

# KINSHIP IN ROMAN-ITALIAN RELATIONSHIPS: DIVERSE TRADITIONS, PERSPECTIVES AND INTERPRETATIONS IN VELLEIUS PATERCULUS AND OTHER ROMAN AND GREEK HISTORICAL WRITERS\*

---

*Abstract:* This paper studies the concept of kinship between Italians and Romans in Velleius Paterculus and other historical writers, both Roman and Greek. The results have both historiographical significance, illuminating the historical writers' varied treatments of the concept and, in some cases, the familial and ethnic influences upon them, and historical significance, allowing considered historical judgements about when and how the concept was used by Italians, including Latins, and how Romans, both corporately and individually, responded to these Italian uses. In studying the important concept of kinship I am of course not claiming that it trumps other historical factors (*Realpolitik* considerations, for instance). In restricting the literary evidence to historical prose writers (whether historiographers, biographers, antiquarians, or orators treating historical matters), I am operating within the brief of *Histos*; focusing on concrete historical contexts; and leaving open the possibility that the picture might be somewhat modified if the evidence of poetry (for example, Virgil's *Aeneid* or Silius' *Punica*) were included.

---

The paper is organised as follows:

1. Introduction: ethnicity in Greek and Roman diplomacy;
2. The Italian perspective on Roman-Italian kinship: the evidence of Velleius Paterculus on the Social War;
3. Roman-Italian kinship in other Greek and Roman historical writers and in other political and military contexts;
4. The case of the Mamertines: *homophylia* in Greece and the *homophylia* of Italy in the Punic Wars;
5. Roman-Italian consanguinity based on common Trojan origins: the Punic Wars;
6. The concept of kinship between Romans and Latins;
7. Roman response to Latin claims of Roman-Latin kinship;

\* This article is part of a wider research project funded by the Alexander von Humboldt Stiftung. I would like to express my gratitude to Dr Federico Santangelo for advice; to the anonymous readers for their fruitful and stimulating critiques; and to Ms Linda Wimmer, Dr Clemence Schultze and Professor John Moles for improving the text in numerous different ways. Translations are original. The copy-editing was done by Thilo Rising.

8. The evidence of Florus on the Social War; differences between Florus and Velleius and Appian; conclusions.

The organisation is thus thematic and synchronic rather than diachronic, though the treatment brings out the importance of specific historical contexts and allows for the possibility of development or change in attitudes, whether on the Italian or on the Roman side.

### **1. Introduction: Ethnicity in Greek and Roman Diplomacy**

**E**thnic discourse represented one of the most distinctive features of Greek diplomacy: the Greeks founded many of their international relationships (between Greeks and non-Greeks, as well as between Greeks and Greeks) on concepts somehow connected to the basic idea of ethnicity. Among all the arguments of an ethnic nature that the Greeks systematised in order to negotiate their diplomatic relationships, kinship was one of the most used by Greek communities that sought to strengthen alliances with other Greek cities. J. M. Hall explains: ‘*Syngeneia* is the regular word for family kinship, though it is important to note that it does not signify an *externally defined* system of cognitive relationships between siblings and cousins, but rather the kin relationships that a particular individual might recognise at any one time *by reference to shared ancestors in the lineage*. In other words, a *syngenes* is one who is recognised as belonging to the same *genos* as oneself, whether or not this is biologically the case. But, just as *genos* can be extended beyond the scope of the family to refer to larger collectivities, so *syngeneia* can refer to the wider kinship that individuals might share with one another by virtue of their belief in descent’.<sup>1</sup> In this sense, the original meaning, connected to familial life, is adopted and adapted to describe and define specific and close kinds of political and diplomatic relationships.

Many studies have focused on reviewing the operation of the concept of kinship in the Greek world, for instance, those by Musti, Curty and Will.<sup>2</sup> The existence of this concept in the traditions of the populations of ancient Italy has also been stressed by Dench.<sup>3</sup> Recently, some studies have been dedicated to the usage of kinship in Roman diplomacy, with specific attention to Roman-Greek relationships and the subsequent exploitation of the Trojan myth.<sup>4</sup> However, none of these studies has directly dealt with such a

<sup>1</sup> Hall (1997) 36–7 (his italics).

<sup>2</sup> Musti (1963); Curty (1994); (1999); Will (1995).

<sup>3</sup> Dench (1995).

<sup>4</sup> See Elwyn (1993), with caution; Jones (1999); Lücke (2000). For the Roman-Trojan *syngeneia*, Erskine (2003) 165–97; recently also, Battistoni (2009); (2010); cf. below, p. 238.

concept in the Italian context,<sup>5</sup> or with the historical sources which treat it, and which suggest that it was frequently invoked in Italian and Latin quarters. Indeed, according to several different historical traditions, between the 5th and 1st centuries BC, Latins or Italians repeatedly claimed to be relatives of the Romans in order to seek some kind of political benefit, such as Roman citizenship.

## **2. The Italian Perspective on Roman-Italian Kinship: the Evidence of Velleius Paterculus on the Social War**

When we survey the handling of our theme in various Classical historical writers, special attention must be paid to the Tiberian historian Velleius Paterculus, since he often adopts in his work a genuine (philo-) Italian slant, and this aspect of his work has been the subject of two recent essays by Bispham and Elefante.<sup>6</sup> The lengthy *excursus* at the end of his first book,<sup>7</sup> which is dedicated to Roman colonisation from the Gallic disaster to the age of Hannibal (1.14–16) and to the proliferation of literary culture in Rome, raises the possibility that, among his sources, Velleius used an actual philo-Italian tradition. This hypothesis is further supported by the presence throughout his work of various accounts that appear to derive from traditions of such an orientation, especially in the second book, where the author deals with the narrative of the Social War.

In that book Velleius' philo-Italian perspective is shown on several occasions. Velleius recalls his own Italian ancestor, Minatius Magius, and his loyalty to Rome (2.16.2).<sup>8</sup> In the same passage, he also evinces knowledge of the names of the commanders on the side of the Italians (2.16.1), listing them with the same attention as that with which, shortly before, he had listed the *clarissimi imperatores* ('the most illustrious commanders') on the Roman side (2.15.3–4). An even more striking example of the same attitude appears in 2.27.2, where the city of Rome is described by the Samnite chief Pontius

<sup>5</sup> With the limited exception of Prag (2010) on cases in Sicily.

<sup>6</sup> See Gabba (1962); Mazzarino (1966) 435–6 (with some reservations); Hellegouarc'h (1974), esp. 73–4; recently also, D'Aloja (2004), esp. 215–16, and for Velleius as a source of Italian ideology, Russo (2006); (2008b); Bispham (2011); Elefante (2011); ead. (1999) (on key passages).

<sup>7</sup> Recent discussion: Bispham (2011) 38; Wiseman (2011) 279–80.

<sup>8</sup> Discussion: Sumner (1970) 257–9. On the role of Hortensius' *Annales* as source of this passage, see Mazzarino (1966) 433; for the connection between Velleius' family background and the philo-Italian traditions, see Gabba (1962) 6; Hellegouarc'h (1974) 73–4; Keaveney (1987) 339; Bispham (2011) 27, 51 n. 95.

Telesinus as the *silva* ('forest') where the *raptores Italicae libertatis lupi* ('the wolves, ravishers of Italian liberty'), that is, the Romans, took refuge. The clear philo-Italian point of view here involves a distinctly anti-Roman one. The striking imagery combines a remarkable inversion of one of the great Roman claims (Rome as asylum)<sup>9</sup> with a sardonic reworking of the Roman foundation myth of the suckling of Romulus and Remus by the she-wolf.<sup>10</sup> We shall see that Italian claims to justice from the Romans often involve subversion—indeed, almost bitter parody—of Roman claims. The philo-Italian perspective of Velleius' narration is even more evident if compared, for instance, to the account of the Greek historian and geographer Strabo (5.4.11) and Sulla's famous 'anathema' hurled at the Samnites at the very end of the Social War, when they were being butchered within Rome itself on the Campus Martius.

Velleius' account of Italian perception of the causes of the Social War (2.15.2) is paradigmatic of this general tendency in his narrative:<sup>11</sup>

quorum ut fortuna atrox, ita causa fuit iustissima: petebant enim eam civitatem, cuius imperium armis tuebantur: per omnis annos atque omnia bella duplici numero se militum equitumque fungi neque in eius civitatis ius recipi, quae per eos in id ipsum pervenisset fastigium, per quod homines eiusdem et gentis et sanguinis ut externos alienosque fastidire posset.

Just as their fortune was cruel, so their cause was most just; for they were seeking citizenship of the state whose empire they were defending by their arms; throughout all years and all wars they were providing a double number of men, of soldiers and of cavalry-men, and yet were not admitted to the rights of citizens in the state which, through their efforts, had reached that very height from which it could look down on men both of the same race and of the same blood as if they were foreigners and aliens.

