GREEK AND ROMAN CIVILIZATION

G.C.E. A/L

Grade - 13

Teacher's Instructional Manual

Faculty of Curriculum Development
National Institute of Education
Maharagama
2010

Preface

The task of introducing the competency based curriculum to the school system reaches completion with the Teacher's Instructional Manual for grade 13.

Due to intense competition to enter the universities, the students in grades 12 and 13 are often under a certain amount of pressure. With the introduction of a new curriculum, the pressure is further increased. An Instructional Manual for teachers of grade 13 in such a context is as important as the syllabus. There are three aspects that a teacher should basically consider here. They are,. the Teacher's Instructional Manual totally matches with the syllabus, the syllabus is based on the vision and mission of the curriculum and the expected competencies of the syllabus, the Instructional Manual has been designed to reach the expected proficiency levels of the students in grades 12 and 13. It is the responsibility of the teachers, therefore, to study the instructional manual intently.

The National Institute of Education is actively involved in training the teachers who handle grade 13 in order to create awareness of the above mentioned aspects. It is, therefore, important that teachers taking part in these training sessions conducted regularly, as these are very useful in understanding the learning teaching principles and procedures given in the Manuals. Teachers are especially expected to use the School Based Assessments to ensure the achievement of competencies. Every body involved in education and evaluation should understand that all these interventions are necessary to enhance the skills of the students without limiting teaching to the subject content only.

I wish to thank all the academics and the other staff of the National Institute of Education and the external resource persons who were involved in the tiring exercise of preparing Teacher's Instructional Manuals.

Dr.Upali M. Sedere

Director General

Preface

This Teacher's Instructional Manual will be useful for teachers who organize the learning teaching process for grade 13 from 2009.

The Teacher's Instructional Manual used to prepare this book, is different to the Teacher's Guides we had earlier. Teacher's who try to understand the change will notice that this is based on the competency based syllabus. Therefore, it is not expected to reach a given competency within the same grade. It might take longer period of time but the learning out-comes given under competency levels under each competency should be acquired within the same grade. Thus, learning out-comes and competency levels would be immensely useful for you to plan your lessons relevant to the grade. Moreover, we would like to draw your attention that the learning out-comes can be used as a criteria in preparing objectives for the learning–teaching process and preparing evaluation tools to assess the work done. This Teacher's Instructional Manual will be useful teachers to make the students aware about the reference materials such as extra books and useful web addresses.

Consider that the suggested activities in this book are presented in such away expecting you to act as a creative teacher. A change towards the student-centred education from teacher- centred education is specially expected. Therefore, the teacher should always create learning situations to explore referring different books and internet. When teaching instead of dictating notes as in the past , new knowledge and principals should be presented in a fascinating manner. For this to happen communication methods using technology should be used creatively.

Introduce the syllabus to your students who start to learn this subject in grade 13. Students can be motivated by giving the work plan you intend to use for the whole year. This will attract the students to come to school to learn the wholes syllabus.

I request you to enliven your creative abilities leading to significant change in your learning-teaching process in the class room which would be a felt experience to the whole country.

I take this opportunity to thank all the resource persons, teachers and the officials of the NIE for their contribution in preparing Teachers' Instructional Manuals. Moreover, my special thanks go to the Director General of NIE Dr. Upali M. Sedara and the Commissioner General of Education publications and his staff for undertaking to print and distribute the materials to schools. I would be grateful if constructive suggestions are provided.

Wimal Siyambalagoda
Assistant Director General
Feculty of Curriculum Development
National Institute of Education,
Maharagama.

Teacher's Guidance Panel

Advisors	-	Dr. Upali M. Sedara Director General National Institute of Education Maharagama. Wimal Siyambalagoda Assistant Director General Languages, Humanities and Social Sciences National Institute of Education Maharagama.
Direction	-	Rev. Dr. Mambulgoda Sumanaratana Thero Director – Department of Religion
Subject Leadership	-	Rev. Fr. A.R. Lloyd Shanthikumar Project Officer, Department of Religion
Subject Committee	-	Emeritus Professor Merlin Peris (University of Peradeniya) Professor D.P.M. Weerakkody (University of Peradeniya) Ms. K.M.R.N. Kulathunga, M.Phil (University of Peradeniya) Ms. S.W.Ekanayake, B.A (University of Peradeniya) Ms. D.M.M.W. Dissanayaka, B.A (University of Peradeniya) Ms. M.M.N.I. Rodrigo B.A (University of Peradeniya) Ms. J.M.S.P. Jayalath (Mahamaya Girl's College, Kandy)
Type Setting	-	Ms. K.H.W.K.G. Kahawala
Book Layout	-	Ms. F.A.F. Nismiya
Cover Design	-	Mr. W.M.P. Sudharshana Bandara

Introduction - School Based Assessment

Learning Teaching and Evaluation are the three major components of the process of Education. It is a fact that teachers should know that evaluation is used to assess the progress of the learning –teaching process. Moreover, teachers should know that these components influence mutually and develop each other. According to formative assessment (continuous assessment) fundamentals, assessment should take place during the process of teaching. Formative assessment can be done at the beginning, in the middle, at the end and at any instance of the learning teaching process.

Teachers who expect to assess the progress of learning of the students should use an organized plan. School based assessment (SBA) process is not a mere examination method or a testing method. This programme is known as an intervention to develop learning of students and teaching of teachers. Furthermore, this process can be used to maximize the students' capacities by identifying their strengths and weaknesses closely.

When implementing SBA programmes, students are directed to exploratory processes through Learning Teaching activities and it is expected that teachers should be with the students facilitating, directing and observing the task they are engaged in.

At this juncture students should be assessed continuously and the teacher should confirm whether the skills of the students get developed up to expected levels by assessing continuously. The Learning teaching process should not only provide proper experiences to the students but also check whether the students have acquired them properly. For this, to happen proper guiding should be given.

Teachers who are engaged in evaluation (assessment) would be able to supply guidance in two ways. They are commonly known as feed-back and feed- forward. Teacher's role should be providing Feedback to avoid learning difficulties when the students' weaknesses and inabilities are revealed and provide feed-forward when the abilities and the strengths are identified, to develop such strong skills of the students.

For the success in the teaching process students need to identify which objectives of the course of study could be achieved and to what extent. Teachers are expected to judge the competency levels students have reached through evaluation and they should communicate information about student progress to parents and other relevant parties. The best method that can be used to assess is the SBA that provides the opportunity to assess students continuously.

Teachers who have got the above objectives in mind will use effective learning, Teaching, evaluation methods to make the Teaching process and learning process effective. Following are the types of evaluation tools students and, teachers can use. These types were introduced to teachers by the Department of Examination and National Institute of Education with the new reforms. Therefore, we expect that the teachers in the system are well aware of them

Types of assessment tools:

1.	Assignments	2.	Projects
3.	Survey	4.	Exploration
5.	Observation	6.	Exhibitions
7.	Field trips	8.	Short written reports
9.	Structured essays	10.	Open book test
11.	Creative activities	12.	Listening Tests
13.	Practical work	14.	Speech
15.	Self creation	16.	Group work
17.	Concept maps	18.	Double entry journal
19.	Wall papers	20.	Quizzes
21.	Question and answer book	22.	Debates
23.	Panel discussions	24.	Seminars
25.	Impromptus speeches	26.	Role-plays

Teachers are not expected to use the above mentioned activities for all the units and for all the subjects. Teachers should be able to pick and choose the suitable type for the relevant units and for the relevant subjects to assess the progress of the students appropriately. The types of assessment tools are mentioned in Teacher's Instructional Manuals.

If the teachers try to avoid administering the relevant assessment tools in their classes there will be lapses in exhibiting the growth of academic capacities, affective factors and psycho- motor skills in the students.

TEACHING THE CLASSICS
SOME THOUGHTS ON TEACHING ANCIENT HISTORY

RATIONALE

Guidelines in the secondary history curriculum recommend that, during his/her lesson, a teacher should make good use of school history textbooks and other books, maps and modern visual aids. Lessons need to be organised in a pragmatic way so that a student is given an opportunity to analyse, judge, compare, become aware, discuss and try to find solutions to problems, to promote creative thinking and to develop particular skills and abilities. A cross-curricular and diachronic approach of topics is encouraged whenever the teacher thinks appropriate.

Generally the secondary school teachers of ancient classical history in Sri Lanka are innovative and resourceful, some of them having much experience in the teaching of Classics. Most of them use chronologically oriented lectures as the traditional method of teaching ancient history. However, this method has certain limitations for students who need to learn about specific themes/aspects in history. Thus, there is a great need for a more comprehensive teaching strategy with a variety of teaching methods and styles that promotes students' interest, enthusiasm and motivation especially to meet the demands of the current syllabus.

The quantity of the subject matter, as determined in the syllabus, is often a cause for stress fro both the teacher and student, and the exam-oriented system of Education centres on knowledge and, therefore, creates an imbalance between knowledge and skills. As a result, teaching methods and approaches which promote dialogue, enquiry, and multi-perspectivity are either avoided, seldom used or inconsistent. We often hear: how much can you teach in 40 minutes especially if you are not the regular teacher of the class? By the time pupils enter, sit down, open their books, and can finally begin to concentrate, time is up. This attitude highlights the need to plan each lesson to achieve specific learning out comes with the available resources within a specific time frame.

Also, the realities of everyday school life creates a gap between theory and practice for various reasons such as the lack of research regarding history and history teaching, the challenges created by a highly centralised and bureaucratic educational system and the lack of pedagogical training provided to secondary school teachers that are beyond the scope of a handbook of this nature. It is noted that these constraints must be acknowledged and a mechanism to deal with them must be put in place since overcoming them is central to the successful teaching of history in schools whether ancient or modern.

It is thus highly recommended that the traditional chronological method of teaching history in the class room be replaced by the thematic approach that enables students to compare and understand perspectives and movements throughout different historical periods of the Greeks and the Romans. Also, to motivate students and to create a healthy level of enthusiasm for ancient history it is also recommended that a student-centred teaching approach be used with a rich variety of teaching methods and styles. This will help teachers to plan their lessons more productively. To this end it is hoped that these few pages would be informative and provide a spring board to further research in creating an interesting and vibrant teaching/learning environment in the class room.

THE EXPERIENCE OF TEACHING HISTORY

- **Why Teach Ancient History?**

The study of history serves two main purposes. On the one hand, it satisfies one's curiosity about the past, about their origins, about the beginnings and development of civilization. On the other hand, history offers a vast treasure of human experience in success and failure and allows one to study the efforts of human societies coping with challenges and crises, to analyze the solutions introduced, to learn lessons, to observe possibilities, to pick up ideas and suggestions. By stimulating one's thinking in many directions, history thus helps one to become more aware of one's own situation and problems — and increased awareness is the first step toward getting involved and finding solutions.

For this purpose, ancient history is particularly helpful. It deals with societies that are part of one's own cultural tradition and thus close enough to still be understandable ; they are small and "uncomplex" enough to allow one to grasp the essentials; but they are distant and different enough to exclude simple identification and thus to facilitate critical analysis. To formulate it paradoxically, the Greek and Roman societies, for example, in their "classical" periods — the only periods that produced the quality and quantity of sources needed for any thorough attempt at political analysis and comparison — represent the closest and most familiar "alien civilizations" that are available to one's scrutiny. As such they are still accessible through one's own patterns of thought and analysis, but they force one to step out of the familiar social, political and cultural framework of the modern world and to gain distance from everything by which one is conditioned. Thus they enable one, by studying others, to learn much about oneself. This in turn is possible only because antiquity has left the right kind of sources – most notably texts whose authors themselves focus on important political issues.

In other words, ancient history is particularly suitable to serve as *magistra vitae* to modern students of history: not so much because, as Thucydides believed, human nature is essentially the same and similar patterns of human behavior and conflict are thus likely to recur, but because sometimes the patterns are eerily familiar: the Roman orator, statesman and philosopher, Cicero, spent his whole life worrying and writing about the crisis of a republic that was being destroyed by its own greatness and success. In other cases, the issues at stake are crucial to any time and society: the Athenians of the fifth and fourth centuries BC were so obsessed with the unprecedented political experiences and discoveries of their own time (which included concepts such as liberty, equality or progress, the realization of democracy and empire, and the possibility of designing, in theory and practice, an ideal state) that their entire literature is permeated by discussions of those very questions that every society can recognize as its own.

For all these reasons, invariably, those who study Greek and Roman history are fascinated by the timeless importance and remarkable topical significance of what they read and see. This is a unique constellation which can be used to the advantage of teachers in their own teaching as well.

- **Thematic Approach to Teaching History**

By relying almost exclusively on the ancient sources, fragmentary and scattered though they are, the teacher could trace the emergence and development of an important political concept (such as liberty) or pattern of thought (such as political theory). In being involved in this kind of pursuit, the teacher does something comparable to reinventing the wheel in the class room. The students are made aware of the fact that for the largest part of human history liberty was known at best as a social concept (opposing the free man to the slave) but not as a political idea, and they are made to understand why this was the case. The students hence perceive as well that in most types of human societies independent political thought was not prized highly; rather, the prime social virtues were obedience and subordination, and the teacher helps the students to figure out why. The teacher follows step by step how and why at specific junctures of history, in very special circumstances, liberty was discovered as a political value or people began to think politically. He/she analyzes how the emergence of such values and patterns of thought was related to important changes in social and political structures and how, once they existed, they in turn affected such structures and brought about further change. Thus, together, the teacher and students are able to trace some important phases of cultural development and recreate crucial human accomplishments that deeply influenced the evolution of western civilization through our own times. All this would inevitably produce a strongly increased awareness of the historical roots and preconditions of modern social and political values, it warns one not to take them for granted, it enhances one's sense of responsibility for fostering and developing further what one considers really important in the current system.

By studying the origins of developments (be they social, political, or intellectual) that ultimately became important elements of one's own civilization, and by following these developments through their individual stages, one uses history as a "museum"; by placing these developmental stages in their proper social and political contexts and by analyzing how individual societies reacted to the changes and challenges with which they were confronted, and why they did so, the teacher uses history as a "laboratory" or "workshop".

PLANNING A LESSON

Lesson planning should deliver a range of teaching and learning styles which should seek to combine and innovate, working within and beyond existing resources. A lesson plan may be identified as a scheme of work used to achieve specific teaching/learning goals during a stipulated time frame. It, in this sense, explains most briefly, why, what, and how a lesson needs to be taught in class within the allocated time. The syllabus itself can be broken in to individual lessons to fit into a scheme of work and can be made as varied, interesting and effective as possible.

Teaching and learning in the modern classroom has so many recognized facets that forces teachers to be innovative and experimental in their approaches. It has long been recognized that not all young people learn in the same way, and that not all students in a class receive the information that is given to them in the same way. A simple understanding of the psychological concept of learning styles using the Auditory, Visual and Kinaesthetic models would rapidly inform any teacher of the need to use a variety of teaching and learning approaches when building a scheme of work and the lessons to go with it. Hence the importance of using a variety of teaching and learning styles to have success with the full range of their students.

CONSIDERATIONS

By being totally open minded about how to actually deliver the lesson, planning becomes an exciting process where the activities will drive the lesson, not the need to be wedded to forcing the subject contents on to the students. The information and content is there to be fitted around whatever activities the teacher chooses to use in that lesson. As the lesson forms part of a scheme of lessons within the scheme of work, the teacher ought to identify teaching and learning styles to be used within that scheme, and this enables the teacher to either build upon the previously used approaches, or to bring in new approaches that will make use of alternative historical skills for students. In this regard the teacher should aim to set out his/her thoughts on how to approach the complex process of developing schemes of work and individual lessons to successfully tap into the wide range of learning styles possessed by students.

- **Study Questions and Activities**

The starting point of the lesson is 'the question for the lesson' – what do I want the students to learn? How do I want the pupils to learn? By what process will the pupils learn? What questions will this topic raise? At the end of the lesson what will the pupils have learned? With all this in mind the process can begin. Often teachers regard these as activities connected to the teaching, not the teaching itself. Many students simply do not learn through being told, and too many teachers tell students the learning, give them an activity connected to it, and then tell them what they have just learned in that activity. This process needs to change and the activity itself should be considered teaching. Good teachers liberate themselves from a 'control freak' attitude to the learning allowing students learn independently through varied learning activities, and then use a good questioning technique to tease out the key learning issues from the activity.

It is extremely important to ensure that large numbers of students are not left behind each lesson, and are unable to make connections with prior learning. In order to achieve this, the teacher needs to use a variety of learning styles to be catered for in each lesson, but without avoiding too much repetition or too much chaos in the classroom as students undertake different activities.

- **Different Learning Styles**

The teacher must ensure that as many learning styles as possible are catered for in every lesson even though it is doubtful that anyone does manage to achieve total coverage on a week in week out basis, but the problem can be minimized.

The Learning styles may be selected from Visual, Auditory, Kinaesthetic. To broaden this out further the teacher may use multiple intelligences as a way of addressing the needs of a variety of learners that are in any class:

The **interpersonal intelligence** is the ability to understand and work with others. Techniques of Assessment:

· Working in groups.
· Problem solving.
· Listening to the views of others.

The **intrapersonal intelligence** has to do with the ability to understand oneself and to access one's own feelings and emotions, to judge and make sense of them and to act on one's judgments. Techniques of Assessment:

· Set yourself personal goals and targets.
· Monitor your goals and targets.
· Keep diaries or learning logs.

· Talk about moral and ethical issues.
· Try to be more assertive.

Linguistic intelligence includes an understanding to the meaning of words, to their order, to the sounds, rhythm and the variety of words and their ability to change moods or get across information.
Techniques of Assessment:
· Use poetry and rhymes.
· Play on words.
· Read more.
· Discussion work.
· Listen.
· Puzzles and anagrams.
· Written and speaking exercises.
· Build up key words.

Mathematical and logical intelligence are problem-solvers. The students look for sequence, logic and order and can tell the difference between patterns. Techniques of Assessment:
These techniques work best to assess this intelligence:
· Try sequencing activities.
· Work with numbers, measurement and estimation.
· Problem-solving activities.
· Brainstorm information before ordering and organizing it.

Visual and spatial intelligence means these learners build pictures of what they have seen in their mind. They learn by seeing and observing. Techniques of Assessment:
· Topic webs.
· Memory maps.
· Visualize.

Kinesthetic intelligence involves the ability to use one's body in highly skilled ways. Kinesthetic learners learn best by doing. Techniques of Assessment:
· Try drama, role-play, and physical movement.
· Field trips, visits, design and make activities.
· Involve yourself in extra-curricular sporting activities.

People with a **musical intelligence** are constantly aware of tones, rhythms and music. Composers constantly work and re-work such patterns. Techniques of Assessment:
· Learn by using raps, rhymes, songs, jingles, and singing.
· Dramatic readings.
· Use music to help with revision.

Those with the **naturalist intelligence** are at home in the natural environment. They can describe the features of the natural environment and name different species of birds, plants and animals. Techniques of Assessment:
· Be responsible for your own environment.
· Nature walks.
· Field trips to places of environmental interest.

- **Teaching/Learning Strategies**

Teaching methods

To transfer enthusiasm for History a rich variety of teaching methods and styles should be used:
· whole class teaching,
· group work,
· paired work,
· independent project work,
· thinking skills,
· accelerated learning techniques,
· presentations,
· ICT,
· music and drama,
· role play
· empathetic reconstruction
· art and craftwork,
· audio-visual,
· display work,
· research,
· field trips,
· effective use of textbooks.

The schemes of work and lessons that are produced should demonstrate a very wide range of teaching and learning strategies, with priority to effective teaching and active learning. Present history topics in lively and interesting ways to motivate and stimulate the pupils. Using a variety of teaching styles to breathe life into the teaching of history for example, thinking skills, brain based learning, accelerated learning, provide students with challenges by setting high standards, structure lessons with engaging, stimulating and motivating activities. Introduce pupils to a wide range of resources. Encourage pupils to become articulate, especially through group discussion, and challenge them in the use of source work. Perhaps the greatest incentive for providing such a varied approach is that it is more fun to teach and to learn in this way.

The main section of the lesson will more often than not include use of texts but can be manipulated to include breaks that involve presentation, debate or role-play - depending on the nature of the tasks being completed. This provides an opportunity for the teacher to double check progress but allowing students who prefer to get up and act things out / talk things through, an opportunity, however brief, to make use of their preferred style of learning.

If the plenary then provides a challenge in the form of a game, puzzle or problem solving exercise, along with a little Q&A most learning styles have been catered for. The lesson would have been well paced; engaging - assuming delivery is good - and appealing to students with most learning styles. If these methods are then mixed up over the course of a scheme of work, making use of the many other methods available, the teacher will have a scheme that does cater very effectively for all.

There is of course the option of having different groups within a class performing different types of task. Differentiation by preferred learning style is not impossible. Once a general task has been explained there's nothing to stop a group working with the teacher in a totally different way However, this requires a lot of planning, a lot of experimentation and a lot of energy. More than anything it requires very good classroom management and a desire to work in this way.

- **Resource Sharing and Making Improvements**

The teacher should always seek to communicate with the other teachers by way of sharing experience and teaching/learning resources. This helps to bring together different expertise in achieving the goals of specific activities. For example a Drama teacher is an excellent resource for ideas on how to get students to internalize and personalize a topic in history through role play. A Maths teacher can help in combining numeracy into History lessons. Language teachers can have many good ideas on how to help students cope with the complexity of new language and key words from the past. The wealth of knowledge and ideas in every school is huge, a resource that needs to be tapped into.

Unsuccessful activities from previous lessons can be analyzed and discussed as part of the planning process. So feedback from colleagues is valuable in helping to formulate a successful range of lesson styles that will meet the needs and learning styles of students. Apart from getting peer feedback, another key source of information that is useful to a teacher in the use and developing lessons is feedback from students. This can come in the form of informal verbal feedback about previous lessons. The quality of work that students produce in response to a variety of lesson activities is also extremely valuable in helping to direct the activities that should be used in a series of lessons.

CONCLUSION

For those at the start of their teaching careers, these thoughts should act as a resource for ideas in how to tackle the daunting process of student based thematic teaching. For the rest it is hoped that these ideas will prove useful and inspiring, and contribute to their own ideas and processes for lesson planning using a variety of styles.

CONTENT

ARISTOPHANES - WASPS

Competency **6.0** : Recognizes the basic characteristics of different literary genres
7.0 : Responds to, and engages with, the texts in relation to imagery ideas, emotions, attitudes, contexts, etc

Competency Level **6.1** : Understands the different genre and recognizes their main features
7.1 : understands the concept of imagery

Duration : 40 periods

Learning Outcomes :
- Students will identify various types of literary works and make out the similarities and differences between each other.
- Students will undestand and comment on the various judicial systems of the society during that period and list examples from the text so that thet would understand them better in their own society.

The Author and His Works

Aristophanes (c.448-c.380 B.C.) is the most important author of Attic old comedy. His family belonged to the deme Of Kudathenaion in the city of Athens, but his father Philippos had a small property on the island of Aegina to which the family moved When Aristophanes was still a boy. Here, he must have developed a feeling for the country and its old ways and, perhaps, learned to dislike the city. His earliest plays have not survived.

Most of his plays were written during the Peloponnesian War, and reflect the political, social, cultural and intellectual atmosphere of that time. In politics and in social questions he was a staunch conservative, proud of the old days of Athenian greatness, apprehensive of the new habits and fashions which he thought tended to enervate the youth of the state, and the new systems of philosophy and education which, he thought, were undermining the foundations of morality and honesty.

His conservatism tended perhaps to the extreme or at least takes that appearance in the exaggeration natural to the comic satirist; for he certainly appears occasionally as the champion of a pre-scientific age, when gymnastics held a higher place in education than philosophy. He hated the mob orators of his time, not only for their principles but also for their vulgar origin. He hated them with an intensity which he did not care to disguise.

In fact the contrast between the old and the new forms the kernel of most of his plays. We see this at the very beginning of his political career: His first comedy, *The Banqueters*, which won second prize in 427, was a satire on the product of a city education as compared with the old-fashioned country training, and the *Frogs*, which he wrote in later life, symbolizes this contrast in the characters of Aeschylus and Euripides. His own heart is with the old, and this is largely the result of his family background.

It would appear that Aristophanes came from a highly cultivated home with a great knowledge of literature. His extant plays show that while Attic tragedy was his favourite subject, he had all the higher literature at his fingertips. Further it would seem that he had been brought up in a somewhat old-fashioned gentlemanly style, which laid stress on good manners, respect for the aged and conventional piety.

His second play, *The Babylonians* (426), was a vigorous attack on the policy of Cleon. Consequently, Aristophanes was prosecuted by Cleon apparently on a charge of alien birth and high treason. None the less, at the Lenaea of the following year (425), appeared his first surviving play, *The Acharnaeans*. This was a plea for the termination of the war, with indications of continued hostility to Cleon. This play won the first prize.

So far, the plays were not produced in his own name, for reasons which are unknown; but in his next play, *The Knights* (424), the author comes forward undisguised. With astonishing courage he heaps invective and ridicule on Cleon (then at the height of his power) and satirizes the defects of democracy. This play again won the first prize.

The Clouds followed in 423, *The Wasps* in 422 and *The Peace* in 421. The plays that he produced during the next six years are lost. In 414 appeared *The Birds*, in 411 *Lysistrata*, in 411 or 410 *The Women and the Poet*, in 405 *The Frogs* (which won first prize at the Lenaea), about 392 *The Women in Parliament* and in 388 *Plutus*. He wrote two comedies after this, which he gave to his son Araros to produce, but they have not come down to us. In all, eleven of his comedies have survived, and these are the only complete examples of Old Comedy that have come down to us.

Some regard him not only as a brilliant humourist but as a high moral teacher concealing a grand design under the mask of a buffoon. They feel that he was inspired by a patriotic seal for the welfare of Athens, and a desire to save his countrymen from corrupting influences. But his comedies have a political cast mainly because at Athens every man was a politician; and no doubt the opinions which he advocates are those which he honestly entertained. But he is basically a dramatist, a humourist, satirist and, above all, a poet.

The Genre of the Work

The Wasps is an example of what is known as Old Comedy. Aristotle in his *Poetics* says that the word "comedy" (*komodia*) is derived from *kome* ("village") because the comedians, being despised in the towns, wandered about the villages. There is now general agreement that Aristotle was wrong, and that the name derives from *komos* ("revel"), not *kome*. There were several kinds of *komoi* which took place on festive days, particularly those in honour of Dionysus. These festivities consisted of, or were wound up with a procession of revelers singing, dancing and bantering the onlookers.

The Aristophanic type of comedy is known as old comedy, as opposed to the later middle and new comedy. The normal type of the old or Aristophanic comedy contained the following parts:

(a) a prologue or exposition;
(b) a *parodos* or entry of the Chorus;
(c) an *agon* or dispute between two adversaries: the main subject of the play;
(d) a *parabasis* in which the chorus addressed the audience on behalf of the poet;
(e) a number of episodes slightly separated by songs of the chorus, sometimes carrying on the main plot, but as a rule only illustrating the conclusion arrived at in the *agon*;
(f) the *exodos* or final scene in which the predominant note is rejoicing, generally leading up to a feast or wedding.

The subject was some simple story or fable, imaginary, novel, amusing, and at the same time satirical, involving a dispute on some subject of current interest, as a result of which the poet's opinion was made known. The chorus, instead of trying to pacify and conciliate the disputants, as they did in tragedy, sought to excite them, and finally sided with the victor. The characters, whether they were taken from real life or were the personification of abstract ideas (such as Peace or The People), were mere caricatures or symbols, not morally responsible human beings. Altogether, the old comedy was a curious blend of religious ceremony, serious satire and criticism (whether political, social or literary), wit and buffoonery.

At Athens comedies were performed at the festivals of Dionysus, namely, the Great Dionysia and the Lenaea. Five poets competed on each occasion, each producing one play. The parts, both male and female, were taken by men. Their dress was that of ordinary life and they wore masks of certain easily recognized types, but more grotesque than those of the tragic actors. They were also extravagantly padded.

The comic chorus probably numbered twenty-four and was often divided into two half-choruses. They wore masks and grotesque dresses to suit their parts (e.g. as birds or wasps), but took off their outer cloaks for the purpose of their dances. Dances were an important feature in the performance.

Old comedy was very much a celebration of the community as a whole. That is one reason why the plays are so much about politics and public affairs rather than the private lives of individuals. A particularly common theme is the war. Nearly all of Aristophanes' plays were written in the time of the Peloponnesian war, a hard and gloomy period, and the comedies gave the Athenians a chance, twice a year, to laugh at their troubles together.

It was regular in a comedy to make jokes against leading politicians and other prominent men. The audience would take delight in seeing and hearing important people brought down to their own level for once. And the gods were the most important people of all, so that it was especially funny to see them brought down to the level of ordinary human beings; and it was assumed that the gods themselves understood that, and would indulgently allow human beings to laugh at them in a comedy, although they would insist on receiving respect and obedience all the rest of the year.

Extreme license of personal attack was accorded by general consent to the writers of comedy, so that any man whose character and habits were at all before the public might find himself at any moment held up to popular ridicule upon the stage. But the sacredness of private life and character was something unknown to an Athenian, and he would not be nearly so sensitive on these points as ourselves. The very fact that this license was allowed to exist so long is some proof that it was on the whole not unfairly exercised. The satiric writer must have felt that his popularity depended upon his aiming his blows only where the popular feeling held them to be well deserved. And there are some follies and vices which this kind of castigation can best reach, and cases of public shamelessness or corruption which, under a lax code of morality, can only be fitly punished by public ridicule.

When, towards the close of the war, the executive power of the state had been usurped by the oligarchy of the "four-hundred", a law was passed to prohibit, under strong penalties, the introduction of real persons into these satiric dramas. But the check thus put to the right of popular criticism upon public men and measures was only a token of the decline of Athenian liberty.

The Plot of the Wasps

The Wasps (Greek*: Sphekes*, Latin*: Vespae*) was produced in 422 B.C. at the Lenaea, where it won the first or second prize. This play has often been described as a satire on the system of the jury courts which at the time provided the chief means of support of a large number of Athenian citizens (a fee of three obols was paid for a day's attendance).

Procleon (Greek: Philokleon, i.e. "Love-Cleon") is crazy with love of judging. His son Anticleon (Greek: Bdelukleon i.e. "loathe-Cleon") has tried to cure him and has finally imprisoned him in his house. The chorus of old jurymen, dressed as wasps, comes along before dawn to take him with them to the court; they assist him to escape. There is a scuffle between the jurymen and Anticleon's slave, and a dispute follows between Procleon and Anticleon as to the merits and evils of the jury system. Procleon defends it on the score of the benefits that he personally derives from it, while Anticleon shows that the jurors are really the slaves of the rulers who divert the bulk of the revenue destined to feed the hungry people. The chorus is converted, and Procleon is persuaded to try his cases at home, beginning with Labes, the dog of the house, who has stolen a cheese. By a trick of his son's, he is led unintentionally to acquit the prisoner, the first that he has ever let off.

Anticleon now takes in hand the social education of his father, improves his dress and manners and takes him out to dinners. The results are unfortunate, for Procleon gets drunk, insults his fellow guests, and behaves generally in an outrageous manner, finally leading off the chorus in a cordax: a licentious dance associated with drunkenness. This dance appears to have originated in the Peloponnese where it was danced in honour of Artemis. It occurs frequently in Attic comedies, though Aristophanes claims to have excluded it from his plays.

Athenian Judicial System

Under the democratic Athenian constitution of the fifth and fourth centuries B.C. the administration of justice was almost entirely in the hands of the popular courts, and the magistrates took only a relatively small part in it. The Areopagus retained its ancient jurisdiction in cases of murder, malicious wounding, poisoning, and arson. The *boule* and *ekklesia* dealt with misdeeds of officials and grave crimes against the state; and trifling cases where the amount in dispute did not exceed ten drachmae were finally disposed of by judges known as "The Forty" (four drawn by lot from each of the ten tribes), a sort of justices of the peace. Most other cases fell within the jurisdiction of the popular tribunal developed from the Heliaea.

The judges (dicasts) composing these tribunals appear to have numbered 6,000. They were citizens over thirty, who were not disqualified in any way. They were distributed into ten sections numbered from A to K, so that each tribe would be represented in each section. From these courts or juries (*dikasteria*) were selected by lot, in numbers varying from 201 upwards, according to the importance of the cases to be tried, but again so that each tribe should be represented. The distribution of the courts and cases was carried out by the *thesmothetae*. Each dicast received a fee of two obols (raised to three in 425) for a day's attendance.

Judicial suits were either public or private. In public suits where (in most cases) some offence against the state was involved, the charge might be introduced either by some magistrate or by a private citizen. The case came first before one of the *thesmothetae*, who prepared it for trial, and subsequently presided over the court where it was heard. The dicasts decided the verdict by vote, a shell or (later) a bronze disk placed in an urn. If the accused was convicted, accuser and accused each proposed a penalty (unless the penalty was fixed by law); and the dicasts decided by vote between the two proposals.

The penalty might be death, imprisonment, confiscation of property or a fine. It usually took the last form. The amount varied from a few drachmae to very large sums. The prosecutor was liable to a fine of 1,000 drachmae if he withdrew before the trial or failed to obtain one-fifth of the votes. The fines (and fees of the litigants) went to supply the fund from which the dicasts were paid. One can therefore understand the jurors' reluctance to acquit a defendant.

The majority of private suits (on rights of property, debts, contract, etc.) came first before the forty, who, if the matter in dispute exceeded the small amount of ten drachmas, referred the case to arbitration by one of the public arbitrators (*diaitetai*), Athenians in their 60th year. Only if this failed did the case come before the court for trial, on submission by the arbitrator.

Accuser and accused were allowed sometimes two speeches each, sometimes only one. The length of the speeches, fixed according to the importance of the matter in dispute, was measured by a water-clock. The parties had to conduct their own cases, though they were normally allowed to call in "friends" to assist them. Hence there were no barristers in Athens, only speech-writers who composed speeches for the parties to learn and deliver.

This judicial system had both advantages and disadvantages. It gave a considerable measure of security against injustice, for the intimidation or corruption of a large number of jurymen was not possible, especially as it was not known beforehand who these would be. On the other hand such juries were more susceptible to emotional appeals, more inclined to admit what was not properly evidence, and less familiar with the law than trained judges would have been.

Aristophanes attacks the system on the ground of the ferocity of the juries in time of war and of their liability to influence by irrelevant motives. The dicasteria were organized as a highly democratic system, yet one which in normal circumstances effectively prevented corruption and intimidation and gave considerable guarantees against injustice. [Bribery of 500 individuals would in any case be difficult, and it was made much more so by a peculiar rule: it was not settled till the last moment which cases would come before which jury]. Even so, no doubt, a really corrupt society could have got round the regulations, and it is a sign of the general soundness of the Athenian public life that we scarcely hear of any attempt to corrupt the jury courts.

But a system that works in normal circumstances may easily break down in times of revolution, poverty or war. War made the Athenians madly suspicious. Again it must be remembered that at this time the citizens of military age were mostly away on active service. The courts were manned by the old men who could no longer fight and were probably more bitter in consequence.

Then the class struggle between rich and poor which so largely underlay the war between Sparta and Athens, introduced a further element of savage prejudice. And the pressure of poverty and sometimes of actual famine, on the Athenian people made all trials for offences which involved confiscation into terrible temptations. Through the light jests one feels Aristophanes' horror at the sheer ferocity of the courts. Old Procleon never cares for a prisoner's prayers. He knows he is feared.

The Theme of the Play

Aristophanes has constructed his play around the contrast between the older and younger generations and the dialectic of nature versus convention. However, the roles of the generations appear reversed. The ethic which questioned the authority of the custom-law and affirmed the necessity of fulfilling nature was ordinarily associated with the younger generation while the old education aimed at instilling the values of behaviour and tradition. But here it is the young man who stands for propriety comfort and convention while his father is the image of natural, all too natural, man.

Anticleon is anomalous in another way too. Sons in comedy are not as a rule noted for their filial piety; but Anticleon is a good son motivated wholly by the desire to take care of his father and keep him in peace and comfort. His effort to divert the old man from his favourite occupation of jury duty and initiate him into the amenities of polite society represents a concern which may be considered natural, but natural under the old dispensation with its immemorial command to honour the gods, parents, and strangers. Indeed, the ambiguities involved in the concept of what is natural create in great part the meaning of the *Wasps*. For here again, as in the *Clouds* the success of the plot effort is double edged, producing an unexpected result, and the ending is quite unresolved.

The names Procleon and Anticleon perhaps do not indicate as much as their explicitness would suggest. Procleon and all the old wasps of the chorus like Cleon because he fosters their conviction that they are the rulers of Athens by virtue of their office in the court. But their affiliation with him ends there, and the meaning of the two names is not consistently followed. Procleon can speak of hoping to convict Cleon of theft, and Anticleon includes Cleon in the typical elegant symposium to which he wishes to escort his father. Cleon's role in the play goes beyond the fact that he encourages the old man's love of jury service and its attendant delusion of grandeur.

Discussion of the Play

In the opening scene two slaves Sosias and Xanthias guard a house to prevent Procleon from getting out. They are drowsy. Each one relates a dream he had. Both dreams have to do with Cleon.

In introducing the play, Xanthias says that there will be no crude Megarian jokes and no hurling of nuts. (According to Aristotle Comedy began with the Megarians, both of Sicily and of the isthmus). Xanthias mentions Anticleon's various attempts to cure his father, including Bacchic priests and incubation at the temple of Asclepius, and Procleon's various attempts to get out of the house.

The play begins on the level of simply satirising the Athenian love of the legal process and this theme remains a dominant one throughout the first two-thirds of the play. But a close examination shows that this satirizing constitutes only one aspect in the total effect of the play.

Take, for instance, the chorus. There appears to have been quite an old tradition of animal choruses in Athens. There is archaeological as well as literary evidence for men dressing up as various kinds of animals to perform songs and dances. Aristophanes makes use of this tradition in several of his comedies. Sometimes animals form the chorus of a play and give the play its title, such as *Birds*, *Frogs*, etc. But in the *Wasps* the situation is rather complex. The principal character is an old man whose favourite occupation is sitting on a jury in a law-court condemning people, and the Chorus consists of other old men who sit on juries like him.

But besides being jurors, they are somehow wasps as well. The text shows us fairly clearly how they must have been dressed in the performance. When they first appear, they wear long cloaks. As they shuffle along they appear to be simply feeble old men. But later they throw up their floaks to prepare for a fight, and then the audience sees that underneath they are dressed as wasps. Aristophanes wishes to make a point about the jurors. They are often bad tempered and vindictive and inflict penalties in an unpredictable way, just as wasps seem to do. His dramatic method of making that point is to dress his jurors as wasps and speak of them as if they actually were wasps.

The chorus of wasps, then, is the older citizens who took their seats in court as jurymen day by day, to the neglect of their private affairs and the encouragement of a litigious disposition. These jurors are lured not just by gain of money, but also by the sense of dignity and interest. For, apart from criminal cases, public affairs came under their judgment. One might therefore think that, by calling them wasps, the poet perhaps intended to represent the acrimonious temper which delighted in the condemnation of individuals without much reference to their actual guilt, and the malevolence which often instigated the accusation.

Aristophanes, however, allows them to give another and more honourable explanation of their name on their own behalf on account of their genuine Athenianness and valour against the Persians. It is curious, in fact, how Aristophanes treats Procleon and his colleagues with a kind of personal sympathy. The truth is that the juries were largely composed of just the class of men that Aristophanes liked and championed, the old men from the country prevented by the war from attending to their farms, prevented by their age from going on military expeditions (military service normally ceased at 60), and consequently left in Athens, old, respectable and poor, embittered and angry, able to serve on juries or sit in the ecclesia and, according to Aristophanes, offering an easy prey to any smart and unscrupulous speaker who chose to gull them. They are "*Marathonomachoi*", tough old veterans, men of a hard and honest age.

