation to the Muse Erato, Virgil declares that (7.44-45): *Maior rerum mihi nascitur ordo, | maius opus moveo.*⁴¹⁸ The theme of *patria's* 'rebirth' enables Virgil to focus the narrative upon the early moments in the creation of Rome and Roman Italy. Although much of the action is set within a violent context, the theme of 'rebirth' illustrates a moment of cultural unity for all the communities involved. Their shared involvement in the struggle for Italy's future signifies the way in which

⁴¹⁶ Verg. *Aen.* 7.116: "Hey! We are eating even our tables."

⁴¹⁷ There is a range of opinion as to when there is a shift, if at all, from past to future in the *Aeneid*. For the view that this transition happens at the end of Book 6 see Miller, P.A. (1995), 229ff; and Gale (2003), 340ff. For the transition occurring in Book 3 see Lyne (1987), 214; Cairns (1989), 117; and Syed (2005), 175. Pöschl (1962), 37-39, states that the middle third of the epic (5-8) marks a transition from past to future. Whilst I see a transition in terms of theme from past to future centered on *patria* in Book 7, I agree with Seider (2013), 30, note 4, that the Trojan past is not entirely abandoned.

⁴¹⁸ "For me a higher class of affairs is born, I commence a greater work."

they all share in the same set of mythological ‘memories’ and in turn in the same *patria* that embodies these memories. The *Aeneid*, therefore, unites these communities in the commemoration of their deeds in a single literary instrument of collective memory, and hence reflects the complex nature of *patria* as a concept of collective identity that is relevant to multiple communities.

Ascanius’ statement that the Trojans have begun to eat their ‘tables’ triggers a memory for Aeneas. Although wrongly attributing the prophecy to his father Anchises, Aeneas declares to his fellow Trojans that their trials are now at an end (7.120-126):⁴¹⁹

“Salve fatis mihi debita tellus 120
vosque” ait “o fidi Troiae salvete penates:
hic domus, haec patria est. Genitor mihi talia namque
(nunc repeto) Anchises fatorum arcana reliquit:
‘cum te, nate, fames ignota ad litora vectum
accisis coget dapibus consumere mensas, 125
tum sperare domos defessus”⁴²⁰

With the fulfilment of this prophecy, the Trojans, and the audience with them, progress from being a group in exile who are only determined by the physical ‘death’ of *patria* to a group that now can look forward to a new future. That the events that follow the fulfilment of this prophecy are entirely concerned with the ‘rebirth’ of *patria* is made clear from the council of the gods at the beginning of Book 10. Concerned as to the future survival of the Trojans, Venus appeals to Jupiter for an explanation as to why they should suffer the

⁴¹⁹ On Aeneas’ poor memory at this point see Seider (2013), 28-31.

⁴²⁰ “Greetings o land fated to me as payment and greetings to you faithful Penates of Troy”, he cried, “Here is home, *patria* is here. For my father Anchises left to me (now I remember) this great mystery of our fate: ‘When, carried to unknown shores, hunger compels you, my son, as food fails, to eat your tables, then exhausted hope for a home’.”

trauma of a second siege, describing Troy in the process as being 'reborn' (10.27: *nascentis Troiae*). Juno then echoes this theme of 'rebirth'. Responding to Venus' claims as to the unjustness of the Trojans' plight, Juno asks how it is wrong for Turnus to be laying siege to the Trojans at the moment of Troy's birth, stating that Turnus is only defending his own *patria* (10.74-75: *indignum est Italos Troiam circumdare flammis | nascentem et patria Turnum consistere terra...?*).⁴²¹

Both Venus and Juno, however, are mistaken in their description of the nature of *patria's* 'rebirth'. Being too embroiled in their personal feud with each other, the goddesses have overlooked the fact that the Trojan *patria* is not being reborn as a new Troy. Nor is it exclusively Rome that is the product of the Trojans' arrival in Italy. Rather, the context of the overall narrative of Books 7-12 draws the audience's attention toward the fact that the future of *patria* and the future of Italy are one and the same thing. The first indication of this comes early on in Book 7. Consulting the oracle of his father Faunus, king Latinus is instructed to look for a foreign husband for his daughter Lavinia (7.96-101). Latinus is told that it will be as a result of this union, not only of two individuals but also of two communities, that the Latins will share in worldwide *imperium*.

This prophecy sets the scene for the narrative that follows, and ultimately directs the fate of the Trojans' *patria*. Offering Lavinia to

⁴²¹ "Is it shameful that the Italians surround newly-born Troy with flames and that Turnus stands in his native land...?"

Aeneas as his bride (7.268-273), Latinus unwittingly drags the Trojans and the Italians into war. The outcome of this war will dictate the future of the 'rebirth' of both *patria* and Italy. In describing the struggle between the Trojans and Etruscans on the one side and the Latins and their Italian allies on the other, the narrator states how the Trojans and the Latins are ultimately battling for the same goal, that of Italy (10.354-355): *Expellere tendunt nunc hi, nunc illi: certatur limine in ipso Ausoniae.*⁴²² Indeed, several scholars have rightly likened this conflict to a civil war.⁴²³ The description of the conflict at 10.354-355 echoes the earlier statements of Venus and Juno. Each goddess illustrates from her perspective the way in which the fate of *patria's* rebirth and the future of Italy are entwined. For Venus, the fierce defence of Italy by the Italian peoples against the arrival of the Trojans threatens to jeopardise *patria's* rebirth (10.27-29). For Juno the opposite is the case. In her eyes it is the rebirth of the Trojan *patria* that threatens the future of the Italian peoples. Both goddesses agree that Aeneas' arrival in Italy will have a lasting impact on Italy, they just do not know exactly what this impact will yet be.⁴²⁴

The interdependence between *patria* and Italy is further reinforced in Books 7 and 8 by the stress placed upon the Trojans'

⁴²² "They strived to expel each other, now these, now those: in the threshold itself of Ausonia is it fought." See also, Verg. *Aen.* 12.34-35.

⁴²³ Pöschl (1962), 14; Otis (1964), 351; Lyne (1987), 100; Cairns (1989), 92; Pogorzelski (2009); and Stover (2011).

⁴²⁴ The importance of the war as dictating the futures of both *patria* and Italy is echoed by Jupiter at Verg. *Aen.* 10.105-113.

descent from Dardanus.⁴²⁵ In the first diplomatic exchange between Latinus and the Trojan envoys, the name of Dardanus is invoked four times in the space of forty-five lines. In greeting the Trojan envoys, Latinus refers to them as “*Dardaniae*” (7.195), and then at the climax to his speech states that Dardanus was a native of Italy who had left for the cities of Ida in Phrygia (7.205-208). Responding to Latinus’ questioning, the Trojan envoys explain that they have come from the vanquished city of Troy and have sailed to Italy under divine auspices (7.216-218). In the process the Trojans identify themselves through reference to their descent from Dardanus and consequently from Jupiter (7.219-220: *Ab love principium generis, love Dardana pubes | gaudet avo*).⁴²⁶ Whilst these three references to Dardanus so far are important in stressing the Trojans’ and their *patria’s* Italian origins, it is the fourth reference that is most significant in highlighting the interdependence of *patria* and Italy (7.234-242):

<i>Fata per Aeneae iuro dextramque potentem, sive fide seu quis bello est expertus et armis:</i>	235
<i>multi nos populi, multae (ne temne, quod ultro praeferimus manibus vittas ac verba precantia) et petiere sibi et voluere adiungere gentes; sed nos fata deum vestras exquirere terras imperii egere suis. Hinc Dardanus ortus,</i>	240
<i>huc repetit iussisque ingentibus urget Apollo Tyrrhenum ad Thybrim et fontis vada sacra Numici.</i> ⁴²⁷	

⁴²⁵ Cf. Nakata (2012), 343-351, who argues instead that the Trojans downplay their Dardanian heritage and place more emphasis upon their Trojan identity. See also Hannah (2004), who offers a convincing argument as to the manufacturing of mythical genealogy in the *Aeneid*.

⁴²⁶ “From Jupiter is the beginning of our race, with grandfather Jupiter the young warriors of Dardanus rejoice.”

⁴²⁷ “I swear by the fortune of Aeneas and his strong right arm, tested for truth either by war or by arms, that many peoples, many *gentes* sought us for themselves and desired to join – do not scorn because we hold forth with hands of our own accord headbands and offer supplicating words. But the proclamations of the gods drove us with commands to seek out your lands. From this place Dardanus originated, here

Although many nations have offered to enter into a union with the Trojans, it is divine destiny coupled with the Trojans' Italian origins that have encouraged Aeneas and his followers to seek out Italy and its peoples. Thus, Virgil's Trojan envoys present the view that the destiny of their 'reborn' *patria*, and that of Virgil's contemporary audience, is, and has always been, tied to the landscape of Italy through Dardanus.

Aeneas echoes the diplomatic exchange between the Trojans and king Latinus on his arrival in Pallanteum. Answering Pallas' challenge, Aeneas declares that (8.119-120) *lectos | Dardaniae venisse duces* seeking the Etruscans' aid in the war against Turnus.⁴²⁸ Once again, it is the stress on the Trojans' Italian origins that takes precedence, and this is highlighted further by the fact that Aeneas does not provide information of any other identity markers. This continues when Aeneas is formally introduced to king Evander. Addressing Evander directly, Aeneas once again stresses the Italian origins of the Trojans and uses this to highlight the already existing connections between the Trojans and the Etruscans (8.134-142):

*Dardanus, Iliacae primus pater urbis et auctor,
Electra, ut Grai perhibent, Atlantide cretus,* 135
*advehitur Teucros; Electrum maximus Atlas
edidit, aetherios umero qui sustinet orbis.
Vobis Mercurius pater est, quem candida Maia
Cyllenae gelido conceptum vertice fudit;
at Maiam, auditis si quicquam credimus, Atlas,* 140
*idem Atlas generat caeli qui sidera tollit.
Sic genus amborum scindit se sanguine ab uno.*⁴²⁹

Apollo calls us back and drives, with mighty decrees, us to Tyrrhenian Thybris and to the sacred waters of the spring of Numicus."

⁴²⁸ "The chosen leaders of Dardanus have come."

⁴²⁹ "Dardanus, the first father and founder of the city of Ilium, born from Atlantean Electra, as the Greeks adduce, was brought to the Teucrians; mighty Atlas, who holds

The Trojans are not, therefore, an alien people. Instead, Aeneas stresses the extent to which they are Italians, returning to the land of their ancestors.⁴³⁰ The accompanying stress that Aeneas places on the kinship that the Trojans share with this group of Etruscans further reinforces that the Trojans are not strangers in Italy. As in the examples of the diplomatic exchange between the Trojans and king Latinus in Book 7, Aeneas' stress on the mythological Italian origins of the Trojans and the divine nature of their destiny to arrive in Italy serves both to illustrate the past relationship between *patria* and Italy and the interdependent nature of their future.

Virgil further indicates that the rebirth of *patria* and the future of Italy are one and the same thing by placing particular emphasis within the narrative of Books 7-12 on the involvement of multiple Italian communities. Virgil mentions more than fifty different Italian communities within the second half of the *Aeneid*, and in the majority of cases these are accompanied by specific identity markers, including mythological heroes, geographical landmarks and what we would today term national traits.⁴³¹ These references to various Italian communities and their particular mythological characteristics or

the heavens back from the world with his shoulders, begat Electra. Mercury is father for you, whom fair Maia conceived and bore from the icy summit of Cyllene; yet Atlas, if we believe what is heard, begat Maia, that same Atlas who elevates the starry sky. Thus the race of each of us divides itself from one blood."

⁴³⁰ See Nakata (2012), 351-356, for a detailed discussion of the genealogical elements of this exchange. Nakata stresses the fabrication of such genealogy and the use of Dardanus by the Trojans for opportunistic political advantage.

⁴³¹ I refer primarily to Virgil's catalogues of Italian people in 7.647-817 and 10.163-214. For a discussion of these passages and their significance see in particular Williams, R.D. (1961); and Saylor (1974).

geographical particularities would have undoubtedly resonated with a contemporary audience. A good example of this is Virgil's own home community of Mantua (10.198-203):

*Ille etiam patriis agmen ciet Ocnus ab oris,
fatidicae Mantus et Tusci filius amnis,
qui muros matrisque dedit tibi, Mantua, nomen, 200
Mantua dives avis, sed non genus omnibus unum:
gens illi triplex, populi sub gente quaterni,
ipsa caput populis, Tusco de sanguine vires.⁴³²*

Although it is a very short passage in relation to the entire epic, Virgil's description of Mantua is quite detailed. It provides the names of Mantua's founding father and his mythical ancestry. As such, Virgil provides the audience with a brief account of Mantua's mythological tradition. The passage also draws attention to the illustrious nature of its people and highlights a particularity of Mantua of being comprised of a federation of otherwise independent people. As Virgil is writing here about his own native traditions, it is safe enough to assume that these were components of myths and legends told amongst the people of Mantua, and which consequently function to highlight a sense of Mantuan collective identity. When one considers that Virgil's contemporary audience would have comprised people from communities all over Italy it is highly likely that Virgil would have been as diligent in recording the mythological traditions for these communities as he does for his own native Mantua.

⁴³² "There also Ocnus summons an army from his native shores, son of prophetic Manto and of the Tuscan river, who gave to you, Mantua, walls and the name of his mother, Mantua, rich in ancestry – but not all one race, there are three races, under the races four peoples – and itself the head for these peoples, its strength from Tuscan blood."

The involvement of Italian peoples is not confined to the catalogues of Italian people in Books 7 and 10. In the narrative account of the events of the war in Italy across Books 7-12 Virgil is careful to ensure that the deeds of mythical characters of the various Italian communities are commemorated as much as those of Aeneas and the Trojans. Toward the climax of Book 10, just as Aeneas stands poised to strike down Mezentius, Lausus, Mezentius' son advances to face Aeneas to save his father. The narrative states (10.791-793):

*Hic mortis durae casum tuaque optima facta,
si qua fidem tanto est operi latura vetustas,
non equidem nec te, iuvenis memorande, silebo*⁴³³

Lausus' stand is in vain as he is quickly slain by Aeneas. Yet, Lausus' actions stand as an example of filial devotion that is resonant to Aeneas' own.⁴³⁴ Lausus is the Italian equivalent to Aeneas and, owing to his equal piety, becomes a celebrated mythical figure of the Etruscan community. In this way, he can be interpreted as an *exemplum* for some members of Virgil's Italian audience as Aeneas does for others.

Camilla, a mythical figure designated by Virgil as being of Volscian origin, is another character other than Aeneas and the Trojans whose deeds are recorded and commemorated.⁴³⁵ Indeed, as Boyd

⁴³³ "For my part, if antiquity is going to bear faith for such labours, I will not keep silent about the event of your cruel death and your best deeds here, nor about you yourself, o youth that is to be remembered."

⁴³⁴ On the similarities between Lausus and Aeneas, especially with regard to their *pietas*, see Otis (1964), 359; Johnson (1976), 72-75; Putnam (1981); Reed (2009), 182; Pogorzelski (2009), 281; and Stover (2011).

⁴³⁵ For various discussions on the character and symbolism of Camilla in the *Aeneid* see Wilhelm (1987), 46-48; Moorton (1989), 114-118; Frantantuono (2006);

notices, Virgil gives her a level of unprecedented importance in the Aeneas myth by mentioning her last in the catalogue of Italian peoples.⁴³⁶ In Book 11 no fewer than 63 lines are dedicated to telling the mythical tale of Camilla's childhood, and her importance as a participant in the war in Italy is further highlighted by Turnus who hails her (11.508) "*O decus Italiae Virgo*"⁴³⁷. Breaking the battle narrative, the narrator asks (11.664-665): "*Quem telo primum, quem postremum, aspera virgo, | deicis? Aut quot humi morientia corpora fundis?*"⁴³⁸ Following her passage across the battlefield, the audience is exposed to Camilla's own particular form of piety to Diana, a piety that earns her remembrance and which is comparable to that of Aeneas (11.841-847):

*Heu nimum, virgo, nimum crudele luisti
supplicium Teucros conata lacessere bello!
Nec tibi desertae in dumis coluisse Dianam
profuit aut nostras umero gessisse pharetras.
Non tamen indecorem tua te regina reliquit 845
extrema iam in morte, neque hoc sine nomine letum
per gentis erit aut famam patieris inultae.*⁴³⁹

Like with Lausus, Camilla's actions, both on the battlefield and off it, have earned her commemoration by the Italian community. Indeed, the actions of Camilla are vividly remembered by the internal audience.

Frantantuono and McOsler (2010); and Egan (2012). On the subject of Virgil's deliberate creation of Camilla see Horsfall (1988).

⁴³⁶ Boyd (1992), 213.

⁴³⁷ "O maiden, the glory of Italy." Green (2007), 125: "we can scarcely doubt that this was also an invocation to Diana and meant to be heard as such."

⁴³⁸ "O wild maiden, who do you slay first with your javelin, who last? Or how many dying bodies do you scatter on the ground?"

⁴³⁹ "Alas, o maiden, you have suffered far too cruel a punishment having tried to challenge the Teucrians with war! Deserted in the woods, neither having worshipped Diana nor having worn our quivers from your shoulder has been useful to you. Now finally in death, however, your queen has not left you inglorious, and this death will not be without renown throughout the *gentes*, nor will you endure the fame of one unavenged."

With their city, *patria*, under direct threat the women of Latium mount the battlements and defend themselves, remembering the example of Camilla as they do so (11.891-895). Camilla is thus to be regarded as much as an *exemplum* for the audience as Aeneas, Lausus, Turnus and any of the other great heroes who are singled out for individual mention. These heroes illustrate the extent to which the *Aeneid* is concerned with recording and commemorating all the great deeds of the participants of this war as equally as possible.⁴⁴⁰

From the narrator's perspective, that is to say for Virgil, it is as important to record the deeds of Lausus and Camilla as it is to record those of Aeneas and Turnus. This determination to commemorate the deeds of all the Italian communities creates an equilibrium between the participants in the war that the *Aeneid* records. The perspectives of the audience thus shift from one Italian community to another, and to some extent, the emphasis placed on the Trojans is lessened to a significant degree. In this way, the individual stories of the Trojans and the various Italian communities become subservient to a greater narrative and destiny: that of an Italy experiencing the first events in a long road to cultural and political unification. Virgil's belief in this is highlighted by the agreement that is reached between Jupiter and Juno toward the climax to Book 12 and the entire epic. In this exchange, the process of rebirth of *patria* is completed and it is the

⁴⁴⁰ The commemoration of all the participants in this fictitious and mythical war in Italy is reminiscent of the opening lines to Herodotus' *Histories*.

merger of Trojan with Italian that is very much at the heart of the agreement.⁴⁴¹

3.II.iii. An Italian Agenda

The rebirth of the Trojan *patria* not just in Italy but also as Italy signals the end of the *Aeneid's* primary narrative. The agreement of Jupiter and Juno that the Italian peoples will come together in the service of a greater destiny brings to an end the *patria's* experiences within the epic narrative. The *Aeneid's* violent conclusion with Turnus' death at the hands of Aeneas (12.869-952) could be interpreted as a portent of the violence that is yet to occur amongst the various communities of Italy.⁴⁴² Despite divine agreement that Italy is to share a single destiny, unity will only be attained as a result of further violence and suffering.

When the themes of 'death' and 'rebirth' are placed together, themes that revolve around the experiences of *patria* within the epic narrative, the epic's role as an instrument of collective memory becomes clear. The *Aeneid* explores the early stages in the development of *patria*, tracing its mythical origins from Troy to its mythical rebirth in Italy. Yet, *patria's* rebirth is not exclusively as Rome. Reference is made to the cities that will lead to the formation of Rome, but this is in many ways overshadowed by Virgil's thematic emphasis on Italy, both as a territorial area and as a federation of peoples that are destined to come together and share in worldwide *imperium*. The

⁴⁴¹ Virgil, *Aeneid*, 12.821-840.

⁴⁴² On the death of Turnus and the significance this episode has on our reading of the *Aeneid* see West, D. (1974); Burnell (1987); Nicoll (2001); and Reed (2009), 44-72.

references to contemporary events tie the epic narrative to the historical memories of the audience, and as such function to establish a psychological sense of historical continuity between the experiences of Aeneas and these of Virgil's audience. In essence, the experience of *patria* in the *Aeneid* serves to bolster the arguments of Syme, Toll, Ando and Pogorzelski, to name but a few, regarding the epic poem as a cultural reflection of Italian political unity.⁴⁴³

The notion that all Italians have a mythological claim to a single *patria* and that this single *patria's* geographical sphere of reference is the entire Italian peninsula is imbued with additional weight and legitimacy with frequent references to divine destiny. Most importantly, the ways in which Virgil creates a tapestry of multiple mythological traditions in the *Aeneid* function to endow the epic with a greater role than simply an expression of Roman collective memory and identity.⁴⁴⁴ The unification of otherwise independent mythological traditions into a single literary narrative acts as the biggest indicator that Virgil's cultural ambitions extend beyond the urban boundaries of Rome. By unifying the mythological traditions of the Italian peoples, Virgil is able to provide a single literary account that acts as an instrument of collective memory that is relevant to all Italian peoples.

⁴⁴³ See Syme (1939), 465-466; Toll (1991 and 1997); Ando (2002); and Pogorzelski (2009).

⁴⁴⁴ Cf. Nakata (2012), 336, who recognises the multiplicity in the *Aeneid* but interprets this in terms of Roman identity rather than Italian: "Roman identity is thus envisioned as a synthesis of multiple parts, stemming from the Trojans and embracing other groups in turn".

Aeneas and the Trojans thus become not only the founders of Rome, but also the founders of a culturally and politically unified Italy.

Thus, Virgil's *Aeneid* has an Italian agenda regarding the concept of *patria*. Virgil's presentation of *patria* in this way, that is to say a concept that undergoes a physical transformation from the city of Troy to the region of Italy, is unique. The question to consider at this point is why Virgil undertakes such a conscious re-conceptualisation of *patria* in this way and why he does so through an epic that functions as an instrument of collective memory that would have resonated with all of Roman Italy rather than Rome alone.

I believe that the answer to these questions lies with the contemporary political and social contexts of the time. The Social War of 90-88 BC had ensured that the communities of Italy had become more politically aligned, building upon already strong shared cultural links. The importance of Italy as a single political and social domain was further engrained as a result of the civil wars. Many of Rome's political and social elite were of Italian origin and the Italian peninsula was a primary strategic objective for both sides.⁴⁴⁵ For Augustus, the salience of Italy as a single unified entity is evident from his *Res Gestae*.⁴⁴⁶ With this in mind, Virgil's emphasis upon *patria* as representing a unified Italy can be understood as simply an attempt to realign what had previously been a predominantly Roman concept

⁴⁴⁵ Important political and cultural individuals of various Italian origins during this time, some of whom stress Italy in their writings, include Cicero, Cato, Virgil, Horace, Maecenas and Augustus.

⁴⁴⁶ *RGDA* 16.1, 21.3, 25.2, 28.2, and App. 4. The *Res Gestae Divi Augusti* will, henceforth, be abbreviated in this study to *RGDA*.

with these changes in the political and social landscapes. As a consequence, Virgil's epic provides the foundations upon which Italy can develop a sense of unified cultural identity that would complement and reinforce the ever deepening political and social unification.

Virgil's *Aeneid*, therefore, is undoubtedly a 'national epic' but one that was much more complex in its composition than has previously been demonstrated, and one that was focused more on Italy than on Rome. The *Aeneid* provides an already well-established sense of Italian political unity at the very least with a strong set of cultural foundations. Combining multiple mythological traditions into a single mythological narrative, and centring them on an account of the establishment of *patria* in Italy from Troy, Virgil composes a literary account of the origins of Italy and a shared concept of *patria* that functions as a shared instrument of collective memory. The *Aeneid's* role as an instrument of collective memory for a culturally and politically united Roman Italy directly affects the Roman concept of *patria*. Thus, reflecting past arguments regarding the poem as a whole, where previously *patria* had been recognised by the Romans as a Rome-centric embodiment of collective identity, Virgil can be seen to reconceptualise it in his epic as an embodiment of Romano-Italian collective identity.

Summary

This chapter has explored how literature functioned to (re)define *patria* in different ways during the Augustan period in order to foster an idea

of cultural unity. This process was entirely subjective, being dependent on the motivations and objectives of the author. In the case of Livy, the discussion illustrated how *exempla* and collective trauma could be used to great effect in such an endeavour. In particular, the attachment of episodes of *exempla* to extant monuments and moments of collective trauma to recent emotional experiences helped to give such episodes a very specific contemporary value. Virgil's *Aeneid* on the other hand involved less the emphasis on unity via specific characteristics or traits associated with *patria* and more on that of its territoriality and Italian mythological relevance. By binding the birth of the concept to the Italian landscape and the early Italian peoples, Virgil attempted to reinvent what *patria* symbolised, creating a cultural legacy that complemented and reinforced the political and social unification of the previous six or seven decades.

The variation in approach and the clearly different intentions of the two authors also reveals the existence of a dynamic dialogue during this specific historical period regarding what *patria* symbolised and what its function should be within Roman culture and society. It is also possible that this dialogue also points towards the existence of political influences and motivations. However, more investigation is clearly required to explore this dialogue of change regarding *patria* in the Augustan period and indeed within the wider context of Roman history.

Methods of communicating notions and features associated with concepts of collective identity as defined by Collective Memory Studies are clearly relevant in helping us to understand the growth and development of conceptions of collective identity in the ancient world. As such, there should be a greater endeavour within the historical scholarship of antiquity to move in this direction and to explore in greater detail how concepts such as *patria* were developed via such processes over a greater period of time than that considered here; how these methods of communication and investigation changed; what their cultural motivations were; and what impacts they had upon contemporary perceptions of collective identity. As this chapter and other recent studies on ancient notions and expressions of identity have shown, identity was as much a dynamic, fluid and dependent feature of human existence as it is today. This dynamism is one we should better learn to embrace.

Chapter Four: The Significance of *Patria* in the Political Identity of Augustus and Septimius Severus

Introduction

Having previously discussed the nature of the relationship between *patria* and politics in the context of the Late Republic, this chapter now seeks to extend the political investigation into the Roman imperial period. By imperial period I refer to the period of Roman history that commences following the final defeat of Antony in Egypt in 30 BC. In particular, this chapter is interested in identifying the political role that *patria* played during this time in the characterisation of Roman emperors and their regimes.

Since this is a particularly vast period of Roman political history, it is necessary to select specific case studies that enable as varied a discussion as possible in order to illustrate the complexities, ambiguities and nuances associated with *patria* at this time. For this reason, I have chosen to discuss *patria* firstly within the context of the Augustan principate, and secondly in that of the *ludi saeculares* that were celebrated during the reign of Septimius Severus. Whilst these regimes are chronologically divided by a time span of some two hundred years, the themes explored in each case study, as well as the political similarities that exist between them, validate such an approach.

In the Augustan case study, I consider the relationship between *patria* and the principate from an external perspective. That is to say, I explore the degree to which *patria* was employed by Augustan writers in order to externally (re)explore, (re)consider and (re)evaluate the nature and significance of the political changes that were taking place at that time. The discussion illustrates how it was that during the Augustan period there existed a highly detailed and comprehensive debate amongst some of the contemporary leading figures of Roman culture and society regarding the nature of Rome's political present and future. There does not appear to have been any consensus as to how Augustus' relationship to *patria* should be understood. Instead, Augustan writers used their poetry as a vehicle through which both they and their readers could explore the nature of the Augustan principate. They do not offer any concrete interpretation, ultimately leaving this task to the audience. Such ambiguity regarding the nature of the Augustan principate is arguably one of the primary reasons for its success, and we should embrace this ambiguity rather than attempt to arrive at definitive conclusions regarding what I believe to have been one of the most carefully constructed political systems of the ancient world.

In the Severan case study, I analyse the messages that are contained within the obverse design of Septimius Severus' DI PATRII coin type. In this case, the use of *patria* as a means by which to characterise imperial regimes is considered from an internal rather

than external perspective. Dismissing previous arguments that the coin represents solely Septimius Severus' Roman, Lepcitane or African identity, I argue that the coin functions as an expression of the emperor's dual identity. That is to say, Severus' DI PATRII coinage expresses the emperor's desire to be recognised as both the leader of the Roman *patria* and an ordinary member of his native *patria* of Lepcis Magna. Whilst a consideration of the coin's iconography reveals that it is undoubtedly Lepcitane in nature, an analysis of the cultural provenance and function of the phrase *deus patrius* in Latin inscriptions and literature reveals it to have been a Roman religio-cultural expression that was used to designate deities considered to ensure the welfare of the Roman *patria*. Politically, this coin can be seen to function as a visual metaphor, characterising Septimius Severus' regime as a continuation of Roman cultural and religious tradition whilst also indicating its role as leading the Roman world into a new era of peace and prosperity.

4.1. *Patria* and the External Characterisation of the Augustan Principate

At 35.1, the concluding chapter of his *Res Gestae*, Augustus informs the reader that:

Tertium dec[im]um consulatu[m] cum gereba[m], sena[tus et e]quester ordo populusq[ue] Romanus universus [appell]av[it] me p[at]r[em] p[at]riae, idque in vestibulo a[ed]ium mearum inscribendum et in c[ur]ia [luliae] in foro Aug[usto] sub

*quadrig[is], quae mihi ex s(enatus) c(onsulto) pos[it]ae [sunt,
censuit.]*⁴⁴⁷

The textual prominence that Augustus grants to this event is significant for three reasons. Firstly, coming at the end of a highly selective autobiographical summary of his political achievements, the title *pater patriae* serves as the deliberate climax to the text's overall narrative. Set within the context of the *RGDA* it explains and in turn is explained by the document's central themes. Secondly, it highlights what Augustus personally regarded as the zenith of his public life, a fact that is reflected in Suetonius' biographical account of the *princeps*.⁴⁴⁸ Thirdly, and most significant of all, is Augustus' clear intention with such a narrative climax that he desires the nature of his political legacy to be defined by his relationship with *patria*.⁴⁴⁹ Yet, what exactly was this relationship and how does its meaning affect our pre-existing evaluations of Augustus and his principate?

Discussion thus far regarding the significance of the title *pater patriae* within the Augustan period has been conducted by focusing

⁴⁴⁷ The Latin is Cooley's reconstruction of the text (2009). "During my thirteenth consulship, the senate and the equestrian order and the people of Rome hailed me collectively as *pater patriae*, and they decreed that this title should be inscribed in the vestibule of my home and in the *Curia Iulia* and in the *Forum Augustum* under the chariot, which was erected by a decree of the senate in my honour."

⁴⁴⁸ Brunt and Moore (1967), 80: "a fitting climax to his [Augustus'] memorial"; Salmon (1956), 276-277: "Readers are left with the impression that Augustus reached the culminating point, the peak and pinnacle of his career, when the Senate, the Equestrian Order and the Roman People named him Pater Patriae in 2 B.C."; Ramage (1987), 108: "the title Pater Patriae serves here [...] as a climactic summary or symbol of Augustus' methods and achievements. [...] In the *RG*, as in real life, Pater Patriae encompasses all [of Augustus' achievements] and also serves as a suitable conclusion to the document"; Cooley (2009), 275: "Given both the prominence given to this episode in *RGDA*, and Augustus' initial reaction in the senate as recorded by Suetonius, Augustus clearly put great value on having been acclaimed as *pater patriae*"; Suet. *Aug.* 58.

⁴⁴⁹ Regarding the nature of *patria* itself and what it signified at this moment in Roman history refer back to the earlier discussion in Chapters One and Two.

attention upon the conceptual associations that attended Augustus' status as *pater*.⁴⁵⁰ The term *pater's* primary political and ideological function, it has been argued, was to encapsulate and symbolise Augustus' role in delivering the Roman state from the clutches of civil war (*custos*) and, consequently, in establishing a new age of peace and prosperity (*conditor*).⁴⁵¹ Such an interpretation reflects the significance of these two themes within the wider framework of Augustan ideology, and provides a degree of credibility to Augustan claims that the principate was acting within the boundaries of Roman republican tradition, and hence was nothing more than a continuation of the past.⁴⁵² In turn, it has been suggested that the title possessed

⁴⁵⁰ Despite the title's clear significance within Augustus' *Res Gestae*, its scholarly reception has been limited at best. Indeed, Stevenson (2009), 98, is right when he states that "the *PP* title tends to attract off-the-cuff comments and throwaway lines rather than comprehensive treatments". Such indifference is illustrated by the mute interest expressed in the title by Mommsen and Syme. Mommsen (1876), 780, rejected the possibility of any significance of *pater patriae*, stating that it was not an essential component of the emperor's status and that it was nothing more than an honorary title. In Syme (1939), 519, *pater patriae* gets a passing mention, being described briefly as the culmination of Augustus' other titles and that it functioned to depict him as the saviour of the Roman world, yet without any accompanying analysis or explanation to support such statements. The exceptions to this indifference are Skard (1933); Alföldi (1971); Weinstock (1971); Ramage (1987); Strothmann (2000); and Severy (2003).

⁴⁵¹ For various discussions on this see Skard (1933); Alföldi (1971), 27ff; Weinstock (1971), 183-184; Strothmann (2000), *passim*; and Severy (2003), 158-160. The Roman political conceptualisation of *pater* as a saviour and founder is believed to have its roots in Greek philosophical writings regarding the qualities of beneficial rulers and in the Hellenistic epithet of *πατήρ και σωτήρ* that was bestowed by Greek cities on its benefactors, particularly Hellenistic monarchs (Skard (1933); Alföldi (1971) 48-49; and Weinstock (1971), 200-201). It is surmised that these ideas passed into Roman political culture as a result of Rome's increased military involvement in Hellenistic affairs (Alföldi (1971) 49ff; and Severy (2003), 158 n. 1).

⁴⁵² Strothmann (2000), has proposed the notion that *pater patriae* was one of three central ideological pillars that conceptualised the emerging principate. Such a hypothesis, however, presents far too neat a picture of the principate's evolution, implying that it was already a foregone conclusion in Augustus' mind as to how his regime would take shape. For evidence of Augustus as 'saviour' and 'founder' in the wider ideological framework of the principate consider a) the memorialisation of Augustus' receipt of the *corona civica* (*RGDA* 34.2; *RIC* 73, 76, 79; the altars to the *lares Augusti* (Galinsky (1996), 306-308, fig. 141, 142, and 144); and its

important religious connotations, that it reflected and complemented the ideology of the already established cult of the *genius Augusti* and enabled the drawing of close parallels between Augustus and Jupiter.⁴⁵³ Lastly, just as strong emotional bonds existed between a *pater familias* and the other members of his family and in the same way as this position would pass from father to son, so has *pater patriae* been interpreted as symbolising the existence of a strong mutual bond of affection between the *princeps* and the dependants of his 'national' family and as illustrating the heritability of Augustus' position in the state.⁴⁵⁴

It has thus been argued, albeit indirectly through the term *pater*, that Augustus' relationship to *patria* was entirely conceptualised along pre-existing paternal connotations; cultural, political and social associations that were simply transferred from the micro to the macro-level of society and politics. Whilst its individual observations are

representation on the shield of Mars in the *Forum Augustum* (Galinsky (1996), 208)), b) the unprecedented scale of peace (*pax Augusta*) provided by his leadership (*RGDA* 13), and c) the heralding of a new Golden Age of prosperity for the Roman world (Virgil, *Aeneid*, 6.792-795; the sculpture of the *Ara Pacis Augustae* (Zanker (1988), 175-183; Elsner (1991), 58-59; Castriota (1995), 124-144 and 164-169; and Rehak (2006), 103ff, and 146). Indeed, Gagé (1977), 168 and Severy (2003), 159-160 rightly point out that Augustus' receipt of the title *pater patriae* on 5th February 2 BC coincided with "the anniversary of a Temple to Concordia". The image of Augustus as the saviour of the state and the founder of a new age has precedent in Cicero and Caesar. Cicero received the *corona civica* in 62 BC for his actions as consul in suppressing the Catilinarian conspiracy. He is also supposedly acclaimed *parens patriae*, but Cicero makes little reference to such an honour (see above). Caesar was bestowed with the *corona civica* in 80 BC (Suet. *Iul.* 2), and the title *parens patriae* in 45 BC. The title *parens patriae* appears on his coinage (*RRC* 480/19 and *RRC* 480/20). For discussions of these precedents see Skard (1933); Alföldi (1971), 53-67; Weinstock (1971), 163ff and 201ff; and Severy (2003), 158-160.

⁴⁵³ Ramage (1987), 106; Brunt and Moore (1967), 80: "The Genius, the mystery power (*numen*) residing in the head of the household, in primitive times the power by which his procreative ability could be explained, had always been an object of cult within the family; to make the Genius of Augustus an object of public cult implied that he stood in the same relation to Rome as the father did to his own household".

⁴⁵⁴ Ramage (1987), 105; Severy (2003), 160-165.

indeed useful, the one-dimensional nature of this overall interpretation is problematic. In the first instance, previous studies have focused their analyses exclusively upon what I term an 'internal' perspective, namely, upon gauging the official, Augustan line. As such, they have failed to consider an external reception of such themes within Augustan society, the nature that this reception may have taken, and the impact that it has upon our understanding of Augustus. Secondly, and a direct consequence of the previous point, the image of Augustus as a benign parental figure offers an excessively positive, or 'pro-Augustan', perspective with regard to the nature of Augustus' public image. It is undoubtedly the case that Augustus desired the communication of a positive representation of himself, indeed what politician of any historical era would not, but was this 'positivity' reflected and expressed externally, and if so with what degree of sincerity? Thirdly, the implication inherent in all the previous studies that the connotations associated with *pater patriae* would have been universally understood and acknowledged seems to me to be far too idealistic. Whilst Augustus and his close group of political associates may have had a clear image as to what the *princeps'* relationship to *patria* was, and thus what the title *pater patriae* symbolised (and of course it is equally possible that they did not), I certainly do not believe that such would have been the case beyond this inner circle. For Augustan society, Augustus' relationship to *patria* would have been a topic that would have sparked more questions and general debate

than provided concrete answers, no matter how easily identifiable or relatable these themes were. Finally, and most importantly, analysis until now has concentrated exclusively upon the term *pater* and its ideological connotations. No attention has actually been placed upon *patria* and the relationship that *it* was perceived to have had with the *princeps*. Indeed, when one considers the fact that the title comprises two terms that are clearly interdependent, this omission seems incredible. Augustus was not simply *pater* but *pater patriae*.

The concept of *patria* and an external perspective are thus two outstanding considerations that require discussion before we can truly state that we have arrived at a complete understanding, or as near to it as possible, of *pater patriae* and its role in the characterisation of the Augustan principate. As such, the analysis that follows combines these two themes and offers a comprehensive chronological examination of the occurrences within a selection of Augustan literature – namely the poetry of Horace, Propertius and Ovid – in which the term *patria* occurs in direct relation to Augustus.