We can see in this passage that Velleius completely justifies the Italians' reasons for waging war against Rome.<sup>12</sup> Although the words *per omnis ... posset*

<sup>9</sup> Virg. *Aen.* 8.342; Liv. 1.9.5; 35.51.2; Dench (2005).

<sup>10</sup> For another interesting dimension see Elefante (2011) 68–9; 72 n. 26.

<sup>11</sup> On the historical problems of the relationships between Romans and Italians, see Gabba (1978); id. (1985) 35–46; Keaveney (1987); Giardina (1997) 21; Mouritsen (1998); Terrenato (1998).

<sup>12</sup> For a different perspective on the passage—concerning Velleius' political understanding—see Marincola (2011) 130, 139 n. 37.

are in *oratio obliqua* and thus formally express the Italian point of view, they develop Velleius' own sentiments *causa fuit iustissima ... tuebantur*. Velleius' words also emphasise that the grandeur of Rome depends, at least in part, on the Italian peoples.<sup>13</sup> The imagery of 'height' and 'looking down on', as applied to the Roman state, subverts Roman claims that the Roman state was like a 'great building' towards which all should 'look',<sup>14</sup> an effect pointed by the suggested *figura etymologica* of 'fastigium' and 'fastidire': the imagery itself suggests Roman 'superbia'.<sup>15</sup> From the Italian perspective, citizenship here assumes a twofold function: on the one hand, it is the just reward for service to the state, and on the other, and perhaps more importantly, it is an instrument for the growth of power of the state itself. It is true that elsewhere in the historical tradition, for example in Velleius' fellow-historian Livy,<sup>16</sup> there are references to the admission of Italian populations to the Roman state through *civitas*, both *optimo iure* and *sine suffragio*. However, Livy does not arrive at the same conclusions as Velleius, and concentrates his narrative on very different events in the same years, thus revealing a point of view that differs strongly from Velleius'.

As Gabba notes,<sup>17</sup> the closest parallels to Velleius' words and concepts in 2.15.2 are in fact to be found in Cicero's speech *Pro Balbo* 31:

illud vero sine ulla dubitatione maxime nostrum fundavit imperium et populi Romani nomen auxit, quod princeps ille creator huius urbis Romulus foedere Sabino docuit etiam hostibus recipiendis augeri hanc civitatem oportere. cuius auctoritate et exemplo numquam est intermissa a maioribus nostris largitio et communicatio civitatis.

<sup>13</sup> For the ideological links between this perspective on the Social War and the *excursus* Velleius dedicates to Roman colonisation in the first book of his work (1.14–16) see Gabba (1962) 5 and Russo (2008b). Gabba notes that no mention is made of the wars which Rome was waging against the many peoples that were later received into her body of citizens. Similarly, Velleius does not even record the alliances Rome entered into with many Italian populations, perhaps because the Roman-Italian confederation must have signified to Velleius or his source 'una condizione di sudditanza o almeno di inferiorità'. For Velleius, colonisation (no matter whether Latin or Roman: Velleius sometimes does not even specify which type he is speaking of), along with the granting of citizenship, contributes to the grandeur of Rome. But it is to the theme of the granting of citizenship that Velleius devotes particular attention, as demonstrated by the passage under discussion, 2.15.2.

<sup>14</sup> E.g. Liv. *praef.* 10.

<sup>15</sup> The 'etymologisation' seems original to Velleius, at least to judge from Maltby (1991) 224 (s.v. 'fastidio' and 'fastus'(2)), but the common *fas-* (~ 'fastus') makes it easy.

<sup>16</sup> Gabba (1962) 6–7.

<sup>17</sup> Gabba (1962) 5.

In truth, without any doubt, that which most founded our empire and increased the name of the Roman people is the fact that Romulus, the first creator of this city, taught, through the treaty with the Sabines, that this state must be increased even by receiving enemies. By his authority and example, largesse and sharing of citizenship was never intermitted by our ancestors.

In Velleius it is especially important to underline the Italians' use of the concept of their consanguinity with the Romans ('of the same ... blood') to justify their request for citizenship, because *consanguinitas* is the principal ideological ground on which they base their claim.<sup>18</sup> Naturally, we may wonder whether the mention of the kinship between Italians and Romans is a rhetorical invention on Velleius' part, exemplifying the acknowledged freedom of ancient historians in the composition of speech material,<sup>19</sup> or whether this particular use of the concept of kinship reflects a genuine Italian perspective on their relationships with the Romans at the time of the Social War. But several other sources (including ones that are independent from Velleius) confirm the existence of a non-Roman—or at least philo-Italian—tradition in which the relationship between Romans and Italians was depicted as one of kinship and in which there is an interesting parallel for Pontius' Samnite perspective as represented in Velleius 2.27.2. This brings us to our next section.

### 3. Roman-Italian Kinship in Other Greek and Roman Historical Writers and in Other Political and Military Contexts

To begin with, Appian (*BC* 1.1.9) attributes the concept of Roman-Italian kinship to the tribune Tiberius Gracchus (133 BC):<sup>20</sup>

Τιβέριος Σεμπρόνιος Γράκχος, ἀνὴρ ἐπιφανὴς καὶ λαμπρὸς ἐς φιλοτιμίαν εἶπεῖν τε δυνατώτατος καὶ ἐκ τῶνδε ὁμοῦ πάντων γνωριμώτατος ἅπασι, δημαρχῶν ἐσεμνολόγησε περὶ τοῦ Ἰταλικοῦ γένους ὡς εὐπολεμωτάτου τε καὶ συγγενοῦς φθειρομένου δὲ κατ' ὀλίγον εἰς ἀπορίαν καὶ ὀλιγανδρίαν καὶ οὐδὲ ἐλπίδα ἔχοντος ἐς διόρθωσιν.

<sup>18</sup> The force of the phrase 'of the same race' is a different matter, which I discuss below, pp. 238–9.

<sup>19</sup> For recent discussion of the problems of speeches in ancient historiography see Foster (2012).

<sup>20</sup> For this evidence of kinship, see Martin (2001), esp. 76.

Tiberius Sempronius Gracchus, an illustrious man, brilliant as regards ambition, and a most powerful speaker, and for these reasons together most well known of all to all, delivered an eloquent discourse as tribune, concerning the Italian race, as being very valiant in war and being kindred but wasting away little by little into destitution and paucity of numbers and not having even a hope for rectification.

According to some scholars,<sup>21</sup> it is impossible that Tiberius was alluding to the Italians, on the ground that his policy was never (at least explicitly) favourable to the allies; for this reason, it is argued, we should think of a problematic mention of the Romans, hidden behind the reference to the Italians. I have already discussed this problem elsewhere.<sup>22</sup> It is sufficient here to underline the fact that, for obvious reasons, Appian is *undoubtedly representing* Tiberius Gracchus as speaking of the Italians: not only is the praise of their military virtue typical of the traditional depiction of Italians' distinctive features in Greek and Latin sources, but also the fact that they are indicated as 'kindred' decisively excludes any possible reference to the Romans:<sup>23</sup> how is it possible to define Romans as 'kindred' of the Romans? How is it possible to 'hide' 'Romans' behind 'Italians'?

It is true that there remains a problem in the apparent inconsistency between Tiberius' alleged concern for the Italians and his actual policies, which were certainly, in many respects, unfavourable to the Italian élites. Modern scholars<sup>24</sup> have generally tried to resolve this problem by arguing that Tiberius' policies did in fact have specific philo-Italian features. However this may be, the crucial immediate point is that a survey of Appian's narrative of the Gracchan period and of the Social War shows that the Roman-Italian or Roman-Latin kinship is mentioned only twice: in the passage above and in a speech attributed to Gaius Gracchus (1.3.23). It cannot be accidental that evidence of the kinship concept occurs only in the words—or reported words—of the two Gracchi.

As I have tried to demonstrate elsewhere,<sup>25</sup> it is likely that in the passage concerning Tiberius Gracchus, Appian reproduces a particular aspect of the later Gracchan philo-Italian propaganda: the second of the two Gracchi, in

<sup>21</sup> Badian (1958) 169; id. (1972), esp. 700–2; Nagle (1970); a different perspective in Schochat (1970).

<sup>22</sup> Russo (2010b).

<sup>23</sup> Gabba (1956) 48.

<sup>24</sup> See the exhaustive bibliography in Russo (2010b).

<sup>25</sup> Russo (2010b).

order to provide a more positive picture of Tiberius' attitude towards the Italians (who constituted, as the Latins, an important part of Gaius' policy agenda)<sup>26</sup> invented a tradition which attributed to his brother a concern for the Italians.<sup>27</sup> The appeal to the Roman-Italian kinship would have been perfectly functional for this purpose. The tradition itself was made up of themes and concepts originally formulated in the Italian *milieu*. On this evidence, too, therefore, kinship with the Romans represented for the Italians a usable and adaptable ideological concept, and one available before the Social War (the context in which, as we have seen, Velleius locates it). There is here the important additional factor that Roman-Italian kinship is being used for political ends by a Roman: formally, Tiberius Gracchus, in reality (as we have seen) his younger brother Gaius, and obviously with some expectation of a favourable response from the Roman people, even though in the event that expectation proved false.