The poet strikes a sympathetic note right at their entrance. One cannot but like these vigorous old warriors who are up before dawn to do their public service, lights in their hands, old music on their lips. Phrynichus, whose songs they sing, belonged to the days of Marathon or even earlier, when Athens was a city of heroes. Later on they go even farther back to the songs of Thespis, reputed to be the originator of Attic tragedy. Men were rough and simple then. They did not understand modern refinement and despised modern luxury. (This is the clue to the end of the play). These old men are entirely within the scheme of nature, and in a way represent it.

Anticleon does not approve, and he tries to mend the father's ways; but the effort ends in a resounding failure precisely because nature is intractable. And this is a good thing from one point of view, for the anger and ferocity of the wasps is part of their virtue, as they themselves explain in their parabasis. The Attic wasp would be nothing without the sting with which he speared the Persians in their baggy breeches.

There is however some designed ambiguity about the war-like sting and the judicial voting stylus. The end of the parabasis exploits the ambiguity nicely. Whether as a soldier or a juror, the waspish nature is the backbone of Athens. There is more than mere self-conceit here; they were the men who fought at Marathon and, whether it be the sword or the stylus, their sting is the badge of the heroic spirit.

What then was so wrong with them as to merit Aristophanes' criticism? Athenian juries were in a sense committees of the sovereign assembly, but committees of a rather special kind. They could not be called to account, nor was there any appeal against their verdicts; and to this extent they were themselves sovereign. Since prosecutions for administrative corruption, procedural irregularity, military failure and bad political advice were common, the juries had it in their power to make and break political careers, and the death penalty was inflicted quite readily. It is this irresponsible exercise of power that Procleon and his aged friends find so congenial: to have distinguished men weeping or flattering them and begging them for mercy, to settle an inheritance law-suit without regard for what the testator's will actually say, to be courted by Cleon and other politicians, to be welcomed home and made a fuss of because of the extra three obols they bring.

A comic fantasy is a symbol of personal authenticity, and no true comic hero can afford to abandon it. There is, as Procleon says, no animal more happy, blest, luxurious than a judge. He insists thatt his life is a rule, an empire. Comic fantasy regularly aspires to the position of a god and defines that position in terms of personal satisfaction and freedom from the restraints of law and authority. Procleon fancies himself as Zeus flashing his lightning in answer to the helplessness of the individual.

To this mighty dream of unsurpassing self-hood Anticleon opposes what may be taken as the hard facts of Athenian political economy. He has been taking notes on his father's speech; but he never refutes or for that matter directly confronts a single one of his points. This is no wonder of course, for facts and fantasy is not commensurate, and the word in question "rule" means two different things to the two speakers. The equivocation on the word "rule" permits the most elegant dramatization of the dilemma of the individual psyche in the complex imperial society of later fifth-century Athens, the dilemma which induced antiphon and other sophistic thinkers to reject, or all but reject, social institutions entirely.

Anticleon's realistic appreciation of where rule really lies comes near to spoiling everything. For him, the answer would be presumably queitism, resignation, and the pursuit of private, harmless satisfaction. The elegant world of dinner parties and small talk into which he tries to bring his father anticipates in a way the refined conceptions of the good life which characterize the fourth century or the hellenistic philosophies.

Most Aristophanic comedies follow a fixed pattern. The hero conceives a fantastic idea which he succeeds in achieving despite opposing forces that contend with him in the *agon*, and then it is followed by a series of episodes illustrating the consequences of his achievement. These are usually scenes of acceptance or rejection, and culminate in a feast, wedding or apotheosis.

But the *Wasps* has an action which is double-edged and it seems to move simultaneously in two directions. The *agon* marks the intersection of the two, and there is one moment at the centre of the play where it seems as if Anticleon has won his case. The chorus grants his wisdom and even Procleon can think of no further argument in defense of the "mighty rule of a juror". This is the point at which, in old comedy, the victorious hero usually proceeds to demonstrate and enjoy the fruits of his fantasy.

But Anticleon is not a hero, and he has no fantasy. He has done no more than show that the jurors are being deceived and exploited by the demagogues; and his only further wish is to teach his father to live like a gentleman. Since his triumph is not a heroic one, nothing transcendent can follow it, and it is presently made clear in any case that he has not really won. The chorus, reflecting now that it is wise to hear both sides of the case, feels "self-straight". They beg Procleon to listen to reason and concur. But Procleon, though bankrupt of arguments, does not concur. Reason has not triumphed; for the passion is too mighty.

Anticleon's argument is designed to prove that the power of the jurors is illusory, and that the jurors are slaves: the real power lies with the politicians. He proves this using arithmetic. The total income of the Athenian empire is two thousand talents a year; and how much of that is paid out at half a drachma a day to six thousand jurors? Where does the rest go? Not a difficult question, if we are permitted to do a little more arithmetic on the cost of fighting a major war and administering a large city. But we are not permitted. Anticleon successfully conveys the impression that somehow or other the money all goes to the politicians who manipulate in their own interest those juries which they seem so to flatter and cherish. But it will soon appear that Anticleon has not really won.

In fact, all anticleon's sane reasoning leads to one of the greatest and funniest scenes of pure nonsense in all literature, the trial of the dog. It has been thought that this scene was the genesis of the whole play which owed its conception to the trial of the general Laches three years before, on some kind of charges of peculation during his mission around Sicily.

The name of the accused dog is Labes, which means "taker" or "snatcher". But when the Athenian audience hears that it is a Sicilian cheese that he is accused of eating, they are likely to start thinking of the general Laches who had recently commanded an Athenian force in Sicily and was alleged to have made money himself out of it. The politician who made that allegation against Laches was Cleon. So when the audience hears that Labes is to be accused by a dog (for which the Greek word is *kuon*), and when the accusing dog is said to come from Kudathenaion, which everyone knew to be Cleon's deme, even the dullest member of the audience would not fail to get the idea that in this scene Aristophanes is not interested only in dogs.

This is one of the most striking pieces of allegory in ancient literature. Cleon was the politician whom Aristophanes hated most. He regarded him as a loud-mouthed demogogue who claimed to be the protector of the Athenian people against oppression and corruption, but whose real motive was his own greed. In the play, he makes these points by representing Cleon as a loudly barking dog who is supposed to be a watch-dog guarding the house, but whose real aim is to gobble up the food himself. Aristophanes is a master of the art of combining comic fantasy with fierce political satire.

But the charm of the scene goes far beyond the political satire. The language, parodying legal and rhetorical formulae, hovers with engaging illusiveness between human and animal contexts, (while the judge on the bench relieves alternately his hunger and other needs). The charge is not so much the theft of the cheese as that Labes had failed to give any to the other dog, and the prosecution raises to a ringing denunciation whose imagistic confusion strikes off the spirit of the whole scene.

Except for the unwilling acquittal, the trial scene marks in one way a further extension of Procleon's fantasy. Relieved of colleagues, or even the necessity of leaving the house, His Lonely Eminence is now more than ever Zeus-like. Yet though he is no longer deceived by the demagogues, he is deceived by his son, and so in another way the end of the trial marks his second great reverse. He is now so downcast indeed that he agrees to let his son dress him and educate him for society. His heart is not in it of course, but it is the dark night of the soul for him, and his fierce fighting nature, momentarily subdued, has yet to be born anew and to greater freedom.

The scene in which Anticleon dresses his father in fine city clothes and schools him in polite conversation is one of several in Aristophanes which depend on simple buffoonery for its effect. The essence of such scenes is to let the proponent express something of pretentious elegance or intellect, which the buffoon then reduces to his own limited scale with calculated bathos.

Though the finale of the play has been thought inorganic it could never be called ineffective. The reason for considering it inorganic is of course that it departs from the theme of Procleon's love of litigation hitherto central. But that is to misunderstand the larger design of the play in which the love of litigation is no more than an important element.

For *The Wasps* is not merely a satire on Athenian litigation. It is much more, and it is hard to imagine a finale which would complete its meaning more aptly. Procleon has broken through into the unlimited freedom of self-fulfilment promised by the ethics of nature. Unfortunately, what is natural for Procleon differs from what Anticleon had imagined was natural and appropriate for old men. But this raises another matter: Procleon is not as old as he was.

The motif of rejuvenation is very frequent in Aristophanes, and may originally have had some connection with spring vegetation rites. As a matter of fact, rejuvenation had been implied earlier in various passages where old and young had been contrasted. All these earlier intimations now mature into the scene where Procleon demonstrates his youthful manliness by stealing the flute-girl and beating up the neighbourhood.

Not only is Procleon in the role of the wild and lawless youth, but Anticleon is thrust into the opposite role of a crazy old guardian just fallen out of his grave. Moreover, nature has emerged with a vengeance, the very nature which Anticleon had tried to suppress. The waspish nature asserts itself, do what one will, and it is equally natural from another point of view for the son, who began by mounting guard on his father, to become in fact a guardian.

At least as important for the unity of the play is the fact that this scene completes Procleon's relation to the courts of law. Although he has repudiated his former love of jury service, he is anything but finished with lawsuits. The bread girl, whose wares he has ruined, the victim of assault and battering, and all the guests at the banquet have sworn to bring suit in the morning.

This whole scene, far from being inorganic, is of great importance for the structure of the play. The futility of education and the incorrigibility of nature is the principle theme, and the finale completes it. Old has become young and young has become old. The judge without mercy has become the defendant who deserves none.

But nature remains unchanged. Anticleon the educator has doubtless learned much, but Procleon has not. In place of the fantasy of himself as Zeus of the law, he now has the fantasy of utter freedom from law, which is not very different.

The final scene is no less well joined to the body of the play, though it may not seem so at first glance. Dramatically it seems to exist to exhibit Procleon once more unsubdued by his recent removal. Had the play ended with his being carried off, one might be tempted to imagine that he was in fact really suppressed and brought into line. As it is, he closes the play in a transport of drunken self-satisfaction, dancing in the old-fashioned style from the days of Thespis, challenging all contemporary tragedians to dance as well, and howling derision at them. Once more, also, the note of old versus new is sounded.

Nor is Procleon's natural force abated even though his eye may be dim as usual, and his concept of polite accomplishment shades off into the use of his fists, and as the son of Carcinus comes on to contends with him, he says he will destroy him with a knuckle dance. Far from cured, Procleon has merely a new disease worse than the first. According to Xanthias and Anticleon, he is outright mad.

The threads are now all pulled together and the final dance begins: a whirling dance which seems to convey symbolically the underlying idea of the vicious circle where all things return upon themselves. It is the dance of the world's madness, the dizzying infectious carousal of self-assertive, irrepressible nature.

Note to Teachers:

Attic Old Comedy, while dealing with universal themes, embodies features which are unique to the place and time of their creation and performance, and it is most important that students learn to appreciate such features and acquire the necessary background. Some features, such as ridiculing of prominant individuals and the use of obscene language, may be explained by comparing with local forms of entertainment. Reference may be made in particular to newspaper cartoons and folk-drama such as Kolam. Above all, students must be guided to appreciate Aristophanes as a poet and dramatist.

Learning Teaching Activities

Activity No 1

Show how Aristophanes uses the play to make Fun of the Athenian courts of the day?

Instructions

- This can be done as an assignment.
- When the text is completed the teacher can discuss the instances where Aristophanes uses to make Fun of the Athenian courts.

Activity No 2

How does Anticleon in the *Wasps* try to physically prevent his father from serving on the Jury?

Instructions

- This can be done as an assignment.
- While the text is read in class the students can collect information on how Anticleaon prevents his father from serving on the jury.

Resources:

Lowe, N.J., *Comedy*, Cambridge University Press, 2008. (Greece and Rome New Surveys in the Classics no. 37).
Dover, K.J., *Aristophanic Comedy*, Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1964, pp. 121-127.
Whitman, Cedric., *Aristophanes and the Comic Hero*, London, Batsford, 1972.

TERENCE – MOTHER-IN-LAW

Competency **6.0** : Recognizes the basic characteristics of different literary genres
8.0 : Obtains insight into the individual traits of authors of prescribed texts

Competency Level **6.2** : Traces these features in the context selected for study
8.2 : Understands main features of his composition

Duration : 40 periods

Learning Outcomes :
- Identifies the theme and moral issues that underlie the drama.
- Examines character, plot, diction and such elements that constitute drama.
- Appreciates the text in relation to imagery, ideas, emotions, attitudes, contexts etc.

General Background

Greek poets wrote the comedies during the period between the death of Alexander the Great in 323BC and the end of the following century. The Latin adaptations of Greek comedies were presented at public festivals in Rome between 240 BC – 160BC. Although the death of Alexander forms a convenient division in the history of the whole Greek world, changes in literature and dramatic taste usually occurred gradually.

Even before the death of Alexander, several leading poets of the Greek New Comedy were writing plays, and the creative phase of the genre continued well into 2nd century BC, but very little is known of these later years. The chronological boundaries for the Roman period are rather easier to establish: 240BC is the year to which ancient scholars assign the first Latin adaptation of a Greek play to be presented at Rome, and 160BCsaw the production of the last surviving play of the *Adelphoe* of Terence. Roman poets continued to write comedies long after this date, but truly creative period of the genre was over by the end of the 2nd century.

Despite we hear of about sixty Greek comic dramatists who were active during the period, only a few draw our attention; in terms of what survives today and of the judgment of antiquity, the most important is Menander (342-290BC) whose originals were later adapted by Plautus and Terence. Among other leading poets of this period who came to Athens from outside were Alexis from Thurii in southern Italy, who is said to have written 245 plays in a fairly long career stretching from the mid 4th century until well after Menander's death. The next poet is Philemon of Syracuse in Sicily, born in the late 360's, and leaving behind at his death nearly 100 plays. Another contemporary of Menander was Diphilos from Sinope on the Black Sea who wrote the several originals of Plautus' plays. The conventional triad of New Comedy poets was completed by Apollodoros from Carystos in Euboea, a poet of the first half of the 3rd century who seems to have been much influenced by Menander's work, and from whom Terence took two of his plays, the *Phormio* and the *Mother in Law.*

Whereas Greek New Comedy was almost entirely lost towards the end of the century, the fates were much better to the Latin adaptations. The works of Plautus and Terence have always been widely read and performed and exerted enormous influence on the western dramatic tradition.

The Author and His Works

According to the ancient Roman biographer Suetonius, Publius Terentius Afer was born in Carthage, in modern day Tunisia in North Africa. If Suetonius is to be believed, Terence may have been a Carthaginian, and therefore Semitic. Given his cognomen "Afer" (African) however, he may also have been of an ethnicity native to Africa. Suetonius also tells that he was later a slave in Rome – whether he was born a slave or became a slave is not certain, but was freed by his master, the Roman senator Terentius Lucanus. He wrote six plays, all of which survive: *The Girl from Andros* (produced in 166BC), *The Mother in Law* (produced unsuccessfully in 165 and 160, successfully at a third attempt in 160BC), *The Self Tormentor* (163), *The Eunuch* (161), *Phormio* (161), and *The Brothers* (160).

After writing the six plays we now possess, he disappeared from Rome on a trip to the East. One story, which has an appeal for modern students of drama, is that he died at sea on his way back to Rome with new translations of Menander in his possession. Whatever the true facts of Terence's life may be, it is clear that in the ancient world he was the most read and studied Latin poet after Virgil.

Terence and His Contemporaries

The two most interesting and especially controversial issues of Terence's life are his association with Scipio Aemilianus and other Roman aristocrats, and his relationship with his audience and fellow playwrights. Both issues have been derived from the prologues of Terence's six plays. Terence does not however explicitly rebut these charges made by his critics. The supposed charges and his refusal to rebut them have led many critics assume that Terence had help in writing his plays from members of the Roman upper class.

Although ancient biographies of Terence preserve anecdotes about the two aristocrats – Scipio Aemilianus, the most prominent Roman statesman of the mid 2nd century BC, and his best friend Gaius Lailus, the entire tradition about the aristocratic helpers is without any firm evidence, and may simply be said that it is quite likely that Scipio had some association with Terence as a friend and/or as a patron. Terence's *The Brothers* and *The Mother in Law* were offered at the funeral games held by Scipio and his brother for their father.

It could also be that being a member of the Scipionic circle, a group of men of letters who gathered around Scipio where there were plenty of literary discussions among the members of whom were Polybius – the historian, Lucilius – the satirist, Posidonius – the philosopher, Scipio's friend Laelius and others. Any connection therefore must remain speculative, but the philhellenism of his aristocratic friends may have helped inspire Terence to be closer to the Greek originals than his predecessor Plautus had been.

Throughout his career many critics, especially Luscius Lanuvinus, persecuted Terence for mixing several Greek comedies into one of his own (*contaminatio)*, and for writing plays "weak in diction and anemic in style". The polemics of the prologues nevertheless suggest that the mid second century BC was a time of lively controversy regarding how Greek comedies could best be adapted to the Roman Stage.

It is also open for speculation whether these controversies and Terence's reactions to them might have had affected his audience; for Terence himself reports that one of his plays, *The Mother in Law*, faced great difficulties: its first performance was disrupted by people hoping to see rope dancers and boxers; a second attempt failed in the face of confusion that there were to be gladiatorial games.

These difficulties however do not imply that Terence was an unsuccessful playwright. It has been conjectured that those who disrupted the two performances of *The Mother in Law* were not the spectators themselves who were unhappy with what they were watching, but those spectators entering the theatre from elsewhere thinking that they were going to see a different form of entertainment. When the comedy was offered for the third time, it was performed to completion, and there is no evidence that any of Terence's other plays met with anything less than success. Indeed, Suetonius reports that for *The Eunuch*, honored with an encore performance, Terence received the highest fee that had ever been paid for a comedy in Rome.

Characteristics of Terentian Comedy

Shortly before Terence produced his first play, Rome had confirmed her control over most of the Greek world with the defeat of Perseus, king of Macedon (168BC). The victory accelerated a process that had been going on in Rome for centuries: the importation and adaptations of things Greek. In her visual arts, rhetoric, philosophy, science and literature Rome had long turned to Greece for inspiration and models. However, the Romans opposed too slavish conformity to Greek models; they took what they admired in Greek culture and made it their own, maintaining their own identity even though they created what has rightly been called the "Graeco - Roman" world.

Roman comedy therefore, is a very good example of Rome's response to Greek culture in the middle Republic. Terence' predecessors, most notably Plautus, had found models for their own plays in the Greek New Comedy of Menander and his contemporaries. In adapting Greek New Comedy, however Plautus and his colleagues made it Roman: they replaced the relatively subdued language of New Comedy with rollicking vocabulary, exaggerated the stock features of characters to the point of absurdity, made the plays more musical, removed the Greek plays' divisions between acts, added characters, and changed the plays they adapted in numerous other ways. Their most conspicuous change was to make the plays more hilarious and enjoyable. That is they broadened the plays farce probably in response to their own traditions of farcical performance. In some ways Terence followed the patterns set by his predecessors. His plays were performed, like those of Plautus, without regular act breaks and included many more lines accompanied by music than did those of New Comedy.

More often, however, Terence' tendency was to take Roman comedy in the opposite direction making it closer to Greek New Comedy in tone and style. Most of Terence' stock characters are less exaggerated than those of Plautus. Though he followed Plautus in increasing the musical element of the plays, he apparently eliminated from his plays many of the widely varied meters of Plautus. Terence' language is more restrained than his predecessors; less alliteration and assonance, fewer similes and allusions, fewer digressions, neologisms, and comic long words.

In comparison with his predecessor Plautus, the text of Terence seems relatively free from actors' interpolations and conflations. This fact reflects not only the scholarly attention which Terence' plays received, but also the different nature of his comedy. In Plautus, repetition and insertion by actors of jokes taken from other plays might have been completely in keeping with the general comic style. In Terence however, the importance of elevated plots and characterization would make such elements quite destructive.

In a number of ways Terence seems to have diverged from New Comedy as well as from his Roman predecessors. Four adjustments he made to his Greek originals are particularly significant: the double plot, an increase of suspense and surprise at the expense of dramatic irony, greater verisimilitude, and the universal humanity of characters.

Most plots of New Comedy seem to have centered around one love affair. Five of Terence' six plays involve, however two sets of lovers, both important to the plot. Although he seems to have found both sets of lovers in his Greek originals, he appears to have expanded the role of the second pair of lovers, and in one play, *The Girl from Andros,* he added the second couple to a play of Menander. This emphasis on two couples adds richness to Terence' plots, and it allows him to paint significant contrasts between the two pairs, as when one man loves a maiden, the other a prostitute.

Writers of New Comedy relied to a greater extent on dramatic irony. Spectators and colleagues of Menander usually had a pretty good idea how things on stage would work out. Many plays of New Comedy had prologues spoken by gods, who could reveal much of what would happen in the plot. Terence removed the divine prologue-speakers from his originals and pointedly refused to discuss the plot of his plays in his prologues.

Therefore, although dramatic irony is still present on many occasions, the audience is frequently in suspense as to what will happen, and a number of the most effective moments in Terence' comedies are surprises. These surprises are particularly potent when Terence reverses the expectations of stock characters: when the prostitute, for example, proves to be generous and kind, or the "clever " slave proves himself incompetent.

In general, New Comedy seems to have been considerably closer to a reflection of reality than was Old Comedy. Terence appears to have increased the relative verisimilitude he found in his Greek originals. His characters are more likely to disguise their addresses from the audience than those of Menander, and on several occasions Terence replaced a monologue from his Greek original with a dialogue. His language is not only restrained, but is filled with interjections, colloquialisms, and ellipses that one may hear in everyday conversation. However within the conventions of ancient drama, Terence achieved an unusual degree of naturalism that allowed his audience to find his characters both believable and familiar.

Those characters in fact have a remarkable relevance well beyond the world of Greece or Rome, for Terence shows great skill in portraying universal human characteristics and foibles. The plays are acutely concerned with the human weaknesses we all share. In Terence' fathers, for example, there is a bit of every parent struggling, often unsuccessfully, to find the best way to raise children. Terence' sympathetic prostitutes advertise the common humanity of a class often dismissed.

Minor characters such as the slave Davus begins *Phormio*, display great personality well beyond what is required by their roles in the plot. Even the pimps in Terence are portrayed with a surprising degree of sympathy. All in all, though we may laugh at Terence' characters – or even find them distasteful – we are continually reminded of the humanity we share with them.

The Plot

In antiquity literary originality was sought to reside in the creative re-working of material that was common to all. In classical tragedy for example, poets based their plays upon myths, which were quite familiar to the audience, and yet when we compare the treatment of the same myth by different poets, we find that the plays are entirely different. The situation is similar in New Comedy as well where two plays by different poets are quite unlike, but a simple plot summary would make them appear very much alike.

The *Epitrepontes* of Menander concerns a young man called Charisios who is informed by his slave that his wife Pamphile, just given birth to and subsequently exposed the child. As they have not been married long enough for the child to be his, Charisios goes off to a neighboring house where, in the arms of a courtesan, he tries to forget his troubles. The play shows us, through the efforts of this courtesan, Charisios discovers that he himself had raped his wife before their marriage and that his treatment of her has been unjust. The exposed child is saved through the lucky chance of being awarded in the arbitration which gives the play its name, to a slave of Charisios' friend and neighbor.

Very similar in outline is the *Mother in Law* of Terence, which is an adaptation of a play by Apollodoros. In this play we learn from the slave, Parmeno that his master Pamphilus was forced by his father's persistent nagging to give up a beloved courtesan, and to marry their neighbor's daughter. So strong, however, was his attachment to the courtesan that for two months after the marriage, Pamphilus did not sleep with his wife, but continued his visits to the courtesan, whose name is Bacchis.

His feelings for his wife eventually deepened, however, and after a while he began to live a normal life with her. While he is away overseas on business, his wife refuses to have anything to do with her mother in law, and finally returns to her parents' house. When Pamphilus returns he discovers his wife in the process of giving birth to a child, and as he believes that the child cannot be his, he refuses to take her back on the pretext that she does not get on with her mother in law. With the help of Bacchis, however, it is discovered that he had raped his wife and made her pregnant before their marriage and all ends happily.

There are certainly striking similarities between these two plays. The two courtesans perform similar functions, although Habrotonon in the *Epitrepontes*has a much larger and active role, whereas Bacchis is rather an instrument of good fortune – when she goes to see Pamphilus' wife and her mother in law to assure them that she has no further interest in Pamphilus, she happens to be wearing the ring which he had snatched during the rape, and which he had then given to her. Pamphilus must then have been the man who ravished Myrrina's daughter before her marriage. Thus the child is proved to be Pamphilus' and all ends happily.

The Characters of the Play

Men and Women

A number of factors suggest that the picture, which New Comedy presents regarding the relationship between the sexes is a very partial one, it is worth setting out the most important of these.

The first fact of obvious significance is that all ancient comic poets were male and the audience, to whom they wrote, in both Athens and Rome, were predominantly male. Comedy may therefore be more valuable as a source for public (male) attitude to women than for privately held sentiments, and the women of comedy can only speak for their sex to the extent that a male dramatist is able to create a convincing character. It is however with a male audience that his character must carry conviction, and so we might expect that the verses which male poets give their female characters will be phrased so as to accord with male assumptions, and avoid giving offences to male prejudices. In particular, the very large number of comic fragments in which women and the institution of marriage are attacked, is not necessarily good evidence for a misogynist tone in comedy as a whole. The husband Laches falsely believes that his wife' behavior to their daughter in law during their son's absence overseas has caused the young girl to return to their family. He expresses his anger in a more forceful and generalized terms, however the truth is that the girl has left in order to conceal the fact that she is about to give birth to a child she believes is not her husband's, and Sostrata turns out to be a mother in law of quite unusual kindness. It is amusing that Laches immediately interprets the situation in terms of the stereotyped male view of women, and is completely wrong. We would probably have gone badly astray in our interpretation of these verses if they had been preserved only as an isolated fragment torn from its dramatic context.

The Role of the Slave

The frequent conflict between the dramatist, and the dramatic conventions of his day appears to be yet another striking feature of Terence' plays. It has been said that Terence' success as a dramatist is, to a large extent depended upon the way in which he solved the problem of the slave.

It could be seen from the plot that the main action of the play can go on without the ministrations of the slave Parmeno. He is admitted into the play only in order to show how necessary he is. At the beginning of the play he is brought in taking himself very seriously as his young master's guardian. It is from him that we hear of Pamphilus' affair with Bacchis and his unhappy married life. He shows that his master has taken him into his confidence about all this, but the fact however, is that in the course of the action Pamphilus never takes Parmeno into his confidence.

It is from Parmeno too that we hear of the quarrel between Pamphilus' wife and his mother Sostrata, and in I. ii he is on his way to the harbour to meet his master on his return and give him news of the quarrel. In short we are made to think that he will play the conventional part of the slave, but everything that happens to him thereafter is unexpected. When Pamphilus goes in to see his wife, Parmeno showing a delicacy of feeling rare in a slave, waits outside. When Pamphilus comes out we would expect him to confide in Parmeno, instead the only notice Pamphilus takes of Parmeno is to send him off to the harbour to fetch his slaves and baggage. When Parmeno returns from the harbour he sees his master waiting for him, his hopes rise immediately, only to be blasted again.

While he is away on the mission of bringing Callidemides home, the most important developments occur in the play: the argument between the father and son, the birth of the child, the sending for Bacchis, and Bacchis' visit to the wife. He returns just in time to meet Bacchis who was coming out of his wife's house. His first few words make quite clear that he has been sent on a wild-goose chase. Callidemides does not exist. When he sees Bacchis his curiosity aroused, but the only information he gets is that Myrrina recognized as her daughter's, the ring that Pamphilus gave Bacchis.

Next we see him returning with Pamphilus, quite at a loss to understand his master's rapturous gratitude to him, but their conversation is interrupted by Bacchis. While Bacchis and Pamphilus converse aside, Parmeno tries to figure things out; and when they have done, he approaches his master. It surely cannot be mere accident that the play ends with such an illuminating remark by Parmeno.

Thus, far from using convention, Terence has here pointedly rejected it. This is the goal towards which he had been moving – the liberation of the action from the deus ex machina that men and women are no longer puppets, but beings capable of significant action: a condition which is the *sine qua non* of serious drama.

While Terence' plays in general indicate a growing interest of social problems, *The Mother in Law*, more than any other, showed promise of the development of a serious social drama. Such development depended largely upon the dramatist's willingness and ability to break away from the limitations imposed by the particular convention. Terence, when he wrote *The Mother in Law*, stood on the very threshold of this liberation, but withdrew twice defeated by his public only to become successful in his third attempt.

Fathers and Sons

Although the clash between generations is very familiar to us as a theme of the New Comedy, it has very strong roots in Old Comedy. The relationship between the father and his son (Laches and Pamphilus in our Play) stands at the centre of a number of plays of the New Comedy and, in particular, comedy is interested in young men in the period just before marriage, which marks the cooling-off of youth and the adoption of the responsibilities of adulthood. The idea is often expressed in comedy that older men should remember they too were once young and that youth is marked by 'extravagance, pugnacity, thoughtlessness, drunkenness and sexual excess.

The treatise *On the Upbringing of Children,* which is transmitted with the works of Plutarch, and which probably contains material from the age of Menander, may be useful here for our understanding of the sort of relationship between Pamphilus and Laches in our play. In the final section of the treatise the author turns to the education of young men, rather than children, and notes that 'young men are given to gluttony, stealing their father's money, gambling, revels, and affairs with both maidens and married women'. Fathers must therefore, use both instruction and threats to quieten their sons. Fathers should make sure that their sons do not associate with wicked men, particularly flatterers, but should also remember that they too were once young and should occasionally turn a blind eye or deaf ear to misdeeds of various kinds.

It is moreover, best for fathers to express their anger and then cool off again quickly than to remain hostile and suspicious. Young men who are resistant, however to this approach should be made to marry as a means of sobering them up, for marriage is the most secure bond for young men, however they should not marry women above their status as they will merely become slaves of their wives' dowry. Most important of all, fathers should in their own lifestyle set an example for their sons so that they turn away from wicked deeds and words.

It is clear from this short summary that there are many points of contact between this treatise and the plays of New Comedy, and it is reasonable to suppose that both reflect a fairly wide ancient consensus about the duties of the older generation towards the younger. The difference between the two is that whereas the author of the treatise is forced to generalize about the characteristics of young men, comedy is able to investigate individual cases exploring the specific relationships in which generalized rules are often of little use.

The Fictions of Patriarchy in the Play

According to scholars, *The Mother in Law* is a woman' play with women as chief sufferers, the chief actors. This leaves us with a remarkable sensitive appreciation of the position of women within the patriarchal city- state. In no other ancient comedy are women so nobler, or so readily condemned. Nowhere is the contrast between appearance and reality so sharp as between the perception of women held by men in this play and their actual roles. The action of the play could be seen as unfolding the real and potentially tragic story of male perfidy, and the necessity of constructing a narrative in which all the difficulties are the faults of the women in the play.

First of all, the institution of marriage is viewed through the eyes of two women for whom it is an enemy. As the play opens Philotis and Syra are discussing the marriage of Pamphilus to Philumena, an event, which has disillusioned the young Philotis because it ended Pamphilus' affair with her friend Bacchis. Bacchis and Philotis are both members of that class of displaced women, which the turmoil of the Hellenistic age created.

A basic study of the social status of such women and their depiction of comedy reveals that they are not slaves, but because they have no male relatives to look after them and give them status, there is no place for them in the social system of the city-state. Whether Terence intended his audience to feel sorry for these women because his own status as an outsider in Roman society may have made him more sensitive to such issues is of course beyond determining.

The opening scene between Philotis and Syra, soon joined by Pamphilus' slave Parmeno, fills in the background to this marriage, and the two women 'read' the situation in two different ways. While the older and more cynical Syra sees relationships between citizen men and women like herself as 'war' in which women must plunder as best they can, Philotis still believes in happy endings for women like herself (despite her own recent ill-treatment by a soldier who carried her off to Corinth) and hopes that the rift Parmeno reports between Philumena and Sostrata will mean the end of Pamphilus' marriage and the renewal of his connection with Bacchis. Parmeno seems quite callous in the face of the women's feelings. He displays no sympathy for Bacchis, but speaks ill of her for refusing to continue her relationship with Pamphilus. He initially seems to admire Philumena' patience which wins over Pamphilus, but is equally ready to hold out hope to Philotis and Syra that Pamphilus' marriage will end over this rift between the mother in law and daughter in law.

Then comes Laches denouncing his unhappy wife and the whole race of women. His wife Sostrata denies that she had quarreled with her daughter in law, and suggests that the girl may only want to see more of her own mother, but Laches, in view of their estrangement, insists that it must be Sostrata' fault. We also learn that they now live apart, he in the country and she in the city, and so he relies on reports, presumably from Parmeno, for his opinion that two women have quarreled.

Phidippus, the father of Philumena, now appears, and the two old men attempt to join forces against the 'conspiracy' among women. Phidippus however will not force his daughter to return against her will. The old men depart, leaving Sostrata to lament the harm done by male stereotypes of female behaviour. Having returned from abroad and filled him with the story of the female feud, Pamphilus too accepts without question that one of the women, either his mother or his wife, must be to blame.

Parmeno misses, though the audience would not, the irony of the line 312 in his mouth that slaves, fall in the same class as women and children in the ancient view, those lacking the mental capacities of free adult males. Indeed the word puer can mean either child or slave. Parmeno has already proved himself a *pure levi sententia* in the opening scene where after his first hint to Philotis that all is not well with his master's marriage, he attempts to be careful claiming that he cannot trust Philotis to keep a secret, but is soon coaxed into telling the whole story. He admits that an eagerness to gossip is his greatest fault.

From the beginning of the comedy to the end Parmeno is sent running about and never learns what he most desires to. If one takes the portrayal of Parmeno as the chief source of the comedy in the play, one can agree that Terence should have pointed out at the beginning the contrast between Parmeno' picture of himself and his real role in the play (NB: the ironic contrast between Parmeno' view of himself as a typical clever slave and his actual uselessness in the play). Since Parmeno knows of his master' abstinence from Philumena early on their marriage, he must be got out of the way until she gives birth. This Pamphilus accomplishes by sending the slave off on a fool's errand which will keep him the whole day at Acropolis.

When Pamphilus is confronted by the two fathers, who beg him to take Philumena back, he insisted that duty towards his mother (*pietas)* demands he suppress his love (*amor)* and give up Philumena. The multiplex ironies of this extraordinary statement are worth dwelling for a moment. In the patriarchal society of Rome the obligations of *pietas* all point to the *pater familias,* the male head of the household. *Pietas* includes the obligation of the wife to be subordinate to the husband though we have seen that Sostrata is sufficiently free from the control of her husband that she lives apart from him. Pamphilus' view of *pietas* in promoting his mother to equality with his father only reinforces her independence.

Moreover, the Roman concept of *manus* in marriages may be divided into those in which the wife passed into the authority of her husband (*patria potestas)* and legally counted among his children i.e. marriages *cum manu,* and those in which she remained under the authority of her father i.e. marriages *sine manu*. Despite the theoretical existence of a system of male guardianship for women even after their fathers had died, marriages *sine manu* in practice gave women considerable legal independence. Sostrata' marriage to Laches is presumably *sine manu* where the wife remains bound by her *pietas* (filial duty) to her father rather than to her husband. Pamphilus

then, in declaring that pietas binds him to the wishes of his mother, who in turn is bound, presumably still to her father, offers a very serious challenge to the authority (*patria potestas)* of his own father Laches. However, as there is no Greek equivalent for the Roman concept of *pietas*, Terence' focusing of this issue on this occasion must be an innovation.

Pamphilus similarly threatens to reverse the usual flow of narrative time in the drama. The normal Roman comedy moves from the apparent disjunction of *amor* and *pietas* to their union when the object of love is identified as simultaneously the object of duty. Pamphilus now, while claiming that he still loves the woman he married out of duty to his father's wishes, threatens to make time run backward by claiming *pietas* can now disjoin him from his love. The fathers both agree he is acting wildly, but he escapes before they can argue with him.

When Philumena' father Phidippus discovers the birth, which precipitates a major shift in male thinking, he regards the birth of a male heir as the happy result of his and Laches' hopes, but his suspicions are aroused by his wife' attempts to keep the birth quiet. Phidippus concludes that his wife Myrrhina is to blame. He accuses her of opposing Pamphilus as a son in law because of his previous relationship with Bacchis and of attempting to turn her daughter against the marriage. He then takes steps to prevent exposure of the child. Myrrhina' soliloquy shows the extent to which she herself has absorbed the patriarchal values of the culture. She also expresses horror at the prospect of acknowledging the child of an unknown assailant as a legitimate family member.

Phidippus' announcement of the birth offers Pamphilus another opportunity: he desperately tries to argue that his wife' concealment of the birth proves she has no wish to reconcile, but Laches dismisses that as well. Laches has his own fiction that the real reason for Pamphilus' refusal is a continued affection for Bacchis. Faced with the demand that he at least acknowledge the child, Pamphilus denies affection for Bacchis, and then simply flees. Continuing to believe that Bacchis is the root of the problem, the fathers now send for her, both to cajole and threaten.

Finally the audience is able to evaluate for itself this woman of whom it has heard so much. Bacchis far from the mercenary woman Parmeno depicted at the beginning proves unusually generous and noble. She denies having encouraged Pamphilus in such temperate tones that the old men merely request that she repeat her story to the 'women within' for the blame has quite silently returned to these women. Bacchis reluctantly agrees.

After the astonishing recognition of the ring, only the women of the play and the one responsible for the whole crisis, Pamphilus, know the real story of the play. He is particularly anxious that the truth does not leak to the male world, embodied by his father.

The play ends however, committing itself to a fiction of male authority and dignity preserved by suppression of the truth. The real and potentially tragic story of rape and rejection disappears behind a narrative in which the women are to blame for all the problems. The mothers in law (it hardly seems to matter which one) will bear the official blame for Pamphilus' and Philumena' estrangement in keeping with the male ideology about mothers in law, which Sostrata enunciated at the beginning of the play (277-278). Male fictions eventually triumph. In this Laches' victory over his wife foreshadows that of his son. Sostrata, who has been living an independent life in the city, agrees to join her husband in the country.

The Dramatic Irony of the Play

The dramatic irony of *The Mother in Law* centers about the assault which Pamphilus had committed several months before the play opens, but owing to the darkness neither assailant nor assailed recognized the other, and this ignorance involves all the *dramatis personae* in serious confusion. For soon after the assault Pamphilus is married to his victim and, since the wedding was none of his seeking, refuses to become a husband to his wife.

Consequently, as the time of her confinement approaches, Philumena seeks to conceal her condition by avoiding her mother in law's company and finally by leaving her husband's house and taking refuge with her parents. This action causes Laches, who notwithstanding his boasted penetration, has no inkling of the real situation and yet (ironically enough) never doubts Pamphilus being the father of the child. He unjustly scolds his wife for driving her daughter in law while Phidippus scolds his daughter for leaving. In her extremity Philumena fastens the blame more securely upon Sostrata by refusing to return so long as her husband is absent, but at this juncture Pamphilus returns from a business trip and discovers his wife' condition. However, inasmuch as he is himself the cause of it, though he does not recognize the fact, his resulting lamentations and 'brain-storm' is ironic (352-407). He is of course unwilling to receive Philumena back into his home, but nevertheless promises not to betray her secret.

