

---

Electronic Theses and Dissertations, 2020-

---

2022

## The Concept of the Populus Romanus in the Late Republic and Augustan Period

Nicklaus Bobertz  
*University of Central Florida*

 Part of the [Ancient History, Greek and Roman through Late Antiquity Commons](#)

Find similar works at: <https://stars.library.ucf.edu/etd2020>

University of Central Florida Libraries <http://library.ucf.edu>

This Masters Thesis (Open Access) is brought to you for free and open access by STARS. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations, 2020- by an authorized administrator of STARS. For more information, please contact [STARS@ucf.edu](mailto:STARS@ucf.edu).

---

### STARS Citation

Bobertz, Nicklaus, "The Concept of the Populus Romanus in the Late Republic and Augustan Period" (2022). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations, 2020-*. 978.

<https://stars.library.ucf.edu/etd2020/978>



# THE CONCEPT OF THE *POPULUS ROMANUS* IN THE LATE REPUBLIC AND AUGUSTAN PERIOD.

By

NICKLAUS BOBERTZ  
B.A. University of Central Florida, 2017

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the degree of Master of Arts  
in the Department of History  
in the College of Arts and Humanities  
at the University of Central Florida  
Orlando, Florida

Spring Term  
2022

## ABSTRACT

This study was undertaken to explore how the concept of the definition of Roman identity changed over the course of the late Roman Republic and into the early Empire culminating with the death of Augustus in 14 AD. Since the 1970's the historiography surrounding the late Roman Republic and early Empire has had to contend with what exactly the *populus Romanus* and its power basis was. From this questions concepts of power, gender, group formation, and even nationalism have emerged. However, few academics have targeted the nucleus that all of these questions revolve around, how did the identity of the people of Rome, the *populus Romanus*, change over the shift from Republic to Empire. To highlight this shift in identity I first studied the public orations of Cicero and how he identifies his *populus Romanus*. After I progressed to studying this expanded *populus Romanus* within the written Latin works of Ovid, Horace, Virgil, and Livy to demonstrate that the identity of the *populus Romanus* is not static but rather continues to evolves along with the transition from Republic to Empire. This study is important to the historiography of the late Roman Republic and early Empire because it demonstrates that during the late Roman Republic Roman identity was shifting to incorporate several outside groups of people, effectively leading to the creation of an empire before Empire.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Several people have aided me on this journey, either directly or indirectly. The first instance of this paper, from which the methodology stemmed, was given during my historiography course and as such I must thank Dr. Amelia Lyons for her feedback and support. From this I presented a paper in 2019 at the University of Toronto on the power of rhetoric and history to influence group formation and national identity.<sup>1</sup> Here I must thank the Toronto History Department for their feedback.

No graduate student is an island, and as such I must thank my peers. What started off as random people quickly turned into friend's as we suffered the normal problems that all graduate students bare. I wish to thank Bryce Fogue, Quintilla Greene, Sharon Rodriguez, Emily Strickland, Timothy Dorsh, Nicholas Brown, and Matthew Patsis for their support and comradery. Our evening meetings for Pizza will be a found memory.

Next I must thank the UCF History Department for funding my studies from 2020-2021. This proved vital to allowing me to continue to research group formation and identity at both a macro level and micro level across several ages of history. For this opportunity I must thank Dr. Perter Larson, Dr. Barbara Gannon, and Tiffany Rivera for giving me an invaluable firsthand experience of teaching and researching.

Out of everything there are three influences which have driven my work on this paper. That is my thesis committee. The first is Dr. Duncan Hardy, to whom I must thank for allowing me to incessantly question the concept of national identity existing within late medieval Europe. A fruitful dialogue, our discussions often turned to the question of a shared identity existing across segments of the population of Europe. A discussion to which this paper has significantly benefited. Second, I must thank Dr. Luis Martínez-Fernández who has proved me a vital beacon of knowledge and inspiration in taking on a thesis far larger in both breadth and scope than I would have previously been comfortable with. Of everyone in the department Dr. Martinez supported my often outlandish ideas and encouraged further research when few others would, for that he has my eternal thanks. Third, is my committee chair, Dr. Edward Dandrow, to whom I must thank for not only providing the necessary guidance but more importantly the ability to build a thesis far beyond the normal confines of a master's student. Not only did Dr. Dandrow encourage me to explore shunned topics such as nation building in antiquity he provided a never ending stream of knowledge and methodologies that have proved invaluable to both my work and career. As careful readers will notice, in the following pages each of these three committee members own work highly influence my own.

Finally, I must thank my family. Without their support I would have never pursued higher education. In many ways this thesis is more of their success as it is mine.

---

<sup>1</sup> Bobertz, Nicklaus. "The Audience, the Archive, and the Historian: An Analysis of the Rhetoric that Exists in the Archive and the Historian's Imaginary Archive." University of Toronto: *AGHS*, May 2-3, 2019.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION.....	1
Introduction, questions, and importance of questions.....	1
Thesis and Primary Sources.....	4
Historiography.....	5
Methodology.....	17
Definition of Terms.....	20
“Conventio and Populus Romanus”.....	20
Conclusion to The Introduction.....	24
CHAPTER 2: CICERO AND THE <i>POPULUS ROMANUS</i> DURING THE LATE ROMAN REPUBLIC.....	27
Cicero and the <i>populus Romanus</i> .....	27
The Eight <i>Contiones</i> of Cicero.....	28
(I): The <i>Pro Lege Manilla</i> : Cicero’s support of Pompey the Great (66 BC.).....	30
(II): The <i>De Lege Agraria</i> : Cicero’s stance against the Tribune Rullus (63 BC.).....	42
(III): <i>Catilinam Oratio Secunda Habita ad Populum</i> : Second Catilinarian Conspiracy (63 BC.).....	51
(V): <i>Post Reditum ad Quirites/Populum</i> : Cicero’s public gratification of the Roman people after Exile (57 BC.).....	63
Epilogue and Conclusion of Results for Chapter 1.....	74
CHAPTER 3: CHARTING CICERO’S EXPANDED <i>POPULUS ROMANUS</i> THROUGH AUGUSTAN LITERATURE.....	76
The Poets, “Golden-Age”, and Literary Chronology.....	76
Ovid’s <i>Metamorphoses</i> Book 1 and 15.....	80
Horace’s <i>Odes</i> .....	88
Virgil’s <i>Aeneid</i> .....	95
Livy’s <i>Ab Urbe Condita</i> .....	104
Conclusion to Chapter 3.....	112
CONCLUSION.....	114
Further Research.....	117

REFERENCES ..... 118

## CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

### Introduction, questions, and importance of questions

From the time of the Gracchi in 121 BCE up through the rise of Augustus in 27 BCE the people of the late Roman Republic saw a time of nonstop conflict. Over a period of 94 years the people of the city of Rome saw two civil wars, a dictatorship, political violence, foreign military conflict, and the crowning of a Roman Emperor. This thesis looks at how the identity of the *populus Romanus* changed over the period of the late Roman Republic up into the early Roman Empire. To accomplish this there are two questions that drive this paper: First, what is the identity of the *populus Romanus* during the late Roman Republic? Second, does this identity change from the time of the Gracchi (122BC) up through the Golden-Era Latin writers of Virgil, Horace, Ovid, and Livy?

The problem that I am addressing is the malleable identity of the *populus Romanus* within Cicero's orations and how it changes over the course of the late Roman republic (121 BC-27 BC). By analyzing Cicero's identity of the *populus Romanus* within his work readers of this paper will see that not only does the *populus Romanus* have a dynamic identity across the late Roman Republic but also that Cicero implies that the identity of the *populus Romanus* drastically expands towards the end of the Republic. The importance of this problem is tantamount to our understanding of the late Roman Republic, as within the past 20 years works such as Fergus Millar's *The*

*Crowd in The Late Roman Republic*, Robert Morstein-Marx's *Mass Oratory and Political Power in the Late Roman Republic*, Karl Hölkeskamp's *Reconstructing the Roman Republic*, Emma Dench's *Romulus' Asylum: Roman Identities from the Age of Alexander to the Age of Hadrian*, and Henrick Mouritsen's *Plebs and Politics in the Late Roman Republic* have interacted with the concept of the identity of the *populus Romanus* in relation to power within the government of the late Roman Republic.<sup>2</sup>

However, patient readers of the historiography surrounding the *populus Romanus* of the late Roman Republic will notice that these scholars place the abstract concept of the *populus Romanus* as a static identity during the events of the late Roman Republic.

This inherently constricts the ability to ask hard questions of power, enfranchisement, nationalism, and ultimately what it would mean to a first century Roman to be Roman.

This thesis demonstrates that the identity of the *populus Romanus* as seen through Cicero's eyes evolves from meaning just the people of the city of Rome to an abstract identity that under the golden-era Latin writers is further supported and encouraged.

To demonstrate this, I utilize the primary sources of Cicero and the Golden-era Latin writers. Cicero is the primary source which this study interacts with to demonstrate the identity of *populus Romanus* during the late Roman Republic. The reliance upon Cicero's written orations is due to a lack of surviving sources that date from the city of

---

<sup>2</sup> Millar, Fergus. *The Crowd in Rome in the Late Republic*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1998. Morstein-Marx, Robert. *Mass Oratory and Political Power in the late Roman Republic*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004. Hölkeskamp's, Karl-J., and Henry Heitmann-Gordon. *Reconstructing the Roman Republic: An Ancient Political Culture and Modern Research*. Princeton; Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2010. Dench, Emma. *Romulus' Asylum: Roman Identities from the Age of Alexander to the Age of Hadrian*. Oxford University Press, 2005. Mouritsen, Henrik. *Plebs and Politics in the Late Roman Republic*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.



Rome during the height of the late Roman Republic.<sup>3</sup> The primary sources of the writers however demonstrate a continuation of the expanded identity of the *populus Romanus* well into the reign of Augustus.

Since 2000 this re-examining of Cicero's writings has progressively become more finite in scope. This is important for two reasons: First, as scholars dive deeper into researching Cicero we begin to uncover more about the events that unfolded within the city of Rome during the late Roman Republic. This only further demonstrates how much we as historians and academics still don't know about the events that transpired during the late Roman Republic. The second reason for the revival of Cicero as a studied primary source over the past two decades has been due to an explosion in new methodologies applied to historical sources. One of the primary examples of this could be seen as Fergus Millar's application of spatial theory to the forum of the late Roman Republic.<sup>4</sup> This work follows in this new tradition of reexamining Cicero by applying new methodologies to ask new questions that will impact the future development of the historiography surrounding the late Roman Republic.

Critics of this thesis who claim that it is simply revisionist history should notice that I am not alone in re-examining Cicero's orations in the relation to the power structure within the city of Rome during the late Roman Republic. A short historiography of recent academics who have used Cicero as a primary source would be: Fergus Millar

---

<sup>3</sup> Outside of Cicero we have extracts Augustus's *Res Gestae*, some parts of Appian's books 13-17 which are considered as primary by most historians, Velleius Paterculus's history, Sallust's account on the *Conspiracy of Catline*, Julius Caesar's diary on the Gallic Wars *Commentarii de Bello Gallico*, and Plutarch's *Parallel Lives* which has to be read extremely critically to gain accurate information.

<sup>4</sup> Millar, Fergus. *The Crowd in Rome in the Late Republic*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1998.

looking at the power of the crowd in the late Roman Republic, Morstein-Marx analyzing the power of oratory to sway political events, J.A North's examining of the concept of voting power within the *populus Romanus* to sway events in Republican Rome, and Mouritsen's view on how the economics of Rome impacted the political development of the late Roman republic.<sup>5</sup> All of these academics engage with Cicero and present arguments that seek to identify the identity, structure, and power inherent in the people in the city of Rome, the *populus Romanus*, during the late Roman republic.

### Thesis and Primary Sources

The thesis of this work centers around the identity of the *populus Romanus*. Over the course of the late Roman Republic and into the early empire we can see through the writings of Cicero and the golden-era Latin writers that the identity of the *populus Romanus* enlarges from just the people of the city of Rome to becoming an abstract identity encompassing people from outside the city under the reign of Augustus.

Chapters two and three of this thesis deal with the primary sources. In chapter two I analyze Cicero's *Pro Lege Manilia*(66 B.C), *De Lege Agraria*(63 B.C), *In Catilinam*(63 B.C), and *Post Reditum ad Quirites/Populum*(57 B.C). For ease of reading when I analyze Cicero I provide both the original Latin and English translation. In chapter 3 I examine the writings of Livy, Virgil, Ovid, and Horace. For Livy I take the first book of his *ab Urbe Condita*, for Virgil I analyze the first 5 pages of his *Aeneid*, for Ovid I

---

<sup>5</sup> Millar, Fergus. *The Crowd in Rome in the Late Republic*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1998. Morstein-Marx, Robert. *Mass Oratory and Political Power in the Late Roman Republic*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004. J. A. North "Democratic Politics in Republican Rome", *Past and Present* 126 (1990), 3-21. Mouritsen, Henrik. *Plebs and Politics in the Late Roman Republic*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

examine the first book of his *Metamorphosis*, and finally for Horace I analyze the first poem of his *Odes*. When appropriate I provide the original Latin for the poets along with a translation.

### Historiography

Since the early 20th century there have been three trends of thought revolving around the people of the late Roman Republic. The first, is the general historiography of the late Roman Republic. Within this trend we can clearly see a shift from a great man's history in the early 20th century up to a social history that better represents the ethnic, social, and traditional dynamics of the late Roman Republic. The second trend of thought begins to emerge in the 1970's with a shift towards literary analysis of both Greek and Roman mythology as a way of identifying social group formation within the late Roman Republic. The third trend of thought begins to emerge in the 1970's within political circles that seek to place a quasi-unification of Italian peoples before the 19<sup>th</sup> century using historical sources.

The first two of these trends began to form into one starting in the mid 1990's with the publication of Fergus Millar's work on the crowd's composition and power in the late Roman Republic. Since the 1990's the historiography of social identity in regards to the *populus Romanus* during the late Roman Republic has had to contend with several primary sources and methodologies. Examples of primary sources would be the introduction of sources outside the Roman Mediterranean that inspired cultural shifts in the late Roman Republic along with iconography laden numismatic evidence from the 1st century B.C.

Any historiography dealing with the late Roman Republic can never be truly complete. Between us and the *populus Romanus* of the late Roman Republic there is both 2,000 years and easily double that number of scholarly publications dealing with just the writings of Cicero. This problem is further exacerbated when attempting to incorporate existing scholarship in German, French, Spanish, Chinese, and Dutch. In spite of this, I have endeavored to provide a near complete historiography surrounding the identity of the *populus Romanus* during the late Roman Republic and early Empire below. I am sure that dedicated readers will undoubtedly find missing sources not directly mentioned.

During the 19th century the historiography of the *populus Romanus* in the late Roman Republic largely was dictated by one theory; that the *populus Romanus* that held any political power was of the patrician class and not the plebian. The reason this now outlandish theory existed was because of the German influenced school of Mommsen. Theodor Mommsen in 1854-1856 would publish his Nobel Prize winning monograph *Römische Geschichte* (History of Rome).<sup>6</sup> Within this three volume work Mommsen would provide a complete history of Rome, from the Republic's inception up through the Emperor Diocletian. In such a massive three-part monograph Mommsen had to glance over certain historical instances such as the concept of identity of the *populus Romanus* in the late Roman Republic. As such within Mommsen's work the concept of the *populus Romanus* during the late Roman Republic was largely sidelined in favor of a patrician lead crowd who supported the senatorial elite.

---

<sup>6</sup> Mommsen, Theodore. *Römische Geschichte*, Leipzig; Reimer & Hirzel, 1854-1856.

Mommsen would be awarded the Nobel prize in literature in 1902. Four years after this award, in September of 1906, George Botsford published his article “The Social Composition of the Primitive Roman *populus*” an article which sought to highlight the political power present within the *populus Romanus* of the late Republic and illuminate Mommsen’s oversight.<sup>7</sup> It is within this article that Botsford presents the argument that the *populus Romanus* in the late Roman Republic held political power and sway over the events of the late Roman Republic while also being at the mercy of the governing elite. Botsford argues in 1906 that the power of the *populus Romanus* to sway the political events in the city of Rome was dangerously misunderstood because previous studies failed to adequately account for the identity of the *populus Romanus*.

Three years later Botsford continued with the concept of identity within the *populus Romanus* and publish his monograph *The Roman Assemblies, from their Origin to the End of the Republic*.<sup>8</sup> This book hammered home how Botsford’s contemporary academics have failed to understand the social composition of the *populus Romanus* and as such the powers at play during the time of the Roman Republic. Botsford’s book in many ways sought to look at the social powers and identity of the *populus Romanus* within the late Roman Republic while also providing a framework for further research to build upon.

Matias Gelzer’s 1912 would expand upon this framework of identity issue of the *populus Romanus* with his work *Die Nobilität der römischen Republik*, a seemingly

---

<sup>7</sup> George Willis Botsford. “The Social Composition of the Primitive Roman Populus.” *Political Science Quarterly* 21, no. 3 (1906): 498–526.

<sup>8</sup> Botsford, George. *The Roman Assemblies, from their Origin to the End of the Republic*, New York: The Macmillan Company. 1909.

forgotten book that sought to understand the noble class in the city of Rome during the late Roman Republic.<sup>9</sup> While still very much being a great man history, the early 20th century historian agreed with Botsford that in order to understand the nobles of Rome historians must begin to focus their efforts upon the actions of the people in response to the nobles. Being a product of the historiography of the early 20th century *Die Nobilität der römischen Republik* certainly pushes the boundaries of what historians can do with their source basis as Gelzer's set his gaze upon the people of Rome and their actions around fifty years before the official cultural turn within history.<sup>10</sup>

The focus on the *populus Romanus*'s identity and power would continue into 1916 with Jefferson Elmore's article "Municipia Fundana " where he looks at the social composition and identity of the *populus fundus* (farm people) within the *municipia fundana* (foundational towns/municipalities).<sup>11</sup> This article positions the *populus Romanus* as having an expanded identity that, according to Elmore, incorporates the Italians into the *populus Romanus* present within Cicero's orations.<sup>12</sup> Elmore does this by looking at how Cicero positions the *populus Romanus*'s identity in his defense of Lucius Cornelius Balbus in 56 B.C. In many ways Elmore's work lays the foundation for incorporating outside groups of people into the crowd that was present during an oration within the forum.

---

<sup>9</sup> Gelzer, Matthias. *Die Nobilität der römischen Republik*. Leipzig; Teubner, 1912.

<sup>10</sup> For definition and examples of the cultural turn in the social sciences see Jacobs, Mark; Spillman, Lynette (2005). "Cultural sociology at the crossroads of the discipline". *Poetics*. **33** (1): 1–14.

<sup>11</sup> Elmore, Jefferson. "Municipia Fundana." *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 47 (1916): 35–42.

<sup>12</sup> Elmore's thesis is incredibly interesting for a publication in the early 20th century " The effect of widespread appropriation of the civil law (no longer the exclusive possession of Roman citizens), in addition to facilitating business and general intercourse, could only have been to create a feeling of unity with Rome, and in this respect was a federal influence of undoubted import."-39

The concept of the composition and identity of the *populus Romanus* can be seen as continuing in Max Radin's 1923 article "Roman Concepts of Equality" where Radin looks at the Roman *leges regiae* or Twelve Tables in an effort to find the *populus Romanus*'s concept of equality.<sup>13</sup> Radin states that much like the 1920's Germany "To borrow a German phrase, the one (roman) was *frei* and the other, *volgel-frei* to kill one was almost parricide, to kill the other (non-roman) was no crime at all."<sup>14</sup> While politically driven, Radin's analysis demonstrated that even within the *populus Romanus* of the Republic there was a fluid identity and composition that existed across the social stratification of the Roman Republic.

In 1927 George La Piana, a theologian, published his article "Foreign Groups in Rome During the First Centuries of the Empire."<sup>15</sup> Within the first chapter of this article Piana would engage with his contemporary scholarship to demonstrate how the identity of the *populus Romanus* expanded in the last century of the Republic as more Italians became enfranchised in the republican government. Further, Piana would push back against the old school of thought that the *populus Romanus* held no political sway within the late Republic. Piana argues that the manumission of slaves during the late Republic lead to an expansion of Roman culture and power across the *populus Romanus* of the late Roman Republic.

From 1927 up through the late 1930's the power and composition of the *populus Romanus* would be sidelined by other more pressing historiographies dealing with the

---

<sup>13</sup> Radin, Max. "Roman Concepts of Equality." *Political Science Quarterly* 38, no. 2 (1923): 262–89.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.* pp.263

<sup>15</sup> La Piana, George. "Foreign Groups in Rome during the First Centuries of the Empire." *The Harvard Theological Review* 20, no. 4 (1927): 183–403.

military history of the late Republic and early Empire. In 1940 however S.M Savage would publish his article "The Cults of Ancient Trastevere."<sup>16</sup> Here Savage presents the argument that the *populus Romanus* would not have been a static identity group but rather composed of several smaller subsections each having their identity correspond to the geographical location within the city they live within.

In 1939 Ronald Syme would publish his monograph *The Roman Revolution*.<sup>17</sup> Within his work Syme positions Octavian as a pragmatic politician who slowly overtime accumulates power acting in support of what he believes would benefit the *res publica*. While Syme connivingly demonstrates that power emulates from proto-political parties in the late Roman Republic he fails to adequately place the power and identity of the *populus Romanus* within his theory on a Roman Revolution.

Writing out of a politically and geographically divided Germany in 1965 Christian Meier looks at how exactly the people of the late Roman Republic influenced the political progression of the Republic in his *Res publica amissa. Eine Studie zu Verfassung und Geschichte der späten römischen Republik*.<sup>18</sup> Looking at the unwritten constitution of the late Roman Republic Meier pays special attention to how the average populace could interact with the Roman system of Governance. Coming to the conclusion that the *Plebs Contionalis* played a key part in the continuance of the unwritten Roman constitution Meier puts considerable power in the hands of the shopkeepers that surrounded the Roman Forum who had both the time and material

---

<sup>16</sup> S. M. Savage. "The Cults of Ancient Trastevere." *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome* 17 (1940): 26–56.

<sup>17</sup> Syme, Ronald. *The Roman Revolution*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1939.

<sup>18</sup> Meier, Christian. *Res publica amissa. Eine Studie zu Verfassung und Geschichte der späten römischen Republik*: Steiner, Wiesbaden 1966.



resources to steal away from their stalls to listen to the orations of the patrician class and weigh support in favor of or against a *lex*.<sup>19</sup> The action of placing the *populus Romanus* within the governmental structure of the Republic took the then dominant paradigm of oligarchical control and presented not a competing paradigm but rather a tangential argument; that the *populus Romanus* could in fact interact through the orator with the governmental structure and influence the Republic.<sup>20</sup>

In many ways Mier's work stands as a watershed mark within the historiography. Up until this point historians would provide a cursory glance at the power and composition of the *populus Romanus*. Mier stands as a point where historians writing about political power within the late Roman Republic would have to contend with the 'power' and composition of the *populus Romanus*.

In 1974 T.P Wiseman would publish his article "Legendary Genealogies in Late-Republican Rome."<sup>21</sup> Wiseman in this article further identifies the composition of the *populus Romanus* in late Republican Rome by looking at how patricians would separate themselves socially from the plebeian class by recanting their families genealogies. Wiseman looks at how this genealogical family history would impact the political dynamics of late Republic Rome.

---

<sup>19</sup> For a good example of how the Roman voting assemblies worked during the late Roman Republic readers should see Taylor, Lily Ross. *Roman Voting Assemblies from the Hannibalic War to the Dictatorship of Caesar*. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan Press, 1990.

<sup>20</sup> For an example of a historian who subscribed to the oligarchical paradigm see Ross Taylor, Lilly. *Party Politics in the age of Caesar*. University of California Press, 1961.

<sup>21</sup> Wiseman, T. P. "Legendary Genealogies in Late-Republican Rome." *Greece & Rome* 21, no. 2 (1974): 153–64.

The same year, 1974, Erich S. Gruen would write his monograph *The Last Generation of The Roman Republic*.<sup>22</sup> Within this book Gruen presents the argument that the people who lived during the late Roman Republic had no idea what was about to happen to the *res publica*. Gruen's work is largely written as a response to Syme's 1939 work who presents the transition from republic to empire as inevitable. Gruen within his work presents the *populus Romanus* as having some degree of agency but still sidelined in comparison to the more influential and established institutions of the *res publica*.