Another passage from Appian is interesting (*Samm.* 5):

καὶ ἐπὶ τοῖσδε τὸν πόλεμον τόνδε ἄσπονδον καὶ ἀκήρυκτον ἐψηφίσασθε, κατ' ἀνδρῶν ποτὲ φίλων, κατὰ Σαβίνων ἐκγόνων τῶν ὑμῖν συνοικούντων. Ἔνεκα μὲν οὖν τῆς ὑμετέρας πλεονεξίας ἔδει καὶ τὰ παρ' ἡμῶν ὑμῖν ἄσπονδα εἶναι. ἐγὼ νέμεσίν τε θεῶν αἰδούμενος, ἣν ὑμεῖς ὑπερείδεσθε, καὶ συγγενείας καὶ φιλίας τῆς ποτὲ μνημονεύων, δίδωμι ἕκαστον ὑμῶν σὺν ἱματίῳ σῶον ὑπὸ ζυγὸν ἀπελθεῖν, ἣν ὁμόσητε τῆν τε γῆν καὶ τὰ χωρία πάνθ' ἡμῖν ἀποδώσειν, καὶ τοὺς κληρούχους ἀπὸ τῶν πόλεων ἀπάξειν, καὶ μηδέ ποτ' ἐπὶ Σαυνίτας στρατεύσειν.

And in addition to this you decreed this treaty-less and herald-less war against men who were once your friends, against Sabines who are descendants of those who lived together with you. So on account of your greed for more our behaviour also to you ought to have been treaty-less. But I, having respect for punishment from the gods, which you despised, and mindful of our kinship and former friendship, grant each one of you to depart under the yoke safely with your cloak, if you swear to give back to us all the land and places and take away

<sup>26</sup> According to Gabba (1956) 79–88, the 'Italian concept' represents an important feature of several of Gaius' policies, at least in Appian's slant on the subject; *contra*, Cuff (1967); see also Massa (1996) 69 n. 183; cf. below, pp. 244–5.

<sup>27</sup> According to Sordi (1976) 327–30, Appian, in the narrative of the Gracchan period, used among other sources the *liber* that Gaius wrote and dedicated to Pomponius. Gaius' work is mentioned by Cicero (*De Div.* 2.29.62) and by Plutarch (*Gracchi* 8.9), who used it in his *Life*; similarly, Fortlage (1971–2); see also Badian (1958) 170–1.

your colonists from the cities, and never to wage war against the Samnites again.

This passage clarifies the grounds of the claim of *consanguinitas* in Italian ideology in a historical context much earlier than the Social War, that of the Caudine Forks of 321.<sup>28</sup> The Samnites, through their leader Pontius, here reject the Romans' requests, citing the memory of how the latter, heedless of the kindred bonds that existed between the Sabines and the Samnites, and between the Sabines and the Romans themselves, on more than one occasion did not hesitate to betray the Samnites and plunder and lay waste their lands. Pontius' words constitute a defence of Italian requests and a precise accusation against the Romans: in order to increase their dominion over Italy, the Romans brutally undertook a relentless war against those whom they once considered allies, and most importantly, those who were the descendants of the Sabines, who shared close political ties as one community with the Romans (*συννοικούντων* ~ *sunoikesis*). Thus, the Romans and the Samnites share, from Pontius' point of view, their origin from the Sabines, and on this basis they can be considered 'kindred'.<sup>29</sup>

Pontius' speech has of course been claimed by some scholars as fictional, and invented under the influence of the climate of propaganda of the first half of the 1st century. Some retrospective colouring from the period of the Social War is no doubt plausible, and consistent with one the main ways in which ancient historical writers represented the past and ancient people generally thought of it. We may even here specifically hypothesise a 'Pontian family tradition', in view of the similar sentiments attributed to the Samnite Pontius of the Caudine Forks and the Samnite Pontius of the Social War.<sup>30</sup> But such retrospective colouring is not sufficient to invalidate the basic tradition, which is by no means isolated: ancient historical sources record various and precise stories concerning the genealogical link between Sabines and Samnites<sup>31</sup> on the one hand, and between Sabines and Romans on the other.<sup>32</sup> The notion of Italian-Roman kinship was founded on ancient tradi-

<sup>28</sup> Gabba (1956) 48; Giardina (1997) 21.

<sup>29</sup> For this passage see also Russo (2007) 56.

<sup>30</sup> Cf. e.g. Drummond (2012).

<sup>31</sup> For instance, according to Strabo (5.4.12), the Samnites derived from the Sabines through a *ver sacrum*. For analysis of this passage, see Russo (2007) 8. For the practice of the sacred spring, see Heurgon (1957); Martin (1973); Tagliamonte (1994) 55–68.

<sup>32</sup> For the ethnic relationships between Samnites–Sabines–Romans, see Poucet (1963), esp. 159–63; Letta (1984); (1985); Musti (1985) 77–86; cf. also Cic. *Pro Balbo* 31; cf. above, pp. 235–6.

tions which already existed at least at the end of the 4th century BC.<sup>33</sup> Therefore, Pontius' speech may reasonably be taken to illustrate an available Italian perspective in the 4th century, whereby knowledge of the mythological bonds which linked Romans and Italians (or some of the Italian populations) through the Sabine element was deployed in political negotiations with the Romans.

Roman historical memory of course conceded the basic facts. For example, it seems that Cato the Elder affirmed the Samnites' origin by Sabines (Just. 20.1.14), and Cato must have recorded the Sabines' contribution to Rome, not only because they gave Rome two kings, but also because they provided Rome with the *mores* which formed the basis of her superiority over other tribes and nations.<sup>34</sup> On a diplomatic level, however, the picture was very different. When Italians corporately sued for Roman citizenship, whether on the basis of a general consanguinity, or on the basis of the more specific Samnite-Sabine connexion, their requests were regularly unsuccessful.<sup>35</sup> Even as late as the Social War, among the reasons which persuaded the Romans corporately to grant citizenship (and other benefits) to the Italians, there is no trace of the concept of Roman-Italian kinship. There were, however, other diplomatic contexts, where the requests that Italians were making were less radical, or where it was more obviously in Rome's interest to accede to them, in which the Romans did respond to Italian appeals to kinship or some other sense of common-ness. It is to these cases that we now turn.

#### **4. The Case of the Mamertines; *Homophylia* in Greece and the *Homophylia* of Italy in the Punic Wars**

At the time of the First Punic War, the Mamertines, an Italian people from Campania who had established themselves as brigands and pirates in Mes-sana in Sicily,<sup>36</sup> sought outside support against the Greek tyrant Hieron II of Syracuse, though they disagreed as to where the support should come from. One party of Mamertines appealed to the Carthaginians, the other to the Romans. The latter appeal was successful. What was its basis?<sup>37</sup>

<sup>33</sup> On these traditions, see Russo (2007).

<sup>34</sup> Letta (1984).

<sup>35</sup> See in general Mouritsen (1998) 153–71.

<sup>36</sup> Tagliamonte (1994).

<sup>37</sup> Brief recent discussion: Prag (2010) 183–5.

Although the versions which the historical sources have supplied us of the aid that the Romans gave to the Mamertines are particularly problematic, one element clearly emerges: the claimed *homophylia* (ὁμοφυλία) between Romans and Mamertines. According to Polybius (1.10.2), the Mamertines who appealed to Rome ‘handed the city over to them and asked them to help them as *homophyloi* (ὁμόφυλοι)’. What is this alleged *homophylia* between Romans and Mamertines? As Mamertines came from Capua, and Capua had alleged Trojan origins (in legend Rhomos, Aeneas’s son, founded the city and called it Capua by the name of Capys, a Trojan hero),<sup>38</sup> so it has been supposed<sup>39</sup> that in order to obtain the help of Rome the pro-Roman Mamertines appealed to their Trojan origins.