However, this engagement leaves him no excuse for refusing to bring back his wife except to employ the old one and say that between his wife and his mother he chooses the latter. Thereupon, Sostrata declares her intention of leaving the coast clear for the young couple by withdrawing to her country residence.

Finally there is irony in the fact that the summoning of Pamphilus' former *amica* to establish the charge against him actually clears him and results in bringing out the truth and solving all difficulties. Therefore, ignorance of one fact has kept both characters and audience writhing in its ironic grasp until the end.

Learning Teaching Activities

Activity No 1

Do you agree with the view that the female characters have no, prominent role than the male in Terence's play "Mother-in-Law"?

Instructions

- This can be done as a structural writing activity.
- Once the whole text is completed the teacher will explain the role played by each character and try to logically prove the fact that the female characters have no prominent role that the male in the play Mother-in-Law.

Resources:

Gilbert Norwood, *The Art of Terence,* Oxford 1923, New York 1965.
Forhand, Walter, *Terence,* Boston, 1985.

Ireland, S., *Terence: The Mother in Law*, Warminster Aris & Phillips 1990.

CICERO – ORATIONS AGAINST CATILINE (1-4)

Competency 6.0 : Recognizes the basic characteristics of different literary genres

Competency Level 6.3 : Examines unique features in the particular text in relation to the genre

Duration : 40 periods

Learning Outcomes :
- Students identify various types of literary works and identify the similarities and differences between each other.
- Students comment on various judicial systems of the society during that period and try to bring out examples about them from the society that they live in.

Life of Cicero

Note: for the life and political career of Cicero see under Power Struggle at Rome (70-30 B.C.), section 2.8 in this manual.

Greek and Roman Oratory

Rhetoric, the art of speaking, in the age of the great Greek orators (5th-4th century B.C.) was regarded as an accomplishment for which preparation was made by careful training in composition and delivery. The accomplishment was of great practical importance, for at Athens a man's life and property might depend on the power of persuading the judges in a lawsuit, while successful eloquence in the ecclesia opened the path to ambition. Owing to the care spent on the composition of speeches, they became an important factor in the formation of Greek (and Latin) prose. Both Aristotle and his pupil Theophrastus wrote treatises on the art of rhetoric.

There were three main classes of ancient oratory: (1) political oratory consisted of speeches made at the assembly; (2) Forensic oratory consisted of speeches made in the law-courts; and (3) epideictic oratory which included funeral orations, panegyrics, etc.

The development of Attic oratory was influenced by two external forces, the rhetoric of sicily and the teachings of the Sophists. The art of rhetoric originated in Sicily, in the middle of the 5th century B.C., when the rule of tyrants gave place to democracy. The names of Corax and his pupil Tisias are associated with the development of Sicilian rhetoric, and, according to Aristotle, the philosopher Empedocles, also a Sicilian, had some part in it. Another Sicilian, the sophist Gorgias of Leontini, made artistic expression the basis of oratory, adopting in particular the rhythms and techniques of poetry.

The earliest of the Attic orators whose speeches survive in part is Antiphon (c. 480-411 B.C.), who was followed by Andocides and the great orators Lysias, Isocrates, Isaeus, Demosthenes,

and Aeschines. Of the remaining Attic orators the most important were Lycurgus, Hyperides, and Dinarchus.

After the end of the 4th century B.C., i.e. during what is known as the Hellenistic age of Greek civilization, the study of oratory was pursued chiefly among the Greeks of West Asia (formerly known as Asia Minor), and showed a tendency to become turgid and declamatory. This tendency has been given the name of Asianism. But this tendency was not universal, and the Hellenistic school of Greek oratory became important, since all the great Roman orators were trained by Greek masters.

At Rome, as in Greece, oratory was from early times recognized as an art. Even in the 4th century B.C. Appius Claudius the Censor had a high reputation as an orator. In the survey of great Roman speakers which Cicero gives in his *Brutus* , the principal names are those of Cato the Censor, the Gracchi, M. Antonius (grandfather of the triumvir), L. Licinius Crassus (consul in 95 B.C., whose speeches were deliberately built up in accordance with the rules of Greek oratory), Julius Caesar, C. Licinius Calvus (an exponent of the pure attic style), and Hortensius, noted, on the contrary, for his luxuriant asianism).

Among the Romans as among the Greeks, oratory was extraordinarily popular, and exercised in consequence a strong influence on all forms of literature. Higher education under the Roman Empire and, so long as ancient civilization lasted, was practically equivalent to rhetorical training. Augustine and Ausonius, for instance, were among the teachers of rhetoric in the West, while Dion Chrysostom and Aelius Aristides in the East. Chairs of rhetoric were endowed in every important city of the empire.

The Conspiracyof Catiline

Life and Character of Catiline

L. Sergius Catiline, at the time when Cicero delivered his famous invectives against him, was a man of desperate fortunes. Like Sulla he was of patrician family, and like him, too his youth was disgraced by vicious indulgence. His family had been reduced to narrow circumstances, and doubtless the troubled times of the proscription were welcome to a man of ruined resources and unbridled passions. At any rate it is as a partisan of Sulla that he first comes into notice, and we are told that he not only killed with his own hand his brother-in-low, Q. Caecilius, and tortured to death Cicero's kinsman and fellow-townsman, M. Marius Gratidianus, but also murdered his own brother, and took advantage of the proscription to have the murdered man's name entered on the list of the condemned, and so secure his own safety from punishment. He was further suspected of an intrigue with the Vestal Virgin Fabia, sister of terentia, Cicero's wife, and he was believed to have made away with his first wife, and after wards his son, in order that he might marry Aurelia Orestilla who objected to having a grown- up step-child in her household.

It must, however, be borne in mind that the worst charges against him rest to a great extent on the authority of his opponent Cicero, and, in any case, he was not without redeeming qualities. He had the art of making and retaining friends, and was generous in helping them at their need. His personal courage also was great and he met his death fighting with valour worthy of a better man and a better cause.

Cicero himself, in his speech pro caelio, gives a sketch of his character, differing materially from that in the catiline Orations, and probably not unfairly drawn, as the purpose of the speech was not only to excuse Cicero's friend Caelius of the ground of being guided by an evil influence, but also to show how attractive were the qualities that had drawn so many Roman youths to Catiline's side. The orator especially dwells on the strange contrasts that his character presented. He was a monster of inconsistency and indulgence of vice. His love of military glory was equaled by the fire of his licentious passions. While he was a favourite with the most illustrious men he was intimate with the basest of individuals. Who could be greedier of money than he was? Who could lavish it more profusely? The numerous friends he made he retained by placing at their service his money, his influence, and his personal exertions. He could change his very nature and rule himself by circumstances. He lived soberly with the serious, he was a boon companion with the gay; grave with the elders, merry with the young; reckless among the desperate, profligate with the depraved. With a nature so complex and many-sided, he not only collected round him wicked and desperate characters, but he also attracted many brave and good men. It would have been impossible for him to have organized his atrocious attack upon the commonwealth, had not that fierce outgrowth of depraved passions rested on some substratum of agreeable qualities and powers.

Public career

A man of such varied endowments for good and evil might count with some certainty on success in a public career; whatever stains might deform his character. He became praetor in 68, and was governor of Africa during the following year. He returned to Rome in 66, and became a candidate for the consulship in 65, the election for which would in the regular course take place in July 66. He was,however, obliged to withdraw from his candidature, as an indictment for extortion in his province was brought against him by P. Clodius Pulcher, afterwards so celebrated as the enemy of Cicero, and the law did not allow a citizen,against whom a suit was pending, to be a candidate for a magistracy. The election for 65 was carried by P. Autronius Paetus and P. Cornelius sulla, who were, however,soon after convicted off bribery, and their places supplied by their competitors and accusers, L. Aurelius cotta and L. Manlius Torquatus.

First Catiline Conspiracy

Catiline and Autronius, along with Cn. Piso now formed a plot, commonly known as the First Catiline Conspiracy, to murder the new consuls when they entered on office on January1, 65, and to seize the consular power for themselves. The design became known, and its execution was consequently postpond till the meeting of the senate on February 5, when the massacre was to have been made a general one. The plot was, however, again frustrated, owing to the impatience of Catiline, who gave the signal before the senate-house on the appointed day, when as yet his armed agents had not assembled in sufficient numbers.

Suetonius, however, says that M. Crrassus and C. Julius Caesar, were the real instigators of this conspiracy. Crassus was to be made dictator and Caesar his *magister equitum*, and after the constitution had been recast on democratic lines, Autronius and sulla were to be restored as consuls. According to a statement quoted by Sallust from the historians Tanusius Geminus, it was Caesar, not Catiline, who was to have given the signal for the massacre, but he refrained from doing so because Crassus, either from repentance or fear, did not make his appearance on the decisive day.

Though the intended crime was well known, no one ventured to bring the criminals to trial, and the senate was even weak enough, on the motion of Crassus, to send one of the conspirators, Piso, in order to get him out of the way, as quaestor with praetorian power to Spain.

The prosecution for misgovernment of his province, referred to above, came on in 65,and by bribing Clodius, his accuser, as well as the jury, Catiline succeeded in escaping condemnation. the case, however, was not decided until the consular comitia for 64 were over, and his candidature was therefore postponed until the following year, when Cicero was also a candidate.

The Elections of 64

The pressure of his debts now made it a matter of supreme importance for Catiline that he should secure the consulship, not only that while in office he might carry measures for a general reduction or even canceling of debts, and tending in other ways to advance his own interests, but especially that he might secure a rich province, and in that way retrieve his fortunes. On this, the second occasion of his being a candidate, he allied himself in his canvass with a man involved in similar difficulties, C. Antonius Hubrida,son of the famous orator M. Antonius,and uncle of the triumvir of the same name. despite the evil antecedents of these men their chance of election was good, as both Caesar and Crassus supported them against Cicero.

Cicero, indeed, had but slight hope of victory,for though his reputation was brilliant and his popularity great,he was opposed by the nobility, who disliked him as being a novus homo, and because of the bitter attacks he had made in the past on members of their order. They also feared he would,in the future, work in the democratic interest and favour the ambitious designs of Pompey. The excesses of catiline and Antony and their canvas, however,proved of advantage to Cicero. For the senate judged it necessary to check them by a measure more rigorrous than the lex Calpurnia de ambitu, and when the tribune Q. Mucius Orestinus put his veto on the measure, Cicero, some days before the elections, rose in the senate,and, in a powerful speech (oratio in toga candida hanita),exposed the intrigues and bribery of Catiline and Antony,and hinted at still more powerful opponents, who stood in the background. Alarmed at these disclosures, and at the danger that threatened their own safety, the nobility gave their votes to Cicero, and he was elected consul for 63 along with Antony; Catiline, however, being in a minority of only a few hundreds. Though Antony had joined Catiline in his canvass, he cared for office only as a means of making gain, and consequently, after the election, Cicero had no difficulty in buying off his opposition by surrendering to him the rich province of Macedonia.

The Elections of 63: Development of the Conspiracy

Catiline now adopted bolder measures, and resolved to secure his election for 62 by revolution if necessary. The time was favourable for his purpose. Many of the younger nobility were bankrupt both in character and fortunes, the Roman mob was restless and discontented, and many of Sulla's veterans, having squandered their ill-gotten gains, were eager for fresh opportunities of plunder and bloodshed. Many of the Democratic Party, too, even probably such men as Caesar and Crassus, were not wholly unfavourable to schemes that tended to check the growing military power of Pompey. There was, moreover, no regular army in Italy; Pompey was fighting in the Far East; the senate was negligent and powerless. These circumstances, rather than any brilliant

abilities on the part of Catiline or of his fellow-conspirators, seem to have been the secret of thee influence they obtained. A conspiracy was formed that soon spread over all Italy, and troops were levied in many places, but especially near Faesulae, under the direction of C. Manlius, one of the veteran centurions of Sulla.

From the time that he entered on his consulship in 63, Cicero received regular information of Catiline's plans through Fulvia, the mistress of Curius, one of the conspirators. It was doubtless at this time, and not, as Sallust says, in 64, that Catiline held at his house the private meeting at which he announced his programme of social revolution, of plunder, and repudiation of debts.

At length, the day before the consular elections for 62 were to have been held, Cicero made a speech in the senate upon the danger in which the state was. The senate thereupon resolved not to hold the elections next day, but to discuss the position of public affairs. At this sitting Cicero gave information of the latest steps taken by the conspirators, and called on Catiline, who had the hardihood to appearing the assembly, to express his opinion on the revelations thus made. Instead of justifying himself, Catiline declared openly that the state had two bodies, an infirm one with a weak head and a strong one without a head, and said that the latter should never want for a head while he breathed. Despite this defiant language the senate took no active measures, and the consul had to depend on his own resources in meeting the danger.

On the day of the election, accordingly, which was probably a few days later, Cicero appeared in the Campus Martius with a glittering cuirass under his toga, and surrounded by a strong bodyguard. No conflict, however, took place: the rabble of Catiline, who had gathered in considerable numbers, was overawed, and Decimus Junius silanus and L.Licinius Murena were elected consuls for 62.

Catiline was thus for a third time disappointed in his hopes of the consulship, and immediately exerted himself to carry out violent measures. It was arranged that Manlius, of whose preparations mention has been made above, should raise the standard of revolt in Etruria on October 27, and that on the next day the consul and the leading optimates should be murdered at Rome.

Action of the senate: Progress of the Conspiracy

Cicero, informed as usual of these plans, summoned the senate on October 21, and made known the critical situation of affairs. After two day's deliberation it passed what was known as the ultimum decretum, 'videant consules ne quid res public detrimenti capiat,' the formula by which, in cases of emergency, the consuls were called on to provide for the safety of the state.

When a few days after, a letter was received from Faesulae stating that Manlius had taken up arms at that place on October 27, and news also came in of risings of slaves at Capua and in Apulia, the senate ordered extensive military preparations to be made, and offered rewards for information as to the conspiracy. Catiline himself, as the author of the troubles was accused of a breach of peace under the lex Plautia de vi by a young patrician L. Aemilius Paullus. He thereupon, as though still undetected, offered to place himself in free custody, under the charge of some citizen of acknowledged position, as a security that he was prepared to meet the charge. He had, however determined to leave the city, but wishing to strike a decisive blow before doing so, on

the night between November 6 and 7, called a meeting of his followers at the house of M. Porcius Laeca to arrange the details of the measures to be adopted. He announced his own intended departure for Etruria, decided who were to remain in the city and who to join the army, allotted to those who were to remain in the city the several parts they were to take in the murder and conflagration that had been determined on, and finally demanded the immediate assassination of Cicero. Hereupon the senator L. Vargunteius and the knight C. Cornelius offered to murder the consul at his house the following morning at daybreak, gaining access to his presence under the pretext of attending his usual morning levee. This danger however, Cicero escaped, as he was informed of the plot, and the conspirators were refused admission when they presented themselves at his house.

First Oration against Catiline

On November 8 Cicero called a meeting of the senate in the temple of Jupiter stator, which for the sake of security, he surrounded with armed Roman knights. At this meeting Catiline had the audacity to appear in his place as usual, and Cicero thereupon delivered the speech commonly called the first Oration against Catiline. In this he showed that he possessed exact information about all the details of the conspiracy, and he advised Catiline to avoid the punishment that threatened him by withdrawing into voluntary exile.

Catiline replied that it was little likely that he, a patrician, sprung of distinguished ancestors, should desire the overthrow of the republic, while its saviour was to be M. Tullius, a mere immigrant into the city of Rome. He was, however, interrupted by cries of 'enemy' and 'traitor' and, overwhelmed by the indignation of his hearers, he rushed from the temple, and the same night set out for the camp of Manlius, spreading a report, however, that his destination was Massilia, whither he said he was going into exile, driven by the intrigues and calumnies of his enemies.

Second Oration against Catiline

Next day, November 9, Cicero addressed the people in the Second Oration against Catiline, in which he endeavored, on the one hand, to quell the general apprehension by making a statement as to the position of affairs, and, on the other, to deter from further efforts the conspirators who remained in the city. The latter, however, continued their activity, and prepared to carry out the plan arranged with Catiline. This was, according to Sallust's account, that when Catiline with his army had entered the district of Faesulae, the tribunal. Bestia should complain of Cicero's measures in an assembly of the people, and lay all the guilt of the war on the consul. When public feeling was thus embittered, the conspirators were, on the following night, to carry out the parts assigned to each. Statilius and Gabinius, with their followers were to set the city on fire in twelve places at once; Cethegus was to beset the doors of Cicero's house and attack him, while other leaders did the same to other distinguished men;the younger conspirators, most of whom belonged to noble families,were to kill their parents, and then, when the confusion through murder and fire had become universal, an attempt was to be made by force of arms to break through to Catiline.

The date fixed for this monstrous attempt was the feast of the Saturnalia, December 17, on which day clients were wont to bring presents to their patrons, and the houses stood open. Cicero had secret information of the plot, but considering the number of persons incriminated, and the influential position of some of them, he did not consider the evidence in his hands sufficient to justify him in taking action.

Envoys of the Allobroges seized

At this conjuncture a fortunate accident furnished him with the proofs he desired. Envoys of the Allobroges from Transalpine Gaul happened to be at Rome seeking from the senate assistance against the oppression of officials and avarice of usurers. Lentulus, by means of one P.Umbrenus, promised to these men relief from their grievances on condition of their giving armed assistance to Catiline, and, in particular, furnishing cavalry.

The envoys at first agreed to co-operate, but on maturer consideration judge it would be more to their advantage to reveal the matter to their patron, Q. Fabius Sanga. Through him Cicero learned of the transaction, and perceiving he had got the very opportunity he desired, directed the envoys to feign participation in the scheme, and to procure before leaving Rome, as they were about to do, papers from the heads of the conspiracy as credentials to their countrymen on their return home. Lentulus, Cethegus,and Statilius fell into the trap and gave, as requested, a written form of oath with their seals affixed, but Cassius refused to give a written pledge on the ground that he was himself shortly going to Gaul. as the envoys would pass through Etruria on their homeward way, it was determined that they should conclude the treaty with Catiline in person, and a certain T.Volturcius of Crotona was sent with them bearing an autograph letter from Lentulus and verbal instructions to Catiline. The envoys,carrying this important evidence with them, left Rome on the night between December 2 and 3, and in accordance with orders given by Cicero, were arrested by the praetors L.Flaccus and c.Pomotinus, on the Mulvian bridge, now the Ponte Molle, to the north of Rome, by which the Via Flaminia crosses the Tiber.

Arrest of the Conspirators

Cicero, being informed of the important capture, at once, before daybreak, summoned to his house Lentulus, Cethegus, Statilius, and Gabinius, who had taken a principal part in the negotiations with the Galls, and a certain Ceparius of Terracina, who was about to leave for Apulia to take command of a slave-revolt.Ceparius had heard of the treachery of the envoys and had fled from the city, but the others came without suspicion. Cicero then summoned a meeting of the senate in the temple of concord, where the prisoners were heard in their defense, and soon convicted upon the statements of the Allobroges and the evidence of their own hands and seals. It was resolved that the prisoners, and also Ceparius, who had in the meantime been brought back from his flight, should be given over to the custody of various senators.

Third Oration against Catiline

The sitting of the senate lasted until evening, and when it broke up the consul,to relieve the anxiety of the people, who had collected in large numbers, made a public statement of the facts in the speech that has been preserved under the name of the Third Catiline Oration.

Next day a rumour spread that an attempt would be made to free the prisoners by violence and Cicero accordingly occupied the Capitol and forum with a strong guard.

Debate in the Senate

On the following day, that is, December 5, Cicero called the senate together in the temple of Concord,protected by a large armed force, in order to decide the fate of the prisoners, which the senate had not constitutionally the right to do. D. Junius Silanus, who as consul elect, was asked his opinion first, spoke in favour of the punishment of death being inflicted on the five prisoners in custody, namely,Lentulus, Cethegus, statilius, Gabinius, and Ceparius, and also on L. Cassius, P.Furius, P. Umbrenus, and Q.Annius, if they should be captured. The consulars who voted next agreed with this view, until it came to the turn of C.Julius Caesar, who was at the time praetor elect, and who gave a different turn to the course of the debate. Having first pointed out the illegality of the proposed course, and the dangerous consequences it might have for its supporters, he proceeded to propose that the property of the conspirators should be confiscated, that they themselves should be sent into perpetual custody in various municipia, which should be made responsible for their safe detention , and that any proposal before the senate or the people for the abatement or remission of their punishment should be declared an attempt against the safety of the state. This speech made a deep impression, and the next opinions began to waver, so that even Quintus Cicero, the consul's brother,agreed to Caesar's proposal.

Fourth Oration against Catiline

Cicero now judged it necessary to take part in the discussion, and to urge the senate to make their decision without regard to his personal safety, for which Caesar's proposal seemed more favourable. His speech, known as the Fourth Catiline Oration, though apparently merely an explanation of the views of Silanus and Caesar as bearing on his own personal safety,evidently favours the adoption of the death penalty. It has been conjectured that the speech as we have it is not in its original form, but has received considerable embellishments that would hardly have been suitable in the midst of the discussion, and this view has been held to account for the somewhat pusillanimous exordium, and also for the occurrence of several passages that would have been expected rather in the opening speech of a presiding consul. As Cicero wrote down the speech, it was to appear as a complete whole in the corpus orationum invectivarum, and not as the isolated portion of a conciliatory sententia in the course of the discussion. We are not expressly told at what point of the debate Cicero made his speech, but it appears certain that he spoke before Cato and Tiberius Nero, the latter of whom proposed a middle course by the adjournment of the decision. As Cicero does not refer to their speeches we may feel pretty confident in putting his speech before theirs. Cicero does not seem to have completely overcome the hesitation of the senate; at least, all historians agree that it was the speech of M. Porcius Cato, at that time tribune elect, that decided them in their resolution. The prisoners were condemned to death, and were strangled before nightfall in the Tullianum, or state prison, on the slope of the Capitoline. Catiline himself and his forces were annihilated at the battle of Pistoria, at the beginning of 62, after they had fought with a desperate courage, worthy of a better cause.

On the Legality of the Execution

The Valerian, Porcian and Sempronian laws enacted that no citizen should be put to death except by a vote of the people after a formal trial before them. On what grounds, then, can the execution of the Catiline conspirators on a vote of the senate be justified? Cicero gives two reasons; firstly, that the conspirators by their act had become *hostes*, and forfeited the rights of citizens; secondly, that the ultimum decretum of the senate armed the consul with dictatorial powers. As to the first point, the very question at issue was whether the conspirators were hostes, and to make the assumption of this, as a fact, the ground of depriving them of their rights as citizens was a petitio principii. As to the second point, it is doubtful what were the exact powers conferred on the consuls by the ultimum decretum. Cicero no doubt claims that they included power of summary execution and Sallust distinctly says that the senate possessed the power of arming the consuls with exceptional powers in cases of emergency, but this was by no means universally admitted. The leaders of the popular party disputed the right, and this was the very point raised by the case of the aged senator C. Rabirius, who, in this very year (63), was accused of murder, as having been concerned in the death of Saturninus thirty- seven years before. Cicero was advocate for the defence, but a conviction would certainly have been contained had not the praetor, Q. Metellus Celer, removed the military standard which floated on the Janiculum, and so, in accordance with an ancient custom, broke up the assembly. In any case it is clear that the senate had no right to enforce the death penalty. At most they could arm the consul with the power of inflicting it; and the sentence would be pronounced on his responsibility, not theirs. The execution of the conspirators, then may have been justified by the necessities of the crisis,but it can hardly be defended as strictly legal.

Learning Teaching Activities

Activity No 1

Discuss the circumstances in which the Catilinian orations of Cicero were meant to be delivered.

Instructions

- This can be done as an assignment.
- When the text is completed the teacher can discuss the instances where Aristophanes uses to make Fun of the Athenian courts.

Activity No 2

Who was Catiline? What were the rows that made him lead an insurrection against Rome?

Instructions

- This can be done as an assignment.
- While the text is read in class the students can collect information on how Anticleaon prevents his father from serving on the jury.

Resources:

- Everitt, Anthony, Cicero: The Life and Times of Rome's Greatest Politician, Random House Trade Paperbacks, 2003.
- Stockton, David, *Cicero: a political biography*, Oxford University Press, 1988.
- Susan Olfson Shapiro, O tempora! O mores!: Cicero's Catilinarian orations, University of Oklahoma Press, 2005.

APPOLONIUS OF RHODES– VOYAGE OF ARGO

Competency **6.0** : Recognizes the basic characteristics of different literary genres
7.0 **:** Responds to and engage with the texts in relation to imagery, ideas, emotions, attitudes, contexts etc

Competency Level **6.3** : Examines unique features in the particular text in relation to the genre
7.1 : Understands the concept of imagery
7.2 : Comprehends the terminology and recognizes different kinds of imagery such as sensory (:eg. visual, auditory, olfactory, gustory, tactile) and literary devices (eg. simile, metaphor, symbol)

Duration : 90 periods

Learning Outcomes :
- Students will be able to identify various types of literary works and identify the similarities and differences between each other.
- Students will identify and comment themes and moral issues that underlie the drama.

Life

Apollonius Rhodius, also known as Apollonius of Rhodes, a writer generally dated early 3rd century BCE - after 246 BCE, was a librarian at the Library of Alexandria. He is best known for his epic poem the *Argonautica*, also known as the *Voyage of the Argo*. There are four main sources of information on Apollonius' life: two texts entitled *Life of Apollonius* found in the scholia on Apollonius; the entry on him in the 10th century encyclopaedia the *Suda*; and a 2nd century BCE papyrus, P.Oxy. 1241, which provides names of several heads of the Library of Alexandria. Of these P.Oxy. 1241 carries much more weight than the others, as it is by far the closest to Apollonius' lifetime. Other miscellaneous texts provide further information.

Well-established facts;

- Birth. The two *Lives* and the *Suda* name Apollonius' father as Silleus or Illeus. (The second *Life* names his mother as "Rhode", but this is unlikely; *Rhodç* means "Rhodian woman", and is almost certainly derived from an attempt to explain Apollonius' epithet "Rhodian".) The *Lives*, the *Suda*, and the geographical writer Strabo say that he came from Alexandria; Athenaeus and Aelian say that he came from Naucratis, some 70 km south of Alexandria along the river Nile. No source gives the date of his birth.
- Student of Callimachus. The *Lives* and the *Suda* agree that Apollonius was a student of the poet and scholar Callimachus. The second *Life* adds that "some say" Apollonius was buried with Callimachus.
- Head of the Library of Alexandria. The second *Life*, the *Suda*, and P.Oxy. 1241 attest that Apollonius held this post. P.Oxy. 1241 establishes moreover that Apollonius was succeeded by Eratosthenes; this must have been after 247/246 BCE, the date of the accession of Ptolemy III Euergetes, who seems to be the monarch that appointed Eratosthenes. (The *Suda* says that Apollonius succeeded Eratosthenes, but this is impossible: Apollonius studied with Callimachus, who died ca. 240 BCE; the first *Life* says Apollonius was contemporary with Ptolemy III; and Eratosthenes held the post until at least 204 BCE)

- Removal from Alexandria to Rhodes. The *Lives* and the *Suda* attest to this; so does the attachment of the epithet *Rhodios* "the Rhodian" to his name. What is uncertain is whether he died there, or came back to Alexandria in order to take up the position of head of the Library afterwards.
- Death. Only the two *Lives* give information about Apollonius' death, and they disagree. The first says he died in Rhodes; the second says he died after returning to Alexandria.

From this we can conclude that (1) Apollonius was born in either Alexandria or Naucratis; (2) he lived for a time in Rhodes; (3) he held the post of Librarian at least until 246 BCE. From this in turn we may infer that he lived in the early-to-mid 3rd century BCE. Beyond this point lies speculation.

Work

The *Argonautica* one of the chief works in the history of epic poetry, is a Greek epic poem composed in the 3rd century BCE and remains the only surviving Hellenistic epic from this period. The *Argonautica* relates the myth of the voyage of Jason and the Argonauts to retrieve the Golden Fleece from the mythical land of Colchis. Another, much less-known *Argonautica*, using the same body of myth, was composed by Valerius Flaccus during the time of Vespasian.

Style

The *Argonautica* differs in some respects from traditional or Homeric Greek epic, though Apollonius may have used Homer as his principal model. The *Argonautica* is much shorter than Homer's epics, with four books totaling less than 6,000 lines. It has been said that *The Voyage of Argo*, by Apollonius of Rhodes has been unfairly compared with Homer's *Odyssey*. This suggests that it would be unrealistic to have the same expectations of the Alexandrian writer considering that Homer's work was in part the foundation upon which much of Greek literature was built.

However, upon consideration of the author's environment and circumstances, and the literary "fashions" of the time, it may not seem such an unfair thing to contrast Apollonius' work with those of the legendary Homer. *The Argonautica* was written centuries after *The Odyssey*, *The Iliad* and the other poems depicting the Trojan wars had become established as the primary epic poems of ancient Greece. Indeed, the work, like other Alexandrian poetry and like Attic tragedy, relies somewhat on the audience's knowledge of Homer to convey its own meanings. Additionally, the language of *The Argonautica* is not the same Greek which was spoken in third century Alexandria. Presumably, the language then is closer to that of Homer. This might allow one to suppose that Apollonius is consciously or unconsciously inviting comparisons by imitating, to some degree, the style and in this case even the content of Homer's *Odyssey*. The journey of Jason and the Argonauts is a similar legend to that of the journey of Odysseus. In many instances there are parallels between the two - there are several characters, besides Olympian Gods like Apollo, Hera, Athena and Aphrodite who appear at least briefly in both epics - King Alkinoos of Phaeacia plays a major role in the safe returns of both Jason and Odysseus. Other examples are the Sirens, and the visit to the nymph Kirke.

Apollonius may have also been influenced by Callimachus' advocacy of brevity, or by Aristotle's demand for "poems on a smaller scale than the old epics, and answering in length to the group of tragedies presented at a single sitting" (*Poetics*). *Argonautica* meets Aristotle's requirements; each of the *Argonautica*'s four books is around the same length as a tragedy. Tragedies were traditionally performed in groups of four, three tragedies and a satyr play, whose total length was very nearly that of the *Argonautica*. Though critics have concentrated on Homeric echoes in *Argonautica*, direct borrowings from tragedy, such as Euripides' *Medea* was inevitable. Hence, the *Argonautica* is often placed in a literary tradition that leads to the Hellenistic novel.

The overall impression of the writing style of Apollonius is one of slightly more literary sophistication in the modern sense. *The Argonautica* excels Homer in areas like character development, pace, and humor. Apollonius relies just as heavily on descriptive metaphors, and the emphasis on paternity and lineage of the characters is just as prominent as in Homer. Although *The Argonautica* lacks nearly all of the complexities of chronology found in *The Odyssey* - *The Argonautica* is completely linear in this respect - for better and for worse its characters seem much more human and believable.

Even though there are similarities and differences in the writing style of Apollonius and Homer one may get a sense of a slightly wiser, more subtle, ironic and humorous style in Apollonius' work. The account of the strange people called Mossynoeci doing "Public things privately and [more importantly] private things publicly" is less an instance of moralizing than a humorous, wide-eyed aside. The story lacks much of the bombast, length and repetition we see in Homer's stories, but rather takes a different, more sophisticated approach both to seek distinction from Homer and to modestly attempt appreciation alongside him.

Plot

The characteristics of adventures of epic proportion include suspense, adventure, danger, and heroism. They mostly involve a task that needs to be completed. The essential elements of the *Argonautica*'s plot are simple: Jason was ordered by King Pelias to find and bring back the Golden Fleece. He fitted a ship called the Argo and sailed from his land with a band of heroes, the Argonauts, drawn from all over the Greek territory. This group called the Argonauts is made up of sons of gods and heroes. Traveling up to the Black Sea in their boat, the Argo, they encounter various obstacles that they must overcome in order to secure the Golden Fleece for their own and return safely to their home. The Golden Fleece was kept in the land of Aia at the mouth of the river Phasis, the easternmost point of the Caucasus. Aia was conceived as the end of the earth. Beyond it the river Phasis empties into the

Themes

Unlike the archaic Epic tradition the *Argonautica* entails many discursions into local custom, aetiology, and other popular subjects of Hellenistic poetry. Apollonius also chooses the less shocking versions of some myths, having Medea, for example, merely watch the murder of Absyrtus instead of murdering him herself. The gods are relatively distant and inactive throughout much of the epic, following the Hellenistic trend to allegorize and rationalize religion. Heterosexual loves such as Jason's are more emphasized than homosexual loves such as that of Heracles and Hylas, another trend in Hellenistic literature, as heterosexual love gained prestige.

Characters

Apollonius' epic also differs from the more traditional epic in its weaker, more human protagonist Jason whose character traits, which are more characteristic of the genre of realism than epic, in that he was:

"chosen leader because his superior declines the honour, subordinate to his comrades, except once, in every trial of strength, skill or courage, a great warrior only with the help of magical charms, jealous of honour but incapable of asserting it, passive in the face of crisis, timid and confused before trouble, tearful at insult, easily despondent, gracefully treacherous in his dealings with the love-sick Medea..."

Thus, the central character (or in the Homeric sense, the hero) is less the virtuous demi-God we see in Odysseus or Achilles; rather Jason is at first glance an unlikely hero. Instead of being on a quest to regain his homeland and simply encountering obstacles in the bargain, Jason is a man sent on an impossible mission by a king who wants him out of the way. Jason's quest for the Golden Fleece is one that appears to be thrust upon him rather than volunteered. This is not to say, however, that Apollonius' Jason is not at least partially modeled on Homer's Odysseus.

As all great stories of adventure, the leader figure is considered to be brave, strong, smart, and have all the characteristics of a true hero. In this story, the question arises; is Jason truly a hero, or just an average person that managed to gather the right group for the task at hand? Jason, as the protaganist, takes his own journey paralleling that of the Argo. Jason is an ordinary man but possesses after all some of the qualities that make a leader: wisdom, abundant charm, and above all a most persuasive tongue. He is a man who gets things done for him. Like many other heroes, it is the initial problem that sets heroes off on a journey. Having a solid base of being raised and trained in leadership and warriorship, he was born for the task, but the story gives one insight of how mortal Jason really is. Jasonhence learns to be a hero along the journey.

Behind every great person there is supposudly a woman. In this story, her name is Medea. Medea aides Jason and the Argonauts in acquiring the Golden Fleece and in turn are forced to flee herself in the face of harsh persecution of her actions- betraying her father and mudering her own brother. This creates a moral dilema within her but bewitched by her passion for Jason engineered by Hera with the help of Eros she opts to bid farewel to her known world - home and family facing the unkown and a life that is much challenging. For doing this, Jason promises her marriage.

Many of her phenomenal powers and attributes can be related to witchcraft, but is Medea actually a witch, or is she just a talented woman? Did she herself graze the ankle of Talos and bring him to his defeat? Although she conjures up an ointment of invulnerability, what exactly did she do herself to it that made it so magical? These questions bring up the possibility that Medea finds her great power not in witchcraft and magic, but in intellect and talent. It was the fact that she was knowledgeable of the roots that possess the magical invulnerability properties and her wisdom of it that had her create the ointment for Jason. In the case of Talos though, one might argue that it was a stroke of luck that he was defeated. Medea stood on the deck of the Argo and summoned the spirits of death to defeat him, but it could have been merely by accident that Talos grazed his ankle on a rock that led to his defeat. Luck or Magic whatever it may be, the power that Medea has was extraordinary.

The end of the story can be characterized as being very abrupt, but hinting to a much larger story than what one reads. The Voyage of Argo is finished off as only a prequel to something much bigger. A final taste of action is given to us before we depart by Medea defeating Talos. Up to that point in the story, Medea's role seems to have become redundent on the voyage, and hence has to prove herself, one more time before returning home. By quickly defeating Talos, in a sense, she again is worthy of Jason and the crew. By simply signing off of a story that he so illustrated and described though out the majority of it, Apollonius gives an idea that there is more of the story to continueo (which there is) and there was more of a story before that too (which there is too).

There are also many instances where Apollonius seems to consciously desire some distance from the ideas in Homer's work. *The Argonautica* is much less apt to moralize on specific topics than Homer was apt to, although in some instances similar themes are presented. The character Medea is one which seems at once less virtuous and less subservient than Odysseus' wife Penelope, who is presented as the "ideal" wife. Medea both disobeys her father and helps kill her own brother in helping Jason to succeed in his quest for the Golden Fleece, and eventually abandons her family and her homeland for Jason, a "foreign man". Although Medea has supposedly been struck with Eros' "arrow of love", she possesses a sharp tongue from which not even Jason is spared; she belittles Jason for his perceived lack of interest in protecting her from. Despite all this Medea is a character presented in a favorable light in *The Argonautica* - she too is shown to be a "good" character though these seem less like the characteristics of Homer's "ideal wife", Penelope, than her antithesis, Klytaemnestra.

Similarities of Apollonius' work in regard to Homer's moral issues, the women of the island of Lemnos, whom the Argonauts encounter on their outward journey, embody characteristics which are respectively praised and condemned in Homer. The Lemnian women have killed their husbands because of marital infidelity - but infidelity is behavior which in Homer is only a disdainful act when committed by women. In keeping with themes presented in Homer, these women would be presented as bad examples of how wives should be - and therefore not presented favorably in general. However, in *The Argonautica*, they also turn out to be terrific hosts to Jason and his men. They in fact offer the Argonauts marriage and all that their late husbands had possessed. This aspect of the "good host" is an important theme of honorable behavior in Homer. One might predict that in Homer, an island full of women who had killed all of the men might not have been depicted as behaving so graciously towards a ship of travelers.

The Argonauts, the men who accompany Jason on this voyage, are all men of great notability. A vast cast of characters make up the men on the adventure and they come from all walks of ancient society and mythology. Over Fifty men are along for the ride, yet only a handful of them are actually mentioned or contribute to the excursion. The idea of selecting participents created an all star complement of some of the most heroic and adventurous men of that time (yet some of the men on the Argo are from different periods of time). These men were the best of the best; they are most heroic and noble men that you could find at the time.

All of this works to show that characters in general are treated more as human beings in *The Argonautica*, with both desirable and undesirable qualities. There is not such a division between "good" and "bad" characters as in Homer. It should be noted, however, that "bad" characters do make appearances in *The Voyage of Argo* and that they do possess the characteristics shown to be "bad" in Homer. An example is King Amykos, whom the Argonauts encounter also on their outward journey. Rather than showing the travelers the grace of a good host - seeing to their needs and offering food before asking their business, inviting them to stay, etc- Amykos straightaway challenges them. This shows at least some commitment to the same values as found in Homer; Polydeukes kills Amykos in the subsequent boxing match, and the Argonauts proceed to plunder his kingdom - an unjust man has received his just desserts.

The character Herakles in *The Argonautica* is one who might have been treated differently in Homer - certainly with more seriousness and respect - being as he was a legendary hero of ancient Greece. It is evident that Apollonius along with other Greeks saw some humor in the character. In *The Argonautica*, Herakles is shown as a well - intentioned oaf who goes about wreaking general havoc, killing all manner of monsters. Even after Herakles has become separated from Jason and his men, the Argonauts come across his trail when they discover the slain serpent Ladon, who had been in charge of guarding the golden apples in the Garden of Atlas. Ladon had been kept company by some friendly nymphs called Hesperides who tell of Herakles' visit with wonder and dismay, lamenting the loss of their friend the serpent. One could guess that in Homer Herakles might have been held accountable by Atlas for the murder of his pet; however Herakles seems here to be impervious to this kind of punishment.