Writing over two decades later in 1987 Dutch historian P. J. J. Vanderbroeck pulls back the curtain once again on the power dynamic of the late Roman Republic in his monograph *Popular Leadership and Collective Behavior in the Late Roman Republic*.<sup>23</sup> Presenting the thesis that the typical patron-client relationships that came to define the governmental structure of the late Roman Republic began to shift in response to a perceived failure of the senatorial class by the *populus Romanus* Vanderbroeck argues that the *populus Romanus* instead began to invest what little political power they had in upstart *populares* politicians. This power shift destabilized the delicate political balance that the Republic was founded upon, and further demonstrated that perhaps historians have failed to address the inherent power the *populus Romanus* held within the late Roman Republic.

---

<sup>22</sup> Gruen, Erich Stephen. *The Last Generation of the Roman Republic*. Berkeley, Calif: Univ. of California Press, 1974.

<sup>23</sup> P.J.J Vanderbroeck. *Popular Leadership and Collective Behavior in the Late Roman Republic (CA. 80-50 B.C)*. Amsterdam; Gieben, 1987.

Nicola Mackie in 1992 would directly address this shortcoming within the historiography with their article “Popularis” Ideology and Popular Politics at Rome in the First Century B.C.”<sup>24</sup> Presenting a thesis that attempts to dissuade contemporary historians from negating the effects of the *popularis* Politicians in Rome during the late Roman Republic due to lack of sources Mackie directly calls out the dominant paradigm that chose to sideline the power of the *populus Romanus* in influencing the events of the Republic stating “although we know what *populares* were not, we do not yet have an adequate account of what they were; and so neither do we have an adequate account of their place in, and impact on, Roman politics.”<sup>25</sup> While no historian is an island, Mackie’s work directly demonstrates a shifting acceptance of the ideology that the *populares* politicians wielding the *populus Romanus* held considerable sway in the events of the late Roman Republic.

If the power of the *populus Romanus* was becoming apparent within the events of the late Roman Republic how did public order function during this time and under the Augustine era? This is the fundamental question asked in 1995 by Wilfried Nippel in his monograph *Public Order in Ancient Rome*.<sup>26</sup> Wilfred provides a succinctly yet highly detailed explanation of how the *populus* through the malleable and unwritten Roman Constitution was able to self-regulate themselves without the need for a state sanctioned police force and that it took outside stimulus to provide a catalyst to

---

<sup>24</sup> Mackie, Nicola. “Popularis” Ideology and Popular Politics in Rome in the First Century B.C.” *Rheinisches Museum Für Philologie* 135, no. 1 (1992): 49-73.

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.* 49.

<sup>26</sup> Nippel, Wilfried. *Public Order in Ancient Rome*. Cambridge, Uk: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

'motivate' this self-regulating entity to move in a political direction; an outside stimulus such as a skilled orator.<sup>27</sup>

Right before the turning of the new millennia a monograph would be published in 1998 by Fergus Millar titled *The Crowd in Rome in the Late Republic*.<sup>28</sup> This highly influential text presents the question that the *populus Romanus* held considerable power in the voting process of the late Roman Republic and as such, much to the dismay of his colleagues, Miller asks the important question of can we look at the late Roman Republic not as a oligarchical institution ran by the senatorial elite but rather a loosely defined democracy guided by oration. While Millar's work is not the first to question the concept of democracy in the Republic it stands as one of the most influential in the west due to its placement of the *populus Romanus* as holding considerable inherent political agency.

Upon Millar's work being published tremors can be seen emanating from the question of political agency with the *populus Romanus*.<sup>29</sup> In 2001 Henrick Mouritsen's *Plebs and Politics in the Late Roman Republic* directly pushed back against Millar's assertion that the *populus Romanus* held power in the late Roman Republic.<sup>30</sup> Claiming that the Roman government was dominated by the elite and that instead of holding political power the *populus Romanus* was simply an anecdote to the political

---

<sup>27</sup> The book itself is split into two main parts, the first demonstrating the self-regulating *populus Romanus* during the late Republic and the second how this self-regulating *populus* continued under the early empire under Augustus.

<sup>28</sup> Millar, Fergus. *The Crowd in Rome in the Late Republic*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1998.

<sup>29</sup> This often can be seen as academics in the 00's posing a direct response to Millar's last chapter of questioning the validity of the democracy debate.

<sup>30</sup> Mouritsen, Henrik. *Plebs and Politics in the Late Roman Republic*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

sovereignty of the Senate. The main criticism of those in the 'democratic camp' by Mouritsen was the identity of this illusive *populus Romanus*, an identity that according to Mouritsen leading scholars such as Millar failed to address due to the amorphous nature of the term.

Published in Germany in 2004, and later by Princeton University Press in 2010, Karl Hölkeskamp's monograph *Reconstructing the Roman Republic* both admonishes Millar's work and supports the use of outside theory to explore the history of the late Republic.<sup>31</sup> Coming to the conclusion that the power of the *populus Romanus* has largely been ignored by academia, Hölkeskamp reprimand's Millar's lack of familiarity with non-Anglo scholarship.<sup>32</sup> At this point within the historiography it has become apparent that the historiography of the late Roman Republic has shifted towards the concept of what exactly constituted the political agency of the *populus Romanus* and how did the role of oratory impact this political agency within the Republic.

In that same year Robert Morstein-Marx's *Mass Oratory and Political Power in the late Roman Republic* would be published by a western press.<sup>33</sup> This work in many ways is the capstone on the debate of the power of oratory in influencing the 'masses' of the late Roman Republic. By putting the role of the *contio* under the magnifying glass Morestein-Marx comes to the conclusion that while oratory could influence the voting population of Rome to take a certain action the very action of the *contio* only served to

---

<sup>31</sup> Hölkeskamp's, Karl-J., and Henry Heitmann-Gordon. *Reconstructing the Roman Republic: An Ancient Political Culture and Modern Research*. Princeton; Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2010.

<sup>32</sup> German academics have asked the question of political power imbued within the *populus* for a while. See Gelzer and Meir.

<sup>33</sup> Morstein-Marx, Robert. *Mass Oratory and Political Power in the late Roman Republic*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

reinforce traditional societal norms of the Republic, societal norms that served to keep the Senate unchecked in their power.

One year later, in 2005, Emma Dench would publish her monograph *Romulus' Asylum: Roman Identities from the Age of Alexander to the Age of Hadrian*.<sup>34</sup> This text outlines how Roman identity was malleable by social norms across both the Republic and Empire. Dench's work imparts a potential methodological approach that through the primary written sources we can define the actors' contemporary Roman identity.

Writing in 2011 Alexander Yakobson's "Traditional Political Culture and the People's Role in The Roman Republic" presents an argument that while the people held some degree of political power in the late Roman Republic it was controlled by the ruling elite.<sup>35</sup> Here Yakobson can be seen as pushing back against the loaded term of democracy being applied to the late Roman republic. At this point within the historiography a power struggle has emerged that seeks to place the *populus Romanus*'s political power either under a patrician elite or as a more independent force.

The debate since then has largely circled around this concept of the power of the *populus* and the role that oration and rhetoric has in steering it. One of the keystones of this debate is centered on the elusive identity of the *populus*, an identity that most scholars treat as being static over the course of the late Republic. Therefore, one of the main aims of this paper is to demonstrate that the identity of the *populus Romanus* is in

---

<sup>34</sup> Dench, Emma. *Romulus' Asylum: Roman Identities from the Age of Alexander to the Age of Hadrian*. Oxford University Press, 2005.

<sup>35</sup> Yakobson, Alexander. "Traditional Political Culture and the People's Role in the Roman Republic." *Historia: Zeitschrift Für Alte Geschichte* 59, no. 3 (2010): 282–302.

fact not static but can be seen as shifting over the course of the late Roman Republic.<sup>36</sup> To accomplish this goal a critical evaluation of Cicero's approach to the term *populus* will be utilized by deconstructing the select orations known to have been performed in *contio*. Upon demonstrating that the lexical definition of the term *populus Romanus* shifts through the eyes of Cicero over the course of the late Roman Republic the second chapter will then progress into demonstrating how this newly defined and vastly expanded *populus*'s identity is utilized by the fledgling empire by performing a similar analysis of the literary works of Ovid, Virgil, Horace, and Livy.

### Methodology

This thesis utilizes several key methodologies to analyze and interpret select works of Cicero and the literary works of Livy, Virgil, Ovid, and Horace. The second chapter of this paper, focusing on the works of Cicero, first places the selected works into three main categories. First, what action is Cicero trying to accomplish by publishing/presenting this work? Second, who or what is Cicero taking a stance against and what is their expected goal through Cicero's eyes? Third, how does Cicero engage with his audience, his *populus Romanus*, in his work?

The reasoning behind this analytical approach is due to Gruen's demonstration that the people of the city of Rome either had no idea their Republic was about to transition into an empire or that they simply did not care. Cicero as a political actor

---

<sup>36</sup> For further research on this concept see Dench, Emma. "Cicero and Roman Identity." Chapter. In *The Cambridge Companion to Cicero*, edited by Catherine Steel, 122–38. Cambridge Companions to Literature. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.

would seek only to further his own political goals, which he wrote down. The first part of the methodological process outlines the background to the oration and the goal Cicero was attempting to accomplish in taking his stance. Here we can position Cicero and his argument. The second part of the methodological process looks at Cicero's opposition within the oration and what this opposition is attempting to accomplish. Finally, the third part demonstrates how Cicero, being a pragmatic politician, seeks to utilize whatever inherent political power the *populus Romanus* had at the time to sway, in his favor, the events surrounding the oration.

Once we have broken down the works into these selected parts then I will chart Cicero's definition of the *populus Romanus* within his work by borrowing the methodology of political ambition theory popularized by Levine and Hyde in their 1977 work "Incumbency and the Theory of Political Ambition: A Rational-Choice Model."<sup>37</sup> The study of how ambition impacted the work of Cicero stems as far back as the 16th century when Niccolò Machiavelli wrote upon the intersection of political theory and the late Roman Republic.<sup>38</sup> In more recent times contemporary academics have built upon the political theory of ambition as it relates to the late Roman Republic.<sup>39</sup> The strength of

---

<sup>37</sup> Levine, Martin D., and Mark S. Hyde. "Incumbency and the Theory of Political Ambition: A Rational-Choice Model." *The Journal of Politics* 39, no. 4 (1977): 959-83.

<sup>38</sup> Machiavelli discusses Cicero's ambitions and political theory in his *The Prince, the Discourses on Livy*.

<sup>39</sup> Levick looks at the power of ambition to drive both private and public life in "Morals, Politics, and the Fall of the Roman Republic" Levick, Barbara. "Morals, Politics, and the Fall of the Roman Republic." *Greece & Rome* 29, no. 1 (1982): 53-62. Alexander Duff looks at how Cicero's failure to perceive fellow politicians' ambitions lead to a downfall of Republican Rome in his "Republicanism and the Problem of Ambition: The Critique of Cicero in Machiavelli's Discourses." (Duff, Alexander S. "Republicanism and the Problem of Ambition: The Critique of Cicero in Machiavelli's Discourses." *The Journal of Politics* 73, no. 4 (2011): 980-92.) Alexander Skinner looks at how individual political ambition in the late Roman Empire influenced numismatic evidence in "Political Mobility in the Later Roman Empire." (Skinner, Alexander. "Political Mobility in the Later Roman Empire." *Past & Present*, no. 218 (2013): 17-53.) Karl-J Hölkeskamp looks at how during the 4th century B.C ambitious plebeians impacted the political landscape of the middle republic in "Conquest, Competition, and Consensus: Roman Expansion in Italy



political ambition theory is the ability to chart the actions of political actors and explain why they were taken.

In this research political ambition will be the guiding force to demonstrate how Cicero's main goal in every part of his work is to further his political career, and as such tailors his approach to identifying his contemporary *populus Romanus*. I will then combine the results to present a final summary of how Cicero presents the *populus Romanus* through his work.

After finishing with Cicero my attention, and thus methodological approach, shifts to the literary authors of Virgil, Horace, Ovid, and Livy. The reasoning behind this chronological and analytical leap is to demonstrate that Cicero's latter expanded identity of the *populus Romanus* continues and is represented in the works of these authors. To accomplish this, I couple political ambition theory with an already existing scholarship on the literary deconstruction and analysis of the Augustine era authors/poets. The main goal of this chapter is to provide a capstone for this paper to demonstrate that Cicero's evolving abstract definition of the *populus Romanus* did not stop with his death on December 7, 43 BC but continued into and under the Augustine Era. Simply put, Cicero's observations of the expansion of identity within the *populus Romanus* can be seen also within the writings of the Augustine literary authors of Virgil, Horace, Ovid, and Virgil.

---

and the Rise of the Nobilitas." (Karl-J. Hölkamp. "Conquest, Competition and Consensus: Roman Expansion in Italy and the Rise of the 'Nobilitas.'" *Historia: Zeitschrift Für Alte Geschichte* 42, no. 1 (1993): 12–39.)

## Definition of Terms

The terms of *Conventio* and *populus Romanus* are abstract and need to be defined in order to successfully evaluate the identity of the *populus Romanus*.

### “Conventio and Populus Romanus”

Academics such as James Tan in his article “Contiones in the Age of Cicero” have often presented reasons to highlight the malleable academic nature and definition of the *contio* of the late Roman Republic.<sup>40</sup> The term *contio* is procured from the Latin term *conventio* and is loosely translated to mean “a gathering.”<sup>41</sup> The purpose of these gatherings typically revolved around an orator informing an audience of contemporary political actions given within the city. A major difference between a *contio* and other forms of public assembly such as a *comitia* is that during a *contio* no voting on a bill or other political action would take place. The purpose of the *contio* on a superficial level was merely to inform the public of upcoming political actions undertaken by the state. Any further academic attempt at defining the nature or reason behind the *contio* must engage in the following debate in relation to the composition of the audience.

First, a group of academics believe that the crowd composition of the *contio* comprised primarily of shop clerks who lived near the forum and could easily attend the oration and stood to profit directly or indirectly from the actions of the crowd and orator.<sup>42</sup> As such the orations given in *contio* were tailored to the audience of the lower

---

<sup>40</sup> Tan, James. "Contiones in the Age of Cicero." *Classical Antiquity* 27, no. 1 (2008): 163-201.

<sup>41</sup> Historians such as Fotini Metaxaki-Mitrou states that a *contio* can be defined as a “coming together” or “a meeting.” For further information on the nomenclature see Metaxaki-Mitrou, Fotini. "Violence in the Contio During the Ciceronian Age." *L'Antiquité Classique* 54 (1985): 180-87.

<sup>42</sup> Tan, James. "Contiones in the Age of Cicero." *Classical Antiquity* 27, no. 1 (2008): 163-201

class, the *plebs*. On the other hand, Mouritsen argues that instead of *plebs* composing the audience of a *contio*, the audience was in fact populated by 'higher class' citizens who had both the luxury of time to meander around and listen to a *contio* but more importantly had access to the education and resources to be able to properly understand the complicated orations that included details on law, politics, and history.<sup>43</sup> Further, each orator giving a *contio* would develop a cult persona surrounding them, a persona that members of the *patrician* class would be intrigued with following and perhaps even supporting.<sup>44</sup>

Both views agree, however, that the *contio* was an 'informal' oration given to inform an audience of an upcoming or ongoing event that should concern them, that is where the definitions diverge. Properly identifying the crowd composition of the *contio* allows for the historian to identify the reason behind holding the *contio* in the first place and thus provides a definition for the event. Was a *contio* held to inform, gather, and convince the *Populus Romanus* to act in a certain way? Or instead was it held to inform the elite of Roman society who could both act and follow the orators dialogue accordingly? These rhetorical questions not only serve to further our narrative but to also provide a definition for *contiones* for the purposes of this endeavor. My definition of the *contio* is thus: A *contio* of the late Roman Republic was given for the purpose of first increasing a pragmatic politician's political power and second to inform the people of

---

<sup>43</sup> Mouritsen, H. (2017). *Politics in the Roman Republic*. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.

<sup>44</sup> Lilly Ross Taylor in her highly influential book demonstrates how the concept of *clientela* impacted the development of politics in the late Roman Republic. So much that toward the end of the *respublica* factions of people formed called the *Optimates* ("Best Ones") and the *Populares* ("populates" or "popularists"). Taylor, Lilly Ross. *Party Politics in the Age of Caesar*. University of California Press, 1961.

Rome, that these *contios* were strategically placed and timed to perform a ritual ceremony that would appeal to the *plebians* who would weigh judgment on not the contents of the speech but rather on the perceived social status of the orator, while conversely the contents of the speech were targeted towards the *patrician* class who had the capacity to act.<sup>45</sup> The *patricians* would lead the way for the *plebeian* class to follow, who acting in accordance with the *mos maiorum* would comply.<sup>46</sup> A good orator at *contio* would garner the support of the *patrician* class while also subsequently stirring up the *plebs* through the use of ritualistic elements that centered around the preservation or protection of the *res publica*.

The *populus Romanus* translated from its native Latin to English reads as “The Roman People” and has a malleable definition when applied towards the rhetorical writings and *contiones* performed by Cicero from 63 BC up until his death in 43 BC. Historians have long labored over properly defining what was the *populus Romanus* and what power did the term hold within the late Roman Republic; academics such as Panagiotis Kontonasis states “Moreover, from Cicero's *contiones* one fairly concludes that the real master of the political life of the *res publica*, was *Populus* (the Roman

---

<sup>45</sup> The act of ritual during a *contio* can not be understated. There have been several academics from varying disciplines that have studied the ritualistic elements of the *contio*. Some of the most notable are Andrew Bell in his work “Cicero and the Spectacle of Power.” *The Journal of Roman Studies* 87 (1997):1-22. And Andrew Dyck in “Dressing to Kill: Attire as a Proof and Means of Characterization in Cicero's Speeches.” *Arethusa* 34, no. 1 (2001): 119-30.

<sup>46</sup> The *mos maiorum* loosely translates to “social norm” and held tantamount importance for the people of the late Roman Republic. It would be impossible to properly identify and provide a definition for exactly what the *mos maiorum* is, we just know that it was societal custom norm that provided a non-written down constitution and was distributed orally and through ritual, and that this grouping of social customs largely dictated political and family life during the late Roman Republic. For more information on this Karl-J. Hölkesskamp has an amazing book providing probably the best definition Hölkesskamp, K., & Heitmann-Gordon, H. (2010). *Reconstructing the Roman republic: An ancient political culture and modern research*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

people.)”<sup>47</sup> I argue that the power and definition of the *Populus* was malleable, a malleability that was used by political actors as a foil to springboard their political ambitions off of. To this end the definition of the *populus* would be properly defined by looking at the author who presents an argument to the *populus Romanus* in *contione* or engages with the *populus Romanus* through their writings.

To properly define such malleability would in turn seek to destroy proper definition of the term. Cicero presents the *populus Romanus* as many different things throughout his writings and *contiones*, any attempt to nail down a static definition would inherently prevent one from fully understanding the nuances of the term.<sup>48</sup> As such I will present an open ended definition that will change chronologically over the course of the late Roman Republic. In the beginning of Marcus Tullius Cicero’s political career the *populus Romanus* is utilized in rhetoric as an ambiguous foil to play proper Roman virtues off of.<sup>49</sup>

The *populus Romanus* cannot be defined by looking at the term itself but rather has to be defined by the power it had within its rhetorical use during the late Roman Republic. On occasion the term *populus Romanus* would be used within an oration to attempt to draw a semblance between the crowd and the orator, an occasion that Holkeskamp calls the “rhetoric of emphatic direct address.”<sup>50</sup> Other times the term

---

<sup>47</sup> Kontonasiotis, Panagiotes. "Cicero's Brutus: a History of Rhetoric or a History of Politics?" *Etc: a Review of General Semantics* 71, no. 3 (2014): 227-38.

<sup>48</sup> Other historians have mentioned this in their works. For an example please see Lacey, W. K. "Octavian in the Senate, January 27 B.C." *The Journal of Roman Studies* 64 (1974): 176-84.

<sup>49</sup> The best example of this use of moral foil *populus Romanus* can be seen in Cicero’s *In Verrem I-III* when Cicero utilizes the *populus Romanus* as a moral foil to demonstrate that the Sicilian Governor Verres failed to treat the Sicilians properly.

<sup>50</sup> Holkeskamp, Karl-J. "Friends, Romans, Countrymen: Addressing the Roman People and the Rhetoric of Inclusion." *Community and Communication*, 18, 2013

*populus Romanus* would be used in empathetic, sometimes condescending, way as such in Cicero's *De Lege Agraria* when Cicero strikes down Rullus's proposed agrarian law because it was not in the favor of the *Popularis*, when in fact it was in their favor.<sup>51</sup>

Therefore, we know a couple salient facts about the *populus Romanus*. First, the *populus Romanus* is malleable and changing through the eyes of Cicero. Cicero will wield the *populus Romanus* when it is convenient for him and oftentimes positions himself to be the sole interpreter of the will of the *populus Romanus*. Second, the term of the *populus Romanus* has political power inherently within its usage. Everything that Cicero speaks or writes about is for the good of the *res publica*, or the public affair. Third, the term of *populus Romanus* can be both negative and positive. Forth, that the composition of the *populus Romanus* is an abstract crowd that would've been composed of anyone who would interpret the authors (Cicero or the Latin writers) writings or be present during his *contios*. To provide a definition then would be the following: The *populus Romanus* is defined as a term that carries tremendous inherent political power during the late Roman Republic, that this term can be both negative and positive in demeanor and that the composition of the *populus Romanus*, or the people of Rome, was both abstract and pragmatic according to the ideas transmitted by the speaker and or writer.

### Conclusion to The Introduction

It is through Cicero's writings that we can peer into the nature and composition of the *populus Romanus* during the late Roman Republic. Within the *populus Romanus* of

---

<sup>51</sup> Cic. *Leg. agr.* 2.9

the late Roman Republic there is some degree of power to sway the events of the late Roman Republic. The keystone of the power question is the identity of the *populus Romanus*, an identity that I argue drastically expands over the course of the late Roman Republic.

This expansion of identity of the *populus Romanus* through the eyes of Cicero results in a lexical shift of the *populus Romanus* forming towards the end of the late Roman Republic. From Cicero's *Pro Lege Manillia* in 66 BC up through his *Post Reditum ad Quirites* in 57 BC the identity of the *populus Romanus* changed from meaning just the literal people of the city of Rome to encompassing all Romans under the Roman hegemonic system. This expansion of identity can be seen taking place between 66 to 57 BC through Cicero's use of the *populus Romanus* as a literary foil against his opposition. I am not arguing that the expansion of Roman territory and the expansion of the *populus Romanus* are not correlated, rather I am focusing upon the *populus Romanus* as an entity in of itself. Potential further research could build upon this paper to demonstrate a correlation.

For the people of the late Roman Republic this expansion of identity indicates that there was a societal change between the mid 60's BC and late 50's BC that resulted in an expansion of Roman identity across previously non-Roman people that lived outside the direct geographic influence of the city of Rome. Simply put, this research presents the argument that our contemporary understanding of the *populus Romanus*, and thus the late Roman republic, is flawed because academics fail to account for this expansion of the *populus Romanus*'s identity from just encompassing

the people of the city of Rome to a significantly larger and more abstract identity that in many ways marks an expansion of empire before the Empire.



## CHAPTER 2: CICERO AND THE *POPULUS ROMANUS* DURING THE LATE ROMAN REPUBLIC

### Cicero and the *populus Romanus*

Cicero was a politician, statesman, orator, lawyer, and political philosopher who lived from 106 BC to 43 BC. Having been born to a non-senatorial family Cicero would strive his entire life to enter into the upper echelon of Roman society. Having a *novus homo* or 'new man' to break into the senatorial elite in Republic Rome was a feat alone, however from an early age Cicero would demonstrate his ability as an outstanding orator and shrewd politician. As a result, in 63 BC Cicero would be elected to the office of *consul* the highest office in the Roman Republic.

One of Cicero's greatest talents was his ability to convince a crowd of people to take his point of view. This was important to the late Roman Republic because while the Senate could propose laws in theory the Roman people had the power to veto a law. This power of veto was held by the Tribune of the Plebs, an office open to the plebian class and created with the inherent power to veto both the Senate and Consul's proposals.