As we shall see, claimed Trojan origin did play an important role in some Italian and Latin claims of kinship with Rome and in some cases where the Romans responded positively.<sup>40</sup> But we may wonder if this supplies a sufficiently strong ground in this particular case. For we must remember the immediately problematic situation of the Mamertines, who had behaved treacherously to the Romans both at Messene and at Rhegium (Pol. 1.10.4): how could the Romans acknowledge *any* ‘kinship’ with them? Moreover, if the allusion were to common Trojan origin, we should have expected to find in Polybius’ text the term *syngeneia* and not *homophylia*. Is it possible, as some scholars argue, that the idea of *homophylia* corresponded completely to the concept of kinship? Was there then a simple semantic overlap between the two terms?<sup>41</sup>

Before analysing the basic Greek sources in the Greek context, a methodological point may be made: as a working hypothesis, the simultaneous use of these words should be considered neither pleonastic nor synonymous. On the contrary, it suggests that there should be a precise semantic distinction between them. Polybius’ own usage further supports this. He uses the concept of *homophylia* widely, but asserts programmatically that he will not speak (9.1.4) *περὶ τὰς ἀποικίας καὶ κτίσεις καὶ συγγενείας*—‘about colonies, foundations and kinships’. For Polybius, therefore, the two concepts immediately seem to be different. It is interesting that the Greek imperial historian Cassius Dio (Zon. 8.8.4, p. 144), evidently following Polybius, offers the following gloss: *οἷα σφίσι προσήκοντας* (‘as being related to them’), which again seems to represent something less than *syngeneia*. It is also interesting that in the important passage of Velleius which we have already discussed, concern-

<sup>38</sup> D. Hal. *A.R.* 1.73.3; Heurgon (1942) 143–5.

<sup>39</sup> Perret (1942) 309; Pinzone (1983) 95.

<sup>40</sup> Cf. below, p. 243.

<sup>41</sup> Cf. my earlier discussion of these questions in Russo (2010a) 74–9.

ing Italian perception of the causes of the Social War (2.15.2),<sup>42</sup> Velleius describes the Italians as being ‘both of the same race *and* of the same blood’, thus implying a distinction in the corresponding Latin terminology.

Analysis of the basic Greek sources supports this picture. Famously, according to Herodotus (8.144), *homophylia* (ὁμοφυλία) constituted the essential component of Greek identity (τὸ Ἑλληνικόν), since it was shared by all the Greeks.<sup>43</sup> A passage in one of the spurious decrees attached to the *De Corona* of Demosthenes (18.186) mentions the two concepts: ‘In addition, the people of Athens regard the people of Thebes as in no way alien either in kinship or in nationality’ (οὔτε τῇ συγγενείᾳ οὔτε τῷ ὁμοφύλῳ). The idea of kinship is expressed clearly by the term *syngeneia*, whereas (again) the term *homophylia* indicates something different, evidently a more generic similarity.<sup>44</sup> A passage in Plutarch (*Aristid.* 16.2–3) suggests this same distinction of meaning: ‘they will not fight with men of the same tribes and kindreds (ὁμοφύλους καὶ συγγενεῖς), but rather with barbarians and natural enemies’ (βαρβάρους καὶ φύσει πολεμίους). If ὁμοφύλους and συγγενεῖς were synonymous, their juxtaposition would (again) be redundant and illogical. So we must suppose a distinction of meaning between the two terms, in exactly the same way as applies to βαρβάρους and πολεμίους, which are obviously not synonymous. The structure of the phrases indicates that the disposition of the terms was not casual, but creates a precise sequence of concepts, organised in a crescendo of intensity. The term *homophylia* evidently indicates something less strong than *syngeneia*, but what?

A clue is provided by Plato’s discussion of slaves (*Laws* 6.777b-d): slaves do not have to be of the same nation, they do not have to speak the same language, and they may be of different races (μήτε πατριώτας ... ἀσυμφώνους ... ὁμόφυλοι). Plato here provides us with a possible meaning of *homophylos*: being part of the same civic framework and speaking the same language.

To clarify the meaning of *homophylia* more precisely, we need to focus on the later Greek use of the concept of *homophylia* (or of its opposite, *allophylia*) within the Roman context. It might be objected that it is not methodologically correct to compare the Greek and Roman contexts, because of the chronological and, even more, the cultural differences between the two. In response, we may insist that both Polybius and the later Latin sources hold the same semantic difference between kinship and *homophylia*, as it was established in the Greek classical tradition, and also attribute to the concept of *homophylia* essentially the same meaning as it already had in Greek usage in

<sup>42</sup> See above, p. 231.

<sup>43</sup> Discussion: Konstan (2001).

<sup>44</sup> Cf. also Loraux (1987).

the Greek context—‘belonging to the same race’, although with some natural and obvious small semantic changes due to the new Roman context.

For example, Polybius (3.61.5) defines the Punic soldiers as *allophyloi* (ἀλλόφυλοι), and praises Hannibal, because his army, though it was ethnically composite, never revolted (11.19.3–4): ‘though he employed regiments which were not only not of the same tribe but not even of the same race. For he had Libyans, Iberians, Ligurians, Celts, Phoenicians, Italians, and Greeks, to whom neither law, nor custom, nor speech, nor anything else was common by nature to one another’. Polybius provides us with a clear explanation of the meaning of the concept of *homophylia*: οἷς οὐ νόμος, οὐκ ἔθος, οὐ λόγος, οὐχ ἕτερον οὐδὲν ἦν κοινὸν ἐκ φύσεως πρὸς ἀλλήλους. If *homophylia* implies speaking the same language, *allophylia*, in contrast, should have exactly the opposite meaning, speaking different languages or having different habits, and this would confirm the strong cultural connotation of these words. The reference to the use of a different language emerges also in Polybius 23.13.1, where he speaks of the numerous languages used by Punic soldiers, defined once again as *allophyloi* and *heteroglottoi*. Polybius therefore makes exactly the same connexion between terms as does Plato.

In the Latin tradition, the term *alienigena* corresponds to the Greek *allophylia*. As in Polybius, where the Hannibalic army is defined as *allophylos*, so in Livy it is defined as *alienigena*, with a perfect lexical, as well as semantic, correspondence.<sup>45</sup> Compare the words attributed to Vibius Virrius by Livy 26.13.7: *cum hostis alienigena in Italia esset et Hannibal hostis* (‘when an alien enemy was in Italy, and that enemy was Hannibal’). The ideological implications are spelled out in Livy 28.12.3–4 (where Livy is partly ‘riffing’ on Polybius 11.19.3–4 quoted above):

exercitu non suo ciuili sed mixto ex conlutione omnium gentium, quibus non lex, non mos, non lingua communis, alius habitus, alia vestis, alia arma, alii ritus, alia sacra, alii prope dii essent ...

having an army which was not his own nor composed of citizens but mixed up from the offscourings of all nations, to whom neither law, nor custom, nor language was common, whose appearance was different, clothing different, weapons different, rites different, sacred things different, almost their gods different ...

Livy provides here a clear understanding of the concept of *alienigena* or *allophylia*, which has a specifically cultural connotation, concerning cultural

<sup>45</sup> On the term *alienigena* in the anti-Hannibalic propaganda, see Urso (1994).

facts, such as language, laws, or customs. For both Livy and Polybius, the principal characteristic of the Hannibalic army is its heterogeneous character.

The polemics about the concept of *alienigena* in the context of the Second Punic War emerge even more forcefully in the speech to the inhabitants of Capua that Livy attributes, after the defeat of Cannae in 216, to Gaius Terentius Varro (23.5.11):

Poenus hostis, ne Africae quidem indigena, ab ultimis terrarum oris, freto Oceani Herculisque columnis, expertem omnis iuris et conditionis et linguae prope humanae militem trahit.

A Punic enemy, not even a native of Africa, is dragging after him from the farthest shores of the earth, from the strait of Ocean and the Pillars of Hercules, a soldiery unacquainted with all law and organization and almost of human language.

Hannibal and his soldiers are stateless: they are foreign in Italy, they are foreign even in Africa; they are utter barbarians and almost sub-human. In the same passage, Varro stresses the difference between the usual Italian enemies of Rome, such as the Etruscans or Samnites, and Hannibal. We may note also the Roman rejection (here pointed up by the explicit allusion to the Pillars of Hercules) of Hannibal's self-representation as a latter-day Hercules.<sup>46</sup> He here appears as the polar opposite of Hercules the civiliser.

We have yet further evidence of the semantic value of the *alienigena/allophylia* concept from the Roman perspective: in 212 BC two *carmina* ('prophecies'), by a *vates* ('seer') named Marcius, were read in Rome<sup>47</sup> in which the Hannibalic army is defined (25.12.5) as *alienigena* and (25.12.9) as *vomica quae gentium venit longe* ('the boil which has come from far-off tribes'). This particular aspect of anti-Hannibalic propaganda emerges also in the prophecy read in 205 BC (Livy 29.10.4): 'when an alien enemy had brought war upon the land of Italy, he could expelled from Italy and defeated, if the Idaean Mother had been brought from Pessinus to Rome'.

In all this Roman material, it is of course an important implication that all populations living in Italy were bonded by a certain degree of common ethnicity and that the Hannibalic campaign was a war not just against

<sup>46</sup> DeWitt (1941).

<sup>47</sup> Russo (2005).