Myth

The Gods are equally prominent in the *Argonautica*, however they are given more distance from mortals here, and we are given less insight into their motives and characters. Although *The Argonautica* was written much later, none of this should be seen as any kind of plagiarism or imitation aspiring to the level of Homer; rather an acknowledgement. It is possible, too, that this works to comfort the audience with recognizable, familiar characters. *The Argonautica*'s considerably shorter length and lack of repetition may stem from the fact that it was originally a written, rather than spoken or performed work such as Homer's. Apollonius tells the story at a faster pace, tending to skip over the intimate details of things like battles and simply recount the result. Jason and Medea's tale is also left hanging to some degree; unlike *The Odyssey*, we are not explicitly given the "happily ever after" details of the epic. When we leave the Argonauts, they are simply said to have encountered no more obstacles on their homeward journey. Jason and Medea's triumphant return and married life are things Apollonius' version of the legend leaves to the audience's (and to other writers') imaginations; this is a tale in its own right. The story of *Jason and the Argonauts* is one of ancient legend pre-dating Apollonius, but it is also one of considerable variation depending on the storyteller.

Mythology plays big role in telling the story as a narrative and understanding it too as the famous epic that it is. An excursion like this is not something that happens every day and some of the things that they see and do are not things that are normally portrayed in this day in age. The procedures, gods, and rituals described represent the power that the gods had back then and their meaning to such a voyage as this one. One of the prime examples of this is the repetitious sacrifices to the gods. In the case of the Argonauts, they sacrificed sheep to the god and built

shrines to them in return for such things as good winds, happy landings, and calm seas. Even the main reason for Jason's voyage is based on a mythological fleece that he doesn't even know exists or not in the first place. The rams golden fleece and the story behind it is a myth in itself. If it wasn't for the great treasure that this fleece was and the great myth that was behind it, then the Voyage of Argo probably wouldn't have happened in the first place.

Movement of the Argo

easternmost point of the Mediterranean, and which is designated as an entrance to Hades (as all important transition points are), the expedition continues toward the land of Aia.

The *Odyssey,* which presents similar adventures, ascribing them to Odysseus, places them in the west. According to the *Odyssey* the city of Aia is in the west. In the *Argonautica* the Black Sea is entered by passing the dangerous point of the Clashing Rocks at the Bosphoros; but in the *Odyssey* the Clashing Rocks are in the west. Once the voyage of the Argo was made to pass through the Black Sea, the idea was conceived of going to the extreme east of the Black Sea, and hence the easternmost point of the maritime area composed of the Mediterranean and the Black Sea. The exact point where the Golden Fleece was kept is a city called Aia, "Earth." It is on the right bank of the Phasis near its mouth. According to Pherekydes, Aia was located on an island of the river Phasis. The land of Aia was called Colchis.

The geodetic data permit to solve the mystery of the location of the island of Circe. The texts clearly indicate that the island of Circe is the duplication of the Aia on the river Phasis. Circe and

Aietes, who lives at Aia, are both children of Helios. According to Hesiod *(Theog.* 1016, fr.) and to Apollonios, Circe, accompanied by her brother Aietes, was taken from Colchis to Tyrrhenia on the Chariot of the Sun. Apollonios gives the name of Aiaie to the residence of Circe in order to distinguish it from the original Aia. In the *Odyssey*, when Odysseus is about to leave Circe, she mentions to him the route followed by the Argonauts.

The *Periplus of Skylax,* Theophrastos, and Aristotle identify the island of Circe with Mons Circeus or Capo Circeo on the coast of Latium. Apollonios accepts this identification.

The position of Monte Circeo, 41°12'N, 13°04'E, explains the importance of the island of Circe: it is a geodetic point on the latitude of the river Phasis. In longitude it is as distant from Tarifa (5°26'W) as it is distant from Aia. According to Hesiod the Argonauts, having reached the land of Aietas, return by way of the Oceanus, Libya (carrying their ship overland) and the Mediterranean (fr. 63, 64).

The meaning of the myth of *Argonautica* is best revealed by fragments of the poem *Nanno* of the lyric poet Mimnermos, who lived in the second half of the sixth century B.C.

> Nor would even Jason himself have ever brought the great fleece from Aia, accomplishing the grievous journey, fulfilling the harsh task imposed by the *hybris* of Pelias, nor would he have reached the fair stream of Oceanus.

Another fragment mentions "the city of Aietes, where the beams of swift Sun lie in a golden bed near the edges of Oceanus, whither the divine Jason went and was gone." The text clearly indicates that Aia is the place of the rising sun. The Golden Fleece could represent the rays of the rising sun, but it appears more likely that it is not different from the Aegis of Athena, which is a goatskin. At the end of their trip, at the western limit of the earth, the Argonauts come to the land where the Aegis originally was.

The poem Nanno continues:

> For the Sun's portion is labor every day, nor is there any rest for him and his horses, once rosy-fingered Dawn has ascended the sky leaving Oceanus. But a lovely hollow bed, forged of precious gold by the hands of Hephaistos, carries him on wings over the waves on the surface of the water while he sleeps pleasantly, from the country of the Hesperides to the land of Ethiopia, where his swift chariot and horses hold still until early-begotten Dawn arrives; then the son of Hyperion mounts his chariot.

This symbolism may be understood when we consider that the Sun was usually conceived as being carried across the sky on a chariot from east to west during the day; sometimes this chariot was thought of as being drawn by a team of horses galloping over the waters. At the point Atlas at the extreme west, near the Garden of the Hesperides, these horses were unyoked. During the night the Sun was carried back on a boat, because the area below the Equator was conceived as immersed in water, whereas the world above the equator is dry land. The ship Argo goes from west to east, to the land of the rising sun, and then follows the sun's nocturnal course in the opposite direction.

At the end of the sixth century B.C., Pindar, in relating the adventures of Jason sums up the mention of the return after the seizure of the Fleece in a single line *(Pyth.* IV, 447): "They penetrated the floods of Oceanus and the Red Sea." In Greek usage the Red Sea refers to the waters east of Egypt and may be the Persian Gulf or the Indian Ocean. By reducing this part of the events to a single line Pindar reflects a tendency that appears in full in the tragic writers of the fifth century B.C., according to whom the Argonauts return to Greece by the route by which they went. This tendency eliminates from the myth the scientific mathematical element.

According to Diodorus (IV 56, 3) a number of ancient historians, among them Timaeus of Tauromenion, who was the first to gather traditions of the Italian area and of the Western Mediterranean, ascribed a northern route to the return of the ship Argo. From the Black Sea,

> they sailed up the river Tanais (Don) as far as its sources, and having hauled the ship overland through some specified place, by following the course of another river that flows into Oceanus they sailed down into the sea. Then they traveled from the north to the west, keeping the land on their left, and having reached the neighborhood of Gadeira (Cadiz) they sailed into our sea.

According to the geographer Timogetos, the Argo ascends the Istros or Danube. The Danube has two branches: one that empties into the Black Sea and one that empties into the Celtic Sea *(i.e.,* the Rhone). By following both branches the Argo reaches the Mediterranean.

In mythical language rivers that originate close to each other are described as merging into one; this was the practical way to convey vividly the information. For preliterate man, for whom rivers were the main means of communication and orientation, to imagine that rivers joined their sources was the way to establish a geographical point.

According to the geographer Hekataios of Miletos, the Argonauts return through the Phasis, the Oceanus, and the Nile. Herodotus mentions that "the Greeks navigated on a great ship to Aia of Colchis and to the river Phasis" (I 2). He relates the version later adopted by Apollonius; when the ship Argo was off Cape Malea it was caught by a northerly gust of wind that transported it to the lagoon Tritonis, characterized by shoal waters. Miraculously the Argonauts found a channel that took them out of there. Morass Tritonis is placed by Herodotus in the territory of the Madilyes. In the Morass Tritonis there flows a large river called Triton.

The Argonauts leave the island of the Phaecians or Corfu in a southerly direction. They had come in sight of the coast of the Peloponnese (about 37½°N) when a storm pushed them for 9 days and 9 nights "over the Libyan Sea and deep into Syrtis." A similar story is told by Homer about Odysseus. The movement of 9 days and nights across the sea may be interpreted as 13½° of longitude. From the southern tip of Corfu (46½°N) to Lake Tritonis (about 33°N) there are about 13½°. These data indicate that the Argo reached the Tropic.

The poem of Apollonius clearly indicates that the ship Argo was carried overland by the waves and it found itself in an area surrounded by sands. It is the area of Lake Tritonis which is connected with the Little Syrtis at the east by an area of low ground and shallow lakes, so that it could be imagined that the waves of the sea storm could carry a ship from the Mediterranean to Lake

Tritonis. All the details of the story indicate that Lake Triton is on the meridian 6°38'E, the limit of the earth in Africa. The Argonauts find themselves in the middle of "a desert spreading out before them from the margin of an empty continent." It is an area which is neither land nor sea "with great breakers rolling over white sand." Probably this represents the concept of chaos which was the state of the world before the waters separated from the land. Places at the margin of the world are always so conceived. Similarly the traveller Pytheas of Marseilles reported that in the area beyond (Strabo II 104) "there is neither land alone nor water nor air, but a mixture similar to a jellyfish . . . . earth and sea and everything swings through the air . . . . this is the bound of the universe through which it is not possible either to march or to navigate."

The Argo had reached the Garden of Atlas, the position that Herodotus calls the Pillar of of the Sky, where there are the three nymphs who are the Hesperides, daughters of Oceanus, and their tree with the apple. The apple had just been stolen the day before, so that the knowledge about geography had been acquired and the Argonauts could leave. In his description of the point reached by the ship Argo, Apollonios confuses two points along the meridian 6°48'E, the Garden of Atlas at the Tropic and the Tritonian Lagoon to the north. But these two places tended to be confused by tradition. He places the birthplace of Athena at the first point reached by the Argonauts, and places the Garden of Atlas at the second point, called by him Morass Tritonis. But he places three goddesses with goatskin capes at the first point and states that they are those who bathed Athena in the water of Trito when she was born. Thus he indicates that the Argo is on a Lake. The Hesperides, "Ladies of the West" and Athena who carries the goatskin aegis were originally one entity. This shift along meridian 6°48'E is part of the tradition. The ideal place of the Hesperides or Gorgones is the island of Atlantis at the Equator. In my opinion Athena is the goddess of the Ecliptic and hence her birthplace is properly placed at the Tropic, where Apollonios places it, although Greek tradition prefers to place her birth in the more familiar area of Morass Tritonis to the north. But the place of the Garden of Atlas is also shifted to the Tropic, and continuing further north along the course of the Trito, it could be shifted to the Morass Tritonis.

The Gorgones are also called Graiai, "Gray Ladies." The mountains called Graiai are placed by Ptolemy at latitude 45°12'N and on the meridian that corresponds to the course of the river Trito in Africa, at the junction of the Alps with the Adulas. I have indicated that the entity Adulas seems to be the equivalent of the Atlas.

The departure from the birthplace of Athena takes place when Amphitrite unyokes the chariot of Poseidon. One of the unyoked horses runs across the waves, indicating the road back to the Mediterranean. From this the Argonauts conclude that they have to carry the ship Argo on their shoulders and follow the route indicated by the horse. The meaning of this passage may be understood on the basis of the ancient concept whereby the horses which draw the sun's chariot over the waters are unyoked at the point Atlas at the extreme west. The course of the sun would continue by night by boat over the waters below the equator; but the Argonauts, who move in the direction opposite to that of the Sun, carry the Argo overland to the north. The Argonauts leave the area of chaos in which they were trapped by walking "across the desert dunes of Libya," following the course indicated by the horse of the chariot of Poseidon.

The Argonauts escape by carrying the ship on their shoulders across the land for 9 days and 9 nights. Normally a day of march is reckoned as half a degree, assuming that one marches only during the day, but here by marching day and night the Argonauts advance 9° to the north and reach Morass Tritonis about 33°N. After walking across this country, the Argonauts feel trapped again in the Morass Tritonis. But Trito points out to them a passage by which they can reach the sea. Lake Tritonis was assumed to be in communication with the sea, with which it is linked by a series of shallow salty lakes. In fact from the Morass Tritonis a series of lowlands and salty water flats leads to the Little Syrtis. The Argonauts follow that line in an easterly direction, carried by a breeze, and continue on the same line when in the Mediterranean, keeping the coast and the desert on the right, up to the point where the coast juts towards the north—that is, as far as Kyrenaika. At that point the wind begins to blow from the south. They advance all along the coast of Libya until the wind changes and pushes them north toward Crete.

Under this favorable wind the Argonauts continue to the north from sunrise to sunset; at sunset the wind stops and they row for a night, a day, and a night again, reaching the island of Carpathos. This implies that leaving Morass Tritonis the ship Argo moved along parallel 33°N until it reached the most northern point of Kyrenaika (Ras el-Hillal, 32°55'N) and then went 2½° to the north, reaching the southern point of Carpathos.

Perhaps the original *Argonautica* concerned adventures along the meridian Atlantis-Thule. The version of Herodotus, according to which Iason, before going on his expedition, is pushed by a storm to the land of Atlas may have been the original one. As a second step there may have been introduced a version in which the meridian Atlantis-Thule was reached through the Danube. The identification of the Danube with Oceanus is a major element of the myth of the Argonauts.

Since the movements of the ship Argo are mainly along the meridian 0, I believe that the voyage to the geodetic point of the Golden Fleece, at the easternmost point of the Black Sea, was added later. The main movement is along the Danube to the meridian 0. The Golden Fleece = Aigis of Athena was originally on meridian 0.

The *Odyssey* differs from the *Argonautica* in that it knows only the movements along meridian 0. The places visited by Odysseus, before coming to the island of the Phaecians, are all along meridian 0.

The myth of the Argo's voyage, far from being evidence of ancient foolishness, indicates how the form of *mythos* was employed to convey scientific information. The course of the ship Argo touches some of the geodetic points I have mentioned. The expedition stops at Sinope and reaches the River Phasis. The versions about the route followed for the return are a mine of geographical information. The Argo sails from the River Phasis into the Caspian Sea and then into the Indian Ocean. According to another version it moves in the opposite direction following the Danube and then the Sava, from which there is a passage into the Adriatic Sea. According to another version the Argo sails up the Danube as far as some eddying pools where the Danube is joined by the Rhone; this is the mythical way of imparting the information that the upper reaches of the Danube are near the sources of the Rhone. According to the historian Timaeus, the Argonauts rowed up to the source of the Tanais or Don and then dragged their ship overland to a river that took it to Oceanus, so that by sailing south-west, keeping land on the left, finally they reached Gadeira or Cadiz to enter the Mediterranean. Instead of laughing at such stories, scholars should

bow in piety before these efforts of our ancestors towards science and knowledge, which may be as old as the Neolithic period.

Learning Teaching Activities

Activity No 1

Discuss Appolonius' treatment of the love affair between Jason and Medea in the *Voyage of Argo*

Instructions

- This can be done as an assignment.
- When the text is completed the teacher can discuss the the theme of love and loyalty concerning Json and Medea.

Activity No 2

Examine Apollonius' psychological treatment of Medea as a woman torn between her devotion to her family and her overwhelming love for a foreigner.

Instructions

- This can be done as an assignment.
- While the text is read in class the students can collect information on the character of Medea.

Resources:

Clare, R.J., The Path of the Argo: Language, Imagery and Narrative in the Argonautica of Apollonius Rhodius, Cambridge, 2002.

Harder, M.A., and M. Cuypers (edd.), Beginning from Apollo: Studies in Apollonius Rhodius and the Argonautic Tradition, Leuven, 2005.

Knight, Virginia H., The Renewal of Epic: Responses to Homer in the Argonautica of Apollonius. Leiden: Brill, 1995.

EARLY HISTORY OF ROME

Competency 9.0 : Gain an insight into the experiences of the Greeks and Romans in Antiquity

Competency Level 9.1 : Appreciates political and social achievements of the Greeks and Romans as a background to Western Civilization

Duration : 20 periods

Learning Outcomes :
- Gets a clear idea about the regal period and the conversion of the regal period to a Republic.
- Identifies the struggle between the two orders.
- Learns about the punic wars and the great personality of Hannibal.

2.6. The Early History of Rome

The early history of Rome offers an essential as well as an interesting topic of study. However, there is little that is known with regard to this period. What we do know comes partially from the accounts of later classical historians as Livy, Tacitus and Plutarch, as well as from the scattered archaeological remains that were uncovered through extensive archaeological excavations conducted through the years. However, the most fruitful source is, undoubtedly, the corpus of myths and legends that seek to narrate the foundation and the earliest beginnings of Rome. Thus, it is through a combination of all these sources that one could construct the early history of ancient Rome.

2.6.1. Kings of Rome

From the available evidence it could be inferred that in its earliest times Rome was ruled by kings. Hence, this period [753 B. C. – 509 B. C.] is often referred to as the *Regal Period*. Though the accounts of the early kings of Rome are purely legendary, it should be noted that these kings did made a substantial contribution to the later development of Rome. In a way it is during the Regal Period that the foundation for Rome's future greatness was laid.

The Nature of Roman Kingship

Election:

Roman kingship was not hereditary, but elective. The king was elected by the Senate and the election needed to be ratified by the people.

Usually, it so happens that the king nominates his successor. However, in case a king dies without nominating his successor, the Senate would appoint two Interim kings or *interreges*. They held

office for five days in turn and the last Interim king would nominate the next permanent king. This nomination once more needed to be approved by the people.

Powers and Functions:

All the important powers of the state were centered around the king. Thus, he was the Chief Judge in all civil cases and the Chief priest - *Pontifex Maximus.* In times of war he was the Commander in chief of the army.

The king alone has the right to summon the Comitia and to instigate legislation, and thereby plays a significant role in the process of law making.

He also represented the community in its foreign relations, in which capacity he made treaties and decided on questions of peace and war.

Thus, it could be simply said that the king held the *Imperium* – command of unlimited range.

The Seven Kings of Rome

Romulus [753 – 716 B. C.]

Romulus was regarded as the legendary founder of Rome and its first king. Because of his divine patronage [Mars – the god of war] his figure is often used to connect the lineage of the Romans to the gods, as well as to justify the unorthodox power of the Roman Empire later on. This is specially seen upon observing the accounts of the Later Roman historians, such as Livy [Books 1 and 2].

Romulus founded the earliest Roman constitution composed of a king, the senate and the Comitia Curiata [a popular assembly composed exclusively of nobles]. He divided the population into two groups; the Patricians and the Plebeians. He is also said to have increased the population of Rome by making it a shelter for run away slaves and criminals, as well as procuring wives for his people [the Rape of the Sabines]. It was believed that he was later deified and worshiped by the people.

Numa Pompilius [715 – 673 B. C.]

Numa Pompilius was a Sabine, which indicates that the Sabines were absorbed into the Roman population by then. His rule was peaceful as well as prosperous.

The main contribution made by Numa Pompilius was that he founded the state religion of Rome by instituting the religious offices of Pontiffs, Augurs, Flamens and Vestal Virgins. He is also said to have built a temple for Janus.

Tullus Hostilius [673 – 642 B. C.]

It was during the reign of Tullus Hostilius, that Alba Longa was conquered by the Romans. The famous legend of the three brothers, Horatii, who championed the course of Rome against the Albans, gives a vivid account of the war. After the conquest of Alba Longa, and subsequently moving the population into Rome, Tullus also waged war against Fidenae and the Etruscans.

Ancus Marcius [642 – 617 B. C.]

Ancus carried successful warfare against the Latins and managed to conquer several Latin towns. He built a fortress at Janiculum in order to protect Rome from the Etruscans and connected this fortress with Rome by a bridge. This is regarded as the first bridge over the Tiber.

Lacius Tarquinius Priscus [616 – 579 B. C.]

Tarquinius Priscus was an Etruscan by birth and the first of the Etruscan kings to rule Rome. He was the guardian of the children of Ancus Marcius. However, with the death of Ancus he was elected king by the Senate and the Cometia. He defeated the Sabines and conquered their town Collatia. His rule is renowned for the various public works such as the construction of the Circus Maximus [the Race Course] and the sewer system.

He also made certain changes in the constitution by increasing the number of the senators by 100 [*Minores Gentes*]

Sevius Tullius [568 – 535 B. C.]

Servius introduced a new division of the Roman population, based on birth and accordingly established the *Cometia Centuriata*; a new assembly that also included the Plebeians. Through this he gave political recognition and representation to the Plebeians.

He made an alliance with the Latins and thus, formed the famous Latin League. Here, it should be noted that this was an important step for Rome, as it would have been difficult for her to survive at this initial stage without the help and protection of the Latin League.

Tarquinius Superbus [535 – 510 B.C.]

He was a cruel and an oppressive ruler; depriving the Plebeians of the privileges granted to them by Servius Tullius, and forcing them to work at low wages upon his public buildings. He did not hesitate to murder people who went against his authority.

However, Tarquinius did contribute to the future greatness of Rome by making Rome the strongest power of the Latin League. He forced the other members of the league to submit to his command, thereby making Rome the head of the Lain League.

The Fall of Monarchy and the Establishment of the Republic

Eventually, Tarquinius' oppressive rule led to the discontentment of the people. This was further aggravated by the rape of Lucretia by Tarquinius' son Sextus. Upon this the people rose against him and drove him and his family into exile. With this monarchy was abolished in Rome and a Republic was established in 510 B. C.

Attempts to Restore Monarchy

Though the Regal Period came to an end with the overthrow of Tarquinius Superbus, there were three attempts to restore monarchy, which all ended in failure. However, attention needs to be given to three legends.

- The story of Consul L. Brutus.
- The legend of Horatius Coeles.
- The legend of Mucius Scaevola

Though these accounts might be nothing more than mere fictitious stories, they do emphasise certain Roman virtues such as loyalty, courage, justice, patriotism and self sacrifice.

2.6.2. The Early Republic

Once the Roman Republic was established in 510 B. C., it had to face numerous challenges. Internally, a number of conspiracies were carried out in order to re - establish the old monarchy. Externally, Rome was engaged in a series of wars with the neighbouring tribes. Thus, it indeed proved to be a critical time for her.

Changes in the Constitution

The Appointment of Consuls

The first change to occur was the establishment of the office of consuls, in place of king. The two consuls were the highest executive authority of the state. Thus, they basically enjoyed the same power previously enjoyed by the kings. However, certain measures were taken to prevent them acting in a tyrannical manner.

- Shortening the duration of their power to a year.
- The consuls were elected by the people, not nominated.
- Making the two consuls of equal authority. Hence, each consul acted as a check upon the others authority.

Dictatorship

During times of public crisis or emergency, the power of the two consuls proved insufficient to meet the requirements of the situation. In such times a Dictator was appointed. A Dictator was nominated by one of the consuls. Once appointed, the dictator held office for six months, during which time his power was absolute. The authority of the consuls was momentarily suspended.

Foreign Relations

Important events to consider

- Volscian War
- War with the Veii
- The Aequian War – 458 B. C.
- Fall of Veii – 396 B. C.
- The Burning of Rome by the Gauls – 390 B. C.

2.6.3 The Struggle of the Orders

From its earliest beginnings, the Roman society was defined by a clear social hierarchy. Thus, the population was divided into two groups.

The Patricians – The patricians or *patricii* were the highly privileged aristocratic class of Roman citizens. They were probably descended from the original Latin settlers in Rome. [The name itself stemmed from the Latin word *patres*, meaning fathers, which was applied to the earliest members of the Roman Senate, from whom the patrician clans claimed descent.] The Patricians were divided into three tribes, *Ramnes, Tities* and *Luceres,* corresponding to the three nationa-lities which made the Roman people, *viz.*, the Latins, the Sabines and the Etruscans. The Patricians alone enjoyed full social and political privileges. They had the government entirely in their own hands. Furthermore, they always tried to maintain the monopoly of these rights and privileges for themselves.

Plebeians - The plebeians or *plebei* were either foreign traders or later immigrants to Rome. Some of them were descended from the enfranchised slaves of the Patricians and

were known as *clients* or dependents. Each client was attached to the Patrician family of his emancipated ancestor. The Plebeians occupied an inferior position in the society, being subjected to political disabilities and social degradation. They were denied all social and political privileges. Hence, they were severely discontented.

Due to the disparity existing between the two classes the discontentment of the Plebeians grew. Besides being subjected to a number of grievances and the oppression of the Patrician magistrates, they were denied any opportunity to rectify their dire state. Thus, a political struggle between the Plebeians and the Patricians resulted, in which the Plebeians sought social and political equality with the Patricians. This is commonly referred to as the Struggle of the Orders. It was the major issue during the beginning of the Roman Republic, and played a dominant role in the development of the Constitution of the Roman Republic. It began in 494 B. C. and ended in 300 B. C.

Important Events

509 B. C. - Passing of the *Lex Valerio de Provocatione* – this law provided that in criminal trials, when the life or the rights of a citizen were at stake, there should always be an appeal from a sentence of a magistrate to the whole assembly. Thus, this law saved the Plebeians from the oppressive judgements of the Patrician magistrates.

494 B. C. - The First Secession of the Plebeians to the sacred mountain. As a result of this they were able to establish their own assembly, the *Concilium Plebis*, and elect their own magistrates; the Tribunes and the Plebeian *Aediles*.

471 B. C. – The passing of the first Publilian Law which endorsed that the election of the tribunes and Plebeian Aediles should take place in the Concilium Plebis.

451 B. C. – The appointment of the Decemvirate and the establishment of the Law of the Twelve Tables. This is the first codification of Roman law.

449 B. C. – the Second Secession of the Plebeians. As a result the Decemvirate was abolishes and the old magistracies restored. The passing of the Valerio – Horatian Laws. These laws proclaimed that

- The resolutions passed through the Concilium Plebis should be binding upon the Patricians and Plebeians alike.
- Tribunes and other Plebeian magistrates should be sacred
- Every citizen should be given the right to appeal against the decisions of the supreme magistrate

445 B. C. – The Third Secession of the Plebeians and the passing of the *Lex Canuleia* which allowed intermarriages between Patricians and Plebeians.

421 B. C. – The Plebeians were granted the right of holding the office of *Quaestor*.

367 B. C. – Passing of the Licinian Laws. These laws limited the amount of land a person could possess. Furthermore, the Plebeians became eligible for holding consulship, as the law declared that one of the Consuls must be a Plebeian.

356 B. C. – The Dictatorship was thrown open to the Plebeians.

339 B. C. – The Second Publilian Law was passed which provided that

- All laws passed by the Comitia Centuriata must receive the sanction of the patrician members of the Senate before and not after their enactment.
- One of the two Censors must be a Plebeian.

300 B. C. – The *Lex Ogulnia* was passed. This law opened the religious offices to the Plebeians.

287 B. C. – Passing of the *Lex Hortensia* through which the Plebeians were granted the concession that all plebiscites, measures passed in the Concilium Plebis, had the force of laws for the whole Roman state.

Outcome of the Struggle

As the result of the struggle, the discrepancy between the Plebeians and Patricians began to dissolve. At first, only the Patricians were allowed to hold political offices. Yet, over time these laws were revoked, and eventually all offices were opened to the Plebeians. Furthermore, since most individuals who were elected to political office were given membership in the Roman senate, this development helped to break down the exclusive patrician nature of the senate. Also, the Plebeian legislative assembly, the Plebeian Council, acquired additional power. At first, its acts or *plebiscites* applied only to Plebeians, although after 449 B. C., these acts began to apply to both Plebeians and Patricians alike.

However, it should be born in mind that the conflict did not eradicate the deep - rooted hierarchy of the Roman society, nor did it greatly improve the lives or the prospects of the Plebeians. What was essentially achieved by the Plebeians during the conflict of orders was the breakdown of an aristocracy of birth and its replacement with an aristocracy that was based on the holding of political offices and on wealth. This opened new opportunities for the Plebeians that were not accessible for them before.

The struggle also had certain far – reaching effects on Rome as a nation. By the end of this struggle, the two orders felt themselves as one people. This sense of unity resulted in the strengthening of Rome, so that she was able to embark upon a successful imperial career.

2.6.4 The Punic Wars: Causes, Main Events, Outcome.

Carthage and Rome before the Punic wars

Carthage was a large port - city in Africa. It was founded by the Phoenicians in the middle of the 9th century B. C., and by the year 264 B. C., it developed as a powerful city - state with a large and lucrative commercial empire. Carthage's navy was the largest in the ancient world at the time, and they were famous for their ability as mariners. However, Carthage did not maintain a

large, permanent, standing army. Instead, it relied on mercenaries, hired with its considerable wealth, to fight its wars.

During the same time, the Roman Republic had gained control of the Italian peninsula south of the river Po. Unlike Carthage, Rome had large standing armies made up almost entirely of Roman citizens. Yet, at the start of the First Punic War she had no standing navy, and were thus at a disadvantage until finally a navy was built.

The First Punic War [264 to 241 B. C.]

Causes

The real cause of the Punic Wars was the clash of interests between the existing Carthaginian Empire and the expanding Roman Republic. At the start of the first Punic War, Carthage was the dominant power of the Western Mediterranean, with an extensive maritime empire, while Rome was a rapidly ascending power in Italy. Thus, a war between these two forces seemed inevitable. Accordingly, a pretext for the immediate outbreak of the war was supplied.A group of Campanian mercenaries, known as the Mammertines, seized Messana and established themselves there. They extended their power and spread terror all around their neighbourhood. Hiero, the king of Syracuse, determined to suppress these robbers, marched against them, defeated them in battle and shut them up within Messana. Thus besieged the Mamertines looked for outside help. One group implored the help of Carthage, while another appealed to Rome. While Rome was hesitating, the Carthaginians send a garrison to occupy Messana. But the Romans looked upon the Carthaginian occupation of Messana as dangerous to Italy and so they induced the Mammertines to expel, the Carthaginian garrison and to admit a Roman garrison instead. Whereupon the Carthaginians made common cause with the Syracusans, and their combined armies besieged Messana. At this the Romans declared war against Carthage in 264 B. C.

Main events

- The Romans defeated the forces of Syracuse and Carthage, after which they advanced to besiege Syracuse. Upon this Syracuse concluded a peace treaty with the Romans.
- Next, the Romans captured Agrigentum in 262 B. C.
- After their defeat at the Battle of Agrigentum, the Carthaginians resolved to avoid further direct land - based engagements with the Romans, and concentrated on the sea, where they believed they had an obvious advantage.
- Initially, the experienced Carthaginian navy prevailed against the fledgling Roman Navy in the Battle of the Lipara in 260 B. C. Rome responded by drastically expanding its navy in a very short time. Within two months the Romans had a fleet of over 100 warships.
- In 241 B. C., Carthage signed a peace treaty under the terms of which they evacuated Sicily and paid Rome a large war indemnity.

Interval between the First and Second Punic Wars

- In 238 B. C. the mercenary troops of Carthage revolted and Rome took the opportunity to take the islands of Corsica and Sardinia from Carthage as well
- Rome engaged in the Illyrian War and Gallic Wars.

The Second Punic War [218 BC to 201 B. C.]

The Immediate Cause - In 219 BC Hannibal, the son of Hamilcar Barca, attacked Saguntum, a city allied to Rome.

There were three military theaters in this war: Italy, where Hannibal defeated the Roman legions repeatedly; Hispania, where Hasdrubal, a younger brother of Hannibal, defended the Carthaginian colonial cities with mixed success until eventually retreating into Italy; and Sicily, where the Romans held military supremacy.

Hannibal's march against Rome in 218 B. C.- Although Hannibal surprised the Romans and thoroughly beat them on the battlefields of Italy, he lost his only siege engines and most of his elephants to the cold temperatures and icy mountain paths. In the end it allowed him to defeat the Romans in the field, but not in the strategically crucial city of Rome itself, thus making him unable to win the war.

However, Hannibal defeated the Roman legions in several major engagements, including the Battle of the Trebia, the Battle of Lake Trasimene and most famously at the Battle of Cannae, but his long - term strategy failed. Lacking siege engines and sufficient manpower to take the city of Rome itself, he had planned to turn the Italian allies against Rome and starve the city out through a siege. However, with the exception of a few of the southern city-states, the majority of the Roman allies remained loyal and continued to fight alongside Rome, despite Hannibal's near-invincible army devastating the Italian countryside. Rome also exhibited an impressive ability to draft army after army of conscripts after each crushing defeat by Hannibal, allowing them to recover from the defeats at Cannae and elsewhere and keep Hannibal cut off from aid.

The Roman army under Quintus Fabius Maximus intentionally deprived Hannibal of open battle. Hannibal's defeated in the Battle of Zama.

The Third Punic War [149 B.C to 146 B.C.]

Having being stripped of her military power, Carthage suffered raids from its neighbour Numidia. Under the terms of the treaty with Rome, such disputes were arbitrated by the Roman Senate. Yet, intercessions were always in favour of the Numidians. Eventually, Carthage mustered an army to repel the Numidian forces, but eventually failed.

In 149 B. C., in an attempt to draw Carthage into open conflict, Rome made a series of escalating demands, one being the surrender of three hundred children of the nobility as hostages, and finally ending with the near - impossible demand that the city be demolished and rebuilt away from the coast, deeper into Africa. When the Carthaginians refused this last demand, Rome declared the Third Punic War.

Having previously relied on mercenaries to fight their wars for them, the Carthaginians were now forced into a more active role in the defence of their city. They made thousands of makeshift weapons in a short amount of time, even using women's hair for catapult strings, and were able to hold off an initial Roman attack. A second offensive under the command of Scipio Africanus [Minor] resulted in a three - year siege before he breached the walls, sacked the city, and eventually burned Carthage to the ground in 146 B.C.

Outcome

Political

- The authority and the prestige of the senate increased.
- The Romans became more and more exclusive in their attitude towards the allies, often treating them with contempt.
- With the extension of Rome's conquest the material benefits of Roman citizenship increased.
- Lastly, the Punic Wars led to the final reduction of the Gauls of northern Italy. The fact that the Gauls had helped Hannibal opened the eyes of the Romans to the necessity of subjugating them thoroughly. This they did. The result was that Roman Civilisation spread up to the river Po and the gates of the Alps were closed to further invasion.

Social

- Farms and homesteads were destroyed and the country districts were largely depopulated by the drafting of the farmers into the army.
- The loss of the old spirit of country life. Long accustomed to the exciting life in the camp the Romans found country life extremely dull find tedious. So they sold up their lands and began to crowd into Rome. The result was the decay of the yeoman class and the decrease of the rural population.
- Increase in the slave population

2.6.4.1 Hannibal.

Hannibal was, undoubtedly one of the towering personalities in ancient antiquity. On the one hand, he was one of the greatest generals known. Though the Romans have often depicted him as a ruthless barbarian bent on revenge, there is no historical basis to justify such view. On the contrary, his achievements indicate his ability and skill as a general as well as a statesman.

The boldness of his plans, as well as the skill which he displayed was definitely marks his greatness. His crossing of the Alps was an astonishing feat of endurance. As he expected, the rapidity of his march took the Romans by surprise and gave him the initiative through the critical stages of the early period of the war. His capacity for leadership is clearly shown by the fact that he exposed a mutely army of alien mercenaries to all kinds of danger and hardship without provoking a single mutiny. The promptitude with which he met the incessant demands of the military situation marks him out as a great organiser. Of his military genius it is enough to say that he inflicted a series of signal defeats on the Romans on their own ground. His victory at Canna was a marvel of skilful general ship. It is true that he failed to conquer Rome but this failure was due not to the superior military talents of the Romans but to their doggedness and superior manpower.

It should be remembered that Hannibal was not a mere soldier. He was a statesman as well. After his defeat at Zama he set himself to reorganise the government of Carthage whose corruption and inefficiency were largely responsible for his failure. Had he been left alone he might have recreated Carthage on a new basis. But the relentless hostility of Romans compelled him to flee away. His life was a failure but none will dispute that it was a noble failure.

Learing Teaching Activities

Activity No. 1 (2.6.1)

Name the early kings of Rome and list out the contributions which were made by them to the Roman society?

Instructions

- The students go through the lesson that they have studied and then find more information about the respective kings from the encyclopedias and the internet.
- Once it is done they can read out the information that they have found to the whole class.

Activity No 2 **(2.6.3)**

Explain the form of government with which the Romans replaced kingship?

Instructions

- The students can do this activity as a structural writing activities

Activity No. 3 **(2.6.4)**

Why did the Cartheginian have to clash with the Romans?

Instructions

- The students can go through the section of the Cartheginian wars and write down the causes of the wars.
- They will list out the causes of the Cartheginian wars with the teacher on the black-board.

Resources:

- Grant, Michael, History of Rome, Prentice Hall, 1978.
- Forsythe, Gary, A Critical History of Early Rome: From Prehistory to the First Punic War, University of California Press, 2006.
- Cornell, T. J., The beginnings of Rome: Italy and Rome from the Bronze Age to the Punic Wars, Routledge Publishers, 1995.

FROM GRACCHI TO SULLA

Competency **9.0** : Gain an insight into the experiences of the Greeks and Romans in Antiquity

Competency Level **9.1** : Appreciates political and social achievements of the Greeks and Romans as a background to Western Civilization

9.2 : Traces and critically evaluates the rich and varied historical experiences of the Romans.

Duration : 20 periods

Learning Outcomes :
- Gets an idea about the condition in Rome after the Punic Wars.
- Identifies the problems within Rome and study about the people like the Gracchi Brothers, Marius and Sulla.

2.7.1 Rome after the Punic Wars

After a long successful struggle with Carthage, Rome had consolidated power throughout the whole Mediterranean world in the form of six provinces: namely, Sicily, Sardinia and Corsica, Hither Spain, Farther Spain, Macedonia, and Africa. She had also been very influential in general supervision over several other allied states and provinces such as Numidian kingdoms in Africa, Pergamum and Bithynia in Asia Minor. However her glamorous position was threatened by the economic disorganization in Italy, which finally resulted in a series of revolutions.

In examining the ways in which the acquisition of power outside the Italian Peninsula affected the Rome and its government, it is necessary to see how those successful campaigns (from 200-167 BC) had poured vast sums to its treasury. No doubt that during this period such campaigns brought back in the shape of booty, gold, silver and other valuable metal which ultimately was used for coinage. With this influx of wealth, all direct taxes were discontinued in 167 BC. The members of the ruling class accumulated large fortunes, which were often justified in Roman eyes: quite clearly the Roman aristocrats had become acquainted with a wealth hitherto unknown, and had started consolidating power among themselves.

The prisoners taken in war were sold into bondage for very cheap prices. As a result household slaves became very common among wealthy Romans, and even slave labor became very general than before. Hellenism too began to spread among the Roman aristocratic class because of their close contacts with Greeks. It was not easy for the wealthy Romans to live a simple life of the older generation, but at the same time to live in the fashion of the day was very expensive; however a change for both good and evil was coming over the ruling class.

While the ruling class was acquiring wealth from office, another class of people known as "knights" was seeking riches through the opportunities made possible by the empire of the Mediterranean world. In fact they were the businessman of Rome whose foreign conquests had transformed them into a powerful capitalist group. The plunder that had brought into her treasury, had poured out again into the pockets of the Roman knights who had by then taken over the field of international trade.

Even though the gains of empire were highly profitable for the upper classes, the ordinary Romans soon began to pay the penalties. The acquisition of provinces outside Italy was largely responsible for the economic crisis as well as an agricultural crisis, which arose within her.

Because Hannibal's fighting's were mainly occupied within the peninsula and because he had devastated the lands which adhered to Rome and in revenge Roman armies destroyed those regions that had joined Carthaginians, the small farmers were faced with the major problem of surviving on the land from which they had been compelled to abandon and flee during the peak of the struggle. In some parts of the peninsula, poor farmers were ruined, and were forced to take refuge in the cities because Hannibal's devastations had plunged many of them into debt and their principal crop-grain was becoming cheap and worthless.