The plebians did not constitute the whole body of Cicero's *populus Romanus*. The *populus Romanus* within Cicero's work can be seen as the crowd that Cicero is interacting with to convince to take action in his favor. Depending upon the *contio* given Cicero's goal ranges from defeating proposed laws, praising other senatorial elite, or attempting to gather public support for defending the abstract concept of the *res publica*.

All of the following orations interact with the *populus Romanus* directly. Often we can place three parties in every one of Cicero's *contiones*. First is Cicero, who is attempting to convince the crowd, the *populus Romanus*, to take action. Here Cicero is orating to two parts of the *populus Romanus* at the same time, his direct audience and the indirect audience. The direct audience would be comprised of those who were present for his orations while his indirect audience would be comprised of those who would have either read his oration or heard about the details from a word of mouth network.<sup>52</sup> Second, is the 'other' that Cicero is orating against. This could be an individual such as Rullus in *De Lege Agraria* (63 BC) or a more abstract other such as a section of the Senate in Cicero's *Post Reditum ad Quirites* (57 BC). Third is the *populus Romanus* who Cicero is trying to convince to take action in his favor. Within this third party Cicero can be seen as combining both parts of the *populus Romanus* that I outline in the first party. At first Cicero only orates to the direct people of the city of Rome, however as time progresses we see that Cicero demonstrates that a more abstract identity begins to form across the *populus Romanus*.

### The Eight *Contiones* of Cicero

A majority of Cicero's *contiones* took place before his consular year of 63 B.C, and out of the fifty-eight mentioned *contiones* that Cicero gave we only have remnants of eight of them.<sup>53</sup> These speeches typically were given to inform the *populus Romanus*

---

<sup>52</sup> Several academics have looked into the inherent power of rumor and communication to sway voting power within the late Roman Republic. Laurence, Ray. "Rumour and Communication in Roman Politics." *Greece & Rome* 41, no. 1 (1994): 62–74.

<sup>53</sup> Gesine Manuwald. "The Speeches to the People in Cicero's Oratorical Corpora." *Rhetorica: A Journal of the History of Rhetoric* 30, no. 2 (2012): 153-75.

of upcoming events that deserve their attention but more than likely served to bolster the Orator's political image and political standing within the city. The eight surviving *contiones* given by Cicero date from 66 BC to shortly before his death in 43 BC and are titled in the following chronological list; *Pro Lege Manillia* (66 BC.), *De Lege Agraria* (II, 63 BC.), *De Lege Agraria* (III, 63 BC.), *In Catilinam* (II, 63 BC.), *In Catilinam* (III, 63 BC.), *Post Reditum ad Quirites* (57 BC.), *Philippic* (IV, 44 BC.), *Philippic* (VI, 43 BC.).<sup>54</sup>

Of these eight *contios* that we know were given before the *populus* I have chosen to focus on four. The reasoning for this is due to the consolidation of both *De Lege Agraria* and *In Catilinam* down into the primary oration given before the *populus* and dropping the *Philippics* due to narrative length constraints. In the case of *de Lege Agraria* the second oration provided the best example of Cicero's plea for the *populus* to vote against Rullus's proposal, while the third oration of *In Catilinam* was chosen due to its direct relation to the *populus*. As a result of the eight surviving orations that we know were given by Cicero in *contio* this article only focuses on the following list; *Pro Lege Manillia* (66 BC.), *De Lege Agraria* (63 BC.), *In Catilinam* (63 BC.), and *Post Reditum ad Quirites* (57 BC.). Each of these aforementioned *contios* were performed by Cicero in public to the *populus Romanus*.

Each of the aforementioned *contiones* will be organized in the following three part-manner. First, I will outline the background of both the *contiones* purpose and Cicero's political standing therein. Second, I will then provide an analysis of his usage of

---

<sup>54</sup> Gesine Manuwald. "The Speeches to the People in Cicero's Oratorical Corpora." *Rhetorica: A Journal of the History of Rhetoric* 30, no. 2 (2012): 153-75.

the *populus*. The third and final task will then be to demonstrate how his view of this *populus* shifts from his previous *contio*.

(I): The *Pro Lege Manilla*: Cicero's support of Pompey the Great (66 BC.)

One of the great scourges of late Republican era Rome was the king Mithridates VI Eupator, the ruler of the Hellenistic kingdom of Pontus in northern Anatolia.

Mithridates was an ambitious ruler who sought to wage a series of wars to lessen Roman influence and dominion of the Hellenistic states from 80 BC up until 63 BC. It is during the last war with the Kingdom of Pontus, called colloquially the Third Mithridatic War, that Cicero's oration takes place.

Four years earlier Cicero was honing his oratory skills as a prosecuting lawyer. His breakthrough moment in the courtroom came in the year 70 BC when he successfully convinced the Senate that the former Roman Governor of Sicily, Gaius Verres, was extorting the native Sicilian population; an action which paved the way for the rest of his career. It was then in the year 66 BC that Cicero would formally enter the political arena with his first public oration, the *Pro Lege Manilla*.

It is within this speech, delivered in *contio* before the *populus*, that he would justify to both a cautious Senate and a jubilant population why exactly sole-command of the Roman army against Mithridates VI should be given to Gnaeus Pompeius Magnus. The Senate of Rome was right to be wary of bestowing such command and honor onto the Roman General for in the previous year (67 BC) Pompey had been given Pro-

Consular naval power to fight against the pirate threat in the Mediterranean, a conflict that only took Pompey three months to end.<sup>55</sup>

Again a wary Senate would be looking to award Pro-Consular powers to the General, a general who had served under the Roman dictator Sulla in hispania from 76-71 BC fighting against pro-senatorial forces. The Senate was cautious to give such power to a man who just a decade earlier had sought to fight against Republican ideals. The successful actions of Pompey the Great would garnish him hordes of followers who supported the idea of giving power to the former Consul, and it was this populism that would put pressure on the senate to bestow sole-command against the Mithridates VI in the Third Mithridatic War.<sup>56</sup>

It is within this political quagmire that Cicero would emerge as a voice of reason among both the Senate and the *populus*. Giving his first public *contio* he voices his support for the proposal, put forth by the Roman Tribune Gais Manilus, to bestow Gnaeus Pompeius Magnus sole-command in the war against Mithridates.

First, what is Cicero attempting to do in this *contio*? He is voicing his support of the plebeian tribune Gaius Manilius's proposition of the *lex Manilia* which is giving support of the Roman military forces in Lucullus and Bithynia to Pompey to wage war against Mithridates.<sup>57</sup> According to Plutarch the *optimates* (Senate) was opposed to the

---

<sup>55</sup> Cassius Dio, *Roman History*, 36.23.4

<sup>56</sup> Cassius Dio writes about Pompey's acceptance of this populism support by stating that Pompey was "always in the habit of pretending as far as possible not to desire the things he really wished." Cassius Dio, *Roman History*, 36.24

<sup>57</sup> Jehne, Martin (2013). "Feeding the Plebs with Words: The Significance of Senatorial Public Oratory in The Small World of Roman Politics". In Steel, Catherine; Van der Blom, Henriëtte (eds.). *Community and Communication: Oratory and Politics in Republican Rome*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. pp. 53–58.

law but caved in due to massive support from the people, who loved Pompey due to his effective culling of the Pirates years before.<sup>58</sup>

Cicero voicing his support for the *lex Manilia* in *contio* would have therefore served two purposes for Cicero. First, he would be publicly demonstrating his support for the *lex Manilia*, to give sole command of Roman military forces on both the land and sea to Pompey. The *populus* present at Cicero's *contio* would have already been in favor of this decision according to accounts by both Cassius Dio and Plutarch.<sup>59</sup> Second, this oration serves as his first foray into Roman politics. Since the *populus* is in favor of the *lex Manilia* Cicero's *contio* can be seen as a safe entrance. By publicly siding with Pompey Cicero would be making a powerful ally as Pompey served as one of the two consoles for the year 70 BC and had a stunning career as a military commander with a total of two triumphs to his name.

Second, who is Cicero's oration against? In performing a *contio* he is orating against two key parties; the current *optimates* (Senate) within the city and the commanders that Pompey would seize military control from, namely Lucius Licinius Lucullus. From 73-66 BC Lucullus held military power in the east and was actively engaged in battle with the Mithridatic army. Although Lucullus was largely successful in his military endeavor he failed to capture any of the monarchs who opposed Roman hegemony in the area and was accused by both the *optimates* and *populus* of prolonging the war to obtain financial rewards and glory.<sup>60</sup> We know that Lucullus

---

<sup>58</sup> Plutarch, *Parallel Lives, Life of Pompey*, 30.1-5

<sup>59</sup> Cassius Dio, *Roman History*, 36.45

<sup>60</sup> Plutarch, *Parallel Lives, Life of Lucullus*, pp. 33-35

openly opposed Pompey taking control of his forces in the east because we have accounts of Lucullus calling Pompey a “vulture” implying that Pompey was feeding off the success of Lucullus.<sup>61</sup>

Lucullus was a member of the old *optimates* of the Social War (91-88 BC) where he distinguished himself at a young age as a daring and cunning commander under the leadership of Sulla.<sup>62</sup> We can see that by Cicero openly supporting Pompey taking command of virtually all Roman military forces he is actively supporting removing Lucullus from power in the east. This action would have directly pinned him against many of the old *optimates* from the dictatorship of Sulla, the same *optimates* who were afraid of Pompey assuming dictatorship powers if given sole command of the Roman military forces. Therefore, he is openly orating in *contio* against the Senate in favor of a bill that is vastly supported by the *populus*, the people of Rome who would also make up the crowd during the *contio*.

Cicero opens his oration with an introduction on why he has gathered the crowd before him today and demonstrating how he, like them, knows the true course of action. That the honor of giving sole command to the Roman forces must go to Pompey, that the *populus* has the power to bestow this power alone due to their foresight, and that nobody is a better fit for this “most important office” than Pompey.

Latin	English
quamquam mihi semper frequens conspectus vester multo iucundissimus, hic autem locus ad agendum amplissimus, ad dicendum ornatissimus es	Although, O Romans, your numerous assembly has always seemed to me the most agreeable body that any

<sup>61</sup> Greenhalgh, Peter A. *Pompey*. London U.a.: Weidenfeld and Nicolson U.a., 1980., p. 107

<sup>62</sup> Plut.*Luc*.2.1

t visus, Quirites, tamen hoc aditu laudis qui semper opti-  
mo cuique maxime patuit non mea me voluntas adhuc  
sed vitae meae rationes ab ineunte aetate susceptae pr-  
ohibuerunt. nam cum antea nondum huius auctoritatem  
loci attingere auderem statueremque nihil huc nisi perfe-  
ctum ingenio, elaboratum industria adferri oportere, om-  
ne meum tempus amicorum temporibus transmittendum  
putavi.<sup>63</sup>

one can address, and this place, which is most  
honourable to plead in, has also seemed always the  
most distinguished place for delivering an oration in, still  
I have been prevented from trying this road to glory,  
which has at all times been entirely open to every  
virtuous man, not indeed by my own will, but by the  
system of life which I have adopted from my earliest  
years. For as hitherto I have not dared, on account of  
my youth, to intrude upon the authority of this place,  
and as I considered that no arguments ought to be  
brought to this place except such as were the fruit of  
great ability, and worked up with the greatest industry, I  
have thought it fit to devote all my time to the  
necessities of my friends.<sup>64</sup>

By speaking this we can see that Cicero is connecting himself with the *populus* and stating they like him are wise for agreeing with the proposed law, and that he is one of the *populus*. This further becomes evident when he directly calls the *populus* “Quirites” or “Citizens.”<sup>65</sup> This opening serves as a way to connect the *populus* with the orator and enfranchise the *populus* within the Roman governance system.

We can see in the opening lines of the *Pro Lege Manilia* that Cicero’s views on the *populus* is pragmatic in nature, meaning that he needs their help to push through a law and support his cause. It is not until the we enter into the *Pro Lege Manilla* 4.1 that he begins to demonstrate how Lucullus has idled for far too long and that because of that the Roman people and their allies suffer.<sup>66</sup>

---

<sup>63</sup> M. Tullius Cicero. M. Tulli Ciceronis Orationes: Recognovit brevique adnotatione critica instruxit Albertus Curtius Clark Collegii Reginae Socius. Albert Curtis Clark. Oxonii. e Typographeo Clarendoniano. 1908. Scriptorum Classicorum Bibliotheca Oxoniensis. *Pro Lege Manilia*, 1.1-1.2

<sup>64</sup> M. Tullius Cicero. *The Orations of Marcus Tullius Cicero*, literally translated by C. D. Yonge, B. A. London. Henry G. Bohn, York Street, Covent Garden. 1856. *Pro Lege Manilla*, 1.1-1.2

<sup>65</sup> Cicero, *Pro Lege Manilla*, 1.1, 2.1-2.5.

<sup>66</sup> Cicero, *Pro Lege Manilla*, 4.1-8.1.



Latin	English
<p>Mithridates autem omne reliquum tempus non ad oblivio nem veteris belli sed ad comparationem novi contulit. q ui postea, cum maximas aedificasset ornassetque class is exercitusque permagnos quibuscumque ex gentibus potuisset comparasset et se Bosphoranis, finitimis suis, bellum inferre simularet, usque in Hispaniam legatos ac litteras misit ad eos duces quibuscum tum bellum gereb amus, ut, cum duobus in locis disiunctissimis maximequ e diversis uno consilio a binis hostium copiis bellum terr a marique gereretur, vos ancipiti contentione districti de imperio dimicaretis. sed tamen alterius partis periculu m, Sertorianae atque Hispaniensis, quae multo plus firm amenti ac roboris habebat, Cn. Pompei divino consilio a c singulari virtute depulsum est; in altera parte ita res ab L. Lucullo, summo viro, est administrata ut initia illa rer um gestarum magna atque praeclara non felicitati eius s ed virtuti, haec autem extrema quae nuper acciderunt n on culpa sed fortunae tribuenda esse videantur. sed d e Lucullo dicam alio loco, et ita dicam, Quirites, ut nequ e vera laus ei detracta oratione mea neque falsa adficta esse videatur; de vestri imperi dignitate atque gloria, quoniam is est ex orsus orationis meae, videte quem vobis animum suscip iendum putetis.<sup>67</sup></p>	<p>But Mithridates employed all the time which he had left to him, not in forgetting the old war, but in preparing for a new one; and, after he had built and equipped very large fleets, and had got together mighty armies from every nation he could, and had pretended to be preparing war against the tribes of the Bosphorus, his neighbours, sent ambassadors and letters as far as Spain to those chiefs with whom we were at war at the time, in order that, as you would by that means have war waged against you in the two parts of the world the furthest separated and most remote of all from one another, by two separate enemies warring against you with one uniform plan, you, hampered by the double enmity, might find that you were fighting for the empire itself. However; the danger on one side, the danger from Sertorius and from Spain, which had much the most solid foundation and the most formidable strength, was warded off by the divine wisdom and extraordinary valour of Cnaeus Pompeius. And on the other side of the empire, affairs were so managed by Lucilius Lucullus, that most illustrious of men, that the beginning, of all those achievements in those countries, great and eminent as they were, deserve to be attributed not to his good fortune but to his valour; but the latter events which have taken place lately, ought to be imputed not to his fault, but to his ill-fortune. However, of Lucullus I will speak hereafter, and I will speak, O Romans, in such a manner, that his true glory shall not appear to be at all disparaged by my pleading, nor, on the other hand, shall any undeserved credit seem to be given to him. At present, when we are speaking of the dignity and glory of your empire, since that is the beginning of my oration, consider what feelings you think you ought to entertain.<sup>68</sup></p>

This statement that the *populus* should be angry over how the war in the east has progressed is interesting. By stating “At present, when we are speaking of the dignity and glory of your empire, since that is the beginning of my oration, consider what feelings you think you ought to entertain” Cicero directly demonstrates that even though the Roman allies are losing their land and wealth to war the *populus* is attached to the

<sup>67</sup> M. Tullius Cicero. M. Tulli Ciceronis Orationes: Recognovit brevique adnotatione critica instruxit Albertus Curtis Clark Collegii Reginae Socius. Albert Curtis Clark. Oxonii. e Typographeo Clarendoniano. 1908. Scriptorum Classicorum Bibliotheca Oxoniensis. *Pro Lege Manilia*, 1.1-1.2.

<sup>68</sup> M. Tullius Cicero. The Orations of Marcus Tullius Cicero, literally translated by C. D. Yonge, B. A. London. Henry G. Bohn, York Street, Covent Garden. 1856. *Pro Lege Manilia*, 1.1-1.2.

allies' loss through their glory and dignity. It is in this instance that we can see that he draws a demarcation between the Roman people in the city and the allies in the east. At this point the definition of the *populus Romanus*, and the Roman allies in the far east whose "interests" and "public health" directly impact the people of Rome, or the *populus Romanus*, are completely separate.<sup>69</sup> This is interesting because although Cicero states that the fate of the eastern allies are connected he clearly demonstrates they are different from the *populus Romanus*. We can see here the beginning of a creation of a Roman expanded identity. However, as we will see this concept is still in its infancy and serves a pragmatic purpose for Cicero to convince the *populus* to care about the proposed *Lex Manilia*.<sup>70</sup>

From *Pro Lege Manilia* 9.1 up through 10.1 Cicero condemns the length of the war and demonstrates how logistically it would be better to have one commander in control of the entire military than to have several commanders in charge of their respective provinces.<sup>71</sup> In the first stanza of *Pro Lege Manilla* 5.1 however he directs his attention again at the *populus* demonstrating how their forefathers have recognized the importance of fighting to help their allies and secure their future.

Latin	English
<p>Maiores nostri saepe pro mercatoribus aut naviculariis nostris iniuriosius tractatis bella gesserunt; vos tot milibus civium Romanorum uno nuntio atque uno tempore necatis quo tandem animo esse debetis? Legati quod erant appellati superbius, Corinthum patres vestri totius Graeciae lumen extinctum esse voluerunt; vos eum regem inultum esse patiemini qui legatum</p>	<p>Your ancestors have often waged war on account of their merchants and seafaring men having been injuriously treated. What ought to be your feelings when so many thousand Roman citizens have been put to death by one order and at one time? Because their</p>

<sup>69</sup> Cicero, *Pro Lege Manilia*, 6.7-7.1.

<sup>70</sup> In Edward Cohen's praised *The Athenian Nation* the funeral orations of Athenian's were a way to connect the attika to the city. Here we see something similar but with a *contio* connecting the *populus* to the allies in the east. Cohen, Edward E. 2000. *Athenian Nation*. Princeton University Press.

<sup>71</sup> Cicero, *Pro Lege Manilia*, 9.1-10.1.

populi Romani consularem vinculis ac verberibus atque omni supplicio excruciatum necavit? Illi libertatem imminutam civium Romanorum non tulerunt; vos ereptam vitam neglegetis? Ius legationis verbo violatum illi persecuti sunt; vos legatum omni supplicio interfectum relinquetis? Videte ne, ut illis pulcherrimum fuit tantam vobis imperi gloriam tradere, sic vobis turpissimum sit id quod accepistis tueri et conservare non posse.<sup>72</sup>

ambassadors had been spoken to with insolence, your ancestors determined that Corinth, the light of all Greece, should be destroyed. Will you allow that king to remain unpunished, who has murdered a lieutenant of the Roman people of consular rank, having tortured him with chains and scourging, and every sort of punishment? They would not allow the freedom of Roman citizens to be diminished; will you be indifferent to their lives being taken? They avenged the privileges of our embassy when they were violated by a word; will you abandon an ambassador who has been put to death with every sort of cruelty? Take care lest, as it was a most glorious thing for them, to leave you such wide renown and such a powerful empire, it should be a most discreditable thing for you, not to be able to defend and preserve that which you have received. What more shall I say? Shall I say, that the safety of our allies is involved in the greatest hazard and danger? King Ariobarzanes has been driven from his kingdom, an ally and friend of the Roman people; two kings are threatening all Asia, who are not only most hostile to you, but also to your friends and allies. And every city throughout all Asia, and throughout all Greece, is compelled by the magnitude of the danger to put its whole trust in the expectation of your assistance. They do not dare to beg of you any particular general, especially since you have sent them another, nor do they think that they can do this without extreme danger.<sup>73</sup>

Cicero upon turning back to the *populus* states “Because their ambassadors had been spoken to with insolence, your ancestors determined that Corinth, the light of all Greece, should be destroyed. Will you allow that king to remain unpunished, who has murdered a lieutenant of the Roman people of consular rank, having tortured him with chains and scourging, and every sort of punishment?” demonstrating that the *populus*

---

<sup>72</sup> M. Tullius Cicero. M. Tulli Ciceronis Orationes: Recognovit brevique adnotatione critica instruxit Albertus Curtis Clark Collegii Reginae Socius. Albert Curtis Clark. Oxonii. e Typographeo Clarendoniano. 1908. Scriptorum Classicorum Bibliotheca Oxoniensis. *Pro Lege Manilia*, 5.1-6.1

<sup>73</sup> M. Tullius Cicero. The Orations of Marcus Tullius Cicero, literally translated by C. D. Yonge, B. A. London. Henry G. Bohn, York Street, Covent Garden. 1856. *Pro Lege Manilia*, 5.1-6.1

owes it to their ancestors to work towards protecting Roman interests. That in order to secure the future of the Roman people the *populus* must give sole command of the Roman military to Pompey just as their ancestors have done in the past.<sup>74</sup>

Cicero in his next statement (12.5-13.1) drives further how the *populus* is connected to Rome's allies in the east, and how these allies' plight is the same as the *populus*.

Latin	English
<p>Quid? quod salus sociorum summum in periculum ac discrimen vocatur, quo id tandem animo ferre debetis? Regno est expulsus Ariobarzanes rex, socius populi Romani atque amicus; imminent duo reges toti Asiae non solum vobis inimicissimi sed etiam vestris sociis atque amicis; civitates autem omnes cuncta Asia atque Graecia vestrum auxilium expectare propter periculi magnitudinem coguntur; imperatorem a vobis certum deprecari, cum praesertim vos alium miseritis, neque audent neque id se facere sine summo periculo posse arbitrantur.<sup>75</sup></p>	<p>King Ariobarzanes has been driven from his kingdom, an ally and friend of the Roman people; two kings are threatening all Asia, who are not only most hostile to you, but also to your friends and allies. And every city throughout all Asia, and throughout all Greece, is compelled by the magnitude of the danger to put its whole trust in the expectation of your assistance. They do not dare to beg of you any particular general, especially since you have sent them another, nor do they think that they can do this without extreme danger.<sup>76</sup></p>

In the above passage Cicero is directly appealing to the *populus* as to why they should feel connected and worry about Rome's eastern allies. That the current commander of the Third Mithridatic War, Lucullus, was failing in his responsibility to protect both the *populus* and her allies. That only by electing Pompey could the *populus* be confident that the conflict in the east could be concluded.

<sup>74</sup> We can see how Cicero wields history when referring to how the *populus Romanus* "unpunished the king of Consular rank."

<sup>75</sup> M. Tullius Cicero. M. Tulli Ciceronis Orationes: Recognovit brevique adnotatione critica instruxit Albertus Curtius Clark Collegii Reginae Socius. Albert Curtis Clark. Oxonii. e Typographeo Clarendoniano. 1908. Scriptorum Classicorum Bibliotheca Oxoniensis. *Pro Lege Manilia*, 6.1-6.3

<sup>76</sup> M. Tullius Cicero. The Orations of Marcus Tullius Cicero, literally translated by C. D. Yonge, B. A. London. Henry G. Bohn, York Street, Covent Garden. 1856. *Pro Lege Manilia*, 6.1-6.3

From *Pro Lege Manilia* 13.1 to 16.7 Cicero goes into detail on how the *populus* will gain not only in prestige but also financially from a quick victory under the command of Pompey. Starting in 16.7 he concludes this statement by stating “Do you to be able to enjoy these advantages unless you preserve those from whom you derive are commandments, you will not only enjoy, as I said before, from calamity, but also fear of disaster?”<sup>77</sup> Indicating that not only will the *populus* benefit materialistically from Pompey’s swift ending of the war but also they will be protected from conflict enveloping them and their allies. At this point it is clear that he makes a clear distinction between the *populus Romanus* and the Roman allies in the east.