The consideration of the relationship between Augustus and *patria* from an external perspective naturally raises the question of the political intentions, motivations and outlooks of the three writers concerned, and thus the political nature of the texts under consideration. To what extent are they to be considered to be pro or anti-Augustan or neutral? What factors are to be used to determine such classifications? And ultimately is a positive/negative political

polarisation of such texts a valid or indeed appropriate approach to take? These are questions that have been the subject of discussion in recent scholarship regarding the political nature of Augustan literature, particularly since (and indeed because of) the thought-provoking argument of Kennedy in 1992.⁴⁵⁵ My position regarding such questions is two-fold. Firstly, I believe that a wide variety of factors must be equally evaluated and the conclusions from these combined to form an overall picture before one can begin to establish a text's political function. Taking into consideration the views of a selection of pre-existing arguments these factors are: a writer's intention; an audience's subjectivism; a text's narrative voice; a text's cultural, political or social themes; the manner, or sincerity, in which such themes are presented; and how a text's themes interact with and relate to those of another. Secondly, I am of the opinion that we need to be more accommodating towards a 'middle-ground' interpretation. That is to say, whilst there are some texts that are undoubtedly positively (e.g. the *RGDA*) or negatively (e.g. Cicero's *Catilinarians*) aligned towards a particular political viewpoint, there are many that I would argue are neither and instead offer a neutral presentation of the political context in which they are composed. I am not advocating such texts as being apolitical, since all texts are products of their political

⁴⁵⁵ See Kennedy (1992), particularly 40-48, for an argument in support of subjectivism (that a text's political nature is ultimately the product of reception, and thus the preconceptions of the audience or critic) as an answer to such questions, an approach adopted by Sharrock (2006). For similar arguments but framed differently see Labate (1984); and Martindale (1993). In contrast see Davis (2006), 9-22 who offers a comprehensive response to Kennedy's arguments. See also the comments on this matter by Habinek (1998), 167; and Hinds (1998), 47-50 and (2006), 42-50.

times, albeit to varying degrees. Rather, I argue that such texts, including the ones that are discussed below, deliberately offer a complex, multifaceted and at times ambiguous or even contradictory picture of the Augustan political context in which they were written, in order for them to be able to function effectively, both for the writer as well as the audience, as instruments of political contemplation, evaluation and exploration.⁴⁵⁶

Thus, taking each writer in turn, my discussion will illustrate that the relationship between Augustus and *patria* was an important theme within Augustan poetry, since it provided the writer with a means by which to (re)explore, (re)consider and (re)evaluate the nature of the principate. As will be seen, these sources do not reflect a one-dimensional presentation of Augustus as *pater patriae*. Instead, they offer a dynamic snapshot of Augustan politics that both portrays Augustus as a benign, traditional protector on the one hand, and as an authoritarian and highly dominant figure in Roman life on the other.

4.1.i: Horace, *Epistulae* 1.3 and *Carmina* 3.6, 4.5.

In *Epistulae* 1.3, Horace asks the question (lines 6-7): *quis sibi res gestas Augusti scribere sumit?* | *Bella quis et paces longum diffundit in aevum?*⁴⁵⁷ After a lengthy digression upon the writing habits of his contemporaries, this literary task is described by Horace as being a valid means by which a Roman may fulfil his duty of ensuring the well-

⁴⁵⁶ Davis (2006), 23, "Augustan ideology is not so much expressed as reflected, refracted and examined in the works of Augustan writers".

⁴⁵⁷ "Who takes it upon himself to write about the achievements of Augustus? Who passes his deeds in war and peace into a far-off time?"

being of the *patria* (lines 28-29): *hoc opus, hoc studium parvi properemus et ampli, | si patriae volumus, si nobis vivere cari.*⁴⁵⁸

Although written some thirty-four years or so before the *RGDA*, and some eighteen years before Augustus' adoption of the *pater patriae* title, the thematic parallel between the document's narrative climax and the central message of this passage is intriguing. As in the case of *RGDA* 35.1, the opening lines to *Epistulae* 1.3 emphasise the interdependent relationship that exists between *patria* and Augustus. Both serve to characterise the other. On the one hand, the literary celebration of the *patria's* glory is depicted as being reliant upon the martial achievements of the princeps. On the other, such a literary celebration of the *patria* functions as an important means by which to reflect the character of Augustus and his political life. The significance of such a relationship was, therefore, already established by 20 BC, and it was recognised (by Horace at the very least) that literature played a central role in its communication. Yet, how does Horace himself present and communicate such a relationship within his poetry, and what impact does this have upon the audience's understanding of the nature of the Augustan principate?

The earliest occurrence of such a relationship within Horatian poetry is found in *Carmina* 3.6. The poem's overarching theme is the decades' long decline in traditional Roman religious and social

⁴⁵⁸ "Let us, great and small, hasten to this endeavour, this study, if we desire to live dear to the *patria* and to ourselves."

values.⁴⁵⁹ In choosing such a theme, Horace reflects the deep feeling of uncertainty within Roman society at this time, a fact illustrated by the thematic parallels that can be drawn between this poem and other Latin writers of the first century BC.⁴⁶⁰ It is deep within this narrative of Rome's religious and social debasement that Horace introduces the reader to the concept of *patria*. At 3.6.19-20, we are confronted with the statement that it was this moral degradation that was the source of destruction (*clades*) – clearly a reference to the civil wars – that is described as literally flooding (*fluxit*) the *patria* and its people.⁴⁶¹ This negative impact upon the *patria* is further emphasised with the contrast that is drawn between it and an idealised portrayal of Rome's glorious past, in which earlier generations were able to bring low the fiercest of external threats and thus ensure Rome's security.⁴⁶²

Horace's underlying message throughout this poem is clear. The security of the Roman *patria* is dependant upon a society that adheres to and respects traditional religious and social values. As such, it is only by returning to such values that Rome will be able to experience once again a period of peace and prosperity that was enjoyed by its ancestors. It is this dependence upon social and religious values that connects *patria* to Augustus. This is because the poem's opening lines (1-4) state that the restoration of such values rests entirely upon the

⁴⁵⁹ See Hor, *Carm.* 3.6.1, 3.6.17-18, 3.6.21-32. Nisbet and Rudd (2004), 97-100; Günther (2013), 401-406.

⁴⁶⁰ See for example Sall. *Cat.* 10-11, Sall. *Jug.* 41, and Liv. 1.pr.

⁴⁶¹ Hor. *Carm.* 3.6.19-20: *hoc fonte derivata clades | in patriam populumque fluxit.* ("From this source is derived the destruction which has engulfed people and *patria*.")

⁴⁶² Horace, *Carmina* 3.6.33-44. Günther (2013), 405, states that such a juxtaposition "serves as a model for a brighter future".

actions of an unnamed Roman (*Romane*), an individual who can be associated with the *princeps* owing to the connections that can be identified between this passage and the wider political context.⁴⁶³ By the time of the poem's composition in 23 BC, for example, Augustus had completed the restoration of eighty-two temples in Rome and it is not too far-fetched to assume that the groundwork for the future *Leges Iuliae* had already been laid if we understand Augustus as having been a man who was careful to plan ahead.⁴⁶⁴

Should we interpret *Carmina* 3.6 as having been a positive endorsement of Augustus' religious and social reforms as argued by Günther, and thus of Augustus as the guardian of the *patria* in religious and moral terms?⁴⁶⁵ Whilst the poem's thematic nature would appear to lend itself to the possibility of such an interpretation, its opening and closing four lines (1-4 and 45-48) provide a degree of doubt, caution and ambiguity, factors that raise more questions as to the nature of Augustus' principate than answers. At the beginning of line 2, the audience is introduced to the addressee of this verse: *Romane*, Roman. In the previous paragraph I suggested how the reference made to the repair of Rome's religious buildings appears to reflect the wider cultural programme of the principate that is recorded at *RGDA* 20.4.

⁴⁶³ Hor. *Carm.* 3.6.1-4. West, D. (2002), 70-71; Nisbet and Rudd (2004), 98; Günther (2013), 402-404.

⁴⁶⁴ *RGDA* 20.4. On the poem's date of composition see West, D. (2002), 64-65; Lyne (1995), 71; and Nisbet and Rudd (2004), xix-xx. Günther (2013), 402, argues for the date of c.28 BC, but this enables the poem still to reflect and interact with the information of *RGDA* 20.4. Regarding the relationship between *Carmina* 3.6 and Augustus' social agenda, that is the *Leges Iuliae*, see Lyne (1995), 174-175; Nisbet and Rudd (2004), 98-99; and Davis (2006), 33-34.

⁴⁶⁵ Günther (2013), 401-402 and 404 n. 720.

Yet, it is equally possible that the vocative form of *Romanus* could simply be a means by which Horace attempts to engage directly a generic Roman audience with the poem's subsequent narrative. Indeed, there is nothing else within the narrative to imply that it is only the *princeps* that is addressed. Thus, whether referring to the *princeps* or to Romans in general or indeed to both simultaneously, *Romanus* functions to seize the attention of the addressee. In so doing, it creates a sense of heightened tension and juxtaposes the morality of the addressee with the religious and social themes of the narrative.⁴⁶⁶ This juxtaposition thus forces the addressee to evaluate the degree to which they adhere to the traditional values and customs of the past.⁴⁶⁷ As such, *Carmina* 3.6 urges the addressee to involve itself directly in the on-going restoration of Rome's cultural heritage and in turn endorses the necessity of collective action as a means by which to heal the wounds of division that, as stated at 3.6.19-20, had engulfed the *patria* in destruction.

If *Romanus* does indeed refer to the *princeps*, why did Horace feel that it was necessary to call fleetingly on Augustus to engage with this situation? As stated above, by the time of the poem's supposed composition in 23 BC Augustus had already completed or commenced

⁴⁶⁶ Cf. Günther (2013), 401, "however, the solemn address, with the generalizing singular *Romane*, "Roman," clearly strikes a religious note".

⁴⁶⁷ It is important to note the description of the addressee as being *immitus*, guiltless or blameless. This term only adds to the ambiguity of the term *Romanus*. Does it refer to the actions of the *princeps* in the civil wars, and thus absolve him from blame? Or does it refer simply to the fact that Augustan society is the unwitting product of past degenerate generations and thus cannot be blamed as such for their lack of respect for Rome's religious and social heritage?

the restoration of a large number of Rome's religious buildings. Moreover, the centrality of traditional Roman values within the ideology of the principate was already a well-advertised fact. Surely, if *Carmina* 3.6 was intended to promote and endorse the *princeps'* religious and social reforms we would expect Augustus to be the object of praise and thus to be held up as an *exemplum* for the rest of Rome.⁴⁶⁸ Yet no praise of the *princeps* is to be found, either explicitly nor implicitly, nor does Horace inform the reader of any steps being taken to counter the religious and social decline that he describes. How are we to interpret this lack of praise of the *princeps*? Whilst I believe we can discount any hostility towards Augustus and thus criticism of his attempts to restore the centrality of both religion and the family within Roman life, it would seem as though Horace did not feel that what had been done by 23 BC was enough to rectify the situation. The poem's muted tone, exemplified by its opening lines thus sows seeds of doubt and caution in the mind of the audience.

The seeds of doubt and caution that are inherent at 3.6.1-4 are echoed and thus compounded by the poem's concluding section (lines 45-48). Having previously described the restoration of Rome's traditional religious and social values as being essential to the security of the *patria*, and that this is a task to which all should be committed, Horace concludes the poetic narrative on what can only be termed a rather pessimistic note. Instead of an optimistic, even panegyric

⁴⁶⁸ For references to Augustus' political activities in Horace's poetry see West, D. (2002), 66ff. Cf. Lowrie (2007), 85.

conclusion to such a poem that looks forward to the days of the Augustan Golden Age, the audience is confronted by the statement that things can only be expected to get worse. The contemporary audience, Horace states, is the inferior offspring of a previous inferior generation, and as such can only be expected to produce yet another degenerate generation of Romans.⁴⁶⁹ The lack of a triumphant, feel-good climax to the poem, combined with its muted and ambiguous opening, steers the audience away from reaching a quick judgement regarding Augustus' religious and social reforms. By failing to provide the audience with a 'happy ending' Horace forces the audience to continue reflecting upon and evaluating the political situation around them. Thus, whilst the poem may imply that Augustus may be offering the Roman people the reforms that are needed in order to return their *patria* to a time of internal and external security, the existing bleakness of the situation indicates that there is much that still needs to be done. In *Carmina* 3.6, therefore, Augustus may be depicted as being on his way to becoming a cultural *custos patriae* but such a status remains yet to be fully earned.

In contrast, in *Carmina* 4.5 there is little doubt as to Augustus' status as *custos patriae*. Written in 13 BC, the poem reflects the eagerly awaited return of Augustus from Spain.⁴⁷⁰ Horace emphasises this eagerness by stressing *patria's* high degree of dependence upon

⁴⁶⁹ Hor. *Carm.* 3.6.45-48.

⁴⁷⁰ On the date of the poem see Du Quesnay (2009), 274-279.

the leadership of the *princeps*.⁴⁷¹ Likening Augustus' absence from Rome to a period of darkness, a description that serves to highlight the deep political uncertainty that attended such eventualities, the narrative urges the *princeps* to return and in so doing to restore 'light' to the *patria* (4.5.5: *lucem redde tuae, dux bone, patriae*). The significance of Augustus' absence from Rome is then further illustrated by the depiction of *patria* at 4.5.9-16 as a mother who is desperately awaiting the return of her son from distant lands. Like this metaphorical mother, the audience's gaze is drawn to the still absent Augustus, an aspect that serves to heighten the audience's anticipation of the 'light' that will be returned. The nature of this 'light' is made clear in lines 17-28. Crediting Augustus as being the source of agricultural prosperity (4.5.17-18), the architect behind the restoration of a virtuous society (4.5.19-24), and in ensuring the security of Rome from external threats (4.5.28-29), the *princeps*' return to *patria* marks the return of stability, prosperity and peace, the central themes of the *pax Augusta* and the resultant Augustan Golden Age.⁴⁷² Horace's poetic narrative would, therefore, appear to suggest that it is thus upon Augustus alone that the welfare and security of *patria* lies.

⁴⁷¹ See Du Quesnay (2009), 295, who emphasises the collective nature of the poem: "In view of the ancient assumption that lyric poetry was normally intended to be performed by a chorus, the most natural inference to draw is that the speaker in this poem is a chorus which represents *senatus populusque Romanus*."

⁴⁷² This image of Augustus in *Carmina* 4.5.17-28 as the provider of security and stability for the Roman world is complemented by the identical themes that are to be found in the *Carmen Saeculare*: 13-24, restoration of traditional Roman values; 29-36, the provision of agricultural prosperity; 53-56, the guarantee of Rome's security against external threats. See Günther (2013), 456; and Nisbet and Rudd (2004), xxi-xxii. In contrast see Lyne (1995), 193-198, who questions Horace's sincerity in writing 4.5.

The textual and thematic parallels that can be drawn between *Carmina* 4.5 and Ennius' *Annales* 1.105-109 (Skutsch) not only serve to strengthen this image of Augustus as a *custos patriae*, but also reinforce the ideological message of the principate that Augustus was a continuation of Rome's historical past and thus was simply the latest in a continuous line of great Roman historical and mythical heroes.⁴⁷³ Firstly, both Ennius and Horace label their protagonists as *custos*. Romulus is described as *custos patriae* (1.107) and Augustus as *custos gentis Romulae* (4.5.1-2). Augustus' description deliberately ties him to Rome's legendary founder and thus in turn to his role as the guardian of the Roman *patria*. Secondly, Romulus and Augustus are stated as being descendants of the gods. Romulus is both begotten by (1.107: *te...di genuerunt*) and descended from (1.108: *sanguen dis oriundum*) the gods, whilst Augustus is sprung from them (4.5.1: *divis orte bonis*). Thirdly, just as Augustus is urged at 4.5.5 to return *lux* to *patria* so Romulus is credited in the *Annales* with leading Rome into the shores of light (1.109: *tu produxisti nos intra luminis oras*), a phrase that, arguably, also refers to the themes of prosperity and security. Fourthly

⁴⁷³ See Fraenkel (1957), 441-442; and Du Quesnay (2009), 298. Such a theme would also reflect the later sculptural manifestation of Augustus as one of a line of great Roman heroes in the *Forum Augustum*. For discussion on these statues and their political significance see Zanker (1988), 210-215; Luce (1990); Galinsky (1996), 204-209; and Geiger (2008). See also Kockel (1995), 285-295. The textual similarities between Ennius' Romulus and Horace's Augustus would seem to give credence to Dio's claim at Cass. Dio 53.16.7 that Romulus was selected ahead of Augustus as an honorary title for the *princeps*. It is equally important to note here that the literary image of Augustus as *custos patriae* also connects him to his republican predecessors. This is owing to the fact that in the writings of Cicero several individuals are referred to in a variety of ways as being the political guardians or protectors of *patria*. See Cic. *Dom.* 76 and 93; Cic. *Har. resp.* 58; Cic. *Vat.* 7; Cic. *Pis.* 23; Cic. *Sest.* 37; Cic. *Mil.* 65 and 94 for examples.

and finally both *Carmina* 4.5.9-16 and *Annales* 1.106-109 involve focusing the gaze of the audience. Where Horace focuses this gaze forward to Augustus' return and thus towards the future glory of Rome through the 'mother metaphor', Ennius' use of the term *memoro* (1.106) focuses this gaze backwards and thus urges the reader to recall the deeds and achievements of Romulus.

Carmina 4.5 appears to adhere to the wider themes of Augustan ideology, simultaneously depicting Augustus as *custos patriae* and as a continuation of Rome's mythical and historical past. However, the extreme nature of *patria's* dependence within this poem calls into question the nature of Augustus' guardianship and the impact that this guardianship has had upon the concept's long established position at the top of the Roman hierarchy of collective social and political obligation. The primary method that Horace employs to highlight the *patria's* dependence upon Augustus is the above mentioned metaphor of the expectant mother. Through this metaphor, the poet describes the energies and attention of *patria* as being entirely absorbed in awaiting Augustus. Its time is spent, he informs us, exclusively attempting to secure divine favour for his return (9-13: *ut mater iuvenem, quem Notus invido | flatu Carpathii trans maris aequora | cunctantem spatio longius annuo | dulci distinet a domo, | votis omnibusque et precibus vocat*)⁴⁷⁴, and she is stated as being

⁴⁷⁴ "Like a mother beckons her son with all promises and prayers, who the South wind separates from home beyond the Carpathian sea with his hostile breath."

entirely unable to remove her eyes from the shoreline (14: *curvo nec faciem litore dimovet*).⁴⁷⁵

With the metaphor having established the highly emotional and dependant nature of *patria*, Horace proceeds in lines 15-16 to describe the impact that this dependence upon Augustus has upon the concept (*sic desiderii icta fidelibus | quaerit patria Caesarem*).⁴⁷⁶ Horace's choice of terminology in this statement is significant. Firstly, the concept's desire or longing (*desiderium*) is of such a degree that it is described as being physically struck, even wounded by it (*ictum*). Such a choice of words stresses to the audience the degree of suffering, the practical need and the necessity of Augustus' presence and guidance. Secondly, that this *desiderium* arises from a sense of loyalty (*fidelis*) towards the *princeps* functions to portray *patria* not as Augustus' superior, nor even as his equal, but as his dependant, as being even subservient to him. Such an image entirely contradicts the widely prevalent and long established definition of *patria* as the ultimate object of devotion and service.

Horace's presentation of Augustus as *custos patriae* in 4.5 thus further enables the audience and the poet to continue their exploration of the nature of Augustus as *princeps*.⁴⁷⁷ In this case, the extreme dependence of *patria* upon Augustus to the degree to which it is depicted as being subservient to him, forces the reader to consider the impact that Rome's new political dynamic has upon traditional

⁴⁷⁵ "Nor does she remove her countenance from the curved shore."

⁴⁷⁶ "Thus does *patria*, stung with a desire born of loyalty, seek Caesar."

⁴⁷⁷ Du Quesnay (2009), 298ff.

Roman notions of collective identity. The writings of Cicero may have stressed the fact that the concept was dependant upon the *res publica* and the competent execution of political duty by Rome's elite, but they did so by maintaining its superiority over the Roman political sphere.⁴⁷⁸ For Cicero, *Res publica* was a vehicle that enabled Romans to maintain the security and conceptual integrity of *patria*. *Carmina* 4.5, however, questions the degree to which this superiority has been eroded under the principate. What is now the primary focus of the Roman people? The *patria*? Or the *princeps*? No definitive answer is given. Although *patria* is described as being loyal to Augustus, the *princeps* is still described as one of its children. It is up to the audience to consider this question in the light of Augustus' status as a *custos patriae* and to arrive at the conclusion that they feel is most accurate. Whichever conclusion is reached, however, there is no doubt whatsoever that in Horace's opinion the principate has transformed the way in which *patria*, and thus Roman collective identity should be defined.

4.1.ii: Propertius, *Elegiae* 4.6⁴⁷⁹

Propertius' *Elegiae* 4.6 echoes Horace's use of *patria* as a means of exploration, reflection and evaluation of Augustus' political character.⁴⁸⁰ In what has been interpreted by some modern scholars as

⁴⁷⁸ See Chapter Two.

⁴⁷⁹ Of the thirteen occurrences of *patria* within Propertius' *Elegiae* (1.4.22, 1.22.3, 2.31.10, 2.32.31, 3.13.59, 3.13.65, 4.1a.60, 4.1a.64, 4.1b.122, 4.2.48, 4.4.87, 4.6.24, 4.6.41), *Elegiae* 4.6 is the only one in which the concept is referred to in direct relation to Augustus.

⁴⁸⁰ Johnson (1973), 171, states with regard to Propertius 4.6: "we find [...] a criticism of our illusions, namely, how we insist on deluding ourselves about ourselves and the things around us". Hutchinson (2012), 193, suggests that Propertius emphasises the

a deliberately alternative presentation of the Battle of Actium – namely one that is more parodistic rather than panegyric in nature – Augustus is addressed ahead of the battle by the god Apollo.⁴⁸¹ Describing the *princeps* as the saviour of the world (4.6.37: *mundi servator*), Apollo commands Augustus to relieve the *patria* from fear (4.6.41: *solve metu patriam*). Such a command would seem to be easy for Augustus to fulfil since his forces have already been described seventeen lines previously as standing ready to conquer in the name of, and hence for the benefit of, the Roman *patria* (4.6.23-24: *hinc Augusta ratis plenis Iovis omine velis, | signaque iam patriae vincere docta suae*).⁴⁸²

Whilst on the face of it these three excerpts could be interpreted as a sincere attempt at celebrating one of the most iconic moments of Augustus’ political life, the poem’s overall parodistic nature, as convincingly argued for by Johnson, forces the audience to reconsider its preconceptions of the battle, of its key protagonist and, most importantly for this investigation, of Augustus’ political relationship to *patria*. Rather than echo the highly panegyric poetic accounts of the battle of Virgil and Horace, Propertius consciously

battle as being a ‘modern’ event, an aspect that would aid the process of reflection and re-evaluation. Cf. Butrica (2012), 58-59.

⁴⁸¹ By the description ‘alternative presentation’ I have in mind the excellent discussion by Johnson (1973) who states (172) that the poem’s parodistic nature forces the reader to reconsider the Battle of Actium and the political claims made about it. For other parodic interpretations of *Elegiae* 4.6 see Sweet (1972); Sullivan (1976), 138-147 (esp. 144-147); Connor (1978); and Gurval (1995), 249-278. For a contrary view see Williams (1968), 51ff and 683ff; Stahl (1985), 250-252; Janan (2001), 102. Consider also the discussion of Hubbard (1974 [2001]), 135-136; and Günther (2006), 373-379.

⁴⁸² “On this side, the ship of Augustus, with sails filled by the omen of Jupiter and with emblems already having been instructed to conquer for their *patria*.”

decides to water down the battle's significance.⁴⁸³ Consequently, the poem would appear to call into question the extent of Augustus' achievement. The portrayal of Cleopatra's forces at 4.6.19-22 as an already defeated enemy, for example, weakens the nature of the threat that is posed to the Roman *patria*.⁴⁸⁴ This lack of a sense of threat thus contradicts the command of Apollo to Augustus to liberate *patria* from fear (*metus*). If the defeat of Cleopatra is indeed something that is preordained, then there is nothing for Rome to fear and hence nothing for Augustus to liberate or protect. In this light, we are encouraged to question the validity of any presentations of Actium as the defining moment in which Augustus saved *patria* from a situation of extreme peril. This doubt over Augustus' status as *custos patriae* is augmented by his depiction at 4.6.41-42 as indecisive and lacking the necessary authoritative leadership.⁴⁸⁵ Augustus has to be commanded to place the concerns and interests of *patria* at the forefront of his mind. He does not assume such a responsibility of his own accord.

Propertius' Actium poem neither explicitly praises nor criticises Augustus. Instead, its parodistic nature encourages his audience to reappraise the battle and its resultant image of the *princeps*. Thus the two observations above can be seen to function as the catalyst for a series of questions by which an audience, both contemporary and modern, can reassess the nature of Augustus and his emerging

⁴⁸³ Johnson (1973), 168. For Horace's and Virgil's poetic presentations of the battle see Hor. *Epod.* 9 and Verg. *Aen.* 8.675-713.

⁴⁸⁴ Johnson (1973), 161. Janan (2001), 136, states that Romulus' involvement de-emphasises the Roman-ness of Antony and his followers.

⁴⁸⁵ Johnson (1973), 164-165.

principate. For example, to what extent do we believe Augustus was truly motivated by the need to protect the welfare and interests of the Roman *patria* and people? More significantly, are we sure there was ever any need for such protection at all? Were Antony and Cleopatra, therefore, the *hostes patriae* that it would seem from other depictions of the battle that Augustus would have us believe? And thus can we take at face value any arguments that make Actium the moment in which Augustus emulates his adoptive father and becomes *custos patriae*? As with Horace, Propertius does not offer his audience any concrete answers. It is up to each of us to arrive at our own conclusions. However, what is certain is the fact that for Propertius any relationship that may have been deemed to exist between *patria* and Augustus was both highly complex and deeply uncertain.

4.1.iii: The Exile Poetry of Ovid

Further evidence that Augustus' political relationship with *patria* was the subject of contemporary exploration and evaluation is found within Ovid's *Tristia* and *Ex Ponto*. It is important to note that Ovid's exile poetry forms by far the largest corpus of literary evidence for this subject. This is explained by the fact that these poems were written ten to sixteen years after the award of *pater patriae* to Augustus. As such, the *Tristia* and *Ex Ponto* reflect the 'official' ideological image of Augustus as both protector or guardian of the Roman *patria*, and as a supreme father figure to a much greater degree than Horace and Propertius. Although occurring throughout the two poetic volumes on

multiple occasions, this reflection of Augustus' 'official' image is most noticeable within *Tristia* 2.⁴⁸⁶

At 2.33-42, Ovid compares Augustus' status as *pater patriae* to the supreme position occupied by Jupiter amongst the gods (2.33-42):

*Si, quotiens peccant homines, sua fulmina mittat
Iuppiter, exiguo tempore inermis erit;
nunc ubi detonuit strepituque exterruit orbem,
purum discussis aera reddit aquis.
Iure igitur genitorque deum rectorque vocatur,
iure capax mundus nil love maius habet.
Tu quoque, cum patriae rector dicare paterque,
utere more dei nomen habentis idem.
Idque facis, nec te quisquam moderatius umquam
imperii potuit frena tenere sui.⁴⁸⁷*

Firstly, both are described as *rector* (Jupiter at 2.37 and Augustus at 2.39), a term that effectively illustrates their positions of supreme authority and power over their respective spheres.⁴⁸⁸ Despite their supreme positions of power and authority neither Augustus nor Jupiter are stated as being excessive in their ability to exercise judgement and punishment to their dependants. Jupiter's calculated, controlled and measured approach to the transgressions of men serves as the template for Augustus' leadership. Indeed, it is because

⁴⁸⁶ *Tristia* 2.39, 2.157, 2.574, 4.4.13 (generic statement of Augustus' status as *pater patriae*), 4.9.12-13; *Ex Ponto* 1.36, 2.9.34, 3.3.88 (generic statement of Augustus' status as *pater patriae*). The image of Augustus as the guardian of *patria* is also evident at *Fasti* 1.531-534 (l.531: *et penes Augustos patriae tutela manebit*).

⁴⁸⁷ "If, whenever humans transgress, Jupiter should hurl his thunderbolt, he would be weaponless in a short time; now, where he has ceased raging and has frightened the world with a din, he returns a clean sky from scattered rain-clouds. Rightly, therefore, is he called the *genitor* and the guardian of the gods, rightly the spacious universe has nothing greater than Jupiter. You also, being called guardian and father of the *patria*, employ the *mores* of the god that has the same name. And you do it: other than you, no-one at any time has been able to hold with more moderation the harness of his *imperium*." Ovid makes a similar comparison between Augustus and Jupiter at *Tristia* 1.5.75-84. Hardie (2016), 252, describes the praise of Augustus here as "irrational panegyric". For a detailed discussion on this passage see Cicarelli (2003), 54-60.

⁴⁸⁸ Cicarelli (2003), 57: "*Rektor* indica "colui che guida verso un determinato fine" e implica l'idea di una meta verso cui è orientata l'azione del dirigere."

Augustus already emulates the example of Jupiter (2.41: *idque facis*) that Ovid is able to justify his statement that no-one before him has been able to hold such a supreme position of power with a greater degree of moderation (*nec te quisquam moderatius umquam | imperii potuit frena tenere sui*). This statement is subsequently reinforced at 2.43-50 through a recollection of Augustus' clemency to his defeated enemies. However, the fact that Jupiter acts as a model for Augustus reduces any sense the audience may have that the two are to be considered equal in nature. In contrast to Jupiter, Augustus is not presented as being inherently clement. Instead, he is depicted as an individual reliant upon a pre-existing example that he can emulate.⁴⁸⁹

Secondly, both Augustus and Jupiter are stated to be paternal figures, an aspect that further reinforces the notion that the two are simultaneously similar yet inherently different. On this occasion, the difference between them is more prominent, since Ovid takes the decision to employ two different terms to illustrate this 'shared' quality. Jupiter is described as *genitor deum* (2.37) and Augustus as *pater patriae* (2.39). Although related, these two terms convey very different paternal qualities. Whereas, in this passage, *pater* appears to illustrate simply the authoritative status of a father, *genitor* stresses a parent's procreational role.⁴⁹⁰ Jupiter is, therefore, not described by Ovid simply as an authoritative father figure as in the case of

⁴⁸⁹ *Tu quoque [...] utere more dei*. ("Likewise you will wear the morals of the god"). See also Ingleheart (2010), 82: "The comments of Thomsen 1979, 54, on 143-6 are relevant here: Ovid 'distinguishes between Jove and Augustus, holding up the former as an example to the latter and implying that Augustus' mercy is not yet perfect'".

⁴⁹⁰ Ingleheart (2010), 84-86.

Augustus, but more significantly as being the source, creator and provider of such authority. As in the case of *rector*, this image challenges any notion that the audience may have that Jupiter and Augustus are to be considered equals. Indeed, I wonder to what extent Ovid is indirectly stating here that although there may be an attempt to position the *princeps* on a level of parity with the god, it is ultimately the fact that he sits firmly within his shadow and thus will fail to rise to such heights.

What is the overall significance of Ovid's presentation of Augustus as simultaneously similar yet different to Jupiter? I argue that this presentation is yet another example of a means by which an Augustan poet encourages an audience to engage in a critical manner with the nature and character of Augustus. What Ovid does in 2.33-42 is to water down any suggestion that Augustus' divine status is predetermined. In the cases of *rector* and *pater/genitor*, the poet highlights the limitations that accompany both Augustus' leadership and governance of Rome, and his claims to be viewed as a supreme father figure. Whilst the presentation of parallels between Augustus and Jupiter can indeed be appropriated by those that wish to forward a favourable presentation of the *princeps*, the fact that Augustus is portrayed as close but not quite close enough functions to ensure that Augustus is viewed for what he ultimately is: a mortal being. Indeed, it could be suggested that Jupiter's close and inherently just involvement in the affairs of men as a benign and protective paternal figure makes

Augustus' role as *pater patriae* redundant or at the very least hollow. Whatever the truth of such interpretations, the undoubted fact of the matter is the degree to which Ovid's less than endorsing comparison between Augustus and Jupiter forces us as the audience to consider in detail the question of how valid, constructive and useful the drawing of such parallels ultimately are. After all, from the poet's perspective, no matter how close Augustus may be to Jupiter his status as an exile is unlikely to change.

Ovid's status as an exile is closely tied to Augustus' relationship with *patria* that is presented at 2.157 and 2.574. In these two occurrences, Ovid focuses the audience's attention upon the image of Augustus as *custos*. Firstly, at 2.157 Ovid describes how the Roman *patria* is safe and secure under the paternal leadership and guidance of Augustus (*per patriam, quae te tuta et secura parente est*).⁴⁹¹ These qualities are echoed in the concluding section of the poem, where at 2.574 Ovid addresses the *princeps* directly as the father, guardian and salvation of *patria* (*o pater, o patriae cura salusque tuae*).⁴⁹² Both of these occurrences precede a plea, made by Ovid to Augustus, that seeks to obtain a more favourable, civilised location for his exile, namely closer to the centre of Roman life and political activity (2.187-188: *ultima perpetior medios eiectus in hostes, | nec quisquam patria*

⁴⁹¹ Ingleheart (2010), 166, sees a contrast between the welfare of Rome under Augustus and that of Ovid at *Ov. Tr.* 2.577.

⁴⁹² Ingleheart (2010), 403, states that it illustrates "a reciprocal relationship between Augustus and his citizens."

*longius exul abest; 2.577-578: tutius exilium pauloque quietus oro, | ut par delicto sit mea poena suo).*⁴⁹³

Such a context has a significant impact upon the reception of Augustus' image as *custos patriae*. Ovid's pleas for relief from exile clash with the accompanying image of Augustus. Augustus is presented as the protective father figure of the Roman community, yet Ovid is no longer a member of this community and thus cannot be viewed as a beneficiary of Augustus' apparently beneficial leadership. As Ovid himself states at 2.158: *ut in populo, pars ego nuper eram.*⁴⁹⁴ Such a juxtaposition functions to highlight Ovid's status as an exile, and, consequently, this raises the question as to whether or not Ovid's usage of the officially recognised ideology of the *princeps* as a protective father-like figure should be regarded as insincere or hollow.⁴⁹⁵ After all, the possibility that Ovid would succeed in his plea was extremely low, especially considering the fact that the poet defends the very poetry that was part of the reason for his exile from Rome.⁴⁹⁶ If Ovid was serious about his request for leniency from the *princeps* why include such a defence at all? Moreover, if Ovid's primary objective in *Tristia 2* was to defend his earlier provocative poetry that had clashed with the vision that Augustus had for Roman society then surely his descriptions of the *princeps* at 2.157 and 2.574 are nothing but hollow and empty statements.

⁴⁹³ Cf. Ingleheart (2010), 404.

⁴⁹⁴ "Of which, among the people, I was recently a part."

⁴⁹⁵ Ingleheart (2010), 166.

⁴⁹⁶ Ov. *Tr.* 239-468. On the subject of *Ars Amatoria* in *Tristia 2* see Habinek (1998), 155-156; Ingleheart (2006).

Whilst we may have good cause to doubt the sincerity of Ovid's adherence to Augustan ideology, I do not believe that the same can be said of Ovid's wish to attain more favourable conditions for his exile or to have it revoked entirely.⁴⁹⁷ Evidence from other poems within Ovid's exile corpus highlights the degree to which his absence from his family and home weighed heavily on his mind, at times being presented as emotionally traumatic.⁴⁹⁸ It seems entirely reasonable to accept that Ovid would indeed wish to relieve himself from this situation in any way he can. Thus, even if his plea to the *princeps* was a long shot, there was still a chance that it could have found a sympathetic audience, either Augustus himself or someone close enough that could wield influence.⁴⁹⁹ In such circumstances, it could be argued that Ovid's adherence to Augustan ideology in praising the *princeps*' benign paternal leadership of Rome was simply an attempt to win favour for his cause.⁵⁰⁰ He may have transgressed in the past, but now he is willing to toe the ideological line.

⁴⁹⁷ On the theme of sincerity with regard to Ovid's exile poetry see Williams, G. (2002a), 235; Lindheim (2003), 222; and Ingleheart (2010), 26-27. Cf. Fitton Brown (1985) and the notion that Ovid was never exiled.

⁴⁹⁸ For examples of this personal emotional trauma with regard to *patria* see *Tristia* 3.3.29-34, 3.3.49-57, 3.4b.53-54, 3.8.5-10, 3.11.15-18; *Ex Ponto* 1.3.27-36

⁴⁹⁹ See Wiedemann (1975), 271; and Syme (1978), 226.

⁵⁰⁰ Habinek (1998), 220-221 n. 33. *Tristia* 1.3.49-56 could also be interpreted as a means by which Ovid attempts to gain the sympathy of Augustus to his plight. Here the poet likens his exile to that of Aeneas with a textual allusion to Virgil's *Aeneid*. Ovid's love of *patria* is described as a powerful force that delayed his departure from Rome (1.3.49: *quid facerem? Blando patriae retinebar amore*. ("What was I to do? I was held fast by the enticing love of *patria*.")). Such was the power of this affection that Ovid states that he thrice attempted to leave his home only to be recalled for some reason or another on each occasion (1.3.55: *ter limen tetigi, ter sum revocatus* ("three times I grasped the threshold, three times I was recalled."). See Williams, G. (2002b), 355-356). The use of *ter* recalls the moments in the *Aeneid* when Aeneas attempts to leave Troy only to be held back by his family (Verg. *Aen.* 2.654-670) and the death of his wife (Verg. *Aen.* 2.769-794). Firstly, Ovid's devotion to *patria*

Although an important question to consider, discussions of sincerity risk distracting us from a more important subject, namely the extent to which Augustus' paternal leadership can truly be considered exclusively beneficial. As stated above, Ovid's use of Augustan ideology in 2.157 and 2.574 is ironic at best given the fact that he himself cannot benefit from the benign guidance of the *princeps* owing to his status as an exile. This irony is further compounded by the fact that it is Augustus who is credited as being the sole source of the poet's misfortunes and for being the only one who can grant him any form of relief. That Ovid's exile was determined by Augustus alone, and thus can only be revoked by him, is a theme that is echoed on several occasions in his exile poetry.⁵⁰¹ This emphasis upon the power of Augustus to deny a Roman continued membership of his or her *patria* highlights the fact that the idealistic benign image of Augustus as *pater patriae* is not the whole picture.⁵⁰² Rather, the audience should consider the wider implications of Augustus' status as the head of the Roman 'national' family. That is to say, Ovid's poetry demonstrates that whilst Augustus may be considered as a protective and beneficial force for Rome that is likened to the care of the *pater*

connects him directly to the ideological image of Augustus as *patria's* supreme protector. Secondly, and more significantly Ovid's deliberate use of intertextuality at 1.3.55 creates an emotional link between the exile and the *princeps*, since it reminds the audience that Augustus' ancestor had also suffered the experiences of being an exile.

⁵⁰¹ See *Tristia* 11.2.84, 1.3.85, 1.5.85, 4.9.12-13, 5.2.47-54; *Ex Ponto* 2.8.27, 4.8.85.