Obviously, there were several regions where the small farmer was pressed so hard with the issues related to the conquests of the Republic whereas in some others he was not affected that much, but could only have a precarious existence. There were also districts where the small farmer almost completely disappeared. However a crisis was at hand to bring about serious economic, social and political changes.

As it was clear that the country's foreign wars and conquests had caused a sharp decline in the number of the small brought at very low prices, it was profitable for the great landowners to run large estates, and even set out olive orchards and vineyards for which they could employ eastern slaves from regions where agriculture had been more developed than any part of the ancient world. As a result of Rome' eastern conquests, slave markets were glutted with many skilled artisans who were far superior in technique of most industries.

The natural consequence was that it made things worse for the traditional Italian farmer to compete with the skilled, Greek and Oriental craftsmen, and in the end both in agriculture and industry, the slaves and freedmen began to crowd out the free-born Roman citizens. With the steady increase in the number of poor Romans living in cities and sinking into poverty day by day, no one had the insight to foresee that such conditions were about to create a serious trouble for the state. It looked as if Rome was paying for her conquests by being obliged to go through a difficult time. On one hand her conquests had made life easy only for a handful of nobles, and on the other the great majority of small farmers had virtually ruined their livelihood.

Thus the acquisition of the empire was the cause of grave economic crisis in Italy- a crisis that also paved way for important political consequences. When the small farmers were forced to sell their possessions for whatever they could get, the nobles could become great proprietors through ownership of land. With the new methods of cultivation, which yielded more and more profit than the old: with land to be owned for a trifle, and slaves available at cheap prices because markets were glutted with captives of war, the nobles and the knights were the only two rich classes among the Romans who chiefly profited by the new conditions?

While the immediate results were undoubtedly all to the advantage of the nobles and the senate, some of course led to further complications: when a farmer lost his land, he naturally drifted to the cities especially to Rome. Being a citizen and voter, he could now vote at every election, and at every bill brought before the assembly. The censures who were always busy in performing duties of their office, did not have time to make enquiries into the actual place of the residence of the poor farmers still registered in the country tribe, who had now moved to Rome having lost o sold

their land. Thus the ruined farmer became politically more powerful than he had been when prosperous.

As the agricultural crisis developed, the grip of the nobility on the assembly was ultimately weakened, until by the time of the Gracchi it had become feeble and precarious. There were only three considerable groups within the rural tribes, namely the nobles and their retainers, the knights and their retainers and the common people (the city populace). In fact the knights were able to maintain a balance of power: whenever they supported the nobles, the ruling class became an immensely powerful machine, but when they joined hands with the city populace, the nobles were powerless. Such was the situation revealed throughout the whole course of Roman history during the last century of the Republic: however, it has been noted that the city mob could never dominate the Republic due to the system of group voting and that he wealthy minority could often outvote the poor majority in the assembly at times when that minority was united.

2.7.2 Reforms of Tiberius and Gaius Gracchus

Tiberius Gracchus

The Romans were quite oblivious to the fact that the expansion of the empire outside the peninsula had caused severe economic crisis. Recruiting of the army had become more and more difficult, for the class to which the conscription was applied, declined in number, and the statesmen were more interested in the increase in the city rabble due to the rapid growth of the number of voters in the rural tribes. In the course of time the city rabble grew constantly greater and the manumission of slaves became less and less effective. The members of the wealthy class began to rely more on the dependents (industrial workers) who were recruited from various tribes, and whose condition were often similar to that of freedmen.

To solve the problem various attempts had been made by the more far -sighted Roman statesmen, but unsuccessful in the face of bitter opposition of those whose immediate interests were threatened. Before the appearance of the Gracchi, Scipio Aemilianus and his friends were responsible for some slight reforms, but could not accomplish anything of real importance. It was Tiberius Gracchus who launched the first effort to deal with the problem.

Being born into a Roman family of noble blood, he had begun his political career as a questor in Spain. It has been said that on his way to Spain he was deeply impressed by the spectacle of Etruria where the plantation had flourished and largely agricultural slaves under oppressive conditions had replaced the free peasants. On his way return from Spain he also saw the danger of such a development when in 135 BC a servile revolt broke out and put down after strenuous efforts. In 132BC he seems to have held the traditional Roman belief that the small farmer was the backbone of the state and their disappearance had caused the number of slaves to be increase at such a rapid speed, which might threaten the safety of the state. There were plenty of men at hand for farming but the only difficulty was to find the land with which they could be equipped with farms.

Having won the office of tribune in 133BC, he brought his project before the assembly. Unfortunately the details of the agrarian bill, which Tiberius laid before the assembly, are uncertain, appear to have been somewhat complicated. However he proposed that the state should take

possession of all public land held by private individuals and should distribute in small allotments to the poor.

On the face of it, it would certainly increase considerably the number of small farmers, but how long they were likely to survive would depend on economic conditions that we cannot estimate due to lack of information on the subject. Neither do we know how he intended to elect those farmers to whom the land was to be allotted, nor whether he expected to make small farmers out of the crowded city streets or had some plan for selecting men with a knowledge of farming. All that we hear of Tiberius goes on to show that he was a typical doctrinaire reformer. He could see a definite threat and thought he found the remedy and was determined to carry through his bill. He was fully convinced that his plan was right and so was unable to conceive of any opposition, which would meet at the assembly as soon as the proposal of the bill was declared.

The nobles supported by a large number of Knights began a bitter resistance, but this proved to be one of the rare occasions when the grip of the ruling class, even reinforced by the knights was greatly weakened by the city rabble. Having caught by this programme, the masses of the country had flocked to Rome to vote for it. Since the opponents of the bill were few in comparison with its supporters, the nobles finally found another tribune, M. Octavius by name, to fight the bill by using the utmost legal power of obstruction. Despite the protests of Octavius, Tiberius proceeded to take a vote on depositioning him from office thinking that such a step was legal. Octavius probably fearing violence from the supporters of Tiberius left the assembly giving Tiberius the chance to fill up the vacant tribuneship by electing one of his friends.

The senate, as we might expect, would at once declare the bill void, but it actually hesitated to do so because such a direct action might arouse further issues, and perhaps because they felt that they had no clear justification for it. What they were aiming at was to carry out the law and at he same time seek foul means to prevent it put into practice.

Tiberius had provided an agrarian commission of three members; himself, his younger brother, and his father in law where he could decide what land was public and what private, and expropriated land to the new settlers. Since the senate had control of the treasure, the work of the commission was greatly obstructed by the refusal of adequate funds. After this event, Tiberius could hardly expect any generous support from the senate, and his attention now turned to an unexpected opportunity to finance his reform.

At the death of the king of Pergamum, Attalus 111 left a bill bequeathing his kingdom to the Roman people. Tiberius at once proposed a bill appropriating the treasures of the king to use of his commission and distribution among the new settlers so that they could have the means of building houses, purchasing tools, stock etc.

Once the country voters left the city, after the passage of the agrarian bill, Tiberius' opponents were planning a serious prosecution against him for deposing Octavius.

Since the early days of the Republic, anyone hindered a tribune in performing his duties were liable to severe punishment. To remove a tribune from office and thereby prevent him using his legal and constitutional rights may have considered to be a crime. Now that the country voters had gone home, the retainers of the nobles and the knights would probably dominate the rural

tribes. So, Tiberius obviously did realize the peril of his position and the only way open for him was by seeking reelection as tribune.
As a candidate Tiberius would have an opportunity to put forth a programme that might gain him some support even from his opponents. With the distribution of the Pergamene treasure among the new settlers he was able to draw the country voters back to Rome. His announcement that he would deal with the cities of the kingdom in the assembly may have been a bid for equestrian support, and he seems to have made further bid by proposing places to the knights in the jury, which had the power to sue governors charged with extortion in the provinces. This would give the knights a position in the government, which they were very much anxious to secure at the time. Because the programme was improvised hastily it could not produce a lasting effect and was not powerful enough to discharge the senatorial opposition.

The nobles however continued to exert their influence to the utmost to bring about his defeat and destruction. On the day of the election the senators' objection was that the reelection of a tribune was illegal, therefore Tiberius' votes should not be counted. Possibly to protect himself from the violence of his enemies or to conduct merely a demonstration together with his fellow Gracchans, he occupied a place in the Capitoline hill where the assembly was to meet. The events did actually go too far that the senatorial forces beat down and killed many of the Gracchans including the Tiberius himself.

Having regained its old supremacy, the senate created a special court, which proceeded to try and execute a number of Tiberius' supporters. Meanwhile to seize the royal treasure of king Attalus from the pretender Aristonicus, the senate had to get involved in a war with him, which lasted nearly four years, but was able to annex Pergamum as the province of Asia. The operations of the agrarian commission started in regions where they would involve as little loss as possible to the senators, so they permitted the election of Crassus as consul for 131BC. However in the following year he was succeeded by C.Gracchus- the brother of Tiberius as the head the commission, and once again the distribution of the public land was begun regardless of the interests of the nobles. During the next year Appius Claudius replaced Gracchus, and there was probably a relaxation in the activity of the commission. When Appius died in the latter half of that year, his death and that of Crassus led to the election of two new members both of whom were supporters of the nobles. When the royal treasure of Attalus finally reached Rome, the nobles had however been forced to allow the commission a brief period of activity, during which many small landowners had been created Due to lack of records it cannot be precisely mentioned how many of the new farmers who were successful, and how many abandoned their allotments for in fact the policy of Tiberius failed to solve the agrarian problem.

Although in 123BC, his brother Gaius attempted to deal with the situation by employing new methods: while continuing Tiberius' work, the change itself shows that the agrarian law was not adequate enough and that it was the work of an idealist rather than the work of a practical statesman.

Gaius Gracchus

The death of Tiberius Gracchus and the punishment of his supporters aught the poor how little they could hope for from the senate. In 129BC the agrarian commission was practically deprived of its powers and the most influential man in Rome - Scipio Aemilianus also died in the same year had often been a moderate man in politics. As a result many of the Italians who held public land

became restless, and it was obvious that though the commission was powerless, its activity might be revived at any time by some new reformer.
Because of their danger in the past and their fears for the future, they now began to seek citizenship. In 125BC a member of the agrarian commission M. Fulvius Flaccus was elected consul, and the opposition to the senate continued to grow further which ultimately paved way for a new struggle against the senate when Gaius Gracchus – the younger brother of Tiberius got elected as tribune for 123BC.

It has been conjectured that he had some kind of understanding with the knights and their retainers in such a way that both knights and the country voters contributed to outvote the nobles and their retainers in the rural tribes. He might have also had a clear idea of carrying out his brother's programme and that the only way of making it successful was to destroy the power that the nobles had upon the rural tribes in the assembly. As it was clear to him, it was not feasible to depend solely on the country voters because they would come to Rome to cast their vote for a particular candidate and would return to their homes in the country and the nobles slip back into power. Therefore with the intention of creating an anti senatorial majority who lived in the city, Gaius combined the knights with the city rabble by making the two elements united and thereby creating a stronger opposition than ever.

During the two consecutive terms (123-122BC) of his tribuneship, Gaius was able to pass several laws that were intended to build up a powerful and well-organized democratic party so that the supremacy of the senate could be overthrown. A coalition between the knights and the proletariat was only possible if he could come up with a plan, which would attract both parties. Obviously he could do that with a remarkable political insight.

On one hand his brother's agrarian commission was given its judicial powers back, which appealed to the country voters very much, and on the other those who were living in the city joining in the rabble and refusing to return to the land, were given an opportunity to reduce their cost of living in the shape of a Corn Law which provided any Roman citizen to buy grain from the government at a fixed rate, considerably below the normal market price. There is no record however that the knights offered opposition regarding the issue.

By one of his laws, Gaius could make the knights benefitted very much through the tithe system that he introduced into the province of Asia. The knights were thus given the right to collect the tithe of the whole province, could now exploit Asia to their best advantage. In order to purify the courts, which were exclusively composed of the senators, he carried another law by which the juries were to be selected entirely from the knights. This simply made the knights more than happy by gaining a means o putting pressure on the governors.

Though Gaius was sincerely expecting that his judicial law would improve the courts, its consequences were often disastrous. Under the old system, the senatorial juries were supporting those governors who had exercised extortion in the provinces, and under the new, the equestrian juries would punish those governors who did not allow them to exploit the provinces.

Gaius probably failed to anticipate the consequences of his law simply because he deliberately attempted to secure the support of the knights for his democratic party. Through these measures Gaius was able to establish a table, reliable majority in the assembly of which he could be the

only common leader. Also he had been completely successful in creating a democratic machine capable of governing the Republic.
Even though many of his comrades were in harmony with him, there had always been the danger that an Octavius would someday appear. The simplest measure that he could take was to dismiss the troublesome tribune from office, but the legality of such a procedure was to a great extent highly doubtful. There was no way that Gaius could bring about a law legalizing it for such an attempt would naturally prove that his brother Tiberius was attempting to violate the constitution.

The only way of doing it was to enact some law, which assumed the validity of Tiberius' action; therefore Gaius proposed a bill providing that anyone who had been deposed from office should be ineligible to hold office again though everyone knew that the bill could affect only one man. Octavius had by no means taken part in politics since his deposition by Tiberius, and most Romans considered it as a vindictive attempt to put a black mark on an innocent private citizen. So, Gaius had no choice but withdraw the bill.

In order to safeguard his position as the leader of the people, Gaius carried out another bill, which proposed a law banishing any magistrate who had put Roman citizens to death without permitting an appeal to the people. After his brother's death, the senate appointed a special commission under the consul P.Popillius, which executed a number of his brother's partisans. This law, therefore directly applied to Propillius who was at last sent into an exile. However, his main target was to deprive the senate of its immense powers, which it had assumed previously.

His programme of reform was not concentrated on electing him to the tribunate year after year, but to solve the problems of the day and to carry through them a permanent benefit to the country. He was aiming at securing welfare of Rome and Italy, and it was these nobler aims that that destroyed him.

To execute his laws, he regularly appointed special commissions, and he himself was a member of some of these commissions thus drawing into his own hands a part of the administration. His policy and success had already filled the nobles and the senate with great frustration. Therefore in utter desperation, they were ready to remove the great tribune by any means that offered.

Although he was still too strong for a direct attack, he was greatly weakened by the fact that many who had supported him, did not agree with one or another of the measures he was advocating. In short, the extension of the franchise was an experiment by which no one could be sure of benefitting, and every class member was ought to run some risk or loss. The nobles at once identified this weakness and concentrated on their attack. As a result one of the tribunes for 122BC -M. Livius Drusus declared himself opposed to this plan. He also attacked the colonial policy of Gaius: in place of two colonies in the peninsula, he advocated twelve, and the senate promptly gave its approval to his proposals.

In the end Drusus was in a position of expelling Gaius from the leadership of the people. This he could easily do, when Gaius left Rome for an inspection of his proposed colony in Africa. In his absence, his enemies worked feverishly, and when he returned he found that his system was seriously collapsed. So in the election for tribunes for 121BC, Gaius was defeated and became

a private citizen. He met his death in the struggle against senators who were ready to repeal the law for the establishment of the colony.

During his career most of the measures that he carried out, had failed to achieve the end. The revived agrarian commission accomplished nothing of great importance. The colonies and plans for the Italians failed. He had sacrificed the provincials to the knights, but they deserted him as soon as they got their pound of flesh. On one hand he had benefitted the rural farmers by his corn law, on the other he had unconsciously prevented the city rabble from becoming a serious threat to the nobles. The aristocratic machine resumed control of the government once more deposing successfully Gaius and his democratic movement, which was in fact strong enough to dominate the Republic.

2.7.3. Marius and the Military Reforms

The Rise of Marius

The political agitation of which the Gracchi had been the leaders seemed to subside without having produced any essential change in the situation. The knights had learned how much they could accomplish by an alliance with the mob, and were likely to resort to such an alliance with them whenever the senators ignored their interests. The rabble also had learned that their poverty could be alleviated by the state, but that it was hopeless to look for support of the senate; henceforth they were ready at all times to support an attack against the nobles by any leader who could put himself at their head.

The knights, having gained what they wanted at the moment, were ready leave the government in the hands of the nobles until some new cause of opposition arose. Although the senate regained its dominant position, it had been greatly weakened by the loss of its control of the courts, and it had been taught by bitter experience the danger of a coalition between the knights and the populace. Accordingly no immediate attack was made on the equestrian juries or the Corn Law.

In later times, the senate formulated a decree that the magistrates should see that the Republic suffered no harm howsoever; this amounted to a proclamation of martial law, and the magistrates whom it directed were clothed with all the powers of the old dictators who had been exempt from the veto of the tribunes and had possessed the power of life and death of all citizens. Not only were the colonies of Drusus quietly dropped, but the colonies projected by Gaius were also abandoned. The agrarian commission was soon abolished, and in 111BC a law, which practically made such land the property of those who then held it, settled the question of the public land.

In the year of Gracchus' death, a further step was taken in the development of the empire; Rome had become involved in a war with two powerful Gallic tribes, and had defeated both. Consequently, a road across Southern Gaul to Spain was built, and a settlement of new Roman veterans was established at AquaeSextiae to protect it, which led to the formation of anew province.

In fact, the senate had regained power with the help of the knights, and it was not long before a fresh break occurred between the two orders in connection with a war in Africa. At first, the nobles cared little about Jugurtha and the Numidian problem. When Juhgurtha – a barbarian king, captured the city Cirta, plundered and butchered a large number of Italian merchants who were settled there to protect it. The knights were furious at the fate of their fellow tradesmen, and

the populace was more than ready to join them in attacking the nobles and the senate who were still reluctant to go to war for they did not desire the annexation of Numidia, yet it must somehow be kept quiet and governed. The senate's reluctance to engage in war with Jugurtha was quite intelligible; in Thrace, the barbarians were menacing Macedonia, having defeated the Roman armies were moving west to into Gaul where they were threatening now Rome's newly acquired province.

When the knights and the populace were alike furious at the events bringing so much disgrace to Rome, the senate was compelled to prepare for war, and appointed Metellus – one of the consuls for 109BC and a partisan of the senate. With the support of the senate, he recruited an army choosing for his staff competent soldiers such as Marius rather than senators or diplomats, and set sail for Africa. Although Metellus launched his operations in Africa, he was unable to achieve any decisive victory, and the war seemed likely to drag on indefinitely. His failure to end the war disappointed the public expectations and provoked ugly suspicions.

People began to suspect that he was either incompetent or that he was letting the war drag on in order to retain his command while Marius was gaining popularity among the soldiers and the Roman traders in Africa. Realizing that there was a chance for him to gain the consulship, he succeeded in getting a furlough from Metellus, and returned to Italy, canvassed for the office successfully and elected in spite of the efforts of the senate.

He even succeeded in securing the quaestorship and tribuneship. After a year of his office in Rome, he was sent as proprietor to Further Spain where he found for the first time with an independent military command. Marius had early abandoned agriculture for business, and had invested money with a profit in equestrian syndicates, which may have led the knights to regard him as more or less one of them in spite of his senatorial rank.

During the interval between his election and the time when he could take over the Jugurthian war, he set about the task of recruiting his army, and sailed for Africa in 107BC. When Marius' term as consul expired, he had apparently accomplished very little, but the senate, perhaps glad to be freed from all responsibility of war, continued him in command as proconsul.

Had it not been for the quaestor Sulla, the war would have continued for many years. When Marius had pressed Jugurtha so closely that the king had taken refuge with Bocchus, king of Mauretania, Sulla staking his life on success, went on a diplomatic mission to Bocchus and persuaded him to betray his ally, and the war ended with the capture of Jugurtha, and at least for the time being Marius received credit from Rome.

The Military Reforms of Marius

Before Marius, the Roman army was based upon conscription, which was applied theoretically to all citizens who owned a certain amount of property, though in practice the burden fell chiefly on the landowners and especially on the poor members of this class. Thus the majority of the Roman citizens who were serving in the ranks were small farmers forced by the state to exchange the plough for the sword. Marius abandoned this system and called for volunteers, and from this time on the new mode of recruiting prevailed.

It essentially altered the character of the army. The reluctant farmer disappeared; his place was taken by men who saw it as their only prospect of escape from poverty. Also, there were some who enlisted in the hope of adventure rather than of gain, but the economic motives were the dominant factor, and with the adoption of the volunteer system began the development of a professional army.

As long as the soldiers were taken from the propertied class and were expected to furnish their own equipment, there were inevitably distinctions in the service based on wealth. With the new type of recruits all such distinctions were abolished and nothing was expected of the men except themselves. They were taught the use of their weapons after they had volunteered, and the new training borrowed from the gladiatorial schools produced more skillful soldiers though it required a long time.

Marius also carried out in completing the reorganization of the legion which had already begun, and by which old maniples became less important while the cohort became the principal unit. The legion whose nominal strength was 6000 men, was divided into six centuries each under a centurion, and these centuries were further grouped into 10 cohorts commanded by legates of the general. Since the staff officers supplied by the military tribunes were mostly young men of the wealthier classes, they became less and less trusted with important military duties. The distinction between the higher and the lower officers was increased, and the common soldier had less and less chance of promotion beyond the rank of centurion.

Undoubtedly, these changes enhanced the efficiency of the army, but their main significance lay in the substitution of the volunteer for the landowner. Whether for good or evil, this had the most far reaching results; it freed the small farmer from a heavy burden which was becoming unbearable, and opened up a new source from which an abundant supply of recruits could be obtained without causing serious difficulty on any class.

There were in the Roman world two distinct kinds of proletariat. In the first place there was the urban rabble in Rome and other cities of Italy, without jobs and relying on the government for help them to live. In the country districts there existed another kind of proletariat made up of agricultural laborers, who in spite of slavery were still numerous so burdened by debt an on the verge of ruin. The aspirations of the new armies made it clear that the urban rabble furnished few recruits, but the most of the volunteers came from the rural proletariat.

Both classes therefore saw in the army the best means of securing what they desired, but were not disposed to rely upon their pay and their share of the booty, and the general in search of recruits found it necessary to offer other inducements, the most effective being the promise that when the army was disbanded, the soldiers should be further rewarded by an allotment of land. The allotments for the soldiers would require legislation, and the senators could raise objections on matters of details to any bill proposed or defeat it in the assembly through the power of their machine.

The soldiers therefore stood by their general, and once he had been commissioned by the state to raise an army, it was not impossible to take it from him, nor would his army hesitate to support him against the government if he could find a reasonable pretext for attacking it. If the army fell more than ever under the control of its general, the general in turn became a servant of his army. It was quite impossible for him to retire from public life when he had won the victory, and disbanded his soldiers, for he had still to redeem the promises by which he had gathered his recruits. Marius could not therefore escape his obligations to his men, but was forced by his military success to play a leading role in politics.

2.7.4. The Clash between Marius and Sulla

The assassination of the elected tribune for 91BC, Livius Drusus who prepared to bring a bill granting citizenship to the allies before the assembly, was clearly a signal for a revolt on the part of her allies who thought that their own safety now called for resolute action.

The revolt of the Italian allies began at Asculum and quickly spread through central Italy and Samnium. At Corfinium the rebels established their headquarters which they renamed Italia, and set up a government more or less closely on that of Rome.

During the year 91-90BC both parties were preparing for war. In the spring one consul took the field in the north with Marius as one of his legates, while the other among whose legates were Sulla in charge of the forces operating in the south against the Samnites. In the north the Romans were so far successful that they were able to besiege Asculum but in the south the rebels won Apulia and Lucania and invaded Campania. With winter came another revolt in Etruria and Umbria, which had hitherto been loyal. The Romans on the whole, therefore had lost, and towards the end of the year 90BC a law was passed granting full citizenship to those allies who had not revolted or should at once return to their allegiance by which Roman authority was largely restored in Etruria and Umbria, but in central Italy the war continued.

In 89BC Sulla was were given the chief command in the south, and was able to gain several important victories in the south while the rebellion was broken in the north. Sulla' successes were however were accompanied by new concessions to the allies. In the course of the year, two tribunes carried a law, which provided that all Italians should receive citizenship within sixty days. This, in combination with the successes of the Roman generals was a decisive factor although the Samnites were still held out.

Before order could be restored in Italy, Rome was forced to make preparations for a campaign in the east, where Mithridates, king of Pontus, had taken advantage of the troubles in Italy to extend his power. In the elections for 88BC, Sulla was chosen the consul, and the command in the east was assigned to him. Marius, however, did not approve this arrangement, and found a tribune who was ready to set it aside.

Seeing in the impending war against Mithridates, an opportunity of regaining his old popularity, he was determined to obtain the command. The war between Rome and her allies had brought Marius again into public notice, and it had also brought Sulla to the front. Although Sulla had only

secured the praetorship with difficulty, in the crisis of the social war military talent was all-important, and Sulla rose rapidly. He seems to have been particularly favored by the aristocracy; the consulship was the reward for his victories against the rebels, though Sulla is said to have appreciated it very much because of the eastern command, which went with it.

Roman politics at this time (88BC) were in a highly confused condition as a result of the war. At its outbreak the party hostile to Drusus had driven a number of the reformer's friends into exile on the charge of treason, and that the knights dominated this party was fairly an obvious fact. Before the first year of the war had ended, several concessions were granted to the allies. In the next year, not only were the concessions extended, but also the knights were deprived of their monopoly of the juries. This was a clear indication that the senatorial machine had regained control, and the knights were doubtless in a very bad situation.

The concessions made however, had not settled the Italian problem: the allies had gained citizenship, but in order to vote, it was necessary that they should be registered in the tribes. There was one strong party suggesting that it should be restricted to a limited number of tribes, and another party wanting to distribute them among all the tribes. The senate however favored the policy of restriction while the Italians were strongly opposing to it.

Sulpicius Rufus – the leading tribune for the year, who had been a friend of Drusus, was ready to come forward for the Italian claims. To do this he needed the support of the knights and perhaps of Marius as well.

Sulpicius brought forward several laws, one of which recalled the exiles, most of whom were friends of Drusus, and another provided for the registration of the Italians and freedmen in all the tribes. The bill of course encountered a bitter opposition, and the political struggle soon became disorderly. The consuls Sulla and Pompeius Rufus, making the best use of the opportunity, suspended all public business so that no meeting of the assembly could be held, probably hoping that this delay would increase their chances of defeating the bills. On this occasion Sulpicus acted very wisely that he met the proclamation by rioting, and did not hesitate to attack the consuls themselves: Pompeius Rufus narrowly escaped from the mob while Sulla was compelled to seek shelter in the house of Marius. Finally the proclamation was cancelled, and Sulla left the city to join his army, which was then besieging Nola. Sulpicius promptly passed the bills, together with a further law transferring the command of the eastern war from Sulla to Marius.

2.7.5 Sulla and the Restoration of Senatorial Power

Sulla' activities in Nola have been open to many interpretations as one might simply point out that because of his true patriotism, he was persuaded that he was the fittest man for the task, however it might be that he was longing for luxury and pleasure for he had struggled with poverty all his life. Since the general who defeated Mithridates would have an opportunity to amass a fortune, Sulla may have had a desire to acquire wealth, which he could use for his own gratification. Certainly he paid no attention to the conduct of Sulpicius until his own prospects were threatened.

He also believed that he could count upon his troops, because the men were devoted to him personally, and they were as eager for the plunder of the east as he himself. Accordingly he

assembled the soldiers and informed them of the new transfer of the command, and their response was all that he could have wished, because apart from their devotion to him they were afraid that Marius would take other troops to the east and leave them to complete the campaign that they had been carrying out with great success. With such a great faith in his army Sulla together with Pompeius Rufus, went straight to the city, and justified their action by the assumption that Sulpicius was at the head of a mob forcing the senate and people to change the existing constitutional government by armed forces.

In this pretext, Sulla could easily become successful that with the help of the senate, at once abolished the Sulpician laws, and twelve leading opponents including Marius and Sulpicius were proclaimed public enemies. Marius however succeeded in escaping his pursuers, and for the moment Sulla was the undisputed master of the situation. Using this opportunity to strengthen the senate he passed a law providing that no bill could be brought before the assembly without the approval of the senate. In spite of his defeat at the election for consul and the return of one consul Cornelius Cinna, he probably considered the position of the senate safe enough, and since he could count upon the consul Octavius, he set about his task in the east once more after hurriedly settling matters in Rome for Greece at the head of his army.

The Proscription

As far as Italy was concerned, the battle of the Colline Gate had ended the Social War, but there were still some scattered bands of democrats to be destroyed. Soon the vengeance of Sulla filled Italy with horror and dismay: he issued formal lists of the proscribed, and those whose names were included in these lists were declared outlaws and a price was set upon their heads, rewards were offered to informers, and all who sheltered the proscribed were threatened with punishment. Appian estimates that Sulla killed 90 senators, 15 consuls, and 2600 knights including those who were banished. The very number of the victims makes it clear that Sulla' purpose was not simply to punish past offences, but to destroy the Democratic Party by removing all possible future leaders. Sulla must have been quite familiar with the history of the last fifty years that the popular leaders of the future were likely to be found in the ranks of aristocracy itself.

Moreover he included in his proscription many wealthy Italians whom he can hardly have regarded as politically dangerous. When the close of the Social War left him absolute master of Rome, always fond of ease and luxury, he was in a position to indulge in his tastes thanks to the fortunes, which he had acquired in the east. He was resolved to safeguard himself so well that he would have no need to draw his sword again. There was only one condition on which this was possible; he must find some way to enhance the power of the aristocratic machine so firmly that it could remain in control of the government for a considerable time. This he undertook, and the proscription had a definite part to play in clearing the way for his reorganization by destroying the political power of the knights, who were the chief sufferers.

The extent of the proscription can also be explained by the fact that Sulla, was then supposed to redeem his promises to his army just as all other Roman armies - their demand being for the allotment of land. Although Sulla had brought a large booty from the east, he had been obliged to spend freely during the Social War, and did not have at hand enough funds to distribute among his troops. The proscription offered a way out for his difficulties by confiscating the property of the proscribed, and by including in the list a large number of landowners and rich men, he could obtain the means of satisfying his troops.

The proscription seemed to the Romans so horrible because of the way in which Sulla showed such cynical carelessness about the drawing up of the lists, slaying thousands against whom he felt no harm and many of whom he had never even heard, some actually being his fellow partisans, simply as a matter of financial and political expediency.

The political motives behind the proscription could be seen in Sulla's undertaking to reorganize the Roman government: he did not want to be hampered by the prejudices or scruples of his partisans, but revived in a new form the obsolete office of dictator, and informed the rest of the senate his wishes by a letter.

Since opposition to his will was impossible, the senate accepted his suggestions at once, and a law was passed accepting him dictator for the purpose of regulating the Republic. The new dictator had very little in common with the old. Formerly a dictator was appointed to meet an emergency, and was expected to resign as soon as the emergency was over, and did not retain his power for more than six months. The office now (82BC) conferred on Sulla was of indefinite duration, and could only be terminated only by death or abdication. All his past acts were duly ratified, and his authority was so complete that it would be difficult for him to do anything illegal in the future. The proscription, which had begun before his appointment thus received legal sanction and in June 81BC, the lists were finally closed down.

His aim was not only to restore the power of the aristocratic machine into power, also to strengthen it so that the senate could govern freely, and defy even a combination of the rabble and the knights. The influence of the knights had been scattered by the proscription, but Sulla must have been too clear sighted that they would not recover soon. The most that could be hoped was to fortify the machine so thoroughly that for a long time to come, it could successfully defend itself against the knights.

The main device by which Sulla was hoping to strengthen the machine was by a reconstruction of the senate, which must have been largely reduced in number by the democratic massacres, followed by the proscription, and by the added loss of life in the Social War where a significant number of its members had perished. It has been generally accepted that when Sulla began his constructive work, there were only about 150 senators. Sulla proceeded to appoint 300 senators from the equestrian class which was double the number required to fill the vacancies and increased the size of the to about 450. He also raised the numbers of the quaestors from 12 to 20. By approximately doubling the size of the senate, Sulla could increase its influence on the assembly. He did not however modify the position of the senate or the constitution. In the past, the authority the authority of the conscript fathers had been based largely upon custom, and therefore been always open to challenge. This he remedied by turning custom into positive law, and thereby making any interference with the affairs of the conscript fathers illegal.

Because the assembly retained its old electoral rights in full, Sulla could not prevent the choice of magistrates belonging to the opposition. Therefore he was making arrangements in such a way that it made impossible for them to alter the policy of the government. The old method by which the opposition had been able to interfere successfully was by legislation. Naturally he revived this law forbidding the submission of any bill to the assembly until it had received the approval of the senate. Since he was aware that they had generally been the leaders of anti – senatorial

combinations, felt it necessary to hamper and restrict them still further. Even without the right to propose legislation, to which the senate objected, they could still hinder its action by the use of their veto by holding public meetings.
Accordingly, Sulla further enacted that no man who held this office should ever be eligible to any other. This, with the loss of their initiative, would render the office unimportant in itself, and prevent anyone accepting it because Sulla also prohibited immediate re-election. The tribunes under Sulla' arrangements would always be insignificant persons, still possessing the right of veto on all magisterial acts, and might thus thwart the senate's policy for a time, but Sulla must have realized that a tribune's veto would be an effective weapon to check the independent consuls. Therefore he contented himself without abolishing it altogether. Any violation of these restrictions were made punishable by a fine which might be so heavy as to amount to the confiscation of the offender's property, and the decision was led to a jury composed exclusively of senators. Thus hampered and restricted, the tribunes might very rarely be of real service to the senate, and could hardly become dangerous.

He re-enacted the *lexVilliaannalis,* which prescribed a regular order in which the offices must be held: first the quaestorship, then the praetorship, and finally the consulship, with an interval of at least two years between each. Among other changes however, permitting re-election to any office after an interval of 10 years, and raising the age of eligibility for each were also important. Henceforth a man had to be thirty years old to be elected qusaetor and forty to be elected praetor so that he could not hold the consulship till he was forty-three.

Inevitably, Sulla deprived the knights of their privileges as jurors in the standing courts. These he thoroughly reorganized by increasing the number and constituting the juries of senators. Another minor reason for enlarging the senate may have been to provide an adequate supply of jurors for these courts since the old senate of 300 members could not furnish a sufficient number. In remodeling the standing courts, Sulla defined the cases over which it had jurisdiction, and prescribed penalties as well as the composition of the jury. In this way he greatly limited the activities of the older praetorian courts, and this part of his work was of a permanent character, and more than any other man he laid the foundation of the Roman criminal law.

While he lived he could maintain his constitution, and it is possible that he cared little what might happen after he was gone. For the present, he had a bodyguard in his veterans to whom he had assigned lands would be forced to support his system.

Once he had completed his reconstruction of the aristocratic machine and his reorganization of the government, Sulla retired to private life. In 80BC he assumed the consulship for the second time and took care to have his laws formally ratified by the assembly. In 79BC he laid down his dictatorship and returned to his country estate in Campania, but he was not destined to enjoy his retirement long for in the next year he died suddenly at the age of sixty.

2.7.6 The Social War

While the fighting was taking place in Greece, Cinna had seized power in Rome and deposed Sulla from his command. So, ValariusFlaccchus who had succeeded Marius as consul in 87 BC was sent to Greece at the head of an army. Flacchus realizing that he had a little hold upon his men, decided that Mithridates was the safer person to encounter, marched to the Hellespont,

ostensibly to cut the communication with the Pontic king and attack him in the rear, but soon after perished in a mutiny instigated by Flavius Frimbria whom the troops chose as his successor in command.
The new general succeeded in capturing Pergamum, which Mithridates had made his capital when he conquered Asia. The king escaped, but was now ready for peace, especially since Sulla was approaching.

The fleet of Lucullus had at length won enough battles to enable Sulla to advance to the Hellespont. Mithridates opened up negotiations with him rather than with Fimbria. In these circumstances, a treaty was finally concluded (85BC) on terms favorable to Rome. The king was left in an undisturbed possession of his original kingdom, but was forced to abandon all his recent acquisitions including the part of Paphlagonia and to surrender all prisoners and deserters. Sulla also demanded and received eighty ships of war and an indemnity in money – these last concessions being greatly to his advantage and strengthening his position against his own country. Therefore on his side, he was anxious to free himself from the eastern war in order that he might have an opportunity to deal with Cinna and his party in Rome.

Before Sulla could turn his attention to Italy, the task of restoring order still remained to be accomplished. The army of Fimbria was easily exposed of, for when Sulla marched against it the soldiers deserted and their commander killed himself. Now that there was no one who could resist his decisions Sulla spent little time in settling affairs there. Some of the most serious offenders were executed, but he was more concerned with money than with vengeance: he imposed heavy fines on several communities collecting what he could immediately leaving the rest to be collected in the future. He then appointed a governor and placed the former soldiers of Fimbria under his command to serve as a garrison for the province.

Sulla' work in the east, being successfully finished, he address a formal letter to the senate in which he gave an account of his services to the state especially during the war, and informed the conscript fathers that he had received his own wife and children whom Cinna had driven from Italy. For receiving the fugitives, he had been declared a public enemy by his opponents, but it is said that he was about to return and punish those guilty of crimes against himself, the people and the senate alike.

The senate attempted to open negotiations for peace, but the consuls Cinna and Carbo, ignoring the senate, eagerly set about for preparing for war. After Cinna gained control of Rome in 87BC, the Republic had been governed by a small group of politicians, calling themselves democrats, but actually showing little respect for the rights of the assembly and for the authority of the senate. They seemed to have secured the support of the new citizens and the majority of the knights and to have paid little attention to constitutional forms. To them, loss of power meant utter ruin, therefore they determined to meet Sulla in Greece rather than wait for him in Italy. Cinna, having gathered a large numbers of recruits, wanted them to sail across the Adriatic, but the soldiers however had little enthusiasm for it that when Cinna tried to force them to embark, he was killed in a mutiny.

After the death of Cinna, Carbo became the chief leader of the democrats. Giving up all thought of leaving Italy, he concentrated on the organization of defence. He did not hold an election to fill

Cinna' place, nor did he try to retain office for himself; so two other democrats took his place in 83BC. Italy looked as though rallying around a democratic government, but the chances the democrats had of victory were thrown away by their own folly.

When Sulla landed Brundisium in 83BC, the democratic movement was more apparent than real, and discontent with the rule of Cinna and his successors was widespread. Somehow Sulla was capable of making a positive advance, yet the greater part of Italy still adhered to the democrats. Carbo, who was busy in Cisalpine Gaul, hastened to Rome where he compelled the senate to declare Sulla and all who had joined him public enemies. This had no effect, but Sulla apparently thought his enemies too strong for an immediate attack, and spent the rest of the year carrying minor operations and sending agents all parts of Italy to raise troops and to conciliate the Italians and win them to his side.

Meanwhile the democrats selected their strongest leaders such as Carbo and the young Marius, and were especially successful in Etruria, Cisalpine Gaul, and Samnium. The war therefore began to take on a new aspect, and to appear as a struggle between the Etruscans, Gauls, and Samnites against the Romans. The two commands divided their responsibilities, Carbo taking the north and leaving Marius to defend Rome. Sulla on his side sent Metlleus and Pompey to deal with Carbo while he marched upon the city. Marius was routed at the battle of Sacriportus and was at once besieged.

After the battle at Sacriportus the democratic leaders saw clearly that they could not hold Rome, but before they fled they murdered four of the more prominent senators who still remained in the city. Under the heavy blows at Umbria and Cisalpine Gaul, the democratic leaders began to abandon all hope of success; some tried to make peace with Sulla by betraying heir friends, while others, like Carbo, sought safety by fleeing. The final blow - the battle of the Colline Gate was fought in November 82BC where Marius committed suicide when he saw that escape was impossible leaving Sulla the master of Italy.