This is evident by Cicero using the roman virtues of *Honestas* and *Pietas* to convince the *populus Romanus* to side with his cause of electing Pompey. Countless times throughout the speech Cicero can be seen comparing his modern *populus* to their ancestors. However, Cicero within his oration makes it clear that the *populus Romanus* has a different identity from Rome's allies.

In *Pro Lege Manilia* 17.1 up through 19.1 Cicero goes into detail how the fortunes of those who go to war are spread about the entirety of the *res publica* and that by supporting Pompey they too will share in his spoils in lands far away from the city.<sup>78</sup> In the last sentence of the 19th section of the *Pro Lege Manilia* he drives home how the *populus* should feel connected to their allies far away, allies that will suffer under the unchecked terror of Mithridatias.

---

<sup>77</sup> Cicero, *Pro Lege Manilia*, 16.7-17.0.

<sup>78</sup> Cicero, *Pro Lege Manilia*, 17.1-19.1.

Latin	English
<p>Qua re videte num dubitandum vobis sit  omni studio ad id bellum incumbere in quo gloria  nominis  vestri, salus sociorum, vectigalia maxima, fortunae  plurimorum civium coniunctae cum re publica  defendantur.<sup>79</sup></p>	<p>Consider, then, whether you ought to hesitate to apply  yourselves with all zeal to that war, in which the glory of  your name, the safety of your allies, your greatest  revenues, and the fortunes of numbers of your citizens,  will be protected at the same time as the republic.<sup>80</sup></p>

Here we can begin to see a formation of an expanded identity across the *populus Romanus* within Cicero's rhetoric. With the *Pro Lege Manilia* he is giving a *contio* before the *populus*. A public oration where he is directly connecting the people of the city of Rome with the city's allies in the far east. Edward Cohen's much praised work *The Athenian Nation* asks the question of whether or not we can call Athens a nation because of the funeral orations that connect the city to the countryside, can we not apply the same methodology here? Substituting the Roman *contio* in place of the Athenian funeral oration? These rhetorical questions serve to further this discussion; it is through the eyes of Cicero that we start to see the *populus* take a more abstract definition. Within the confines of the *Pro Lege Manilia* the *populus* is still clearly defined as a separate entity from those not present within the ancient city of Rome (as evidenced by the above 19.13-19.15 section of the *Pro Lege Manilia*), but we can start to see how he recognizes that his version of the *populus* shares some connections with the entirety of the Republic; that the *populus* is Roman, and that the allies, to some degree, are Roman as well.

<sup>79</sup> M. Tullius Cicero. M. Tulli Ciceronis Orationes: Recognovit brevique adnotatione critica instruxit Albertus Curtius Clark Collegii Reginae Socius. Albert Curtis Clark. Oxonii. e Typographeo Clarendoniano. 1908. Scriptorum Classicorum Bibliotheca Oxoniensis. *Pro Lege Manilia*, 17.1-19.1

<sup>80</sup> M. Tullius Cicero. The Orations of Marcus Tullius Cicero, literally translated by C. D. Yonge, B. A. London. Henry G. Bohn, York Street, Covent Garden. 1856. *Pro Lege Manilia*, 17.1-19.1

From 19.15 up through the end of the *Pro Lege Manilia* Cicero first shifted his attention to the current commander of Roman forces in the east, Lucullus. Cicero here walks a tight line between avoiding offending Lucullus and providing support for Pompey to seize power over all Roman forces. He states that Lucullus is a masterful tactician and commander but needs to give power to Pompey who has a proven record of bringing a swift end to conflicts.<sup>81</sup>

The *Pro Lege Manilia* fits into this thesis by demonstrating that during the year of 66 B.C the *populus Romanus* had not obtained an expanded identity yet as evidenced by Cicero's rhetoric. Examples of this can be seen in Cicero stating "For he of whom the glory of the Roman people is at stake, which you from your ancestors in all matters, but also in military affairs, with a large delivered to the safety of our friends and our allies." While Cicero is laying out the framework for an expanded identity of the *populus Romanus* he is making a clear distinction between the *populus Romanus* and the eastern allies. Simply put, the *Pro Lege Manila* gives this thesis a bedrock from which to start building the expanded identity of the *populus Romanus* as seen through Cicero's orations.

The point that readers should take from this oration is that in 66 B.C the *populus Romanus* had not achieved an expanded identity yet. It still comprised only of the people of the city or Rome during the year of 66 B.C. In 66 B.C Cicero's oration demonstrates a clear distinction between the identity of the *populus Romanus* and those outside the confines of the city of Rome itself.

---

<sup>81</sup> Cicero, *Pro Lege Manila*, 19.15-51.1

We can see in the *Pro Lege Manilia* that Cicero positions the *populus* as a separate entity to the rest of the Roman citizens and allies in the outlying provinces. That Cicero demonstrates that his *populus* at this point are just the members of his crowd attending the *contio*; the direct people of the city of Rome. As we will come to see this differs drastically from Cicero's later orations where he presents the identity of the *populus Romanus* as far more abstract in both geographical location and member count.

(II): The *De Lege Agraria*: Cicero's stance against the Tribune Rullus (63 BC.)

It would be three years after Cicero's successful speech, the *Pro Lege Manilia*, that once again Cicero would return to publicly speak on a topic that concerns the *populus*. This time however Cicero would speak against the proposed legislation put forth by the Tribune of the people, Rullus.

Rullus in 63 B.C was serving as the tribune of the Roman people. A position that served to represent the plebians within the *populus Romanus* and provide a check on the Roman Senate. Over the course of the Roman Republic one of the most common ailments for the average Roman in the city of Rome was the disparity in wealth between the patrician class and the publicani class.<sup>82</sup>

---

<sup>82</sup> This conflict between the Patricians and the Publicani classes can be traced back to shortly after the founding of the eternal city. From 500 BC up until the early 2nd century BC these classes would constantly bicker and fight over the concept of political equality. This is called the Conflict of the Orders.



This difference in wealth took the form of arable land surrounding the city of Rome. Rullus's Agrarian bill had the ultimate goal of redistributing land to 5,000 Roman colonists initially with several other lots of land being redistributed over time. These lands were currently being held in the public trust and as such were, in theory, available to be redistributed across the public.<sup>83</sup> In order to do this Rullus proposed electing a ten-man commission that would oversee the whole distribution process.

To be clear this would have most certainly benefited the *populus* by giving them access to land which they could then generate wealth from. It was not hard for Rullus to initially gain a large amount of support for his proposed agrarian reform bill. This would have undoubtedly not only made Rullus a very popular man in 63 BC but also placed a target upon him. Rullus was standing up to the Patrician Class, the Senate of Rome, who had in theory could justify the use of the public land of Rome. Whether or not Rullus knew this would happen historians do not know, all history has left us is the response Cicero has towards this bill.

Cicero's stood firmly in opposition to Rullus's proposed agrarian reform bill. Now a member of the Senate Cicero would be tasked with destroying support for this dangerous bill. In 63 BC Cicero was elected to one of the highest offices in Republican Rome, the office of consul. Cicero, a *novus homo* or new man, to the Senate class, was elected because he had support from the people as well as the several prominent members of the Senate who feared reform. Cicero was seen as a traditional man who would protect the members of the senate.

---

<sup>83</sup> Sumner, G. V. "Cicero, Pompeius, and Rullus." *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 97 (1966): 569-82.

This is why Cicero in the year 63 BC attacked Rullus. In order to save his political career, he had to take a stand against a land redistribution bill that would support the *populus*. Over the course of the speech Cicero successfully managed to convert the *populus Romanus* to his side, to vote against the very bill that would have given them more political and economic power within Republic Rome.

It is within the *De Lege Agraria* that Cicero demonstrates how effectively he can manipulate and control the crowd through oratory. At first, as we shall see, Cicero portrays Publius Servilius Rullus as a false savior for the *populus*. Cicero points out that Rullus has little experience in the way of politics and that he has been bought out by corrupt men who would seek to control the proposed ten-man redistribution commission. The goal of Rullus, according to Cicero, was not to redistribute land across the *populus* but was to funnel it to a select group of shadowy figures that would lord over the land for themselves.<sup>84</sup>

At the end Cicero manages to convince the *populus* to vote against Rullus's agrarian reform bill. The *De Lege Agraria* is a unique text as it directly shows Cicero orating against a *popularis* politician and convincing the *populus* that his stance on the bill was better.

First, what is Cicero attempting to do by performing this *contio*? Well on the surface he is attempting to stop Rullus's land reform bill from going through. This is rather obvious, but is important to note. This is because Cicero is establishing himself

---

<sup>84</sup> Ibid.

firmly on the side of the optimates, who had just supported his election to the highest political office in the Republic, the office of consul.

In theory, this is the only reason that Cicero is orating against such a popular *popularis* politician, to protect the power of those who had elected him to power. However, there is a subtler second reason why Cicero would go directly against Rullus in *contio*. This reason is to establish himself again as a man of the people, as a *popularis* himself.

How does Cicero do this if he is directly trying to take away power from the *populus*? The answer is in Cicero's subtle way of portraying Rullus as secretly trying to hurt the *populus* by electing a commission of ten people to redistribute the land. Cicero firmly positions himself as a man of the people who is in defense of the Republic; a theme that Cicero repeatedly relies upon. This was done so effectively that Cicero not only completely discredited Rullus, a Tribune of the people, but also achieved at the same time a solidification of his power within the Senate. Effectively winning the oratory battle without upsetting either side, except of course Rullus.

Second, who is Cicero's oration against? The answer is rather straightforward, Cicero is speaking against Rullus and whomever would support the bill. As such the goal of Cicero here is to fragment the *populus* into two groups. Those who support Rullus and his proposition, and the group that Cicero can convert to supporting himself and the Senate.

Here lies the secret to Cicero's success in the *De Lege Agraria*. It is the fragmentation of the *populus* into two different groups, the pro Rullus and the pro

Cicero. For Cicero this would prove to be an easy task as Rullus was new to the politics of Rome.

As patient readers will notice, in order for Cicero to convince a portion of the *populus Romanus* to vote against a bill that would benefit them most he must present Rullus and his followers amongst the *populus Romanus* as un-Roman. To do this effectively Cicero builds upon the expanded *populus Romanus* identity he began to create in his *Pro Lege Manilia* nearly 6 years before. As a result of this we can begin to see a more defined version of an expanded identity across the *populus Romanus* forming during the Cicero's *contio* on *De Lege Agraria*.

The *De Lege Agraria* fits into this thesis by highlighting how Cicero's expanded identity of the *populus Romanus* begins to mature during the year of 66 B.C. Readers will note that within this following oration Cicero pulls in the surrounding Italians and Sicilians into the fold of the *populus Romanus* through the use of a moral foil. This directly demonstrates an expanded identity forming which at this point constitutes people living in the city of Rome, Sicilians, and Italians all bound together through the Roman value of private land ownership.

In the opening paragraphs of Cicero's *De Lege Agraria* Cicero positions himself as the true defender of the people against enemies of the *res publica*.

Latin	English
<p>Commodius fecissent tribuni plebis, Quirites, si, quae apud vos de me deferunt, ea coram potius me praesente dixissent; nam et aequitatem vestrae disceptationis et consuetudinem superiorum et ius suae potestatis retinissent. Sed quoniam adhuc praesens certamen contentionemque fugerunt, nunc, si videtur eis, in meam contionem prodeant et, quo provocati a me venire noluerunt, revocati saltem</p>	<p>The tribunes of the people, O Romans, would have pursued a more convenient course, if they had said to my face, in my presence, the things which they allege to you concerning me. For then, they would have given you an opportunity for a more just decision in the matter, and they would have followed the usages of their predecessors, and have maintained their own privileges and power. But, since they have shunned any open</p>

<p>revertantur. Video quosdam, Quirites, strepitu significare nescio quid et non eosdem voltus quos proxima mea contione praebuerunt in hanc contionem mihi rettulisse.<sup>85</sup></p>	<p>contest and debate with me at present, now, if they please, let them come forth into the assembly which I have convened, and though they would not come forward willingly when challenged by me, let them at least return to it now that I openly invite them back. I see, O Romans, that some men are making a noise to imply something or other, and that they no longer show me the same countenance in this present assembly which they showed me at the last assembly in which I addressed you.<sup>86</sup></p>
--	--

Cicero immediately opens up by claiming that those who want this bill to go through will not publicly show support for the proposed agrarian reform. This immediately demonstrates how Cicero is attempting to drive a wedge through the *populus* and convert a select portion over to his side by demonstrating how those who would want the bill to be passed have not come forth to confront him.

The reason for this tactical move is to position Cicero as a defender of the interests of the *populus* and at the same time discredit those who he is orating against, namely the elected council of ten people who would distribute the land in the proposed law and Rullus, who unfortunately had to defend the *De Lege Agraria* against Cicero.

This is a smart move for Cicero as in the next passage Cicero states that true Romans of the city of Rome would not support this bill.

Latin	English
<p>Si ostendo non modo non adimi cuiquam glebam de Sullanis agris, sed etiam genus id agrorum certo capite legis impudentissime confirmari atque sanciri, si doceo agris eis qui a Sulla sunt dati sic diligenter Rullum sua lege consulere ut facile appareat eam legem non a vestrorum commodorum patrono, sed a Valgi genero esse</p>	<p>Your minds and ears, O Romans, are blocked up with the assertion that I am opposing the agrarian law and your interest, out of a desire to gratify the seven tyrants, and the other possessors of Sulla's allotments. If there be any men who have believed these things, they must inevitably first have believed this, that by this agrarian law which has been proposed, the lands allotted by</p>

<sup>85</sup> M. Tullius Cicero. M. Tulli Ciceronis Orationes: Recognovit brevique adnotatione critica instruxit Albertus Curtius Clark. *Lege Agraria*, 3.1-3.23.

<sup>86</sup> M. Tullius Cicero. The Orationes of Marcus Tullius Cicero, literally translated by C. D. Yonge, B. A. London. Henry G. Bohn, York Street, Covent Garden. 1856. 3.1-3.23.

conscriptam, num quid est causae, Quirites, quin illa criminatione qua in me absentem usus est non solum meam sed etiam vestram diligentiam prudentiamque despexerit?<sup>87</sup>

Sulla are taken away from their present possessors and divided among you, or else, that the possessions of private individuals are diminished, in order that you may be settled on their lands. If I show you, not only that not an atom of laud of Sulla's allotments is taken from any one, but even that that description of property is ensured to its possessors, and confirmed in a most impudent manner; if I prove, that Rullus, by his law, provides so carefully for the case of those lands which have been allotted by Sulla, that it is perfectly plain that that law was drawn up, not by any protector of your interests, but by the twin law of Valgius; is there then any reason at all, why he should disparage not only my diligence and prudence, but yours also, by the accusations which he has employed against me in my absence?<sup>88</sup>

Notice how Cicero openly credits the party of Sulla when discussing how the public lands have already been appropriately rewarded. This serves two purposes; First, the party of Sulla was seen as the optimates or the Senate. Second, Sulla was a brutal dictator who removed the power of the *populus* to veto a law.

Once Sulla died in 78 B.C the surviving members of the Senate began to remove all traces of the dictator's changes. This included returning power to the *populus* by reincarnating the office of the Tribune. Sulla seized land for himself and his supporters. With the decline of Sulla's power came the decline of his supporters and as such the land was "redistributed" away from the Sullan party. Naturally this land was returned to the rightful owners, the Senatorial party.

As such, when Cicero states that Rullus wanted to "redistribute" the land again away from the enemies of Sulla he clearly draws upon the delineation he successfully created amongst the *populus*. Succinctly explained, Cicero successfully makes the *populus* think that Rullus's main goal is to redistribute land again away from the current

---

<sup>87</sup> Cicero, *De Lege Agraria*, 3.1.3-3.1.4

<sup>88</sup> M. Tullius Cicero. The Orations of Marcus Tullius Cicero, literally translated by C. D. Yonge, *de Lege Agraria*, 3.1.3-3.1.4

holders to his benefactors. That Rullus is lying that the land will go to the *populus*, and that instead they will be worse off if Rullus's *Lege Agraria* is passed. Cicero positions himself as the defender of the *populus* and the *res publica*.

Finally, when analyzing this segment of text another instance jumps out. Cicero speaks "but that it was written by the son-in-law of Valgus" indicating that Rullus was influenced by outside Gallic interests when pursuing this law.<sup>89</sup> This is very interesting as here we can see Cicero clearly creating a delineation between the *populus* and those of Gallic descent.

The reason behind this delineation is rather interesting as the inhabitants of Gaul at this time were not subjugated by the Roman Republic. Indeed, it would be five years later in 58 B.C Julius Caesar would begin his iconic campaign against the Gauls. At the time however, during Cicero's 63 B.C speech against Rullus, the Gauls were seen as the enemy of both the *populus* and *res publica*. As such, Cicero is drawing a clear distinction between the *populus* and those not under Roman cultural hegemony.<sup>90</sup>

It is within the final passage of the *de Lege Agraria* that Cicero truly drives home how the *populus* should feel connected and united against the proposed law of Rullus.

Latin	English
<p>Et quoniam qua de causa et quorum causa ille hoc promulgarit ostendi, doceat ipse nunc ego quem possessorem defendam, cum agrariae legi resisto. Silvam Scantiam vendis; populus possidet; defendo. Campanum agrum dividis; vos estis in possessione; non cedo. Deinde Italiae, Siciliae ceterarumque provinciarum possessiones venalis ac proscripitas hac lege video; vestra sunt praedia, vestrae possessiones; resistam atque repugnabo neque patiar a quoquam</p>	<p>And since I have shown for what reason and for whose sake he has proposed this, let him show whether I am defending any particular proprietor, while I resist this agrarian law. You are selling the Scantian wood. The Roman people is in possession of it. I am defending the Roman people. You are dividing the district of Campania. It is you, O Romans, who are now its proprietors. I will not give it up. In the next place, I see possessions in Italy and in Sicily, and in the other</p>

<sup>89</sup> Cicero, *De Lege Agraria*, 3.14.0

<sup>90</sup> For the theory of cultural hegemony see Gramsci, Antonio, Quintin Hoare, and Geoffrey Nowell-Smith. *Selections from the Prison Notebooks of Antonio Gramsci*. New York: International Publishers, 1972.

populum Romanum de suis possessionibus me consule demoveri, praesertim, Quirites, cum vobis nihil quaeratur. Hoc enim vos in errore versari diutius non oportet. Num quis vestrum ad vim, ad facinus, ad caedem accommodatus est? Nemo. Atqui ei generi hominum, mihi credite, Campanus ager et praeclara illa Capua servatur; exercitus contra vos, contra libertatem vestram, contra Cn. Pompeium constituitur; contra hanc urbem Capua, contra vos manus hominum audacissimorum, contra Cn. Pompeium duces comparantur. Veniant et coram, quoniam me in vestram contionem vobis flagitantibus evocaverunt, disserant.<sup>91</sup>

provinces, put up for sale and advertised. The farms are yours, the possessions are yours, O Romans. I will resist and oppose such a measure; and I will not permit the Roman people to be ousted from its possessions by any one, while I am consul. Especially when no advantage is sought for you by the proceeding. [16] For you ought no longer to lie under this mistake. Is any one of you a man inclined to violence, or atrocity, or murder? Not one. And, believe me, it is for such a race of men as that that the district of Campania and that beautiful Capua is reserved. It is against you, against your liberty, against Cnaeus Pompeius that an army is being raised. Capua is being got ready in opposition to this city; bands of audacious men are being equipped against you; ten generals are being appointed to counterbalance Cnaeus Pompeius. Let them meet me face to face, and since they have summoned me to this assembly of yours, at your request let them here argue the case with me.<sup>92</sup>

Cicero in this passage is demonstrating why the *populus* should worry about their fellow Romans. That the proposed land redistribution bill that Rullus has proposed will hurt all other people under Roman control. We can clearly see this when Cicero states “Then see the possessions of Italy, Sicily, and other provinces for sale and advertised under this law.”<sup>93</sup>

Within the above passage Cicero presents the Sicilians, Italians, and other provinces as being impacted by the decisions of the *populus Romanus*. This is important because Cicero presents the *populus Romanus* as being connected to the people of Italy and Sicily through the economic results of them voting for Rullus's proposed agrarian reform law. Here we can see the evolution of the identity of the

<sup>91</sup>Cicero, M. Tulli Ciceronis Orationes: Recognovit brevique adnotatione critica instruxit Albertus Curtis Clark. *De Lege Agraria*, 3.15.0-3.16.0

<sup>92</sup> M. Tullius Cicero. The Orations of Marcus Tullius Cicero, literally translated by C. D. Yonge, *Agraria*, 3.15-3.16

<sup>93</sup> Ibid. The translation for this passage reads “Then, of Italy, of Sicily and of the other provinces are for sale and advertised by this law.”



*populus Romanus* from just the people of the city of Rome to becoming something significantly larger that begins to encompass the Italians and Sicilians.

The *de Lege Agraria* is an important look into how Cicero positions the *populus* to vote directly against a law that would benefit them. Cicero skillfully positions the *populus* to worry about not only their own economic interests but the economic interests of those whose land would be repurposed; in Cicero's eyes the Italians and Sicilians.

At this point we can clearly see that an abstract identity of the *populus* is starting to form. No longer is the *populus* just the inhabitants of the city of Rome but now the *populus*'s identity comprises those of the outlying countryside. It is unclear if that during this oration the crowd at Cicero's orations, the *populus Romanus*, was physically composed of Italians and Sicilians. What we do know without a doubt was that Rullus's proposed Agrarian Reform was struck down by both Cicero and the *populus*. An action which belies the fact that Cicero successfully managed to convince the *populus* that Rullus was not acting in their best interests and that they should be worried about the land that was being repurposed. Succinctly put, Cicero managed to convince the *populus* in 63 B.C that Rullus's bill would hurt not only them, but their fellow countrymen the Italians and Sicilians.

### (III): Catilinam Oratio Secunda Habita ad Populum: Second Catilinarian Conspiracy (63 BC.)

In the year 63 B.C, just after Cicero's stance against Rullus's *Agrarian* bill, Cicero would uncover a terrible plot to overthrow the Roman Republic. Cicero would accuse

before the Senate and *populus* that Lucius Sergius Catilina was leading a plot to overthrow the Roman Senate.<sup>94</sup>

Cataline, who was running against Cicero for the consulship in 63 B.C, was in favor of land redistribution and canceling debts across the *populus*. Naturally this made Cataline a popular man across the city of Rome, the Senate however Cataline had to approach differently. Using a combination of bribes and blackmail Cataline sought to sway just enough votes in the Senate to make himself *consol*.

Cicero uncovered this first plot and as consul issued a law outlawing the act of bribing politicians.<sup>95</sup> Now this was not uncommon, and chances are Cicero, as a *novus Homo* or 'new man', would have engaged in bribing as well. This law was directly issued against Catalina to prevent him from coming to power.

Cataline would prove to be tenacious in his lust for power. In the weeks leading up to the election Cataline would conspire with veterans from Sulla's army to murder Cicero and other key Senators to swing the remaining vote in favor of Cataline. Cicero uncovered this plot and the day before the scheduled election he announced Catalines intentions to the Senate.

Naturally this really angered Cataline, who immediately attempted to murder Cicero and several senators before fleeing. Historians are aware of this due to the Senate passing a *senatus consultum ultimum* seizing all power over the city and for a brief period of time making Cicero a dictator.

---

<sup>94</sup> Hoffman, Richard. "Sallust and Catiline". *The Classical Review*. 1998, 48: 50–52.

<sup>95</sup> Dio Cassius XXXVII.29.1

With Cicero vested with more power the scheduled election went underway, and not to anybody's surprise Cataline lost his bid for consulship. Historians can say that this loss was to be expected by Cataline because while Cicero and the Senate were voting Cataline and the rest of the conspirators had assembled an army outside the city.

Now that the city was in danger Cicero called the Senators to the Temple of Jupiter Stator, an action which only took place when the city was in grave danger. Cataline, who was just outside the city, attended Cicero's meeting where Cicero gave one of the shortest orations of his career to the Senate, the *Oratio in Catilinam Prima in Senatu Habita*. (The First Speech against Cataline in the Senate)

Cataline would flee from this oration, claiming that he was going into self-imposed exile. Before leaving Cataline would hurl insults at the Senate and instead of going into self-imposed exile Cataline would return to rebel camp.