⁵⁰² Although discussion here is focused on the exile of Ovid we must not forget Augustus' decision to banish his daughter Julia. Indeed, Velleius in his *Historiae Romanae* (2.100.5) describes this event by stating that Julia is pulled from under the eyes of her *patria* and her family (*Iulia relegata in insulam patriaeque et parentum subducta oculis*).

familias for his dependants, he is equally a figure perceived as wielding supreme and undisputed control over the lives of his subjects.⁵⁰³ The audience of Ovid's exile poetry is, therefore, made to reflect upon the fact that *patria's* dependence upon the *princeps* may extend beyond the theme of its general welfare.

Ovid's reflection upon the extent to which *patria* is dependant upon Augustus is extended at *Tristia* 5.2.49 and *Ex Ponto* 2.8.1-20 where the poet illustrates the influence that Augustus' leadership of Rome has upon the concept's overall definition. At *Tristia* 5.2.49, as part of an address to Augustus, Ovid describes the *princeps* as *o decus, o patriae per te florentis imago*.⁵⁰⁴ Once again, it is Ovid's use of terminology that is significant. Meaning more than simply an image, the term *imago* emphasises an almost exact likeness, an imitation or representation of an object. The best examples of this are the *imagines maiorum*. These wax funerary masks of male members of Roman families were permanently displayed in the *atria* to Roman houses and played a prominent role within Roman funerary rites.⁵⁰⁵ They were also renowned for being powerful sources of inspiration for the living. Young members of Rome's leading political families in particular were expected to be so inflamed by the deeds associated with each *imago*

⁵⁰³ Cf. Severy (2003), 160: "Some scholars have seen in the title *pater* a reference to *patria potestas*, the legal authority which Roman fathers had over the lives of their children and slaves. But even if a Roman father had the legal right to kill his children, which has been seriously questioned, not only did the title *Pater Patriae* not confer any corresponding legal status or right on Augustus, but absolute authoritarianism cannot have been the image deliberately drawn by him and his contemporaries with such a title." Cf. Weinstock (1971), 204; and Richlin (1992), 74.

⁵⁰⁴ "O glory, o image of the *patria* that prospers through you."

⁵⁰⁵ See note 143.

as to become living extensions or imitations of their ancestors.⁵⁰⁶ In other words, Roman children were expected to learn from the examples set by their ancestors and in turn physically and mentally to embody them in order to ensure and advance their family's social and political status.⁵⁰⁷ The fact that *patria* is dependant upon Augustus in this context is undeniable, since the *princeps* functions as the source of its inspiration.

Not only, therefore, does Ovid's poetry illustrate the important role that *patria* plays in the characterisation of Augustus, but it also suggests that the Augustan principate had a profound impact upon the conceptualisation of *patria* in turn. In essence, such occasions in Ovid's poetry encourage his audience to reflect upon the changes that have occurred and continue to occur to *patria* – that is to say upon the traditional and accepted conceptualisation of Roman collective identity – under the Augustan principate. Further evidence to this effect is provided by *Ex Ponto* 2.8.1-20. In this poem, Ovid writes to the senator Marcus Aurelius Cotta Maximus in order to express his gratitude for a gift.⁵⁰⁸ Whilst the poet does not explicitly state what the gift is, the fact that he describes it as *argentum felix* (happy silver) that bears the portraits of three individuals – two Caesars, one of which is undoubtedly Augustus, and Livia – highly suggests that it was

⁵⁰⁶ Polyb. 6.53

⁵⁰⁷ See Rawson (2003), 212; and Baroin (2010). Consider also *Ov. Pont.* 2.8.31-32.

⁵⁰⁸ Marcus Aurelius Cotta Maximus is an example of one of the influential political individuals that Ovid may have hoped could and would intervene on his behalf to change the terms of, or to revoke entirely his exile to Tomis.

either a medallion or coin.⁵⁰⁹ For Ovid the most significant of these three portraits is that of Augustus. This is owing to the fact that Augustus' likeness is described as being simultaneously that of the *patria* (2.8.19-20: *hunc ego cum spectem, videor mihi cernere Romam; | nam patriae faciem sustinet ille suae*). Ironically, this image of Augustus achieves what the *princeps* himself cannot, since it offers Ovid a brief moment of escapism from his exile.

4.I.iv: An Inherently Ambiguous Relationship

In discussing a selection of Augustan literature I have attempted to unpack the true nature of the relationship that was perceived to exist within Augustan poetry between Augustus and the concept of the *patria*. In doing so, I have not looked to offer any revolutionary interpretation, either of Augustus or of the literary sources considered. Rather, I have attempted to test the accuracy and true extent of pre-existing hypotheses by considering from an external perspective the validity of the inherent implication of *RGDA* 35.1 that *patria* was an essential means by which to comprehend the political character of Augustus and, consequently, the principate. It has been seen that this

⁵⁰⁹ Cf. Johnson (1997), 418, who states that these images are “either statues or on coins”; Davis (2002), 268, who states that Ovid received from Cotta Maximus “three silver statuettes”; and Lahusen (1999), 262, who interprets *argentum felix* as silver busts: “Wie verbreitet derartige Siberbüsten übrigens auch im Privatbereich sein konnten, beleuchtet z.B. ein Brief des Ovid aus dem Exil, in dem er sich bei Aurelius Cotta Maximus dafür bedankt, daß dieser ihm die silbernen Bildnisse von Augustus, Livia und Tiberius habe zukommen lassen; Ovid stellt sie in seinem Lararium auf”. The argument that these images were statues or statuettes, or indeed a collection of coins, rather than a single object is contradicted by the fact that Ovid uses the first person singular of *argentum* to describe the object that he receives. Miller, P.A. (2009), 57-58, and Lahusen (1999), 262, would also appear to accept the fact that the second Caesar referred to by Ovid is Tiberius.

significance of *patria* is indeed reflected in the poetry of Horace, Propertius and Ovid. Yet, I have demonstrated how the relationship between Augustus and *patria* was reflected in such a way as to encourage an audience to (re)explore, (re)consider and (re)evaluate the political nature of the *princeps*. Horace's *Carmina* 3.6 and 4.5 questioned respectively the extent to which Augustus could truly be considered a *custos patriae* and the impact that his supreme status had upon traditional and accepted Roman ideas as to what should be the primary focus of collective duty and devotion. Propertius' parodistic account of the battle of Actium in *Elegiae* 4.6 not only functioned to challenge any preconceptions the audience may have had regarding the significance of the battle but also to query the true extent to which it is claimed that Augustus acted with the interests of *patria* at heart. Finally, Ovid's exile poetry contemplates the true extent to which Augustus can be likened to Jupiter and highlights the highly authoritarian dimension to Augustus' paternal status. If any concrete conclusion can be reached from this varied discussion, therefore, it is that there existed a detailed and comprehensive debate within the Augustan period as to exactly what the political nature of Augustus and his principate was. As such, maybe we as modern day external observers of the Augustan regime should take a similar approach. Rather than try to pin down the Augustan era to one particular interpretation or another, perhaps it is more beneficial and accurate to embrace the ambiguity and complexities of Augustan politics as they

are. From the perspective of this discussion at least such an approach would help us to arrive at a greater degree of historical accuracy.

4.II. The DI PATRII Coinage of Septimius Severus: A Tale of Two Identities

The ambiguity of imperial identity as expressed through the concept of *patria* is a theme present in the reign of Septimius Severus. This period of imperial history is particularly worthy of consideration within this current study into the definition and function of *patria* in the Roman world. This is owing to the fact that it is the one and only time (that we as yet know of) that the concept appears in a general sense, that is to say independent from the title *pater patriae*, within the legends of Roman republican, provincial and imperial coinage. It does so in the form of the adjective *patrius*, which in the context of *deus patrius* refers to a *patria* as a community with a shared ancestral religious heritage.⁵¹⁰

⁵¹⁰ Serv. *ad Geor.* 1.498: *dii patrii Patrii dii sunt, qui praesunt singulis civitatibus, ut Minerva Athenis, Iuno Karthagini* (*Di Patrii*: the *patrii dii* are those deities which preside over a particular civic community, such as Minerva of Athens or Juno of Carthage). See also Seston (1928-1929), 169, note 1; Mundle (1957), 90; Kovács (2000), 242-246; Nemeti (2004), 38; and Rowan (2012), 75. As will be seen in the discussion below, however, the phrase *di patrii*, with relatively few exceptions, has strong cultural resonances and connotations with the religious heritage of Rome. Other collective groups that use the phrase *di patrii* are in the minority and, as I will argue, can be interpreted as using a pre-existing Roman formulae to honour their particular local deities, thus making them pseudo-Roman in nature.



Fig. 2: Denarius of Septimius Severus, AD 200-204. *RIC* IV.I.762. Image from http://www.wildwinds.com/coins/ric/septimius_severus/RIC_762_denarius.jpg.

This unique coin type was issued by the emperor Septimius Severus and his sons Geta and Caracalla in a variety of denominations between the years AD 200 and 204.⁵¹¹ The reverse of the *denarius* type issued by Septimius Severus shows the laureate bust of the emperor, facing to the right and the legend *SEVERVS PIVS AVG. P. M. TR. P. XII* (Severus Pius Augustus, Pontifex Maximus, holder of the Tribunician Power for the twelfth time). On the reverse are depicted two gods who look towards one another. Liber Pater (Shadaphra) stands on the left and holds in his hands a cup and *thyrsus*. At the god's feet sits a panther. Opposite him is Hercules (Melqart), who is

⁵¹¹ *Severus*: *RIC* IV.I.762 (*denarius* and *sestertius*, description above). *Geta*: *RIC* IV.I.112 (*sestertius*, issued in AD 200-202, iconography identical to that of *RIC* IV.I.762 except bust of Geta is bare, obverse legend P. SEPT. GETA CAES. PONT. (Publius Septimius Geta Caesar, Pontifex Maximus), reverse legend DI PATRII S.C. (gods of the *patria*, *Senatus Consultum*)); *RIC* IV.I.117 (*dupondius* or *as*, issued in AD 200-202, iconography and legends identical to *RIC* IV.I.112). *Caracalla*: *RIC* IV.I.76 (*aureus*, issued AD 204, iconography identical to that of his father, obverse legend ANTON. P. AVG. PONT. TR. P. VII (Antoninus Pius Augustus Pontifex Maximus, holder of the Tribunician Power for the seventh time), reverse legend DI PATRII (gods of the *patria*)); *RIC* IV.I.422 (*as*, issued in AD 204, iconography identical to that of *RIC* IV.I.76 and *RIC* IV.I.762, obverse legend ANTONINVS PIVS AVG. PONT. TR. P. VII (Antoninus Pius Augustus Pontifex Maximus, holder of the Tribunician Power for the seventh time), reverse legend DI PATRII S.C. (gods of the *patria*, *Senatus Consultum*)).

easily recognisable from the club and lion-skin that he holds. The gods are accompanied by the legend DI PATRII (gods of the *patria*).

What is it that this coin type signifies? Why was it issued? What is the *patria* that is referred to? What impact does this coin have upon our understanding of the way in which Septimius Severus wished to be characterised either personally or politically? Was it his desire that he be viewed as a true Roman, as the emperor from Lepcis Magna, or as both simultaneously? And what does it tell us about the *patria's* relationship to the Severan regime?

Hasebroek and subsequently Mundle have proposed that the DI PATRII coinage was issued to commemorate a visit of Septimius Severus and his sons to Africa in AD 204.⁵¹² This visit to Africa was supposed to have included a brief stay at Lepcis Magna – Septimius Severus' local or native *patria* – the tutelary deities of which were Liber Pater (Shadaphra) and Hercules (Melqart). As such, Hasebroek and Mundle have suggested that this particular coin type highlights simultaneously the emperor's 'African' or Leptitane heritage and the central role that these gods had played in his rise to imperial power.⁵¹³ However, this interpretation is negated by the fact that we now know *sestertius* and *dupondius* or *as* denominations of this type were struck by Geta up to four years earlier in AD 200-202, and that more

⁵¹² Hasebroek (1921), 135; Mundle (1957), 78 and 90-91; Halfmann (1986), 222-223.

⁵¹³ Mundle (1957), 90-91.

evidence exists to suggest that Septimius Severus' visit to Africa took place in AD 207.⁵¹⁴

In contrast, Barnes, whilst seeking to de-emphasise Septimius Severus' 'African' identity, states in passing that the *DI PATRII* coinage was undoubtedly struck to commemorate the commencement (those coins minted by Geta in AD 200-202) and dedication (the remaining examples minted in AD 204) of a temple to Liber Pater (Shadaphra) and Hercules (Melqart) in Rome.⁵¹⁵ For Rowan, Barnes' assertion is worthy of further consideration. Although rightly questioning the validity of the suggestion that such a monument could be constructed in the space of only four years at most, Rowan proposes that the coin could at least mark the beginning of the construction phase. She argues that the physical incorporation of the tutelary deities of Lepcis Magna into the urban landscape of Rome, and the promotion of this event through coinage, can be interpreted as marking "the moment in which these gods became the *di patrii* of Rome", an aspect that is then reflected in their prominent position in the *ludi saeculares* of AD 204.⁵¹⁶

Despite disagreeing on the fine details, these interpretations have rightly recognised how the *DI PATRII* coinage of the Severans

⁵¹⁴ Rowan (2012), 81-85; Mattingly, T. (1950) *clix*, 262 note 530, 264 note 541a; Strocka (1972), 169-170. Kotula (1985), 151-165, proposes that although Septimius Severus may have intended to have visited Africa in AD 202-204 this visit was delayed to a later date. Birley (1988a), 147, suggests that Septimius' visit coincided with the creation of Numidia as a Roman province in AD 208.

⁵¹⁵ Barnes (1967), 104. See also Damsky (1990), 86-89. Regarding this specific temple see Santangeli Valenzani (1991); Rowan (2012), 67-72; and Lusnia (2014), 132-137.

⁵¹⁶ Rowan (2012), 75.

function as a visual reflection of the emperor's identity, and that of the dynasty as a whole. Hasebroek and Mundle have argued for an 'African' or Lepcitane identity, and Barnes and Rowan have argued for a Roman one. The disagreement regarding Septimius Severus' identity is not something that is confined to modern-day scholarship. What little literary evidence we have is also split on the matter. On the one hand, the historian Cassius Dio presents the emperor in a highly Roman manner, making no reference at all to his 'African' origins. Such an omission seems particularly strange when we consider the fact that Septimius Severus himself made no attempt to hide the fact that he originated from Lepcis Magna. On the other hand, the *Historia Augusta* places considerable emphasis upon the emperor's non-Roman origins. It emphasises the fact that Lepcis Magna was Septimius Severus' *patria* and provides a series of anecdotes that were clearly designed to attest to the emperor's foreignness and thus portray him in a less than favourable light.⁵¹⁷ Such stark differences can possibly be accounted for if we consider the motivations behind the respective historical accounts. It can be argued that Dio's exclusively (and possibly excessively) Roman presentation of Septimius Severus functioned as a means by which he could emphasise the emperor's suitability to hold the reins of imperial power, whilst the *Historia Augusta's* emphasis upon the emperor's foreignness served to stress the opposite.

⁵¹⁷ *Hist. Aug. Sept. Sev.* 15.7 and 19.9.

In the discussion that follows I aim to contribute to this debate regarding the identity of Septimius Severus by offering an alternative interpretation of the DI PATRII coinage to those mentioned above. Rejecting the notion that this coin type can be defined ‘neatly’ as *either* ‘African’ *or* Roman, I offer the argument that the coin’s overall message is much more complex than has been previously recognised. Rather than reflect one identity or another, I propose that the coin is deliberately designed to be ambiguous. That is to say, I suggest that Septimius Severus’ DI PATRII coinage functions as a means to display publicly his native origins (and hence identity) through its iconography, whilst simultaneously using its legend to highlight the emperor’s status as the caretaker of Roman religious tradition. Such a discussion causes us to re-evaluate previous interpretations regarding the cultural associations of the phrase *deus patrius* within the Roman world and presents an optimal context in which to explore the relationship between *patria* and religious culture.

4.II.i: Lepcitane Iconography

My discussion begins by considering the Lepcitane element of the DI PATRII coinage, namely the joint visual representation of the gods Liber Pater (Shadaphra) and Hercules (Melqart). As has been stated above, these gods were the tutelary deities of Lepcis Magna, Septimius Severus’ local or native *patria*, and they occupied a prominent place within the city’s coinage, sculpture and inscriptions.

Whilst there is no evidence of a joint appearance of Liber Pater (Shadaphra) and Hercules (Melqart) in the iconography of Roman coinage of any kind before the reign of Septimius Severus, such a feature is a frequent occurrence within the few examples that we have of 'early' Lepcitane coinage.⁵¹⁸ As such, there can be little doubt that these gods were two of the most significant visual representations of collective identity in Lepcitane coin iconography.⁵¹⁹ Eleven examples, which are believed to have been minted between 108 BC and AD 37, are recorded by Alexandropoulos in *Les monnaies de l'afrique antique* (MAA).⁵²⁰ In order effectively to illustrate the joint representation of the gods Liber Pater (Shadaphra) and Hercules (Melqart) in these early Lepcitane coin types, it is necessary to divide them into four iconographic groupings.

⁵¹⁸ Rowan (2012), 41. However, Liber Pater and Hercules do appear independently on Roman republican and imperial coinage. See, for example, *RRC* 20/1, 27/3, 35/4, 266/3, 341/2, 385/3; *RIC* I² (Civil Wars) 49, I² (Augustus) 278, I² (Augustus) 282, I² (Augustus) 314. The DI PATRII was not the only coin issue of Septimius Severus that displayed the gods Liber Pater (Shadaphra) and Hercules (Melqart) together. For a discussion of these other coin types and their political or ideological messages see Rowan (2012), *passim*.

⁵¹⁹ On the function of ancient coinage as a means by which to promote or communicate a sense of collective identity see Howego, Heuchert and Burnett (eds.) (2005).

⁵²⁰ MAA (III) 1; MAA (III) 2; MAA (III) 3; MAA (III) 4; MAA (III) 5; MAA (III) 6; MAA (III) 7; MAA (III) 11; MAA (III) 12; MAA (III) 13; MAA (III) 19. On occasion, Liber Pater (Shadaphra) and Hercules (Melqart) also appear individually on Lepcitane coinage. For sole Liber Pater (Shadaphra) Lepcitane coin iconography see, for example, MAA (III) 10 and MAA (III) 17.

Group One:



© <http://www.cgb.fr>

Fig. 3: Bronze Coin from Lepcis Magna, 1st Century BC. *MAA* (III) 1, 2 and 6.
Image from <https://www.numisbids.com/n.php?p=lot&sid=491&lot=241>.

MAA (III) 1, 2 and 6 all display the head of Liber Pater (Shadaphra) facing to the left on the obverse, and a club (a widely recognised attribute of Hercules (Melqart)), on the reverse. These three coins differ slightly in their reverse legends. *MAA* (III) 1 and 2 bear the Neo-Punic legend of *MPQD LPQY*, whereas *MAA* (III) 6 has that of *LPQY* only.⁵²¹

Group Two:



Fig. 4: Bronze Coin from Lepcis Magna, 1st Century BC. *MAA* (III) 4 and 7.
Image from http://www.wildwinds.com/coins/greece/syrtica/leptis_magna/SNGCop_006.jpg.

⁵²¹ *LPQY* is the neo-Punic for Lepcis Magna (Krahmalkov (2000), 263). *MPQD* would seem to indicate an issuing authority (Garfinkel (1987); and Manfredi (2006), 287).

MAA (III) 4 and 7 portray the turreted head of Tyche on the obverse and a club crossed with a thyrsus (an iconographic reference to Liber Pater (Shadaphra)) on the reverse. *MAA* (III) 5, 12 and 13 can be seen as variations of this design. Whilst the reverse iconography remains the same, *MAA* (III) 5, 12 and 13 replace the head of Tyche with either the head of Hercules (Melqart) (*MAA* (III) 5) or that of Augustus (*MAA* (III) 12 and 13). All five coin types bear the same Neo-Punic legend of *LPQY* on the reverse.

Group Three:

Of all eleven examples under discussion, those of *MAA* (III) 3 and 11 come the closest to the iconography of Septimius Severus' *DI PATRII* coinage. This is owing to the fact that they display the gods Liber Pater (Shadaphra) and Hercules (Melqart) facing each other. In the case of *MAA* (III) 11, this is achieved by displaying both gods facing towards each other on the reverse. In the case of *MAA* (III) 3, however, the gods face each other in a more indirect manner.



Fig. 5: Bronze Coin from Lepcis Magna, 1st Century BC. *MAA* (III), 3. Image from <http://www.harvardartmuseums.org/art/170120>.

The head of Liber Pater (Shadaphra) is portrayed on the obverse facing to the left, whilst the head of Hercules (Melqart) is displayed on the reverse and faces to the right. Both coins bear the legend *LPQY* on the reverse.

Group Four:



Fig. 6: Bronze Coin from Leptis Magna, 1st Century BC. *MAA* (III), 19. Image from http://www.wildwinds.com/coins/greece/syrtica/leptis_magna/RPC_851.jpg.

MAA (III) 19 bears the head of Liber Pater (Shadaphra) on the obverse and a club crossed by a bull hide on the reverse, although it has been suggested that this might be the hide for a wild boar instead. Whatever the truth of the matter, both interpretations refer to Hercules (Melqart), since they represent his fourth (Erymanthian Boar) and seventh (Cretan Bull) labours respectively. On the obverse is the legend *LPQY*.

Liber Pater (Shadaphra) and Hercules (Melqart) also occupy a prominent place within Leptitane public sculpture.⁵²² During the imperial period, the city experienced a series of urban developments and renovations. These public building projects were directly linked to

⁵²² The deities also occupied a prominent position via the temples in the Old Forum. See Di Vita (1968).

the changing political status of the city.⁵²³ Indeed, the majority of the most striking extant sculpture that depicts the gods Liber Pater (Shadaphra) and Hercules (Melqart) is dated to the reign of Septimius Severus. Despite the highly imperial nature of these building projects, the central position of the gods in the cultural identity of the settlement does not appear to have diminished. Two of these imperial structures are particularly worthy of discussion. The first of these is the *Basilica Severiana*. Constructed as part of a series of civic improvements to the city in the early third century AD, this basilica contained multiple visual representations of the city's tutelary gods.⁵²⁴ Existing evidence of this is provided by the sculpture that adorned the pilasters of the building's north-west and south-east ends. In the north-west, the pilasters are decorated with sculpture that records the twelve labours of Hercules (Melqart), whilst those in the south-east depict a series of images that would appear visually to represent myths associated with Liber Pater (Shadaphra).⁵²⁵

Liber Pater (Shadaphra) and Hercules (Melqart) are also prominent within the friezes and reliefs that adorned the Severan *quadrifrons*. This four-faced arch has been interpreted as being erected by the city to mark the visit of Septimius Severus and his

⁵²³ Lepcis Magna became a *colonia* under Trajan (see *IRT* 353).

⁵²⁴ Ward-Perkins (1993), 57, states that the building was begun under Septimius Severus and completed in AD 216 by his son Caracalla (see *IRT* 428).

⁵²⁵ On the sculpture of the Basilica Severiana see Pensabene (2006).

family in AD 207.⁵²⁶ Three of the four friezes are in a good enough condition to permit detailed analysis, and the tutelary gods appear in two of them. The frieze on the north-western face of the arch has been interpreted as depicting a triumphal procession.⁵²⁷ Septimius Severus is seen riding in a *quadriga* along with his sons Geta and Caracalla. In the decoration that adorns the chariot directly below the three Caesars are representations of Liber Pater (Shadaphra) and Hercules (Melqart) who stand either side of Tyche, another important tutelary deity of Lepcis Magna.⁵²⁸ In the background of the relief is a tiered structure that has been identified as the lighthouse of Lepcis Magna's Severan harbour.⁵²⁹ This particular detail, combined with the prominent position of the city's tutelary gods, strongly suggests that the frieze depicts a procession that occurred in Lepcis Magna rather than in Rome.⁵³⁰ However, if Septimius Severus had indeed taken the unprecedented step of staging a triumph in his *patria* rather than Rome, this would be a significant historical and political detail that we would expect to have been included within the contemporary literary

⁵²⁶ Newby (2007), 206-207; McCann (1968), 74-78; Strocka (1972), 169-170; Bonanno (1976), 155; Ghedini (1984), 88-90; and Faust (2011). In contrast, Ward-Perkins (1951), 227, dates this event, and thus the monument, to AD 203.

⁵²⁷ Newby (2007), 207-209; and Rowan (2012), 87-91.

⁵²⁸ Tyche is also prominent within Lepcitane coinage, although to a lesser degree than Liber Pater (Shadaphra) and Hercules (Melqart): see, for example, Fig. 4 above.

⁵²⁹ Romanelli (1925), 91-100; Townsend (1938), 517; Ward-Perkins (1951), 271-274; and Newby (2007), 207. Cf. Bandinell, Caffarelli, Caputo and Clerici (1966), 47, who suggest that the lighthouse may instead be that of Ostia and thus that the relief represents a *reditus*. The hypothesis of Bandinell, Caffarelli, Caputo and Clerici, however, has been effectively disproved by Strocka (1972), 166, and Rowan (2012), 88.

⁵³⁰ Townsend (1938), 517; Romanelli (1925); Bandinell, Caffarelli, Caputo and Clerici (1966); and Newby (2007), 207-209.

accounts of the time.⁵³¹ Added to the facts that the relief depicts magistrates and other civic officials at the front of the procession, rather than the rear as would be expected, and that Severus' visit to Lepcis Magna is highly likely to have occurred some nine years or so after his victories over the Parthians, we need to question whether the frieze represents a triumphal procession at all.⁵³² Strocka has proposed that the relief celebrates a close and unique connection between the emperor and the city, rather than recording a specific historical event, an interpretation that is supported by Newby and Rowan.⁵³³ However, if we accept that this frieze commemorates the visit of Severus to the city in AD 207 and that it celebrates the connection between the emperor and his native roots, it is perhaps equally credible to suppose that the relief memorialises the emperor's arrival. Such a one-off event would undoubtedly have been marked with much pomp and ceremony, and may well have commemorated the emperor's military achievements, considering the presence of Parthian prisoners within the relief ahead of the *quadriga*.⁵³⁴

If the previously labelled 'triumphal' relief can be considered to memorialise the arrival of Septimius Severus into his *patria*, then perhaps the other reliefs can equally be identified as commemorating

⁵³¹ Bandinell, Caffarelli, Caputo and Clerici (1966), 47; Rowan (2012), 87.

⁵³² Strocka (1972), 166; Rowan (2012), 88.

⁵³³ Strocka (1972), 166-169; Newby (2007), 209; Rowan (2012), 88-91.

⁵³⁴ Whilst these prisoners could have been genuine captives of the Parthian wars of AD 195 and AD 197-198, they could equally have been actors or slaves dressed in Parthian garb to represent such prisoners and thus give a flavour of the spectacles associated with Roman military success. On the use of props in Roman triumphs see Beard (2009), 143-186; and Östenberg (2009), 189-261.

the imperial visit to Lepcis Magna. The relief that would originally have been displayed on the southwestern face of the arch displays Septimius Severus and Caracalla grasping right hands (*dextrarum iunctio*) in front of Geta. This motif undoubtedly functions on one level to symbolise the peace and unity of the *concordia Augustorum* of the Severan dynasty.⁵³⁵ Yet, it could also be interpreted as a further visual emphasis of a special relationship existing between Lepcis Magna and the imperial family. This is owing to the fact that this important political image of imperial harmony is surrounded by the tutelary deities of Lepcis Magna. Standing behind and slightly to the left of Caracalla is Hercules (Melqart). Hercules (Melqart) is complemented by Liber Pater (Shadaphra) who stands behind and slightly to the right of the emperor. Finally, standing behind Geta in the middle of the relief is Tyche. Thus, it is possible that the close proximity of the deities of Lepcis Magna to the *concordia Augustorum* served as a visual metaphor of the perceived closeness on the part of the Lepcitanes of their city to the Severan dynasty.

Hercules (Melqart) and Liber Pater (Shadaphra) are also visible within the sacrificial relief that comprised the internal sculpture of the *quadrifrons*. Hercules (Melqart) stands between Septimius Severus and Caracalla who have their heads covered in preparation for the impending sacrifice. Across from his brother and father, on the left hand side of the relief, stands Geta. Behind Geta stands a figure that

⁵³⁵ Townsend (1938), 519; Newby (2007), 209; and Rowan (2012), 91-93. For other interpretations of this relief see Bartoccini (1931); Rubin (1971), 374; Rubin (1976/1977), 169; Cordovana (2007), 421.

Bober has identified as Liber Pater. In the context of the re-interpretation of the 'triumphal' relief above and the continued emphasis upon the tutelary deities of Lepcis Magna, it is highly probable that this relief records a sacrifice undertaken as part of the celebrations marking the imperial visit to the city.⁵³⁶ When we take these three reliefs together it would seem clear that the sculpture of the *quadrifrons* was commissioned to celebrate Lepcitane collective identity both as a local community and as an integral part of the Roman Empire, highlighting the close relationship that existed between the city and its tutelary gods on the one hand and the imperial family on the other.

Liber Pater (Shadaphra) and Hercules (Melqart) are named in eleven Latin inscriptions that have been found at Lepcis Magna during excavations.⁵³⁷ As in the case of the Lepcitane coin examples discussed above, these inscriptions do not demonstrate the existence of any official uniformity. Five of the eleven inscriptions (*IRT* 287, 288, 296, 297 and 298) refer to the gods as *Genii Coloniae*, the guardian spirits of the colony. As such, these inscriptions would date to during and after the reign of Trajan, since it was under Trajan that Lepcis Magna was designated a *colonia*. The status of the gods as guardian spirits is echoed in *IRT* 295 where Liber Pater (Shadaphra) is described as *lar Severi patrio*, the guardian deity of the *patria* of Septimius Severus. *IRT* 275 addresses the gods as *dibus Lepcis Magnae*. Found

⁵³⁶ Mundle (1957), 125; and Rowan (2012), 96-97.

⁵³⁷ *IRT* 231, *IRT* 275, *IRT* 286, *IRT* 287, *IRT* 288, *IRT* 289, *IRT* 294, *IRT* 295, *IRT* 296, *IRT* 297, *IRT* 298.

near the temple of Liber Pater (Shadaphra) in the old forum, *IRT 275* clearly commemorates a patriotic service undertaken by a certain Marcus Vipsanius Clemens, the importance of which is signified by the titles that he gives himself. He is described as both *amator* and *ornator patriae*, lover and adorer of his *patria*. Since Clemens is described as *redemptor marmoris templi Liberi*, it is possible that this service was related to the marbling of the temple that occurred in the imperial period. That a potential service to the temple of Liber Pater (Shadaphra) merits such self-description indicates firstly the close relationship between the god and the Lepcitane community, and secondly the ongoing importance for individuals in the imperial period to honour their local *patria*.

4.II.ii: *Deus Patrius*: A Roman Religio-Cultural Expression

Inscription *IRT 289*, however, is unique in Lepcis Magna. This is owing to the fact that it is the only Latin inscription in the city that describes Liber Pater (Shadaphra) and Hercules (Melqart) as *dii patrii* ([...*Herc*]u[*i* et] / *Libero Patri* [...] / *diis p[at]rii[s]*).⁵³⁸ Taken on face value, it matches the DI PATRII coin perfectly, both in relation to the gods mentioned and their description as native deities. Surely, therefore, this is clear evidence that the DI PATRII coin type exclusively celebrates the tutelary deities of Lepcis Magna and thus Septimius Severus' Lepcitane origins? However, a detailed consideration of the phrase *deus patrius* in the context of Latin inscriptions and literature

⁵³⁸ *IRT 289* was found in the *Forum Vetus* and is believed to date to the second to third centuries AD.

illustrates how it primarily connotes deities and religious cults that were considered to play a central role in ensuring the welfare of Rome (either as a city or as a cultural and political idea), its empire (either as a geographical entity or an ideology of Roman power) and the emperor (either the office or a particular holder), all of which can be interpreted as definitions of *patria* within this particular context.

4.II.II.I: The Epigraphic Evidence

Provinces (Arranged Alphabetically)	Number of <i>Di Patrii</i> Inscriptions
Aegyptus	1
Africa Proconsularis	15
Britannia	1
Dacia	6
Dalmatia	1
Germania Inferior	2
Germania Superior	2
Latium et Campania	5
Lugdunensis	1
Lycia et Pamphylia	1
Mauretania Caesariensis	3
Moesia Superior	1
Numidia	15
Pannonia Inferior	4
Raetia	1

Fig. 7: A Table Showing the number of *Di Patrii* Inscriptions that have been found in Roman Provinces.

There is a total number of fifty-nine extant inscriptions from across the Roman Empire that contain the phrase *deus patrius*. These inscriptions are found overwhelmingly in the empire's frontier provinces. More than half (58%) originate on the 'southern frontier', namely the

provinces of Aegyptus (one inscription), Africa Proconsularis (fifteen inscriptions), Mauretania Caesariensis (three inscriptions) and Numidia (fifteen inscriptions). Just over a quarter (27%) have been discovered in provinces that make up the 'northern frontier': Dacia (six inscriptions), Germania Inferior (two inscriptions), Germania Superior (two inscriptions), Moesia Superior (one inscription), Pannonia Inferior (four inscriptions) and Raetia (one inscription). A single inscription has been found in Lugdunensis, Britannia and Lycia et Pamphylia respectively. The remaining six inscriptions were discovered more centrally, namely in the provinces of Latium et Campania (five inscriptions) and Dalmatia (one inscription).

This peripheral distribution of the *di patrii* inscriptions means that they often coincide with the distribution of Rome's legions. Of the fifteen provinces listed, ten can be classified as 'legionary provinces', since they possessed a permanent garrison of at least one Roman legion.⁵³⁹ This strong military context of the *di patrii* inscriptions is further illustrated, as is the apparent association between the inscriptions and Roman imperial administration, when the types of settlements in which they were erected and the professions of their dedicators are taken into consideration. Forty individual settlements have been identified as being the locations for the *di patrii* inscriptions. It is possible concretely to define the function or status of twenty-five of these. Seven can be classified as being solely 'military' in function,

⁵³⁹ These ten provinces are Aegyptus, Britannia, Dacia, Germania Inferior, Germania Superior, Mauretania Caesariensis, Moesia Superior, Numidia, Pannonia Inferior and Raetia.

being for the most part garrison towns; six were ‘military’ in nature but were also designated as *coloniae*; four were ‘military’ in nature as well as being *municipia*; six solely *coloniae*; and two solely *municipia*.⁵⁴⁰ Since these settlements would have played an important role in the policing and administration of the Roman Empire in their respective regions it is hardly surprising to discover that the dedicators were either Roman soldiers of a variety of ranks or individuals who held imperial or municipal offices. *RSO* 92 = *AE* 1978, 525, a votive inscription set up along the *limes* of Germania Superior to a number of traditional Roman deities including *deus patrius Martius conservator*, was dedicated by a certain Gaius Securius Domitianus, a *miles* of the eighth Augustan Legion.⁵⁴¹ *CIL* 3, 15156 is also a votive inscription that was erected in the city of Aquincum in Pannonia Inferior. It records the dedication of an altar to the *di patrii conservatores* by Lucius Flavius Aper, *vir perfectissimus*, who was *praeses* or governor of the province.⁵⁴²

On the face of the evidence so far, it would appear that the *di patrii* inscriptions are closely associated with the policing and

⁵⁴⁰ Solely military in nature: Bonna, Buljesovce, Fectio, Intercisa, Luguvalium, Micia, and Osterburken; military and *colonia*: Apulum, Aquincum, Lambaesis, Lepcis Magna, Napoca, and Sarmizegetusa; military and *municipium*: Augusta Vindelicorum, Porolissum, Rapidum, Tibiscum; solely *coloniae*: Cuicul, Salona, Sigus, Sufetula, Thamugadi, and Zucchabar; solely *municipia*: Bulla Regia and Diana Veteranorum.

⁵⁴¹ Other *di patrii* inscriptions with military dedicators are: *AE* 1928, 106; *AE* 1929, 135; *AE* 1980, 755; *AE* 1983, 795; *AE* 2000, 1210 = *CIL* 3, 3668; *AE* 2009, 1643 = *CIL* 3, 14147, 5; *CIL* 8, 17721; *RIU*-5, 1139 = *AE* 1910, 1139; *RSO* 36 = *CIL* 13, 6559.

⁵⁴² Other *di patrii* inscriptions with dedicators who held either a Roman imperial or municipal office are: *AE* 1920, 29; *AE* 1944, 74; *AE* 1957, 246; *AE* 1957 246b; *AE* 1962, 229; *AE* 1967, 571 = *CIL* 8, 2585; *AE* 1968, 445 = *CIL* 3, 7954; *AE* 1973, 631 = *CIL* 8, 2678; *AE* 1995, 128 = *CIL* 8, 16809; *AE* 2009, 1643 = *CIL* 3, 14147, 5; *CIL* 3, 15156; *CIL* 8, 21486; *BCTH*-1918-240.

administration of the Roman Empire, particularly along its most volatile and vulnerable frontiers, and as such this makes a Roman identification of these deities highly probable. Further evidence to support this conclusion is obtained through a more detailed consideration of a number of examples.

The earliest extant *di patrii* inscription (*CIL* 3, 14147, 3) is a trilingual *stèle* that was dedicated to the *di patrii* and the river Nile, which receives the epithet of *adiutor* (helper). This *stèle* was erected on the island of Philae by the first Roman governor of Egypt, Gaius Cornelius Gallus, in 29 BC. The *stèle* records in Egyptian Hieroglyphs, Latin and Greek Gallus' extensive and occasionally unprecedented achievements during his seemingly successful suppression of a popular uprising that occurred in the city of Thebes and neighbouring settlements. The reader is informed of how Gallus was victorious in battle, sacked multiple cities, crossed the cataract of the Nile for the first time and negotiated a diplomatic settlement with a legation that was sent from the king of Ethiopia. Since the inscription was erected by a leading member of Roman political society and, more significantly, clearly functions to stress the military and consequently cultural supremacy of Rome, the *di patrii* can only logically be interpreted as being Roman. That is to say, we can safely conclude that the *di patrii* honoured in this inscription were those traditional Roman deities which were believed to play an important role in ensuring and extending the glory of Rome.

The military supremacy of Rome is also the primary theme of *CIL* 8, 21486.⁵⁴³ Datable from AD 267 to AD 277, this votive inscription was dedicated to the *di patrii* alongside the local *mauri conservatores* in the city of Zucchabar by the then governor of Mauretania Caesariensis, Aelius Aelianus. The inscription commemorates Aelianus' forceful subjugation of the *gens Bavares Mesegneitises*, an otherwise unknown tribe.⁵⁴⁴ The reader is informed of how Aelianus, having been victorious, made away with an unspecified amount of plunder and led the tribe's family units into slavery. Whilst nothing is known about the causes, events or severity of this military campaign, the fact that this inscription once again quite clearly functions to glorify the might of Rome makes the identification of the *di patrii* as anything other than Roman highly unlikely. Moreover, the inclusion of the *di maurii* in this inscription further strengthens its Roman military nature, and thus the identification of the *di patrii* as Roman. This is owing to the fact that Camps has identified the term *di maurii* as being one that was employed almost exclusively by Roman imperial officials or soldiers to refer to local

⁵⁴³ *Di[is]s Patriis et Mauris / Conservatoribus / Aelius Aelianus v(ir) p(erfectissimus) / praeses provinciae / Mauretaniae Caes(ariensis) / ob prostratam gentem / Bavarum Mesegneitsium / praedasque omnes ac fami/lias eorum abductas / votum solvit.* ("To the *di patrii* and the *mauri conservatores*. Aelius Aelianus, *vir perfectissimus*, governor of the province of Mauretania Caesariensis, has fulfilled his vow on account of the subverted *gens Baraves Mesegneitises* and all the carried off spoils of war and their families.")