Learning Teaching Activities

Activity No. 1 (2.7.1)

Explain the condition of Italy on the Eve of the reforms introduced by the Gracchi Brothers?

Instructions

- This can be done as an assignment.
- The students will be able to analyse the condition of Italy after the Punic wars.

Activity No 2 (2.7.2)

List out the reforms introduced by both Tiberius Gracchus and Gaius Gracchus.

Instructions

- This can be done as a group activity.
- Each group of students will list out the reforms introduced by the two brothers respectively.

Activity No 3 (2.7.3)

Outline the Military reforms of Marius.

Instructions

- This can be done as a group activity.
- The students will be able to outline the military reforms introduced by Marius.

Activity No 4 (2.7.4)

Explain the causes for the clash between Marius and Sulla.

Instructions

- This can be done as a structural writing activity.
- The students will go through the text and find out the causes for the clash between the two personalities.

Resources:

Greeenide, A.H.J. & Clay A.M., *Sources of Roman History 133 to 70 BC*, Oxford Clarendon Press, 1960.

Marsh, Feank B., *A History of the Roman World from 146 to 30 BC,* London, 1963.
Tingay G. & Badock J., *The Romans and their Empire,* London, 1991.

POWER STRUGGLE IN ROME

Competency 9.0 : Gain an insight into the experiences of the Greeks and Romans in Antiquity

Competency Level 9.2 : races and critically evaluates the rich and varied historical experiences of the Romans.

Duration : 20 periods

Learning Outcomes : · Grasp the outlines of the struggle for power in Rome during the latter part of the first century B.C.

- Gain insight into the political careers of four distinguished Romans of the period: Cicero, Pompey, Julius Caesar, and Crassus.
- Understand the roles of the First and Second Triumvirates, their similarities and differences.

9.2.8: Power Struggle in Rome (70-30 B.C.)

The period of the complicated struggle associated with the names of Cicero, Pompey, Caesar, and Crassus represents the second stage of the Civil War (the first stage consisted of the struggle between Marius and Sulla, the leaders of the democratic and aristocratic factions, respectively). In this struggle the idea of the "common weal" gave place to the ambitions of military leaders, who built their own political fortunes on their conquests.

Pompey, victorious over Sertorius in Spain, and Crassus, who had suppressed the revolt of Spartacus in Italy, united as consuls against the senate and repealed much of Sulla's legislation in 70 B.C. While Pompey was subduing the East, Caesar and Crassus became leaders of the Democratic Party. Their intrigues and Catiline's attempt at revolution (foiled by Cicero in 63 B.C.) failed to give the democrats the control of Rome.

A compact was formed in 60 B.C. between Caesar, Pompey, and Crassus by which they secured a commanding position in the state. This compact is known as the First Triumvirate. It endured, while Caesar was conquering Gaul, until Crassus was killed after the defeat at Carrhae (53 B.C.) and relations between Caesar and Pompey became strained.

Dreading the military prestige acquired by Caesar in Gaul, the senate allied with Pompey. Caesar crossed the Rubicon, and civil war broke out. Pompey was utterly defeated at Pharsalus and was murdered in Egypt (48 B.C.).

Caesar became dictator and, prematurely, introduced into the Roman constitution the principle of personal autocracy. He was assassinated by senatorial conspirators in 44 B.C.

Now followed the third stage of the Civil War. At first the struggle was between the Republican Party (backed by Octavian) and Mark Antony. This phase of the struggle was terminated after the battle of Mutina (43 B.C.), by the compact of the three Caesarian leaders AntonyOctavian, and Lepidus. This compact is known as the Second Triumvirate.

A conflict followed between the forces of the triumvirs and those of the senatorial party led by Brutus and Cassius, who met their death at Philippi (42 B.C.), and finally between the two principal members of the triumvirate, Antony and Octavian.

This struggle ended in Antony's defeat at Actium in 31 B.C. and his death at Alexandria in the following year. Thus Octavian was left sole master of the Roman Empire, bringing to an end the period of republican government at Rome.

9.2.8.1 The Political Careers of Cicero, Pompey, Julius Caesar, Crassus.

Cicero (106-43 B.C.)

Marcus Tullius Cicero was born in 106 b.c. at Arpinum, a town picturesquely situated among the Volscian hills.

His family was old and respectable, though of plebeian, not patrician, rank. He was the first of his family to obtain a curule office, and was therefore, like his fellow townsman Marius, the founder of his family's Nobilitas, or as it was called a novus homo -a term, it is to be observed, never applied to a patrician.

To secure educational advantages for Cicero and his brother Quintus, their father either himself removed with them to Rome or placed them there with their uncle Aculeo, who had a house in the fashionable quarter of the Carinae, between the Coelian and Esquiline Mounts. One of Cicero's most famous teachers at this time was the poet Archias of Antioch, whom he afterwards defended against the charge of illegally assuming the Roman citizenship.

He was intimate with Antonius, the grandfather of the triumvir, and studied law under Quintus Mucius Scaevola, the augur. In 89 B.C. he served in the Social War under Cn. Pompeius Strabo, the father of the great Pompey, and thus acquired the military experience that was so important a part of a Roman gentleman's education, especially if he aspired to high office. During the civil wars between Marius and Sulla, Cicero devoted himself to the study of law, philosophy, and rhetoric under the guidance of Phaedrus the Epicurean,Philo the chief of the New Academy, Diodotus the stoic, and Molo the Rhodian.

After the overthrow of the Marian party in 81 B.C. Cicero made his first extant speech on behalf of P. Quintius, on which occasion the famous advocate Hortensius was retained on the opposite side, an antagonist whom he again encountered afterwards at the trial of Verres. Next Year he defended Sex. Roscius of Ameria, charged with parricide by Chrysogonus, a favourite freedman of Sulla. His advocacy was successful, but he went to Greece soon after wards, nominally on account of his health, but, according to Plutarch,really to avoid the resentment of Sulla. Doubt, however, is thrown on Plutarch's view by the fact that Sulla resigned the Dictatorship in the very year of Cicero's departure for Greece.

He spent six months at Athens, the great University town of the day, and he afterwards went to Rhodes, where, for a second time, he attended the instruction of Molo. After two year's absence he returned to Rome in 77 B. C. and soon won a leading position as an orator.

In 75 he was quaestor in Sicily under Sex. Peducaeus,proprietor of Lilybaeum. The uprightness with which he discharged the duties of his office and the success with which he won the confidence of the Sicilians is shown by the fact that a deputation from the principal cities of Sicily requested him to come forward as the accuser of Verres when that notorious oppressor was arraigned at Rome in 70. Hortensius was retained for the defense on this occasion, but so overwhelming was the evidence against his client that he threw up his brief at an early stage of the proceedings, and Verres retired to Marseilles, where his condemnation to banishment and a heavy fine did not prevent him from enjoying the bulk of his ill-gotten wealth. Cicero published the pleadings he had intended to deliver, and they remain as a record of how completely the wealth and the art

treasures of a province, as well as the persons and lives of the provincials, lay at the mercy of an unscrupulous Roman governor.

Cicero was curule aedile in 69, at the age of thirty-eight, praetor in 66, and consul in 63. He was thus able to boast that he had filled each public office suo anno, that is at the earliest age it could legally be held.

His praetorship fell in a time of much excitement. In the year before it, 67, the tribune Aulus Gabinius passed his law for conferring extraordinary powers on Pompey for carrying on war against the pirates who swarmed in the Mediterranean and went so far as actually to destroy a Roman fleet in the port of Ostia and carry off Roman magistrates and their lictors from the Appian Way. In the following year the Manilian Law conferred on the same general the command in the war against Mithridates. Cicero's speech in support of the latter measure is still extant, and as Catulus, Hortensius, and the leaders of the aristocratical party were opposed to the bill as conferring unconstitutional powers such as the example of Marius and Sulla furnished a warning against, it can readily understood that the excitement ran high.

It was in 67 also that Lucius Roscius Otho carried his famous law assigning to the equites a special place in the theatre in the fourteen rows of seats next to the place of the senators, which was in the orchestra. This measure was naturally very unpopular in a republic like Rome, and gave rise to tumults. The disturbances on account of the measure continued for a considerable time, and gave Cicero in his consulship several years later an opportunity of showing the power of his ready eloquence. The populace, on seeing Otho enter the theatre, rose in a body and greeted him with hisses; a tumult ensued; Cicero was sent for; he summoned the people into an adjoining temple, and rebuked them with such sparkling wit as to restore completely their good humour.

The most important event of Cicero's consulship was the detecting and crushing of the Catiline conspiracy. There is no doubt that Cicero rendered the state an important service on the occasion, but the manner in which the criminals were condemned to punishment was of doubtful legality, and gave Cicero's enemies an opportunity for attacking him, of which they were not slow to avail themselves.

On the last day of his term of office as consul, when he pose to make the usual address to the people on laying down his authority, the tribune Metellus Nepos interposed his veto, saying that no man should be heard who had put Roman citizens to death without trial. At the time, indeed, he cleverly turned the attack to his advantage; for, debarred from making a speech, and limited to taking the formal oath usual on quitting office, he swore that he had saved the state. the people shouted that he had sworn the truth, and the attempt to injure him only served to heighten his glory. The charge, however, was well grounded, and soon the fickle popular voice turned against him.

Clodius, who was adopted into a plebeian family and elected a tribune of the plebs expressly for the purpose, brought forward a bill in 58 interdicting from fire and water, that is banishing, anyone who should be found to have put a Roman citizen to death untried. Cicero, though not expressly named in the bill, knew that it was aimed at him, and without waiting for it to become law

withdrew from Rome. His name was then introduced into the measure, and it was passed, forbidding that any one should give him shelter within 400 miles of Italy. He took up his residence at Thessalonica, where he gave way to despair, of which we have full knowledge from his correspondence.

His exile, however, did not last long. Through the exertions of his friends he was recalled to Rome in the following year in 57 and the enthusiasm with which he was welcomed must have gone far to console him for his temporary disgrace. His progress from Brundisium was one continued ovation. The peasants left their labour in the fields and crowded to see him pass, deputations from distant places met him, and as he approached Rome by the Via Appia the Senate came forth to welcome him. No wonder that he declared that one day to be the equivalent of immortality.

Cicero had not claimed the provincial government to which he was entitled at the close of his praetorship, and which was usually eagerly sought as a valuable prize. To a man of his just and upright principles the pecuniary value of the appointment was doubtless comparatively small, and he probably did not wish to leave Rome during the period preceding his candidature for the consulship, a time at which a novus homo especially would require to keep himself well in evidence.

In 52, however, he was obliged to undertake the government of Cilicia. Pompey had revived the law prohibiting an ex-consul from assuming a provincial command until the expiration of five years from the date of his consulship. The number of persons thus qualified was limited, and Cicero, as not having yet held a government, was pressed into the service. He administered his province in the most praiseworthy manner, and with purity, disinterestedness, and justice not often found in Roman governors.

The chief event of his term of office was the conquest of some robber tribes that infested the fastnesses of the Amanus range. For this achievement he vainly claimed a triumph, and persisted in his demand long after more important matters had engaged the public attention.

He returned to Rome,or at least to its neighbourhood—for he could not enter the city without forfeiting his claims to a triumph-in 49,just as the civil war between Caesar and Pompey broke out. He chose the side of Pompey and followed his fortunes to Greece. After the battle of Pharsalia in 48, he returned to Brundusium, where Caesar arrived in the following year and treated the orator with the greatest favour. For the next three years Cicero took little part in public affairs, and devoted himself chiefly to the composition of works on philosophy and rhetoric.

On the Ides of March 44 Caesar was assassinated. Though Cicero was not privy to the plot, he approved of the deed, and taking the lead of the republican party, assailed Mark Antony in his famous Philippic orations, so named after the speeches of Demosthenes against Philip of Macedon that more appropriately bore the title. The second of these speeches, which however was never delivered, is one of the most famous examples of invective extant, and was doubtless, as is hinted by Juvenal, largely responsible for the bitter enmity of Antony that was the cause of Cicero's violent death.

On the formation of the triumvirate between Octavian, Antony, and Lepidus in 43 Cicero's name was put on the list of the proscribed. He was slain near his villa at Formiae on the coast of Latium, the supposed ruins of which are still to be seen. His head and hands were cut off and carried to Antony, by whose order they were nailed to the Rostra, the orators' platform in the Forum, from which he had so often addressed the people.

The firmness with which he met his death redeemed the weaknesses of his life.

Pompey (106-48 B.C.):

Gnaeus Pompeius, commonly known as "Pompey The Great", was the son of Cn. Pompeius Strabo, one of the consuls for the year 89 B.C. He first came into prominence by raising an army to support Sulla on his return to Italy in 83, and by distinguished service against the Marians in Sicily and Africa.

After Sulla's death he held an extraordinary command against Sertorius in Spain. In 70 he and Crassus, having settled their differences, obtained the consulship, intending to revoke some of Sulla's outstanding laws. In 67 he was charged with the mission of expelling the pirates from the Mediterranean, which he successfully accomplished.

In the following year he was given the command against Mithridates with extraordinary powers. He utterly defeated Mithridates, made provinces of Bithynia-Pontus and Syria (capturing Jerusalem after a siege), enlarged the province of Cilicia, and effected a general settlement. He was a great founder and restorer of cities in the East.

However, On his return to Italy in 62 he failed to take advantage of his strength, as leader of a devoted army, to make himself a secure position in the state. Though a good general and a great organizer, he lacked political enterprise and originality. He dismissed his legions and allowed himself to be humiliated by the senate, which refused to ratify his eastern settlement and to recompense his troops.

After his consulate, Pompeius took Spain as his province, but did not go there, managing it by deputy; while Crassus had Syria, and there went to war with the wild Parthians on the Eastern border. In the battle of Carrhae, the army of Crassus was entirely routed by the Parthians; he was killed, his head was cut off, and his mouth filled up with molten gold in scorn of his riches.

At Rome, there was such distress that no one thought much even of such a disaster. Bribes were given to secure elections, and there was nothing but tumult and uproar, in which good men like Cicero and Cato could do nothing. Clodius was killed in one of these frays, and the mob grew so furious that the Senate chose Pompeius to be sole consul to put them down; and this he did for a short time, but all fell into confusion again while he was very ill of a fever at Naples, and even when he recovered there was a feeling that Caesar was wanted. But Caesar's friends said he must not be called upon to give up his army unless Pompeius gave up his command of the army in Spain, and neither of them would resign. Caesar advanced with all his forces as far as Ravenna,

which was still part of Cisalpine Gaul, and then the consul, Marcus Marcellus, begged Pompeius to protect the commonwealth, and he took up arms. Two of Caesars great friends, Marcus Antonius and Caius Cassius, who were tribunes, forbade this; and when they were not heeded, they fled to Caesar's camp asking his protection.

So he advanced. It was not lawful for an imperator, or general in command of an army, to come within the Roman territory with his troops except for his triumph, and the little river Rubicon was the boundary of Cisalpine Gaul. So when Caesar crossed it, he took the first step in breaking through old Roman rules, and thus the saying arose that one has passed the Rubicon when one has gone so far in a matter that there is no turning back.

Though Caesar's army was but small, his fame was such that everybody seemed struck with dismay, even Pompeius himself, and instead of fighting, he carried off all the senators of his party to the South, even to the extreme point of Italy at Brundusium. Caesar marched after them thither, having met with no resistance, and having, indeed, won all Italy in sixty days. As he advanced on Brundusium, Pompeius embarked on board a ship in the harbor and sailed away, meaning, no doubt, to raise an army in the provinces and return—some feared like Sulla—to take vengeance.

Caesar was appointed Dictator, and after crushing Pompeius' friends in Spain, he pursued him into Macedonia, where Pompeius had been collecting all the friends of the old commonwealth. There was a great battle fought at Pharsalia, a battle which nearly put an end to the old government of Rome, for Caesar gained a great victory; and Pompeius fled to the coast, where he found a vessel and sailed for Egypt. He sent a message to ask shelter at Alexandria, and the advisers of the young king pretended to welcome him, but they really intended to make friends with the victor; and as Pompeius stepped ashore he was stabbed in the back, his body thrown into the surf, and his head cut off.

Julius Caesar:

Gaius Julius Caesar was born probably in 102 B.C. (Mommsen's date; the traditional date is 100), and was assassinated on the 15th March 44 B.C.

In politics, Caesar began as the secret ally of Catiline and ended as the remaker of Rome. Hardly a year after Sulla's death he prosecuted Gnaeus Dolabella, a tool of the Sullan reaction; the jury voted against Caesar, but the people applauded his democratic offensive and his brilliant speech.

In 68 he was chosen quaestor and was assigned to serve in Spain. He led military expeditions against the native tribes, sacked towns, and collected enough plunder to pay off some of his debts. At the same time he won the gratitude of Spanish cities by lowering the interest charges on the sums that had been lent them by the Roman bankers. He returned to Rome and plunged again into the race for office and power. In 65 he was elected aedile, or commissioner of public works. He spent his money- i.e., the money of Crassus- in adorning the Forum with new buildings and colonnades, and courted the populace with unstinted games. Sulla had removed from the Capitol the trophies of Marius- banners, pictures, and spoils representing the features and victories of the old radical; Caesar had these restored,

to the joy of Marius' veterans; and by that act alone he announced his rebel policy. The conservatives protested and marked him out as a man to be broken.

In 64, as president of a commission appointed to try cases of murder, he summoned to his tribunal the surviving agents of Sulla's proscriptions and sentenced several of them to exile or death. In 63 he voted in the Senate against the execution of Catiline's accomplices and remarked casually, in his speech, that human personality does not outlive death; it was apparently the only part of his speech that offended no one. In that same year he was elected pontifex maximus, head of the Roman religion. In 62 he was chosen praetor, and prosecuted a leading conservative for embezzling public funds. In 61 he was appointed propraetor for Spain, but his creditors prevented his departure. He admitted that he needed 25,000,000 sesterces in order to have nothing. Crassus came to his rescue by underwriting all his obligations. Caesar proceeded to Spain, led militarily brilliant campaigns against tribes with a passion for independence, and came back to Rome with spoils enough to pay off his debts and yet so enrich the Treasury that the Senate voted him a triumph. Perhaps the optimates were subtle; they knew that Caesar wished to stand for the consulate, that the law forbade candidacy in absence, and that the triumphator was required by law to remain outside the city until the day of his triumph- which the Senate had set for after the election. But Caesar forewent his triumph, entered the city, and campaigned with irresistible energy and skill. His victory was obtained by his clever attachment of Pompey to the liberal cause.

Taking full advantage of the situation, Caesar formed with Pompey and Crassus the First Triumvirate (60), by which each pledged himself to oppose legislation unsatisfactory to any one of them. Pompey agreed to support Caesar for the consulate, and Caesar promised, if elected, to carry through the measures in which Pompey had been rebuffed by the Senate.

The campaign was bitter, and bribery flourished on both sides. When Cato, leader of the conservatives, heard that his party was buying votes, he unbent and approved the procedure as in a noble cause. The populares elected Caesar, the optimates Bibulus.

Caesar had hardly entered upon his consulate (59) when he proposed to the Senate the measures asked for by Pompey: a distribution of land to 20,000 of the poorer citizens, including Pompey's soldiers; the ratification of Pompey's arrangements in the East; and a one-third reduction of the sum which the publicans had pledged themselves to raise from the Asiatic provinces. As the Senate opposed each of these measures by every means, Caesar, like the Gracchi, offered them directly to the Assembly.
The conservatives induced Bibulus to use his veto power to forbid a vote, and had omens declared unfavorable. Caesar ignored the omens and persuaded the Assembly to impeach Bibulus; and an enthusiastic popularis emptied a pot of ordure upon Bibulus' head. Caesar's bills were carried. As in the case of the Gracchi, they combined an agrarian policy with a financial program pleasing to the business class.

Pompey was impressed by Caesar's performance of his pledges. He took Caesar's daughter Julia as his fourth wife, and the entente between plebs and bourgeoisie became a feast of love.

The Triumvirs promised the radical wing of their following that they would support Publius Clodius for the tribunate in the fall of 59. Meanwhile they kept the voters in good humor with profuse amusements and games.

In April Caesar submitted his second land bill, by which the areas owned by the state in Campania were to be distributed among poor citizens who had three children. The Senate was again ignored, the Assembly passed the bill, and, after a century of effort, the Gracchan policy triumphed. Bibulus kept to his house and contented himself with periodical announcements that the omens were unpropitious to legislation. Caesar administered public affairs without consulting him, so that the town wits referred to the year as "the consulate of Julius and Caesar."

To bring the Senate under public scrutiny, he established the first newspaper by having clerks make a record of Senatorial and other public proceedings and news, and post these Acta Diurna, or "Daily Doings," on the walls of the forums. From these walls the reports were copied and sent by private messengers to all parts of the Empire.

Toward the end of this historic consulate Caesar had himself appointed governor of Cisalpine and Narbonese Gaul for the ensuing five years. As no troops could lawfully be stationed in Italy, the command over the legions stationed in north Italy gave its possessor military power over the whole peninsula. To guarantee the maintenance of his legislation, Caesar secured the election of his friends Gabinius and Piso as consuls for 58 and married Piso's daughter Calpurnia. To ensure continued support from the plebs he lent his decisive aid to the election of Clodius as tribune for 58. He did not let his plans be influenced by the fact that he had recently divorced his third wife, Pompeia, on suspicion of adultery with Clodius.

From 58 to 49 Caesar was proconsul in Gaul and Illyricum, conducting the wonderful series of campaigns described in his commentaries, by which he not only carried the Roman dominion to the Atlantic and the English Channel, but established his own reputation as a great general and attached to himself a devoted army.

The compact with Pompey and Crassus had been renewed at Luca in 56; but the death of Crassus in 53 and the estrangement of Pompey from Caesar following the death of Julia in 54 put an end to the league. The opposition of Pompey and the senate to Caesar's plans for retaining office, and the intention of his enemies to prosecute him as soon as he relinquished it, brought matters to a head.

Early in 49, Caesar at the head of the 13th legion crossed the Rubicon into Italy to enforce his demands, and launched civil war. His success was rapid. Pompey was outmaneuvered and driven from Italy, and Caesar became master of Rome almost without a blow.

He showed a political clemency to the defeated, in strong contrast with the action of earlier Roman leaders.

In the same year (49), by a brief and brilliant campaign, he forced the surrender of the Pompeian army in Spain, where it held a strong position at Ilerda. In 48 Caesar followed Pompey to Epirus, finally defeated him at Pharsalus, and pursued him to Egypt, to find he had been murdered. After some months of dalliance with Cleopatra, Caesar passed to Syria and Asia Minor, where his easy defeat of Pharnaces at Zela in 47 was the occasion of his well-known message to Rome "Veni, vidi, vici" ("I came, I saw, I conquered").

After a brief stay in Rome, he was called upon to face Cato and the other members of the senatorial party supported by Juba in Africa. These he defeated with great slaughter at Thapsus in 46.

His last campaign was in Spain, against the sons of Pompey and the survivors of Thapsus; it was closed by the victory of Munda (45).

Less than a year later, in the midst of uncompleted schemes for the reorganization of Rome and the empire, he was assassinated by a band of those whom his measures had offended, led by M. Brutus and C. Cassius whom he had pardoned after Pharsalus.

His amazing energy had already done much, in the brief intervals of his campaigns, to found a new regime. Pharsalus had made him an autocrat and he had used his power to re-establish order, to restore the economic situation, to extend the franchise of the provincials, to regulate taxation, and to reform the Calendar.

He had other projects, such as that of codifying the law and establishing a public library. His measures showed breadth of view and were conceived on a popular basis, but were carried out with a contempt of republican institutions which was in part the cause of his assassination.

But Rome had outgrown her ancient constitution, and his murder was a foolish crime. For Caesar combined pre-eminently, the qualities of statesmanship and generalship, discernment, determination, promptitude, and Clemency.

Crassus (108-53)

Marcus Licinius Crassus was one of Sulla's lieutenants, and a man of great wealth. He was popularly known as Dives, "The Rich".He was of aristocratic lineage. His father, a famous orator, consul, and censor, had fought for Sulla and had killed himself rather than yield to Marius. Sulla rewarded the son by letting him buy at bargain prices the confiscated properties of proscribed men.

As a youth Marcus had studied literature and philosophy and had assiduously practiced law; but now the smell of money intoxicated him. He organized a fire brigade- something new to Rome; it ran to fires, sold its services on the spot, or bought endangered buildings at nominal sums and then put out the fire; in this way Crassus acquired hundreds of houses and tenements, which he let at high rentals. He bought state mines when Sulla denationalized them. Soon he had inflated his fortune from 7,000,000 to 170,000,000 sesterces, a sum nearly equal to the total yearly revenue of theTreasury. No man should consider himself rich, said Crassus, unless he could raise, equip, and maintain his own army; it was his destiny to perish by his definition.

Having become the wealthiest man in Rome, he was still unhappy; he pitched for public office, for a province, for the leadership of an Asiatic campaign. He solicited votes humbly in the streets,

memorized the first names of countless citizens, lived in conspicuous simplicity, and, to tether influential politicians to his star, lent them money without interest but payable on demand.

With all his eager ambitions he was a kindly man, accessible to everyone, generous without limit to his friends, and contributing to both political parties with that bilateral wisdom which has always distinguished his kind. He fulfilled all his dreams: he became consul in 70 and again in 55, governed Syria, and helped to raise the great army that he led against Parthia.

As praetor in 71 B.C. he defeated the insurrection of Spartacus. He pointed the moral of his victory by hanging, along the road from Rome to Capua, six thousand captives whom he had taken.

He was consul with Pompey in 70, and combined with him to abolish Sulla's constitution and diminishing the power of the senate. Crassus was the richest man in Rome, and next to Pompey, possessed the greatest authority; his party in the senate was even greater than that of his rival, and the envy raised against him was less. He and Pompey had long been disunited by an opposition of interests and of characters; however, it was from a continuance of their mutual jealousies that the state was in some measure to expect its future safety.

During Pompey's absence in the East he joined Caesar in the lead of the popular party, and in 60 with Caesar and Pompey formed the coalition known as the "First Triumvirate".

He chose the province of Syria in 54, as an easy way of acquiring wealth and glory, but was defeated by the Parthians at Carrhae in 53 and subsequently murdered by them. He had conducted the war against the Parthians with so little prudence, that he suffered them to get the advantage of him in almost every skirmish; incapable of extricating himself, he fell a sacrifice to his own rashness in trusting himself to a perfidious enemy.

Crassus was accompanied by his son, who had done good service under Caesar in Gaul. They arrived at Zeugma, a city of Syria, on the Euphrátes; and the Romans, seven legions strong, with four thousand cavalry, drew themselves up along the river.

The Quaestor, Cassius, a man of ability, proposed to Crassus a plan of the campaign, which consisted in following the river as far as Seleucia, in order not to be separated from his fleet and provisions, and to avoid being surrounded by the cavalry of the enemy. But Crassus allowed himself to be deceived by an Arab chief, who lured him to the sandy plains of Mesopotamia at Carrhae.

The forces of the Parthians, divided into many bodies, suddenly rushed upon the Roman ranks, and drove them back. The young Crassus attempted a charge at the head of fifteen hundred horsemen. The Parthians yielded, but only to draw him into an ambush, where he perished, after great deeds of valor. His head, carried on the end of a pike, was borne before the eyes of his unhappy father, who, crushed by grief and despair, gave the command into the hands of Cassius. Cassius gave orders for a general retreat.

Crassus was inveigled into the power of Surena, the Parthian general, under the pretence of treating for peace. His head was cut off and sent to Orodes, the king of Parthia, who poured molten gold down his throat, as a mockery of his riches.

Crassus had amassed immense wealth by speculation, mining, dealing in slaves, and other methods. Plutarch relates that he owned silver mines, purchased confiscated estates during Sulla's Proscriptions, and also made a practice of buying houses in Rome when they were on fire and consequently cheap, thus coming to own a large part of the city. He made himself popular by his general affability and his good offices to all. Avarice is said to have been his ruling passion, though he gave large sums to the people for political effect.

9.2.8.2 First and Second Triumvirates

The First Triumvirate

Pompey was ostensibly at the head of the first Triumvirate, and in return supported Caesar in his candidacy for the consulship. Crassus was to contribute his wealth to influence the election. Caesar was elected without opposition (59); his colleague, the Senate's tool, was Marcus Bibulus.

Caesar had now reached the highest round in the ladder of political offices. He had shown himself in his entire course to be careful in keeping within the bounds of the constitution, never exerting himself in political quarrels except to defend the law against lawlessness. Now he was in a position to push his ideas of reform, and to show the aristocracy of what stuff he was made.

It would have been well for Cicero, and better for the state, had the orator been willing to join hands with Caesar and Pompey; but he was too vain of his own glory to join hands with those who were his superiors, and he clung to the Senate, feeling that his talents would shine there more, and be more likely to redound to his own personal fame.

Caesar's consulship increased his popularity among all except the aristocrats. His Agrarian Law, carefully framed and worded, was bitterly opposed by the Senate, especially by his colleague, Bibulus, and by Cato. The law provided that large tracts of the _ager publicus_, then held on easy terms by the rich patricians, be distributed among the veterans of Pompey. Caesar proposed to pay the holders a reasonable sum for their loss, though legally they had no claim whatever on the land. Although Bibulus interfered, Cato raved, and the Tribunes vetoed, still the Assembly passed the law, and voted in addition that the Senate be obliged to take an oath to observe it. The Leges Juliae were a code of laws which Caesar drew up during his year of office. They mark an era in Roman law, for they cover many crimes the commission of which had been for a long time undermining the state.

The most important of these was the Lex De Repetundis, aimed at the abuses of governors of provinces. It required all governors to make a double return of their accounts, one to be left in the province open for inspection, the other to be kept at Rome.

When Caesar's term of office was nearly ended, he obtained from the reluctant Senate his appointment as Proconsul of Gaul for five years. He must leave the city, however, in safe hands,

otherwise all his work would be undone. He managed the consular elections for the next year (58) so adroitly, that Piso and Gabinius, on whose friendship he could rely, were elected.

There were in Rome, however, two men whom it would be dangerous for Caesar to leave behind. Cato, the ultra aristocrat, hated him bitterly. Cicero, whose ambition was to lead the Senate, a body only too willing to crush Caesar, might do him great harm. It was Caesar's good fortune, or, as some believe, the result of his own scheming, that both these men were put temporarily out of the way.

Clodius Pulcher was a young aristocrat, notorious for his wildness. At one time, by assuming the dress of a woman, he had gained admittance to the festival of _Bona Dea_, which was celebrated only by women. He was discovered and brought to trial before the Senate, but acquitted by means of open bribery. Cicero had been instrumental in bringing him to trial, and Clodius never forgot it. He got adopted into a plebeian family in order to be a candidate for the tribuneship, and was successful. He then proposed to the Assembly that any person who had put to death a Roman citizen without allowing him to appeal to the people be considered a violator of the constitution. The proposal was carried. All knew that Cicero was meant, and he fled at once to Macedonia. His property was confiscated, his houses were destroyed, and his palace in the city was dedicated to the Goddess of Liberty.

The kingdom of Cyprus, which had long been attached to that of Egypt, had been bequeathed to Rome at the death of Ptolemy Alexander in 80. The Senate had delayed to accept the bequest, and meanwhile the island was ruled by Ptolemy of Cyprus, one of the heirs of the dead king.

Clodius, on the plea that this king harbored pirates, persuaded the Assembly to annex the island, and to send Cato to take charge of it. He accepted the mission, and was absent two years. His duties were satisfactorily performed, and he returned with about $7,000,000 to increase the Roman treasury. Thus, Cicero and Cato being out of the city, the Senate was without a leader who could work injury in Caesar's absence.

The Second Triumvirate (44-33)

Caesar in his will had appointed GAIUS OCTAVIUS, the grandson of his sister Julia, heir to three fourths of his property; and his other relatives were to have the remaining fourth.

Young Octavius was in his nineteenth year when Caesar was murdered. He went at once to Rome to claim his inheritance. Caesar's widow, Calpurnia, had intrusted to Mark Antony all the money in the house,—a large sum,—and had also delivered to his care all the Dictator's writings and memoranda.

Octavius was cool and sagacious, without passion or affection, and showed himself a match for all his opponents. His arrival at Rome was disagreeable to Antony, who was unwilling to surrender Caesar's property. He claimed that he had already expended it for public purposes. Octavius at once paid the dead Dictator's legacies, mostly out of his own fortune, thus making himself very popular among the people. He then joined the party of the Senate, and during the autumn and

winter of 44 was its chief champion. He was helped by the eloquent Cicero, who was delivering against Antony his famous fourteen Philippicus,—so called from their resemblance to the great orations of Demosthenes against Philip.

During the spring of 43 Octavius advanced against Antony, who was at Mutina (Modena), and defeated him in two battles. He was then appointed Consul, and, finding it for his interest, he deserted the Senate, made friends with Antony, and with him and Lepidus formed (27 November, 43) the Second Triumvirate, assuming full authority to govern and reorganize the state, and to hold office for five years.

The provinces were divided as follows: Lepidus was to have Spain and Gallia Narbonensis; Antony, the rest of Gaul beyond the Alps and Gallia Cisalpína; Octavius, Sicily, Sardinia, and Africa. A bloody prescription followed. Among its victims were Cicero, who was surrendered to please Antony, 300 Senators, and 2,000 Equites.

The Triumvirs could now concentrate their energies upon the East; whither BRUTUS and Cassius, the murderers of Caesar, had fled. These two had organized in the provinces of the East an army amounting to 80,000 infantry and 20,000 cavalry. They were employed in plundering various towns of Asia Minor, and finally, in the spring of 42, assembled their forces at Sardis preparatory to an invasion of Europe.

After marching through Thrace they entered Macedonia, and found Antony and Octavius opposed to them at PHILIPPI, with an army of 120,000 troops. There were two battles at Philippi in November, 42. In the first, Brutus defeated Octavius; but Cassius was defeated by Antony, and, unaware of his colleague's victory, committed suicide. In the second battle, three weeks later, Brutus was defeated by the united armies of the Triumvirs, and, following the example of Cassius, put an end to his life. With Brutus fell the Republic-the absolute ascendency of individuals, which is monarchy, was then established.

The immediate result of Philippi was a fresh arrangement of the Roman world among the Triumvirs. Antony preferred the East, Octavius took Italy and Spain, and Africa fell to Lepidus.

Octavius tried to establish order in Italy, but many obstacles were to be overcome. Sextus Pompeius, who had escaped from Munda, was in command of a strong naval force. He controlled a large part of the Mediterranean, and, by waylaying the corn ships bound for Rome, exposed the city to great danger from famine. Octavius was obliged to raise a fleet and meet this danger. At first he was defeated by Pompey, but later, in 36, in the great sea fight off Naulochus in Sicily, the rebel was overcome. He fled to Asia with a few followers, but was taken prisoner at Milétus by one of the lieutenants of Antony, and put to death.

Lepidus now claimed Sicily as a part of his province, and an equal share in the government of the Roman world with the other Triumvirs. But his soldiers were induced to desert him, and he was obliged to surrender to Octavius. His life was spared, but he was deprived of his power and provinces. He lived twenty years longer (until 13), but ceased to be a factor in public affairs. Having rid themselves of all rivals, Octavius and Antony redivided the Empire, the former taking the West, the latter the East.

Antony now repaired to Alexandría, and surrendered himself to the fascinations of the famous Cleopátra. He assumed the habits and dress of an Eastern monarch, and by his senseless follies disgusted his friends and supporters. He resigned himself to luxury and idleness, and finally divorced himself from his wife Octavia, sister of Octavius, disregarding his good name and the wishes of his friends. Thus gradually he became more and more estranged from Octavius, until finally the rupture resulted in open war.

The contest was decided by the naval battle off Cape Actium, in Greece, September 2, 31. Antony had collected from all parts of the East a large army, in addition to his fleet, which was supported by that of Cleopátra. He wished to decide the contest on land; but Cleopátra insisted that they should fight by sea. The fleet of Octavius was commanded by Agrippa, who had been in command at the sea- fight off Naulochus. The battle lasted a long time, and was still undecided, when Cleopátra hoisted sail and with her sixty vessels hastened to leave the line. Antony at once followed her. The battle, however, continued until his remaining fleet was destroyed, and his army, after a few days' hesitation, surrendered.

Octavius did not follow Antony for about a year. He passed the winter in Samos, sending Agrippa to Italy with the veterans. His time was occupied in restoring order in Greece and Asia, in raising money to satisfy the demands of his troops, and in founding new colonies. At length he turned his attention to Egypt. After capturing Pelusium, the key of the country, he marched upon Alexandría. Antony, despairing of success, committed suicide, expiring in the arms of Cleopátra. The queen, disdaining to adorn the triumph of the conqueror, followed his example, and was found dead on her couch, in royal attire, with her two faithful attendants also dead at her feet.

Octavius was now sole ruler of Rome. Before returning to the capital to celebrate his triumphs, he organized Egypt as a province, settled disputes in Judaea, and arranged matters in Syria and Asia Minor. He arrived at Rome (August 29), and enjoyed three magnificent triumphs. The gates of the temple of JANUS—which were open in time of war, and had been closed but twice before, once during Numa's reign, and once between the First and Second Punic Wars—were closed, and Rome was at peace with the entire world.

Learning Teaching Activities

Activity No 1 (9.2.8.1)

Prepare short biographical sketches on Cicero, Pompey, Julius Caesar and Crassus.

Instructions

- This can be done as a creative activity.
- The students will find additional details and pictures on the above mentioned personalities.
- The teacher can give the students the chance to read out their biographical sketches.

Activity No 2

Write in detail the circumstances which and to the formation of the First Triumvirate and what each partner expected to get out of it.

Instructions

- This can be given to the children as an assignment.

Resources:

The Cambridge Ancient History, Volume 9: chapters 13, 15, 16, and 17.

Merivale, Charles: *The Roman Triumvirates*.

Rice Holmes, T. *The Roman Republic*.

Cowell, F.R. *Cicero and the Roman Republic*.

FROM JULIUS CAESAR TO AUGUSTUS CAESAR

Competency 9.0 : Gains an insight into the experiences of the Greeks and Romans in Antiquity

Competency Level 9.3 : Understands the evolution of political ideals and institutions that are fundamental to modern civilization.

Duration : 30 periods

Learning Outcomes :
- Gets a clear idea about the regal period and the conversion of the regal period to a Republic.
- Identifies the struggle between the two orders.
- Learns about the Punic wars and the great personality of Hannibal.

2.9.1 The Dictatorship and Reforms of Julius Caesar

The Life and Early Career of Julius Caesar

Julius Caesar was born into a patrician family, of the *gens* Julia, which claimed descent from Iulus [the son of the Trojan Prince Aeneas]. Despite their ancient pedigree, the *Julii Caesares* were not especially politically influential, having produced only three consuls.

It should be noted that Caesar's formative years were a time of turmoil. The Social War was fought from 91 to 88 B. C. between Rome and her Italian allies over the issue of Roman citizenship. At the same time Mithridates of Pontus threatened Rome's eastern provinces. Domestically, the political strife between the Optimates and the Populares culminated in the Civil War between Marius and Sulla.

Despite his noble birth Julius Caesar often identified himself with the aspirations of the popular party. Infact, this was further encouraged by the marriage of his aunt with Marius as well as by his own marriage with Cinna's daughter. Hence, a constant animosity existed between Caesar and the Senate.

Because of his family background as well as his own political ideals Caesar naturally became an enemy of Sulla. Hence, during Sulla's dictatorship Caesar left Rome and joined the army.