The next day, Cicero would gather the *populus* and give his *Oratio in Catilinam Secunda Habita ad Populum*. This oration was given before the people of Rome and it was Cicero's goal to inform the people of Rome, who many were pro-Cataline, that Cataline had not fled the city into exile but rather had voluntarily left to join a band of rebel forces seeking to overthrow the city of Rome. Cicero reassured the people of Rome that he, as their *consul*, would protect the city and their interests better than Cataline could.

First, what is Cicero attempting to do by performing this *contio*? Much like the *De Lege Agraria*, Cicero is walking into a loaded crowd with the Second Catilinarian Oration, the *Oratio in Catilinam Secunda Habita ad Populum*. This is because the lower class of Rome, the slaves, servants, and laborers had thought that Cataline would serve

their interests better by canceling debt and redistributing land. They had already been rejected land redistribution by Cicero, who earlier that year had fought against the Rullus's *de Lege Agraria*.

Cicero was again rejecting their wills while Cataline was promoting them. Cicero was attempting with the second Catilinarian Oration to appeal to the lower class in an effort to remove a power basis within the city of Rome from Cataline. As such Cicero would have to convince the *populus* that he, and not Cataline, would serve their interests better and that he knew what would benefit them most.

Second, who is Cicero orating against? While on the surface this is obviously Cataline there is a second more obscure opposing ideology that he is openly rejecting. Cicero's second Catilinarian oration serves to demonstrate how those who want land redistribution and the elimination of debts are not Roman, but rather they are like Cataline, people who would willingly reject the Roman virtues and actively work against the betterment of the *populus*. The *optimates* were correct when they said that Cicero would be the best choice for protecting their values, on two occasions in the same year Cicero would beat back the *popularis* politicians of Rome by discrediting their entire platform, the platform of land redistribution and debt forgiveness.

As such, we can see that Cicero is not just fighting against Cataline when giving this oration but rather that Cicero is fighting against the *populus* itself. Cicero skillfully approaches this subject by instilling and stoking a quasi-Roman 'nationalism' across the *populus*. Cicero does this to save the *res publica* from certain destruction.

Upon gathering the people together Cicero gives his *Catilinam Oratio Secunda Habita Ad Populum* or the second speech on Cataline to the Roman People. It is within

this speech that Cicero serves to unite the *populus* in two categories; first, that Cicero and not Cataline knows what's best for the *populus*. Second, that Catalina and his followers are not Roman and that they are dangers to the *res publica*.

Addressing the people Cicero states, the following. Pay special attention to how Cicero makes a clear distinction in his opening paragraph between *patriae* (country) and *ex urbe* (city).

Latin	English
<p>Tandem aliquando, Quirites, L. Catilinam, furem audacia, scelus anhelantem, pestem patriae nefarie molientem, vobis atque huic urbi ferro flammaque minitantem ex urbe vel eiecimus vel emisimus vel ipsum egredientem verbis prosecuti sumus.<sup>96</sup></p>	<p>At length, O Romans, we have dismissed from the city, or driven out, or, when he was departing of his own accord, we have pursued with words, Lucius Catiline, mad with audacity, breathing wickedness, impiously planning mischief to his country, threatening fire and sword to you and to this city.<sup>97</sup></p>

The fact that Cicero clearly states that Catalina is a threat to both “his country” and “this city” before the city is a tell-tale sign that the identity of the *populus* at this point is abstract and not just of the city. The rhetorical question one must ask then is why would Cicero state both *patriae* and *ex urbe* in the same paragraph when addressing a major threat to the *res publica*? Yes, Cicero could have made a mistake in addressing the crowd like this, more than likely however the answer lies in Cicero’s goals in performing this operation.

Remember, Cicero is attempting to sway support away from Cataline within the *populus*. This is because Cataline had promised to forgive debts and redistribute land away from the optimates. Cicero successfully drives home the point as to why the

<sup>96</sup> Cicero, M. Tulli Ciceronis Orationes: Recognovit brevique adnotatione critica instruxit Albertus Curtis Clark Collegii Reginae Socius. *Catiline*, 1.1

<sup>97</sup> Cicero, Catil, 2.1. Translation by C.D. Yonge, 1856.

*populus* should listen to him instead of Cataline by combining the fate of the *populus Romanus* with the abstract identity of the city of Rome itself. The *populus* should care about both the *patriae* and *ex urbe* because Cataline is a threat to both.

Next Cicero has to justify why his speech given before the Senate the day before resulted in Catalina fleeing the city, for he was not expelled.

Latin	English
<p>Ac si quis est talis qualis esse omnis oportebat, qui in hoc ipso in quo exultat et triumphat oratio mea me vehementer accuset, quod tam capitalem hostem non comprehenderim potius quam emiserim, non est ista mea culpa, Quirites, sed temporum. Interfectum esse L. Catilinam et gravissimo supplicio adfectum iam pridem oportebat, idque a me et mos maiorum et huius imperi severitas et res publica postulabat.<sup>98</sup></p>	<p>But if there be any one of that disposition which all men should have, who yet blames me greatly for the very thing in which my speech exults and triumphs, — namely, that I did not arrest so capital mortal an enemy rather than let him go, —that is not my fault, O citizens, but the fault of the times.<sup>99</sup></p>

Cicero here states that Cataline does not follow the traditions that all Romans follow. These virtues bound a loose constitution together that dominated Roman society. If a Roman was not upholding the traditions of their ancestors and demonstrating the necessary Roman virtues then they were not part of the *populus Romanus*.<sup>100</sup>

In essence here we can see Cicero separating Cataline away from those who wish to be Roman or who are Roman. This is the same method Cicero used during his

<sup>98</sup> Cicero, M. Tulli Ciceronis Orationes: Recognovit brevique adnotatione critica instruxit Albertus Curtis Clark Collegii Reginae Socius, *Catiline*, 2.10.0-2.19.1

<sup>99</sup> Cicero, *Catil*, 2.1-2.19.1. Translation by C.D. Yonge, 1856.

<sup>100</sup> For an iconic article on Roman virtues see Mattingly, Harold. "The Roman 'Virtues'." *The Harvard Theological Review* 30, no. 2 (1937): 103-17.

speech against Rullus in the *De Lege Agraria*. Cataline does not follow the same laws and traditions that bind all of the *populus* together, therefore he is not a proper Roman.

Further in the closing sentence of Cicero's argument states that anyone who believes the Cataline has been treated unfairly is also not Roman because previously "severity of the empire and the republic demanded"<sup>101</sup> These words bely that both the Roman state and empire follow traditional ideologies in that previous trials have been judged by, that the Roman ancestors would have judged Cataline in a harsh manner. If the *populus* were true Romans they would have followed their ancestors' example and never followed Cataline in the first place.

Cicero goes on to call out those in the *populus* who would still follow Cataline.

Latin	English
<p>Iam vero quae tanta umquam in ullo iuventutis inlecebra fuit quanta in illo? qui alios ipse amabat turpissime, aliorum amori flagitiosissime serviebat, aliis fructum libidinum, aliis mortem parentum non modo impellendo verum etiam adiuvando pollicebatur. Nunc vero quam subito non solum ex urbe verum etiam ex agris ingentem numerum perditorum hominum conlegerat!<sup>102</sup></p>	<p>But in what other man were there ever so many allurements for youth as in him, who both indulged in infamous love for others, and encouraged their infamous affections for himself, promising to some enjoyment of their lust, to others the death of their parents, and not only instigating them to iniquity, but even assisting them in it. But now, how suddenly had he collected, not only out of the city, but even out of the country, a number of abandoned men!<sup>103</sup></p>

This passage is interesting as it directly follows the aforementioned one. Here we can clearly see Cicero stating that those who would willingly follow Cataline are the worst of society. Cicero opens up by stating to the *populus* that those who follow Cataline are misguided youth who have forgotten what it means to be Roman.<sup>104</sup> What

<sup>101</sup> Cicero, *Catiline*, 2.19.1

<sup>102</sup> Cicero, M. Tulli Ciceronis Orationes: Recognovit brevique adnotatione critica instruxit Albertus Curtis Clark Collegii Reginae Socius, *Catiline*, 2.8.1-2.8.8

<sup>103</sup> Cicero, *Catil*, 2.8.1-2.8.8. Translation by C.D. Yonge, 1856.

<sup>104</sup> *Ibid.* 2.8.1

is interesting is that Cicero states that Cataline's followers are misguided. This indicates that the followers can be 'converted' back to being good Roman citizens.

This is interesting as Cicero is orating to the *populus* who would have at this point undoubtedly been composed of followers of Cataline. Cicero knew this and chose his words carefully. This further reiterates the point that one of Cicero's main goals was to convert Cataline's followers within the city of Rome by appealing to the *populus's* instilled Roman virtues and values.

Cicero further hammers home how those who follow Cataline have forsaken the Roman virtues when he states that what drives the followers of Cataline is "to them the fruit of lust, and to the other the death of their only parents."<sup>105</sup> Within this sentence two words stand out, *parentum* ('parents') and *mortem* ('death'). Cicero was no idiot when speaking these words as he was directly making a comparison between those who would follow Cataline and those who kill their own parents. The act of killing one's own parents was one of the biggest crimes within the *mos Mairum* of Rome, and if convicted of such a crime the criminal would face execution in the form of *poena cullei* or 'penalty of the sack.'<sup>106</sup>

This was a serious accusation by Cicero that was blanketed across the *populus Romanus* to anyone whose allegiance was with Cataline. It is clear as day that Cicero is attempting to win over the *populus* by positioning those who would agree with Cataline as anti-roman.

---

<sup>105</sup> Ibid. 2.8.5

<sup>106</sup> Bauman, Richard. *Crime and Punishment in Ancient Rome*, London & New York: Routledge. P.23.



Cicero goes on to again link the countryside to the *populus* by stating that “and how suddenly he collected a great number of men, not only from the city but also from the countryside”<sup>107</sup> This sentence serves to link those within the *populus* to the outcasts from the countryside. Here Cicero is stating that those who follow Cataline are no better than the desperate men that Cataline has gathered from around the countryside to attack the city.

Remember that in earlier speeches such as the *de Lege Agraria* earlier in the year 63 B.C Cicero positions the *populus* as superior yet joined with those in the countryside. Here Cicero is essentially stating that those who would follow Cataline are no longer part of the self-perceived superior population/*populus*. Cicero’s oration is no longer about how Cataline’s followers are misjudged but has branched out to claim that those who follow Cataline are no longer enfranchised in the ‘first-class’ of the *populus*; instead being regulated to the lower class of the *populus* that comprised those of the Roman allies thus removing them from what it means to be Roman.

We can clearly see that the *populus* has a delineation of classes amongst itself. Cicero is stoking this comparison by first stating that those who follow Cataline are misguided children who can be saved, then moving to compare the Roman citizens who elect to follow Cataline as the same as opportunists who would kill their own parents, and finally coming to rest on making the delineation between the *populus Romanus* and those who have become unRoman in his eyes.

---

<sup>107</sup> Cicero, *Catiline*, 2.8.8

Cicero then moves to claim that the *populus* should unite against Cataline.

Cicero claims that this is a necessity because Cataline only moved against the city when he failed to become Consul in 63 B.C.

Latin	English
Quod si iam sint id quod summo furore cupiunt adepti, num illi in cinere urbis et in sanguine civium, quae mente conscelerata ac nefaria concupiverunt, consules se aut dictatores aut etiam reges sperant futuros? <sup>108</sup>	And if they had already got that which they with the greatest madness wish for, do they think that in the ashes of the city and blood of the citizens, which in their wicked and infamous hearts they desire, they will become consuls and dictators and even kings? <sup>109</sup>

As we can clearly see from the above passage Cicero poses the theoretical and rhetorical question to the *populus* of what would happen if Cataline's forces should win and take over the city? The answer, claims Cicero is that after Cataline's forces overthrow the city then they would turn to trying to seize control. Cicero even goes as far as to state that Cataline and his forces could attempt to become Kings. Just like with claiming that those who follow Cataline are no better than those who would kill their parents, Cicero once again utilizes the *mos Maiorum* once again when claiming that Cataline would seek to become king.

The *populus* feared a return of another king. In the early stages of the Republic Rome was a monarchical dictatorship and the *populus* feared above all else, a return to a dictatorship.<sup>110</sup> Tyrants were feared above all in ancient Rome, and those who engaged in tyrannicide would often be praised by Roman historians in the early to

---

<sup>108</sup> Cicero, M. Tulli Ciceronis Orationes: Recognovit brevique adnotatione critica instruxit Albertus Curtis Clark Collegii Reginae Socius, *Catiline*, 2.19.13-2.19.17.

<sup>109</sup> Cicero, *Catil*, 2.19.13-2.19.17. Translation by C.D. Yonge, 1856.

<sup>110</sup> For an amazing source on the rhetorical nature of tyrannicide and the "rhetorical-tyrant" in ancient Roman historiography see Dunkle, J. Roger. "The Rhetorical Tyrant in Roman Historiography: Sallust, Livy and Tacitus." *The Classical World* 65, no. 1 (1971): 12-20.

middle empire.<sup>111</sup> As such we can see Cicero cleverly positioning the *populus* to have to act to preserve their contemporary social hierarchy within the late Republic.

Cicero in his *Catilinam Oratio Secunda Habita ad Populum* directs all of his efforts into convincing the people of the city of Rome, the *populus*, that they are being misled by Cataline. That Cataline has set out to destroy the *res publica* and all that the *populus* hold dear. Cicero states that only he and the good members of the Senate can protect the people of Rome because they, like the *populus*, are part of the same 'system', that he much like them is part of the *populus Romanus*.

Further, Cicero goes into detail time and time again on how the *populus* should be afraid of Cataline. This is because Cataline has lied to the *populus* and seeks to become the next Sulla and remove their rights; this can be seen by Cicero stating the following line "*Sulla sit eis ab inferis excitandus*" which loosely translates to having the supporters of Cataline supporting even the resurrecting of Sulla.<sup>112</sup> Rhetoric such as this served to terrify the *populus* who were afraid of having their rights taken away, either by the *optimates* or by Cataline. It was Cicero's job to convince them that only he, and not Cataline, would protect their interests.

Finally, it is within this oration that we can see something incredibly important taking place. Cicero's line "But now how suddenly not only from the city but also from the countryside" is a dead giveaway that in Cicero's eyes the *populus*'s identity is now comprised of those outside the city along with those inside of it.<sup>113</sup> It is within *Catilinam*

---

<sup>111</sup> Ibid, 18.

<sup>112</sup> Cicero, *Catiline*, 2.20.10

<sup>113</sup> Cicero, *Catiline*, 2.8.1-2.8.8

*Oratio Secunda Habita ad Populum* that Cicero begins to form an abstract identity for the *populus* that includes not only those within the city of Rome but now comprises the abstract identity of being 'Roman.'

This is incredibly important because Cicero is attempting to 'save' the *populus Romanus* as a whole from Cataline. Now it's not just about the people of the city of Rome but also the countryside of Rome where Cataline has gathered numerous outcasts of the countryside.<sup>114</sup>

Cicero's *Catilinam Oratio Secunda Habita ad Populum* is important to this thesis because it demonstrates that at this point in 63 B.C the identity of the *populus Romanus* has expanded far beyond the confines of the city. Readers will note that Cicero is orating to a crowd of people that would compose of members of the countryside, city, and other provinces all interested in the events unfolding in Rome.

Further, by this point within Cicero's *contios* the expanded identity across the *populus Romanus* has formed held together by Roman morals and traditions that resound among the *populus Romanus*. This concept started in the *Pro Lege Manila* when Cicero invoked Roman tradition dictating that the *populus Romanus* should give leadership to Pompey. In the *De Lege Agraria* patient readers will notice that Cicero expands upon this concept by adding Roman morals and the concept of private land ownership into the identity of the *populus Romanus* which at that point had expanded to include the Sicilians and Italians. In his *Catilinam Oratio Secunda Habita ad Populum*

---

<sup>114</sup> Ibid.

Cicero demonstrates that this expanded identity of the *populus Romanus* is no longer confined to a geographical location but rather is focused more upon Roman values.

The final oration of this chapter deals with Cicero's speech given to the people upon his return from exile. Careful readers will notice how within this oration Cicero further solidifies the concept of the expanded identity of the *populus Romanus* built around shared common 'Roman' interests of morals, values, and property.

(V): *Post Reditum ad Quirites/Populum*: Cicero's public gratification of the Roman people after Exile (57 BC.)

In 60 BC Cicero would be invited by Julius Caesar to join in an alliance with Pompey and Crassus; this alliance would eventually come to be known as the First Triumvirate. If Cicero had accepted this offer he would have quickly become one of the most powerful men in the Roman Republic virtually overnight.

However Cicero would refuse to join the alliance with Caesar, Pompey, and Crassus for fears that this type of union directly would work to destroy the *res publica*.<sup>115</sup> This first triumvirate's goals within the first two years were to appeal to the *populus* to achieve political power over the Senate. To achieve these goals, the first triumvirate had to pass laws on debt forgiveness for the *publicani* class along with land reform. This directly went against Cicero's previous orations and as a result put the first triumvirate at odds against a majority of the Senate along with Cicero.

The first triumvirate moved fast and a majority of their laws were successfully passed. However, two of the three members of the first triumvirate, Pompey and

---

<sup>115</sup> Mitchell, Thomas N. "Cicero, Pompey, and the Rise of the First Triumvirate." *Traditio* 29 (1973): 1-26.

Caesar, were generals who would soon be dispatched away from the city. They needed a way to ensure that their laws would remain and secure their stranglehold on Roman politics even when away from the city. To perform this, they needed a puppet.

The only problem was that a majority of the patrician class, who comprised the Senate, would not help either Pompey or Caesar undermine their own authority. As a result, Caesar and Pompey had to become creative in securing their power. The major check on the Senate's power in Rome was the elected office of Tribune. As such, Pompey and Caesar would need to find a person to hold the Tribuneship while they were away.

Pompey and Caesar found their man in Pubilius Clodius Pulcher. History remembers Clodius for his outlandish feats, colorful personality, and most importantly his ambition. Clodius willingly allowed himself to be adopted by a plebeian family away from his patrician family. This obscure action was a direct demotion in societal rank in Republican Rome.<sup>116</sup> The reasoning behind why Clodius was willing to undergo this became apparent in 58 BC when the first triumvirate arranged to have Clodius be elected as one of the ten tribunes of the plebs. Now Caesar and Pompey had the ability to prevent the Senate from redacting the laws they had struggled to pass.

Now there was one man in Rome at this point who had demonstrated his ability to sway the voting power of the *populus*. Once Clodius was elected to the office of the Tribune the next step was to get rid of Cicero in any way possible. This more than likely was to prevent Cicero from swaying the *populus* into voting against Caesar and

---

<sup>116</sup> Thompson, E. P. "Patrician Society, Plebeian Culture." *Journal of Social History* 7, no. 4 (1974): 382-405.

Pompey's laws. As a result, Clodius, with the backing and support of the first triumvirate, worked fast to grow the support of the *populus* and find a way to get rid of Cicero.

To do this Clodius would introduce a law that would automatically exile a Roman citizen who had executed another Roman citizen without trial.<sup>117</sup> This law was directed at Cicero and gave the first triumvirate the power to push to have Cicero expelled. This law took effect because Cicero four years before had executed the conspirators in the Catinliarian conspiracy without trial. In a cruel twist of fate Cicero who had saved the *Republica* less than 5 years before would now be exiled by the same city he saved.

Cicero after being exiled from Rome arrived in Thessalonica on the 23rd of May 58 BC.<sup>118</sup> Clodius, being a fan of irony, would purchase a portion of Cicero's estate in Rome and demolish the rest. In place of Cicero's home Clodius would erect a statue of *Libertatis* and have the land consecrated by the Roman priests.

Cicero would only be in exile for around a year before being recalled to the senate. This was because a recently elected tribune, Titus Annius Milo, would push for legislation to remove Cicero's exile status. Pompey would support this due to his belief that now he could control the famed orator. This would prove to be a mistake in time, but for a brief moment Pompey would gain the support of Cicero.

---

<sup>117</sup> A great study done on how Clodius's laws impacted the late Roman Republic can be seen in the works of Tatum, W. Jeffrey. *The Patrician Tribune: P. Clodius Pulcher. Studies in the History of Greece and Rome*. University of North Carolina Press, 1999.

<sup>118</sup> Plutarch's *parallel lives* outlines this transition process. It's debatable on how accurate Plutarch's accounts are but it's really the only source we have to go off. Further Cicero's own accounts seem to verify this timeline of exile.

Clodius however would be the only person in the Senate to cast a vote against the law that would allow Cicero to return. In 57 BC Cicero would return to Rome to a cheering crowd. After giving an oration in the Senate and convincing the Roman priests (pontiffs) to restore his home. Cicero would then give the oration we are analyzing to the *populus*, the *post Reditum ad Populum*. A speech which when translated roughly means “After back to the people” or “Upon Cicero’s return to the people.”

First, what is Cicero attempting to do by performing this *contio*? This rhetorical question serves to isolate and distil the main reason for Cicero giving this oration before the people of Rome, the *populus*, upon his return from exile.

On the surface, the *post Reditum ad Populum* appears to simply give thanks to the Roman people for supporting Cicero’s return from exile. Cicero routinely gives praise to the Roman people, even at one point comparing the whole of the *populus* to the Roman gods.<sup>119</sup>

However, the goal here for Cicero was not only to praise the *populus* for returning him to Rome after his exile but also to consolidate Cicero’s persona as an orator that will support the preservation of the *res publica* by defending the *populus*. In essence Cicero here is attempting to regain political power over the *populus* and within the city of Rome by restoring *auctoritas and dignitas* to his name after being absent from the political theater due to his exile.<sup>120</sup>

---

<sup>119</sup> We can see Cicero’s stance when he states the following “*aeque mihi grave et sanctum ac deorum immortalium.*” Cicero, *post Reditum ad Populum*, 19.0.

<sup>120</sup> One of the foundational studies done on the Roman virtues can be seen in Mattingly, Harold. "The Roman 'Virtues'." *The Harvard Theological Review* 30, no. 2 (1937): 103-17.



As such Cicero's major goal by performing this *contio* is to show the *populus* that he still holds political power in the city. It is no coincidence that just before performing the *post Reditum ad Populum* Cicero gave a speech to the Senate that is similar in both stance and demeanor; the speeches title is fittingly called *post Reditum in Senatu*.

Second, who is Cicero orating against? Much like the previous rhetorical question of why, the who is Cicero orating against is at first hidden. At first glance the *post Reditum ad Populum* appears to only be in praise of the *populus* and not targeted at anybody.

This however is not the case. Cicero was exiled due to a law put forward by Clodius. During Cicero's exile Clodius had the priests of Rome consecrate the portion of Cicero's house within the city and after demolishing the house Clodius had a statue of the Roman goddess *Libertatis* erected on the spot.<sup>121</sup> This was more than just a defiant act of land acquisition.

Clodius by erecting a statue of *Libertatis* on Cicero's land attempted to accomplish two different goals. The first and most obvious was to mark his victory and prevent Cicero from returning to his home even if the exile was lifted. It was no easy task to convince both the Roman priests and people that a temple was wrongfully erected and that a statue of one of their gods should be removed.

Second, was the selection of the god *Libertas*. Clodius was a smart man, *Libertatis* was seen during the late Roman Republic as the patron god of the *populus*

---

<sup>121</sup> Cerutti, Steven M. "The Location of the Houses of Cicero and Clodius and The Porticus Catuli on the Palatine Hill in Rome." *American Journal of Philology* 118, no. 3 (1997): 417-426.

and as a result represented the *populus* and all those who supported the *populus*.<sup>122</sup>

Was Cicero going to attempt to remove a statue that represented the *populus*? If Cicero openly did this, he absolutely would lose *auctoritas* with the Roman people. As such Cicero would have to carefully engage with deification of the Roman people so he could continue to hold political power and keep his residence in the city.<sup>123</sup>

As such we can see Cicero's *modus operandi* and target when he performs the *post Reditum ad Populum*. Cicero is directly orating against Clodius and the actions of the first triumvirate in a strategic way as to still keep and hold power with the *populus*.