⁵⁴⁴ For the date of the inscription see Mennen (2011), 229, who states that Aelius Aelianus is identifiable with a Publius Aelius Aelianus who was *agens vice legati* in Pannonia Inferior from AD 260 to AD 267, and (n.152) that he probably governed Mauretania Caesariensis before AD 277. For similar discussions regarding the career of Aelius Aelianus, and thus further evidence for dating the inscription to this ten year period see Nagy (1967), and Dobson (1978), 312.

African deities which had not been assimilated into the Roman pantheon.⁵⁴⁵ Such deities were, therefore, essentially 'African'. As such, this particular inscription draws a clear distinction between the local deities, the *di maurii*, and the gods of Rome, the *di patrii*. By giving thanks to both sets of deities, Aelianus characterises his military campaign against the *Bavares Mesegneitises* as being significant to the personal security of the inhabitants of Mauretania Caesariensis as well as for the general military prowess of Rome.

In a number of the inscriptions the *di patrii* referred to are the traditional deities of Rome. These include Mars (*AE* 1953, 86; *AE* 2000, 1613; *CIL* 8, 23356; *CIL* 8, 23769; *CIL* 13, 6559; *RSO*, 92);⁵⁴⁶ Apollo (*AE* 1953, 86 = *CIL* 8, 25511; *CIL* 8, 25513); Jupiter Optimus Maximus (*CIL* 13, 6559; *CIL* 13, 8810); Juno Regina (*CIL* 13, 6559); Hercules (*CIL* 13, 6559; *CIL* 8, 4634); and Quirinus (*AE* 1999, 1828). Such deities were closely associated with Rome's military past and hence occupied a special place within the religious life of the Roman army.⁵⁴⁷ They not only ensured the security the empire and the health and success of the emperor, but also sought to guarantee the welfare

⁵⁴⁵ Regarding the identification of the *dii mauri* see the excellent discussion by Camps (1990), 131-153. The inclusion of the *dii mauri* alongside the *di patrii* of Rome indicates that Aelianus' campaign was seen from a Roman perspective as being as important to the security and well-being of the local African population as to that of Rome.

⁵⁴⁶ *CIL* 8, 23769 is an extremely fragmentary inscription. Only *deo patrio M* remains. However, I believe that this inscription could be extended to *deo patrio M[arti]* or indeed possibly to *deo patrio M[arti Aug(usto)]*. This is owing to the fact that there are two inscriptions from Bulla Regia (*AE* 1953, 86) and Thala (*AE* 2000, 1613), both within the same province and relatively close to one another that have yielded inscriptions that state *deo patri/o Marti / Aug(usto) ad/sertori / libertatis*.

⁵⁴⁷ Le Bohec (1994), 244.

of the Roman *patria*, in this case definable as the conceptual essence of Rome.

Other *di patrii* inscriptions are dedications that were made to a variety of Roman military cults. Two cults of Jupiter from Numidia were accorded the status of *deus patrius*. *CIL* 8, 2585 was dedicated by an unknown *consul designatus* to Jupiter Valens Aesculapius, and *CIL* 8, 17721 was dedicated to Jupiter Serapis by a military tribune. *CIL* 8, 2585, also designates Silvanus Pegasianus as *deus patrius* alongside Jupiter Valens Aesculapius. The connection between the epithet *Pegasianus* and the Pegasus standard of the Third Augustan Legion would seem to suggest that this was a cult of Silvanus that was localised to the soldiers of this particular legion.⁵⁴⁸ *BJ*-1921-17, a votive inscription from Bonna in Germania Inferior, was dedicated to a *deo Invicto patrio*.⁵⁴⁹ The epithet *invictus* could in fact refer to a variety of Roman martial gods. There is epigraphic evidence of its usage in relation to the traditional Roman deities of Jupiter, Mars, Apollo, Hercules and Silvanus, as well as of the later imperial and significant military cults of Mithras and Sol Invictus. Whichever of these gods was the intended dedicatee, it seems highly probable that this inscription is evidence of another Roman military cult that was deemed worthy of the title of *deus patrius*.

Other deities that have been designated *di patrii*, and which can be interpreted as military cults of the Roman army, are slightly more

⁵⁴⁸ Dorcey (1992), 64.

⁵⁴⁹ *BJ* = Bonner Jahrbücher.

obscure. Four inscriptions from the Numidian settlement of Lambaesis are dedicated to a certain Jupiter Bazosenus by Marcus Aurelius Decimus, the Roman equestrian governor of Numidia.⁵⁵⁰ These four inscriptions are the only evidence that we have for this particular cult for Jupiter, and since it is clearly not Roman in origin it could easily be taken on face value as being identified as a *deus patrius* of Lambaesis. However, there are features that lead us to the conclusion that Jupiter Bazosenus was a military cult that was particular to the troops garrisoned at Lambaesis, and thus similar in nature to that of Silvanus Pegasianus. Bricault has suggested that the dedicator was not a local, proposing instead that he originated from an as yet unknown city in the east of the Roman Empire.⁵⁵¹ Indeed, Marcus Aurelius Decimus was responsible for the erection of a number of inscriptions at Lambaesis to Mithras and Sol Invictus, both of which were prominent military cults. As such, it has been argued by Gasparini that Jupiter Bazosenus was one of several military cults that were imported into the region by the Roman army.⁵⁵² Such cults, he argues, did not involve local ‘African’ populations. Instead, their spread was controlled

⁵⁵⁰ AE 1957, 246: [numini pr]aesenti Iovi Ba/z[osen]o deo patrio M(arcus) Au/[rel(ius) Dec]imus v(ir) [p(er)fectissimus] p(raeses) p(rovincia) N(umidia) / v(otum) l(ibens) S(olvit). (“Marcus Aurelius Decimus, *vir perfectissimus*, governor of the province of Numidia, fulfilled his vow freely to Jupiter Bazosenus, *deus patrius* propitious *numen*.”); AE 1973, 631 = CIL 8, 2678: N[umini pr]aesenti Iovi Ba/z[osen]o deo patrio M(arcus) Au/[rel(ius) Dec]imus v(ir) [p(er)fectissimus] p(raeses) p(rovincia) N(umidia) / v(otum) l(ibens) s(olvit). (Translation as AE 1957, 246.); AE 1957, 246b and BCTH-1918-140: deo patrio pr/aesenti numi/ni Iovi Bazos/eno cuius pr/aesentem ma/iestatem frel/quenter expel/rtus sum / Aurelius Decimus v(ir) p(er)fectissimus p(raeses) p(rovincia) Numid/iae ex principl/e peregrinol/rum / votum solvit. (“Aurelius Decimus, *vir perfectissimus*, governor of the province of Numidia, previously commander of foreign troops, fulfilled his vow to Jupiter Bazosenus, *deus patrius*, propitious *numen*, whose present majesty I have often enjoyed.”)

⁵⁵¹ Bricault (2005), 300.

⁵⁵² Gasparini (2015), 485.

by members of the local Roman elite or by Roman imperial officials. Indeed, there is no epigraphic evidence to suggest that Bazosenus was a local deity who was worshipped prior to Numidia's incorporation into the Roman Empire. Moreover, if Jupiter Bazosenus was a local 'African' deity who was worshipped by the Roman army, but had not been absorbed into the Roman pantheon, we would expect to find the phrase *deus Maures* in place of *deus patrius*. Thus, by being the deity of a Roman military cult in a highly Roman militarised area, Jupiter Bazosenus can be interpreted as being a locally adopted *deus patrius* of Rome.

Similar conclusions can be reached regarding similarly obscure deities that are labelled as *di patrii*. *AE* 1995, 128 = *CIL* 8, 16809, an inscription from the Numidian town of Naraggara, was dedicated to a *deus patrius* named Iocolon.⁵⁵³ The dedicator, Marcus Mevius Romanus, was a member of the Roman equestrian order as indicated by the title of *vir egregius*. He is also recorded as being a *comes Augusti nostri*. Camps has argued that Iocolon should be regarded as a local African deity, a hypothesis that is based upon the assumption that the dedicator was himself a native of Naraggara.⁵⁵⁴ However, as with the case of Jupiter Bazosenus and Jupiter Pegasianus, this inscription is the only evidence that we have of this particular god. There is no other epigraphic evidence that suggests Iocolon was

⁵⁵³ *Iocoloni de/o patrio / M(arcus) Mevius / Romanus / com(es) Aug(usti) / n(ostris) vir egr(egius)*. ("For Iocolon, *deus patrius*. Marcus Mevius Romanus, companion of our Augustus, a distinguished man made it.")

⁵⁵⁴ Camps (1990), 140.

worshipped by anyone, either 'African' or Roman, before or after the arrival of Rome. Thus, it is a possibility that locolon was another obscure deity who was imported into the area by the Roman army, and which was subsequently worshipped locally by the resident Roman population as a de facto *deus patrius* of Rome.

In *CIL* 8, 19121, the *deus patrius* referred to is Baliddir Augustus.⁵⁵⁵ According to Camps, the cultural origins of Baliddir are incontestably Punic. On this occasion, there is more evidence to support her argument. This is owing to the fact that a neo-Punic inscription mentions a sanctuary that was dedicated to a Ba'al 'Addir at Bir Telesa, and multiple *stelae* bearing the same name have been discovered at Cirta.⁵⁵⁶ Whilst I agree that the Punic origins of Baliddir cannot be refuted, the inscription in question contains features that point towards the deity's assimilation with, or adoption into the *di patrii* of Rome. Firstly, although little is known of the dedicator, his use of the *tria nomina* would seem to suggest a Roman pedigree, although this possibility is reduced if this inscription were to have been erected after the *Constitutio Antoniniana*. His cognomen of *victor* could be an indication of the dedicator's previous military service, possibly memorialising his success as commander of a particular military campaign. It is thus easy to imagine that such an individual was a prominent member of the local Roman population. Secondly, the use of the epithet Augustus would seem to evince a connection between

⁵⁵⁵ For a similar inscription see *CIL* 8, 19122.

⁵⁵⁶ Camps (1990), 135.

the god and the person of the emperor. McAllen Green and Fishwick have offered the highly convincing notion that this epithet functions to illustrate deities whose worship was considered as a means by which to honour the emperor. Such gods, therefore, can be considered a significant component of Roman imperial culture.⁵⁵⁷ Thirdly, Le Bohec has stated that the Punic deity Baliddir was assimilated with the above-mentioned Jupiter Valens by Roman soldiers posted to Africa, and thus was part of the complex local system of Roman military cults.⁵⁵⁸ Finally, a conscious decision has been taken to label Baliddir *deus patrius*. If the deity was entirely Punic and not assimilated into Roman religious culture then we would expect the dedicator to have employed the phrase *deus Maures* that was intended to indicate this fact.

Thus far, the discussion has illustrated how the phrase *deus patrius* does not indicate the tutelary deities of the communities in which the inscriptions were erected, but rather highlights gods that would appear to have played a significant role in Roman cultural life within the outermost provinces of the empire. This is most notably the case amongst the Roman army and Roman imperial officials, the two primary vehicles of Roman imperial politics outside the city of Rome. Owing to their association with the Roman army and Roman imperial officials, these deities can be interpreted as having been perceived

⁵⁵⁷ McAllen Green (1927), 92; Fishwick, D. (1991), 446-454. Three other inscriptions from North Africa add the epithet of Augustus to Baliddir: *CIL* 8, 19122 (which also names the god *deus patrius*), *CIL* 8, 19123 and *AE* 1989, 850.

⁵⁵⁸ Le Bohec (1994), 244.

contemporaneously as guardians of the Roman *patria*. Indeed, for this reason, the honouring of such deities can also be seen as a mechanism by which members of the Roman *patria* were able to illustrate or fulfil their obligation of service to it.

There are, however, five inscriptions from along the northern frontier that do not fit this hypothesis. Two inscriptions from different settlements in Dacia are clearly dedicated to important deities of the city of Palmyra. *AE* 1980, 755 is a dedicatory inscription from Porolissum that records the restoration of a temple to *deus patrius Belus* by a unit of Palmyrene archers. Although the dedicators are members of the Roman army, there is no possibility by which Belus can be mistaken as being a locally worshipped *deus patrius* of Rome. There are two reasons for this. Firstly, the name Belus is undoubtedly a Latinised reference to Bel, the most significant deity in the Palmyrene pantheon. Secondly, the use of the term *numerus* indicates that this particular unit of archers was part of the irregular, auxiliary forces of the Roman army. Such units comprised non-Romans who retained their specific collective traits such as weaponry and clothing.⁵⁵⁹ Thus, similarly, *AE* 1968, 445 = *CIL* 3, 7954. This is a dedicatory inscription from Sarmizegetusa that records the construction of a temple to four other Palmyrene deities (*dis patriis*

⁵⁵⁹ Le Bohec (1994), 27-29.

Malagbel et Bebellahamon et Benefal et Manavat) by a Publius Aelius Theimes, a dedicator who is also of Palmyrene origin.⁵⁶⁰

From Raetia and Pannonia Inferior are single inscriptions to the primary deity of the city of Emessa, Deus Sol Elagabalus. *RIU* 5, 1139 (= *AE* 1910, 133) is a votive tabula inscription that was erected at Intercisa by *militēs cohortis milliariae Hemesenorum Antoninanae* to the *deus patrius Solus Elagabalus*. *AE* 1962, 229 is an honorific inscription from Augusta Vindelicorum that was dedicated also to *deus patrius solus Elagabalus* by Gaius Iulius Avitus Alexianus. Owing to the Emessene origins of the dedicators, the Sol Elagabalus that is honoured in these two inscriptions cannot be confused with the cult that the emperor Elagabalus (218-222) would attempt to incorporate into Roman culture at the expense of the traditional gods of Rome.⁵⁶¹ This interpretation is further supported by the fact that both inscriptions are pre-AD 218. *AE* 1962, 229 is datable to AD 196-197, the years in which the dedicator was pro praetor of Raetia, and *RIU*-5, 1139 is datable precisely to 23rd September AD 214 (*dedicatum opus X Kal(endas) Sep(tembres) / Messala et Sabino co(n)s(ulibus)*). It is only logical, therefore, that in both cases *deus patrius* Sol Elagabalus refers to the tutelary deity of the city of Emessa.

⁵⁶⁰ Byros (2011), 9-10, states that Theimes is a typical Palmyrene cognomen. Cf. Smith II (2013), 167. For a detailed discussion of this particular inscription see Betz (1960).

⁵⁶¹ The dedicators of *RIU* 5, 1139 were soldiers that comprised *cohors I milliaria Hemesenorum*, mounted archers drawn from the city of Emessa (Agócs (2013), 10). Gaius Julius Avitus Alexianus was a Roman citizen born and raised in Emessa. Elevated to senatorial rank, Alexianus held multiple military and political offices, including that of consul in AD 200.

Finally, *AE* 2000, 1210 = *CIL* 3, 3668 is a votive inscription that commemorates the erection of an altar in Pannonia Inferior *dis patri(i)s Manapho et Theandrio*. Manaphos and Theandrios were traditional Arabic deities that had been given Greek names and were worshipped by communities that were within the vicinity of Mount Hermon.⁵⁶² The dedicators are recorded as having originated from such a community. Not only was the primary dedicator, Claudius Victorinus, an *eques* of *cohors D Canathenorum et Trachonitaorum*, an auxiliary unit that was named after the city of Canatha and the region of Trachontis that stood to the south east of Mount Hermon, but he and his son, Claudius Maximus, are explicitly stated as being from Canatha (*dom(o) Can(atha)*). As with the previous four examples, on account of the shared non-Roman origins of both the gods and dedicators in question these deities cannot be interpreted as *di patrii* of Rome.

Although these five inscriptions designate non-Roman deities as *di patrii* I do not believe that this undermines the argument presented here that the phrase *deus patrius* was inherently Roman. This is owing to the fact that these inscriptions can be described as being interesting anomalies. Out of the fifty-nine *di patrii* inscriptions, only these five can be concretely interpreted as being non-Roman, both in terms of dedicators and dedicatees. Moreover, amongst the many other Latin inscriptions that were erected to the gods of other collective groups, these are the only ones to have been designated *di patrii*. Surely if the

⁵⁶² For the Arabian identity of these deities see Aliquot (2008), 87.

phrase *deus patrius* was indeed generic and thus could be used to refer to gods of any community that was large enough to be identified in the Roman world as a *patria* there would be many more non-Roman examples? As it is, I believe that this small group of five anomalous *di patrii* inscriptions can be classified as being pseudo-Roman. That is to say, I believe that these inscriptions could have been conceived of in such a way as to provide non-Roman deities with the appearance of being Roman.

This pseudo-Roman interpretation or phenomenon is supported and explained by several factors. Firstly, the non-Roman *di patrii* inscriptions are not widespread across the empire. Rather they are geographically limited to three neighbouring provinces of the northern frontier. Secondly, the inscriptions are culturally limited to dedicators who originated from Coele Syria. Thirdly, there is no evidence that the erection of *di patrii* inscriptions to non-Roman deities was an extended practice. Four of the five pseudo-Roman *di patrii* inscriptions are datable from a collective timescale of AD 130-217, a period of only eighty-seven years at the very most.⁵⁶³ Fourthly, the continued military context of the pseudo-Roman *di patrii* inscriptions (dedicated by auxiliary units in legionary provinces and in settlements that had a military function) means that their dedicators could have been influenced by their interaction with a regular unit of the Roman army

⁵⁶³ *CIL* 3, 7954 is dated to between AD 131 and 170; *RIU* 5, 1139 to AD 214; *AE* 1980, 755 to AD 215-217; and *AE* 1962, 229 to AD 196-197. Only *CIL* 3, 3668 remains undated, although it is highly probable that it belongs to the late second-early third centuries AD also.

that had erected inscriptions dedicated to the *di patrii* of Rome. Moreover, in the case *AE* 1962, 229, it is highly likely that the dedicator Gaius Julius Avitus Alexianus would have had some degree of exposure to the habit of the Roman army and Roman imperial officials of honouring the *di patrii* in inscriptions as a result of his time spent as a Roman military commander and imperial official.

4.II.ii.ii: The Literary Evidence

The hypothesis that the phrase *deus patrius* was an inherently Roman religious expression of high cultural significance is supported by a consideration of its usage and function in Latin literature.⁵⁶⁴ This involves a chronological step backwards, but one that is necessary and enlightening. According to Virgil, for example, the *di patrii* were an indication of Rome and Italy's Trojan heritage, having been brought to Italy by Aeneas.⁵⁶⁵ Within the narrative of the *Aeneid*, it is their possession of the *di patrii* that enables the Trojans to conceptualise themselves as a collective group whilst in exile. That is to say, it is the *di patrii* that function as the definition of the Trojan *patria*, and it is the temples and shrines of these *di patrii* that will form the heart of the

⁵⁶⁴ There are a total of thirty-nine occurrences of the phrase *deus patrius* in Latin literature: Cic. *Dom.* 144; Cic. *Har. resp.* 37; Cic. *Phil.* 2.72, 2.75; Cic. *Sull.* 86.1; Cic. *Verr.* 2.1.7, 2.4.11; 2.4.18, 2.4.77, 2.4.94, 2.4.132; Curt. 4.10.30, 4.10.34, 4.14.23, 4.14.24, 6.11.15, 7.4.1; Hor. *Carm.* 2.7.4; Liv. 1.25.1; Nep. *Them.* 4; Ov. *Fast.* 2.728; Ov. *Her.* 1.26, 12.128; Ov. *Met.* 13.412; Ov. *Rem. am.* 158; Serv. *ad Aen.* 2.702.1, 12.768.3; Serv. *ad Geor.* 1.498.1; Sil. 4.670, 4.819; Stat. *Silv.* 4.8.45; Stat. *Theb.* 12.699-700; Tac. *Ann.* 1.59.12; Tib. 2.1.17; Verg. *Aen.* 2.702, 7.229, 9.247; Verg. *G.* 1.498.

⁵⁶⁵ Regarding the high significance of *patria* to the narrative of the *Aeneid* refer back to the discussion in Chapter Three. The *di patrii* would appear to comprise the *penates* and the flame of Vesta, the sacred objects that are entrusted to Aeneas by Hector in Book 2.

new Trojan and subsequently Roman (if not also Italian) concept of *patria*.

The significance of the *di patrii* to the security of the Trojan *patria*, and thus further evidence of their martial nature, is illustrated at 2.702-703 and 9.247-250. These two passages occur during moments in which the future of the Trojans as an independent and united community truly hangs in the balance. In the first passage, 2.702-703, Anchises responds to Jupiter's omen and calls on the *di patrii* to safeguard his family, declaring that the security of Troy rests in their hands (*Di patrii...vestroque in numine Troia est*).⁵⁶⁶ The sentiments of Anchises are then echoed at 9.247, where the Trojan Aletes invokes the *di patrii* with the statement of *di patrii, quorum semper sub numine Troia est*.⁵⁶⁷ By giving Anchises and Aletes almost identical statements, Virgil is able thematically to connect the situations of Book 2 and Book 9. In Book 2, the Trojans faced annihilation at the hands of the Greeks. In Book 9, with their camp surrounded and with no apparent relief for their situation near at hand, they once again face the prospect of annihilation, only this time at the hands of Turnus and the Rutulians. However, Aletes' subsequent statement that the *di patrii* do not intend

⁵⁶⁶ "O *di patrii*...in your divine sway is Troy."

⁵⁶⁷ "Under whose divine protection is Troy." Scipio, at 4.670 of Silius Italicus' epic poem the *Punica*, utters a similar statement: *Di patrii, quorum auspiciis stat Dardana Roma*. Indeed, the similarities in terms of structure and sentiment would seem to indicate that this phrase is based upon II.702-703 and IX.247 of the *Aeneid*. Such syntactical and thematic similarity helps create the impression that the *Punica* is the natural extension of the *Aeneid's* narrative, something Silius Italicus attempts to do by labelling Rome Dardana throughout his poetic narrative. Whatever the truth of the matter this passage is yet another example of the protective role of the *di patrii* and the close association they would appear to have had with military adventures of Rome.

to permit such an annihilation from taking place (9.248: *non tamen omnino Teucros delere paratis*) serves as an indication for the audience that an end to the suffering of the Trojans may be near at hand.

The idea that the *di patrii* were closely associated with both the definition and security of *patria* as the conceptual embodiment of Roman collective identity is illustrated in a number of other literary sources. With a single exception (Stattius' *Silvae*), these literary sources are derived exclusively from the late-Republican and Augustan periods, and comprise around half of all literary occurrences of the phrase *deus patrius*.⁵⁶⁸ In *Carmina* 2.7 the *di patrii* function as a means by which Horace is able to describe the restoration of a certain Pompeius to the Roman community following the conclusion of the civil war between Augustus and Mark Antony (2.7.3-4: *quis te redonavit Quiritem | dis patriis Italoque caelo*). In this case the *di patrii* are associated with Italy (*Italoque caelo*), an indication that Horace may have shared Virgil's notion that the territorial dimensions of *patria* may have expanded to include all of Italy by this time.⁵⁶⁹ At *Fasti* 2.727-728, Ovid echoes Horace's notion that an individual's absence from the *di patrii* symbolises his absence from the *patria*. In this passage, Ovid has Tarquinius, the young son of the last king of Rome Tarquinius Superbus, exclaim to his companions how it is the on-going war with

⁵⁶⁸ Cic. *Verr.* 2.1.7; Cic. *Sull.* 86.1; Cic. *Dom.* 144; Cic. *Har. resp.* 37; Cic. *Phil.* 2.72, 2.75; Verg. *G.* 1.498; Hor. *Carm.* 2.7.4; Ov. *Rem. am.* 158; Ov. *Her.* 1.26; Ov. *Her.* 12.128; Ov. *Met.* 13.412; Ov. *Fast.* 2.728; Liv. 1.25.1; Tib. 2.1.17; Stat. *Silv.* 4.8.45.

⁵⁶⁹ See Chapter Three for a discussion of the Italian nature of *patria* within Virgil's *Aeneid*.

Ardea that detains them from the *di patrii* (*Fasti* 2.727-728: *dum nos sollicitos pigro tenet Ardea bello | nec sinit ad patrios arma referre deos*). Since the *patria* was regarded as the physical home of the *di patrii*, and was thus the place where they could be honoured and worshipped, this absence from the *di patrii* is a potent means by which to illustrate physical distance from the *patria*. However, it must be noted that Tarquinius' lament that the war keeps him away from the religious heart of his *patria* is ironic considering the fact that he will soon violate Lucretia, an exemplary symbol of all that was considered pure and pious in Roman culture.⁵⁷⁰

The *di patrii*'s protective nature is evident in Cicero's *De Domo Sua* and *Pro Sulla*, Virgil's *Georgics* and Statius' *Silvae*. At *De Domo Sua* 144-145, Cicero calls upon the *di patrii* alongside Vesta as witnesses to the justification and legitimacy of his actions as consul, namely in having striven to ensure the security of the *res publica* and Roman *patria*. Similarly, at *Pro Sulla* 86, Cicero invokes the *di patrii* as a force of divine protection in order to illustrate the rightness of his actions and the innocence of his client. At the climax to the first book of Virgil's *Georgics*, the *di patrii* are called upon, alongside a series of other Roman traditional deities, to provide aid to Octavian's work of restoring peace and security to Rome and its empire (1.498-501: *Di patrii, Indigetes, et Romule Vestaque mater, | quae Tuscum Tiberim et*

⁵⁷⁰ On the exemplary character of Lucretia and her significance to Roman culture see Donaldson (1982); Klindienst Joplin (1990); Joshel (1992); Calhoon (1997); Mustakallio (1999); Dixon (2001), 46-47; and Langlands (2006), 78-122. On Lucretia in Ovid's *Fasti* see Newlands (1995), 146-174.

*Romana Palatia servas, | hunc saltem everso iuvenem succurrere saeclo ne prohibete).*⁵⁷¹ Finally, in Statius' *Silvae* the *di patrii* are included in a series of gods that the poet calls upon to protect the people so that they in turn can protect the *patria*.⁵⁷²

Arguably owing to their role as the divine guardians of the Roman *patria*, Cicero and Livy describe the *di patrii* as objects that are worthy of religious devotion and martial protection, and thus illustrate their central place within Roman religious culture. At *De Haruspicum Responsis* 37, Cicero addresses an addition that has been made to the soothsayers' interpretation of a mysterious noise. This addition states that traditional Roman religious custom has been either neglected or performed without due diligence (*sacrificia vetusta occultaque minus diligenter facta pollutaque*). Cicero asks rhetorically whether this criticism has been levelled by the soothsayers or by the *di patrii* and *penates* themselves (*Haruspices haec loquuntur an patrii penatesque di?*). By offering the notion that it is the *di patrii* that have accused the Romans of neglecting their religious practices, Cicero is able to highlight the severity of the situation at hand and thus the depth of Publius Clodius' crimes against the state. Not only is Rome experiencing an apparent religious crisis, but this crisis is being brought to their attention by the very gods the Romans should be honouring.

⁵⁷¹ "O *di patrii*, o *indigentes*, o Romulus and mother Vesta, you who protects the Tusan Tiber and the Roman Palantine, do not hinder this young man reserved to succour a cleaned out *saeculum*."

⁵⁷² Statius, *Silvae*, 4.8.45-54.

Thus, if the *di patrii* are being disrespected in this way, what impact is this then having upon the *patria* itself?

In some literary examples, the *di patrii* are used to either justify or criticise Roman political activity.⁵⁷³ Some of the most intriguing examples of *di patrii* being used to highlight political malpractice are to be found in Book 2 of Cicero's *Verrines*. Written in 70 BC, the orations present Cicero's prosecution of Gaius Verres on charges of extortion following his governorship of Sicily. Of the six occurrences, however, only one refers directly to the *di patrii* of Rome (2.1.7). This particular occurrence enables Cicero to set the tone of severity regarding the accusations that will follow. In this passage, the reader is informed how the political malpractice of Verres was of such a magnitude that even the *di patrii* of Rome believe him to be worthy of punishment (*rapient eum ad supplicium di patrii*). More significantly, this exclamation also serves to contextualise Verres' crimes. This is owing to the fact that it emphasises the degree to which Cicero regards them to be as much crimes committed against Rome as against the inhabitants of Sicily.

Despite the unquestionably Roman context, the remaining five occurrences of the phrase *deus patrius* are used to refer to the deities of Sicily, which were violated by Verres. Verres is accused of having coerced a Sicilian into selling off his *di patrii* as a means by which to relieve his personal debts (2.4.11) as well as having commanded the seizure of the images of the *di patrii* of several Sicilian communities

⁵⁷³ See also Cic. *Phil.* 2.72 and 2.75.

(2.4.77 and 2.4.94). In contrast, Cicero uses the relationship of the inhabitants of Sicily to their respective *di patrii* to highlight their pious nature and thus depicts them as helpless victims of a single man's avarice. At 2.4.17, Cicero informs his audience how a Messanian citizen who has agreed to testify against Verres is not motivated by the thought of recovering lost personal wealth, but by the determination to recover the sacred images of his *di patrii*.⁵⁷⁴ At 2.4.94-95, all the citizens of Agrigento without exception are stated to have been stirred to action at the news that the images of their *di patrii* were being carried away by the cronies of Verres, and at 2.4.132, they are described as being a deeply pious people who take the religious responsibilities towards their *di patrii* seriously.

The use of the *di patrii* to describe the gods of the Sicilian communities violated by the actions of Verres is an effective means by which Cicero is able to communicate the severity of Verres' crimes to a Roman audience. Firstly, Verres' behaviour to the sacred images of the gods of Sicily highlights his lack of any sense of cultural duty. After all, the *di patrii* are not simply ordinary deities. They are rather those that are firmly located at the cultural heart of a community, and which are thus deserving of the utmost respect. Secondly, it could be argued that Cicero, for the purposes of this particular speech, deliberately applied a Roman religio-cultural expression to the gods of another community in order to culturally tie them to Rome so as to further

⁵⁷⁴ See also Cic. *Verr.* 2.4.18.

heighten the nature of Verres' criminality. Such a strategy would have enabled a Roman audience to understand the severity of the accusations against Verres, not just against a provincial population but also against the laws, cultural traditions and political standards of Rome.

The use of the phrase *deus patrius* as a means by which to render a foreign group culturally accessible to a Roman audience is a literary strategy that is also evident within Quintus Curtius Rufus' *Historiae Alexandri Magni*. Believed to have been written at some time during the first century AD, Rufus' history has been interpreted as being inherently a Roman historical narrative written for a specifically Roman audience.⁵⁷⁵ This Roman nature is particularly noticeable in his literary style, emphasis on particularly Roman concepts and his desire to explore the particularly Roman preconception regarding the power and extent of monarchy.⁵⁷⁶ Rufus' strategy of applying Roman concepts to a non-Roman historical context enables him indirectly to explore a range of contemporary cultural, political and social questions, as well as to emphasise specific traits of various historical characters.

Deus patrius falls within this category. At 4.10.30-31, Tyriotes swears by the *di patrii* (*affirmare per deos patrios*) that Alexander caused no harm to Darius' wife, but lamented her passing as deeply as Darius. The employment of *di patrii* highlights the veracity of Tyriotes'

⁵⁷⁵ For discussions of the Roman nature of Quintus Curtius Rufus' history of Alexander see especially Atkinson (1994); Baynham (1998); and Spencer (2002).

⁵⁷⁶ On Curtius' Roman literary style see Baynham (1998), 15-56. On his preoccupation with the themes of power and monarchy see Baynham (1998), 132-200 and Spencer (2002), 80-82.

statement and eventually saves him from torture at the hands of Darius. Moreover, Tyriotes' invocation of the *di patrii* as witnesses of his account provides evidence as to the pious and princely character of Alexander. Accepting the truth of Tyriotes' account, Darius offers his own prayers to the *di patrii*. In the first instance he invokes them to watch over his kingdom. Whilst this is similar to the appeals of Anchises and Aletes in the *Aeneid*, it is ultimately a self-serving prayer. Darius' primary concern is for the continuation of his own royal power rather than the security of his people (4.10.34: "*Di patrii*" inquit, "*primum mihi stabilite regnum*").⁵⁷⁷ His prayer is then laced with a degree of irony and foreboding, as he asks the *di patrii* to ensure that it is Alexander who succeeds him if his reign is at an end (4.10.34: *deinde, si de me iam transactum est, precor ne quis potius Asiae rex sit quam iste tam iustus hostis, tam misericors victor*).⁵⁷⁸ With the decisive battle at Gaugamela imminent, the invocation at this point of the narrative marks an important transition point.⁵⁷⁹ This is the moment in which Darius unknowingly signs away his kingdom to his opponent, as the *di patrii* will ultimately reward the pious Alexander over the tyrannical Darius with victory and thus the rule of Asia.

⁵⁷⁷ "'*Di patrii*" he said, "First, make secure for me the kingdom".

⁵⁷⁸ "Thereafter, if it is now finished for me, I pray that no-one rather than that very just enemy, that very compassionate victor may be king of Asia."

⁵⁷⁹ The theme of transition and sense of defeat at the hands of Alexander, which accompanies an act of worship to the *di patrii*, is echoed at Curt. 7.4.1. The theme of transition was one that was closely associated with the *di patrii* within the context of the *ludi saeculares*, where one *saeculum* gave way to another. Central in the festivities to mark such a momentous event were the traditional deities that we have seen designated *di patrii* within Latin inscriptions and literature. The relationship between *di patrii* and the *ludi saeculares* is discussed in more detail in the subsequent section.

Darius' unsuitability to continue as king is emphasised in his final rhetorical references to the *di patrii*. At 4.14.24-25, Darius urges his troops to battle in the name of the *di patrii*, calling on them to deliver the Persian people from danger. Such an appeal has the effect of imbuing the imminent battle with the impression that it is a collective struggle against a common enemy. However, this notion of collectiveness is without substance. Darius' real aims have been revealed only a few lines earlier. Immediately before, at 4.14.22-23, Darius does not refer to the battle as a means by which to deliver the Persian people from the jaws of foreign aggression but as a means by which to free his royal household from slavery, which is depicted as praying to the *di patrii* for such an outcome, and thus ensure the survival of his royal dynasty. Essentially, Rufus' use of *di patrii* in Darius' speeches at this moment highlights to the audience Darius' unsuitability to rule, and in turn emphasises the necessity for a ruler to place the interests of the collective at the heart of his government.

The *di patrii* as a source of security is also evident at 6.11.15. Having been arrested by Alexander and facing torture in order to establish his involvement in a plot to assassinate the Macedonian king, Philotas calls to the *di patrii* for deliverance. However, Rufus informs us that the *di patrii* were deaf to his pleas, rather than unable to help (*Tum corripitur et, dum obligantur oculi, dum vestis exuitur, deos*

patrios, gentium iura nequiquam apud surdas aures invocabat),⁵⁸⁰ a statement that only indicates from the perspective of the audience Philotas' guilt. Rufus' message in this passage is two fold. Firstly, he stresses how the *di patrii* will only heed the appeals of those who are truly deserving of it, namely those of a moral and upright character. Secondly, the passage reflects the Roman belief evident in a number of *di patrii* inscriptions that the *di patrii* watch over the welfare of the emperor as well as that of Rome.⁵⁸¹

4.II.iii: Context and Purpose: A Visual Metaphor for Tradition and Innovation

From the discussion above, it is possible to conclude that the reverse design of the DI PATRII coin type of Septimius Severus draws on the religio-cultural heritage of two, separate *patria*e. The coin's iconography is undoubtedly Lepcitane in nature, whereas the phrase *di patrii* would appear to have had a strong, if not entirely exclusive, association within Latin inscriptions and literature with the religious heritage of Rome. As such, the coin can be said publicly to display the dual Romano-Lepcitane identity of the emperor and his dynasty.

However, in order to understand the political function of the coin and thus of *patria* it is necessary to consider the context in which it was issued. As stated in the introduction to this case study, the DI PATRII coin type was first issued by Geta in AD 200-202 and then subsequently by his father and brother in AD 204. This latter date

⁵⁸⁰ "Then he is seized and, while he is blindfolded, while he is freed from clothing, in vain he invoked the *di patrii* and the rights of peoples via deaf ears."

⁵⁸¹ See *AE* 1944, 74; *ILD* 663; *RIU* 5, 1139; *CIL* 8, 2585; and *AE* 1983, 795.

coincides with the celebrations of the *ludi saeculares*. This festival traditionally marked the transition from one *saeculum* to another, namely from a period of crisis to a period of peace and security. The festival also provided an opportunity for Rome to reaffirm its relationship with the gods which protected it from harm.⁵⁸² As identified in the discussion above, such gods were frequently designated *di patrii*. In 17 BC, Augustus revived the practice of holding the festival. The *ludi saeculares* provided Augustus with the means by which publicly to mark the transition from civil war to Augustan Golden Age. In essence, the Augustan festival was an effective opportunity to promote the ideology of the principate.

The Severan festival of AD 204 was closely modelled upon its Augustan predecessor. The parallels that can be drawn between the Augustan and Severan festivals indicate that Septimius Severus wished the people of Rome to identify his regime not simply as a continuation of Roman religious and cultural tradition, but as a political extension of the peace and prosperity associated with the reign of Augustus. The Severan festival followed the Augustan dating system of being held every 110 years; emulated the Augustan practice of having *acta* of the festival inscribed; and mirrored the central religious elements.⁵⁸³ Most

⁵⁸² Lusnia (2014), 105; and Beard, North and Price (1998), 201-206.

⁵⁸³ Augustus instituted the practice that the *ludi saeculares* should be held every 110 years, basing this upon an oracle of the Sibyl. However, this was not adhered to by all emperors, with Claudius and Antoninus Pius marking the time span between festivals as 100 years (AD 47 and AD 147 respectively). On the Augustan *ludi saeculares* see Zanker (1988), 167-183; Feeney (1998), 28-31; Schnegg-Köhler (2002) and Davis (2006), 23-59. For a detailed discussion of the Severan festival see Lusnia (2014), 105-116. On the *ludi saeculares* in general see Gag  (1934) and Pighi (1965). On the similarities between the Augustan and Severan festivals and

significantly, however, the Severan festival emulated the Augustan ideological initiative of marrying Roman religious and cultural tradition with religious and political innovation by incorporating the tutelary gods of Lepcis Magna into a highly traditional Roman cultural and religious festival.⁵⁸⁴

In this context the DI PATRII coin can be interpreted as a visual metaphor for the central themes associated with the Severan *ludi saeculares*. On the one hand, the phrase *deus patrius* can be identified as representing and reflecting the continuation of the cultural and religious heritage of Rome. Like the *ludi saeculares* it was closely associated with deities which were considered as being essential to the preservation of Rome and its empire. On the other hand, the juxtaposition of the tutelary gods of another *patria* with such a Roman religio-cultural expression can be seen to reflect innovation. This is owing to the fact that just as non-traditional or non-Roman gods were added to an inherently Roman festival in order to highlight the personal ideology of the emperor, the DI PATRII coin type affixes two non-Roman gods to the phrase *deus patrius*. Moreover, since Liber Pater (Shadaphra) and Hercules (Melqart) were closely associated with Septimius Severus' military successes, the designation of the tutelary gods of Lepcis Magna as pseudo *di patrii* emphasises their martial nature and thus their role in having aided the emperor in establishing

Septimius Severus' desire to have his regime identified as a continuation of that of Augustus see Cooley (2007), 391-393.