Rome, but against all Italy.<sup>48</sup> Italian populations, united by their common belonging to Italy, under the leadership of Rome oppose the *alienigena* Hannibal, to defend Roman as well as Italian freedom. This implication often finds explicit expression, as in the prophecy of 205 BC. There is the fear that all Italy would become ‘a province of Africa’ (Liv. 24.47.5). Similarly, in Livy 23.5.13, the consul asserts that for those who are born in Italy it would be intolerable *iura petere* (‘to seek laws’) from Carthage and to permit Italy to become *Numidarum ac Maurorum provincia* (‘the province of Numidians and Moors’). We can now clearly see the fundamental difference between the Italian side, led by Rome, and the Punic side, led by Hannibal: on the Italian side we have a *homophylos* army, formed by soldiers who fight to save their common homeland, Italy; on the Punic side, an *allophylos* army, formed by soldiers of every race, who cannot fight for a homeland because they do not have one, and who, above all, have no right to Italy. The basic factor that unites Romans and Italians is the most basic of all: residence on the same territory, or, in effect, autochthony.<sup>49</sup>

The same themes were also adopted by Cato, whose *Origines* recalls the propaganda applied by Rome to unite the Italian front against Hannibal,<sup>50</sup> thereby again stressing the importance of the idea of Italy in Roman anti-Hannibalic propaganda (Gell. 2.6.7):

M. Catonis verba sunt ex oratione, quam de Achaeis scripsit: ‘Cumque Hannibal terram Italianam laceraret atque vexaret’; ‘vexatam’ Italianam dixit Cato ab Hannibale, quando nullum calamitatis aut saevitiae aut immanitatis genus reperiri queat, quod in eo tempore Italia non perpressa sit.

Marcus Cato’s words, in the speech which he wrote on the Achaeans: ‘And when Hannibal was rending and harrying the land of Italy’. Cato said that Italy was ‘harried’ by Hannibal, when no *genus* of disaster or of cruelty or of savagery can be discovered which Italy<sup>51</sup> did not suffer to the extreme in that time.

<sup>48</sup> On the concept of *terra Italia*, Catalano (1961–2); (1971); (1978); Mazzarino (1966) 211–32; Brizzi (1987); Valvo (1997); recently: Harris (2007); Russo (2008a); on the concept of *Italia* in Roman international relationships, see Russo (2010a).

<sup>49</sup> On the idea of autochthony see Loraux (1996).

<sup>50</sup> Letta (2007).

<sup>51</sup> For Cato, the term ‘Italy’ at the time of the Hannibalic war meant the territory between the Alps and the Strait of Messina; Mazzarino (1966) 211.

Cato adopted the ideological climate of the Hannibalic period, inserting it into a complex structure of genealogical relationships between Rome and other Italian peoples. The fragment elegantly asserts the ‘genealogical’ unity of Italy against the barbarous, ‘degenerate’, ‘inhuman’, ‘genus’ of evils unleashed upon it by the alien Hannibal.

With all this comparative material, we may now return to the Roman-Mamertine *homophylia*. Another passage from Cassius Dio (II.43.6) clarifies the reason why the Romans agreed to help the Mamertines: in the words of the Roman general involved, it was διὰ τὸ γένος αὐτῶν τῆς Ἰταλίας ὄν: ‘because of their γένος being from Italy’. The primary allusion here no doubt is to Italy in the narrow sense, but it may also be relevant that at the time of the First Punic War and before the reduction of Sicily to the status of a province, Sicily—especially northeast Sicily—could be conceptualised as a part of Italy.<sup>52</sup> Thus the consul C. Cotta was able to take *auspicia* in Messana (252 BC), because, thanks to the presence of the Mamertines, this city was part of Italy (Val. Max. 2.7.4). In any event, the Romans helped the pro-Roman Mamertines because of their Italian origin, a relationship expressed not by the concept of *syngeneia*, but by the idea of *homophylia*, founded on the basic idea of *Italia*. This looks like a pre-echo of the propaganda of the Second Punic War. Against the threat of Carthage, *homophylia* played a primary role in defining the Roman and Italian front against an enemy perceived as ‘Barbarian’ or ‘Other’ (*allophylos*).<sup>53</sup>

## 5. Roman-Italian Consanguinity Based on Common Trojan Origins: the Punic Wars

We turn now to another category of interaction between Roman and Italians in the same context, that of the First Punic War, and in the year 263 BC. Cassius Dio, as excerpted by Zonaras 8.9, tells us that alliance between Segesta and Rome was proposed by Segesta and accepted by Rome.<sup>54</sup> In response, the Romans enhanced the *cognatio* (‘kinship’; the Latin term is the equivalent of *syngeneia*) between themselves and the Segestans (Cicero, *In Verrem*, 4.72, cf. also *In Verrem* 2.5.83), and they did so because of their common Trojan origins.<sup>55</sup> The concept of common Trojan origins by-passes the spe-

<sup>52</sup> See recently Russo (2008a).

<sup>53</sup> Cf. also Pinzone (1983) 95.

<sup>54</sup> Discussion: Giardina (1997) 21–4; Prag (2010) 186–9.

<sup>55</sup> For the Trojan origins of Segesta and the exploitation of the Trojan myth during the Hannibalic period, see recently Chirassi Colombo (2006). On the political value of the Trojan myth in Rome, see in general Gabba (1976) 84–101; Erskine (2003) 165–205;

cific question of Roman-Italian connections. In context, it represents another example of Rome embracing, in the years of the conflict with the Carthaginians, a particular type of propaganda devised to meld around Rome the multiplicity of the Italian peoples, through the adoption of a variety of ideas and concepts. For, as we have seen, already at this period Sicily could be considered as part of ‘Italy’.

## 6. The Concept of Kinship between Romans and Latins

So far we have considered use of the concept of kinship in a range of Roman-Italian relationships. But the concept also had a function in the more specific category of Roman-Latin relationships.

Let us first look at some concrete cases before exploring their rationale in more detail.

A crucial initial passage comes from Appian’s *De Legationibus*, cited in the Suda s. v. ἔνσπονδος. In the year 498, the Latins, although in a state of treaty with the Romans, made a campaign against them: οἱ δὲ Λατῖνοι ἐγκλήματα εἰς Ῥωμαίους ἐποιοῦντο τήν τε πάρεσιν αὐτῶν τήν ἐπὶ σφᾶς ὄντας ἐνσπόνδους καὶ συγγενεῖς (‘the Latins made accusations against the Romans, including their neglect of them, although they were in a state of treaty and were kindred’). It is interesting to see how deeply rooted the idea of ‘moral rectitude’ towards the Romans was in the Latins who, unlike the Romans, respected the bonds of kinship between the two peoples. As in Pontius’ words in Appian’s *Saunitika*,<sup>56</sup> the theme of *cognatio* becomes a means to discredit the Romans’ behaviour towards their sister populations.

Again, according to Livy (8.5.4–5), in 340 BC Annius Setinus, Latin legate, invoked the idea of Latin-Roman kinship before the Roman Senate. Livy has Annius assert that though the Latins could have resorted to arms to obtain the freedom of Latium, they accepted *foedus* in the name of their kinship with the Romans:

Sed quoniam vos regno impotenti finem ut imponatis non inducitis in animum, nos, quamquam armis possumus adserere Latium in libertatem, consanguinitati tamen hoc dabimus ut condiciones pacis feramus aequas utrisque, quoniam vires quoque aequari dis immortalibus placuit.

---

and Battistoni (2010) 113. Note in *In Verrem* 2.5.83 the mention of another Sicilian city, Centuripae, which can also affirm Trojan *cognatio* with Rome.

<sup>56</sup> Cf. above, p. 235.

But since *you* cannot induce your minds to put an end to your overpowering desire for sovereignty, *we*, though we have the power to assert Latium's claim to freedom by force of arms, will nevertheless concede this much to consanguinity: to tolerate conditions of peace equitable to both sides, since it has pleased the immortal gods that our strength too should be equal.

Like Pontius' speech in Appian,<sup>57</sup> this episode is often considered a transposition into the past of an Italian legation sent to Rome before the outbreak of the Social War. We might then surmise that an annalist of that period, under the influence of the political climate of his own times, described an event that had occurred many centuries before, anachronistically projecting on to the Latins of the 4th century BC the requests of the Italians of the 1st century.<sup>58</sup> No doubt, as with Pontius' speech, there is *some* retrospective colouring, but (again) this does not suffice to invalidate the essential historicity. For we must emphasise that the Latins' demand (Livy 8.5.6) for half of the senate and a consul is more consistent with the events of 340 BC than with the climate of the 1st century BC, when the Italians' requests were different (as we have seen from Velleius 2.15). Nor in 91 could the Latins remotely claim equal strength with the Romans. These considerations, and the high number of attestations of the use of this concept, allow us to conclude that this particular kind of diplomatic instrument was already valid far before the 1st century BC. Thus, from the Latin point of view, kinship with the Romans had an important political value from very early times.