Cicero opens up his *post Reditum ad Populum* with a prayer to Jupiter for allowing him entrance back into Rome. As previously stated Cicero's main goal with this oration was to convince the *populus* that he was acting in their best interest while also paying homage to the Roman gods so that he could restore his estate in Rome.

Within the public eye Cicero opens his oration by taking the stance that in order to preserve the peace and save the *Civitatis* he had to go into exile. However, Jupiter saw his punishment fit enough to save the *populus* so his exile was lifted and he was allowed to return to Rome.

Latin	English
Quod precatus a Iove Optimo Maximo ceterisque dis immortalibus sum, Quirites, eo tempore cum meae fortunaeque meas pro vestra incolumitate otio concordiaeque devovi, ut, si meas rationes umquam vestrae salutis anteposuissem, sempiternam poenam sustinerem mea voluntate susceptam, sin et ea quae ante gesseram conservandae civitatis causa gessissem et illam miseram profectionem vestrae salutis gratia	That which I requested in my prayers of the all-good and all-powerful Jupiter, and the rest of the immortal gods, O Romans, at the time when I devoted myself and my fortunes in defence of your safety, and tranquillity, and concord,—namely, that if I had at any time preferred my own interests to your safety, I might

<sup>122</sup> We know that *Libertatis* was held in very high esteem by the *popularis* and *populus* of the late Roman Republic because of numismatic evidence. Richard A. Grossmann and William E. Metcalf. *Roman Coins*. Yale University Art Gallery, 2001.

<sup>123</sup> Cicero was no stranger to the rhetorical process of deification. Cole, S. *Cicero and the Rise of Deification at Rome*. Cambridge. 2013

suscepissem, ut quod odium scelerati homines et audaces in rem publicam et in omnis bonos conceptum iam diu continerent, id in me uno potius quam in optimo quoque et universa civitate defigerent,—hoc si animo in vos liberosque vestros fuissem, ut aliquando vos patresque conscriptos Italiamque universam memoria mei misericordia desideriumque teneret: eius devotionis me esse convictum iudiciodeorum immortalium, testimonio senatus, consensu Italiae, confessione inimicorum, beneficio divino immortalique vestromaxime laetor.<sup>124</sup>

find that punishment, which I was then encountering of my own accord, everlasting; but that if I had done those things which I had done out of an honest desire to preserve the state, and if I had undertaken that miserable journey on which I was then setting out for the sake of ensuring your safety, in order that the hatred which wicked and audacious men had long since conceived and entertained against the republic and against all good men, might break upon me alone, rather than on every virtuous man, and on the entire republic—if I say these were my feelings towards you and towards your children, that in that case, a recollection of me, a pity and regret for me should, at some time or other come upon you and the conscript fathers, and all Italy, I now rejoice above all things that that request is heard that I am bound to perform all that I then vowed, by the judgment of the immortal gods,—by the testimony of the senate by the unanimous consent of all Italy,—by the confession of my enemies,—by your godlike and never-to-be-forgotten kindness, O citizens of Rome.<sup>125</sup>

What is truly interesting about this introductory passage is Cicero's stance on being banished from the City of Rome by Clodius. Cicero in his introduction manages to do two main; first, Cicero manages to praise the gods for returning him to the city. By Cicero stating this in front of the *populus* we can see that Cicero is demonstrating his *Pietas* before the *populus*. Classicists such as Joanna Kenty have demonstrated that by looking closely at Cicero's orations we can see how Cicero cleverly uses the *mos maiorum* or socially accepted traditions to steer an oration when orating before the *populus*.<sup>126</sup> Cicero in this case is attempting to sway the *populus* into believing that he is a man of piety and respectful of the gods.

<sup>124</sup> Cicero. M. Tullius Cicero. M. Tulli Ciceronis Orationes: Recognovit brevique adnotatione critica instruxit Albertus Curtis Clark, *post Reditum ad Populum*, 1.1.1-2.1.1

<sup>125</sup> Cicero, *Post Reditum ad Populum*, 1.1-1.2. Translation by C.D. Yonge, 1856

<sup>126</sup> Joanna Kenty. "Congenital Virtue: Mos Maiorum in Cicero's Orations." *The Classical Journal* 111, no. 4 (2016): 429-62.

Second, Cicero is also attempting to gather the respect and support of the *populus*. Philologist Nicola Mackie calls into question the overarching class of politicians called *popularis* or popularism politicians stating that “The Romans themselves had a conception of a distinction between ‘true’ and ‘false’ *populares*.”<sup>127</sup> This is interesting as Cicero starts to praise the people in the same passage as the gods, in essence venerating them for allowing him to return to the city. This would have stood out amongst the *populus* as unique for a politician or man of prominence to do. Here Cicero was uncharacteristically praising the people of Rome for allowing him to return to the city.

Furthermore, it is this last statement “and the memory of my pity and regret would hold on to all such things. I am convince of his devotion to the immortal judgments by the testimony of the senate, by the consent of the Italians, by the confession of our enemies, by the divine and immortal kindness of yourself.” that we can clearly see that Cicero links the *populus* to the whole of Italy.<sup>128</sup> Cicero directly links the *populus*, the Senate, the Roman Gods, and the ‘whole of Italy’ into “compassion and regret” at his banishment. Thus it is by all four of these parties; the *populus*, Senate, Gods, and the rest of Italy that Cicero has been allowed to return.

Cicero was careful when choosing his sentence structure and style.<sup>129</sup> The sentence structure is important when looking at this introductory paragraph of Cicero’s oration. Cicero starts the *post Reditum ad Populum* by praising the Gods, then praising

---

<sup>127</sup> Macki, Nicola. “‘Popularis’ Ideology and Popular Politicians at Rome in the First Century B.C.” *Rheinisches Museum Für Philologie* 135, no. 1 (1992): 49-73.

<sup>128</sup> Cicero. *post Reditum ad Populum*, 1.15-2.1.1

<sup>129</sup> Several philologists have studied Cicero’s dictation style; a good selection can be found here Murgia, Charles E. “Review Article: Analyzing Cicero’s Style.” *Classical Philology* 76, no. 4 (1981): 301-13.

the people, and finally combining both the Gods, Senate, and the *populus* together on the same level in praise. This is pivotal for two reasons; first, it demonstrates that Cicero is an honorable Roman politician who deserves respect as Cicero follows the *mos maiorum*. Second, that Cicero links the *populus* on the same level to the whole of Italy.

Here we can see how Cicero has increased the scope of his definition of the *populus Romanus* by 57 B.C to include all of Italy. It remains to be seen if Cicero had done this because he inadvertently knew that Italians would have been among the crowd that he was attempting to influence or if rather Cicero saw that the average Roman was no longer just the actual inhabitants of the city of Rome but rather the entirety of those under Roman rule.

Cicero then enters into the second passage where he attempts to further praise not only the people of the city of Rome but all of Italy stating just how beautiful and amazing they all are.

Latin	English
Ipsa autem patria, di immortales dici vix potest quid caritatis, quid voluptatis habeat; quae species Italiae, quae celebritas oppidorum, quae forma regionum, qui agri, quae fruges, quae pulchritudo urbis, quae humanitas civium, quae rei publicae dignitas, quae vestra maiestas! <sup>130</sup>	And as for my country, O ye immortal gods, it is scarcely possible to express how dear, how delightful it is to me. How great is the beauty of Italy! how renowned are its cities! how varied are the enchantments of its scenery! What lands, what crops are here! How noble is the splendour of this city, and the civilization of its citizens, and the dignity of the republic, and your majesty, O people of Rome! <sup>131</sup>

---

<sup>130</sup> Cicero. M. Tulli Ciceronis Orationes: Recognovit brevique adnotatione critica instruxit Albertus Curtius Clark, *post Reditum ad Populum*, 4.9-5.1.1

<sup>131</sup> Cicero, *Post Reditum ad Populum*, 4.9-5.1.1. Translation by C.D. Yonge, 1856

Here Cicero is attempting to deify the *populus* along with not only the city of Rome but the entire Italian countryside. This is rather peculiar for the time as Cicero would have been elevated upon the Rostra well above the *populus* below. This elevation difference was utilized to demonstrate the orator's *gravitas* when addressing the crowd.<sup>132</sup> Here Cicero was using this elevated position to also elevate not only the people of Rome but also the surrounding countryside, the Italian towns, the Italian countryside, and most importantly the "*humanitas civium*."

This referencing the "citizen's humanity" as "*humanitas civium*" in the sentence position of between the dignity of the state and the beauty of the city belies Cicero's definition of the identity of the *populus*. At this point, 57 B.C, Cicero clearly has increased the definition of the *populus* in his orations to include the surrounding Italian cities, countryside, and people.

Cicero in the 18th book of the *post Reditum ad Populum* (57 BC) then for the first time in the oration returns to standard orating procedure of thanking the Senate and the individual senators who were in charge of his lifting his exile. What is interesting however is the fact that Cicero states the following when addressing the *populus* "En ego tot testimoniis, Quirites, hac auctoritate senatus, tanta consensione Italiae."<sup>133</sup> The ending of this stanza "tanta consensione Italiae" translates to "so much by the consensus of Italy." It is important to remember that at this point Cicero is addressing

---

<sup>132</sup> Andrew J. E. Bell addresses how this elevation difference was intentional and designed to cause the *populus* to revere the orator. Andrew J. E. Bell. "Cicero and the Spectacle of Power." *The Journal of Roman Studies* 87 (1997): 1-22.

<sup>133</sup> Cicero. *post Reditum ad Populum*, 18.1

the *populus* whom he is thanking on the same level as the Senate and stating that the whole of Italy came together to agree that he should be returned to Rome.

Cicero within the *post Reditum ad Populum* is attempting to do two things. First, is to re-establish himself as a leading political figure within the city. Second, is to gather support from the *populus* for his future endeavors. The rhetorical question then is why would Cicero thank the whole of Italy for his return before the *populus*? This answer is rather straightforward, because at this point Cicero's *populus Romanus* has an abstract definition consisting of not just the inhabitants of the city of Rome but the whole of Italy. In essence the *populus* within Cicero's orations no longer can be seen as identifying the direct people of the city of Rome, but now can be seen as much larger, the people of Italy.

This oration serves a vital purpose to the overall thesis. Within Cicero's *post Reditum ad Populum* we can see Cicero positioning the *populus Romanus* as the base moral backdrop for which to base all Roman orations off. These underlying morals have guided and created the expanded identity of the *populus Romanus* from the start of this thesis with the *Pro Lege Manila*. However, it is within this oration that Cicero clearly lays out and demonstrates that the *populus Romanus* has expanded in identity well beyond the confines of the city and now no longer can represent just the people of the city.

This new abstract definition of the *populus* was brought about by the rise of popularis politicians over the course of the late Republic, who wielded the *populus* to achieve personal gain of power and wealth.<sup>134</sup> Not all politicians in the late Rome

---

<sup>134</sup> Luciano Canfora goes into great detail on how Julius Caesar wielded the *populus*. Canfora, Luciano, et al. *The People's Dictator*. Edinburgh University Press, 2007.

Republic would be considered 'popularis' by nature, Cicero in his later orations was firmly seated in the camp of the Senate. However, as Cicero demonstrated in his *De Lege Agraria*, even a member of the Senate would have to know how to control the masses to encourage the passing of a *lex*.

Undoubtedly there were issues present in the government system of Roman politics long before the late Roman republic. However over the course of the late Republic the population demographics of the Italian Cities and Rome expanded while the free peasantry of the countryside declined.<sup>135</sup> This increasing population within the major cities of Italy, including Rome, would have resulted in increased *popularis* political power, who either would have received word of Cicero's orations through rumor or actually been present during the oration itself. Thus we can see the cause' for Cicero to expand his definition of the *populus Romanus* in order to further his political career. The *populus Romanus* was no longer composed solely of the people of the city of Rome, but was rather a citizen body whose personal identity expanded out far beyond the confines of the eternal city, held together by a perceived shared belief in the *mos maiorum* and personal property rights.

### Epilogue and Conclusion of Results for Chapter 1

The identity of the *populus Romanus*, as seen through Cicero's orations, changed considerably over the course of the late Roman Republic. Initially the identity of the *populus Romanus* was defined as the people of the city of Rome but as the late

---

<sup>135</sup> One of the hardest parts of any historical valuation is population demographics, especially in antiquity. Morley, Neville. "The Transformation of Italy, 225-28 B.C." *The Journal of Roman Studies*, vol. 91, 2001, pp. 50-62.



Republic progressed we see an expansion of the Cicero's *populus* to include at first select Italians and coming to rest with those under Roman rule.

## CHAPTER 3: CHARTING CICERO'S EXPANDED *POPULUS ROMANUS* THROUGH AUGUSTAN LITERATURE

### The Poets, “Golden-Age”, and Literary Chronology

“Fléctere si néqueo súperos Acheronta movebo”

-Virgil, *The Aeneid*

This chapter looks at how the *populus Romanus* with its expanded identity, which by the time of Augustus, can be seen as encompassing those under Roman hegemonic rule can be seen through the written works of Ovid, Horace, Virgil, and Livy. If the first chapter of this thesis presents the argument that through Cicero's orations we can see an expanding identity of the *populus Romanus* taking place then this chapter is the proof of concept that the literature of the Augustan regime was created with this new audience in mind.

This new audience, the new *populus Romanus*, by this point in time (27 BC-19 AD) would have comprised of not only the people of Rome but all those who would digest the literary works of the Golden-Era Latin Writers.<sup>136</sup> Everyone who either read or heard these written works while under Roman rule between the years of 27 BC-19 AD was part of this expanded *populus Romanus*. This is the point that readers should take away from this chapter of the thesis and why examining these authors is so important.

---

<sup>136</sup> The concept of Augustan literature is a wholly contemporary definition. Undoubtedly those who lived under the regime of the first Roman Emperor, Augustus, did not associate an entire era to one man. However contemporary historians refer to this period, 27 BC-AD 14, as a golden age for ancient Latin literature. Livy, Horace, Virgil, and Ovid are not the only golden-era latin writers of note some other ones include Gaius Valgius Rufus, Marcus Porcius Latro, Gnaeus Pompeius Trogus, Marcus Antistius Labeo, Marcus Verrius Flaccus, Grattius Faliscus, Albius Tibullus, and many others. For further information, see Millar, Fergus. “Ovid and the Domus Augusta: Rome Seen from Tomoi.” *The Journal of Roman Studies* 83 (1993): 1–17.

Simply put, Cicero's written work demonstrates an evolution in identity across the *populus Romanus* from a small citizen body only within the confines of the city to an incredibly abstract identity that encompasses far more members than previously thought and that by critically reading the golden era Latin writers we can clearly see that this expanded *populus Romanus* existed because this abstract identity was the target audience of Horace, Livy, Virgil, and Ovid.

However, in order to demonstrate that this expanded *populus Romanus* can be seen through the written works of the golden era Latin writers there are two things that must be outlined before the analysis of the texts themselves. First, is the target audience of these works. The expanded *populus Romanus* that transitioned from the end of the Republic to the start of the Empire included both the illiterate and literate. Second, is the capability for communication and rumor to transfer knowledge across the *populus Romanus*. This drastically increased the 'audience' of each one of the writers. Each one of these two issues I address below.

The *populus Romanus* of the late Roman Republic and early Empire had a varying degree of literacy rates. The education system during this time revolved around patrician parents teaching their children much of the ancient Greek language along with Latin. Even though family education dominated much of a child's potential education we know that to some degree there existed a public school system during the end of the Republic and start of the Empire.<sup>137</sup> The peasantry of the countryside and slave

---

<sup>137</sup> Our best known written primary source on the education system of the late Republic and early Empire comes from a passing mention by Quintilian in his *Institutio Oratoria* where he mentions how the education system should at first pass from family to formal once the child is ready and young. Quintilian, *Institutio Oratoria*, 1.1.1

population of the expanded *populus Romanus* however more than likely remained illiterate.

However, being illiterate did not mean that they could not have interacted with golden-era Latin writers works. Iconography and word of mouth communication dominated the communication lines of the late Republic and early Empire. One example of this network of communication can be seen in Purcell's examination of the gambling games where the *populus Romanus* of the late Republic and early Empire engaged with games of *Alea*.<sup>138</sup> Noting that good players of chance would spread knowledge across the *populus Romanus* Purcell comes to the conclusion that although formal literacy rates across the *populus Romanus* remained low during the late Republic and early Empire the ability to communicate ideals through either iconography or word of mouth allowed for a streamlined communication process to exist across the *populus Romanus*.

This alone indicates that overtime stories of Virgil's *Aeneas* or Livy's histories would have spread from one person to another throughout the *populus Romanus*. The golden-era Latin writers knew of this powerful effect and contemporary research has shown that they indeed wrote their works to be both read and performed in oration.<sup>139</sup> Although a peasant from the countryside might not have been able to read they could have recounted some of Horace's odes to eager ears in a social setting. In essence, the expanded *populus Romanus* did not have to have to read the written works, hearing the tales of bravery were enough, especially when these tales indicated that from the

---

<sup>138</sup> Purcell, Nicholas. "Literate Games: Roman Urban Society and the Game of *Alea*." *Past & Present*, no. 147 (1995): 3–37.

<sup>139</sup> Much of Ovid for example was designed to be performed in front of crowds. One such section is his 'triumph' poems designed to be performed in front of a crowd. For more information, see Millar, Fergus. "Ovid and the Domus Augusta: Rome Seen from Tomoi." *The Journal of Roman Studies* 83 (1993): 1–17.

beginning 'Romans' were comprised of not only people who lived within the city but also those outside of the city. Further, golden-era writers tailored their work to appeal to the two levels of education throughout the *populus Romanus*, the literate and illiterate. For ease of reading it is within each of the following authors that I go into further detail on how we can see that they wrote their works to be performed along with being read. The fact that the whole of the expanded *populus Romanus* was part of the golden-era Latin writer's audience is important to this thesis due to the fact that when we critically evaluate the authors work we can see this expanded *populus Romanus* as the target audience.

The second point, that rumor and communication spread far past the confines of the direct audience hearing or reading the golden-era writers work. For example, a merchant from Greece or Egypt might have heard or read a passage of Virgil's *Aeneid* while in the city of Rome and then told of the exploits back in their home location. This presented a diffusion of Roman culture and ideals out to the *populus Romanus* outside of the city. We know that the power of rumor to galvanize the senate and *populus Romanus* during the late Republic was a powerful force when wielded properly such as Cicero's use of the rumor of Clodia's lustful obsession of Marcus Caelius to sway jurors decision in his *pro Caelio*.<sup>140</sup>

This word of mouth communication would mean that the golden-era Latin writers would be writing their work for a significantly larger audience than just the people of the city of Rome. An example of this expanded audience can be seen in Pliny the Younger's

---

<sup>140</sup> Dufallo, Basil. "Appius' Indignation: Gossip, Tradition, and Performance in Republican Rome." *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, 131 (2001): 119–42.

account that Livy's *Ab Urbe Conditia* was so popular and widespread that a fan traveled from modern day southern Spain just to meet him.<sup>141</sup> It is within this fame and notoriety that we can see the expanded *populus Romanus* that the golden-era Latin writers also wrote for. As patient readers will come to see each one of the following authors writes for an expanded *populus Romanus* that stretches far out beyond the confines of the city.<sup>142</sup>

This chapter of my thesis is important because it is through the works of the Latin writers that we can see that the expanded *populus Romanus* continued well past the death of Cicero and up through the Augustan regime. It is within the following pages that readers can see how the golden-era Latin authors interacted and wrote their works for not only the people of Rome, the initial *populus Romanus*, but rather the expanded *populus Romanus*. A body of people that from December 7<sup>th</sup> 43 BC up through August 19<sup>th</sup>, 14 AD consisted of the Romans, Italians, and allies of Rome.

### Ovid's *Metamorphoses* Book 1 and 15

Pūblius Ovidius Nāsō was born in 43 BC in the Italian town of Sulmo, around 100 miles east of Rome. Ovid was born into an equestrian family which allowed him to pursue an education. Fortunately for him he was born during the end of the late Roman Republic outside the walled city, which prevented him from seeing the mayhem at an early age.<sup>143</sup>

---

<sup>141</sup> Pliny. *Epistulae*. II.3

<sup>142</sup> Another good paper on the power of word of mouth communication is to spreading ideals and information can be seen in Laurence, Ray. "Rumor and Communication in Roman Politics." *Greece & Rome* 41, no. 1 (1994): 62–74.

<sup>143</sup> P.O. Mark and Lenardon, Robert. *Classical Mythology*, Oxford University Press, 1999.

In 8 AD Ovid completed what is considered his magnum opus, *Metamorphoses*, to which this section shall analysis. In his epic 15 book poem he recounts the story of the foundation of the world up through the assassination of Julius Caesar in a hexameter style.<sup>144</sup>

This hexameter style belies a subtle fact about Ovid's writings, that they were designed to be performed before a crowd as well as read. Fergus Millar in his 1993 article "Ovid and the Domus Augusta: Rome Seen from Tomoi" outlines how a majority of Ovid's works were supposed to be performed before large crowds.<sup>145</sup> Millar is not alone in this critique of *Metamorphoses*, 5 years after Millars article Stephen Wheeler published his book *Audience and Performance in Ovid's Metamorphoses* the thesis of which is that Ovid's work was designed to be read aloud in one continuous poem.<sup>146</sup>

This performative aspect of *Metamorphoses* is important to this thesis because just like Cicero's orations we can critically read how Ovid presents stories that demonstrate that the audience, the *populus Romanus*, is during Ovid's time abstract and far larger in terms of identity than existed during the late Republic.<sup>147</sup>

As previously mentioned the *populus Romanus* of the early Empire would have obtained some degree of literacy. Even hearing about the poems of Ovid would have filled them with speculation and wonder on the far reaching lands of the Empire. What

---

<sup>144</sup> *Metamorphoses* is one of the most influential poems in western world having influenced several prominent authors such as William Shakespear, Gooffry Chaucer, and Giovanni Boccacio. The first english translation of this work was done by William Caxton in 1480.

<sup>145</sup> Millar, Fergus. "Ovid and the Domus Augusta: Rome Seen from Tomoi." *The Journal of Roman Studies* 83 (1993): 1–17.

<sup>146</sup> Wheeler, Stephen. *A discourse of wonders: audience and performance in Ovid's Metamorphoses*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1999. 272 pages; 23 cm.

<sup>147</sup> For another study of the performative aspect of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* see Boyd, Barbara Weiden. "Still, She Persisted: Materiality in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*" *The Classical Journal* 96, no. 2 (2000): 228–33.

follows is a critical evaluation of sections of his work that would explain to an audience member, both in person and through text, what it means to be Roman and how others are Roman.

Ovid starts off his 15 book magnum-opus by describing the time before man, the ‘gods’, and order itself. Within his book he details how the world was initially formed in a chaotic manner by raw and primordial nature. The past as Ovid puts it was “*rudis indigestaque*” (raw and unorganized); Earth as Ovid imagined it was a primordial entity in its founding, devoid of any and all sentient control.<sup>148</sup>

In the beginning the world was a blank canvas according to Ovid, full of possibility and discord. It was going to take a singular entity that he refers to as “*deus*” to instill order and begin the creator’s timeline, by fighting back against this chaotic nature of his primordial world.<sup>149</sup>

Latin	English
<p><i>“Hanc deus et melior litem natura diremit. nam caelo terras et terris abscidit undas et liquidum spisso secrevit ab aere caelum. quae postquam evoluit caecoque exemit acervo, dissociata locis concordia pace ligavit: ignea convexi vis et sine pondere caeli emicuit summaque locum sibi fecit in arce; proximus est aer illi levitate locoque; densior his tellus elementaque grandia traxit et pressa est gravitate sua; circumfluis umor ultima possedit solidumque coercuit orbem.”<sup>150</sup></i></p>	<p>But God, or kindly Nature, ended strife—  he cut the land from skies, the sea from land,  the heavens ethereal from material air;  and when were all evolved from that dark mass  he bound the fractious parts in tranquil peace.  The fiery element of convex heaven  leaped from the mass devoid of dragging weight,  and chose the summit arch to which the air  as next in quality was next in place.  The earth more dense attracted grosser parts  and moved by gravity sank underneath;  and last of all the wide surrounding waves  in deeper channels rolled around the globe.<sup>151</sup></p>

<sup>148</sup> Ovid. *Metamorphoses*. Hugo Magnus. Gotha (Germany). Friedr. Andr. Perthes. 1892. *Metamorphoses, Liber 1, 5-10*.