⁵⁸⁴ The inclusion of non-traditional deities into the *ludi saeculares* had precedent in the festivals of Augustus and Domitian who honoured their personal deities of Apollo and Minerva. See Rowan (2012), 54-60.

for the Roman *patria* a new era of peace and prosperity akin to the Golden Age of Augustus.

Summary

The aim of this chapter was to extend the investigation of *patria's* relationship to Roman politics into the imperial period. In the course of discussing the concept's political function within the context of two specific imperial regimes I have been able to reach four primary conclusions. Firstly, it is clear that the concept was employed both externally and internally in order to explore and debate the nature and character of an emperor and his particular regime. Secondly, as a consequence, the salience of *patria* to define the political actions of Roman emperors led to an increased degree of politicisation of the concept. Indeed, the fact that it was tied so closely to the person of the emperor, most especially through the title of *pater patriae*, illustrates the degree to which emperors placed a considerable degree of political ownership over the concept. This sense of ownership enabled the emperors considered to emphasise in particular their role as the supreme head of Roman culture, politics and society. Thirdly, the analysis of the DI PATRII coinage of Septimius Severus revealed how this particular emperor's personal identity was more complicated than previously recognised. Rather than having been solely Roman, Lepcitane or African, Septimius Severus appears to have been consciously proud to display his sense of possessing a dual identity, being both proud to be the head of the Roman *patria* whilst

maintaining a deep affection for his local or native one. Most importantly, this indicates the fact that there were multiple concepts of *patria* in existence during the imperial period, a feature that will be explored in much more detail in the following and final chapter of this study. Fourthly and finally, the discussion of the dual identity of Septimius Severus highlighted the close association that existed between *patria* and religious heritage. Most particularly, it revealed that the phrase *deus patrius*, was one that was at its heart a Roman religio-cultural expression, which was used to designate those deities in particular that ensured the welfare of the Roman *patria*.

Although these findings are undoubtedly important for our understanding of the Augustan and Severan regimes, there remains much more that could be explored. The concept's function as a means by which to characterise emperors and their regimes, for example, could be extended to consider other emperors for whom we have much literary evidence. In particular, this would be particularly valid in the case of Tacitus' *Annales*, especially since this text would enable an effective degree of comparison between emperors. There is also much scope to consider the ways in which *patria* is used within imperial decrees that exist today as inscriptions. What does this usage say about the regimes in question, and does it provide any insight into the regime's definition of the concept? Finally, it would be especially interesting to consider the function of the concept during the late Empire as various emperors competed for the various parts of the

Roman Empire. Did each 'zone' define itself as the definitive Roman *patria*, and to what extent did each emperor present his actions as defending or regaining the concept? As such, it is hoped that the above discussion has provided firm foundations for any future scholarship into this highly dynamic period of Roman history.

Chapter Five: *Roma Communis Nostra Patria Est?*

Introduction

Three Latin writers express the notion of Rome as a single, common or shared *patria*. This shared singularity is stressed via the adjectives *communis*, *noster* or *omnis*. In *De Lege Agraria* 2.86, Cicero states *hanc Romam, communem patriam omnium nostrum*. In the *Digesta* of Justinian, Callistratus is recorded as having declared *Roma omnium est patria* (DG 48.22.19), a statement that is later echoed by Modestinus, *Roma communis nostra patria est* (DG 50.1.33). Since *patria* has predominantly been associated with civic or municipal membership, these statements have frequently been interpreted as indicating the spread of Roman citizenship outside Rome. This has especially been the case with regard to the *Constitutio Antoniniana*, the moment in which all inhabitants of the Roman world were granted full Roman citizenship by the emperor Caracalla in AD 212.⁵⁸⁵ The notion that *patria* was synonymous with citizenship is a theory that has already been debunked during the course of this study. Thus, rather than indicate the spread of citizenship, Cicero, Callistratus and Modestinus would seem to be suggesting that, over time, a shared and unifying

⁵⁸⁵ For the relationship between the notion of *communis patria* and the edict of Caracalla see von Savigny (1869), 52; Wharton (1872), 38; and Mathisen (2012), 755. This is yet further evidence of the prior association between *patria* and Roman citizenship in scholarship. Cf. Ando (2000), 19, who, although believing in the existence of a *communis patria*, states “no event marked the transformation of her empire from an aggregate of ethnic groups into a *communis patria*.”

sense of collective identity emerged throughout the Roman Empire. Yet, to what extent were they right to make such a claim? After all, there have been plenty of examples in the previous four chapters that reveal the existence of a multitude of *patriae* in the Roman world.

This final chapter thus explores the question of ‘competing’ *patriae*, and examines the extent to which *patria* within the Roman world signified Rome or local communities. It does so by analysing the occurrence of the term in inscriptions across the Roman Empire. *Patria* occurs in a generic sense in a total of four hundred and twenty inscriptions and in thirty-nine provinces.⁵⁸⁶ Such inscriptions offer us an invaluable insight into the lives and thoughts of provincial communities with regard to the subject of *patria* as an expression of collective identity and what this conceptualisation symbolised or embodied. Since there is a vast amount of data that could be analysed, this chapter has been divided into three specific geographical case studies in order to provide as representative a discussion as possible. These three case studies consider inscriptions erected and found in what were the Greek-speaking eastern provinces, Spain and North Africa. These case studies enable a wide geographical analysis to be

⁵⁸⁶ The number of *patria* inscriptions by province: Aegyptus, 1; Africa Proconsularis, 138; Aquitania, 5; Arabia, 1; Asia, 6; Baetica, 13; Belgica, 1; Bithynia et Pontus, 3; Britannia, 2; Dacia, 10; Dalmatia, 7; Galatia, 1; Germania Inferior, 3; Germania Superior, 7; Hispania Citerior, 16; Lugdunensis, 2; Lusitania, 5; Lycia et Pamphylia, 8; Macedonia, 1; Mauretania Caesariensis, 21; Mauretania Tingitana, 2; Moesia Inferior, 2; Moesia Superior, 3; Narbonensis, 7; Noricum, 1; Numidia, 60; Pannonia Inferior, 5; Pannonia Superior, 2; Picenum, 2; Rome: 39; Samnium, 9; Sardinia, 3; Sicily, 4; Syria, 5; Thracia, 3; Transpadana, 5; Umbria, 5; Venetia et Histria, 11. *Patria* inscriptions where province is unknown: 1.

undertaken that identifies and interprets regional variation or similarity of context and function.

What emerges from this discussion is not evidence of a one-concept-for-all conceptualisation of *patria* as suggested by Cicero, Callistratus and Modestinus, but rather an indication that there existed a vast and complex network of individual and independent *patriae* across the Roman Empire. It is clear that these *patriae* were honoured on a regular basis by their members and clearly commanded a great degree of affection. They were also, as has been seen elsewhere in this study, an important marker of an individual's collective identity. It is also evident from the discussion below that there was a degree of regional variation in the epigraphic context in which *patria* is found and the function for which it was used. Such regionalism in phraseology, usage and context further emphasises the local definition of the *patriae* concerned.

5.1. The Epigraphic Evidence from the Hellenic Provinces

My investigation into the generic epigraphic occurrences of *patria* across the Roman Empire begins with those provinces that comprised its eastern half. These provinces were predominantly Hellenic in terms of culture and language and thus are referred to in this chapter as the Hellenic provinces.⁵⁸⁷ Owing to the predominance of Greek over Latin in these provinces it is not surprising to discover that Latin inscriptions

⁵⁸⁷ These provinces are: Achaia, Asia, Bithynia et Pontus, Cappadocia, Cilicia, Cyprus, Cyrene, Galatia, Lycia et Pamphylia, Macedonia, Thracia.

containing a generic occurrence of the term *patria* are rare.⁵⁸⁸ A total of eighteen such inscriptions are found in only five of eleven Hellenic provinces, and these can be divided into three categories (public, dedicatory and funerary).⁵⁸⁹ That such inscriptions were erected in predominantly Greek-speaking regions raises the intriguing question as to who was the intended audience for their respective messages and what effect this has on our definition of *patria* within them. Whilst five of the seventeen inscriptions were bilingual, the others appear to have been erected solely in Latin. Were these private messages? Were they intended primarily for the Latin-speaking Roman population of Greek cities? Is the use of Latin an indicator of the dedicator's or dedicatee's cultural and thus collective identity? Does the use of Latin mean that we should interpret *patria* as referring to Rome or Latin-speaking communities? A close inspection of these inscriptions by type helps us to answer these questions.

5.1.i. Public Inscriptions

Of the seventeen Latin inscriptions from the Hellenic provinces that contain a generic occurrence of the term *patria* within them, three fall into the category of public or civic inscriptions. These inscriptions were erected in the Roman province of Asia and publicise important political events to the local populace. The first of these, *AE* 1989, 683, is a

⁵⁸⁸ On the use of Latin in inscriptions in the eastern provinces see Levick (1995).

⁵⁸⁹ Asia: *AE* 1989, 683; *AE* 1999, 1577 = *CIL* 3, 352; *CIL* 3, 361; *CIL* 3, 461; *CIL* 3, 6998. Bithynia et Pontus: *AE* 1969/70, 592 (dedication); *AE* 1914, 135; *CIL* 3, 6989. Lycia et Pamphylia: *AE* 1988, 1036; *CIL* 3, 6885; *CIL* 3, 6888; *CIL* 3, 6890; *IK*-54, 86; *IK* 57, 44; *IK* 57, 45. Macedonia: *AE* 2002, 1293. Thracia: *AE* 1903, 246 = *CIL* 3, 14207, 15; *CIL* 3, 12333.

large bilingual stele from Miletus that has been dated to AD 177.⁵⁹⁰ This inscription is a record of a successful petition by the Milesians to the emperor Marcus Aurelius to have their Didymeia, a festival dedicated to the god Apollo, upgraded. The Greek section is a public record of a letter received by the Milesians from the emperor. This letter informs the reader that the Milesians' petition was presented to the Roman senate as part of a package of issues, a package on which a *Senatus Consultum* was passed. The reader is also informed that an excerpt from the emperor's speech to the senate that specifically addressed the Milesians' petition was attached to this letter. This excerpt is believed to be the Latin section of the inscription. There is no evidence that there was a Latin version of the letter nor that there existed a Greek translation of this extract. Instead, the Milesians appear to have published these documents publicly in the languages in which they received them.⁵⁹¹ The term *patria* occurs within this Latin extract of the emperor's speech. Its usage is entirely generic, since it regards the returning of an athlete to his native community. This generic usage results in a local definition of the concept. It clearly does not refer to Rome neither does it abstractly indicate the Roman Empire as a united entity. Rather the emperor's use of *patria* in this way reinforces the concept's role as a conceptual embodiment of an individual's sense of local collective origin.

⁵⁹⁰ Herrmann, Günther, Ehrhardt, Feissel and Weiss (1997), 49-50. For discussions of this inscription see Talbert (1984), 291-293; Herrmann, Günther, Ehrhardt, Feissel and Weiss (1997), 48-50; Ando (2000), 157-160.

⁵⁹¹ Ando (2000), 158.

The second of these two public or civic inscriptions is *AE* 1999, 1577. This inscription is dated to AD 331 and was originally erected in the city of Orcistus.⁵⁹² The inscription records in Latin an appeal from the city of Orcistus to the emperor Julian requesting autonomy over its civic affairs and thus civic independence from the neighbouring city of Nacolia. Between AD 237 and 324, Orcistus had been forced to pay its neighbour a regular tribute and yield to it its prior prominence in the region. The concept of *patria* plays a not insignificant role within this appeal. The term occurs a total of three times in the inscription in relation to two important arguments in the Orcistans' favour. Firstly, the concept is used to highlight Orcistus' ancient pedigree (*[patria] nostra Orcistos vetusti[s]/[sim]um oppidum fuit et ex antiquis[si]/[m]is temporibus ab origine etiam / [civ]itatis dignitatem obtinuit*).⁵⁹³ This study has already highlighted the importance of antiquity in relation to *patria*, most especially with regard to the concept's role as an embodiment of collective identity. As such, this statement can be understood to have been composed to make a deliberate and significant impact upon the reader. The description of Orcistus as a *patria* places it on the same level as other communities in the Roman world that also defined themselves as *patriae* and thus emphasised their ancient origins in the process. Foremost amongst these was

⁵⁹² This inscription has been published on a number of occasions. For the primary publications of this inscription see Mommsen, Hirschfeld and Domaszewski (1902), 1266-1268; Calder (1956); and Feissel (1999). For discussions of this inscription see Chastagnol (1981); Van Dam (2007), 368-372; and Lenski (2016), 96-103.

⁵⁹³ "Orcistus, our *patria*, was a most ancient town and, furthermore, from the beginning, out of the most ancient times, it possessed the status of a civic community."

Rome itself. Secondly, the now termed *patria* of Orcistus is stated as sitting at the meeting point of four trade routes in the region in which it is located (*[e]t in medio confinio Gal[ati]ae P(h)ri[g]/iae situm est nam quattuor viar[um] / [t]ransitus exhibet*). Moreover, the inscription states the distances of the neighbouring communities of Pessinus, Midaion and Amurium as being *a nostra patria*, from our *patria* (*id est civita[tis] / [P]essinunte(n)sium quae civita[s] dis]/[ta]t a patria nostra tricensim[o fe]/[re]lapide necnon etiam civitat[is Mi]/[d]aitanorum quae et ipsa est a [patria] / [n]ostra in tricensimo miliario e[t civi]/[t]atis Amorianorum quae posita [...]*).⁵⁹⁴ Such statements further reinforce the definition of *patria* as referring to the collective identity of a specific local community.

The use of *patria* in an appeal to obtain a civic upgrade for a city from the emperor is evident also in *AE* 2002, 1293.⁵⁹⁵ In this case, the inscription publishes a decree of the emperor Galerian that is datable to between 10th December AD 307 and 30th April AD 308.⁵⁹⁶ This decree publicises Heraclea Sintica's promotion to the status of *civitas*. Within his decree to the Heracleans, the emperor refers to their city as *patria vestra*, your *patria*. In the first instance, the emperor states that the bestowing of city rights on Heraclea Sintica enobles the

⁵⁹⁴ "That is of the *civitas* of Pessinus, which *civitas* is separated from our *patria* by roughly the thirtieth milestone, and likewise, too, of the *civitas* of Midaion which is itself separated from our *patria* by the thirtieth milestone, and of the *civitas* of Amurium which is placed [...]"

⁵⁹⁵ See Mitrev and Tarakov (2002); Mitrev (2003); Lepelley (2004); and Lenski (2016), 90-92.

⁵⁹⁶ Lepelley (2004), 221.

*patria (iure civitatis patri/am vestram nobilitare cuperemus).*⁵⁹⁷ In the second instance, the decree makes reference to the original petition or appeal from the Heracleans, stating that they had drawn the emperor's attention to the fact that their *patria* had enjoyed civic status in the past (*unde cum / etiam de praeterito eamdem Heracleotarum [patriam] / civitatem fuisse dicatis ac nunc postuletis / beneficio nostro eidem tribui iura civita/tis libenter admodum petitionibus vestris / opem ferimus).*⁵⁹⁸ It thus appears as though the Heracleans had, like the Orchistans, stressed the antique nature of their *patria* in order to support their appeal. The final instances of the term occurs in the emperor's closing remarks, where he acknowledges and praises the Heracleans for their affection to their *patria* (*cum itaque tantum patriae ve/strae sanctione nostra honoris ac/cessisse videatis eniti debebitis / quatenus studio et adfectu iuxta patriam / vestram dignis(sime) vos in omnibus nostra provisione / faciatis feliciter).*⁵⁹⁹ This inscription is significant, since it illustrates the emperor's recognition of the existence of local *patriae* within the confines of the Roman Empire.

5.1.ii. Dedicatory inscriptions

More than half of the seventeen generic *patria* inscriptions from the Hellenic provinces are dedications. These inscriptions record for the

⁵⁹⁷ "We have desired to enoble your *patria* with civic rights."

⁵⁹⁸ "Which, furthermore, since you say this same *patria* of the Heracleans was in the past of civic status, and now you request that the same *patria* be granted civic status with our blessing, we willingly offer support to full measure for your petition."

⁵⁹⁹ "Since, you see the approving of such an honour for your *patria* by our confirmation, you must far ascend by your zeal and your affection according to your *patria*, and you should fashion yourselves worthy from all our provisions. Good fortune."

most part services rendered by Roman citizens or local officials to specific local *patria*. For example, *CIL* 3, 361 commemorates the erection by a certain Gaius Octavius Cornelius of a temple and *porticus* in Blaundus, a city located in the province of Asia. The inscription describes these edifices as being erected *in patriam amantissimus*, a statement that must be interpreted as referring to *patria* in a local rather than imperial sense. As such, this inscription functions as a public record of Gaius Octavius Cornelius' service and devotion to his local *patria*.

Another example of a public record of service to *patria* is found in *CIL* 3, 6998. This is an inscription from the city of Nacolia that has preserved an excerpt from the will of Publius Aelius Onesimus, an imperial freedman (*Augusti libertus*) of Rome and a citizen of the city. In this short yet informative excerpt, Publius Aelius Onesimus requests that his heirs pay *meae patriae amantissimae*, to my most beloved *patria*, a sum of two hundred thousand sesterces, the interest from which is to be used for the benefit of the inhabitants of Nacolia.⁶⁰⁰ Once again, *patria* can only be interpreted as referring to a specific local place, in this case Nacolia, since the inscription refers directly to the town in which it was erected. Since Onesimus was an imperial freedman, Nacolia would appear to be the place in which he was born and to which he has returned on manumission.⁶⁰¹ Onesimus thus clearly wished his deeply felt affection for his native *patria* to be

⁶⁰⁰ See Mitthof (2013), 181-182.

⁶⁰¹ Andreau (1993), 193. See also Silver (2011), 92, who defines *patria* as birthplace.

publicly displayed and immortalised for future generations. The degree to which such publicity of service to *patria* was aimed to inspire future generations or to embellish an individual's reputation is a subject to which I will return later on in this chapter.⁶⁰²

Patria is also mentioned in *IK* 57, 45. This dedicatory inscription was erected to do honour to the renowned memory of a woman who belonged to a consular family.

] / c(larissimae) m(emoriae) f(eminae) consular(i) quae / in
confectionem oeco/basilici reliquit (denarios) XII (milia) /
col(onia) patria sua⁶⁰³

Whilst the name of this woman is now lost, presumably preceding the extant inscription, we know that she was honoured for having provided a sum of twelve thousand denarii during the construction of an *oecobasilica*, an extension to the Hadrianic basilica of the city of Cremna.⁶⁰⁴ The inscription ends with *colonia patria sua*. *Patria's* position at the end of the inscription appears to indicate that it functions as the dedicator, erecting the inscription to the honour of a notable member. However, there is no verb to confirm this. If it is indeed the case that *patria* is the dedicator it can only be interpreted as referring to Cremna. This interpretation is reinforced by the fact that *patria* is qualified as being a *colonia*, since Cremna was designated a Roman *colonia* under Augustus after the death of Amyntas in 25 BC.

⁶⁰² The *patria* as the benefactor of a dedication is a theme evident in *CIL* 3, 6885; *CIL* 3, 6888; and *CIL* 3, 6890.

⁶⁰³ "To the most renowned memory of a woman of consular rank who left behind for the completion of the *oecobasilica* 12 000 denarii, her *colonia patria*..."

⁶⁰⁴ Mitchell, S. (1995), 85; and Barresi (2003), 535.

Two final dedicatory inscriptions are worthy of mention at this point in the discussion. The first is *AE* 1969/70, 592, a dedicatory inscription that was inscribed on a marble column in the city of Sinope.⁶⁰⁵ Only the first part of the inscription remains. It informs us that the dedicatee was a certain Titus Veturius Collinus Campestris, a man of high standing seeing as he held a number of important local offices, including *augur*; *sacerdos omnium Caesarum* (priest of all the Caesars); *duumvir* on multiple occasions and for a variety of festivals; and *curator annonae* (curator of the grain supply). Amongst Veturius' extensive titles is that of *conditor patriae*, preserver of the *patria*. This is a particularly intriguing title, especially since this is the only epigraphic evidence for its existence. What does this title refer to? Is it a local title that honoured an inhabitant of Sinope for remarkable civic or public service? Or does the title refer to some military exploit undertaken by Veturius that either ensured the security of Sinope or the Roman Empire as a whole?

Similar questions surround the use of *conservator patriae* in *CIL* 3, 12333. This dedicatory inscription from Serdica in Thrace honours the emperor Aurelian and can be dated to AD 272-275. This title comes towards the end of a long list of titles that refer to the emperor's victories over the Germanic people, the Britons and the Sarmatian Goths. Clearly, the title *conservator patriae* refers to these

⁶⁰⁵ For previous historical references of this inscription see Abbott and Johnson (1926), 451, note 126; Sherwin-White (1966), 626; Hüttl (1975), 64, 142 and 150; Millar (1977), 380; and Eck (2009), 195.

military achievements, but what does *patria* signify? Does it refer to the Roman Empire as a whole or does it refer explicitly to Serdica? Both possibilities are equally credible. Owing to Serdica's position close to the northern frontier of the Roman Empire, Aurelian's victories over the Goths would have been an event of local significance. Indeed, the significance of such victories after this event would have been magnified by the emperor's decision to abandon the province of Dacia. As with so many of these inscriptions, it is hard to arrive at a definitive answer. Considering the evidence presented I believe that *patria* in *AE* 1969/70, 592 refers to Serdica, whilst the concept's occurrence in *CIL* 3, 12333 would seem more likely than not to buck the trend and thus function as a reference to the empire as a whole.

5.1.iii. Funerary Inscriptions

Arguably the most notable inscriptions from the Hellenic provinces to contain a generic occurrence of the term *patria* are two funerary inscriptions, *AE* 1914, 135 and *AE* 1903, 246. *AE* 1914, 135 was a bilingual funerary inscription that was erected in Amaseia for a certain Lucius Julius Maximus, a veteran standard bearer of the Fifth Macedonian Legion, by his *patria*. Why was Lucius Julius Maximus honoured in this way and what does *patria* in this particular inscription refer to? The first question is difficult to answer with any degree of certainty. It is a high possibility based on previously considered inscriptions in this study that Lucius Julius Maximus received this honour in return for one or several acts of distinguished local service

of some kind. Such an interpretation would lead to the conclusion that the *patria* referred to is itself local, more than likely referring to Amaseia. A local interpretation of *patria* is further supported by the bilingual nature of the inscription. It could be argued that the inscription was erected to mark the dedicatee's military service, yet this would switch the focus from a local context to a Roman imperial one and would in turn have an effect on how we interpret *patria*. Since *patria* seems more likely than not to be local in this case it seems safe to rule out this second, military-orientated interpretation.

AE 1903, 246 is an inscription from the fourth century AD that appears to have been originally part of a tomb. Although potentially being Christian in nature, and thus an inscription that this study normally would have overlooked, its evidence for the relationship between freedmen and *patria* makes it too important to ignore:

*Domo(m) (a)eterna(m) fecit / do(mi)n(a)e Fl(avius) Moco
dome/sticos de patria Ar/tacia de vico Calso*⁶⁰⁶

We learn that this inscription marks the final resting place of an unnamed mistress, constructed by a certain Flavius Moco, a freed domestic slave. The inscription tells us much about how Flavius Moco wished to be identified by passers-by. The reader learns that Moco was of the *patria* Artacia and that his *vicus* was Calso. Why is this information significant? It is notable owing to the fact that this is one of the only occurrences whereby *patria* is used by an individual to

⁶⁰⁶ "Flavius Moco, native of the *patria* Artacia and of the *vicus* of Calso, made this eternal resting place for his mistress." See Seure (1901), 318-320, for a discussion of the Thracian locations of Artacia and Calso.

indicate his or her tribal origins, and ones that must correspond to Moco's life before he became a slave. Although being highly unusual, this usage of *patria* is not conceptually incorrect. Flavius Moco uses *patria*, a recognised concept in the Roman world to refer to one's collective identity or origins, to illustrate the collective cultural or tribal group to which he considered himself still to belong, namely that of the Thracian Artacoi or Artacii. The use of *vicus* in this context is used to indicate his specific place of domicile before his subsequent enslavement. This inscription does not, therefore, fit the model outlined in Chapter One where freedmen were seen to take on the *patria*, and thus the identity, of their respective masters on manumission. If it did we would expect Moco to declare his *patria* as being that of his mistress, possibly Augusta Traiana.

Flavius Moco has thus consciously chosen to retain the collective identity he bore in his previous life as a free man. As such, *AE* 1903, 246 could be interpreted as an example of a manumitted slave resisting Roman attempts to monopolise the definition of his collective identity on the occasion of his freedom. Indeed, the ambiguous nature of *domesticos* in this inscription emphasises this fact. *Domesticos* can be translated either as 'domestic slave' or as 'native or resident of a place'. I find it tempting to think that Moco intentionally plays on this ambiguity, knowing that it is highly likely to be read by the majority of Roman readers as 'slave', but actually using it surreptitiously to stress his native and thus non-Roman identity. His

use of *patria* to depict a tribal group reinforces this point. By describing his tribe as a *patria*, Moco categorises his native origins as being equal in status to the *patriae* of inhabitants of the Roman world and thus himself as possessing a collective identity that was clearly identifiable to a Roman audience. Could this inscription contain, therefore, a private joke? Such is impossible to prove, but what can be said for sure is that this inscription once again emphasises the use of *patria* within Latin inscriptions of the Roman Empire to indicate to an external audience the local identity of an individual.

5.II. The Epigraphic Evidence from the Roman Provinces of Spain

The use of *patria* to indicate local communities and to emphasise specific local collective identities is evident from the generic *patria* inscriptions to be found in the Roman provinces of Spain. These provinces contain almost twice the number of such inscriptions in comparison with the Hellenic provinces of the east. A total of thirty-three are identifiable, twelve from Baetica, sixteen from Hispania Citerior and five from Lusitania. However, of these thirty-three inscriptions only twelve fall within the parameters of this study. Of the other twenty-one, seven are Christian inscriptions that are dated to late antiquity;⁶⁰⁷ six have been identified to be *imitationes*;⁶⁰⁸ three fall

⁶⁰⁷ *AE* 2007, 838; *CIL* 2/5, 29 = *CIL* 2, 187; *IHC* 227a; *IHC* 227b; *IHC* 283; *IHC* 389; and *IHC* 469.

⁶⁰⁸ *CIL* 2, 278d; *CIL* 2, 363; *CIL* 2, 380; *CIL* 2, 397; *CPILCaceres* 194; and *CPILCaceres* 196. See González Germain and Carbonell Manils (2012).

into the already examined *dii patrii* category;⁶⁰⁹ a further three are too fragmentary to examine with any degree of certainty;⁶¹⁰ one inscription dates to the Visigothic period of Spain's history;⁶¹¹ and one other from the tenth century.⁶¹² The twelve inscriptions that remain reveal an interesting regional variation in usage in comparison with the Hellenic provinces. Whereas the generic *patria* inscriptions of the Hellenic provinces were for the most part dedicatory, in Spain they are predominantly funerary. Of the twelve inscriptions that will be discussed within the following case study, seven are funerary; three are public or civic; and two are honorific.

5.II.i. Funerary

The funerary *patria* inscriptions from Baetica and Hispania Citerior further highlight the strong emotional bond that was deemed to have existed between an individual and the concept. Our first indication of this is provided by *CIL* 2²/7, 439. This inscription originally marked the final resting place of a certain Clodia Euporia who died aged 40 years and 28 days. The inscription informs the passer-by *quae mu/tata patria casu raptu mane[t]*.⁶¹³ The use of the past participle *mutata* to describe *patria* in this statement is interesting as it forces the reader to consider the extent of the relationship between *patria* and Clodia Euporia. The reader learns that the *patria* the inscription speaks of (most likely

⁶⁰⁹ *AE* 1994, 935; *AE* 1976, 287; and *AE* 1969/70, 248.

⁶¹⁰ *AE* 1994, 963; *CIL* 2²/7, 199; and *CLEHisp* 126.

⁶¹¹ *AE* 2008, 646 = *CLE* 900. See Koch (2008).

⁶¹² *ILPGranada* 148.

⁶¹³ "Who remains, *patria* having been exchanged by chance seizure."

definable as Cordoba in this context) has been imposed upon Euporia by force, arguably as a result of her enslavement. Her native *patria* has thus been exchanged for that of her master on manumission, an action that, as has already been established, would appear to have been official Roman practice. The statement that this exchange occurred as a result of a 'chance seizure' appears to indicate a degree of remorse at Euporia's unfortunate change in circumstances and the exchange of *patriae* that followed. Such remorse can only be interpreted as an indication of Euporia's continuing affection for her native *patria*.

The importance of *patria* to the eternal image of an individual is evident in *CIL* 2, 3256, an inscription that marked the final resting place of a certain Cassius Crescens. It is clear that this particular inscription was deliberately constructed as an effective medium through which to display the character and achievements of the individual concerned. This is owing to the fact that it grabs the attention of the reader by addressing it directly on two occasions as *tu praeteriens* (you that are passing by). The inscription also states that it will be read by many (*[qu]od via finitimast mul[tis haec scripta legentur*]), a statement that also leads us safely to assume that this epitaph was erected beside a busy thoroughfare leading to one of the gates of Baesucci. It is these aspects that emphasise the fact that the information contained within the inscription was intended to leave a lasting impression on the reader and to create a powerful image of Cassius Crescens. *Patria* plays a part in establishing this image, as the

deceased is praised for his *amor patriae*, his love of *patria*. The significance of this aspect of his character is revealed in the statement that succeeds it, where it is stated that *hunc mors praecipuum testi[ficata meast]*.⁶¹⁴ The image that Crescens' death has witnessed this love of *patria* leads one to consider the idea that he has potentially fallen in its defence.

The bond between local *patriae* and individuals is a feature that is also clear in *CIL* 2, 6087. In the case of this inscription this bond remains strong despite a long geographical distance between the *patria* and individual concerned. The inscription itself marks the final resting place of a certain Marcus Aurelius Victorinus, an *evocatus*, who died in Tarraco aged thirty-four. His *patria* is stated as being Iulia Emona, a Roman settlement that had been established on the border between Roman Italy and Pannonia in AD 14. Thus, similar to the case of *AE* 1903, 246, *patria* refers to a specific local community, but one that is geographically distant from the place in which the inscription in question has been erected. This aspect has an understandable influence on the way in which we thus interpret the message of *CIL* 2, 6087. The inscription testifies to the inhabitants of Tarraco the deceased's external origins. It thus emphasises how the deceased in question or his family wished for him to be identified in death. Moreover, despite having died and thus buried far from his Iulia Emona, the inclusion of his *patria* on his epitaph enables Marcus

⁶¹⁴ "My death has witnessed this especially."

Aurelius Victorinus to be reunited with his home. Consequently, this inscription is a superb example of how the strong emotional bond between *patria* and individual that has been so often emphasised in this study can remain strong even into death.

5.II.ii. Honorific

Service towards *patria* is a theme that once again occurs within the generic *patria* inscriptions of Roman Spain. There are two such examples, *CIL* 2, 1054 and *CIL* 2, 1185. Both draw the reader's attention towards the great largess that their respective dedicators have bestowed upon the communities in question. In *CIL* 2, 1185, Lucius Horatius Victorinus receives a statue from the people of Hispalis *ob plenissimam / munificentiam erga patriam / et populum*.⁶¹⁵ We do not learn what this great largess consisted of, since it could have involved the erection, extension or restoration of public buildings; the distribution of coins; or the putting on of public festivities.

CIL 2, 1054 also records the dedication of a statue, this time by the people of Axati to a certain Gaius Iuventius Albinus.⁶¹⁶ Albinus is recorded as having been an *aedile* and *duumvir*, and for having received this particular honour *ob / merita as patrono / patriae*. The use of the title *patronus patriae* is particularly interesting. It is one of only two such occurrences of this title in all of the Latin inscriptions of which we thus far have knowledge. Why was this title used and what

⁶¹⁵ "For his greatest largess towards *patria* and people"

⁶¹⁶ For detailed discussions of this inscription, particularly regarding its discovery, reconstruction and significance, see Remesan Rodríguez (1998); and Castillo Guerrero (1998).

does it signify? It is highly probable that *patronus patriae* is a variation on *patronus civitatis*. *Patronus civitatis* is a title that was commonly bestowed on prominent individuals in Roman Italy, North Africa and Numidia between AD 180 and 350 and recognised high levels of civic service.⁶¹⁷ If this is indeed the case, this feature would challenge Castillo Guerro's dating of the inscription to the first century AD.

If the title *patronus patriae* is designed to indicate Albinus' high level of public service, why not just adopt a pre-existing title word-for-word? Why change *civitas* to *patria*? From my perspective, there is a clear change in meaning with such a transformation. Whereas *patronus civitatis* draws the reader's attention to benefactions made to the citizen body, *patronus patriae* draws the reader's attention to the conceptualisation or embodiment of Axatian collective identity. Thus, it may be that rather than emphasise the undertaking of great civic service, Albinus provided benefactions that contributed to the development of Axatian collective identity. The use of *patria* rather than *civitas* also invites a comparison between *patronus patriae* and the imperial title of *pater patriae*. As was seen in Chapter Four, *pater patriae* stressed the position of the emperor or *princeps* as a father figure that ensured the stability and prosperity of the Roman world. It could, therefore, have been the case that either Albinus or the people of Axati wanted to highlight a more paternal or protective quality and thus looked to the title of *pater patriae* for inspiration.

⁶¹⁷ See the in depth study by Bond (2007) on the 1200 *patronus civitatis* inscriptions.

5.II.III. Public or Civic

The three remaining *patria* inscriptions from Roman Spain that require discussion fall into the category of public or civic inscriptions. *AE* 1996, 885 and *ZPE* 192, 284 are identical public records of the *Senatus Consultum de Cn. Pisone Patre*. Although not Baetican in origin, its publication in a Roman province and thus its presentation of *patria* make it worthy of discussion in this context. The document publishes the Roman Senate's judgement on the charge of *maiestas* that was brought against Gnaeus Calpurnius Piso following the death of Germanicus in AD 19.⁶¹⁸ It is a remarkably detailed document that sheds further light upon Tacitus' account of the same significant political event during the reign of Tiberius.⁶¹⁹ This *Senatus Consultum* also sheds further light upon the relationship between *princeps* and *patria*. At lines 130-132 the senate states, in reference to Tiberius: *Quo nomine debere eum finire dolorem ac restituere patriae suae non tantum animum, sed etiam voltum, qui publicae felicitate conveniret.*⁶²⁰ With these words, the *princeps* is urged to draw a line under the situation and to place the energy that he had invested in the trial of Piso in ensuring the security, stability and prosperity of the Roman *patria*. These are aspects that previously we have seen were closely associated with the character and hence image of the Augustan

⁶¹⁸ For a detailed discussion of the document see Cooley (1998). For editions of the text see Eck, Caballos and Fernández (1996); and Potter and Damon (1999). See also Griffin (1997), 252.

⁶¹⁹ Cooley (1998), 199.

⁶²⁰ "That he should end his sorrow and restore to his *patria* not only his spirit but also his face [i.e. his physical presence], which are intended for the prosperity of the people."

principate. Thus it would appear that the practice of using *patria* to create the character and image of the *princeps* was a practice that continued into the reign of Tiberius. Yet, this statement also reveals the senate taking on or maintaining a proactive role with regard to the welfare of *patria*, a theme that was so prominent in the writings of Cicero. It is the senate that calls on the *princeps* to ensure the wellbeing of the *patria*, revealing a degree of guardianship over the *patria* by Rome's collective governing body.

Whereas in the *Senatus Consultum Cn. Pisone Patre*, *patria* clearly referred to Rome in an imperial sense, in *CIL* 2, 172, the only *patria* inscription from Lusitania that falls within the parameters of this study, the concept once again refers to a specific local community. Published on bronze and dated to AD 37, this inscription records an oath of allegiance made by the Aricenses, a Spanish tribe, to the emperor Caligula. *Patria* itself is mentioned within the penalties that will befall the people of Aricio should they renege on their promise:

*Si s[cie]ns fa[ll]o fefellerove tum me / liberosq(ue) meos
Iuppiter Optimus Maximus ac / divus Augustus ceteriq(ue)
omnes di immortales / expertem patria incolumitate
fortunisque / omnibus faxint⁶²¹*

The inclusion of *patria* amongst the items that the Aricenses should be deprived of by the gods in the event of their breaking their promises to the emperor functions to underline the seriousness of this oath. It is a powerful emotional binding agreement between a clearly defined

⁶²¹ "If, knowingly, I swear falsely or I will swear falsely then may Jupiter Optimus Maximus and divine Augustus and all the other immortal gods make me and my children be without *patria*, safety and all possessions."

community and the leader of the Roman world upon which the existence of this community depends. Indeed, this inscription would seem to reflect the situation with regard to the *patria*e that comprised the Roman world. There was not a single, all-embracing concept of *patria* to which all inhabitants of the Roman Empire owed their allegiance. Rather, the empire encapsulated a large number of distinct communities, the independence of which in terms of identity were understood and thus conceptualised via the concept of *patria*. Yet, these individual *patria*e were united in the duty and service that they owed the emperor.

5.III. The Epigraphic Evidence from the Roman Provinces of North Africa

From the case studies of the Hellenic provinces and Roman Spain, evidence of a degree of regional variation has emerged regarding the epigraphic context and function of *patria*. Regional variation is a theme that is especially predominant with regard to the Roman provinces of North Africa. These provinces contain the highest concentration of generic *patria* inscriptions in the Roman Empire, with two hundred and twenty-one of the four hundred and twenty in total found there. That these provinces yield more *patria* inscriptions than either Rome or the Italian regions put together is especially intriguing. This fact alone indicates that the concept occupied an important position within the local culture of these provinces.