As in Pontius' words, in this case, too, the allies stigmatise Roman imperialism against them as an injustice: the Romans, because of the blood relationships they had with the Latins, should desist from the recourse to violence against their 'brothers'. These same blood bonds between Romans and Latins induce Annius Setinus on his side to prefer a peaceful agreement to armed intervention against Rome. Interestingly also, Annius' Latin claim, like Pontius' Samnite claim, involves an inversion of Roman claims: the Roman association with 'power' ('Roma' ~ *ῥώμη*)<sup>59</sup> is doubly contested: by their own 'overpowering' desire for sovereignty (which 'overpowers' them) and by the 'equal power' of the 'Latins' (whose own name, piquantly, can be associated with *rejection* of 'power').<sup>60</sup>

<sup>57</sup> See above, p. 235.

<sup>58</sup> Dipersia (1975).

<sup>59</sup> Maltby (1991) 530–1.

<sup>60</sup> Moles (2007) 172.

The Latins' insistence on *consanguinitas* with the Romans is not accidental: Latins claimed to have a 'stronger bond' with Rome than the other Italian populations, and therefore, to have a greater right to obtain Roman citizenship or other kinds of privileges. The words of another discourse attributed to Gaius Gracchus in 122 BC indicate a similar perception (Appian, *BC* 1.3.23):<sup>61</sup>

καὶ τοὺς Λατίνους ἐπὶ πάντα ἐκάλει τὰ Ῥωμαίων, ὡς οὐκ εὐπρεπῶς συγγενέσι τῆς βουλῆς ἀντιστήναι δυναμένης, τῶν τε ἐτέρων συμμάχων, οἷς οὐκ ἐξῆν ψῆφον ἐν ταῖς Ῥωμαίων χειροτονίαις φέρειν, ἐδίδου φέρειν ἀπὸ τοῦδε ἐπὶ τῷ ἔχειν καὶ τοῦσδε ἐν ταῖς χειροτονίαις τῶν νόμων αὐτῶ συντελοῦντας.

He summoned the Latins to everything characteristic of the Romans, on the grounds that the Senate could not fittingly stand in the way of their kindred, and as regards the other allies, to whom it was not allowed to vote in the Romans' elections, he sought to give the right to vote from this point on, with a view to having them too counted on his side in the votings for his laws.

Gaius here clearly distinguishes the situation of the Latins, whom he urges to request complete Roman citizenship by virtue of their *syngeneia* with the Romans, from that of the other Italian populations, for whom he requests only the right to vote, evidently because they do not have the same *syngeneia*. *Syngeneia* has here a very strong political value, since it is the principal reason why the Roman Senate should not deny the Latins' request. It is also interesting and important that Gaius stresses that it would not be 'decent' or 'fitting' (πρέπον, 'decens') for the Senate to oppose the Latins' request: this shows that Gaius could appeal to some sense of obligation on the Senate's part regarding this issue (although of course such a sense did not prevail until the aftermath of the Social War and even then was not officially acknowledged by Rome). We have seen him making a similar, though less radical, appeal to the Roman People.<sup>62</sup>

Another example of Latin appeal to *consanguinitas* between Latins and Romans is mentioned by Plutarch in his *Life of Romulus* (29.3–4); the historical context is the aftermath of the Gallic Sack: 'Livius Postumius ... stationed his army not far from Rome, and sent a herald saying that the Latins wished to rekindle their ancient affinity and kinship, now dying, by new in-

<sup>61</sup> On this passage, see recently (with further bibliography) Russo (2010b).

<sup>62</sup> See above, pp. 233–4.

termarriages between the two intermingled peoples' (βούλεσθαι λέγων τοὺς Λατίνους ἐκλιποῦσαν ἤδη τὴν παλαιὰν οἰκειότητα καὶ συγγένειαν ἐκζωπυρῆσαι, καιναῖς αὐθις ἀνακραθέντων ἐπιγαμίαις τῶν γενῶν).

This episode brings out the basic ground for Latin claims of consanguinity with Rome: original intermarriage. Elsewhere, Plutarch quotes another *aition* of *Poplifugia* (*Camillus* 33.3–10), where the Latins ask for Roman women to marry, in order to repeat an ancient mix between these two people. This version of the origins of *Poplifugia* is accepted by the Roman polymath and historian Varro (*LL* 6.31.18), so that we have here another case of a prominent Roman in effect accepting consanguinity between Romans and Italians. Significantly, however, Varro here omits specific allusion to *consanguinitas*, presumably because in this case not only the Latins, but also the *Ficuleates*, *Fidenates* et *finitimi alii* are treating with Rome. From the Latin perspective the concept of kindred should have been valid only for themselves, not for the other peoples, and the same applied to the Roman perspective on those occasions where Romans accepted the Latin claim. In other traditions, concerning *Tusci* (L. Calpurnius Piso Frugi, *HRR* I<sup>2</sup> F 43 = *FRH* 7 F 45), or *Galli* (Ovid, *AA* 2.258; Aristides of Miletus, *FGrHist* 286 F 1), there is no trace of *consanguinitas*, presumably because it could not be regarded as applicable to these populations.

There existed, indeed, an undeniably special position for the Latins among the Italian allies in relation to Rome: even more than cities such as Segesta or Centuripae, they were part of the Trojan saga of the mythical origins of Rome. As we know, at the end of the 4th century BC, with the dissolution of the Latin League, Rome began to use the myth of Aeneas in Latium more regularly, associating it with the traditions of her origins.<sup>63</sup> The insertion of the figure of Aeneas into the 'Latium' line of the origins of the city caused more than a few *aporiae* within the new tradition of the origins of the city, precisely because of the meeting of the two nuclei which had previously been kept separate. The Latins, like the Trojans, therefore became an element—albeit a contested element—within the variegated ethnic mix which formed the origins of the city.

## 7. Roman Response to Latin Claims of Roman-Latin Kinship

How did the Romans *respond* on the diplomatic level to official Latin claims of Roman-Latin kinship? A typical example of the Roman response towards

<sup>63</sup> Castagnoli (1967); Galinsky (1969) 68; Ampolo (1992).

this kind of Latin ethnic argument is the irate and indignant answer to Annius Setinus as attributed to T. Manlius by Livy (8.5.8):

et conversus ad simulacrum Iovis, ‘audi, Iuppiter, haec scelera’ inquit; ‘audite, Ius Fasque. peregrinos consules et peregrinum senatum in tuo, Iuppiter, augurato, templo captus atque ipse oppressus visurus es?’

And turning towards the statue of Jupiter, he said: ‘Hear, O Jupiter, these wicked words! Hear them, O Justice and Right! Are you, Jupiter, yourself to be conquered and captive, and to see in your consecrated temple foreign consuls and a foreign senate?’

In the words attributed to Manlius, Latins are *peregrini*, *externi* and *alieni*. The semantic and ideological connection between these words and Velleius’ evidence (2.15) is clear and indubitable: ‘and yet [they] were not admitted to the rights of citizens in the state which, through their efforts, had reached that very height through which it could look down on men both of the same race and of the same blood as if they were foreigners and aliens’. At a corporate and an official level the Romans did not accept the Latins’ claim of common kinship, which from their point of view did not represent a justification for granting citizenship.

### **8. The Evidence of Florus on the Social War; Differences between Florus and Velleius and Appian; Conclusions**

We may appropriately end our survey with the 2nd century AD Roman historian Florus. His narrative of the Social War (26.1–3) follows immediately after his treatment of the career of Livius Drusus, on which he, in contrast to Velleius (2.13.1–3), expresses a very negative judgement (26.1):<sup>64</sup>

Bellum, quod adversus socios gestum est, sociale bellum vocetur licet, ut extenuemus invidiam; si verum tamen volumus, illud civile bellum fuit. quippe cum populus Romanus Etruscos, Latinos Sabinosque sibi miscuerit et unum ex omnibus sanguinem ducat, corpus fecit ex membris et ex omnibus unus est; nec minore flagitio socii intra Italiam quam intra urbem cives rebellabant. itaque cum ius civitatis, quam viribus auxerant, socii iustissime postularent, quam in spem eos

<sup>64</sup> On Drusus and his closeness to the Italians, see Bancalari Molina (1988a) and (1988b).

cupidine dominationis Drusus erexerat, postquam ille domestico scelere oppressus est, eadem fax, quae illum cremavit, socios in arma et expugnationem urbis accendit. quid hac clade tristius? quid calamitosius? cum omne Latium atque Picenum, Etruria omnis atque Campania, postremo Italia contra matrem suam ac parentem urbem conurgerent; cum omne robur fortissimorum fidelissimorumque sociorum sub suis quisque signis haberent municipalia illa prodigia, Poppaedi Marsos et Paelignos, Latinos Afranius, Umbros Plotius, Egnatius Etruscos, Samnium Lucaniamque Telesinus; cum regum et gentium arbiter populus ipsum se regere non posset, ut victrix Asiae et Europae a Corfinio Roma peteretur.