<sup>149</sup> Ovid, *Metamorphoses, Liber 1, 21*.

<sup>150</sup> Ovid. *Metamorphoses*. Hugo Magnus. Gotha (Germany). Friedr. Andr. Perthes. 1892. *Metamorphoses, Liber 1, 20-30*.

<sup>151</sup> Ovid. *Metamorphoses*. Brookes More. Boston. Cornhill Publishing Co. 1922. *Liber 1, 5-10*



Ovid started off his first book by describing the chaotic nature of the world at its creation. Now Ovid positions an unnamed god "*deus*" to begin the process of fighting with "*natura*" to put the Roman world back into order. Out of this conflict this unnamed god would begin to mold the world to allow for the creation of man, the gods, and ultimately the Roman Empire. The statement "dissociated parts of a harmonious peace" demonstrates to his readers how one singular entity settled the conflict with nature to lay the foundation for their prosperity.

At the end of Ovid's creation passage he states "Thus the earth was unsteady, the waves swirled, the air lacking light; none of them remained in their form, and opposed the other, because in one body they were fighting cold, hot, moist, dry, soft with hard, without weight, having weight" can be seen as drawing a direct comparison to how the world existed before the unnamed god instilled order and how the *populus* fought amongst themselves before the empire.<sup>152</sup> The "*innabilis unda(waves swirled)*" and the "*nulli sua forma manebat(air lacking light)*" are unnatural and foreboding to Ovid's readers. These primordial elements fought amongst themselves instead of working together "*quia corpore in uno frigida pugnabant calidis (In one body the cold fought with the hot).*"<sup>153</sup> It would be an unnamed god that would correct this infighting and allow for the differing elements of the primordial body to work together.

This first book of Ovid's *Metamorphosis* would have set the stage for an audience of the early Empire to draw direct correlations between the events of the late Roman Republic where the *populus Romanus* was fighting amongst themselves. In the end

---

<sup>152</sup> Ovid, *Metamorphoses, Liber I, 15-20.*

<sup>153</sup> Ibid.

however Ovid presents a situation where one god unites all the disorganized elements of nature into one solid body to achieve peace. To both the literate and illiterate *populus Romanus* this would have resounded as an allegory to Augustus uniting the varying people of the late Roman Republic into one entity and finally achieving harmony. Thus we can begin to see an expanded *populus Romanus* within Ovid's work. Initially the *populus Romanus* in the late Roman Republic was only comprised of the people of the city of Rome. This is apparent through the early Cicero orations. Ovid here presents the argument that his god/Augustus was the unifying power that settled this conflict among Roman people and created one expansive group of people, the expanded *populus Romanus* that I charted through Cicero. This becomes even further solidified in further passages from his *Metamorphosis*.

The next passage from Ovid's *Metamorphosis* comes from his last book where Ovid recounts the myth of the serpent god Aesculapius who saves Rome from a devastating plague.

Latin	English
<p><i>Aeneadae gaudent caesoque in litore tauro  torta coronatae solvunt retinacula navis.  Impulerat levis aura ratem: deus eminent alte,  impositaque premens puppim cervice recurvam  caeruleas despectat aquas modicisque per aequor  Ionium zephyris sextae Pallantidos ortu  Italiam tenuit praeterque Lacinia templo  nobilitata deae Scylaceaque litora fertur;  linquit lapygiam laevisque Amphrisia remis  saxa fugit, dextra praerupta Celennia parte,  Romethiumque legit Caulonaque Naryciamque,  evincitque fretum Siculique angusta Pelori  Hippotadaeque domos regis Temesesque metalla,  Leucosiamque petit tepidique rosaria Paesti. Inde legit  Capreas promunturiumque Minervae et Surrentino  generosos palmite colles Herculeamque urbem  Stabiasque et in otia natam</i></p>	<p>All present then adored the deity as bidden by the priest. The multitude repeated his good words, and the descendants of Aeneas gave good omen, with their feelings and their speech. Nodding well pleased and moving his great crest, the god at once assured them of his favor and hissed repeatedly with darting tongue. And then he glided down the polished steps; turned back his head; and, ready to depart, gazed on the altars he had known for so long—a last salute to the temple of his love. While all the people strewed his way with flowers, the great snake wound in sinuous course along and, passing through the middle of their town, came to the harbor and its curving wall. He stopped there, and it seemed that he dismissed his train and dutiful attendant crowd, and with a placid countenance he placed his mighty body in the Ausonian ship, which plainly showed the great weight of the god. The glad descendants of Aeneas all</p>

*Parthenopen et ab hac Cumaeae templa Sibyllae. Hinc  
calidi fontes lentisciferumque tenetur*

*Liternum multamque trahens sub gurgite harenam  
Volturnus niveisque frequens Sinuessa columbis  
Minturnaeque graves et quam tumulavit alumnus  
Antiphataeque domus Trachasque obsessa palude et  
tellus Circaea et spissi litoris Antium.*

*Huc ubi veliferam nautae advertere carinam  
(asper enim iam pontus erat), deus explicat orbes  
perque sinus crebros et magna volumina labens templa  
parentis init flavum tangentia litus. Aequare placato  
patrias Epidaurius aras linquit et hospitio iuncti sibi  
numinis usus litoream tractu squamae crepitantis  
harenam sulcat et innixus moderamine navis in alta  
puppe caput posuit, donec Castrumque sacrasque  
Lavini sedes Tiberinaque ad ostia venit. Huc omnis  
populi passim matrumque patrumque obvia turba ruit,  
quaeque ignes, Troica, servant, Vesta, tuos, laetoque  
deum clamore salutant. Quaque per adversas navis cita  
ducitur undas, tura super ripas aris ex ordine factis parte  
ab utraque sonant et odorant aera fumis, ictaque  
coniectos incalfacit hostia cultros. Iamque caput rerum,  
Romanam intraverat urbem: erigitur serpens  
summoque acclinia malo colla movet sedesque sibi  
circumspicit aptas. Scinditur in geminas partes  
circumfluus amnis (Insula nomen habet), laterumque a  
parte duorum porrigit aequales media tellure lacertos.*

*Huc se de Latia pinu Phoebeius anguis contulit et  
finem, specie caeleste resumpta, luctibus imposuit  
venitque salutifer urbi.<sup>154</sup>*

rejoiced, and they sacrificed a bull beside the harbor, wreathed the ship with flowers, and loosed the twisted hawsers from the shore. As a soft breeze impelled the ship, within her curving stern the god reclined, his coils uprising high, and gazed down on the blue Ionian waves. So wafted by the favoring winds, they came in six days to the shores of Italy. There he was borne past the Lacinian Cape, ennobled by the goddess Juno's shrine, and Scylacean coasts. He left behind lapygia; then he shunned Amphrasyian rocks upon the left and on the other side escaped Cocinthian crags. He passed, near by, Romechium and Caulon and Naricia; crossed the Sicilian sea; went through the strait; sailed by Pelorus and the island home of Aeolus and by the copper mines of Temesa. He turned then toward Leucosia and toward mild Paestum, famous for the rose. He coasted by Capreae and around Minerva's promontory and the hills ennobled with Surrentine vines, from there to Herculaneum and Stabiae and then Parthenope built for soft ease. He sailed near the Cumaeian Sibyl's temple. He passed the Warm Springs and Liternum, where the mastick trees grow, and the river called Volturnus, where thick sand whirls in the stream, over to Sinuessa's snow-white doves; and then to Antium and its rocky coast. When with all sails full spread the ship came in the harbor there (for now the seas grew rough), the god uncoiled his folds, and, gliding out with sinuous curves and all his mighty length, entered the temple of his parent, where it skirts that yellow shore. But, when the sea was calm again, the Epidaurian god departing from his father's shrine, where he a while had shared the sacred residence reared to a kindred deity, furrowed the sandy shore with weight of crackling scales, again he climbed into the lofty stern and near the rudder laid his head at rest. There he remained until the vessel passed by Castrum and Lavinium's sacred homes to where the Tiber flows into the sea there all the people of Rome came rushing out— mothers and fathers and even those who tend your sacred fire, O Trojan goddess Vesta— and joyous shouted welcome to the god. Wherever the swift ship steered through the tide, they built up many altars in a line, so that perfuming frankincense with smoke crackled along the banks on either hand, and victims made the keen knives hot with blood. The serpent-deity has entered Rome, the world's new capital and, lifting up his head above the summit of the mast, looked far and near for a congenial home. The river there, dividing, flows about a place known as the Island, on both sides

<sup>154</sup> Ovid. *Metamorphoses*. Hugo Magnus. Gotha (Germany). Friedr. Andr. Perthes. 1892. *Metamorphoses Liber 15*, 15.680-15.744

	an equal stream glides past dry middle ground. And here the serpent child of Phoebus left the Roman ship, took his own heavenly form, and brought the mourning city health once more. <sup>155</sup>
--	---

Within the above passage Rome seeks help from the healing serpent god Aesculapius to save their city from a devastating plague. The passage starts out with Ovid recounting the offerings given to the serpent god who in turn joined the Roman's on their voyage back to save their city. What is interesting about this passage however is that the ship carrying the Roman god underwent a voyage across Italy where the God was given the chance to look at the lands surrounding the city of Rome. In the end Aesculapius decided to settle in Rome after he "raises his neck and looks around the houses suitable for him."

To the *populus Romanus* of Ovid's time this directly demonstrates the expanded identity present within in Cicero's orations because of the reaction the Italians had to Aesculapius approaching the city of Rome. We can see this when the serpent god on his way back to Rome voyages around the Ionian Sea on the southern end of Italy. Here he is given the chance to view how the Italians lived before entering into the Roman city and even more importantly how joyful these Italians were to see the god En route to heal Rome. Chronologically, this mythical event took place long before the social war where Rome's Italian allies gained enfranchisement however within Ovid's tale the Italians line the mouth of the Tiber with joyous cries and burning incense.<sup>156</sup> This is curious because in reality the early Roman Republic/Monarchy would have been in a state of near constant conflict with the other Italian cities. Here he is presenting an

---

<sup>155</sup> Ovid. *Metamorphoses*. Brookes More. Boston. Cornhill Publishing Co. 1922.

*Metamorphoses Liber 15*, 15.680-15.744

<sup>156</sup> Ovid, *Met*, 15.729-15.735

argument where the Italians are joyous to see a god saving the city of Rome from a plague, that from the beginning the Italians would have wanted to save the city of Rome. At this point in the early Empire there would have been Italians both reading and hearing Ovid's work. This would have indicated to his audience that from the start the Italians would have been in some way associated with the Roman people. This demonstrates the existence of an expanded identity across Ovid's audience, the *populus Romanus*.

Within Ovid's first book of his magnum-opus the *Metamorphoses* we can see a creation myth that breaks down Ovid's dawn of time into two sections. First, is a primordial time that existed forever where the world was in a state of pure chaos and ruled over by nature. Within this time none of the elements that comprised nature worked together and as such the entirety of the body of the natural world was in chaos.<sup>157</sup>

This demonstrates that during the time of the Republic the people of Rome were disorganized and fighting amongst themselves. However, upon Augustus ascending this fragmented *populus Romanus* would be unified under one banner. From this we can see that Ovid is writing to an audience that is the expanded *populus Romanus* explaining how it was only under Augustus that all of them began to work together to achieve peace.

---

<sup>157</sup> We can see this in the following statement "*nulli sua forma manebat, obstabatque aliis aliud, quia corpore in unofrigida pugnabant calidis, umentia siccis, mollia cum duris, sine pondere, habentia pondus.*" Ovid, *Metamorphoses, Liber I, 15-20*.

Within Ovid's last book he presents the story of the serpent god Aesculapius traveling across the Ionian Sea past the heel of Italy, around Sicily and up the mouth of the Tiber river. During this travel the people of Italy, which would come to eventually be the Italian allies, gather around the mouth of the Tiber to joyfully welcome the healer of Rome. Ovid here was purposely writing for the expanded identity of the *populus Romanus* which at this point encompassed the very same Italians which would have either read or heard Ovid's work. This action purposely joined both the Romans and Italians into one group, the expanded *populus Romanus*.

These two stories from Ovid's *Metamorphosis* demonstrate a body of people joined together into one group under an emperor. This body of people included both people from the city of Rome and those outside it. This is a far cry from the initial orations of Cicero where the *populus Romanus* was clearly different than the allies in the east or the Italians. As such we can see that Ovid is writing for an expanded *populus Romanus* and serves as a vital piece of evidence to support this chapter that through these golden-era Latin writers we can see evidence of the expanded identity of the *populus Romanus* that was growing during the time of Cicero.

### Horace's Odes

Quintus Horatius Flaccus was born on the 8th of December 65 BC into a family of freedmen status.<sup>158</sup> From an early age Horace showed great skill in writing, prose, and language. Noticing his son's innate ability Horace's father, a former slave, worked

---

<sup>158</sup> Horace is a rare example of an autobiographer in ancient Latin, in his *Odes* 3.21.1 he details his youth and upbringing.

diligently to give him the best education that money could buy.<sup>159</sup> As a result of this education Horace would routinely visit the capital city of Rome to further his studies. Recent scholarship surrounding Horace indicates that the *Odes* were designed to be performed to the accompaniment of music.<sup>160</sup> This indicates that even the most illiterate of the *populus Romanus* could hear and interact with each of the poems. As such we can see that the way that Horace would interact with his audience as a sign of the expanded *populus Romanus*.

*The Odes 1-3* cover a wide range of topics that would intrigue the *populus* during the reign of Augustus. Horace was a master of combining ancient Greek myth and history in a way that explained the contemporary world of the *populus* of the 1st century BC. Within *The Odes 1-3* one can find topics such as wine, religion, patriotism, morality, love, friendship, and praise to Augustus.<sup>161</sup>

Of the *Odes* books one and two are what the following pages focus on. While book three deals with Augustus and the Republic it fails to provide much in the way of identifying the *populus Romanus* of Horace's time. Of these two books of the *Odes* first I will focus upon the geographical location presented in book one as the ideal Roman life. Next I will move one to hymn to Fortuna. Finally, I will move on to Horace's pleading of Pollo to write a history of the Roman Civil war.

---

<sup>159</sup> Eduard Fraenkel in his influential book *Horace* outlines how much Horace revered his father for his selfless action in supporting Horace's education "No son ever set a finer monument to his father than Horace did in the sixth satire of his *Satires*." Fraenkel, Eduard. *Horace*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1957, pp.5-7.

<sup>160</sup> Lyons, Stuart. *Music in the Odes of Horace*. Aris and Phillips Classical Texts, 2010.

<sup>161</sup> Bennett, Charles. *Horace: The Complete Works*, Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1901, pp. xvii-xii.

Horace's *Odes*(*Carmina*) starts off with Horace thanking his patron Maecenas and to demonstrate to his readers that he desires above all else to be a great poet worthy of their attention stating "But if you'll insert me into lyric poets, I'll make the stars more sublime."<sup>162</sup> Horace was keenly aware of his audience's reaction to his *Odes* and above all else he wished for his readers' admiration, with recent scholarship indicating that Horace's *Odes* were to be performed publicly in song.<sup>163</sup>

As such, much like Cicero, Horace would have to relate his work to his audience.<sup>164</sup> He accomplishes this feat by indicating that every good man is driven by his chosen passion "Never dislodge the lands of the Attalic country from enjoying their country with a hoe."<sup>165</sup> This is important to the thesis because Horace was driven by fame and admiration which he sought to achieve from the *populus Romanus*.

Latin	English
<p style="text-align: center;"> <i>Gaudentem patrios findere sarculo            agros Attalicis condicionibus            numquam demoveas, ut trabe Cypria            Myrtoum pavidus nauta secet mare.            Luctantem Icaris fluctibus Africum            mercator metuens otium et oppidi            laudat rura sui; mox reficit rates            quassas, indocilis pauperiem pati.            Est qui nec veteris pocula Massici            nec partem solido demere de die</i> </p>	<p style="text-align: center;">           That, if his granary has stored away            Of Libya's thousand floors the yield entire;            The man who digs his field as did his sire,            With honest pride, no Attalus may sway By proffer'd            wealth to tempt Myrtoan seas,            The timorous captain of a Cyprian bark.            The winds that make Icarian billows dark            The merchant fears, and hugs the rural ease Of his own            village home; but soon, ashamed Of penury, he refits            his batter'd craft. There is, who thinks no scorn of            Massic draught, Who robs the daylight of an hour         </p>

<sup>162</sup> Horace, *Odes*, 1,20-35

<sup>163</sup> We know that Horace was impacted by the negative reception that he received for his *Odes I-III* in *Epistles* 1.19.35–44. For song performance Lyons, Stuart. *Music in the Odes of Horace*, Aris & Phillips, 2010.

<sup>164</sup> Horace was driven by an unending desire to be famous for his own writings and poems in his time. Both by his contemporaries and the average audience of the *populus* this is evident within his 19th poem of his *Epistles* where he states "You'd want to know, why an ungrateful reader praises my works and loves me at home, is that unjust man to press outside the threshold? I do not hunt the votes of the windy people at the expense of the banquets and the worn-out clothing of their gift; I am not a listener and avenger of famous writers and deign to go around grammars on three different platforms. Therefore, those tears" Horace, *Epistles*, 1, 30-41 (<http://www.thelatinlibrary.com/horace/epist1.shtml>)

<sup>165</sup> Horace, *Odes*, 1,10-15



This relation of Horace to the expanded *populus* is present within this first book of the *Odes*. We can see this in the geographic location in which the 10th through 16th line in *Odes* locates. Horace idealizes Greek culture when referring to his patron and friend Maecenas. The explanation for this geographical context is twofold, first Horace sought his education in Athens as a young adult.<sup>168</sup> Second, he knew that Hellenistic influences would gather the attention of his readership, the *populus Romanus*.

This Hellenistic influence among the *populus* in Rome came from two major sources. First, emulation throughout the upper class of the Roman state of Hellenistic ideals.<sup>169</sup> Second, the burgeoning interlinking amount of trade within the Empire.<sup>170</sup> Horace was aware of this influence and by choosing the Greek world as the focal point for him relating himself and his experiences to his audience.<sup>171</sup>

So the rhetorical question remains; Why would Horace choose the Hellenistic world to idealize in his opening poem instead of Rome when he cared about the success of his book within the *populus Romanus*? If the *populus Romanus* indeed only comprised of the people of the city of Rome, then Horace would have simply just idealized the city itself. Horace deciding to use the Hellenistic world to idealize the ideal

<sup>166</sup> Horace. *Horace, Odes and Epodes*. Paul Shorey and Gordon J. Laing. Chicago. Benj. H. Sanborn & Co. 1919. *Odes*, 1, 10-21

<sup>167</sup> Horace. *The Odes and Carmen Saeculare of Horace*. John Conington. trans. London. George Bell and Sons. 1882. *Odes*, 1, 10-21

<sup>168</sup> Horace dedicates a poem to the influential peers he made in his time in Athens. Horace, *Odes*, 2.7

<sup>169</sup> Hammond, Mason. "Hellenistic Influences on the Structure of the Augustan Principate." *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome* 17 (1940): 1–25.

<sup>170</sup> Thorley, J. "The Development of Trade between the Roman Empire and the East under Augustus." *Greece & Rome* 16, no. 2 (1969): 209–23.

<sup>171</sup> Recent scholarship has looked into how Hellenistic culture impacted the societal development of the early to middle Empire. Galasso, Vittorio Nicholas. "Honor and The Performance of Roman State Identity." *Foreign Policy Analysis* 8, no. 2 (2012): 173–89.

Roman world indicates that at this point within Horace's *Odes* the *populus Romanus* considered Greece to also be part of their identity. This indicates a drastically expanded *populus Romanus* when compared to the early orations of Cicero where the Greeks are merely allies in the east.<sup>172</sup>

The next instance of Horace writing for the expanded *populus Romanus* can be seen in his Hymn to Fortuna.

Latin	English
<p><i>O diva, gratum quae regis Antium, praesens vel imo tollere de gradu mortale corpus vel superbos vertere funeribus triumphos, te pauper ambit sollicita prece ruris colonus, te dominam aequoris quicumque Bythyna lacessit Carpathium pelagus carina. Te Dacus asper, te profugi Scythae, urbesque gentesque et Latium ferox regumque matres barbarorum et purpurei metuunt tyranni, iniurioso ne pede proruas stantem columnam, neu populus frequens ad arma cessantis, ad arma concitet imperiumque frangat. Te semper anteit serva Necessitas, clavos trabalis et cuneos manu gestans aena nec severus uncus abest liquidumque plumbum; te Spes et albo rara Fides colit velata panno nec comitem abnegat, utcumque mutata potentis veste domos inimica linquis; at volgus infidum et meretrix retro periura cedit, diffugiunt cadis cum faece siccatis amici, ferre iugum pariter dolosi. Servas iturum Caesarem in ultimos orbis Britannos et iuenum recens examen Eois timendum partibus Oceanoque rubro. Heu heu, cicatricum et sceleris pudet fratrumque. Quid nos dura refugimus aetas, quid intactum nefasti liquimus? Unde manum iuventus metu deorum continuit? Quibus pepercit aris? O utinam nova incude diffingas retusum in Massagetis Arabasque ferrum!</i><sup>173</sup></p>	<p>Lady of Antium, grave and stern! O Goddess, who canst lift the low to high estate, and sudden turn A triumph to a funeral show! Thee the poor hind that tills the soil Implores; their queen they own in thee, Who in Bithynian vessel toil Amid the vex'd Carpathian sea. Thee Dacians fierce, and Scythian hordes, Peoples and towns, and Rome, their head, And mothers of barbarian lords, And tyrants in their purple dread, Lest, spurn'd by thee in scorn, should fall The state's tall prop, lest crowds on fire To arms, to arms! the loiterers call, And thrones be tumbled in the mire. Necessity precedes thee still with hard fierce eyes and heavy tramp: Her hand the nails and wedges fill, The molten lead and stubborn clamp. Hope, precious Truth in garb of white, attend thee still, nor quit thy side When with changed robes thou tak'st thy flight in anger from the homes of pride. Then the false herd, the faithless fair, start backward; when the wine runs dry. The jocund guests, too light to bear an equal yoke, asunder fly. O shield our Caesar as he goes to furthest Britain, and his band, Rome's harvest! Send on Eastern foes Their fear, and on the Red Sea strand! O wounds that scarce have ceased to run! O brother's blood! O iron time! What horror have we left undone? Has conscience shrunk from aught of crime? What shrine has rapine held in awe? What altar spared? O haste and beat The blunted steel we yet may draw On Arab and on Massagete!<sup>174</sup></p>

<sup>172</sup> For evidence of this see my section on Cicero *Pro Lege Manilia* where the allies in the east are not part of the *populus Romanus*.

<sup>173</sup> Horace. Horace, Odes and Epodes. Paul Shorey and Gordon J. Laing. Chicago. Benj. H. Sanborn & Co. 1919. *Odes*, 1, 10-21

<sup>174</sup> Horace. The Odes and Carmen Saeculare of Horace. John Conington. trans. London. George Bell and Sons. 1882. *Odes*, 1, 10-21

Horace in the above passage is recounting how everyone fears and admires Fortuna. What is interesting however is the Horace's accounting of the far off distant lands in the Empire that much like the denizens of the city of Rome also fear Fortuna in the same capacity. Further, that even Caesar stands before Fortuna as a lesser along with his fellow members of the *populus Romanus* is indicative a significantly expanded identity.<sup>175</sup>

This direct linking of everyone across the early Empire, from the Britons to the Red Ocean, into a universal awe and fear of the goddess Fortuna further exemplifies how Horace was at this point writing for an expanded *populus Romaus*. As such this is further evidence that the *populus Romanus* that through the writings of Cicero we see expanding can also be seen later on in the writings of Horace, which were designed to be performed before a crowd of the *populus Romanus*.

The next passage from book two outlines how Horace, who was requested to write a history of the Roman Civil War, implores Asinius Pollio to write a tragedy of the war.