The overwhelming majority of these inscriptions are dedicatory and many of them contain what appear to be specifically regional epigraphic titles and expressions. The most notable of these titles and expressions are *ornator patriae* and *amator patriae*. There has been a disagreement in previous scholarship with regard to the cultural origins of these two titles. Mattingly has argued that these titles are Latin translations of what were originally Punic titles, whereas Amadosi Guzzo has argued that they are inherently Roman.⁶²² Having considered the evidence available Mattingly's hypothesis appears to be the more accurate. There are no occurrences of *ornator patriae* or *amator patriae* in Latin inscriptions that have been discovered outside the Roman provinces of North Africa, and the number of thematic variations on them within these provinces further illustrates their social and civic significance on a local level. This final case study will examine these titles and their thematic variations in detail. It will catalogue who the recipients of these honours were; when and why they were given; and what social or personal messages are associated with them. In doing so, this final case study will explore the meaning behind the practice of individuals providing an epigraphic record of services or benefactions given to their *patriae*. Were these records designed to inspire future generations? Or were they used to inflate the social and civic standing of the dedicator?

⁶²² Mattingly, D.J. (1987), 74; and Amadosi Guzzo (1988), 32. Wilson (2012), 280, agrees with Mattingly and interprets them as local titles with no Latin equivalent outside of Tripolitania.

My attempt to answer these questions begins with a series of inscriptions that were erected in Lepcis Magna by a certain Annobal Rufus. His name indicates that he was of Punic ethnic origin but his social prominence (*flamen*, *sufete*, sacred prefect) and his adoption of the Roman *cognomen* Rufus indicate a degree of assimilation of Roman culture.⁶²³ Three *patria* inscriptions bear his name (*IRT* 321; 322; and 323), followed by the title *ornator patriae*. In another inscription found alongside those bearing the name of Annobal Rufus (*IRT* 269), the only female example of the title (*ornatrix patriae*) is used to describe Suphunibal, a woman of another elite local family.⁶²⁴ The Latin in *IRT* 321 and 322 is accompanied by a Neo-Punic translation. All four of these inscriptions were erected prominently in the theatre of Lepcis Magna. *IRT* 321, 322 and 323 all record the same message and inform the reader that the theatre was constructed by Annobal Rufus at his own expense and subsequently dedicated by him during the reign of Augustus.⁶²⁵ There is a high degree of probability that the title *ornator patriae* is related to such high profile building projects. A theatre was a significant public building in an ancient city and it is

⁶²³ Cooley (2012), 256. On the subject of names at Lepcis Magna see Birley (1988b).

⁶²⁴ *Cereri Augustae sacrum / C(aius) Rubellius Blandus co(n)s(ul) pont(ificex) proco(n)s(ul) dedic(avit) Suphunibal ornatrix pat[ria]e Annobalis Rusonis d(e) s(ua) p(ecunia) f(aciendum) c(uravit)*. ("Sacred to Ceres Augusta. Caius Rubellius Blandus, consul, pontifex, proconsul, dedicated it; Suphunibal, *ornatrix patriae*, wife of Annobal Ruso, with her money arranged the construction.")

⁶²⁵ *Imp(eratore) Caesare divi filio Aug(usto) pont(ifice) max(im)o tr(ibunicia) pot(estate) XXIV / co(n)s(ule) XIII patre patri(ae) / Annobal Rufus ornator patriae amator concordiae / flamen sufes praef(ectus) sacr(or)um Himilchonis Tapapi f(ilius) / d(e) s(ua) p(ecunia) fac(iendum) coer(avit) idem(que) dedicavit*. ("With Imperator Caesar Augustus, son of the divine Caesar, *Pontifex Maximus*, holder of the tribunician power for the twenty-fourth time, consul for the thirteenth time, *pater patriae*, Annobal Rufus, *ornator patriae*, *amator concordiae*, *flamen*, *sufete*, prefect of sacred things, son of Himilcho Tapapius, with his money arranged the construction and also dedicated it.")

highly likely that the provider of such an edifice would have been greatly rewarded for such a benefaction.

The exclusivity of the title locally is attested by the fact that only two other inhabitants of Lepcis Magna are described as *ornator patriae*. *IRT* 318 and 347 record the erection and dedication of altars by Tiberius Claudius Sestius.⁶²⁶ As with the case of *IRT* 321, 322, 323 and 269, these inscriptions were set up in the theatre of Lepcis Magna. *IRT* 275 is an inscription that has already been discussed in the previous chapter. This inscription was found in the area of the *forum Vetus* of Lepcis Magna and records the marbling of the temple of Liber Pater by a certain Marcus Vipsanius Clemens. This benefaction is stated to have occurred under the supervision of Quintus Servilius Candidus who is described as *ornator patriae*. Both Candidus and Sestius were individuals who appear to have had a high social and civic

⁶²⁶ Both inscriptions are dated to AD 92. *IRT* 318:] / [Augu]sto / [sac]rum / Asp[r]enas / proco(n)s(ul) / dedicavit // [Ti(berius) Claudius Sestius] / ornator pat[r]ia[e] / amator concor/diae cui primo / ordo et populus / ob merita maio/rum eius et ipsius / lato clavo sem/per uti concessit / aram et podi(um) / d(e) s(ua) p(ecunia) f(acienda) c(uravit). ("Sacred to [...] Augustus; Asprenas, proconsul, dedicated it. Tiberius Claudius Sestius *ornator patriae*, *amator concordiae*, to whom first, on account of his merit and that of his ancestors, the governing order and the people allowed to always wear the broad band of purple, with his money arranged the construction of the altar and the paved base.") *IRT* 347: Imp(eratore) Caesare divi Vespasiani [[f(ilio) Domitiano Aug(usto) Germanico pont(ifice) max(imo) trib(unicia) potest(ate) XI imp(eratore) XXI co(n)s(ule) XVI censore pe[r]petuo]o patre patriae]] / Ti(berius) Claudius Quir(ina) (tribu) Sestius Ti(beri) Claudi Sesti f(ilius) praefectus sacrorum flamen divi Vespasiani sufes flamen perpetuus amator patriae amator civium ornator patriae amator concordiae cui primo ordo et populus ob merita maiorum eius et ipsius lato clavo semper uti conce[ssit] / podi(um) et aram d(e) s(ua) p(ecunia) f(acienda) c(uravit). ("With *Imperator* Caesar Domitian Augustus Germanicus, son of the divine Vespasian, *Pontifex Maximus*, holder of the tribunician power for the eleventh time, *imperator* twenty-one times, consul sixteen times, perpetual censor and *pater patriae*, Tiberius Claudius Sestius, of the Quirina tribe, son of Tiberius Claudius Sestius, prefect of sacred things, *flamen* of the divine Vespasian, *sufete*, perpetual *flamen*, *amator patriae*, *amator civium*, *ornator patriae*, *amator concordiae*, to whom first, on account of his merit and that of his ancestors, the governing order and the people allowed to always wear the broad band of purple, with his money arranged the construction of the altar and the paved base.")

standing within the Lepcitane community. Candidus was a *flamen* of the deified Vespasian, an office that Sestius also possessed. Sestius is also recorded in *IRT* 347 as having been a *sufete* and perpetual *flamen*. He is also stated to have been the first citizen of Lepcis Magna to have been given the right to wear the *toga praetexta*.

There thus seems to be a correlation between the bearers of the title *ornator patriae* and high social or civic status. This correlation is reflected in the one remaining *ornator patriae* inscription. *CIL* 8, 22743 is an inscription from Gigthis that records the erection of a statue to Marcus Ummidius Sedatus by the *ordo decurionum*. The *ordo decurionum* was a body charged with the administration and general governance of a Roman *municipium*. Consequently, to have received an honour from the local government, Marcus Ummidius Sedatus must either have been a prominent member of this body or undertaken public service of a significant nature.

Similar conclusions can be reached regarding the title *amator patriae*. It would also appear to have been awarded specifically to individuals of high social standing and to those that had exhibited a high level of public largesse. In a couple of cases *amator patriae* is used in conjunction with *ornator patriae* reinforcing these correlations. This conjunction is evident in *IRT* 275 and 347 that have been discussed above. *IRT* 567 records honours being awarded to Titus Fabius Vibianus, *amator patriae*, as voted by the people and town council of Lepcis Magna in recognition of having put on at his own expense a

series of public spectacles.⁶²⁷ Once again, the dedicatee is a man of high social and civic standing since he is stated as holding and having held a series of local civic and religious offices. Porfyrius is another inhabitant of Lepcis Magna described as *amator patriae*. *IRT* 603 records how the Lepcitane council voted to honour him with a *quadriga* for having presented the city with four elephants.⁶²⁸ On this occasion, however, the dedicatee is not listed as having held any civic or religious offices.

Whereas *ornator patriae* appears to have been restricted almost exclusively to Lepcis Magna, its counterpart *amator patriae* is more widespread. Inscriptions containing it have been found in Lepcis Magna (*IRT* 275; 347; 567; and 603), Sabratha (*IRT* 95), Madauros (*CLE* 1963), Uzelis (*AE* 1917/18, 44), Thiblis (*CIL* 8, 5530), and Altava (*IdAltava* 15; and 317). Despite this large geographical spread there is clear uniformity in usage. With only one exception (*CLE* 1963) all the above listed *amator patriae* inscriptions are dedications and, as far as

⁶²⁷ *Uno eodemque anno / du(u)mviro Lepcimagn(ensium) / et sacerdoti prov(inciae) Trip(o)(itanae) / innocentissimo viro / principali integerrimo / amatori patriae acci/vium suorum T(ito) Flavio / Vibiano v(iro) p(er)fectissimo fl(amini) p(er)p(etuo) et pont(ifici) / cur(atori) rei pub(licae) Lepcimagn(ensis) / sac(erdoti) Laur(entium) Lav(inatium) et sac(erdoti) M(atris) D(eum) / praef(ecto) omnium sacr(or)um ob diversarum voluptatum exhibitionem / et Libycarum ferarum X / ex populi suffragio et ordi(n)is d(ecreto)*. ("For Titus Flavius Vibianus, in one and the same year, a *duumvir* of the Lepcitanes and priest of the province of Tripolitania, a most blameless man, a very upright leading citizen, *amator patriae* and *amator civium suorum*, an excellent man, perpetual *flamen*, priest of the Laurentes Lavinatium and priest of the Mother of the Gods, prefect of all sacred things; by a vote of the people and a decree of the governing order owing to his production of different pleasures and of ten Libyan beasts.")

⁶²⁸ *Amatori patriae et civium suorum quod indulgentia sacra / civibus suis feras dentatas quattuor vivas donavit / ex decreto splendidissimi ordinis bigam decreverunt / Porfyri Porfyri*. ("By a decree of the most splendid governing order, they voted for a two-wheeled chariot for Porfyrius of Porfyrius, an *amator patriae* and *amator civium suorum*, because by sacred concession he bestowed to his citizens four live toothed beasts.")

can be told, all of the recipients were of high social or civic standing. In Altava, for example, both recipients hold the office of *rex sacrorum* raising the question of whether, in this particular town, the title was endowed on the assumption of this important religious office.

However, terming *ornator patriae* and *amator patriae* as titles and the individuals described by them as recipients or holders raises the question of how it was that an individual came to possess them. Were *ornator patriae* and *amator patriae* honours that were officially awarded by the local population or its governing body? Or did an individual simply assume them on his own initiative? The small number of examples that we possess and the fact that for the most part they occur on inscriptions that have been erected at the behest of the local populations or the local governing bodies suggests a degree of officiality and exclusivity. Indeed, this has already been touched upon with regard to *IdAltava* 15 and 317 where a formal connection between *amator patriae* and the office of *rex sacrorum* is indicated. The significance of both 'titles' is emphasised by the prominent locations in which these inscriptions were erected in Lepcis Magna. *IRT* 269, 318, 321, 322, 323 and 347 were all found in the vicinity of the theatre; *IRT* 275 was found in the *forum Vetus*; *IRT* 567 in the *forum Severianum*; and *IRT* 603 in the Punic market. It can also be fairly safely assumed that *IdAltava* 15 and 317 must also have been displayed in a prominent public location owing to their association with a specific religious office, possibly within the religious heart of the

settlement. These inscriptions were meant to be seen, to be read and to be acknowledged by the local populace.

Yet what was the message that these inscriptions and those others that publicised service to local *patriae* conveyed to this highly public audience? Were they intended to inspire contemporaries and future generations towards emulation? Or were they simply a medium by which to further promote and polish the public image of high profile individuals? *AE* 1987, 1085 comes from the city of Mascula in Numidia and is dated to AD 364-367.⁶²⁹ This inscription attests to a large scale renovation of the urban landscape of Mascula during this time: *aureis ubique temporibus dd(ominorum) nn(ostorum) Valentiniani et Valen/tis perpetuorum (Au)gg(ustorum) statum desperata recipiunt Ami/ssa renovatur ruinarum deformitatem decor novit/atis excludit.*⁶³⁰ Involved in this urban renovation was the governor of Numidia Publilius Ceionius Albinus who, it is recorded, restored the public baths *ad splendorem tam patriae quam provinciae* (for the splendour of the *patria* and the province). Whilst it is stated that this action is inspired by and intended for the common good and indeed would have greatly benefited the local community it is undoubtedly the case that it also does much to promote the individual character of Albinus. A benefaction on this scale, like the construction of the theatre of Lepcis Magna by Annobal Rufus, would have served as an efficient way to

⁶²⁹ See Lepelley (1992 [2001]), 57-58.

⁶³⁰ "In the golden times that spread everywhere of our lords Valentinian and Valens, the perpetual Augusti, the derelict regains its original condition, that abandoned is renovated, new charms replace the ugly ruins."

promote and publicly display the wealth, generosity and status of the benefactor. After all, one of the primary purposes of dedicatory inscriptions was to ensure that credit was given where credit was due.

Thus, *IRT 55*, a broken marble panel from the city of Sabratha that would have originally have been displayed on the temple to Liber Pater. As with *AE 1987, 1085*, *IRT 55* records a period of urban renovation. In this particular case it is the temple of Liber Pater, located in the east of the forum, that is being restored after a period of neglect (*a[ede]m Liberi Patris quam antiqua ruina cum lab[e]*) during the reign of Constantius II (the inscription is dated to AD 340-350). This project seems to have involved several prominent individuals of the city. The names of two are preserved (Flavius Victor Calpurnius and Lucius Aemilius Caelestinus) and it is likely that these were accompanied by the names of one if not two others. Lucius Aemilius Caelestinus' involvement in the restoration of the temple is stated as having been motivated by his *amor patriae*. The statement in this context does much to highlight to the reader the patriotic nature of Caelestinus. Not only is he described as a patriotic individual but the temple functions as physical evidence of this. Moreover, it also acts as physical proof of Caelestinus' fulfilment of his duty and service to his *patria*.

The theme of restoration for the benefit of a local *patria* is one that reoccurs in a number of inscriptions from the provinces of North Africa. Many of these date from AD 321 onwards and reflect an

imperial preference to restore and renovate existing public monuments rather than construct new ones.⁶³¹ A final such example worthy of consideration is *AE* 1995, 1655. This inscription from the city of Abthugni records the restoration of the city's forum during the proconsulship of a certain Decimus Hesperius. Like the previous inscriptions of this kind that have been discussed, *AE* 1995, 1655 opens by informing the reader of the sorry condition the forum had been in: *forum quod per annorum seriem turpi[ter iacebat ita ut pars quae frontem] / moenium aspiciebat tantummodo remansisse[restitutum est].*⁶³² This practice of stressing the abysmal state of the monuments and public spaces that were being restored either served to justify, legitimise or emphasise the scale of the project that was being undertaken. Once again, Decimus Hesperius is stated to have undertaken this public benefaction *pro splendore patriae* (for the splendour of the *patria*) yet the inscription serves to publicise and promote his deep patriotic sentiments.

The inscriptions considered in this case study are only a small selection of the two hundred and twenty-one *patria* inscriptions that have been found in the provinces of Africa Proconsularis, Numidia, Mauretania Caesariensis and Mauretania Tingitana. The vast majority of them are dedicatory inscriptions that stress the same themes and sentiments that have been explored in the chapters above. It is clear

⁶³¹ Leone (2013), 125. On the subject of rebuilding inscriptions see also Thomas and Witschel (1992); and Fagan (1996).

⁶³² "The forum, which for many years had lain in a sorry state so that only the part which faced the walls was still standing, was restored."

that public benefactions on behalf of or for the benefit of a local *patria* were an important local custom. However, whereas the inscriptions from the Hellenic provinces and Roman Spain were erected by a cross section of society the dedicatory *patria* inscriptions of Roman North Africa appear to have been almost exclusively the preserve of the upper echelons of society. Whilst the members of this social group may have illustrated a deal of affiliation or assimilation with Roman cultural, political and religious practices the *patriae* they honour are entirely local. There is no occasion in which *patria* can be interpreted as Rome or referring to the Roman world as a collective or unified whole.

Summary

This chapter set out to explore whether there was any degree of credence to the claims made by Cicero, Callistratus and Modestinus that a single concept of *patria* evolved which came to signify the Roman Empire as a united collective body. It is clear from the epigraphic evidence that has been discussed that this was not the case. Instead, it appears to have been an accepted fact, even at the highest levels of Roman politics and society, that the Roman Empire comprised a multitude of *patriae*, each of which emphasised a specific local identity. This local definition of *patria* is evident even at the very heart of the Roman Empire.

This chapter thus provides the perfect endpoint to this study of *patria*. It reiterates the concept's role as an expression of collective

identity within the Roman world and its status as an object of service and devotion. Moreover, this chapter has further revealed the complex nature of *patria*. Whilst the statements of Cicero, Callistratus and Modestinus seemed to reveal unequivocally that *patria* signified Rome, we have seen that the reality was more complicated. There is no doubt that occasionally *patria* was used and would have been used to signify the heart of the Roman world. Yet, *patria* ultimately signified to the people of the Roman Empire the community in which they were born, lived, to which they contributed and in which they died. In essence, this epigraphic survey of *patria* in the Roman Empire has revealed how there existed a network of *patria*e. This network, based on a single concept, enabled the recognition and understanding of identity on a level of complexity that is comparable to today's notions of nationality. It thus seems important for us as scholars of the ancient world to use these findings to further improve our understanding of how identity was conceptualised in the ancient world.

Conclusion

The aim of this study was to offer a preliminary scholarly overview of the concept of *patria* in the context of the Roman world. It set out to identify how the concept was conceptually defined; how its themes were established, reinforced and communicated; what function, role and relationship it had with regard to Roman politics both in the context of the Late Republic and the imperial period; and the extent to which a single concept of *patria* that embraced all the communities of the Roman world did indeed ever develop over time as suggested by Cicero, Callistratus and Modestinus. The results of this study have been surprising and highly illuminating and above all provide a useful foundation for future research into what is clearly an important feature of the Roman world.

In Chapter One I set myself the task of reconsidering how we define the concept. I did so by going back to the drawing board. Starting from a clean slate and considering carefully the vast quantity of information provided in contemporary literary and epigraphic sources I was able to identify a range of recurring themes. Firstly, I was able to identify that *Patria* had a significant relationship with regard to specific elements of collective identity including mythology, religious practice, family identity, ancestry and ancestral tradition and thus was clearly a means by which an individual could draw attention to and highlight his or her collective identity to a stranger. Although this was a

theme that has been identified by other scholars, most notably Bonjour and Gasser, its full extent had not previously been understood.⁶³³ Another feature that has not been fully appreciated until now is the extent to which *patria* was seen to be inclusive in terms of membership. Men and women were both recognised as being members of a *patria* and possessing the same responsibilities towards it. The epigraphic evidence clearly demonstrates the willingness to publicise devotion and affection towards *patriae* by both men and women. Indeed, the notion of undertaking service for the *patria* is a theme that has reoccurred in all five chapters and arguably remains one of its most important defining features. A more surprising discovery in terms of membership was the fact that it extended to freedmen via their masters on manumission, although the adoption of their master's *patria* was not something that ex-slaves were always willing to collaborate with as was seen in the case of *AE* 1903, 246. The final theme that was considered in the opening chapter was territoriality. This was by far the most difficult theme to examine in terms of arriving at a stable picture. There was no single definition of *patria* that prevailed in the Roman world. In some literary and epigraphic contexts *patria* clearly refers to a specific urban area. In other contexts, this urban area is expanded to incorporate the surrounding rural communities that supported ancient cities. Others, however, expanded the territoriality of *patria* even further to include

⁶³³ Bonjour (1975a); and Gasser (1999).

entire provinces or regions, such as Italy or Sicily. Such variation in terms of territoriality would seem to reflect that different notions of collective identity were being presented. For some people their collective identity was defined by the city in which they were born or lived. For others, especially those of a more regional or provincial background, this sense of collective identity seems to have taken on larger proportions. If an overall definition can be reached from these themes it is that *patria* was recognised contemporaneously as being a complex and at times abstract embodiment of collective identity to which all its members, male and female, free and freed, had a binding obligation of service and devotion. Indeed, the complexity and subjectivity that surrounded *patria* in the Roman world is comparable to that which surrounds the modern-day concept of the nation. Each individual will reflect on his or her nationality in a different way, emphasising aspects that have a particular resonance or connection to him or her, or which respond to the context in which he or she are in.

Having arrived at a better understanding of how *patria* was conceptualised in the Roman world, it was important to explore how such themes and ideas were created and then communicated to a wider audience. In particular, it was interesting to consider what were the driving forces behind *patria* in terms of its conceptualisation. Was there a collective decision-making process or did it depend upon the motivations and ambitions of individuals? This investigation considered these questions from both a political and cultural angle.

From a cultural perspective, I considered the role of *patria* in the important literary works of Livy (*Ab Urbe Condita*) and Virgil (the *Aeneid*). By employing research methods used in the field of Collective Memory Studies, I was able to delve into how the conceptualisation of *patria* was a subjective exercise. How *patria* was understood and what themes were communicated were dependent on individuals and the ways in which they responded to the political or cultural changes of the time. Thus in Livy we saw how there was a particularly strong emphasis on championing the notion of collectivism over individualism. This was achieved through the careful and deliberate utilisation of *exempla* and collective trauma. In Virgil, however, the focus was on ensuring that the cultural definition of *patria* reflected the political and social changes that had been occurring in Italy since the time of the Social War. Thus, Virgil sets out in the *Aeneid* to provide a 'national' epic that celebrates the early history of Italy rather than exclusively of Rome. In Virgil's eyes, the Italian people had, by his time, formed a united cultural and political body and thus needed a concept of collective identity to reinforce this. Hence, *patria* under Virgil is transformed physically from the small urban centre of Troy to the vast geographical space of Roman Italy. This chapter hinted towards the existence of a dynamic dialogue at Rome during the early Augustan period as to what *patria* should signify following decades of civil conflict out of which Rome and its empire had emerged uncertain and unsure in terms of its political identity. It is highly likely that the crisis

that engulfed Rome's political identity extended to its wider cultural collective identity and that the leading cultural figures of the time would have debated what *patria* now signified at a time of cultural and political rebirth and restoration.

One of the most interesting areas to explore in this study was the relationship between *patria* and Roman politics. Seeing that previous scholarly interpretations of *patria* had centred around its synonymy with citizenship or indeed the state in which citizenship was held, this was an essential theme to explore. What emerged from the discussion of *patria* in the context of the Late-Republic, early *principate* and Severan period was the confirmation that *patria* had a dynamic and interdependent relationship with Roman politics. *Patria* and the Roman political system were closely entwined and were recognised contemporaneously to influence each other. *Patria* had a clear role in the development and portrayal of public image both internally, that is at the hand of the individual concerned as was seen to be the case with Cicero, and externally, that is at the hands of influential contemporaries, as was seen to be the case with Augustus. The concept also had an important function with regard to factional or regime image. For factions during the civil war it was important for them to be able to portray themselves as the defenders of *patria's* welfare and thus to be acting in the interests of the Roman people. For regimes, *patria* enabled emperors to characterise the nature of their rule, with Septimius Severus using *patria* on coinage to emphasise the

theme of innovation alongside continuity. The consideration of *patria* in the coinage of Septimius Severus also provided the means by which to examine further the religious context of *patria*. As such, a detailed consideration of *di patrii* inscriptions revealed its function to indicate deities that were associated specifically with the defence and protection of Rome.

Throughout the course of the study it became clearly apparent that *patria* was not used exclusively to refer to Rome. Whilst Cicero, Callistratus and Modestinus asserted that *Roma communis nostra patria est* there was no evidence at a local level that this was indeed a reality. Instead, such turns of phrase must be interpreted as ideological visions of what these three writers hoped might evolve over time. This is because a consideration of *patria* in inscriptions from three specific geographical areas of the Roman Empire illustrated that *patria* was used to refer to a multitude of local communities. The large number of communities describing themselves as *patriae* underlines the concept's function as an expression of collective identity; that this function was widely understood and utilised; and that consequently it can be concluded that a network of *patriae* was in existence late into antiquity. Indeed, this network and the widespread recognition of its function as an expression of collective identity once again forces us to draw parallels between *patria* and modern-day nations.

Whilst this study has indeed advanced our understanding of *patria* in the Roman world, its representative rather than exhaustive

nature means there remain many questions and topics that need further scholarly analysis. What relationship was there between *patria* and its Greek counterpart? Was the conceptualisation of *patria* at times influenced by cultural practices or trends of the Hellenic world? What function did *patria* have in other imperial periods? How was *patria* defined when the Roman Empire eventually split into two halves? What happened to the concept when the Western Empire eventually collapsed in the fifth century AD? Was there a set way in which *patria* was represented in art and sculpture? If so, did this change over time? I believe that this study has the potential to influence the beginning of a new chapter of scholarly exploration into the Roman world, specifically into how collective identity was conceptualised in antiquity. I, therefore, hope that the work I have undertaken sparks debate, engages imaginations and encourages future generations of scholars in Classics and Ancient History to expand our horizons of the ancient world even further. Indeed, I believe that the true testament to the success of this study lies in the extent to which scholarship over the years ahead is able to build on and one day overshadow these early findings. For the affection I hold for this fascinating historical period that I have had the greatest of fortunes to engage with, I truly wish that this desire does indeed come to pass.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Augustus:

Cooley, A.E.

- (ed. and trans.) (2009) *Res Gestae Divi Augusti: Text, Translation, and Commentary*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cassius Dio:

Cary, E.

- (trans.) (1917) *Dio Cassius. Roman History, Books 51-55*, The Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge (MA) and London: Harvard University Press.
- (trans.) (1927) *Dio Cassius. Roman History, Books 71-80*, The Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge (MA) and London: Harvard University Press.

Catullus:

Goold, G.P.

- (ed.) (1989) *Catullus, translated by F.W. Cornish. Tibullus, translated by J.P. Postgate. Pervigilium Veneris, translated by J.W. Mackail. Second Edition*, The Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge (MA) and London: Harvard University Press.

Cicero:

Freese, J.H.

- (trans.) (1930) *Cicero. Pro Quinctio. Pro Roscio Amerino. Pro Roscio Comoedo. On the Agrarian Law*, The Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge (MA) and London: Harvard University Press.

Gardner, R.

- (trans.) (1958) *Cicero. Pro Caelio. De Provinciis Consularibus. Pro Balbo*, The Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge (MA) and London: Harvard University Press.
- (trans.) (1958) *Cicero. Orations. Pro Sestio. In Vatinius*, The Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge (MA) and London: Harvard University Press.

Greenwood, L.G.H.

- (trans.) (1929) *Cicero. The Verrine Orations. Volume I*, The Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge (MA) and London: Harvard University Press.

- (trans.) (1935) *Cicero. The Verrine Orations. Volume II*, The Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge (MA) and London: Harvard University Press.

Hodge, H.G.

- (trans.) (1927) *Cicero. Pro Lege Manilia. Pro Caecina. Pro Cluentio. Pro Rabirio Perduellionis Reo*, The Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge (MA) and London: Harvard University Press.

Hubbell, H.M.

- (trans.) (1949) *Cicero. On Invention. The Best Kind of Orator. Topics*, The Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge (MA) and London: Harvard University Press.

Keyes, C.W.

- (trans.) (1928) *Cicero. De Re Publica. De Legibus*, The Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge (MA) and London: Harvard University Press.

MacDonald, C.

- (trans.) (1977) *Cicero. In Catalinam I-IV. Pro Murena. Pro Sulla. Pro Flacco*, The Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge (MA) and London: Harvard University Press.

Manuwald, G.

- (ed. and trans.) (2007) *Cicero. Philippics 3-9. Volume 1. Introduction, Text and Translation*, Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Miller, W.

- (trans.) (1913 [2005]) *Cicero. On Duties*, The Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge (MA) and London: Harvard University Press.

Ramsey, J.T.

- (ed.) (2003) *Cicero. Philippics I-II*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Shackleton Bailey, D.R.

- (ed. and trans.) (1999) *Cicero. Letters to Atticus. Volume I*, The Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge (MA) and London: Harvard University Press.
- (ed. and trans.) (1999) *Cicero. Letters to Atticus. Volume II*, The Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge (MA) and London: Harvard University Press.
- (ed. and trans.) (1999) *Cicero. Letters to Atticus. Volume III*, The Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge (MA) and London: Harvard University Press.

- (ed. and trans.) (1999) *Cicero. Letters to Atticus. Volume IV*, The Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge (MA) and London: Harvard University Press.
- (ed. and trans.) (2001) *Cicero. Letters to Friends. Volume I*, The Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge (MA) and London: Harvard University Press.
- (ed. and trans.) (2001) *Cicero. Letters to Friends. Volume II*, The Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge (MA) and London: Harvard University Press.
- (ed. and trans.) (2001) *Cicero. Letters to Friends. Volume III*, The Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge (MA) and London: Harvard University Press.
- (ed. and trans.) (2002) *Cicero. Letters to Quintus and Brutus. Letter Fragments. Letter to Octavian. Invectives. Handbook of Electioneering*, The Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge (MA) and London: Harvard University Press.
- (ed. and trans.) (2009) *Cicero. Orations. Philippics 1-6. Revised by J.T. Ramsey and G. Manuwald*, The Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge (MA) and London: Harvard University Press.
- (ed. and trans.) (2009) *Cicero. Orations. Philippics 7-14. Revised by J.T. Ramsey and G. Manuwald*, The Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge (MA) and London: Harvard University Press.

Watts, N.H.

- (trans.) (1923) *Cicero. Orations. Pro Archia. Post Reditum in Senatu. Post Reditum in Quirites. De Domo Sua. De Haruspicum Responsis. Pro Plancio*, The Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge (MA) and London: Harvard University Press.
- (trans.) (1931 [1992]) *Cicero. Pro Milone. In Pisonem. Pro Scauro. Pro Fonteio. Pro Rabirio Postumo. Pro Macello. Pro Ligario. Pro Rege Deiotaro*, The Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge (MA) and London: Harvard University Press.

Digesta Seu Pandectae:

Mommsen, T. and Krueger, P.

- (eds.) (1985) *The Digest of Justinian, English Translation edited by A. Watson*, Pittsburgh: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Dionysios of Halicarnassus:

Cary, E.

- (trans.) (1943) *Dionysius of Halicarnassus. Roman Antiquities, Books 1-2*, The Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge (MA) and London: Harvard University Press.

Ennius:

Skutsch, O.

- (ed.) (1985), *The Annals of Q. Ennius*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Grattius:

Duff, J.W. and Duff, A.M.

- (eds.) (1934) *Minor Latin Poets. Volume I. Publilius Syrus. Elegies on Maecenas. Grattius. Calpurnius Siculus. Laus Pisonis. Einsiedeln Eclogues. Aetna*, The Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge (MA) and London: Harvard University Press.

Historia Augusta:

Magie, D.

- (ed.) (1921) *Historia Augusta. Volume I*, The Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge (MA) and London: Harvard University Press.

Horace:

Fairclough, H.R.

- (trans.) (1926) *Horace. Satires. Epistles. The Art of Poetry*, The Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge (MA) and London: Harvard University Press.

Rudd, N.

- (ed. and trans.) (2004) *Horace. Odes and Epodes*. The Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge (MA) and London: Harvard University Press.

Livy:

Foster, B.O.

- (trans.) (1919) *Livy. History of Rome, Books 1-2*, The Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge (MA) and London: Harvard University Press.
- (trans.) (1922) *Livy. History of Rome, Books 3-4*, The Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge (MA) and London: Harvard University Press.
- (trans.) (1924) *Livy. History of Rome, Books 5-7*, The Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge (MA) and London: Harvard University Press.
- (trans.) (1926) *Livy. History of Rome, Books 8-10*, The Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge (MA) and London: Harvard University Press.
- (trans.) (1929) *Livy. History of Rome, Books 21-22*, The Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge (MA) and London: Harvard University Press.

Moore, F.G.

- (trans.) (1940) *Livy. History of Rome, Books 23-25*, The Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge (MA) and London: Harvard University Press.

- (trans.) (1943) *Livy. History of Rome, Books 26-27*, The Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge (MA) and London: Harvard University Press.
- (trans.) (1949) *Livy. History of Rome, Books 28-30*, The Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge (MA) and London: Harvard University Press.

Sage, E.T.

- (trans.) (1935) *Livy. History of Rome, Books 31-34*, The Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge (MA) and London: Harvard University Press.
- (trans.) (1935) *Livy. History of Rome, Books 35-37*, The Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge (MA) and London: Harvard University Press.
- (trans.) (1936) *Livy. History of Rome, Books 38-39*, The Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge (MA) and London: Harvard University Press.

Sage, E.T. and Schlesinger, A.C.

- (trans.) (1938) *Livy. History of Rome, Books 40-42*, The Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge (MA) and London: Harvard University Press.

Schlesinger, A.C.

- (trans.) (1951) *Livy. History of Rome, Books 43-45*, The Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge (MA) and London: Harvard University Press.
- (ed.) (1959) *Livy. History of Rome. Summaries. Fragments. Julius Obsequens. General Index*, The Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge (MA) and London: Harvard University Press.

Lucan:

Duff, J.D.

- (trans.) (1928 [1969]) *Lucan. The Civil War*, The Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge (MA) and London: Harvard University Press.

Lucilius:

Krenkel, W.

- (ed.) (1970) *Lucilius. Satiren. Lateinisch und deutsch*, Berlin: Brill.

Lucretius:

Rouse, W.H.D.

- (ed.) (1924) *Lucretius. On the Nature of Things*, The Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge (MA) and London: Harvard University Press.

Maurus Servius Honoratus:

Thilo, G. and Hagne, H.

- (eds.) (1881) *In Vergilii carmina comentarii: Servii Grammatici qui feruntur in Vergilii carmina commentarii*, Leipzig: B.G. Teubner.

Nepos:

Marshall, P.K.

- (ed.) (1977) *Cornelii Nepotis vitae cum fragmentis*, Leipzig: B.G. Teubner.

Rolfe, J.C.

- (ed.) (1929) *On Great Generals. On Historians*, The Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge (MA) and London: Harvard University Press.

Ovid:

Cicarelli, I.

- (ed.) (2003) *Commento al II libro di Tristia di Ovidio*, Bari: Edipuglia.

Frazer, J.G.

- (trans.) (1931 [1996]) *Ovid. Fasti. Revised by G.P. Goold*, The Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge (MA) and London: Harvard University Press.

Goold, G.P.

- (ed.) (1924 [1996]) *Ovid. Tristia. Ex Ponto. With an English Translation by Arthur Leslie Wheeler*. Second Edition, The Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge (MA) and London: Harvard University Press.

Ingleheart, J.

- (ed.) (2010) *A Commentary on Ovid, Tristia, Book 2*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Miller, F.J.

- (trans.) (1916 [1984]) *Ovid. Metamorphoses, Books 1-8. Revised by G.P. Goold*, The Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge (MA) and London: Harvard University Press.
- (trans.) (1916 [1984]) *Ovid. Metamorphoses, Books 9-15. Revised by G.P. Goold*, The Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge (MA) and London: Harvard University Press.

Mozeley, J.H.

- (trans.) (1929 [1999]) *Ovid. The Art of Love and Other Poems. Revised by G.P. Goold*, The Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge (MA) and London: Harvard University Press.

Showerman, G.

- (trans.) (1914 [1977]) *Ovid. Heroides. Amores. Revised by G.P. Goold*, The Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge (MA) and London: Harvard University Press.

Plautus:

De Melo, W.

- (ed. and trans.) (2011) *Plautus. Amphitryon. The Comedy of Asses. The Pot of Gold. Two Bacchises. The Captives*, The Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge (MA) and London: Harvard University Press.
- (ed. and trans.) (2011) *Plautus. The Merchant. The Braggart Soldier. The Ghost. The Persian*, The Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge (MA) and London: Harvard University Press.
- (ed. and trans.) (2012) *Plautus. The Little Carthaginian. Pseudolus. The Rope*, The Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge (MA) and London: Harvard University Press.
- (ed. and trans.) (2013) *Plautus. Sticus. Three-Dollar Day. Truculentus. The Tale of a Traveling Bag. Fragments*, The Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge (MA) and London: Harvard University Press.

Plutarch:

Perrin, B.

- (trans.) (1919) *Plutarch. Lives. Demosthenes and Cicero. Alexander and Caesar*, The Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge (MA) and London: Harvard University Press.

Propertius:

Goold, G.P.

- (ed. and trans.) (1990) *Propertius. Elegies*, The Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge (MA) and London: Harvard University Press.

Quintus Curtius Rufus:

Rolfe, J.C.

- (trans.) (1946) *Quintus Curtius. The History of Alexander, Books 1-5*, The Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge (MA) and London: Harvard University Press.
- (trans.) (1946) *Quintus Curtius. The History of Alexander, Books 6-10*, The Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge (MA) and London: Harvard University Press.

Silius Italicus:

Duff, J.D.

- (trans.) (1934) *Silius Italicus. Punica, Books 1-8*, The Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge (MA) and London: Harvard University Press.
- (trans.) (1934) *Silius Italicus. Punica, Books 9-17*, The Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge (MA) and London: Harvard University Press.

Statius:

Shackleton Bailey, D.R.

- (ed. and trans.) (2004) *Statius. Thebaid, Books 1-7*, The Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge (MA) and London: Harvard University Press.
- (ed. and trans.) (2004) *Statius. Thebaid, Books 8-12. Achilleid*, The Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge (MA) and London: Harvard University Press.
- (ed. and trans.) (2015) *Statius. Silvae*, The Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge (MA) and London: Harvard University Press.

Suetonius:

Rolfe, J.C.

- (trans.) (1914) *Suetonius. Volume I*, The Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge (MA) and London: Harvard University Press.

Tacitus:

Moore, C.H. and Jackman, J.

- (trans.) (1931) *Tacitus. Histories, Books 4-5. Annals, Books 1-3*, The Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge (MA) and London: Harvard University Press.

Terence:

Barsby, J.

- (ed. and trans.) (2001) *Terence. The Woman of Andros. The Self-Tormentor. The Eunuch*, The Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge (MA) and London: Harvard University Press.

Tibullus:

Goold, G.P.

- (ed.) (1989) *Catullus, translated by F.W. Cornish. Tibullus, translated by J.P. Postgate. Pervigilium Veneris, translated by J.W. Mackail. Second Edition*, The Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge (MA) and London: Harvard University Press.

Vellieus Paterculus:

Shipley, F.W.

- (trans.) (1924) *Vellieus Paterculus. Compendium of Roman History. Res Gestae Divi Augusti*, The Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge (MA) and London: Harvard University Press.

Virgil:

Fairclough, H.R.