The First Triumvirate and Caesar

- After the suppression of the Catilinarian conspiracy, Caesar entered into a secret alliance with Pompey and Crassus, thus forming the First Triumvirate. This was formed against the senate
- With the help of Pompey and Crassus, Caesar was elected Consul in 60 B. C.
- Next he got a law passed that granted him the government of the province of Cisalpine Gaul and Illyria for five years at the end of his consulship, and after a short period also obtained the Transalpine Gaul. Gaul at the time comprised the subjugated region south of the Alps and to the east of the Apennines as far as the river Rubicon, together with a small portion of territory on the other side of the Alps.
- Caesar had studied himself well in the art of warfare. The skill and foresight which he displayed as a general could be clearly seen through his military campaigns – specially when considering his popularity. In Spain. Caesar's first task was to start raising, partly at his own expense, more troops than those which he already commanded as governor. Over the next few years he was to raise a force of ten legions, about 50,000 men, as well as 10,000 to 20,000 allies, slaves and camp followers. But it was to be in his very first year in office, 58 B. C., before many additional troops had been levied that occurrences beyond Caesar's control should set him on the path to history. Thus, after a series of campaigns [from 58 – 50 B.C.] Caesar was able to pacify Gaul. This pacification of the Gauls was politically significant to Rome.

- With the death of Crassus the friendship between Caesar and Pompey slowly dwindle. Especially, Caesar's successful Gallic campaigns and his growing popularity roused the jealousy of Pompey. This resulted in the Civil War between Caesar and Pompey.
- Thus, when Caesar's governorship of Gaul was revoked by the senate, he crossed the Rubicon, the demarcation line between his province and Italy. He marched on Rome at the head of his battle - hardened army, where he met little resistance.
- Caesar might have ruled Rome thus, yet the entire state of Rome was under threat and only one man had the potential to stop Caesar - Pompey. But Pompey, though an excellent general, and often thought to be superior to Caesar by many, he didn't possess the troops to take on the invader. So he withdrew his troops from Italy to gain time to train his troops. Caesar tried to stop him but failed.
- But with Pompey forced to flee eastwards, Caesar was left to turn to Spain to put the Pompeian legions there out of action. Not so much by fighting as by skilful manoeuvring was Caesar by his own admission for once outdone. However, the campaign was brought to a successful end within a short period, most of the troops joining his standard.
- Caesar now turned east to deal with Pompey himself. The supporters of Pompey controlled the seas, causing him great difficulty in setting across to Epirus, where he was shut up within his own lines by a much larger army of Pompey.
- Caesar avoided a pitched battle with some difficulty, whilst waiting for Mark Antony to join him with the second army in 48 B.C. Then, later in the same year, Caesar met Pompey on the plain of Pharsalus in Thessaly. Pompey's army was much the bigger, though Pompey himself knew them not of the same quality as Caesar's veterans.
- Caesar won the day, utterly destroying the force of Pompey, who fled to Egypt. Caesar followed, though Pompey was eventually assassinated on arrival by the Egyptian government.
- Caesar, in hot pursuit of Pompey, arrived in Alexandria, only to get entangled in the quarrels of succession to the throne of the Egyptian monarchy. Initially asked to help settle a dispute, Caesar soon found himself attacked by Egyptian royal troops and needed to hold out for help to arrive. His few troops he had with him, barricaded the streets and held off their opponents in bitter street fighting.
- The partisans of Pompey still controlling the seas with their fleet, made it nigh impossible for Rome to send help. Though faced with such a desperate situation, Caesar did not leave Egypt at once, as Cleopatra, persuaded him to stay a while as her personal guest. However, a son, named Caesarion, was born the following year.
- Caesar first dealt with king Parnaces, the son of Mithridates of Pontus, before returning to Rome. Pharnaces had used the Roman's weakness during their civil war to recover his father's lands. It was after this crushing victory in Asia Minor that he sent his celebrated message to the senate *'veni, vidi, vici'* (I came, I saw, I conquered.)

Caesar, Dictator of Rome

- Back home Caesar had been confirmed dictator in his absence, an appointment which was regularly renewed thereafter. With this began an era, the rule of Rome being held by men who successively held the name Caesar, by birth or adoption.
- But the fact that Caesar had not returned home at once had given Pompey's sons enough time to reinforce their armies. Two more campaigns were carried out, in Africa and Spain, culminating in the battle of Munda in 45 B.C. In the same year Caesar returned to Rome.

- Once, in Rome he established order, begun measures to reduce congestion in Rome, draining large tracts of marshy lands, gave full voting rights to the inhabitants of his former province south of the Alps, revised the tax laws of Asia and Sicily, resettled many Romans in new homes in the Roman provinces and reformed the calendar.
- Caesar's colonial policy, combined with his generosity in granting citizenship to individuals and communities, was to revitalize both the Roman legions and the Roman governing class. Furthermore, Caesar, who included some provincial aristocrats in his enlarged Senate, was perfectly aware of what he was doing.
- But despite the pardons he granted to his old senatorial enemies, despite not drowning Rome in blood like Sulla and Marius had done, when they had seized power, Caesar failed to win over his enemies. Furthermore, many Romans feared that Caesar was going to make himself king. And Rome still held an old hatred to its ancient kings. Many saw their fears only confirmed as Cleopatra with her son Caesarion was brought to Rome.
- But Caesar did manage to persuade a senate which knew it possessed no effective powers to declare him dictator for life.

2.9.2 The murder of Julius Caesar.

Five months after his arrival back in Rome, on the Ides of March 44 B. C., Caesar was assassinated at the hands of a band of senatorial conspirators led by Marcus Junius Brutus and Gaius Cassius Longinus. Both of them were former supporters of who had been pardoned by Caesar after the battle of Pharsalus.

Thus, it is apparent that Julius Caesar had changed the nature of the Roman Empire. He had swept away the old, corrupt system of the late Roman republic and had set an example to future Roman emperors as well as other future European leaders to live up to.

2.9.3 Events following the murder

When Julius Caesar was assassinated in 44 B.C., Octavius was studying in Illyria. When Caesar's will was read it revealed that, having no legitimate children, he had adopted his great - nephew as his son and main heir. Through adoption, Octavius assumed the name Gaius Julius Caesar. Roman tradition dictated that he also append the surname Octavianus or Octavian to indicate his biological family. However, no evidence exists that he ever used that name.

Octavian recruited a small force in Apollonia. Crossing over to Italia, he bolstered his personal forces with Caesar's veteran legionaries, gathering support by emphasizing his status as heir to Caesar. Only eighteen years old, he was consistently underestimated by his rivals for power.
In Rome, he found Mark Antony and the Optimates led by Marcus Tullius Cicero in an uneasy truce. After a tense standoff, and a war in Cisalpine Gaul after Antony tried to take control of the province from Decimus Junius Brutus Albinus, he formed an alliance with Mark Antony and Marcus Aemilius Lepidus [the Second triumvir]. The Second Triumvirate, unlike the first, was an explicit grant of special powers lasting five years and supported by law.

The triumvirs then set in motion proscriptions in which 300 senators and 2,000 of the Equestrian order or *equites* were deprived of their property and, for those who failed to escape, their lives. Going beyond a simple purge of those allied with the assassins, the triumvirs were probably motivated by a need to raise money to pay their troops.

Antony and Octavian then marched against Marcus Junius Brutus and Gaius Cassius, who had fled to the east. After two battles at Philippi in Macedonia, the Caesarian army was victorious and Brutus and Cassius committed suicide (42 B.C.). After the battle, a new arrangement was made between the members of the Second Triumvirate: While Octavian returned to Rome, Antony went to Egypt where he allied himself with Cleopatra VII, the former lover of Julius Caesar and mother of Caesar's infant son, Caesarion. Lepidus, now clearly marked as an unequal partner, settled for the province of Africa.

While in Egypt, Antony had an affair with Cleopatra that resulted in the birth of three children. Antony later left Cleopatra to make a strategic marriage with Octavian's sister, Octavia Minor, in 40 B.C. During their marriage Octavia gave birth to two daughters, both named Antonia. In 37 B.C., Antony deserted Octavia and went back to Egypt and Cleopatra. The Roman dominions were then divided between Octavian in the West and Antony in the East.

Antony occupied himself with military campaigns in the East and a romantic affair with Cleopatra; Octavian built a network of allies in Rome, consolidated his power, and spread propaganda implying that Antony was becoming less than Roman because of his preoccupation with Egyptian affairs and traditions. The situation grew more and more tense, and finally, in 32 B.C., the senate officially declared war on "the Foreign Queen," to avoid the stigma of yet another civil war. It was quickly decided. In the bay of Actium on the western coast of Greece, after Antony's men began deserting, the fleets met in a great battle in which many ships burned and thousands on both sides lost their lives. Octavian defeated his rivals, who then fled to Egypt. He pursued them, and following another defeat, Antony committed suicide. Cleopatra also committed suicide after her upcoming role in Octavian's Triumph was "carefully explained to her," and Caesarion was "butchered without compunction." Octavian supposedly said "two Caesars are one too many" as he ordered Caesarion's death.

2.9.4 Augustus: his imperial rule and Reforms

The Western half of the Roman Republic territory had sworn allegiance to Octavian prior to Actium in 31 B.C.E., and after Actium and the defeat of Antony and Cleopatra, the Eastern half followed suit, placing Octavian in the position of ruler of the Republic. Years of civil war had left Rome in a state of near-lawlessness, but the Republic was not prepared to accept the control of Octavian as a despot. At the same time, Octavian could not simply give up his authority without risking further civil wars amongst the Roman generals, and even if he desired no position of authority whatsoever, his position demanded that he look to the well-being of the city and provinces. Disbanding his personal forces, Octavian held elections and took up the position of consul; as such, though he had given up his personal armies, he was now legally in command of the legions of Rome.

The First Settlement

In 27 B.C., Octavian officially returned power to the Roman Senate, and offered to relinquish his own military supremacy. Reportedly, the suggestion of Octavian's stepping down as consul led

to rioting amongst the commoners in Rome. A compromise was reached between the Senate and Octavian's supporters, known as the First Settlement. Octavian was given proconsular authority over the Western half and Syria. The provinces combined contained almost 70 percent of the Roman legions.

The Senate also gave him the titles Augustus and Princeps. However, it should be noted that Augustus was a title of religious rather than political authority. In the mindset of contemporary religious beliefs, it would have cleverly symbolized a stamp of authority over humanity that went beyond any constitutional definition of his status. Additionally, after the harsh methods employed in consolidating his control, the change in name would also serve to separate his benign reign as Augustus from his reign of terror as Octavian. Princeps translates to "first-citizen" or "first-leader." It had been a title under the Republic for those who had served the state well. For example, Pompey had held the title.

In addition, and perhaps the most dangerous innovation, the Roman Senate granted Augustus the right to wear the Civic Crown of laurel and oak. This crown was usually held above the head of a Roman general during a Roman Triumph, with the individual holding the crown charged to continually repeat, "Remember, thou art mortal," to the triumphant general. The fact that not only was Augustus awarded this crown but awarded the right to actually wear it upon his head is perhaps the clearest indication of the creation of a monarchy. However, it must be noted that none of these titles, or the Civic Crown, granted Octavian any additional powers or authority. For all intents and purposes the new Augustus was simply a highly-honoured Roman citizen, holding the consulship.

These actions were highly abnormal from the Roman Senate, but this was not the same body of patricians that had murdered Caesar. Both Antony and Octavian had purged the Senate of suspect elements and planted it with their loyal partisans. How free a hand the Senate had in these transactions, and what back room deals were made, remain unknown.

The Second Settlement

In 23 B.C., Augustus renounced the consulship, but retained his consular imperium, leading to a second compromise between Augustus and the Senate, known as the Second Settlement. Augustus was granted the power of a tribune, though not the title, which allowed him to convene the Senate and people at will and lay business before it, veto the actions of either the Assembly or the Senate, preside over elections, and the right to speak first at any meeting. Augustus' authority also included powers usually reserved for the Roman censor. These included the right to supervise public morals and scrutinize laws to ensure they were in the public interest, as well as the ability to hold a census and determine the membership of the Senate. No Tribune of Rome had held these powers previously, and there was no precedent within the Roman system for combining the powers of the Tribune and the Censor into a single position, nor was Augustus ever elected to the office of Censor. Whether censorial powers were granted to Augustus as part of his tribunician authority, or he simply assumed these responsibilities, is still a matter of debate.

In addition to tribunician authority, Augustus was granted sole imperium within the city of Rome itself: All armed forces in the city, formerly under the control of the Praefects, were now under the sole authority of Augustus. Additionally, Augustus was granted imperium proconsulare maius, or "imperium over all the proconsuls," which translated to the right to interfere in any province and override the decisions of any governor. With maius imperium, Augustus was the only individual able to receive a triumph as he was ostensibly the head of every Roman army.

Many of the political subtleties of the Second Settlement seem to have evaded the comprehension of the Plebeian class. When, in 22 B.C.E., Augustus failed to stand for election as consul, fears arose once again that Augustus, seen as the great "defender of the people," was being forced from power by the aristocratic Senate. In 22, 21, and 20 B.C.E., the people rioted in response, and only allowed a single consul to be elected for each of those years, ostensibly to leave the other position open for Augustus. Finally, in 19 B.C.E., the Senate voted to allow Augustus to wear the consul's insignia in public and before the Senate, with an act sometimes known as the Third Settlement. This seems to have assuaged the populace; regardless of whether or not Augustus was actually a consul, the importance was that he appeared as one before the people.

Thus, it must be understood that all forms of permanent and legal power within Rome officially lay with the Senate and the people. However, though Augustus was given extraordinary powers, it was only as a proconsul and magistrate under the authority of the Senate. Augustus never presented himself as a king or autocrat, once again only allowing him to be addressed by the title princeps. This is a valuable lesson he learnt from the failure of Julius Caesar.

After the death of Lepidus in 13 B.C., Augustus additionally took up the position of *pontifex maximus*, the most important religious position in Rome.

Later Roman Emperors would generally be limited to the powers and titles originally granted to Augustus, though often, in order to display humility, newly appointed Emperors would often decline one or more of the honours given to Augustus. Just as often, as their reign progressed, Emperors would appropriate all of the titles, regardless of whether they had actually been granted by the Senate. Thus, the Civic Crown, consular insignia, and later the purple robes of a Triumphant general became the imperial insignia in future times.

Death and Succession

Augustus' control of power throughout the Empire was so absolute that it allowed him to name his successor, a custom that had been abandoned and derided in Rome since the foundation of the Republic. At first, it was indicated that his sister's son, Marcus Claudius Marcellus, who had been married to Augustus' daughter Julia the Elder. However, Marcellus died in 23 B.C.

After the death of Marcellus, Augustus married his daughter to his right hand man, Marcus Vipsanius Agrippa. Augustus' intent to make the first two children his heirs was apparent when he adopted them as his own children. Augustus also showed favour to his stepsons, Livia's children from her first marriage, Nero Claudius Drusus Germanicus and Tiberius Claudius, after they had conquered a large portion of Germany.

After Agrippa died in 12 B.C., Livia's son Tiberius divorced his own wife and married Agrippa's widow. Tiberius shared in Augustus' tribune powers, but shortly thereafter went into retirement. After the early deaths of both Gaius and Lucius, and the earlier death of his brother Drusus, Tiberius was recalled to Rome, where he was adopted by Augustus.

On August 19, 14 B.C., Augustus died. Postumus Agrippa and Tiberius had been named co-heirs. However, Postumus had been banished, and was put to death around the same time. The one who ordered his death is unknown, but the way was clear for Tiberius to assume the same powers that his stepfather had.

2.9.5 Domestic and Foreign Policy of Augustus

Augustus started out his reign by continuing many of the reforms started by Julius Caesar. One of his first acts was to continue the regulations for the distribution of corn begun under Caesar and he also improved the water supply of Rome. Augustus also instituted a fire brigade and made Rome's police force more efficient. His most famous civil change, however, was the institution of the Praetorian Guard who were his personal police force and that of most emperors who came after him. This select group of men numbered 3000, and was stationed all over Italy.
Augustus also had an extensive building program which helped to beautify Rome. Some of his better known building projects were the construction of the Forum of Augustus, the Mausoleum of Augustus, the Theatre of Marcellus and the baths of Agrippa. Also, he rebuilt many roads and temples. Thus, he is said to have boasted ' I found Rome a city of wood and left her a city of marble.'

The most important reforms Augustus made involved how the provinces would be ruled. The problem was that Rome tried to Rule the provinces like she ruled herself but what works well with a small city state would not work well with a vast empire. It is because of this misrule during the last century of the republic that the provinces had suffered greatly due to wasted land and heavy taxation to fund Rome's many wars. As well, there had been a great deal of fighting within the provinces which led to barbarian invasions on the frontier towns.

To remedy the problem with the provinces, Augustus first divided them into two classes. In his division, the older provinces were kept under the control of the senate but the newer provinces or ones which were on the frontiers were put under his control. This division worked well for Augustus in all ways since the senate had given him some power in all provinces. He even had power in the provinces ruled by the senate. These reforms of Augustus resulted in better and more honest governing of the provinces because it was no longer possible for the governors to misgovern them. Any governor who did misgovern was responsible to Augustus or the senate and was immediately called to Rome to be punished.
Augustus was also a firm believer that the empire was as large it could possibly be for it to be governed justly, and so had no real ambitions of conquest. He believed that his job was to unify all the different societies into one that was loyal to only Rome. In order for this peace to occur, the frontiers must be secured and Augustus believed that natural barriers would be the easiest and most effective security. The Roman empire was so large that it did include many such natural barriers. It extended to the East to the Euphrates, in the west to the Atlantic Ocean and on the South by the great African desert. It was only in the North and North East that there were problems with the boundaries.

Through his many campaigns, Augustus pacified and reorganized the provinces, first in the west and then in the east. In 18 B. C. his imperium, or supreme command, was renewed for five years.

From 16 B. C. to 13 B.C. he was again absent, strengthening and extending the northern frontiers. His imperium was renewed for another five years when he returned.

Throughout this period, and thereafter, Gallia, most of Spain, the Balkans, Syria, and Egypt were under his direct control, and administered for him by his own legates and prefects.

It should be noted that Augustus established a firm frontier for the empire: to the north, the Batavians held the Rhine delta, and the course of the Rhine and Danube. To the east, the Parthians and the Euphrates gave the next line; to the south, the African colonies were protected by the desert; to the west were Spain and Gaul. The provinces were governed either by imperial legates responsible to the princeps or by proconsuls appointed by the Senate.

2.9.6 The Golden Age of Rome.

After his death Augustus was deified by the Roman people. Both his borrowed surname, Caesar, and his title Augustus became the permanent titles of the future rulers of Rome.

Many consider Augustus to be Rome's greatest emperor; his policies certainly extended the empire's life span and initiated the celebrated *Pax Romana* or *Pax Augusta*. He was intelligent, brave as well as a shrewd politician, but he was not perhaps as charismatic as Julius Caesar or Mark Antony. Nevertheless, his legacy proved more enduring. He spent a lot of time reorganizing the army and the administration. He organized the army into 25 legions. Consuls and Tribunes were still elected. He himself lived a modest life-style and appeared anxious to be seen as on the same level as his subjects, or citizens. He disliked luxury and wore the plain dress of an ordinary Senator. He was especially anxious to restore the sanctity of marriage.

In looking back on the reign of Augustus and its legacy to the Roman world, its longevity should not be overlooked as a key factor in its success. As one ancient historian says, people were born and reached middle age without knowing any form of government other than the Principate. Had Augustus died earlier, matters may have turned out differently. The attrition of the civil wars on the old Republican oligarchy and the longevity of Augustus, therefore, must be seen as major contributing factors in the transformation of the Roman state into a de facto monarchy in these years. Augustus' own experience, his patience, his tact, and his political acumen also played their parts. He directed the future of the empire down many lasting paths, from the existence of a standing professional army stationed at or near the frontiers, to the dynastic principle so often employed in the imperial succession, to the embellishment of the capital at the emperor's expense. Augustus' ultimate legacy was the peace and prosperity the empire enjoyed for the next two centuries under the system he initiated. His memory was enshrined in the political ethos of the Imperial age as a paradigm of the good emperor, and although every emperor adopted his name, Caesar Augustus, only a handful, such as Trajan, earned genuine comparison with him. His reign laid the foundations of a regime that would last for 250 years.

Learning Teaching Activities

Activity No 1

Give briefly how and why Julius Caesar was murdered?

Instructions

- This can be done as a structural writing activity.

Activity No 2

How did Augustus Caesar retain the power and position where Julius Caesar had failed?

Instructions

- This can be done as an assignment.

Resources:·

- Baker, Simon, Ancient Rome: The Rise and Fall of An Empire, BBC Books, 2007.
- Everitt, Anthony, Augustus: The Life of Rome's First Emperor, Random House Trade Paperbacks, 2007.
- Freeman, Philip, Julius Caesar, Simon & Schuster, 2009.

VIOLENCE IN ROMAN POLITICS

Competency 9.0 : Gains an insight into the experiences of the Greeks and Romans in Antiquity

Competency Level 9.4 : Comprehends the role and importance of war in Greek and Roman History

Duration : 20 periods

Learning Outcomes :
- Gets a clear idea about the regal period and the conversion of the regal period to a Republic.
- Identifies the struggle between the two orders.
- Learns about the Punic wars and the great personality of Hannibal.

2.10.1 Violence in Politics from the Gracchi to Julius Caesar

Violence Enters Politics

133 BCE: Tiberius Sempronius Gracchus, a noble plebeian, was elected tribune. He proposed essential land and economic reforms which threatened the wealthy senatorial classes, so he passed these through the Assembly of Tribes. Gracchus was very popular with the masses, so he ran for a second consecutive term as tribune (though this was unconstitutional). A group of senators led an armed band against him in the Assembly and killed him and 300 of his followers.

123-21 BCE: Gaius Sempronius Gracchus (the younger brother of Tiberius) was elected tribune for two successive years; through the Assembly, he increased the power of the equestrian class at the expense of the senators. He also attempted sweeping economic reforms. Opposition between his followers and the Senate broke into riots and bloodshed, and he died in the violence.

The reform efforts of the Gracchi and the opposition these generated in the Senate constituted the foundation of the two political factions, the ***populares*** and the ***optimates.***

Rise of the Generals

107 BCE: Gaius Marius, a plebeian of the equestrian class and a *novus homo*, was elected consul and was designated by the Assembly of Tribes as general in the African war against the wishes of the Senate. He reorganized the army and successfully concluded several wars. Marius was elected to five consecutive consulships (though this was unconstitutional) and then to a sixth consulship in 100. He became leader of the *populares*. During this time there was considerable unrest and rioting in Rome.

88 BCE: Lucius Cornelius Sulla, a patrician leader of the *optimates*, was elected consul and designated by the Senate as general in the war in Asia Minor although the Assembly had given this command to Marius. Sulla marched his legions into Rome itself to enforce his appointment and to stop the reform legislation of the *populares*; this was the first time in history that a Roman army marched upon Rome. Sulla outlawed Marius and took up his command in Asia Minor.

86BCE: Marius returned to Rome and he outlawed Sulla who was elected to his seventh consulship. He led a five-day bloody campaign against the *optimates*. Marius, however, died within the year.

82-79 BCE: Sulla returned to Italy with his army and had himself proclaimed dictator. He conducted first "proscriptions," in which he posted lists of those condemned to be executed (the Senate had asked him to *publish* these names with the following plea: "We do not ask you to pardon those whom you have destined for destruction; we only want you to relieve the anxiety of those whom you have decided to spare"). A large number of Roman aristocrats associated with the *populares* (520, according to Sorbonne professor Francois Hinard) were proscribed and their property confiscated. Sulla strengthened the power of the Senate, weakened the power of the tribunes, and stopped the grain dole. He passed a law that no army was to be stationed in or near Rome—in effect, he banned standing armies in Italy—and no general was to lead his army out of the provinces without permission of the Senate. Sulla retired and died in 79.

77-72 BCE: Gnaeus Pompeius Magnus, Pompey the Great, who had been a general under Sulla and celebrated a triumph at the exceptionally young age of 24, took command of the Roman legions in Spain and put down a revolt led by the followers of Marius.

Revolt of Spartacus:

73 BCE: Spartacus escaped with 70-80 gladiators, seizing the knives in the cook's shop and a wagon full of weapons. They camped on Vesuvius and were joined by other rural slaves, overrunning the region with much plunder and pillage, although Spartacus apparently tried to restrain them. His chief aides were gladiators from Gaul, named Crixus and Oenomaus.

Spartacus subsequently defeated two forces of legionary cohorts; he wanted to lead his men across the Alps to escape from Italy, but the Gauls and Germans, led by Crixus, wanted to stay and plunder. They separated from Spartacus, who passed the winter near Thurii in southern Italy.

72 BCE: Spartacus had raised about 70,000 slaves, mostly from rural areas. The Senate, alarmed, finally sent the two consuls (L. Gellius Publicola and Cn. Cornelius Lentulus Clodianus), each with two legions, against the rebels. The Gauls and Germans, separated from Spartacus, were defeated by Publicola, and Crixus was killed. Spartacus defeated Lentulus, and then Publicola; to avenge Crixus, Spartacus had 300 prisoners from these battles fight in pairs to the death. (map)

At Picenum in central Italy Spartacus defeated the consular armies, then pushed north and defeated the proconsul of Cisalpine Gaul at Mutina. The Alps were now open to the rebels, but again the Gauls and Germans refused to go, so Spartacus returned to southern Italy, perhaps intending to ship to Sicily.

In the autumn, when the revolt was at its height and Spartacus had about 120,000 followers, the Senate voted to pass over the consuls and grant *imperium* to Marcus Licinius Crassus, who had been a praetor in 73 B.C. but currently held no office. Crassus was the wealthiest man in Rome, a noble from an old plebeian family; since he had received very little support from the conservative nobles who dominated the Senate, he had allied himself with the faction of the *populares*.

Crassus was given six new legions plus the four consular legions. When one of Crassus' legates attacked Spartacus with two legions, against orders, Spartacus roundly defeated them. Crassus decimated the most cowardly cohort, and then used his combined forces to defeat Spartacus, who retreated to Rhegium, in the toe of Italy. Spartacus tried to cross the straits into Sicily, but the Cilician pirates betrayed him.

Meanwhile, the Senate recalled Pompey and his legions from Spain, and they began the journey overland; Marcus Licinius Lucullus landed in Brundisium in the heel of Italy with his legions from Macedonia. When Spartacus finally fought his way out of the toe of Italy, he could not march to Brundisium and take ship to the east because of the presence of Lucullus. (map)

71 BCE: Spartacus started north; some of the Gauls and Germans separated from him and were nearly defeated by Crassus before Spartacus rescued them. The slaves gained one more minor victory against part of Crassus' forces, but they were finally wiped out by Crassus' legions in a major battle in southern Italy, near the headwaters of the Siler river. It is believed that Spartacus died in this battle; there were so many corpses that his body was never found. The historian Appian reports that 6000 slaves were taken prisoner by Crassus and crucified along the Appian Way from Capua to Rome.

As many as 5000 slaves escaped and fled northward, but they were captured by Pompey's army north of Rome as he was marching back from Spain; Pompey subsequently tried to claim the glory of victory from Crassus, although he had not actually participated in any of the battles. The Senate voted Pompey a triumph because of his victory in Spain, but they decreed an ovation (a far less splendid and prestigious parade) for Crassus because his victory had been merely over slaves. There were no political purges or proscriptions after the rebellion was crushed.

70 BCE: Pompey and Crassus were elected consuls, although Pompey was six years too young for the office and had never held any of the lower magistracies. As consuls, they repealed some of the unpopular laws of Sulla and restored the power of the tribunes.

2.10.2 Reasons for Violence in Roman Politics

In 509 B.C., Rome became a republic, a government in which power is controlled by the common people. It was under this Republic that Rome grew and expanded by conquest into the most powerful nation in the world at the time. As Roman territory increased, however, politicians and generals became more and more powerful and hungry for power. A series of events during the 1st and 2nd centuries B.C. led to the demise of the Roman Republic. Under the reigns of Julius Caesar and Augustus Caesar, the Roman Empire was formed. The Empire was ruled by an emperor, who had complete control over his people. Power was no longer in the hands of the people, but Rome continued to prosper and expand for several centuries.

Under the Republic, senators were elected by the people to run the government. The vote of wealthy landowners counted for more than others and many elections were fixed by bribes. However, the common people still maintained a significant power in government affairs.

When Rome's Republic was formed, Rome was a mere small city-state, easily managed. However, as time went on, politicians found it harder to maintain the growing country. Extremely wealthy landowners, known as patricians, began to have more and more political power. After the second

Punic War, marking the destruction of Rome's enemy Carthage, the Roman economy and trade grew at a fast pace. Rich landowners and merchants were able to buy up most of the country land. Under Roman law, only landowners could serve in the military, but with the rich owning the land, the number of available soldiers dwindled. This caused instability in the Roman military.

Tiberius Gracchus, an enthusiastic politician, was elected tribune, an important political office, in 133 B.C. He proposed several laws to reshape Rome into the honest, pure republic that it had once been. His propositions included giving an equal share of land to all citizens, limiting the amount of land one person could have, and allowing every free Roman citizen to vote (at the time, only residents of Rome could vote). Tiberius's ideas were very controversial, so he was murdered by a riot. His brother Gaius as tribune in 123 B.C., also attempted to pass these laws, but he too, was murdered.

More problems arose with the reforms of General Marius. In 104 B.C., he established a new law, which stated that people did not have to own land to be a soldier. This worked to strengthen the military. However, in return for their service, soldiers wanted to be granted land. Only under the general's influence over the senate could soldiers be granted that land. The result was that soldiers tended to trust the general more and be more loyal to him than to the senate. The generals started to gain significant political power in Rome.

In 88 B.C., Sulla was elected consul. He gained much power within the senate, and was the first one to challenge Marius' position, for until then Marius had been the most powerful man in Rome. A civil war erupted. Marius marched his army on Rome forcing Sulla to flee. Marius soon died, but his supporters continued the fight. Sulla came back with an army of his own and marched on Rome, declaring himself dictator in 82 B.C. He died in 78 B.C, but his reign encouraged others to grab absolute power over Rome.

After Sulla's dictatorship was over, Rome temporarily went back to being controlled by the senate. Meanwhile, Pompey, the most distinguished general of the time, was gaining public favor from his many military victories. At the same time, Crassus, the wealthiest man in Rome, also gained much popularity from the common people, for defeating a large slave uprising. Each held the ambition of someday ruling Rome. Another prominent general who was gaining popularity was Julius Caesar. Pompey, Crassus, and Caesar made a secret alliance to work together to gain control over the senate. This alliance became known as the First Triumvirate.

Caesar was elected consul in 60 B.C. He proposed laws that would gain the triumvirate even more power. When these laws were opposed, Crassus and Caesar resorted to violence and intimidation in order to get them passed. After a short time, the First Triumvirate began to crumble. Crassus was killed in battle in 53 B.C. Caesar, after his term as consul ended, was given a governorship of the area of southern France. Unheeding the word of the senate, Caesar raised his own army and led a path of conquest throughout all of Gaul.

After 8 years Julius Caesar returned. The senate was afraid that he might march on Rome with his loyal army. The senate's fears proved correct. Pompey could not organize a counter offensive in time to save Rome, so he was forced to flee. Caesar marched into the city and appointed himself dictator. While the senate still existed, it was practically powerless against Caesar's commands.

Desperate politicians Brutus and Cassius plotted against Julius and eventually killed him, stabbing him in the back on March 15, 44 B.C. The conspirators believed that the senate would regain control of Rome. However, strong generals Mark Antony and Marcus Lepidus unofficially established their power by intimidation through their armies. In the ensuing years the Second Triumvirate was formed. This consisted of Mark Antony, Lepidus, and Julius Caesar's nephew Octavian, who had demanded a position in the senate after Julius' death. The three men swept the senate with terror, killing Cicero, who was the greatest supporter of the republic.

Brutus and Cassius retaliated by raising an army against the triumvirs. However, Antony met their army and, after fierce fighting, defeated it. Brutus and Cassius killed themselves after viewing their defeat.

Now, Antony and Octavian received no more opposition from the senate and were supreme rulers. They were powerful enough that they didn't need Lepidus anymore, so they betrayed him by knocking him out of their alliance. Antony took control over Eastern Rome, while Octavian controlled Western Rome After a few years, in 36 B.C. Octavian, needing an excuse to wage war on Antony, accused him of being disloyal to Rome by becoming involved with Cleopatra of Egypt. Octavian attacked Eastern Rome and defeated Antony. Octavian, who had changed his name to Augustus, was finally supreme ruler over Rome.

The republic had died. While the senate still existed, it had little say in government matters and could certainly not challenge the word of the emperor. Ten Caesars came after Augustus to rule over Rome. Despite the crippling of the Republic, Rome continued to prosper and expand for several centuries until its eventual decline.

2.10.3 Insurgency of Spartacus and its Suppression

Spartacus

Spartacus (c. 109–71 BC) was the most notable leader of the slaves in the Third Servile War, a major slave uprising against the Roman Republic. Little is known about Spartacus beyond the events of the war, and surviving historical accounts are sometimes contradictory and may not always be reliable. Spartacus' struggle is often seen as oppressed people fighting for their freedom against a slave-owning aristocracy.

According to the differing sources and their interpretation, Spartacus either was an auxiliary from the Roman legions later condemned to slavery, or a captive taken by the legions. Spartacus was trained at the gladiatorial school (*ludus*) near Capua, belonging to Lentulus Batiatus.

In 73 BC, Spartacus was among a group of gladiators plotting an escape. The plot was betrayed but about 70 men seized kitchen implements, fought their way free from the school, and seized several wagons of gladiatorial weapons and armor. The escaped slaves defeated a small force sent after them, plundered the region surrounding Capua, recruited many other slaves into their ranks, and eventually retired to a more defensible position on Mount Vesuvius.

Once free, the escaped gladiators chose Spartacus and two Gallic slaves — Crixus and Oenomaus — as their leaders. Though Roman authors assume that the slaves were a homogeneous group with Spartacus as their leader, this may be the Romans projecting their own hierarchical view of military leadership on the spontaneous organization of the slaves, reducing other slave leaders to subordinate positions in their accounts. The positions of Crixus and Oenomaus — and later, Castus — cannot be clearly determined from the sources

Third Servile War

The Third Servile War (73-71 BC), also called the Gladiator War and The War of Spartacus by Plutarch, was the last of a series of unrelated and unsuccessful slave rebellions against the Roman Republic, known collectively as the Roman Servile Wars. The Third Servile War was the only one to directly threaten the Roman heartland of Italy and was doubly alarming to the Roman people due to the repeated successes of the rapidly growing band of rebel slaves against the Roman army between 73 and 71 BC.

The able-bodied adults of this band were a surprisingly effective armed force that repeatedly showed they could withstand the Roman military, from the local Campanian patrols, to the Roman militia, and to trained Roman legions under consular command. Plutarch described the actions of the slaves as an attempt by Roman slaves to escape their masters and flee through Cisalpine Gaul, while Appian and Florus depicted the revolt as a civil war in which the slaves waged a campaign to capture the city of Rome itself.

The Roman Senate's growing alarm about the continued military successes of this band, and about their depredations against Roman towns and the countryside, eventually led to Rome's fielding of an army of eight legions under the harsh but effective leadership of Marcus Licinius Crassus. The war ended in 71 BC when the armies of Spartacus, after long and bitter fighting, retreating before the legions of Crassus, and realizing that the legions of Gnaeus Pompeius Magnus and Marcus Terentius Varro Lucullus were moving in to entrap them, launched their full strength against Crassus' legions and were utterly destroyed.

The rebellion was finally crushed through the concentrated military effort of a single commander, Marcus Licinius Crassus, although the rebellion continued to have indirect effects on Roman politics for years to come.The Third Servile War was significant to the broader history of ancient Rome mostly in its effect on the careers of Pompey and Crassus. The two generals used their success in putting down the rebellion to further their political careers, using their public acclaim and the implied threat of their legions to sway the consular elections of 70 BC in their favor. Their actions as Consuls greatly furthered the subversion of Roman political institutions and contributed to the eventual transition of the Roman Republic into the Roman Empire.

2.10.4 The Conspiracy of Catiline and its Suppression

Catiline

Lucius Sergius Catilina (108 BC–62 BC), known as Catiline, was a Roman politician of the 1st century BC who is best known for the Catiline (or Catilinarian) conspiracy, an attempt to overthrow the Roman Republic, and in particular the power of the aristocratic Senate.

Cospiracy

During 64 BC Catiline was officially accepted as a candidate in the consular election for 63 BC. He ran alongside Gaius Antonius Hybrida whom some suspect may have been a fellow conspirator. Nevertheless, Catiline was defeated by Cicero and Antonius Hybrida in the consular election, largely because the Roman aristocracy feared Catiline and his economic plan. The Optimates were particularly repulsed because he promoted the plight of the urban plebs along with his economic policy of *tabulae novae*, the universal cancellation of debts.

He was brought to trial later that same year, but this time it was for his role in the Sullan proscriptions. At the insistence of Cato the Younger, then quaestor, all men who had profited during the proscriptions were brought to trial. For his involvement, Catiline was accused of killing his former brother-in-law Marcus Marius Gratidianus,[19] carrying this man's severed head through the streets of Rome and then having Sulla add him to the proscription to make it legal. Other allegations claimed that he murdered several other notable men.[20] Despite this, Catiline was acquitted again, though some surmise that it was through the influence of Caesar who presided over the court.

Catiline chose to stand for the consulship again in the following year. However, by the time of the consular election for 62 BC, Catiline had lost much of the political support he had enjoyed during the previous year's election. He was defeated by two other candidates, Decimus Junius Silanus and Lucius Licinius Murena, ultimately crushing his political ambitions. The only remaining chance of attaining the consulship would be through an illegitimate means, conspiracy or revolution.

But at power or wealth, for the sake of which wars, and all kinds of strife, arise among mankind, we do not aim; we desire only our liberty, which no honorable man relinquishes but with life.

From Manlius' message to an approaching army as recorded in Sallust's *Bellum Catilinae* (XXXIII)

Catiline began to attach many other men of senatorial and equestrian rank to his conspiracy, and like him many of the other leading conspirators had faced similar political problems in the Senate. Publius Cornelius Lentulus Sura, the most influential conspirator after Catiline, had held the rank of consul in 71 BC, but he had been cast out of the senate by the censors during a political purge in the following year on the pretext of debauchery. Autronius was also complicit in their plot, since he was banned from holding office in the Roman government. Another leading conspirator, Lucius Cassius Longinus who was praetor in 66 BC with Cicero, joined the conspiracy after he failed to obtain the consulship in 64 BC along with Catiline. By the time that the election came around, he was no longer even regarded as a viable candidate. Gaius Cethegus, a relatively young man at the time of the conspiracy, was noted for his violent nature. His impatience for rapid political advancement may account for his involvement in the conspiracy. The ranks of the conspirators included a variety of other patricians and plebeians who had been cast out of the political system for various reasons. Many of them sought the restoration of their status as senators and their lost political power.

Promoting his policy of debt relief, Catiline initially also rallied many of the poor to his banner along with a large portion of Sulla's veterans. Debt had never been greater than in 63 BC since the previous decades of war had led to an era of economic downturn across the Italian countryside. Numerous plebeian farmers lost their farms and were forced to move to the city, where they swelled the numbers of the urban poor. Sulla's veterans had spent and squandered the wealth they acquired from their years of service. Desiring to regain their fortunes, they were prepared to march to war under the banner of the "next" Sulla. Thus, many of the plebs eagerly flocked to Catiline and supported him in the hope of the absolution of their debts.