The war which was waged against the allies can be called a war against allies, in order that we extenuate its odium; if, however, we want the truth, that was a war against citizens. For since the Roman people mixed in itself the Etruscans, the Latins and the Sabines, and traces one blood from all of them, it made a body of their members and is one people composed of all these; nor did allies rebel within Italy with less criminality than citizens within the city. And so, although the allies were demanding most justly the rights of citizens in the state which they had made larger by their strength, to which hope Drusus had aroused them through his desire for mastery, after he was crushed by a domestic crime, the same torch which cremated him fired the allies to arms and storming of the city. What was sadder than that disaster? What more calamitous? When all Latium and Picenum, all Etruria and Campania, in short Italy herself, rose together against the city that was her mother and parent; when the whole strength of the most powerful and the most loyal allies each had under their own arms those municipal monsters: Poppaedi the Marsi and Paeligni, Afranius the Latins, Plotius the Umbri, Egnatius the Etruscans, Telesinus Samnium and Lucania; when the people, arbiter of kings and nations, could not rule itself, so that Rome, victor of Asia and Europe, was attacked by Corfinium.

According to Florus, the Italian allies made their demand for citizenship *iustissime*. The echo of Velleius, who had proclaimed the allied cause *iustissima* (2.15.2), is quite clear. Moreover, here, too, as in Velleius, we find the concept of the Italian contribution to the growth of the power of Rome. But although he understands and accepts the reasons why the allies rebelled, Florus cannot justify their action. He defines the war as a civil one and explicitly condemns the allies' recourse to war, focusing more on the negative results of this situation (a social/civil war) than on the causes of the conflict.

And for Florus, it is a civil war because those who fought it were descendants of the populations, Sabines, Latins, Etruscans, who, in Rome's distant past, had been welcomed into the city. Florus here refers to a different kind of kinship between Italians and Romans, which does not correspond to the positions the Italians (or the Latins) expressed in their requests to the Romans. Italians and Romans can be considered kinsmen not because of a common, Sabine origin, but because all the Italian populations were welcomed, in the past, by Rome.

Consequently, an important difference exists between Florus' and Velleius' conception of Roman-Italian kinship: in Florus, kinship between Romans and Italians is not by reason of birth, due to ancient blood bonds. Rather, it arises at the moment in which Rome chooses to welcome different ethnicities into her realm. The kinship is a 'second-degree' bond, born through Roman concessions and, most importantly, valid only from the moment of these concessions. That is why Rome is called *mater ac parens*. Hence Florus condemns the Italians more than the Romans, since, to use the historian's metaphor, the Italians would be stained by their shameful crime akin to 'matricide'.

Florus' position on the issue of consanguinity also contrasts significantly with Appian's. In Florus' case, the decision to wage war against the *mater ac parens* city is attributed to the Italian populations; in Pontius' address in Appian, which, as we have seen, has first-century resonances,<sup>65</sup> blame is attributed to the Romans, not only for breaking their *philia* with the Samnites, but especially for betraying the bonds of kinship (the brotherhood deriving from a common origin) that existed between them and the Samnites. Appian's position, like that of Velleius, is clearly philo-Italian, while Florus, even while he justifies the Italians' requests, assumes a clear Roman or philo-Roman slant. *Consanguinitas*, one of the principal reasons for the Italian propaganda, becomes a weapon against the Italians themselves, who are perceived as responsible for the 'civil' war. It is of great interest to observe how Roman propaganda was able to adopt and adapt to its needs a theme which was often employed by Roman enemies against Rome herself: as once the Romans were blamed for not respecting the kinship with the Italians, so now the Italians are blamed for assaulting their own mother, Rome. Kinship, once again, plays a primary role in the relationships between Romans and Italians, at least on the propagandistic level.

This is not the place to discuss the general problem of Roman ethnic identity and self-perception and of its role in Roman international relation-

<sup>65</sup> See above, p. 235.

ships.<sup>66</sup> Our central concern has been with specific images the Greeks codified in order to manage their diplomacy and which the Italians and the Latins later adapted to their problematic relationships with the Romans. It is a long and complicated story. If history is written by the victors, this history at least gives eloquent voice to the many voices of Rome's Italian and Latin allies. And in the 1st century BC those voices were in fact finally heard. Yet even in the 2nd century AD, when the thus enlarged Roman People had conquered the world, Florus condemned the Italians more than the Romans for the Social War and turned their just claim to consanguinity against them. In this long and bitter quarrel between kindred peoples, Rome had to have the last word.

*University of Konstanz*

FEDERICO RUSSO  
Federico.Russo@uni-konstanz.de

<sup>66</sup> On Roman ethnic identity, see fundamentally Dench (1995) 20–32; ead. (2005) 37–92; for Italian ethnic self-perception, ead. (1997); on ethnicity in early Roman history, see especially Cornell (1997); Farney (2007) 26–38.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ampolo, C. (1992) 'Enea ed Ulisse nel Lazio da Ellanico (*FGrHist* 4 F 84) a Festo (432 L)', *PP* 47: 321–42.
- Badian, E. (1958) *Foreign Clientelae* (Oxford).
- (1972) 'Tiberius Gracchus and the Beginning of Roman Revolution', *ANRW* I.1: 668–731.
- Bancalari Molina, A. (1988a) 'El juramento de fidelidad de los Italicos a Livio Druso. Problemática en torno su autenticidad', *Limes* 1: 115–28.
- (1988b) 'Gli interventi degli Italicici nella lotta politica romana durante il tribunato di Livio Druso', *SCO* 37: 407–37.
- Battistoni, F. (2009) 'Rome, Kinship and Diplomacy', in C. Eilers, ed., *Diplomats and Diplomacy in the Roman World* (*Mnemosyne* Suppl. 304; Leiden and Boston) 73–97.
- (2010) *Parenti dei Romani—Mito Troiano e diplomazia* (Bari).
- Bispham, E. (2011) 'Time for Italy in Velleius Paterculus', in Cowan (2011) 17–57.
- Brizzi, G. (1987) 'L'Appennino e le due Italie', in *Cispadana e letteratura antica*, Atti del Convegno, Imola 1986 (Bologna) 27–72.
- Castagnoli, F. (1967) 'I luoghi connessi con l'arrivo di Enea nel Lazio (Troia, Sol Indiges, Numicus)', *ArchClass* 19: 1–13.
- Catalano, P. (1961–62) 'Appunti sopra il più antico concetto giuridico di Italia', *AAT* 96: 198–228.
- (1971) 'Latinus come sinonimo di Italicus nel linguaggio giuridico e religioso', in *Studi in onore di E. Volterra* 6 (Milano) 799–809.
- (1978) 'Aspetti spaziali del sistema giuridico-religioso romano', *ANRW* II.16.1: 440–553.
- Chirassi Colombo, I. (2006) 'La Sicilia e l'immaginario romano', in P. Anello, G. Martorana, and R. Sammartano, edd., *Ethne e religioni nella Sicilia antica*, Atti del Convegno, Palermo 2000 (Rome) 217–49.
- Cornell, T. J. (1997) 'Ethnicity as a factor in early Roman History', in Cornell and Lomas (1997) 9–22.
- and K. Lomas, edd. (1997) *Gender and Ethnicity in Ancient Italy* (London).
- Cowan, E. (2011) *Velleius Paterculus: Making History* (Swansea and London).
- Cuff, P. J. (1967) 'Prolegomena to a Critical edition of Appian, *B.C. I. The Unity of Chs. 7–53 and the Case Against Asinius Pollio as their Source*', *Historia* 16: 177–88.
- Curty, O. (1994) 'À propos de la syggeneia entre cités', *REG* 107: 698–707.
- (1999) 'La parenté légendaire à l'époque hellénistique: précisions méthodologiques', *Kernos* 13: 167–94.