- (trans) (1916 [1999]) *Virgil. Eclogues. Georgics. Aeneid 1-6. Revised by G.P. Goold*, The Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge (MA) and London: Harvard University Press.
- (trans.) (1918 [2000]) *Virgil. Aeneid, Books 7-12. Appendix Vergiliana. Revised by G.P. Goold*, The Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge (MA) and London: Harvard University Press.

Secondary Sources

Online Sources:

- Oxford English Dictionary Online: www.oed.com/

Literary Sources:

Abbott, F.F. and Johnson, A.C.

- (1926) *Municipal Administration in the Roman Empire*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Agócs, N.

- (2013) 'People in Intercisa from the Eastern Parts of the Roman Empire. Catalog', in Z. Visy, M. Fekete and L. Vilmos (eds.) *Specimina Nova Dissertationum ex Institutis Historiae Antiquae et Archaeologiae Universitatis Quinqueecclesiensis. Pars Prima. Tomus XXI-XXII*, Pécs. 9-27.

Alexandropoulos, J.

- (2000) *Les monnaies de l'afrique antique*, Université de Toulouse: Le Mirail.

Alföldi, A.

- (1971) *Vater des Vaterlandes in römischen Denken*, Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

Aliquot, J.

- (2008) *Inscriptions grecques et latines de la Syrie. Vol. 11. Mont Hermon (Liban et Syrie)*, Beyrouth: Institut français du Proche-Orient.

Allen, W.

- (1944) 'Cicero's House and *Libertas*', *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 75: 1-9.

Amadasi Guzzo, M.G.

- (1988) 'Cultura punica e cultura latina in Tripolitania: osservazioni in base alle iscrizioni puniche e alle iscrizioni bilingui', in E. Campanile, G.R. Cardona and R. Lazzevoni (eds.) *Bilinguismo e biculturalismo nel mondo antico*, Pisa: Giardini. 23-33.

Anderson, B.

- (1983 [2006]) *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism*, London: Verso.

Ando, C.

- (1999) 'Was Rome a Polis?', *Classical Antiquity* 18.1: 5-34.
- (2000) *Imperial Ideology and Provincial Loyalty in the Roman Empire*, Berkley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- (2002) 'Vergil's Italy: ethnography and politics in first-century Rome', in D.S. Levene and D. Nelis (eds.) *Clio and the Poets: Augustan Poetry and the Traditions of Ancient Historiography*, Leiden and Boston: Brill. 123-142.

Andreau, J.

- (1993) 'The Freedman' in A. Giardina (ed.) *The Romans*, trans. L.G. Cochrane, Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press. 175-198.

Arena, V.

- (2013) 'The orator and his audience: the rhetorical perspective', in C. Steel and H. van der Blom (eds.) *Community and Communication: Oratory and Politics in the Roman Republic*, Oxford: Oxford University Press. 195-210.
- (2014) *Libertas and the Practice of Politics in the Late Roman Republic*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Armstrong, J.

- (1982) *Nations before Nationalism*, Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Armstrong, R.

- (2013) 'Journeys and Nostalgia in Catullus', *The Classical Journal* 109: 43-71.

Assmann, A.

- (2008) 'Canon and Archive', in A. Erll and A Nünning (eds.) *Cultural Memory Studies: An International and Interdisciplinary Handbook*, Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter. 97-107.

Assmann, J.

- (1992) *Das Kulturelle Gedächtnis: Schrift, Erinnerung und Politische Identität in frühen Hochkulturen*, Munich: Verlag C.H. Beck.
- (2011) *Cultural Memory and Early Civilisation: Writing, Remembrance, and Political Imagination*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Assmann, J. and Czaplicka, J.

- (1995) 'Collective Memory and Cultural Identity', *New German Critique* 65: 125-133.

Atkinson, J.E.

- (1994) *A Commentary on Q. Curtius Rufus' Historiae Alexandri Magni Books 5 to 7.2* (Acta Classica, supplement 1), Amsterdam: Hakkert.

Bandinelli, R.B., Caffarelli, E.V., Caputo, G., and Clerici, F.

- (1966) *The Buried City: Excavations at Lepcis Magna*, New York: F.A. Praeger.

Barber, K.A.

- (2004) *Rhetoric in Cicero's Pro Balbo*, London and New York: Routledge.

Barnes, T.D.

- (1967) 'The Family and Career of Septimius Severus', *Historia* 16: 87-101.

Baroin, C.

- (2010) 'Remembering one's ancestors, following in their footsteps, being like them', in V. Dasen and T. Späth (eds.) *Children, Memory and Family Identity in Roman Culture*, Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press. 19-48.

Barresi, P.

- (2003) *Province dell'Asia Minore: costo dei marmi, architettura pubblica e committenza*, Rome: L'Erma di Bretschneider.

Bartoccini, R.

- (1931) 'L'arco quadrifonte dei Severi a Lepcis', *Africa italiana* 4: 116-152.

Batstone, W.W.

- (1994) 'Cicero's Construction of Consular *Ethos* in the First Catilinarian', *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 124: 211-266.

Baynham, E.

- (1998) *Alexander the Great: The Unique History of Quintus Curtius*, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Beard, M.

- (2009) *The Roman Triumph*, Cambridge (MA): Harvard University Press.

Beard, M., North, J. and Price, S.

- (1998) *Religions of Rome. Volume 1: A History*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Belfiore, E.

- (1984) 'Ter Frustra Compresa: Embraces in the *Aeneid*', *Phoenix* 38.1: 19-30.

Bell, K.K.

- (2008) 'Translatio and the Constructs of a Roman Nation in Virgil's *Aeneid*', *Rocky Mountain Review* 62.1: 11-24.

Bellen, H.

- (1985) *Metus Gallicus - Metus Punicus. Zum Furchtmotiv in der römischen Republik*, Wiesbaden: Bender.

Beneker, J.

- (2009) 'Nepos' Biographical Method in the Lives of Foreign Generals', *The Classical Journal* 105.2: 109-121.

Beretta, D.C.

- (1996) 'Promoting the Public Image: Cicero and his Consulship', Unpublished PhD Dissertation, John Hopkins University.

Berg, R.

- (1997) 'Cicero's Palatine Home and Clodius' Shrine to Liberty. Alternative Emblems of the Republic in Cicero's *De domo sua*', *Latomus* 8: 122-143.

Berliner, D.

- (2005) 'The Abuses of Memory: Reflections on the Memory Boom in Anthropology', *Anthropological Quarterly* 78: 197-211.

Berry, D.H.

- (ed.) (2004) *Cicero. Pro P. Sulla Oratio. Edited with Introduction and Commentary*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bettini, M.

- (1997) 'Ghosts of Exile: Doubles and Nostalgia in Vergil's *parva Troia* (*Aeneid* 3.294ff)', *Classical Antiquity* 16: 8-33.
- (2005) 'Death and its double. *Imagines*, *ridiculum* and *honos* in the Roman aristocratic funeral', in K. Mustakallio, J. Hanska, H.-L. Sainio and V. Vuolanto (eds.) *Hoping for Continuity*.

Childhood, Education and Death in Antiquity and the Middle Ages, Rome: Institutum Romanum Finlandiae. 191-202.

Betz, A.

- (1960) '*Pietas Deorum Erga Homines* zu CIL III, 7954, aus Sarmizegetusa', in *Omăgiu lui Constantin Daicoviciu cu prilejul împlinirii a 60 de ani*, Bucarest: Academia Republicii Populare Romîne. 33-37.

Birley, A.R.

- (1988a) *Septimius Severus, The African Emperor* (2nd Edition), London: Routledge.
- (1988b) 'Names at Lepcis Magna', *Libyan Studies* 19: 1-19.

Bispham, E.

- (2007) *From Asculum to Actium: The Municipalisation of Italy from the Social War to Augustus*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bodnar, J.

- (1992) *Remaking America: Public Memory, Commemoration, and Patriotism in the Twentieth Century*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Bond, S.E.

- (2007) '*Ob Merita*: The Epigraphic Rise and Fall of the Civic Patrona in Roman North Africa', Unpublished MA Dissertation, University of North Carolina.

Bonjour, M.

- (1975a) *Terre Natale*, Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- (1975b) 'Les personnages féminins et la terre natale dans l'épisode de Coriolon (Liv. 2.40)', *Revue des Études Latines*, 53: 157-181.

Bonnano, A.

- (1976) *Portraits and Other Heads on Roman Historical Reliefs up to the Age of Septimius Severus*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Bowman, A.K.

- (1994) 'The Roman imperial army: Letters and *literacy* on the northern frontier', in Bowman, A.K. and Woolf, G. (eds.) (1994), *Literacy and Power in the Ancient World*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 109-125.

Bowman, A.K. and Woolf, G.

- (eds.) (1994) *Literacy and Power in the Ancient World*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Boyd, B.W.

- (1992) 'Virgil's Camilla and the Traditions of Catalogue and Ecphrasis (*Aeneid* 7.803-17)', *The American Journal of Philology* 113.2: 213-234.

Bricault, L.

- (2005) 'Les dieux de l'Orient en Afrique romaine', *Pallas* 68: 289-309.

Brunn, C.

- (2002) 'What everyman in the street used to know: M. Furius Camillus, Italic Legends and Roman Historiography', in C. Brunn (ed.) *The Roman Middle Republic. Politics, Religion, and Historiography c.400-133 BC*, Rome: Institutum Romanum Finlandiae. 41-68.

Brunt, P.A.

- (1982) 'The legal issue in Cicero, *Pro Balbo*', *Classical Quarterly* 32: 136-147.
- (1988) *The Fall of the Roman Republic and Related Essays*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Brunt, P.A. & Moore, J.M.

- (1967) *Res Gestae Divi Augusti: The Achievements of the Divine Augustus with an introduction and commentary by P.A. Brunt and J.M. Moore*, Oxford: Oxford University Press

Burger, T.

- (1976) *Max Weber's Theory of Concept Formation: History, Laws and Ideal Types*, Durham (N.C.): Duke University Press.

Burke, P.

- (1989) 'History as Social Memory', in T. Butler (ed.) *Memory: History, Culture and the Mind*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell. 97-113.

Burnell, P.

- (1987) 'The Death of Turnus and Roman Morality', *Greece and Rome* 34.2: 186-200.

Butrica, J.

- (2012) 'Editing Propertius', in E. Greene and T.S. Welch (eds.) *Propertius*, Oxford: Oxford University Press. 42-93.

Byros, G.M.

- (2011) 'Reconstructing Identities in Roman Dacia: Evidence from Religion', Unpublished PhD Dissertation, Yale University.

Cairns, F.

- (1977) 'Geography and National Identities in the *Aeneid*', *Liverpool Classical Monthly* 2: 109-116.

- (1989) *Virgil's Augustan Epic*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Calder, W.M.

- (1956) *Monumenta Asiae Minoris Antiqua VII: Monuments from Eastern Phrygia*, Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Calhoon, C.G.

- (1997) 'Lucretia, savior and scapegoat: the dynamics of sacrifice in Livy 1.57-59', *Helios* 24: 151-169.

Camps, G.

- (1990) 'Qui sont les *Dii mauri*?', *Antiquités Africaines* 26: 131-153.

Cape, R.W.

- (1995) 'The rhetoric of politics in Cicero's Fourth Catilinarian', *The American Journal of Philology* 116: 255-277.
- (2002) 'Cicero's Consular Speeches', in J.M. May (ed.) *Brills' Companion to Cicero: Oratory and Rhetoric*, Leiden and Boston: Brill. 113-158.

Casali, S.

- (2014) 'The Development of the Aeneas Legend', in J. Farrell and M.C.J. Putnam (eds.) *A Companion to Vergil's Aeneid and its Tradition*, Oxford: Wiley Blackwell. 37-51.

Castillo Guerrero, M.

- (1998) 'Patrimonio Arqueológico de Lora. Las vicisitudes de un pedestal romano del siglo I, Lora del Rio', *Revista de Estudios Locales* 9: 49-54.

Castriota, D.

- (1995) *The Ara Pacis Augustae and the Imagery of Abundance in Later Greek and Early Roman Imperial Art*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Cerutti, S.M.

- (1996) *Cicero's Accretive Style: Rhetorical Strategies in the Exordia of the Judicial Speeches*, New York: University Press of America.

Chaplin, J.D.

- (2000) *Livy's Exemplary History*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- (2014) 'Livy's Use of *Exempla*', in B. Mineo (ed.) *A Companion to Livy*, Hoboken: John Wiley and Sons. 102-113.

Chastagnol, A.

- (1981) 'L'inscription constantinienne d'Orcistus', *Mélanges de l'École française de Rome, Antiquité* 93.1: 381-416.

Cicarelli, I.

- (2003) *Commento al Il libro di Tristia di Ovidio*, Bari: Edipuglia.

Coarelli, F.

- (1996) 'Porta Carmentalis', in E.M. Steinby (ed.) *Lexicon Topographicum Urbis Romae: Volume Terzo H-O*, Rome: Edizione Quasar.
- (2008) 'Un'iscrizione onoraria da Falacrinae (Cittareale) relative alla guerra sociale', in M.L. Caldelli, G.L. Gregori and S. Orlandi (eds.) *Studi in onore di S. Panciera, Atti della XIV Rencontre sur l'Épigraphie in onore di Silvio Panciera con altri contribute di colleghi, allievi e collaborator*, Rome: Edizioni Quasar. 79-86.

Coarelli, F., Kay, S. and Patterson, H.

- (2008) 'Investigations at Falacrinae, the Birthplace of Vespasian', *Papers of the British School at Rome* 76: 47-73.

Cole, S.

- (2014) *Cicero and the Rise of Deification at Rome*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Colman, J.

- (2012) *Lucretius as Theorist of Political Life*, New York: Plagrave Macmillan.

Connerton, P.

- (1989) *How Societies Remember*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Connolly, J.

- (2009) 'Virtue and violence: The historians on politics', in A. Feldherr (ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to the Roman Historians*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 181-194.

Connor, P.J.

- (1978) 'The Actian Miracle: Propertius 4.6', *Ramus* 7: 1-10.

Cooley, A.E.

- (1998) 'The Moralizing Message of the *Senatus Consultum de Cn. Pisone Patre*', *Greece and Rome* 45.2: 199-212.
- (2007) 'Septimius Severus: The Augustan Emperor' in S. Swain, S. Harrison and J. Elsner (eds.) *Severan Culture*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 385-397.
- (2009) *Res Gestae Divi Augusti: Text, Translation, and Commentary*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- (2012) *The Cambridge Manual of Latin Epigraphy*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cordovana, D.

- (2007) *Segni e immagini del potere tra antico e tardoantico: I Severi e la provincial Africa Proconsularis*, Catania: Prisma.

Cornell, T.J.

- (1997) *The Beginnings of Rome: Italy and Rome from the Bronze Age to the Punic Wars (c.1000-264 BC)*, London: Routledge.

Craig, C.

- (1993) 'Three simple questions for teaching Cicero's *First Catilinarian*', *The Classical Journal* 88.3: 255-267.

Crook, J.A.

- (1967) '*Patria Potestas*', *Classical Quarterly* 17: 113-122.

Dainotti, P.

- (2015) *Word Order and Expressiveness in the Aeneid*, trans. A Campbell, Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Damsky, B.L.

- (1990) 'The Stadium Aureus of Septimius Severus', *The American Journal of Numismatics* 2: 77-105.

Davis, P.J.

- (2002) 'The Colonial Subject in Ovid's Exile Poetry', *The American Journal of Philology* 123.2: 257-273.
- (2006) *Ovid and Augustus: a political reading of Ovid's erotic poems*, London: Duckworth.

De Ruggiero, E.

- (1921) *La patria nel diritto pubblico romano*, Rome: Maglione e Strini.

Dench, E.

- (2005) *Romulus' Asylum: Roman Identities from the Age of Alexander to the Age of Hadrian*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- (2013) 'Cicero and Roman Identity' in C. Steel (ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to Cicero*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 122-137.

Dinter, M.

- (2005) 'Epic and Epigram: Minor Heroes in Virgil's *Aeneid*', *The Classical Quarterly* 55.1: 153-169.

Dionisotti, A.C.

- (1988) 'Nepos and the Generals', *Journal of Roman Studies* 78: 35-49.

Di Renzo, A.

- (2000) 'His Master's Voice: Tiro and the rise of the Roman secretarial class', *Journal of Technical Writing and Communication* 30.2: 155-168.

Di Vita, A.

- (1968) 'Shadaphra e Milk'ashart dei patri di Leptis ed i templi del lato nord-ovest del Foro vecchio leptitano', *Orientalia* 37.2: 201-211.

Dobbin, R.

- (2002) 'An Ironic Allusion at *Aeneid* 1.374', *Mnemosyne* 55.6: 736-738.

Dobson, B.

- (1978) *Die Primipilares*, Cologne: Rheinland Verlag.

Dohrn, T.

- (1964) 'Des Romulus' Gründung Roms', *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts. Römische Abteilung*, vol. 71: 1-18.

Donaldson, I.

- (1982) *The Rapes of Lucretia: A Myth and its Transformations*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Dorcey, P.F.

- (1992) *The Cult of Silvanus: A Study in Roman Folk Religion*, Leiden and Boston: Brill.

Drexler, H.

- (1957) 'Res Publica (Teil 1)', *Maia* 9: 247-281.
- (1958) 'Res Publica (Teil 2)', *Maia* 10: 3-37.

Drummond, F.S.

- (1995) *Law, Politics and Power: Sallust and the Execution of the Catilinarian Conspirators*, Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.

Dufallo, B.

- (2001) 'Appius' Indignation: Gossip, Tradition, and Performance in Republican Rome', *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 131: 119-142.
- (2007) *The Ghosts of the Past: Latin Literature, the Dead, and Rome's Transition to a Principate*, Columbus: Ohio State University Press.

Dugan, J.R.

- (2005) *Making a New Man: Ciceronian Self-Fashioning in the Rhetorical Works*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- (2013) 'Cicero and the politics of ambiguity', in C. Steel and H. van der Blom (eds.) *Community and Communication: Oratory and Politics in the Roman Republic*, Oxford: Oxford University Press. 211-225.

Dupont, F.

- (1987) 'Les morts et la mémoire: la masque funèbre', in F. Hinard (ed.) *La Mort, les Morts et l'Au-Delà dans le monde romain. Actes du colloque de Caen (20-22 novembre 1985)*, Caen: Centre de publications de l'Université de Caen. 167-172.

Du Quesnay, I.M. Le M.

- (2009) 'Horace, Odes 4.5: *Pro Reditu Imperatoris Caesaris Divi Filii Augusti*', in M. Lowrie (ed.) *Horace: Odes and Epodes*, Oxford: Oxford University Press. 271-336.

Dyck, A.R.

- (2004) *A Commentary on Cicero, De Legibus*, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- (ed.) (2008) *Cicero. Catilinarians*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Earl, D.C.

- (1960) 'Political Terminology in Plautus', *Historia 9*: 235-243.
- (1961) *The Political Thought of Sallust*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- (1962) 'Terence and Roman Politics', *Historia 11*: 469-485.
- (1967) *The Moral and Political Tradition of Rome*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Eck, W.

- (2009) 'Diplomacy as Part of the Administrative Process in the Roman Empire', in C. Eilers (ed.) *Diplomats and Diplomacy in the Roman World*, Leiden and Boston: Brill. 193-207.

Eck, W., Caballos, A. and Fernández, F.

- (1996) *Das senatus consultum de Cn. Pisone patre*, Munich: Beck.

Egan, R.B.

- (1974) 'Aeneas at Aeneia and Vergil's *Aeneid*', *Pacific Coast Philology 9*: 37-47.
- (2010) '*Insignes Pietate et Armis*: The Two Camilli of the *Aeneid*', *Vergilius 58*: 21-52.

Elliott, J.

- (2013) *Ennius and the Architecture of the Annales*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ellis, R.

- (1889 [1988]) *A Commentary on Catullus*, Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag.

Elsner, J.

- (1991) 'Cult and Sculpture: Sacrifice in the Ara Pacis Augustae', *The Journal of Roman Studies* 81: 50-61.

Fagan, G.G.

- (1996) 'The Reliability of Roman Rebuilding Inscriptions', *Papers of the British School at Rome* 64: 81-93.

Fantham, E., Foley, H.P., Kampen, N.B., Pomeroy, S.B. and Shapiro, H.A.

- (1995) *Women in the Classical World: Image and Text*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Faust, S.

- (2011) 'Zur Repräsentation des severischen Kaiserhauses im Bildschmuck des Quadrifons von Lepcis Magna', in S. Faust and F. Leitmeir (eds.) *Repräsentationsformen in severischer Zeit*, Berlin: Verlag Antike. 111-145.

Feeney, D.

- (1983) 'The Taciturnity of Aeneas', *Classical Quarterly* 33: 204-219.
- (1998) *Literature and religion at Rome: Cultures, contexts, and beliefs*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Feissel, D.

- (1999) 'L'adnotatio de Constantin sur le droit de cité d'Orcistus en Phrygie', *Antiquité Tardive* 7: 255-267.

Feldherr, A.M.

- (1997) 'Livy's revolution: civic identity and the creation of the *res publica*', in T. Habinek and A. Schiesaro (eds.) *The Roman Cultural Revolution*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 136-157.
- (1998) *Spectacle and Society in Livy's History*, Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Feldman, L.

- (1953) 'The Character of Ascanius in Virgil's *Aeneid*', *The Classical Journal* 48.8: 47-67.

Ferriss-Hill, J.L.

- (2011) 'Virgil's Program of Sabellic Etymologizing and the Construction of Italic Identity', *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 141.2: 265-284.

Fishwick, D.

- (1991) *The Imperial Cult in the Latin West. Volume 2. Studies in the Ruler Cult of the Western Provinces of the Roman Empire. Part 2.2*, Leiden and Boston: Brill.

Fitton Brown, A.D.

- (1985) 'The Unreality of Ovid's Tomitan Exile', *Liverpool Classical Monthly* 10.2: 18-22.

Flower, H.I.

- (1996) *Ancestor Masks and Aristocratic Power in Roman Culture*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Forsythe, G.

- (1999) *Livy and Early Rome: A Study in Historical Method and Judgement*, Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.
- (2006) *A Critical History of Early Rome: From Prehistory to the First Punic War*, Berkley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Fox, M.

- (2014) 'The Representation of the Regal Period in Livy', in B. Mineo (ed.) *A Companion to Livy*, Hoboken: John Wiley and Sons. 286-297.

Fraenkel, E.

- (1957) *Horace*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Frantantuolo, L.M.

- (2006) 'Ut vedere Camillam: The Nachleben of Reckless Heroism', *Revista di cultura classica e medioevale* 48.2: 287-308.

Frantantuono, L.M. and McOsker, M.F.

- (2010) 'Camilla and Cydippe: A Note on *Aeneid* 11.581-582', *Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica* 96.3: 111-116.

Fuhrer, T.

- (1989) 'Aeneas: A Study in Character Development', *Greece and Rome* 36.1: 63-72.

Gagé, J.

- (1934) 'Les jeux séculaires de 204 ap. J.-C. et la dynastie des Sévères', *Mélanges d'archaéologie et d'histoire* 51: 33-78.

- (1977) *Res gestae divi Augusti ex monumentis Ancyrano et Antiocheno latinis Ancyrano et Apolloniensi Graecis*, Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

Gale, M.R.

- (2003) 'Poetry and the Backward Glance in Virgil's *Georgics* and *Aeneid*', *Transactions of the American Philological Society* 133.2: 323-352.

Galinsky, K.

- (1969 [2015]) *Aeneas, Sicily and Rome*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- (1988) 'The Anger of Aeneas', *The American Journal of Philology* 109.3: 321-348.
- (1996) *Augustan Culture: An Interpretive Introduction*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Garman, S.

- (2007) 'Ethnosymbolism in the Ancient Mediterranean World', in A.S. Leoussi and S. Grosby (eds.) *Nationalism and Ethnosymbolism: History, Culture and Ethnicity in the Formation of Nations*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press. 113-125.

Gardner, J.F.

- (1998) *Family and Familia in Roman Law and Life*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Garfinkel, Y.

- (1987) 'The Meaning of the Word *MPQD* in the Tel 'Ira Ostrakon', *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* 119: 19-23.

Gasparini, V.

- (2015) 'Tracing Religious Change in Roman Africa' in R. Raja and J. Rüpke (eds.) *A Companion to the Archaeology of Religion in the Ancient World*, Oxford: Wiley Blackwell. 478-488.

Gasser, F.

- (1999) *Germana Patria: die Geburtsheimat in den Werken römischer Autoren der späten Republik und der frühen Kaiserzeit*, Stuttgart: B.G. Teubner.

Geiger, J.

- (1985) *Cornelius Nepos and Ancient Political Biography*, Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.
- (2008) *The First Hall of Fame: A Study of the Statues in the Forum Augustum*, Leiden and Boston: Brill.

Genovese, E.N.

- (1975) 'Death in the *Aeneid*', *Pacific Coast Philology* 10: 22-28.
- Ghedini, F.
- (1984) *Giulia Domna tra oriente e occidente. Le fonti archeologiche*, Rome: L'Erma di Bretschneider.
- Glover, T.R.
- (1903) 'Virgil's Aeneas', *The Classical Review* 17: 34-42.
 - (1923) *Virgil*, London: Methuen and Co.
- Godwin, J.
- (1995) *Catullus: Poems 61-68*, Warminster: Aris and Phillips Ltd.
- Golden, G.K.
- (2013) *Crisis Management During the Roman Republic: The Role of Political Institutions in Emergencies*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Goldschmidt, N.
- (2013) *Shaggy Crowns: Ennius' Annales and Virgil's Aeneid*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- González Germain, G. and Carbonell Manils, J.
- (2012) *Epigrafía hispánica falsa del primer Renacimiento español. Una contribución a la historia ficticia peninsular*, Bellaterra: Servei de Publicacions de la Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona.
- Goody, J.
- (1998) 'Memory in Oral and Literate Traditions', in P. Fara and K. Paterson (eds.) *Memory*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 73-94.
- Görler, W.
- (1984) 'Zum Virtus-Fragment des Lucilius (1326-1338 Marx) und zur Geschichte der stoischen Güterlehre', *Hermes* 112.3: 335-365.
- Gould, H.E. and Whiteley, J.L.
- (ed.) (1982) *In Catilinam I & II. Edited with Introduction, Notes and Vocabulary*, Bristol: Bristol Classical Press.
- Graff, J.
- (1963) *Ciceros Selbstauffassung*, Heidelberg: C. Winter.
- Gratwick, A.S.
- (1982) 'Ennius' *Annales*', in E.S. Kenney and W.V. Clausen (eds.) *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature. II Latin Literature*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 60-76.

Green, C.M.C.

- (2007) *Roman Religion and the Cult of Diana at Aricia*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Griffin, M.

- (1997) 'The Senate's Story', *Journal of Roman Studies* 87: 249-263.

Grimm, R.E.

- (1967) 'Aeneas and Andromache in *Aeneid* III', *The American Journal of Philology* 88.2: 151-162.

Gruen, E.S.

- (1992) *Culture and National Identity in Republican Rome*, London: Duckworth.

Grünewald, T.

- (2004) *Bandits in the Roman Empire: Myth and Reality*, trans. J. Drinkwater, London and New York: Routledge.

Günther, H.-C.

- (2006) 'The Forth Book', in H.-C. Günther (ed.) *Brill's Companion to Propertius*, Leiden and Boston: Brill. 353-395.
- (ed.) (2013) *Brill's Companion to Horace*, Leiden and Boston: Brill.
- (2013) 'The First Collection of Odes: *Carmina* I-III' in H.-C. Günther (ed.) *Brill's Companion to Horace*, Leiden and Boston: Brill. 211-406.

Gurval, R.A.

- (1995) *Actium and Augustus: The Politics and Emotions of Civil War*, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Habicht, C.

- (1990) *Cicero the Politician*, Baltimore and London: John Hopkins University Press.

Habinek, T.N.

- (1998) *The Politics of Latin Literature: Writing, Identity and Empire in the Roman World*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Halbwachs, M.

- (1925) *Les Cadres sociaux de la mémoire*, Paris: Librairie Félix Alcan.
- (1950) *La mémoire collective*, Paris: Presses universitaires de France.

Halfmann, H.

- (1986) *Itinera Principium. Geschichte und Typologie der Kaiserreisen im Römischen Reich*, Stuttgart: F. Steiner Verlag Wiesbaden.

Hall, J.

- (2002) 'The *Philippics*', in J.M. May (ed.) *Brill's Companion to Cicero: Oratory and Rhetoric*, Leiden and Boston: Brill. 273-304.
- (2013) 'Saviour of the Republic and Father of the Fatherland: Cicero and political crisis', in C. Steel (ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to Cicero*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 215-230.

Hallett, J.P.

- (2004) 'Matriot games? Cornelia, mother of the Gracchi, and the forging of family-orientated political values', in F. McHardy and E. Marshall (eds.) *Women's Influence on Classical Civilisation*, London and New York: Routledge. 26-39.

Hammond, M.

- (1951) 'Germana Patria', *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 60: 147-174.

Hannah, B.

- (2004) 'Manufacturing Descent: Virgil's Genealogical Engineering', *Arethusa* 37.2: 141-164.

Hardie, P.

- (2013) 'Trojan Palimpsests: The Archaeology of Roman History in *Aeneid* 2', in J. Farrell and D. Nelis (eds.) *Augustan Poetry and the Roman Republic*, Oxford: Oxford University Press. 107-123.
- (2016) *Augustan Poetry and the Irrational*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hardy, C.S.

- (1996) *Antiqua Mater: Misreading Gender in Aeneid 3.84-191*, *The Classical Journal* 92.1: 1-8.

Hariman, R.

- (1989) 'Political Style in Cicero's Letters to Atticus', *Rhetorica: A Journal of the History of Rhetoric* 7.2: 145-158.

Harris, W.V.

- (1986) 'The Roman Father's Power of Life and Death', in R.S. Bagnall and W.V. Harris (eds.) *Studies in Roman Law in Memory of A. Arthur Schiller*, Leiden: Brill. 81-95.
- (1989) *Ancient Literacy*, Cambridge (MA): Harvard University Press.

Harrison, I.

- (2008) 'Catiline, Clodius, and popular politics at Rome during the 60s and 50s BCE', *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 51: 95-118.

Harrison, S.

- (2004) 'Altering Attis: Ethnicity, Gender and Genre in Catullus 63', *Mnemosyne*, Fourth Series, 57: 520-533.

Hasebroek, J.

- (1921) *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Kaisers Septimius Severus*, Heidelberg: Carl Winter.

Hawes, G.

- (2014) *Rationalizing Myth in Antiquity*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Head, B.V.

- (1911) *Historia Numorum*, 2nd Edition, Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Head, B.V. and Poole, R.S.

- (1879 [1963]) *Catalogue of the Greek Coins: Macedonia, Etc.*, Bologna: Arnaldo Forni Editore.

Herrmann, P., Günther, W., Ehrhardt, N., Feissel, D., and Weiss, P.

- (1997) *Inschriften von Milet. Teil 3, Inschriften n. 1020-1580*, Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Heskel, J.

- (2001) 'Cicero as Evidence for Attitudes to Dress in the Late Republic', in J.L. Sebesta and L. Bonfante (eds.) *The World of Roman Costume*, Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press. 133-145.

Hinds, S.

- (1998) *Allusion and intertext: Dynamics of appropriation in Roman poetry*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- (2006) 'Generalizing about Ovid' in P.E. Knox (ed.) *Oxford Readings in Ovid*, Oxford: Oxford University Press. 15-50.

Hine, H.

- (2010) 'Form and function of speech in the prose works of the younger Seneca', in D.H. Berry and A. Erskine (eds.) *Form and Function in Roman Oratory*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 208-224.

Hodgson, L.L.

- (2013) "'Without Body or Form": Res Publica and the Roman Republic', Unpublished PhD Dissertation, University of Durham.

Hölkeskamp, K-J.

- (2010) *Reconstructing the Roman Republic*, translated by H. Heitmann-Gordon, Oxford: Princeton University Press.
- (2013) 'Friends, Romans, Countrymen: addressing the Roman people and the rhetoric of inclusion', in C. Steel and H. van der Blom (eds.) *Community and Communication: Oratory and Politics in the Roman Republic*, Oxford: Oxford University Press. 11-28.

Holleman, A.W.J.

- (1976) 'Myth and Historiography: The Tale of the 306 Fabii', *Numen* 23: 210-218.

Holliday, V.L.

- (1969) *Pompey in Cicero's "Correspondence" and Lucan's "Civil War"*, The Hague and Paris: Walter de Gruyter.

Horsfall, N.

- (1982) 'Cornelius Nepos', in E.J. Kenney and W.J. Clausen (eds.) *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature. Vol. 2, Latin Literature*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 290-292.
- (1986) 'The Aeneas-Legend and the *Aeneid*', *Vergilius* 32: 8-17.
- (1987) 'The Aeneas-Legend from Homer to Virgil', in J.N. Bremmer and N. Horsfall (eds.) *Roman Myth and Mythography*, Institute of Classical Studies, Bulletin Supplement 52. 10-24.
- (1988) 'Camilla o i limiti dell'invenzione', *Athenaeum* 66: 31-51.

Howe, G.

- (1930) 'The Development of the Character of Aeneas', *The Classical Journal* 26: 182-193.

Howego, C., Heuchert, V. and Burnett, A.

- (eds.) (2005) *Coinage and Identity in the Roman Provinces*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hritzu, J.N.

- (1944) 'Piety in the Character of Aeneas', in *The Classical World* 38: 171-172.
- (1945) 'New and Broader Interpretation of the Ideality of Aeneas', *The Classical World* 39: 98-103.

Hubbard, M.

- (1974 [2001]) *Propertius*, London: Duckworth.

Hutchinson, H.O.

- (2012) 'Propertius and the Unity of the Book', in E. Greene and T.S. Welch (eds.) *Propertius*, Oxford: Oxford University Press. 186-202.

Hüttl, W.

- (1975) *Antoninus Pius*, vol. I, New York: Arno Press.

Ingleheart, J.

- (2006) 'What the Poet Saw: Ovid, the Error and the Theme of Sight in *Tristia* 2', *Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici* 56: 63-86.
- (2010) *A Commentary on Ovid, Tristia, Book 2*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jaeger, M.

- (1997) *Livy's Written Rome*, Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.
- (2014) 'Urban Landscape, Monuments and the Building of Memory in Livy', in B. Mineo (ed.) *A Companion to Livy*, Hoboken: John Wiley and Sons. 65-77.

Jal, P.

- (1963) '*Hostis (publicus)* dans la littérature latine de la fin de la République', *Revue des Études Anciennes* 65: 53-79.

Janan, M.

- (2001) *The Politics of Desire: Propertius IV*, Berkley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Jocelyn, H.D.

- (1969) 'Chrysalus and the Fall of Troy (Plautus, *Bacchides* 925-978)', *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 73: 135-152.

Johnson, P.J.

- (1997) 'Ovid's Livia in Exile', *The Classical World* 90.6: 403-420.

Johnson, W.R.

- (1973) 'The Emotions of Patriotism: Propertius 4.6', *California Studies in Classical Antiquity* 6: 151-180.
- (1976) *Darkness Visible: A Study of Vergil's Aeneid*, Berkley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Joshel, S.R.

- (1992) 'The Body Female and the Body Politic: Livy's Lucretia and Verginia', in A. Richlin (ed.) *Pornography and Representation in Greece and Rome*, Oxford: Oxford University Press. 112-130.

Kananack, C.H.E.

- (2012) 'Reconsidering "The Conspiracy of Catiline": Participants, Concepts, and Terminology in Cicero and Sallust', Unpublished PhD Dissertation, University of Exeter.

Kapust, D.J.

- (2011) *Republicanism, Rhetoric, and Roman Political Thought: Sallust, Livy and Tacitus*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Karakasis, E.

- (2003) 'Language and Plot in Plautus' *Bacchides*', *Rivista di cultura classica e medioevale* 45.1: 47-67.

Kaster, R.A.

- (ed.) (2006) *Cicero: Speech on Behalf of Publius Sestius*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Keith, A.M.

- (2006) 'Women's networks in Vergil's *Aeneid*', *Dictynna* 3: 211-233.

Kennedy, D.F.

- (1992) "'Augustan" and "Anti-Augustan": Reflections on Terms of Reference', in A. Powell (ed.) *Roman Poetry and Propaganda in the Age of Augustus*, Bristol: Bloomsbury. 26-58.

Kirichenko, A.

- (2013) 'Virgil's Augustan Temples: Image and Intertext in the *Aeneid*', *Journal of Roman Studies* 103: 65-87.

Kirk, G.S.

- (1971) *Myth: Its Meaning and Functions in Ancient and other Cultures*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Klindienst Joplin, P.

- (1990) 'Ritual Work on Human Flesh: Livy's Lucretia and the Rape of the Body Politic', *Helios* 17: 51-70.

Knapp, C.

- (1930) 'Some Remarks on the Character of Aeneas', *The Classical Journal* 26: 99-111.

Knoche, U.

- (1968) 'Ciceros Verbindung der Lehre vom Naturrecht mit dem römischen Recht und Gesetz' in G. Radke (ed.) *Cicero. Ein Mensch seiner Zeit. Acht Vorträge zu einem geistesgeschichtlichen Phänomen*, Berlin: Walter de Gruyter. 38-60.

Koch, M.

- (2008) 'Nunc tempore potentis Getarum Eurici regis. El impacto visigodo en Hispania a través de la inscripción del puente de Mérida (483 d.C.)', *Pyrenae: revista de prehistòria i antiguitat de la Mediterrània Occidental* 39.2: 137-142.

Konstan, D.

- (1986) 'Narrative and Ideology in Livy: Book I', *Classical Antiquity* 5: 198-216.
- (1993) 'Rhetoric and the Crisis of Legitimacy in Cicero's Catilinarian Orations', in T. Poulakos (ed.) *Rethinking the History of Rhetoric: Multidisciplinary Essays on the Rhetorical Tradition*, Boulder: Westview Press. 11-30.
- (1997) *Friendship in the Classical World*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kockel, V.

- (1995) 'Forum Augustum', in E.M. Steinby (ed.) *Lexicon Topographicum Urbis Romae: Volume Secondo D-G*, Rome: Edizione Quasar. 289-295.

Koselleck, R.

- (2002) *The Practice of Conceptual History*, trans. T.S Presner, K. Behnke and J. Welge, Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Kotula, T.

- (1985) 'Septime-Sévère, a-t-il visité l'Afrique en tant qu'empereur?', *Eos* 73: 151-165.

Kovács, P.

- (2000) 'Iuppiter Optimus Maximus Paternus and the Cohors Milliarum Maurorum', *Acta Antiqua Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 40: 239-246.

Krahmalkov, C.R.

- (2000) *Phoenician-Punic Dictionary*, Leuven: Peeters.

Kraus, C.S. and Woodman, A.J.

- (1997) *Latin Historians*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kriekhaus, A.