After Catiline's death, many of the poor still regarded him with respect and did not view him as the traitor and villain that Cicero claimed he was.[39] However, the patrician element of Rome certainly viewed him in a much darker light. Sallust wrote an account of the conspiracy that

epitomized Catiline as representative of all of the evils festering in the declining Roman republic. In his account, Sallust attributes countless crimes and atrocities to Catiline, but even he refuses to heap some of the most outrageous claims on him, particularly a ritual that involved the drinking of blood of a sacrificed child. Later historians such as Florus and Dio Cassius, far removed from the original events, recorded the claims of Sallust and the aforementioned rumors as facts. Up until the modern era Catiline was equated to everything depraved and contrary to both the laws of the gods and men as Sallust so eloquently described.

He had many things about him which served to allure men to the gratification of their passions; he had also many things which acted as incentives to industry and toil. The vices of lust raged in him; but at the same time he was conspicuous for great energy and military skill. While the Romans despised Catiline for everything he did, they still viewed his character with a degree of respect. Well after Catiline's death and the end of the threat of the conspiracy, even Cicero reluctantly admitted that Catiline was an enigmatic man who possessed both the greatest of virtues and the most terrible of vices. Catiline spoke with an eloquence that demanded loyalty from his followers and strengthened the resolve of his friends. Without doubt Catiline possessed a degree of courage that few have, and he died a particularly honorable death in Roman society. Unlike most Roman generals of the late republic, Catiline offered himself to his followers both as a general and as soldier on the front lines.

Learning Teaching Activities

Activity No 1

Summarise and make a list of key acts of violence and persons involved during the Republic leading up to imperiel Rome.

Instructions

- This can be done as a structural writing activity.

Resources:

Sherwin-White, A.E., 'Violence in Roman Politics', *The Journal of Roman Studies*, Vol. 46, Issue Parts I and II, 1956, 1-9.

ROME AND PROVINCIAL ADMINISTRATION

Competency 10.0 : Analyzes the value of looking at Greek and Roman history to understand the modern social developments and changes

Competency Level10.1 : Evaluates the background that led to social changes in Greece and Rome

Duration : 30 periods

Learning Outcomes :
- Acquires knowledge about Roman magistrates, their duties and powers
- Examines the various types of Roman pronices, and their administration.

General Introduction

While the Romans were expanding their territory and building up their confederation in Italy, the Roman state itself experienced a profound internal evolution. This was brought about in part by the necessity of modifying the governmental organization to meet the needs of a rapidly growing community and in part by a successful struggle on the part of the plebians to secure for themselves the political and other privileges which were monopolized at first by the Patricians.

2.11.1 The Magistracies

Upon the overthrow of the monarchy, the Romans set up a republican form of government, where the chief executive office was filled by popular election. The conception of magistracy, embodied in the word *imperium*, is the key to almost all the problems of Roman political theory. *Imperium* in the Roman republic means an authority vested by the community in one or more of its members. It implies two sets of its relations, first between its holder, the magistrate, and the whole body of citizens; and second, between its holder, the magistrate, and the individual citizen. In the first case the magistrate is empowered to ascertain the will of the people, for instance making of new laws or the election of new magistrates, and to represent them in their dealings with the gods and with other communities. In the second he is empowered to lay his commands in the name of the state and to enforce them by punishment- fine, flogging imprisonment or death. This includes both the power of judge to sentence, and that of the general to command the soldier. In exercising these powers, the magistrate is required by custom to seek the advice of the council, a body of men qualified by position and experience to advice. Further in historical times, certain limits have been imposed upon his authority.

1. He is appointed for a fixed period, usually for one year, at the end of which he resumes the rank of an ordinary citizen.
2. Every magistracy apart from one exceptional case is held by more than one man at a time. These are of equal authority, and each of them may by simple veto debar his colleague or colleagues from any action which he disapproves.
3. Any citizen against whom a magistrate has pronounced a capital sentence may appeal to the assembly to reverse it, except when the magistrate is acting as general in the field, in which case his authority is absolute.

The exception referred to is the office of dictator, which in brief was a temporary revision to monarchy in times of such danger as demanded an undivided and absolute authority. The dictator's judgment was above appeal, but he held office for a fixed term, usually of sixth months. As the community's affairs became more complex, the number of magistrates was increased, and their functions were differentiated. And again when Rome began to make conquests of territories beyond Italy, further changes were made in the magisterial system.

Their Duties and Powers

The Consulship

At the head of the state were two annually elected magistrates or presidents, called at first praetors but later consuls. Together they exercised the old kingly power known as the *imperium*, symbolized by the rods and the axes carried by the lictors. The *imperium* also involved the *auspicium that* is the right to take omens by which the gods were believed to declare their approval or disapproval of public acts. Both consuls enjoyed these powers in equal measure and by his veto one could suspend the other's action.

The Praetorship

The praetors were elected annually by the *centuriate* assembly and took charge of civil jurisdiction, relieving the consuls' of this responsibility. The praetors were regarded as a junior colleague of the consuls and exercised *the imperium*. Consequently if need arose, he could take command of an army, convene the senate or an assembly and exercise the other consular functions. They had their power over provinces as well. However *praetor urbanus* supervised cases involving citizens. The praetor peregrines looked after those involving non citizens. At first there was a single praetor. The second was added in the middle of the third century. With the rising number of the provinces the number of the praetors increased. By the end of the republic there were sixteen. To meet the growing demand for magistrates the commands of consuls and praetors were often continued.

The Censorship

An important step in the expansion of the magistracy was the creation of the censorship. This magistracy was established during the fifth century. The two censors served about a year and a half, and they were the only officials whose terms were for more than one year. They were elected usually every five years. They took the census assigning each citizen to his century.(important military, politically, and for tax purposes). The censors appointed and removed members of the cavalry and of the senate. Later censors like Cato used this power to influence morality, hence the developed meaning of censorship. By the middle Republic also the censor let important contracts for public works such as roads and temples. For example Appius Claudius, censor in 312 B.C. built the first stage of the famous Appian Way and also Rome's first aqueduct, the Aqua Appia. The censors appointed the *princeps senatus*, or first senator. In practice only consulars were chosen censor.

The Quaestorship

In the early republic the consuls had appointed two officers called quaestors to act as their deputies in administering criminal justice. Not long after the middle of the fifth century the quaestors were raised to the status of magistrates and elected by vote of the people. In 421 B.C. their number was increased to four, of whom two served as public treasurers (quaestores aerarii or urbani). The other pair was assigned to as assistants to the consuls; they accompanied the latter to war and performed the duties of quartermasters in charge of supplies and payment of troops.

The Aedileship

Evidence for the growth of the city Rome and the increasing burden of municipal administration which this entailed is found in the establishment of the magistracy called the aedileship, probably at about the same time as the elevation of quaestorship to magistracy. The aediles as the holders of the new office were called, acted as superintends of public works, as market commissioners, and as police magistrates. They had the duty of supervising public games and festivals. By the late republic they were expected to lavish personal funds on grand festivals. Caesar borrowed heavily to gain great popularity. At first they were two in number and were selected from among the plebians. In 366, however, coincident with the restoration of the consulship, their number was increased to four by the addition of two curule aediles, so called because they had the right to use the seat known as the curule chair, which had been a prerogative of the higher magistrates. For some time curule aedileship was open only to the patricians, but its duties were the same as those of the Plebian aediles.

The Promagistracy

The Roman magistrates were elected for one year only and after 342 B.C. re-election to the same office could only be sought after an interval of ten years. This system entailed some inconveniences, especially in the conduct of military operations, for in the case of the campaigns that lasted longer than one year the consul in command had to give place to his successor as soon as his own term of office had expired. Thus the state was unable to utilize for a longer period the services of men who had displayed special military capacity. The difficulty was eventually overcome by the prolongation, at the discretion of the senate, of the command of a consul in the field for an indefinite period of time after the lapse of his consulship. The person whose term of office was thus extended was no longer a consul but acted in the place of a consul. (proconsul). This was the origin of the promagistracy. It first appeared in the campaign at Naples in 327 B.C., its use eventually became very widespread and extended to other offices than that of consul.

Characteristics of the magistracy

By the close of the fourth century the roman magistracy had attained the form that it preserved until the end of the republic. It consisted of number of committees which had an independent sphere of action. But among these committees there was a regularly established order of rank running from lowest to highest, as follows: quaestors, aediles, censors, praeotors, and consuls. With the exception of the cencorship, which was regularly filled by ex-consuls, men who followed a public career usually advanced from one magistracy to another in this order. A distinctive feature of the committee system was the right of any magistrate to veto action of his colleague. This applied to the consulship as well as to the lower magistracies. To avoid a frequent use of this right, the consuls alternated each month in taking charge of the administration when both were in the city, and when both were with the army they held the chief command on the alternate days.

Magistrates of the higher rank enjoyed greater authority than all those who ranked below them and as a rule could annul or forbid the actions of the latter. In this way the consuls or the dictator were able to exercise at least a control over the negative activities of the all other magistrates. Only the dictator, consuls, and praetor had *imperium*. Consequently they were the only ones who could exercise military command, summon people to elective or legislative purposes on their authority, and try civil and criminal cases. All magistrates however had the power to enforce obedience to their orders by arresting persons who refused to obey them. The high degree of power and the relative freedom of action enjoyed by the magistrates, and the respect that they implied for public authority are of special characteristics of early roman society.

2.11.2 Administration of the provinces under the Republic

The Roman word province means an administrative department or set of duties assigned to a magistrate, in which he acts in virtue of his magisterial powers. It comes to be applied in particular, to the administration of a district of subject territory, a group of subject communities outside Italy. The conquests of such territories and communities in the period following the first Punic war, led to the creation of number of these provincial commands, to each of which a Roman governor was appointed. Sicily, Sardinia with Corsica in 227 B.C.; the two provinces of hither and further Spain, in 197;Macedonia in 148; Africa in 146; and Asia in 133. To these, during revolution period, were added transalpine or Narbonese Gaul, about 121; Cilicia in 103; Bithynia and Cyrene in 74; Crete in 67; Syria in 62; Cyprus in 58; and in 82 the Cisalpine Gaul was separated from the control of the consuls, and erected into a regular provincial command. Thus when Caesar was made governor of the two Gauls in 58, there were fifteen provinces included in the list: their respective boundaries were changed from time to time, and sometimes more than one, as in the instance named, might be placed under a single command.

The possession of these territories presented the Roman state with a new set of problems in the government. Machinery has to be constructed through which its authority could be brought to administer them, and the method chosen was to adapt the Roman magisterial system for the purpose. At first a number of magistrates were created, called praetors: like the praetors already existing they had the *imperium*, which empowered them to command an army. But the praetors at Rome were dealing with Roman citizens according to Roman law, the praetors in the provinces were dealing with subjects who had no right to the Roman law, and, in particular, were not entitled to the privilege of appeal or to the protection of a tribune.

Although each province had its own peculiar features and in general all were organized and administered in the following way. The provincial charter had its own peculiar features and in general all were organized and administered in the following way. A provincial charter (*lex provinciae*) drawn up on the ground by a commission of ten senators and ratified by the senate fixed the rights and obligations of the provincials. Each province was an aggregate of communities (*civitates*) enjoying city or tribal organization which had no political bond of unity except in the representative of the Roman authority. There were three classes of these communities: the free and federate, the free and non tributary, and the tributary. The first were few in number and although within the boarders of a province did not really belong to it, as they were free allies of Rome whose status was assured by a permanent treaty with the Roman state. The second class likewise is not very numerous, enjoyed exemption from taxation and quartering of troops. The third group was by far the most numerous and furnished the taxes laid upon the province. As a rule each of the communities enjoyed its former constitution and laws and customs, subject to the supervision of the Roman authorities.

Over this aggregate of communities stood the Roman governor and his staff. We have already seen how the governor was appointed and was his rank among the roman magistrates. His term of office was annual but might be extended for several years by prorogation or simple failure to appoint a successor. His duties were of a threefold nature: military, administrative, and judicial. He was in command of the Roman troops stationed in the province for the maintenance of the order and the protection of the frontiers; he supervised the relations between the communities of his province and their internal administration, as well as the collection of the tribute; he presided over the trial of the more serious cases arising among provincials, over all cases between the provincials and Romans or between Roman citizens. As a Roman magistrate administering Roman law, he was not bound to conform to the rules of the native law out of which arose the cases which he had to decide. Thus upon entering his province each governor made for himself a set of legal rules, which he published as an edict when he came into office. The edict would be based largely on the act of the Roman assembly which created the province, and also on the edicts of his predecessors in the governorship. But it was not a code: its rules held only during its author's term of office. The province was divided into judicial circuits (*conventus*) and cases arising in each of these were tried in designated places at fixed times.

The governor was accompanied by a quaestor that acted as his treasurer and received the provincial revenue from the tax collectors. His staff also comprised of three legati or lieutenants, senators appointed by the senate, but usually nominated by him, whose function it was to assist him with their council and act as his deputies when necessary. He also took with him number of companions(*comites*), usually young men from the families of his friends, who were given this opportunity of gaining a knowledge of provincial administration and who could be used in any official capacity. In addition the governor brought his own retinue, comprising clerks and household servants. Although he received no salary, the governor was allowed a very handsome sum for the expenses of himself and his staff.

The Provincial Taxation

The taxes levied upon the provinces were at first designed to pay the expenses of occupation and defence. Hence they bore the name *stipendium*, or soldier's pay. The term *tributum* (tribute) used of the property tax imposed on Roman citizens, did not come into general use for the provincial revenues until later epoch. As a rule the Romans accepted the tax system already in vogue in each district before their occupancy and exacted either a fixed annual sum from the province as in Spain, Africa, and Macedonia, or one tenth (*decuma*) of the annual produce of the soil as in Sicily and Asia. The tribute imposed by the Romans was not higher but usually lower than that exacted by the previous rulers. The public or royal lands, mines, and forests of the conquered state were incorporated in the Roman public domain, and the right to occupy or exploit them was leased to individuals or companies of contractors. The raising of revenue was thus done by the method of tax farming. Every five years the censors at Rome sold the right of collecting the provincial tributes, tithes, and customs to private speculators, individuals or syndicates who paid a lump sum to the government and then proceeded to recover their money by exacting it from the provinces, where they were entitled to help from the governor's troops. These contractors were called *bublicani* and their class naturally became very influential in Roman politics. By this means the state saved expense and delay in getting in its revenues, and avoided the necessity of creating a regular financial service for the provinces. But the element of private profit thus introduced into provincial administration, had very evil effects.

Oppression in the Provinces

It was inevitable that the system of collecting taxes through the *publicani* should become a source of oppression for the provincials. In fact it proved to be the greatest evil in roman imperial administration. Interested solely in making a profit from their speculation and having no share in the government of the empire which might give them some feeling of responsibility for the wellbeing the subject people, they extorted upon various pretexts or even by threats of violence far more than the legitimate amount of taxation. It was the duty of the governor to check their rapacity, but from want of sympathy with the oppressed and unwillingness to offend the influential business men of Rome this duty was rarely performed. Again, the publicani, who were doing what was really government work, could exercise a great influence on the policy of the governor: if he attempted to restrict their extortions, they would use their influence against him at Rome. And even with the best of will, upright governors found it all but impossible to keep the tax gatherers under control. Government circles in Rome were perfectly aware of the situation but were slow and ineffective in applying remedies. As the historian Livy expressed it "whenever there are *publicani*, public laws are disregarded and the allies have lost their freedom."

Another cause of oppression was to found in the activities of the Roman bankers and moneylenders (*negotiatores*) who swarmed all over the provinces and even in adjacent districts where they might still have some protection from Roman authority. They made loans at high rates of interest to provincial communities and individuals, and called in the help of roman troops to enforce payment. Consequently, when the *negotiatores* called upon to help them collect outstanding debts, the latter frequently complied out of regard for their own political future. Governors Also, a great deal of land in the provinces, especially in Africa and Sicily, was taken up by roman capitalists and exploited by means of slave-labour. This practice tended to diminish and degrade the free populations of the provinces.

A further source of misgovernment lay in the greed of the governor and his staff. The temptations of unrestricted power proved too great for the morality of the average Roman. The shortness of his term of office prevented a good governor from thoroughly understanding the conditions of his province. For an avaricious magistrate often heavily indebted from the expenses of his election campaigns bribes, presents, illegal exactions, and open confiscations, were the chief means of amassing wealth. In this the almost sovereign position of the governor, with his military command and absolute power of life and death over all persons in the province and his freedom from immediate senatorial control, guaranteed him a free hand. During the wars of conquest great numbers of prisoners were taken, and these, according to the usual practice of ancient warfare, were sold as part of the booty. Italy was filled with slaves, and the supply was maintained and increased by the growth of a regular slave trade, fed by kidnapping especially in the countries of Asia Minor. Thus methods of capitalistic production, in which slaves played the part of machinery, were rapidly developed. Free labour was driven out of employment into destitution, and at the same time enormous fortunes began to appear in Roman society.

The great masses of booty, and especially of the precious metals, which poured into Italy during the wars, raised the standard of the living for these imports by any corresponding increase of output- there was no large development of manufactures. Thus Italy, and especially Rome, came to live upon the provinces: the conquering state became the parasite of its corn, much of it in the form of tribute, made it increasingly difficult for the small cultivators of Italy to live, and their lands were bought up by wealthy speculators to be thrown into pasture, or, in the regions near Rome, into pleasure grounds.

Moral and Social Effects

The material expansion of the Roman power made the Romans feel themselves superior to other people, and retained for their own exclusive use the benefits of their victories. The people of the provinces outside Italy were treated as sources as revenue and material for the aggrandizement of Rome and within Italy, the allies who had so largely assisted Rome in her victories found their position lowered, their privileges becoming less valuable. In the early days of the Republic, it had been the Roman policy that the conquered Italians, now allies of Rome, should not be excluded from the roman citizenship. They had before them the hope that they might by loyal service attain that citizenship. Thus the member of an allied state whether Latin or other, had a double loyalty, first to his own city then to Rome, of which he might one day become a citizen. But in the later periods after the Punic wars and conquests the Roman citizenship became more valuable. For instance after the fall of Macedon in 168 B.C. direct taxes ceased to be paid by the Romans, because of the new revenues from the provincial tributes and thus its holders, the voters in the assemblies refused to share it with their Italian allies, though the latter had to serve with the armies which made the conquests.

2.11.3 Provincial Administration under Augustus

In January of 27 B.C. when Augustus or Octavian as he then was consented to administer a large area of empire, he was granted a special ten year commission. The sphere of his authority was large and formidable. In his reforms pertaining to the provincial administration, the provinces were divided between the Principate and the Senate. The provinces henceforth fell into two groups: the imperial provinces which were administered by the emperor himself and the senatorial provinces for whose government the senate was responsible. Emperor took for himself the more powerful provinces which could neither be conveniently nor safely be administered by magistrates holding office only for a single year. In other words he chose those which required the presence of troops to keep them in subjection, and great frontier provinces which came in contact with barbarianism; those which lay outside the path of the storm he handed over to the senate. Africa which still retained a legion, Baetica, Asia, Sicily, Dalmatia, Macedonia, Achaia, Crete and Cyrene, Bithynia, and Pontus, Sardinia and Corsica, were placed under the senate. Of these Dalmatia was transferred to the emperor in 11 B.C., on the outbreak of the Pannonian wars, and Sardinia and Corsica in A.D. 6, probably to enable the emperor to exercise better control over the grain supplies. But the senate had been more than compensated for the loss of these by the acquisition of Gallia Narbonesis, and Cyprus in 22 B.C. The remaining provinces were directly administered by the emperor. Lusitania and Terraconensis in Spain, Aquitania, Lugdunensis and Belgica in Gaul, the two Germanic provinces on the Rhine, formed towards the close of his reign. Cilicia, the great eastern frontier province of Syria and Egypt were entirely removed from the sphere of the senate's influence. Under the Principate some of the features of this republican system were retained, but many new ones were introduced. No doubt the official justification for this allocation of the empire's armed forces was the senate's repeated failure to control ambitious men who possessed the *imperium* and an army. Augustus was well aware that the threat to the constitution came from ambitious governors who could use the military forces of their provinces to impose their regulations on the provincials.

The Senatorial Provinces

The governors of the senatorial provinces continued to be chosen by lot from among the ex-consuls and ex-praetors of five years standing. Owing to their wealth and importance, Asia and Africa seem to have been reserved for men of consular rank, but Augustus ordained that all senatorial governors should rank as pro-consuls, even though they had never held the consulship. The governor's freedom of action was curtailed in number of ways. Except in the case of Africa, no senatorial governor commanded an army. His freedom of action was curtailed in number of indirect ways. He was no longer at liberty to plunder the provincials at discretion. His receipt of a fixed and adequate salary left him no excuse for levying exactions upon the natives, and there is good reason to believe that the senatorial commissioners or legati, sent to accompany him and keep watch over his doings, were much more carefully selected than they had been in Republican days. Even his quaestor , his finance officer, whose chief duty was to look after the payment of the tribute and to see that neither the provincials nor the governor robbed the state, was now entrusted to undertake definite judicial functions, which limited the old absolute irresponsibility of the provincial governor.

The Imperial Provinces

In the imperial provinces, on the other hand, the governors were merely the representatives of the Princeps. One and all bore the title of pro-praetor, even though they had passed the curule chair. Answerable for their conduct to the emperor alone, they remained in their commands at his sole discretion. Thus while the system of annual governorship still prevailed in the senatorial provinces it became a common thing for the ruler of an imperial province to stay for a long term of years in his command. This resulted strongly in efficient administration. These imperial governors were attended by procurators who performed the duties of quaestor and eventually became persons of hardly less importance. Sometimes, indeed, the procurator was actually the governor of the district in which he was placed. This was the case in Judaea, when that country was attached to Syria, and in Rhaetia, Noricum, Epirus, and Thrace. Occasionally, indeed, the procurators were under the general supervision of the pro-praetor of the adjoining province, but for most practical purposes they held independent command.

Beyond the sweeping reform involved by this division of the provinces into separate and distinct classes, Augustus did not introduce any violent changes into provincial administration itself. He took over the republican system and saw that it was worked in an efficient manner, his aim being rather to destroy its abuses than to recast its general character.

Improvement in Provincial Administration

The provinces welcomed the change from Republic to Principate; and it is a fact that provincial administration markedly improved under Augustus. Various factors contributed to this improvement in the provinces. In the first place there was now a consistent and well thought-out frontier policy. In the republican period the method of supervising the provinces once they were acquired was haphazard. Augustus introduced order and regularity into all matters pertaining to the provinces. Secondly the standard of governors undoubtedly improved. The republican governors had not received a salary but an allowance. Therefore the republican governors were notoriously venal and their chief, although not their only, method of amassing fortunes was by plundering their provinces. The Principate altered this and the corruption was minimized.

Thirdly not only the governors, but also their staffs and assistants improved. Under the Principate a regular civil service gradually came into being, and as a result a provincial governor now had at his disposal a staff of experienced officials; no longer was he almost exclusively dependent on the advice of the *publicani* in his province. This dependence had been particularly vicious feature of the provincial system, for the *publicani*, not being state officials but only the representatives of private co operations, considered primarily their own private and selfish interests. Under Augustus the imperial provinces were better served with officials than the senatorial, although the by no means was neglected; for the questors,who were concerned with their finances were not amateurs but serious career men. In all his own provinces the Princeps had his procurators, salaried men appointed for indefinite periods. They were almost imperial spies and usually on bad terms with governors. A governor had only a very limited power over the procurator in his province. For fro very early times in the Principate the procurator had supreme and independent authority in the financial affairs of the province. Imperial procurators were also frequently stationed in senatorial provinces, the Princeps no doubt relying on his *imperium maius* to dispatch them.

Fortunately and most important, the governors were now much more carefully supervised and could be much more quickly and certainly brought to book if they misbehaved. Most of the surviving accounts of extortion trials concern governors of the senatorial provinces, the reason being that in the case of the imperial provinces the Princeps himself would immediately recall and punished the governor. The senatorial provinces apparently were less closely supervised; but their governors, too, were obliged periodically to send back formal reports, and in any event were encouraged to administer wisely by the hope that a successful term in the senatorial provinces would lead to one of the great posts in the imperial provinces.

The control of the governors was tightened at both ends, both in Rome and in the province itself. In Rome the authorities were constantly getting reports on conditions in the provinces. Augustus regularized the courier service along the great highways. He had spent public money freely upon the construction of great military roads which led to the frontiers. Relays of post horses were kept at fixed stages along the roads to enable the couriers to travel easily and swiftly. This system was no longer, as in republican times at the exclusive disposal of senators. Nevertheless, complains that it was unfair was frequent. The burden of the upkeep of essentially national service fell exclusively upon the local communities through which the couriers travelled, while imperial servants and even favoured individuals were granted "free travel tickets". It is supposed that the construction of roads was primarily intended for the rapid movement of the legions and the imperial governors used these and other communications to consult the Princeps on all aspects of their charge.

Besides the check at Rome there was also a control in the province itself. Augustus discouraged all organizations that might acquire a political character; but beginning with the three imperial provinces of Gaul in 12 B.C., he granted the various provinces their own councils. The *concilium Provinciae* consisted of representatives from the various units composing the province. It lacked the power to legislate, although it did have the right to protest against legislation deleterious to the interests of its province. Its primary duty was to foster the loyalty of the province to the roman government, and to that end it was largely concerned with Caesar-worship.

There is no reason to believe that the burden of taxation was unduly heavy. The chief direct taxes were the *tributum soli* and the *tributum capitis*, the former a land-tax, paid either in money or in grain and the latter a personal tax on property or income. The principal indirect tax was the customs, which varied in amount in different provinces. In addition to these there were other imposts, such as the four per cent. Tax on all inheritances, the five percent on the enfranchisement of every slave, and the one per cent on all commodities sold by auction or in open market, and the two percent, on the sale of slaves. The revenue derived from the state domains in Italy, had dwindled almost to the vanishing point, and the fact that Augustus practically introduced no new taxes to meet the enormously increased public expenditure is a striking proof at once of the prosperity during his rule and it reflects the greater honesty of the public officials. In the reign of Augustus trade had revived with a bound.

Highly centralized though the provincial system was, a generous measure of local government was left to the provincials. Throughout the east there were many free cities which were autonomous. These paid no taxes of any sort to the empire; they managed their finances and enjoyed their own laws. The emperor was not suspicious of local self government and did not consider it incompatible with a highly centralized regime. Augustus while generally confirming them in their privileges did not hesitate to punish them by deprivation for turbulence or maladministration. For example, during his visit to Asia Minor in 22 B.C., he conferred freedom upon Samos but took it away from Cyzicus, Tyre, and Sidon on account of their maladministration. But he lightened the burdens of the provinces which were heavily in debt, rebuilt others which had been shattered by earthquakes, and bestowed Latin rights, and in some instances, the full roman citizenship upon those which had rendered valuable service to the Romans. Under the Republic there were also individual provincials on whom citizenship was conferred, but not whole provincial communities. The republican government apparently found it hard to reconcile itself to the idea of a whole community of roman citizens residing outside Italy. Julius Caesar was the first to depart from this narrow conception. Under the Principate we find more and more provincial communities obtaining citizenship until in 212 it became universal throughout the empire. As the provincial coveted citizen status, Augustus was able to exploit this fact to obtain provincial loyalty. '

The emperor also gave the provinces an honest currency, a boon which all engaged in commerce must have hailed with delight. He withdrew from circulation the debased coins issued in the days of Sulla. It was enacted that all gold and silver coins should be of standard weight and that the right of coinage should be restricted to Rome and to a few provincial mints. Peace and order could be seen in the provinces of Spain, Narbonensis, Macedonia, Asia, Bithynia, and Cilicia and their seas were swept clear of pirates and their coasts were secure. The rapid Romanization of Spain and Gaul was the chief triumph of Augustus in the west while throughout the east commerce prospered as it had never prospered before.

There can be no question that the provinces were the chief gainers by the change from the Republic to the Principate, and that they sincerely welcomed the establishment of the empire. The strong central government in Rome under Augustus imposed peace within the frontiers.

Before leaving this account of the provinces a few words must be said about Egypt. As a result of the defeat and death of Cleopatra the kingdom of the Ptolemies was added to the dominions of the roman people by Agustus. It was not however organized as a regular province, but was an altogether exceptional equestrian one. The Princeps kept it under his own very close personal control although it apparently did not form a part of the Princep's private property. So jealous an eye did the Princeps keep on Egypt that senators were not allowed setting foot in it without special permission. Egypt thus occupied a unique position. Even its legions were unique since they were commanded by men of equestrian, not senatorial, rank, who were granted *imperium* to permit them to do so.

The reasons for the Princeps' vigilance were the extremely strategic position occupied by Egypt at the eastern end of the Mediterranean and the importance of the country as a granary for Rome. In order to avoid the risk of food riots the Princeps had to maintain an adequate supply of grain in the capital and no less than a third of all Rome's grain requirements came from Egypt. Augustus laid down a grain quota, which the country had to meet every year. But of course, there were years when the yield was low, and in such years Egypt itself was obliged to go short and was expected to recoup itself from later harvests. But each time that this happened, recovery became more difficult. The standard of living of the Egyptian peasant undoubtedly suffered. Moreover, Egypt had to pay more than the annual grain quota. Its heterogeneous population contained roman citizens, Greeks and a large Jewish community at Alexandria, besides the native Egyptians. The burdens and the privileges of these various groups differed widely, and as Egypt did not like other provinces contain self governing municipalities. Nevertheless various taxes were remorselessly collected. One of them was a poll tax paid by all native male Egyptians between the ages of fourteen and sixty, which must have been a particularly grievous burden. Such a system of exaction was vicious and ultimately indeed the system led to the economic ruin for the land of pharaohs.

Learning Teaching Activities

Activity No 1

Give briefly how and why Julius Caesar was murdered?

Instructions

- This can be done as a structural writing activity.

Activity No 2

How did Augustus Caesar retain the power and position where Julius Caesar had failed?

Instructions

- This can be done as an assignment.

Resources:

Stevenson, G.H., *Roman Provincial Administration*, Oxford, 1939.

Boren, H.C., *The Roman Republic*, New York, 1965.

Kamm, A., *The Romans*, London & New York, 1995.

School Based Assessment Tools

1. School Term : 1 st Term

2. Competency Level : Understands the different genres and recognizes their main features.

3. Subject Content : Aristophanes 'Wasps'

4. Assessment Tool and Number : Speech activity (Have a debate on the title "Aristophanes' Wasps is a satire on the System of the jury")

5. Objectives

- Students will get an idea about the jury system which prevailed in the Athenian society during the period that the play was written.
- Help the children appreciate the different types of literary works.
- The students will prepare a plan on their own of how to have a debate.

Criteria	Has reached the Competeny Level		Has boy reached the Competency Level	
(1) Will show the asctivities done by them freelyand will show the relavence of it for the subject	4	3	2	1
(2) They will discuss the activity given to them among themselves, record the data, and prepare an active plan	4	3	2	1
(3) They will attend to work cooperatively, bear responsibilities and work according to the time frame given	4	3	2	1
(4) Present the data, creatively, logically, methodology used, leadership	4	3	2	1
(5) Make suggestions, present auses, accuracy and prepare reports	4	3	2	1
Total of Marks				20
Final Mark=Total mark gained				10

School Based Assessment Tools

1. School Term : 1st Term

2. Competency Level : Understands the different genres and recognizes their main features

3. Subject Content : Terence's *Mother in Law*

4. Assessment Tool and Number : Assignment. How appropriate is the title 'Mother-in-Law' to Terence's play of that name? Give your reasons?

5. Objectives
- The students learn to appreciate different types of literary works.
- Finds the merits and defects of the main characters discussed in the play.

Criteria	Has reached the Competeny Level		Has boy reached the Competency Level	
(1) Will show the asctivities done by them freelyand will show the relavence of it for the subject	4	3	2	1
(2) They will discuss the activity given to them among themselves, record the data, and prepare an active plan	4	3	2	1
(3) They will attend to work cooperatively, bear responsibilities and work according to the time frame given	4	3	2	1
(4) Present the data, creatively, logically, methodology used, leadership	4	3	2	1
(5) Make suggestions, present auses, accuracy and prepare reports	4	3	2	1
Total of Marks				20
Final Mark=Total mark gained				10

School Based Assessment Tools

1. School Term : 1st Term

2 Competency Level : Appreciates political and social achievements of the Greeks and Romans as a background to Western Civilization.

3. Subject Content : Early History of Rome (2.6)

4. Assessment Tool and Number : Group Activity. Draw up a suitable chart based on your understanding on the strengths that both Rome and Carthage had at the outbreak of the Punic wars

5. Objectives
   - Gets an idea about the advantages and disadvantages that the respective parties had at the outbreak of the war.
   - Through analyzing the advantages and disadvantages they will be able to identify the weakness of both the parties.

Criteria	Has reached the Competeny Level		Has boy reached the Competency Level	
(1) Will show the asctivities done by them freelyand will show the relavence of it for the subject	4	3	2	1
(2) They will discuss the activity given to them among themselves, record the data, and prepare an active plan	4	3	2	1
(3) They will attend to work cooperatively, bear responsibilities and work according to the time frame given	4	3	2	1
(4) Present the data, creatively, logically, methodology used, leadership	4	3	2	1
(5) Make suggestions, present auses, accuracy and prepare reports	4	3	2	1
Total of Marks				20
Final Mark=Total mark gained				10

School Based Assessment Tools

1. School Term : 2 nd Term

2. Competency Level : Examines unique features in the particular text in relation to the genre

3. Subject Content : Orations Against Catiline (1-4)

4. Assessment Tool and Number : Assignment. Who was Catiline? What were the rows that made him lead an insurrection against Rome?

5. Objectives

- Identifies the characters and evaluates the circumstances that led to one of the most important historical events.

Criteria	Has reached the Competeny Level		Has boy reached the Competency Level	
(1) Will show the asctivities done by them freelyand will show the relavence of it for the subject	4	3	2	1
(2) They will discuss the activity given to them among themselves, record the data, and prepare an active plan	4	3	2	1
(3) They will attend to work cooperatively, bear responsibilities and work according to the time frame given	4	3	2	1
(4) Present the data, creatively, logically, methodology used, leadership	4	3	2	1
(5) Make suggestions, present auses, accuracy and prepare reports	4	3	2	1
Total of Marks				20
Final Mark=Total mark gained				10

School Based Assessment Tools

1. School Term : 2nd Term

2. Competency Level : Traces and critically evaluates the rich and varied historical experiences of the Romans

3. Subject Content : From Gracchi to Sulla (2.7)

4. Assessment Tool and Number : Creative Activity. Prepare a grid and put the reforms introduced by each brother in the respective columns.

5. Objectives
   - Identifies the reforms introduced by each reformer respectively.
   - Writes the contributions made by each brother to the Roman society.

Criteria	Has reached the Competeny Level		Has boy reached the Competency Level	
(1) Will show the asctivities done by them freelyand will show the relavence of it for the subject	4	3	2	1
(2) They will discuss the activity given to them among themselves, record the data, and prepare an active plan	4	3	2	1
(3) They will attend to work cooperatively, bear responsibilities and work according to the time frame given	4	3	2	1
(4) Present the data, creatively, logically, methodology used, leadership	4	3	2	1
(5) Make suggestions, present auses, accuracy and prepare reports	4	3	2	1
Total of Marks				20
Final Mark=Total mark gained				10

School Based Assessment Tools

1. School Term : 2nd Term

2. Competency Level : Traces and critically evaluates the rich and varied historical experiences of the Romans

3. Subject Content : Power Struggle in Rome (2.8)

4. Assessment Tool and Number : Creative activity. Prepare a grid on the formation and contributions made by each Triumvirate

5. Objectives
- Identifies the reforms introduced by each Triumvirate respectively.
- Writes the contributions made by each to the Roman society.

Criteria	Has reached the Competeny Level		Has boy reached the Competency Level	
(1) Will show the asctivities done by them freelyand will show the relavence of it for the subject	4	3	2	1
(2) They will discuss the activity given to them among themselves, record the data, and prepare an active plan	4	3	2	1
(3) They will attend to work cooperatively, bear responsibilities and work according to the time frame given	4	3	2	1
(4) Present the data, creatively, logically, methodology used, leadership	4	3	2	1
(5) Make suggestions, present auses, accuracy and prepare reports	4	3	2	1
Total of Marks				20
Final Mark=Total mark gained				10

School Based Assessment Tools

1. School Term : 3rd Term

2. Competency Level : Understands the concept of imagery

3. Subject Content : Appollonius' *Voyage of Argo*

4. Assessment Tool and Number : Speech. Organise a debate on how justifiable it is for Jason, being the hero, to rely on Medea's help for his success.

5. Objectives

- Compares and contrasts the aspects that govern human relationships through an unmderstanding of themes and characters of the work concerned.

Criteria	Has reached the Competency Level		Has boy reached the Competeny Level	
(1) Will show the asctivities done by them freelyand will show the relavence of it for the subject	4	3	2	1
(2) They will discuss the activity given to them among themselves, record the data, and prepare an active plan	4	3	2	1
(3) They will attend to work cooperatively, bear responsibilities and work according to the time frame given	4	3	2	1
(4) Present the data, creatively, logically, methodology used, leadership	4	3	2	1
(5) Make suggestions, present auses, accuracy and prepare reports	4	3	2	1
Total of Marks				20
Final Mark=Total mark gained				10

School Based Assessment Tools

1. School Term : 1st Term

2. Competency Level : Appreciates political and social achievements of the Greeks and Romans as a background to Western Civilization.

3. Subject Content : From Julius Caesar to Augustus Caesar (2.9)

4. Assessment Tool and Number : Group Activity. Prepare a presentation on Augustus Caesar focussing on one of the followin; (i) life (ii) career (iii) achievements

5. Objectives
   - Appreciate the life and career of Augustus Caesar as a historical personality and his contribution.

Criteria	Has reached the Competency Level		Has boy reached the Competeny Level	
(1) Will show the asctivities done by them freelyand will show the relavence of it for the subject	4	3	2	1
(2) They will discuss the activity given to them among themselves, record the data, and prepare an active plan	4	3	2	1
(3) They will attend to work cooperatively, bear responsibilities and work according to the time frame given	4	3	2	1
(4) Present the data, creatively, logically, methodology used, leadership	4	3	2	1
(5) Make suggestions, present auses, accuracy and prepare reports	4	3	2	1
Total of Marks				20
Final Mark=Total mark gained				10

School Based Assessment Tools

1. School Term : 3rd Term

2. Competency Level : Comprehends the role and importance of war in Greek and Roman History

3. Subject Content : Violence in Roman Politics

4. Assessment Tool and Number : Written Assignment. Summarise and make a list of key acts of violence and persons involved during the Republic leading up to imperiel Rome.

5. Objectives : · Identifies the trends of violence during the Republic and the key persons involved. Criteria Has reached the Competency Level Has boy reached the Competeny Level

Criteria	Has reached the Competency Level		Has boy reached the Competeny Level	
(1) Will show the asctivities done by them freelyand will show the relavence of it for the subject	4	3	2	1
(2) They will discuss the activity given to them among themselves, record the data, and prepare an active plan	4	3	2	1
(3) They will attend to work cooperatively, bear responsibilities and work according to the time frame given	4	3	2	1
(4) Present the data, creatively, logically, methodology used, leadership	4	3	2	1
(5) Make suggestions, present auses, accuracy and prepare reports	4	3	2	1
Total of Marks				20
Final Mark=Total mark gained				10