- D'Aloja, C. (2004) 'Velleio Patercolo e la visione italica tra vecchio e nuovo: temi di antichità romane', in M. Pani, ed., *Epigrafia e territorio, politica e società*, VII (Bari) 213–24.
- Dench, E. (1995) *From Barbarians to New Men: Greek, Roman, and Modern Perceptions of Peoples from the Central Apennines* (Oxford).
- (1997) 'Sacred Springs to the Social War: Myths of Origins and Questions of Identity in the Central Apennines', in Cornell and Lomas (1997) 43–51.
- (2005) *Romulus' Asylum: Roman Identities from the Age of Alexander to the Age of Hadrian* (Oxford).
- DeWitt, Norman J. (1941) 'Rome and the "Road of Hercules"', *TAPhA* 72: 59–69.
- Dipersia, G. (1975) 'Le polemiche sulla guerra sociale (90–88 a. C.) nell'ambasceria latina in Livio (Liv., ab Urb. Cond. VIII, 4–6)', in M. Sordi, ed., *Storiografia e Propaganda* (CISA 3; Milan) 11–21.
- Drummond, A. (2012) 'Pontius Gavius', *OCD<sup>4</sup>* 1183.
- Elefante, M. (1999) *I due libri al Console Marco Vinico: Velleio Patercolo; introduzione, testo e traduzione* (Naples).
- (2011) 'A Page in the History of Campania', in Cowan (2011) 59–72.
- Elwyn, S. (1993) 'Interstate Kinship and Roman Foreign Policy', *TAPhA* 123: 261–86.
- Erskine, A. (2003) *Troy between Greece and Rome* (Oxford).
- Farney, G. D. (2007) *Ethnic Identity and Aristocratic Competition in Republican Rome* (New York and Cambridge).
- Fortlage, H. G. (1971–72) 'Die Quelle zu Appians Darstellung der politischen Ziele des Tiberius Sempronius Gracchus', *Helikon* 11–12: 166–91.
- Foster, E. (2012) 'Some Recent Work on Direct and Indirect Discourse in the Ancient Historians [on D. Pausch (ed.), *Stimmen der Geschichte: Funktionem von Reden in der antiken Historiographie* and M. Lang, *Thucydidean Narrative and Discourse*]' *Histos* 6 (2012).
- Gabba, E. (1956) *Appiano e la storia delle guerre civili* (Firenze).
- (1962) 'Italia e Roma nella storia di Velleio Patercolo', *CS* 1: 1–9.
- (1976) 'Sulla valorizzazione politica della leggenda delle origini troiane di Roma fra III e II secolo a. C.', in M. Sordi, ed., *I canali della propaganda nel mondo antico* (CISA 4; Milan) 84–101.
- (1978) 'Il problema dell' "unità" dell'Italia romana', in E. Campanile, ed., *La cultura italica* (Pisa) 11–27.
- Galinsky, G. K. (1969) *Aeneas, Sicily and Rome* (Princeton).
- Giardina, A. (1997) *L'Italia romana: Storie di un'identità incompiuta* (Rome and Bari).
- Hall, J. M. (1997) *Ethnic Identity in Greek Antiquity* (Cambridge).

- Harris, W. V. (2007) 'Quando e come l'Italia divenne per la prima volta Italia? Un saggio sulla politica dell'identità', *SS* 48: 301–22.
- Hellegouarc'h, J. (1974) 'L'impérialisme romain d'après l'oeuvre de Velleius Paterculus', in *L'idéologie de l'impérialisme romain* (Paris) 69–90.
- Heurgon, J. (1942) *Recherches sur l'histoire, la religion et la civilisation de Capoue pré-romaine de l'origine à la deuxième guerre punique* (Paris).
- (1957) *Trois études sur le ver sacrum* (Bruxelles).
- Jones, C. P. (1999) *Kinship Diplomacy in the Ancient World* (Cambridge, Mass.).
- Keaveney, A. (1987) *Rome and the Unification of Italy* (London).
- Konstan, D. (2001) 'To Hellenicon ethnos: Ethnicity and the Construction of Ancient Greek Identity', in I. Malkin, ed., *Ancient Perceptions of Greek Ethnicity* (Cambridge Mass.) 29–50.
- Letta, C. (1984) 'L'Italia dei mores romani nelle *Origines* di Catone', *Athenaeum* 62: 3–29, 416–39
- (1985) 'I mores dei Romani e l'origine dei Sabini in Catone', in B. Riposati, ed., *Preistoria, Storia e Civiltà dei Sabini* (Rieti) 15–34.
- (2007) 'I legami tra i popoli italici nelle *Origines* di Catone', in G. Urso and M. Sordi, edd., *Patria diversis gentibus una? Unità politica ed identità culturale nell'Italia antica*, Atti del Convegno, Cividale del Friuli 2007 (Pisa) 171–95.
- Loraux, N. (1987) 'Oikeios polemos: la guerra nella famiglia', *SS* 28: 5–35.
- (1996) *Né de la terre: politique et autochtonie à Athènes* (Paris).
- Lücke, S. (2000) *Syngeneia: Epigraphisch-historische Studien zu einem Phänomen der antiker griechischen Diplomatie* (Frankfurt am Main).
- Maltby, R. (1991) *A Lexicon of Ancient Latin Etymologies* (Leeds).
- Marincola, J. (2011) 'Explanations in Velleius', in Cowan (2011) 121–40.
- Martin, P. M. (1973) 'Contribution de Denys d'Halicarnasse à la connaissance du ver sacrum', *Latomus* 32: 23–38.
- (2001) 'La tradition sur l'intégration des peuples vaincus à l'origine de Rome et son utilisation politique', in G. Urso, ed., *Integrazione Mescolanza Rifiuto: Incontri di popoli, lingue e culture in Europa dall'Antichità all'Umanesimo*, Atti del Convegno, Cividale del Friuli 2000 (Rome) 65–88.
- Massa, G. (1996) *La formazione del concetto d'Italia: tradizioni politiche e storiografiche nell'età precedente la rivoluzione romana* (Como).
- Mazzarino, S. (1966) *Il Pensiero storico classico* II.1 (Rome and Bari).
- Moles, J. (2007) 'Philosophy and Ethics', in S. Harrison, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Horace* (Cambridge) 165–80.
- Mouritsen, H. (1998) *Italian Unification: A Study in Ancient and Modern Historiography* (London).
- Musti, D. (1963) 'Sull'idea di *συγγένεια* in iscrizioni greche', *ASNP* 32: 225–39.

- (1985) 'I due volti della Sabina. Sulla rappresentazione dei Sabini in Varrone, Dionigi, Strabone, Plutarco', *DArch* 3: 77–86.
- Nagle, D. B. (1970) 'The Failure of Roman Political Process in 133 B.C.', *Athenaeum* 48: 372–94.
- Perret, J. (1942) *Les origines de la légende troyenne de Rome (281–31)* (Paris).
- Pinzone, A. (1983) *Storia ed etica in Polibio* (Messina).
- Poucet, J. (1963) 'Les origines mythiques des Sabins à travers l'oeuvre de Caton, de Cn. Gellius, de Varron, d'Hygin et de Strabon', in *Études Etrusco-Italiques* (Louvain) 155–225.
- Prag, J. (2010) 'Kinship Diplomacy between Sicily and Rome', in D. Bonanno, C. Bonvet, N. Cusunano and S. Péré-Noguès, edd., *Alleanze e parentele: Le "affinità elettive" nella storiografia sulla Sicilia antica: Convegno internazionale Palermo 14–15 aprile 2010* (Catanisetta and Rome) 179–206.
- Russo, F. (2005) 'I carmina marciana e le tradizioni sui Marcii', *PP* 140: 7–35.
- (2006) 'Atene e Roma, Grecia e Italia nell'*excursus* letterario di Velleio Patercolo, I, 17–18', *RSA* 36: 211–29.
- (2007) *Pitagorismo e Spartanità: Elementi politico culturali tra Roma, Taranto e i Sanniti alla fine del IV secolo a. C.* (Campobasso).
- (2008a) 'Su alcuni aspetti dei *Ludi Saeculares* del 249 a. C.', *SCO* 54: 115–35.
- (2008b) 'The Literary Excursus of Velleius Paterculus and the Exaltation of the Italic Contribution to the Grandeur of Rome', *FlorIl* 19: 293–312.
- (2010a) 'Il concetto di Italia nelle relazioni di Roma con Cartagine e Pirro', *Historia* 30: 74–105.
- (2010b) 'Il motivo della *consanguinitas* tra Romani ed Italici nella propaganda graccana', *AR* 4: 178–96.
- Schochat, Y. (1970) 'The *lex agraria* of 133 B.C. and the Italian Allies', *Athenaeum* 48: 24–45.
- Sordi, M. (1978) 'La tradizione storiografica su Tiberio Sempronio Gracco e la propaganda contemporanea', *MGR* 6: 299–330.
- Sumner, G. V. (1970) 'The Truth about Velleius Paterculus: Prolegomena', *HSCPh* 74: 257–97.
- Tagliamonte, G. (1994) *I figli di Marte: mobilità, mercenari, mercenariato italici in Magna Grecia e Sicilia* (Rome).
- Terrenato, N. (1998) 'The Romanization of Italy: Global Acculturation or Cultural Bricolage?', in *Proceedings of the Seventh Annual Theoretical Roman Archaeology Conference*, Nottingham 1997 (Oxford) 20–34.
- Urso, G. (1994) 'Il concetto di *alienigena* nella guerra annibalica', in M. Sordi, ed., *Emigrazione e immigrazione nel mondo antico* (CISA 20; Milan) 223–36.
- Valvo, A. (1997) 'Terra Italia, Terra Etruria, Terra Histria', *AN* 58: 10–9.

Will, E. (1995) 'Syngheneia, oikeiotés, philà', *RPhil* 69: 299–325.

Wiseman, T. P. (2011) 'Velleius and the Games', in Cowan (2011) 279–86.