- (2001) 'Roma communis nostra patria est? Zum Einfluß des römischen Staates auf die Beziehungen zwischen Senatoren und ihren Heimatstädten in der Hohen Kaiserzeit', in L. de Blois (ed.) *Administration, Prosopography and Appointment Policies in the Roman Empire, Proceedings of the First Workshop of the International Network Impact of Empire (Roman Empire, 27 B.C. – A.D. 476), Leiden, June 28-July 1, 2000*, Amsterdam: Brill. 230-245.
- (2004) 'Duae Patriae? C. Plinius Caecilius Secundus zwischen germana patria und urbs', in L. de Ligt, E.A. Hemelrijk and H.W. Singor (eds.) *Roman Rule and Civic Life: Local and Regional Perspectives. Proceedings of the Fourth Workshop of the International Network Impact of Empire (Roman Empire, c. 200*

B.C. – A.D. 476), Leiden, June 25-28, 2003, Amsterdam: Brill. 299-314.

Labate, M.

- (1984) *L'arte di farsi amare: Modelli culturali e progetto didascalico nell'elegia ovidiana*, Pisa: Giardini.

Lacey, W.K.

- (1986) 'Patria Potestas', in B. Rawson (ed.) *The Family in Ancient Rome: New Perspectives*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press. 121-144.

Lahusen, G.

- (1999) 'Zu römischen Statuen und Bildnissen aus Geld und Silber', *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 128: 251-266.

Lambert, A.J., Scherer, L.D., Rodgers, C. and Jacoby, L.L.

- (2009) 'How does memory create a sense of the collective?', in P. Boyer and J. Wertsch (eds.) *Memory in Mind and Culture*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 194-222.

Langlands, R.

- (2006) *Sexual Morality in Ancient Rome*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Le Bohec, Y.

- (1994) *The Imperial Roman Army*, London: Batsford.

Lee-Stecum, P.

- (2008) 'Roman *refugium*: refugee narratives in the Augustan versions of Roman prehistory', *Hermathena* 184: 69-91.

Lefèvre, E.

- (1988) 'Plautus-studien V. Plautus' Iliupersis (Ba. 925-977)', *Hermes* 116.2: 209-227.

Lennon, J.

- (2010) 'Pollution and Ritual Impurity in Cicero's *De Domo Sua*', *The Classical Quarterly* 60.2: 427-225.

Lenski, N.

- (2016) *Constantine and the Cities: Imperial Authority and Civic Politics*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Leone, A.

- (2013) *The End of the Pagan City: Religion, Economy, and Urbanism in Late Antique North Africa*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lepelley, C.

- (1992 [2001]) 'The survival and fall of the classical city in Late Roman Africa', in J. Rich (ed.) *The City in Late Antiquity*, London and New York: Routledge. 50-76.
- (2004) 'Une Inscription d'Heraclea Sintica (Macédoine) récemment découverte, révélant un recit de l'empereur Galère restituant ses droits à la cité', *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 146: 221-231.

Leroi-Gourhan, A.

- (1993) *Gesture and Speech*, trans. A.B. Berger, Cambridge (MA): The MIT Press.

Lesueur, R.

- (1978) 'Civitas et Patria. Unité ou dualité du message virgilien dans l'Enéide?', in R. Chevallier (ed.) *Présence de Virgile: Actes du Colloque des 9,11, et 12 Décembre 1976*, Paris: Les Belles Lettres. 35-47.

Levene, D.S.

- (1993) *Religion in Livy*, Leiden and New York: Brill.
- (2008) 'Allusion and Intertextuality in Livy's Third Decade' in B. Mineo (ed.) *A Companion to Livy*, Hoboken: John Wiley and Sons. 205-216.

Levick, B.

- (1995) 'The Latin Inscriptions of Asia Minor', in H. Solin, O. Salomies and U.-M. Liertz (eds.) *Acta Colloquii Epigraphici Latini Helsingiae. 3-6 sept. 1991 habiti*, Helsinki: Societas Scientiarum Fennica. 393-402.
- (2010) *Augustus: Image and Substance*, London and New York: Routledge.

Linderski, J.

- (1984) 'Rome, Aphrodisias and the *Res Gestae*: The *Genera Militae* and the Status of Octavian', *Journal of Roman Studies*, 74: 74-80.

Lindheim, S.H.

- (2003) *Mail and Female: Epistolary Narrative and Desire in Ovid's Heroides*, Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Lintott, A.

- (2008) *Cicero as Evidence: A Historian's Companion*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lloyd, R.B.

- (1957a) 'The Character of Anchises in the *Aeneid*', *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 88: 44-55.
- (1957b) 'Aeneid III: A New Approach', *American Journal of Philology* 78: 133-151.

Lowenstam, S.

- (1993) 'The Pictures on Juno's Temple in the *Aeneid*', *The Classical World* 87.2: 37-49.

Lowrie, M.

- (2007) 'Horace and Augustus', in S. Harrison (ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to Horace*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 77-92.

Luce, T.J.

- (1971) 'Design and Structure in Livy: 5.32-55', *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 102: 265-302.
- (1990) 'Livia, Augustus, and the Forum Augustum', in K. Raaflaub and M. Toher (eds.) *Between Republic and Empire: Interpretations of Augustus and his Principate*, Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press. 123-138.

Lusnia, S.S.

- (2014) *Creating Severan Rome: The Architecture and Self-Image of L. Septimius Severus (A.D. 193-211)*, Brussels: Latomus.

Lushkov, A.H.

- (2015) *Magistracy and Historiography of the Roman Republic*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lyne, R.O.A.M

- (1987) *Further Voices in Vergil's Aeneid*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- (1995) *Horace: Behind the Public Poetry*, New Haven and London: Yale University Press.

MacCormack, S.

- (2007) *On the Wings of Time: Rome, the Incas, Spain and Peru*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Mackay, A.

- (ed.) (2008) *Orality, Literacy, Memory in the Ancient Greek and Roman World (Orality and Literacy in Ancient Greece, Volume 7)*, Leiden and Boston: Brill.

Madejski, P.

- (2012) 'Antirelics – *Loca Scelerata* in Ancient Rome', *Sacrum et profanum* V: 79-84.

Manfredi, L.-I.

- (2006) 'Le monete puniche nel Mediterraneo antico: produzione, coniazione e circolazione', *Mediterranea* 3: 257-298.

Manuwald, G.

- (ed.) (2007) *Cicero. Philippics 3-9. Volume 2. Commentary*, Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Marshall, B.A.

- (1975) 'The Date of Delivery in Cicero's *In Pisonem*', *The Classical Quarterly* 25.1: 88-93.

Martindale, C.

- (1993) *Redeeming the Text: Latin Poetry and the Hermeneutics of Reception*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mustakallio, K.

- (1999) 'Legendary Women and Female Groups in Livy', in P. Setälä and L. Savunen (eds.) *Female Networks and the Public Sphere in Roman Society*, Rome: *Institutum Romanum Finlandiae*. 53-64.

Mathisen, R.W.

- (2012) 'Concepts of citizenship', in S.F. Johnson (ed.) *The Oxford Handbook of Late Antiquity*, Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press. 744-763.

Mattingly, D.J.

- (1987) 'Libyans and the *limes*: culture and society in Roman Tripolitania', *Antiquités africaines* 23: 71-94.

Mattingly, H.

- (1950) *Coins of the Roman Empire in the British Museum, Volume V (Pertinax to Elagabalus)*, London: The Trustees of the British Museum.

May, J.M.

- (1988) *Trials of Character: The Eloquence of Ciceronian Ethos*, Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- (1996) 'Cicero and the Beasts', *Syllecta Classica* 7: 143-153.

McAllen Green, W.

- (1927) 'Notes on the Augustan Deities', *The Classical Journal* 23.2: 86-93.

McAuley, M.

- (2015) *Reproducing Rome: Motherhood in Virgil, Ovid, Seneca, and Statius*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

McCann, A.M.

- (1968) *The Portraits of Septimius Severus, AD 193-211. Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome, vol. 30*, Rome: American Academy in Rome.

McConnell, S.

- (2014) *Philosophical Life in Cicero's Letters*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

McDonnell, M.

- (2006) *Roman Manliness: Virtus and the Roman Republic*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

McLeish, K.

- (1972) 'Dido, Aeneas and the Concept of *Pietas*', *Greece and Rome* 19.2: 127-135.

Mennen, I.

- (2011) *Power and Status in the Roman Empire, AD 193-284*, Leiden and Boston: Brill.

Michels, A.

- (1997) 'The Many Faces of Aeneas', *The Classical Journal* 92.4: 399-416.

Millar, F.

- (1977) *The Emperor in the Roman World: 31 BC - AD 337*, London: Duckworth.

Miller, F.J.

- (1908) 'The Topical Method in the Study of Vergil', *The Classical Journal* 3.4: 141-149.

Miller, P.A.

- (1995) 'The Minotaur within: Fire, the Labyrinth, and Strategies of Containment in *Aeneid* 5 and 6', *Classical Philology* 90.3: 225-240.
- (2009) 'Ethics and Irony', *SubStance* 38.3: 51-71.

Millett, M.

- (1991) 'Roman towns and their territories: an archaeological perspective', in J. Rich and A. Wallace-Hadrill (eds.) *City and Country in the Ancient World*, London and New York: Routledge. 169-189.

Mira Seo, J.

- (2013) *Exemplary Traits: Reading Characterization in Roman Poetry*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Miralles Maldonado, J.C.

- (1997) 'Lucilio y Horacio: El motivo del ornatus corporis en la sátira', *Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica* 57.3: 119-138.

Mitchell, S.

- (1995) *Cremna in Pisidia: An Ancient City in Peace and War*, Swansea: Classical Press of Wales.

Mitchell, T.

- (1975) 'Veteres Hostes, novi amici (Cic. Fam. V.7,1)', *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte* 24.4: 618-622.
- (1991) *Cicero, the Senior Statesman*, Yale: Yale University Press.

Mitthof, F.

- (2013) 'Überteuerter Weizen und private Munifizienz: Bemerkungen zu zwei Weihungen aus Thuburnica und verwandten Inschriften', in W. Eck, B. Fehér and P. Kovács (eds.) *Studia Epigraphica in memoriam Géza Alföldy*, Bonn: Dr. Rudolf Habelt GMBH. 163-204.

Mitrev, G.

- (2003) 'Civitas Heracleotarum: Heracleia Sintica or the Ancient Village of Rupite (Bulgaria)', *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 145: 263-272.

Mitrev, G. and Tarakov, T.

- (2002) 'Civitas Heracleotarum. A new epigraphic inscription indicating the name of the ancient city near the village of Rupite, Petrich Region', *Archeologija* 43.4: 25-32.

Moatti, C.

- (1997) *La raison de Rome. Naissance de l'esprit critique à la fin de la République (Ile-Ier siècle avant Jésus-Christ)*, Paris: Seuil.

Moles, J.L.

- (1989) 'Nepos and Biography', *Classical Review* 39.2: 229-233.

Mommsen, T.

- (1876) *Römisches Staatsrecht*, Leipzig: S. Hirzel.
- (1899) *Mommsen's History of Rome*, trans. W.P. Dickson, New York: Scribner's.

Mommsen, T., Hirschfeld, O. and Domaszewski, A.

- (eds.) (1902) *Inscriptionum Orientis et Illyrici Latinarum supplementum. Pars Prior*. Berolini: G. Reimerum.

Moorton, R.F.

- (1989) 'The Innocence of Italy in Vergil's *Aeneid*', *The American Journal of Philology* 110.1: 105-130.

Morstein-Marx, R.

- (2008) *Mass Oratory and Political Power in the Late Roman Republic*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- (2013) 'Cultural hegemony and the communicative power of the Roman elite', in C. Steel and H. van der Blom (eds.) *Community and Communication: Oratory and Politics in the Roman Republic*, Oxford: Oxford University Press. 29-47.

Moser, C. and Hay, S.

- (2013) 'The Orientations of the Altars at Lavinium and the Republican Calendar', *Papers of the British School at Rome* 81: 363-366.

Mundle, I.

- (1957) 'Untersuchungen zur Religionspolitik des Septimius Severus (Herkules, Bacchus, Jupiter, Juno)', Unpublished PhD Dissertation, Albert-Ludwigs-Universität, Freiberg.

Nagy, T.

- (1965) 'Die Inschrift des Legionspräfekten P. Ael. Aelianus aus Ulcisia castra', *Klio* 46: 339-350.

Naiden, F.S.

- (2006) *Ancient Supplication*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Nakata, S.

- (2012) '*Egrederet o quicumque es*: Genealogical Opportunism and Trojan Identity in the *Aeneid*', *Phoenix* 66.3/4: 335-363.

Nauta, R.R.

- (2004) 'Catullus 63 in a Roman Context', *Mnemosyne*, Fourth Series, 57: 596-628.

Nauta, R.R. and Harder, A.

- (eds.) (2005) *Catullus' Poem on Attis: Text and Contexts*, Leiden and Boston: Brill.

Neal, A.G.

- (2005) *National Trauma and Collective Memory: Extraordinary Events in the American Experience*, London and New York: Routledge.

Nemeti, S.

- (2004) "Dii Patrii" ai Maurilor din Micia', *Orma. Revistă de studii istorico-religioase* 1: 36-45.

Newby, Z.

- (2007) 'Art at the crossroads? Themes and styles in Severan art' in S. Swain, S. Harrison and J. Elsner (eds.) *Severan Culture*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 201-249.

Newlands, C.E.

- (1995) *Playing with Time: Ovid and the Fasti*, Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.

Nicoll, W.S.M.

- (2001) 'The Death of Turnus', *The Classical Quarterly* 51: 190-200.

Nisbet, R.G.M.

- (1964) 'The Speeches', in T.A. Dorey (ed.) *Cicero (Studies in Latin Literature and its Influence)*, London and New York: Basic Books. 47-79.

Nisbet, R.G.M. and Rudd, N.

- (2004) *A Commentary on Horace: Odes Book III*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Nora, P.

- (1978) 'Mémoire collective', in J. Le Goff (ed.) *La Nouvelle Histoire*, Paris: Retz. 398-401.
- (ed.) (1984a) *Les Lieux de mémoire*, Paris: Gallimard.
- (1984b) 'Entre mémoire et histoire', in P. Nora (ed.) *Les Lieux de mémoire*, Paris: Gallimard. 23-43.

Oakley, S.P.

- (2014) 'Reading Livy's Book 5', in B. Mineo (ed.) *A Companion to Livy*, Hoboken: John Wiley and Sons. 230-242.

Ogilvie, R.M.

- (1965) *A Commentary on Livy: Books 1-5*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ogle, M.B.

- (1925) 'Vergil's Conception of Dido's Character', *The Classical Journal* 20.5: 261-270.

O'Hara, J.J.

- (1990) *Death and the Optimistic Prophecy in Vergil's Aeneid*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Olick, J.K., Vinitzky-Seroussi, V. and Levy, D.

- (eds.) (2011) *The Collective Memory Reader*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Opelt, I.

- (1965) *Die lateinischen Schimpfwörter und verwandte sprachliche Erscheinungen. Ein Typologie*, Heidelberg: Bibliothek der Klassischen Altertumswissenschaften.

Osgood, J.

- (2005) 'Cicero's *Pro Caelio* 33-34 and Appius Claudis' *Oratio de Pyrrho*', *Classical Philology* 110.4: 355-358.

Östenberg, I.

- (2009) *Staging the World. Spoils, Captives, and Representations in the Roman Triumphal Procession*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- (2014) 'War and Remembrance: Memories of Defeat in Ancient Rome', in B. Alroth and C. Scheffer (eds.) *Attitudes towards the past in Antiquity Creating identities. Proceedings of an International Conference held at Stockholm University 15-17 May 2009*, Stockholm: Acta Universitatis Stockholmensis. 255-265.

O'Sullivan, T.M.

- (2009) 'Death *ante ora parentem* in Virgil's *Aeneid*', *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 139.2: 447-486.
- (2011) *Walking in Roman Culture*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Otis, B.

- (1964) *Virgil: A Study in Civilised Poetry*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Outhwaite, W.

- (2010) *Concept Formation in Social Science*, London: Routledge.

Pais, E.

- (2014) 'The Fabii at the River Cremera and the Spartans at Thermopylae', in J.H. Richardson and F. Santangelo (eds.) *The Roman Historical Tradition: Regal and Republican Rome*, Oxford: Oxford University Press. 167-186.

Panoussi, V.

- (2002) 'Vergil's Ajax: Allusion, Tragedy, and Heroic Identity in the *Aeneid*', *Classical Antiquity* 21.1: 95-134.

Patterson, L.E.

- (2010) *Kinship Myth in Ancient Greece*, Austin: University of Texas Press.

Pease, A.S.

- (1927) 'Some Aspects of the Character of Dido', *The Classical Journal* 22.4: 243-252.

Pellizzari, A.

- (2000) '*Roma communis nostra patria est*: costanti e variabili del patriottismo romano nei secoli dell'impero', *Atti della Accademia delle scienze di Torino. Classe di scienze morali, storiche e filologiche*, 133: 3-41.

Pennebraker, J.W. and Gonzales, A.L.

- (2009) 'Making History: Social and Psychological Processes Underlying Collective Memory', in P. Boyer and J.V. Wertsch (eds.) *Memory in Mind and Culture*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 171-193.

Penrose, J.

- (2002) 'Nations, states and homelands: territory and territoriality in nationalist thought', *Nations and Nationalism* 8.3: 277-297.

Pensabene, P.

- (2006) 'Le scuole di Nicomedia e Afrodisia e i pilastri della basilica severiana di Leptis Magna', *Marmora* 2: 41-58.

Piel, T. and Mineo, B.

- (2010) *Camille ou le destin de Rome, 406-390 av. J.-C.*, Clermont-Ferrand: Les Editions Maison.

Pighi, I.

- (1965) *De ludibus saecularibus populi Romani Quiritum*, Amsterdam: P. Schippers.

Pogorzelski, R.J.

- (2007) 'Epic and Nation in Virgil's *Aeneid* and Joyce's *Ulysses*', Unpublished PhD Dissertation, University of California, Santa Barbara.
- (2009) 'The "Reassurance of Fratricide" in the *Aeneid*', *American Journal of Philology* 130.2: 261-289.

Pollini, J.

- (2012) *From Republic to Empire: Rhetoric, Religion, and Power in the Visual Culture of Ancient Rome*, Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.

Pöschl, V.

- (1962) *The Art of Virgil: Image and Symbol in the Aeneid*, trans. G. Seligson, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Post, G.

- (2015) *Studies in Medieval Legal Thought: Public Law and the State 1100-1322*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Potter, F.J.

- (1926) 'How Long was Aeneas at Carthage?', *The Classical Journal* 21.8: 615-624.

Potter, T.W.

- (1991) 'Towns and territories in southern Etruria', in J. Rich and A. Wallace-Hadrill (eds.) *City and Country in the Ancient World*, London and New York: Routledge. 191-209.

Potter, D.S. and Damon, C.

- (1999) 'The *Senatus Consultum de Cn. Pisone Patre*', *The American Journal of Philology* 120.1: 13-42.

Price, J.J.

- (1998) 'The Failure of Cicero's First Catilinarian', in C. Deroux (ed.) *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History IX (Collection Latomus 244)*, Brussels: Latomus. 106-128.

Price, M. and Waggoner, N.

- (1975) *Archaic Greek Coinage. The Asyut Hoard*, London: Vecchi.

Przywansky, M.M.

- (2009) 'Cornelius Nepos: Key Issues and Critical Approaches', *The Classical Journal* 105.2: 97-108.

Putnam, M.C.J.

- (1981) 'Pius Aeneas and the Metamorphosis of Lausus', *Arethusa* 14: 139-156.

Quint, D.

- (1982) 'Painful Memories: *Aeneid* 3 and the Problem of the Past', *The Classical Journal* 78.1: 30-38.

Raaflaub, K.A.

- (1986a) 'From Protection and Defence to Offence and Participation: Stages in Conflict of the Orders', in K.A. Raaflaub (ed.) *Social Struggles in Archaic Rome*, Berkley and Los Angeles: University of California Press. 198-243.
- (1986b) 'The Conflict of the Orders in Archaic Rome: A Comprehensive and Comparative Approach', in K.A. Raaflaub (ed.) *Social Struggles in Archaic Rome*, Berkley and Los Angeles: University of California Press. 1-51.

Ramage, E.S.

- (1987) *The Nature and Purpose of Augustus' "Res Gestae"*, Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag Wiesbaden GMBH.

Ramsey, J.T.

- (ed.) (2003) *Cicero. Philippics I-II*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- (ed.) (2007) *Sallust's Bellum Catilinae*. Second Edition. Edited, with Introduction and Commentary, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Raschke, W.J.

- (1990) 'The Virtue of Lucilius', *Latomus* 49.2: 352-369.

Rawson, B.

- (1986) 'The Roman Family', in B. Rawson (ed.) *The Family in Ancient Rome: New Perspectives*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press. 1-57.
- (2003) *Children and Childhood in Roman Italy*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Rawson, E.

- (1975) *Cicero: A Portrait*, London: Allen Lane.

Reed, J.D.

- (2009) *Virgil's Gaze: Nation and Poetry in the Aeneid*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Rehak, P.

- (2006) *Imperium and Cosmos: Augustus and the Northern Campus Martius*, Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press.

Reitzenstein, R.

- (1894) *Drei Vermutungen zur Geschichte der römischen Litteratur*. Marburg: N. G. Elwert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung.

Remesan Rodríguez, J.

- (1998) 'Cuatrocientos años de historia e historiografía a través de la inscripción de C. Iuventius Albinus (CIL II 1054). La labor de Tomás Andrés de Gussemme en Lora del Río (Sevilla)', *Gerión* 16: 223-253.

Richlin, A.

- (1992) 'Julia's Jokes, Gallia Placidia, and the Roman Use of Women as Political Icons', in B. Garlick, S. Dixon and P. Allen (eds.) *Stereotypes of Women in Power: Historical Perspectives and Revisionist Views*, New York: Greenwood. 65-91.

Rickert, H.

- (1926 [1986]) *The Limits of Concept Formation in Natural Science: A Logical Introduction to the Historical Sciences*, trans. G. Oakes, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- (1929) *Grenzen der naturwissenschaftlichen Begriffsbildung: eine logische Einleitung in die historischen Wissenschaften*, 5th Ammended Edition, Tübingen: Mohr.

Riggsby, A.M.

- (2002) 'The *Post Reditum* Speeches', in J.M. May (ed.) *Brills' Companion to Cicero: Oratory and Rhetoric*, Leiden and Boston: Brill. 159-196.

Robinson, E.A.

- (1950) 'The Date of Cicero's *De Legibus*', Unpublished PhD Dissertation, Harvard University.

Romanelli, P.

- (1925) *Lepcis Magna*, Rome: Società editrice d'arte illustrata.

Rosenberger, V.

- (2003) 'The Gallic Disaster', *The Classical World* 96: 365-373.

Rowan, C.

- (2012) *Under Divine Auspices: Divine Ideology and Visualisation of Imperial Power in the Severan Period*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rubin, Z.

- (1971) 'Supernatural and Religious Sanction of the Emperors' Rule Under the Severi, 193-217', Unpublished PhD Dissertation, University of Oxford.
- (1976/1977) 'The *Felicitas* and the *Concordia* of the Severan House', *Scripta Classica Israelica* 3: 153-172.

Saller, R.P.

- (1994) *Patriarchy, Property, and Death in the Roman Family*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Salmon, E.P

- (1956) 'The Evolution of Augustus Principate' *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte* 5.4: 456-478.

Santangeli Valenzani, R.

- (1991) 'ΝΕΩΣ ΥΠΕΡΜΕΓΕΘΗΣ: Osservazioni sul tempio di piazza del Quirinale', *Bullettino della commissione archeologica comunale di Roma* 94: 7-16.

Saylor, C.F.

- (1970) 'Toy Troy: The New Perspective of the Backward Glance', *Vergilius* 16: 26-28.
- (1974) 'The Magnificent Fifteen: Vergil's Catalogues of the Latin and Etruscan Forces', *Classical Philology* 69: 249-257.

Schepens, G.

- (1989) 'Review of Geiger 1985b', *Mnemosyne* 42:214-217.

Schmidt, E.A.

- (2001) 'The Meaning of Vergil's *Aeneid*: American and German Approaches', *The Classical World* 94.2: 145-171.

Schmidt, P.L.

- (1969) *Die Abfassungzeit von Ciceros Schrift über die Gesetze*, Rome: Centro di studi ciceroniani.
- (2001) 'The Original Version of the *De Re Publica* and the *De Legibus*', *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 45: 7-16.

Schnegg-Köhler, B.

- (2002) *Die augusteischen Säkularspiele*, München and Leipzig: Saur.

Seager, R.

- (1965) 'Clodius, Pompeius and the Exile of Cicero', *Latomus* 24.3: 519-531.

Sebillotte, V.

- (1999) 'La *patris* grecque: essai d'interprétation', *Cahiers du Centre Gustave Glotz*, 10.1: 7-25.

Seider, A.M.

- (2013) *Memory in Vergil's Aeneid: Creating the Past*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Seixas, P.

- (ed.) (2004) *Theorizing Historical Consciousness*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Sellar, W.Y.

- (1892 [2010]) *The Roman Poets of the Augustan Age. Horace and the Elegiac Poets*, Edited by W.P. Ker, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Settle, J.N.

- (1962) 'The Publication of Cicero's Orations', Unpublished PhD Dissertation, University of North Carolina.

Seston, W.

- (1928) 'Le secteur de *Rapidum* sur le *Limes* de Mauritanie césarienne après les fouilles de 1927', *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire* 45: 150-183.

Seure, G.

- (1901) 'Voyage en Thrace: inscriptions funéraires', *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique* 25.1: 308-324.

Severy, B.

- (2003) *Augustus and the Family at the Birth of the Roman Empire*, London: Routledge.

Sharrock, A.R.

- (2006) 'Ovid and the Politics of Reading' in P.E. Knox (ed.) *Oxford Readings in Ovid*, Oxford: Oxford University Press. 238-261.

Sherwin-White, A.N.

- (1939 [1973]) *The Roman Citizenship*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- (1966) *The Letters of Pliny: A Historical and Social Commentary*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Silver, M.

- (2011) 'Contractual Slavery in the Roman Economy', *Ancient History Bulletin* 25: 73-132.

Skard, E.

- (1933) '*Pater Patriae*: zum Ursprung einer religiös-politischen Idee', *Festschrift H. Koht*, Oslo: 42-70.

Skutsch, O.

- (1985) *The Annals of Q. Ennius*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Smith, A.D.

- (1986 [1993]) *The Ethnic Origins of Nations*, Oxford: Blackwell.
- (1991) *National identity*, London: Penguin.
- (1999) *Myths and Memories of the Nation*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Smith, C.J.

- (2006) *The Roman Clan: The Gens from Ancient Ideology to Modern Anthropology*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Smith, R.A.

- (1997) *Poetic Allusion and Poetic Embrace in Ovid and Virgil*, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- (2005) *The Primacy of Vision in Virgil's Aeneid*, Austin: University of Texas Press.

Smith, S.D.

- (2007) *Greek Identity and the Athenian Past in Chariton: The Romance of Empire*, Groningen: Barkhuis and Groningen University Library.

Smith II, A.M.

- (2013) *Roman Palmyra: Identity, Community, and State Formation*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Solodow, J.B.

- (1979) 'Livy and the Story of Horatius I.24-26', *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 109: 251-268.

Spencer, D.

- (2002) *The Roman Alexander: Reading a Cultural Myth*, Exeter: University of Exeter Press.

Spiegel, J.

- (1541) *Lexicon iuris civilis ex variis probatorum autorum commentariis congestum*, Lyon: Seb. Gryphius.

Stadter, P.

- (2007) 'Biography and History', in J. Marincola (ed.) *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography*, Oxford: Blackwell. 528-540.

Stahl, H.-P.

- (1985) *Propertius: "Love and War". Individual and the State Under Augustus*, Berkley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Stark, R.

- (1967) 'Res Publica' in H. Oppermann (ed.) *Römische Wertbegriffe*, Darmstadt: 42-110.

Steel, C. and van der Blom, H.

- (eds.) (2013) *Community and Communication: Oratory and Politics in the Roman Republic*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Stek, T.D.

- (2009) *Cult Places and Cultural Change in Republican Italy: A Contextual Approach to Religious Aspects of Roman Society After the Roman Context*, Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Stem, S.R.

- (2009) 'Shared Virtues and the Limits of Relativism in Nepos' *Epaminondas and Atticus*', *The Classical Journal* 105.2: 123-136.
- (2012) *The Political Biographies of Cornelius Nepos*, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Stevenson, T.

- (2009) 'Acceptance of the Title *Pater Patriae* in 2 BC', *Antichthon* 43: 97-108.

Stewart, R.

- (2012) *Plautus and Roman Slavery*, London: Wiley-Blackwell.

Stockton, D.

- (1971) *Cicero: A Political Biography*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Stover, T.

- (2011) 'Aeneas and Lausus: Killing the Double and Civil War in *Aeneid* 10', *Phoenix* 65.3/4: 352-360.

Strocka, V.M.

- (1972) 'Beobachtungen an den Attikareliefs des severischen Quadrifons von Lepcis magna', *Antiquités africaines* 6: 147-172.

Stroh, W.

- (2004) 'De Domo Sua: Legal Problem and Structure', in J. Powell and J. Paterson (eds.) *Cicero the Advocate*, Oxford: Oxford University Press. 313-370.

Strothmann, M.

- (2000) *Augustus – Vater der res publica. Zur Funktion der drei Begriffe restitutio – saeculum – pater patriae im augusteischen Principat*, Stuttgart: Steiner.

Suerbaum, W.

- (1977) *Vom Antiken zum Frühmittelalterlichen Staatsbegriff*, Münster Westfalen: Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung.

Sullivan, J.P.

- (1976) *Propertius: A Critical Introduction*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sweet, F.

- (1972) 'Propertius and Political Panegyric', *Arethusa* 5: 169-175.

Syed, Y.

- (2005) *Vergil's Aeneid and the Roman Self: Subject and Nation in Literary Discourse*, Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.

Syme, R.

- (1939) *The Roman Revolution*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- (1964) *Sallust*, Berkley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- (1978) *History in Ovid*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Talamanco, M.

- (2009) 'I client di Q. Cervidio Scevola', in M. Talamanc (ed.) *Bullettino dell'Istituto di Diritto Romano. "Vittorio Scialoja"*, Milan: Giuffrè Editore. 483-722.

Talbert, R.J.A.

- (1984) *The Senate of Imperial Rome*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Tarpin, M.

- (2002) *Vici et pagi dans l'Occident romain*, Rome: École Française de Rome.

Tatum, W.J.

- (2014) *The Patrician Tribune: Publius Clodius Pulcher*, Chapel Hill and London: University of North Carolina Press.

Tempest, K.

- (2011) *Cicero: Politics and Persuasion in Ancient Rome*, London: Continuum.

Thomas, Y.

- (1984) 'Vitaie necisque potestas. Le père, la cité, la mort', in Y. Thomas (ed.) *Du châtime dans la cité: Supplices corporels et peine de mort dans le monde antique. Table ronde organisée par l'École française de Rome avec le concours du Centre national de la recherche scientifique (Rome 9-11 novembre 1982)*, Rome: École français de Rome. 499-548.
- (1996) «Origine» et «Commune Patrie». *Étude de droit public romain (89 av. J.-C.-212 ap. J.-C.)*, Paris and Rome: École français de Rome.

Thomas, E. and Witschel, C.

- (1992) 'Constructing reconstruction: Claim and Reality of Roman Rebuilding Inscriptions in the Latin West', *Papers of the British School at Rome* 60: 135-177.

Thome, G.

- (1986a) 'Die Begegnung Venus-Aeneas im Wald vor Karthago (Aen. 1, 314-417)', *Latomus* 45.1: 43-68.
- (1986b) 'Die Begegnung Venus-Aeneas im Wald vor Karthago (Aen. 1, 314-417): Zweiter Teil', *Latomus* 45.2: 284-310.

Titchener, F.

- (2003) 'Cornelius Nepos and the Biographical Tradition', *Greece and Rome* 50.1: 85-99.

Toll, K.

- (1991) 'The *Aeneid* as an Epic of National Identity: *Italiam laeto socii clamore salutant*', *Helios* 18: 3-14.

- (1997) 'Making Roman-ness and the *Aeneid*', *Classical Antiquity* 16.1: 34-56.

Townsend, P.W.

- (1938) 'The Significance of the Arch of the Severi at Lepcis', *The American Journal of Archaeology* 42.4: 512-524.

Tuplin, C.

- (2000) 'Nepos and the Origin of Political Biography', in Carl Deroux (ed.) *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History, X*, Brussels: Latomus. 124-161.

Turcan, R.

- (2011) 'Notions Romaines de l'État: de la *Res Publica* au *Status Romanus*', *Latomus* 70: 621-641.

Tzounakas, S.

- (2006) 'The Personified *patria* in Cicero's First Catilinarian: significance and inconsistencies', *Philologus* 150: 222-231.

Urban, D.C.

- (2011) 'The Use of *Exempla* from Cicero to Pliny the Younger', Unpublished PhD Dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.

Van Acker, L.

- (1964) 'Een interpretatie van Lucilius' vv. Inc. 1326-1338', *L'Antiquité Classique* 33.1: 116-120.

Van Dam, R.

- (2007) *The Roman Revolution of Constantine*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

van der Blom, H.

- (2010) *Cicero's Role Models: The Political Strategy of a Newcomer*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- (2014) 'Character Attack and Invective Speech in the Roman Republic: Cicero as Target', in E. Shiraev and M. Icks (eds.) *Character Assassination Throughout the Ages*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan. 37-57.

van der Val, R.L.

- (2007) "'*Urbem, urbem cole!*' Taking a Walk in Cicero's *Vestigia*", *Akroterion* 52: 61-76.

Vasaly, A.

- (1993) *Representations: Images of the World in Ciceronian Oratory*, Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- (2015) *Livy's Political Philosophy: Power and Personality in Early Rome*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Verboven, K.

- (2002) *The Economy of Friends. Economic Aspects of Amicitia and Patronage in the Late Republic*, Brussels: Latomus.
- (2011) 'Friendship among the Romans', in M. Peachin (ed.) *Social Relations in the Roman World*, Oxford: Oxford University Press. 404-421.

von Albrecht, M.

- (1997) *A History of Roman Literature: From Livius Andronicus to Boethius*, Leiden and Boston: Brill.
- (1999) 'The Art of Mirroring in Virgil's *Aeneid*', trans. H. Harvey, in P.R. Hardie (ed.) *Virgil. Critical Assessments of Classical Authors. Volume IV: The Aeneid (continued)*, London and New York: Routledge. 1-12.

von Savigny, F.K.

- (1869) *Private International Law. A Treatise on the Conflict of Laws and the Limits of their Operation in Respect of Place and Time*, trans. W. Guthrie, Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, Law Publishers.

von Ungern-Sternberg, J.

- (2001) 'Camillus, ein zweiter Romulus', in M. Choudry and T. Spath (eds.) *L'invention des grands hommes de la Rome antique, Actes du colloque du Collegium Beatus Rhenanus*, Paris: De Boccard. 289-297.

Ward-Perkins, J.B.

- (1951) 'The Arch of Septimius Severus as Lepcis Magna', *Archaeology* 4.4:226-231.
- (1993) *The Severan Buildings of Lepcis Magna: An Architectural Survey. With a contribution by B. Jones and R. Ling. Edited by P. Kendrick*. London: The Society for Libyan Studies.

Walsh, P.G.

- (1961 [1963]) *Livy: His Historical Aims and Methods*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Watson, A.

- (1979) 'The Death of Horatia', *The Classical Quarterly* 29.2: 436-447.

Weber, M.

- (1921 [1968]) *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Wissenschaftslehre*, Tübingen: Mohr.

Weinstock, S.

- (1971) *Divus Julius*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Weiss, A.H.

- (1974) 'The *Poem of the Cid* and the *Aeneid*: Two National Epics', *The Classical Journal* 69.4: 340-347.

Welch, T.

- (2012) 'Perspectives On and Of Livy's Tarpeia', *Journal of Gender Studies in Antiquity* 2: 169-200.

West, D.

- (1974) 'The Deaths of Hector and Turnus', *Greece and Rome* 21.1: 21-31.
- (1994) 'In the Wake of Aeneas (*Aeneid* 3.274-88, 3.500-5, 8.200-3)', *Greece and Rome* 41.1: 57-61.
- (2002) *Horace Odes III: Dulce Periculum. Text, Translation and Commentary*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

West, G.S.

- (1983) 'Andromache and Dido', *The American Journal of Philology* 104.3: 257-267.

Wharton, F.

- (1872) *A treatise on the Conflict of Laws, or Private International Law, Including a Comparative view of Anglo-American, Roman, German, and French Jurisprudence*, Philadelphia: Kay and Brother.

White, P.

- (2010) *Cicero in Letters: Epistolary Relations of the Late Republic*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wiedemann, T.

- (1975) 'The Political Background to Ovid's *Tristia* 2', *The Classical Quarterly* 25: 264-271.

Wilhelm, M.P.

- (1987) 'Venus, Diana, Dido and Camilla in the *Aeneid*', *Vergilius* 33: 43-48.

Williams, G.

- (1968) *Tradition and Originality in Roman Poetry*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- (2002a) 'Ovid's exile poetry: *Tristia*, *Epistulae ex Ponto* and *Ibis*', in P. Hardie (ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to Ovid*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 233-245.
- (2002b) 'Ovid's Exilic Poetry: World's Apart', in B.W. Boyd (ed.) *Brill's Companion to Ovid*, Leiden and Boston: Brill. 337-381.

Williams, R.D.

- (1960) 'The Pictures on Dido's Temple (*Aeneid* I.450-493)', *The Classical Quarterly* 10.2: 145-151.
- (1961) 'The Function and Structure of Virgil's Catalogue in Book 7', *The Classical Quarterly* 11.2: 146-153.

Wilson, A.

- (2012) 'Neo-Punic and Latin inscriptions in Roman North Africa: function and display', in A. Mullen and P. James (eds.) *Multilingualism in the Graeco-Roman Worlds*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 265-316.

Wirszubski, C.H.

- (1950) *Libertas as a Political Idea at Rome during the Late Republic and Early Principate*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wiseman, T.P.

- (1987) 'Review of Geiger 1985b', *Journal of Roman Studies* 77: 250.

Woolf, G.

- (1994) 'Power and Writing in the West', in A.K. Bowman and G. Woolf, (eds.) *Literacy and Power in the Ancient World*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 84-98.

Young, A.

- (1996) 'Bodily Memory and Traumatic Memory' in P. Antze and M. Lambek (eds.) *Tense Past: Cultural Essays in Trauma and Memory*, New York: Routledge. 89-102.

Young, J.E.

- (2002) *At Memory's Edge: After-Images of the Holocaust in Contemporary Art and Architecture*, New Haven: Yale University Press.

Zanker, P.

- (1988) *The power of Images in the Age of Augustus*, trans. A. Shapiro, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Zarker, J.W.

- (1978) 'Vergil's Trojan and Italian *Matres*', *Vergilius* 24: 15-24.

Zertal, I.

- (2005) *Israel's Holocaust and the Politics of Nationhood*, trans. C. Galai, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Zerubavel, Y.

- (1995) *Recovered Roots: Collective Memory and the Making of Israeli National Tradition*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.