Latin	English
<p><i>Pollio, curiae, cui laurus aeternos honores Delmatico peperit triumpho. Iam nunc minaci murmure cornuum perstringis auris, iam litui strepunt, iam fulgor armorum fugacis terret equos equitumque voltus. Audire magnos iam videor duces non indecoro pulvere sordidos et cuncta terrarum subacta praeter atrocem animum Catonis. Iuno et deorum quisquis amicio Afris inulta cesserat impotens tellure, victorum nepotes rettulit inferias Iugurthae. Quis non Latino sanguine pinguior</i></p>	<p>Pollio, forsaking the tragic stage and the triumphs of the Forum, undertakes the history of our civil wars-- setting his feet 'on the thin crust of ashes beneath which the lava is still glowing.' Methinks even now I hear the trumpet's blare. Again 'our Italy shines o'er with civil swords.' Again the tale is told of great captains soiled with noble dust, and all the world subdued save Cato's indomitable soul. Now, Jugurtha, thou art avenged. Our blood has fertilized every field, crimsoned every pool, and the crash of ruin in Italy rejoiced the ears of our</p>

<sup>175</sup> The goddess of Fortuna had several temples built to her honor within the city of Rome. The *populus Romanus* of Horace's time would have undoubtedly interacted with her iconography to some degree. For more research on the topic see Kajanto, Iiro. "Epigraphical Evidence of the Cult of Fortuna in Germania Romana." *Latomus* 47, no. 3 (1988): 554–83.

<p><i>campus sepulcris impia proelia testatur auditumque Medis Hesperiae sonitum ruinae? Qui gurgis aut quae flumina lugubris ignara belli? Quod mare Daunia non decoloravere caedes? Quae caret ora cruore nostro? Sed ne relictis, Musa procax, iocis Caeae retractes munera Neriae, mecum Dionaeo sub antro quaere modos leviore plectro. 176</i></p>	<p>enemy the Mede. But hush! my light muse. So high a strain is not for thee.<sup>177</sup></p>
--	---

This above passage is interesting because the Horace would have known that members of his audience would have comprised of Italians and other allies who fought within the Roman civil war. As such Horace does not state "Roman blood" he is very clear to succinctly state "Latin blood."<sup>178</sup> This would have resounded across Horace's audience who would have then communicated this story to others. This choice of words to be spoken before an expanded *populus Romanus* is indicative of an expanded identity across the *populus Romanus*. Further, evidence of this can be found later on with the statement where the sound of the Roman Civil war could even be heard at the Medes of Hesperia which is indicative of the fact that while the Romans and their allies attacked each other the Parthians were watching and waiting. This indicates that the expanded *populus Romanus* was aware of the 'real enemy' while they were fighting amongst themselves, which indicates that even though discord was present across the *populus Romanus* they remained unified against 'outside' threats. In Horace's work Parthia remained ever vigilant to strike.<sup>179</sup>

---

<sup>176</sup> Horace. Horace, Odes and Epodes. Paul Shorey and Gordon J. Laing. Chicago. Benj. H. Sanborn & Co. 1919. *Odes*, 2.1.

<sup>177</sup> Horace. Odes and Epodes. Edited with commentary by. Paul Shorey. revised by. Paul Shorey and Gordon J. Laing. New York. Benj. H. Sanborn and Co. 1910. *Odes*, 2.1.

<sup>178</sup> Ibid. 2.1.29

<sup>179</sup> After Augustus ascended to the throne there was an uneasy truce between Parthia and the Roman Empire. However it is evident that the people of the early Empire, the *populus Romanus* was aware that peace between the two powers could not last. Here we can see Horace demonstrating this. For further evidence of Parthian and Empire relations see Rose, Charles Brian. "The Parthians in Augustan Rome." *American Journal of Archaeology* 109, no. 1 (2005): 21–75.

This above passage is important to this thesis because it shows that Horace was writing for an audience that not only included direct Romans living in the city of Rome but rather a substantially larger group of individuals who were united into one *populus Romanus*.

Within the first poem of Horace's *Odes* we can see the expanded identity of the *populus Romanus* due to Horace idealizing not the city of Rome but rather the Greek countryside in the far east. This is followed up later on in book one during the Hymn to Fortuna where Horace discusses how all Romans fear the goddess, this directly demonstrates a drastically expanded identity of the *populus Romanus*. Finally, the last instance is within book two during Horace's discussion of the Roman civil war where he highlights the wording on Latin blood and not just Roman. All of these instances are important to this thesis because they demonstrate that the *populus Romanus* which would either have read or listened to Horace's odes holds a significantly larger identity than previously thought.

### Virgil's Aeneid

Publius Vergilius Maro saw the fall of the late Roman Republic and the rise of the Empire; he lived from 70 BC up until 19 BC dying at the age of 50.<sup>180</sup> Because of this

---

<sup>180</sup> Unlike Horace, Virgil does not detail his life within his works. Because of this much of his life is shrouded in mystery. Much of what we know about the poet comes from a lost biography written by the poet Varius, which supposedly incorporated into the work of the 1st century AD Roman historian Suetonius. Fowler, Don. "Virgil (Publius Vergilius Maro)." *Oxford Classical Dictionary*, Oxford University Press, 1996.

timeline Virgil's works incorporate many of the themes present within the late Roman Republic; themes such as warfare, peace, and the struggle for power.<sup>181</sup>

The Aeneid is the foundational myth for the Roman Empire. The Aeneid's main protagonist, Aeneas, was already known within the ancient world. Within the Odyssey, Aeneas is said to have wandered around the Aegean Sea. Virgil simply took this story and spun it into the foundational myth for the Roman Empire.<sup>182</sup> Incorporating many elements that would be familiar to his contemporary readership.<sup>183</sup>

We can see examples of the expanded identity of the *populus Romanus* several times throughout Virgil's *Aeneid*. Historians are aware that Virgil's story was a near overnight success throughout the early Empire due to iconography left over from the both the plebian and patrician class of the early Empire.<sup>184</sup> This demonstrates that across the *populus Romanus* people would have heard and interacted with Virgil's *Aeneid*. For the purposes of this thesis this is important because it demonstrates that the allegory in Virgil's story was not lost on the plebian class of the *populus Romanus*.

Virgil begins his epic poem by providing a synopsis of the entire story. Aeneas would flee the burning of Troy, wander across the sea, and eventually found the city/nation of Rome, stating "*tantae molis erat Romanam condere gentem*" ("Of so great

---

<sup>181</sup> Vance, Eugene. "Warfare and the Structure of Thought in Virgil's Aeneid." *Quaderni Urbinati Di Cultura Classica*, no. 15 (1973): 111–62.

<sup>182</sup> Donlan, Walter. "The Foundation Legends of Rome: An Example of Dynamic Process." *The Classical World* 64, no. 4 (1970): 109–14.

<sup>183</sup> Historians have long drawn similarities between Aeneas's shield and Augustus's *pax Romana*. Bell, Kimberly K. "'Translatio' and the Constructs of a Roman Nation in Virgil's 'Aeneid.'" *Rocky Mountain Review* 62, no. 1 (2008): 11–24. Andrew J. E. Bell. "The Popular Poetics and Politics of the Aeneid." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* (1974-) 129 (1999): 263–79.

<sup>184</sup> Andrew Bell outlines just how popular Virgil's work was across the early Empire in his article "Popular Poetics and Politics in the Aeneid." Andrew J. E. Bell. "The Popular Poetics and Politics of the Aeneid." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* (1974-) 129 (1999): 263–79.

a task it was to found the Roman Nation").<sup>185</sup> To the expanded *populus Romanus* Virgil's choice of wording "*condere gentem*" would prove interesting. This wording directly implies that Virgil's audience comprises members of a nation and not just a city. This is important to the thesis because during the initial orations of Cicero the *populus Romanus* would not have constituted anything to the size of a nation. Indeed it is Cicero who later on in his career starts to refer to the citizen body of the Romans as a *natio* but merely in a theoretical stance and only in his written works.<sup>186</sup> As such we can see within the opening pages of the *Aeneid* that Virgil is referring to a *populus Romanus* which during the early Empire has a significantly expanded identity when compared to the late Republic.

Later on in the first book Virgil's audience, the *populus Romanus*, would hear of a prophecy put forth by the Roman god Jupiter. Virgil's audience would have heard how Venus was upset that her people, the Trojans, were destroyed when they were supposed to create a great empire. Jupiter calms the fears of Venus by stating that his prophecy still holds true, and that from the ashes of Troy a great empire will rise. That this empire will be brought about by a Caesar of Trojan origin, that the Trojan people at large will still have their great empire.<sup>187</sup>

Latin	English
-------	---------

<sup>185</sup> The wording on *condere gentem* is interesting, the Romans had a Latin word for nation (*natio*). Virgil saw fit to describe this grouping of 'roman' people as a gathered group of people sharing similarities. For the purposes of the English translation I provided nation instead. *Virgil, The Aeneid*, 1, 33

<sup>186</sup> The concept of a the Roman word of *natio* is significantly different than what we could call a nation today. *Natio* to the Romans implies a tribal grouping of people. For more research see Kočovska-Stevović, Svetlana. "On the Roman Concept of *Natio*", *Colloquia Humanistica*, 5, 2016.

<sup>187</sup> Here Virgil's passage is less than 10 lines long, but is one of the most detailed in the entire epic. Virgil, *Aeneid*, 1, 286-295.

"*quin aspera luno, quae mare nunc terrasque metu  
caelumque fatigat, consilia in melius referet, mecumque  
fovebit Romanos, rerum dominos gentemque togatam.  
sic placitum. ueniet lustris labentibus aetas cum domus  
Assaraci Pthiam clarasque Mycenae seruitio premet ac  
uictis dominabitur Argis nascetur pulchra Troianus  
origine Caesar, imperium Oceano, famam qui terminet  
astris, lulius, a magno demissum nomen Iulo. hunc tu  
olim caelo spoliis Orientis onustum accipies securo;  
uocabitur hic quoque uotis.*"<sup>188</sup>

Yea, even my Queen, Juno, who now chastiseth land and sea with her dread frown, will find a wiser way, and at my sovereign side protect and bless the Romans, masters of the whole round world, who, clad in peaceful toga, judge mankind. Such my decree! In lapse of seasons due, the heirs of Ilium's kings shall bind in chains Mycenae's glory and Achilles' towers, and over prostrate Argos sit supreme. Of Trojan stock illustriously sprung, lo, Caesar comes! whose power the ocean bounds, whose fame, the skies. He shall receive the name Iulus nobly bore, great Julius, he. Him to the skies, in Orient trophies dress, thou shalt with smiles receive; and he, like us, shall hear at his own shrines the suppliant vow.<sup>189</sup>

This passage would have resounded across the *populus Romanus* reading and hearing the first book of Virgil's *Aeneid*. The Roman people at large were descendants of Troy and were blessed by the Gods to found the city of Rome. That the *populus* was destined to assimilate the surrounding Italians into their mythical ranks and that with the deification of Julius Caesar a *pax* would be ushered in bringing them all to glory.<sup>190</sup>

For the past half century scholars have spilled ink regarding the question of how much Virgil's *Aeneid* draws parallels to the Augustan regime. Recently however academics have begun to ask the important question of how much Virgil's *Aeneid* demonstrates the ideal Roman, and not just Augustus.<sup>191</sup> That the *Aeneid* was designed instead for the *populus* at large and not just for propaganda purposes.

While the above passage on a surface level certainly predicts the rise of Augustus under Caesar's lineage and could be interpreted as simply foreshadowing the plot. I suggest that rather Virgil is demonstrating how expanded his *populus* had

<sup>188</sup> Vergil. *Bucolics, Aeneid, and Georgics Of Vergil*. J. B. Greenough. Boston. Ginn & Co. 1900. *Aeneid*, 1, 279-290.

<sup>189</sup> Vergil. *Aeneid*. Theodore C. Williams. trans. Boston. Houghton Mifflin Co. 1910. *Aeneid*, 1, 279-290

<sup>190</sup> Dobbin, Robert F. "Julius Caesar in Jupiter's Prophecy, 'Aeneid', Book 1." *Classical Antiquity* 14, no. 1 (1995): 5-40.

<sup>191</sup> Toll, Katharine. "Making Roman-Ness and the 'Aeneid.'" *Classical Antiquity* 16, no. 1 (1997): 34-56.



become by the latter half of the first century BC. Virgil is presenting the heir of Julius Caesar as “Of Trojan stock illustriously sprung, lo, Caesar comes! whose power the ocean bounds, whose fame, the skies” that Caesar upon his death will have ‘reconquered’ what was taken from his ancestors. Through Caesar’s actions Rome will inherit its former glory, that within this glory the *populus Romanus* will finally know peace and prosperity.

We can see Virgil’s allegory to this peace among the expanded *populus Romanus* within this passage “The age will come when the lusts are passing, along with the famous Pthias of the house of Assaracus.”<sup>192</sup> Here we can see Virgil mentioning the house of Assaracus, the founder of Ilium/Troy. Under Assaracus’s leadership Troy would undergo an era of peace and prosperity, something that during the time of Virgil the *populus* at large wanted.<sup>193</sup>

Within the fifth book of the *Aeneid* we can see Virgil detailing how before *Aeneas* would come to Italy he would first found a city in Sicily with his remaining crew after fleeing Dido.

Latin	English
<p><i>"Interea Aeneas urbem designat aratro sortiturque domos; hoc Ilium et haec loca Troiam esse iubet. Gaudet regno Troianus Acestes, indicitque forum et patribus dat iura vocatis. Tum vicina astris, Erycino in vertice sedes fundatur Veneri Idaliae, tumuloque sacerdos ac lucus late sacer additur Anchiseo."</i><sup>194</sup></p>	<p>The prince designs a city with the plow; The lots their sev'ral tenements allow. This part is nam'd from Ilium, that from Troy, And the new king ascends the throne with joy; A chosen senate from the people draws; Appoints the judges, and ordains the laws. Then, on the top of Eryx, they begin A rising temple to the Paphian queen. Anchises, last, is honor'd as a god; A priest is</p>

<sup>192</sup> Virgil, *Aeneid*, 1, 283-285.

<sup>193</sup> Recent scholarship has shed light upon the use of Assaracus within Roman iconography for an allegory to peace and prosperity during the time of Augustus. Rehak, Paul. “Aeneas or Numa? Rethinking the Meaning of the Ara Pacis Augustae.” *The Art Bulletin* 83, no. 2 (2001): 190–208.

<sup>194</sup> Vergil. *Bucolics, Aeneid, and Georgics Of Vergil*. J. B. Greenough. Boston. Ginn & Co. 1900. *Aeneid*, 5.755-5.761

	added, annual gifts bestow'd, And groves are planted round his blest abode. <sup>195</sup>
--	--

This passage is important because it would have demonstrated to Virgil's audience, the expanded *populus Romaus* either reading or listening to this passage, that the Sicilians were also founded by their great mythical hero *Aeneas* using the very crew he used to settle in Italy and build the 'Roman nation'. Within this passage we can see evidence for the expanded identity of the *populus Romanus* during the early Empire. Here the Sicilians are being included in the identity of the *populus Romanus* an action which under the early orations of Cicero would have never happened.<sup>196</sup> This passage is important because it demonstrates that Virgil is including the Sicilians in the foundation of the "Roman nation" he mentions in the opening pages of his epic. This directly demonstrates an expansion of the target audience of Virgil, the *populus Romanus*.

In book 6 of the *Aeneid* Virgil begins a very graphic account of *Aeneas*'s trip to the underworld to receive instructions from his dead father. Within the end part of this book Virgil gives us a passage detailing how those who drink from the river Lethe are to be reborn into not a Roman nation, but rather Italy as a whole.

Latin	English
<p><i>"Hunc circum innumerae gentes populi que volabant; ac—velut in pratis ubi apes aestate serena floribus insidunt variis, et candida circum lilia funduntur—strepit omnis murmure campus. Horrescit visu subito, causasque requirit inscius Aeneas, quae sint ea flumina porro, quive viri tanto compleverint agmine ripas. Tum pater Anchises: "Animae, quibus altera fato corpora</i></p>	<p>After these things Aeneas was aware Of solemn groves in one deep, distant vale, Where trees were whispering, and forever flowed The river Lethe, through its land of calm. Nations unnumbered roved and haunted there: As when, upon a windless summer morn, The bees afield among the rainbow flowers Alight and sip, or round the lilies pure Pour forth in busy swarm, while far</p>

<sup>195</sup> Vergil. *Aeneid*. John Dryden. trans. 5, 755-761

<sup>196</sup> Cicero routinely makes a clear distinction between Italian Allies and the Sicilians when referencing the crowd. One of his most notable examples can be seen in *In Verrem* where he defends the Sicilians against extortion by Gaius Verres.

<p><i>debentur, Lethaei ad fluminis undam securos latices et longa oblivia potant. Has equidem memorare tibi atque ostendere coram, iampridem hanc prolem cupio enumerare meorum, quo magis Italia mecum laetere reperta.</i><sup>197</sup></p>	<p>diffused Their murmured songs from all the meadows rise. Aeneas in amaze the wonder views, And fearfully inquires of whence and why; What yonder rivers be; what people press, Line after line, on those dim shores along. Said Sire Anchises: "Yonder thronging souls To reincarnate shape predestined move. Here, at the river Lethe's wave, they quaff Care-quelling floods, and long oblivion. Of these I shall discourse, and to thy soul Make visible the number and array Of my posterity; so shall thy heart In Italy, thy new-found home, rejoice." "O father," said Aeneas, "must I deem That from this region souls exalted rise To upper air, and shall once more return To cumbering flesh? O, wherefore do they feel, Unhappy ones, such fatal lust to live?" "I speak, my son, nor make thee longer doubt," Anchises said, and thus the truth set forth, In ordered words from point to point unfolding.<sup>198</sup></p>
---	--

It is the ending of this passage that details the most important part of Virgil's audience. In the beginning of Virgil's epic, he details the Roman nation, indeed Aeneas travels to the underworld to receive a vision of what Rome will be, however he is met with a vision of all of Italy. This directly demonstrates that Virgil's audience, the *populus Romanus*, was not only comprised of Romans but was comprised of all Italians waiting to be reborn in to a Roman nation.

Finally, it is within book eight during the time when Venus presents Aeneas with a shield detailing the glory of the future Roman nation on it that we can clearly see how Virgil is writing for a *populus Romanus* which has a significantly expanded identity when compared to the *populus Romanus* of Cicero's time.

<p style="text-align: center;">Latin</p> <p><i>"Hinc Augustus agens Italos in proelia Caesar cum patribus populo, penetibus et magnis dis, stans celsa in puppi; geminas cui tempora flammis laeta vomunt patriumque aperitur vertice sidus. Parte alia ventis et dis Agrippa secundis arduus agmen agens; cui, belli</i></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">English</p> <p>Caesar Augustus led Italia's sons to battle: at his side concordant moved Senate and Roman People, with their gods of hearth and home, and all Olympian Powers. Uplifted on his ship he stands; his brows beneath a double glory smile, and bright over his</p>
---	---

<sup>197</sup> Vergil. *Bucolics, Aeneid, and Georgics Of Vergil*. J. B. Greenough. Boston. Ginn & Co. 1900. *Aeneid*, 6.703-6.723

<sup>198</sup> Vergil. *Aeneid*. Theodore C. Williams. trans. Boston. Houghton Mifflin Co. 1910. *Aeneid*, 6.703-6.723

*insigne superbum; tempora navali fulgent rostrata corona. Hinc ope barbarica variisque Antonius armis; victor ab Aurorae populis et litore rubro, Aegyptum viresque Orientis et ultima secum Bactra vehit, sequiturque nefas Aegyptia coniunx. Una omnes ruere, ac totum spumare reductis. convolsum remis rostrisque tridentibus aequor. alta petunt: pelago credas innare revolsas Cycladas aut montis concurrere montibus altos, tanta mole viri turrilis puppibus instant. stuppea flamma manu telisque volatile ferrum spargitur, arva nova Neptunia caede rubescunt. Regina in mediis patrio vocat agmina sistro necdum etiam geminos a tergo respicit anguis. omnigenumque deum monstra et latrator Anubis contra Neptunum et Venerem contraque Minervam tela teneat. Saevit medio in certamine Mavors caelatus ferro tristesque ex aethere Dirae; et scissa gaudens vadit Discordia palla, quam cum sanguineo sequitur Bellona flagello. Actius haec cernens arcum tendebat Apollo desuper: omnis eo terrore Aegyptus et Indi. omnis Arabes, omnes vertebant terga Sabaei. Ipsa videbatur ventis regina vocatis vela dare et laxos iam iamque inmittere funis. Illam inter caedes pallentem morte futura fecerat Ignipotens undis et lapyge ferri; contra autem magno maerentem corpore Nilum pandentemque sinus et tota veste vocantem caeruleum in gremium latebrosa que flumina victos. At Caesar triplici invectus Romana triumpho moenia, dis Italis votum inmortale sacrabat, maxuma tercentum totam delubra per urbem. Laetitia ludisque viae plausuque fremebant; omnibus in templis matrum chorus, omnibus arae; ante aras terram caesi stravere iuveni. Ipse sedens niveo candentis limine Phoebi, dona recognoscit populorum aptatque superbis postibus; incedunt victae longo ordine gentes, quam variae linguae, habitu tam vestis et armis. Hic Nomadum genus et discinctos Mulciber Afros, hic Lelegas Carasque sagittiferosque Gelonos finxerat; Euphrates ibat iam mollior undis; extremique hominum Morini, Rhenusque bicornis; indomitique Dahae, et ponteni indignatus Araxes."<sup>199</sup>*

forehead beams the Julian star. in neighboring region great Agrippa leads, by favor of fair winds and friendly Heaven, his squadron forth: upon his brows he wears the peerless emblem of his rostral crown. Opposing, in barbaric splendor shine the arms of Antony: in victor's garb from nations in the land of morn he rides, and from the Red Sea, bringing in his train Egypt and Syria, utmost Bactria's horde, and last—O shameless!—his Egyptian spouse. All to the fight make haste; the slanted oars and triple beaks of brass uprear the waves to angry foam, as to the deep they speed like hills on hill-tops hurled, or Cyclades drifting and clashing in the sea: so vast that shock of castled ships and mighty men! Swift, arrowy steel and balls of blazing tow rain o'er the waters, till the sea-god's world flows red with slaughter. In the midst, the Queen, sounding her native timbrel, wildly calls her minions to the fight, nor yet can see two fatal asps behind. Her monster-gods, barking Anubis, and his mongrel crew, on Neptune, Venus, and Minerva fling their impious arms; the face of angry Mars, carved out of iron, in the centre frowns, grim Furies fill the air; Discordia strides in rent robe, mad with joy; and at her side, bellona waves her sanguinary scourge. There Actian Apollo watched the war, and o'er it stretched his bow; which when they knew, Egyptian, Arab, and swart Indian slave, and all the sons of Saba fled away in terror of his arm. The vanquished Queen made prayer to all the winds, and more and more flung out the swelling sail: on wind-swept wave she fled through dead and dying; her white brow the Lord of Fire had cunningly portrayed blanched with approaching doom. Beyond her lay the large-limbed picture of the mournful Nile, who from his bosom spread his garments wide, and offered refuge in his sheltering streams and broad, blue breast, to all her fallen power. But Caesar in his triple triumph passed the gates of Rome, and gave Italia's gods, for grateful offering and immortal praise, three hundred temples; all the city streets with game and revel and applauding song rang loud; in all the temples altars burned and Roman matrons prayed; the slaughtered herds strewed well the sacred ground. The hero, throned at snow-white marble threshold of the fane to radiant Phoebus, views the gift and spoil the nations bring, and on the portals proud hangs a perpetual garland: in long file the vanquished peoples pass, of alien tongues, of arms and vesture strange. Here Vulcan showed ungirdled Afric chiefs and Nomads bold, Gelonian

<sup>199</sup> Vergil. *Bucolics, Aeneid, and Georgics of Vergil*. J. B. Greenough. Boston. Ginn & Co. 1900. *The Aeneid*, 8.678-8.728

	bowmen, men of Caria, and Leleges. Euphrates seemed to flow with humbler wave; the world's remotest men, Morini came, with double-horned Rhine, and Dahae, little wont to bend the knee, and swift Araxes, for a bridge too proud <sup>200</sup>
--	--

This above passage details an inscription upon Aeneas's shield. Here we can see Venus foretelling the history of the coming empire that Aeneas would found. To the *populus Romanus* of Virgil's time this passage outlines how the Italians and all other forms of conquered nations were part of Caesar's parade procession all marching in unification under the order of Caesar.

This passage is important to this thesis because it demonstrates that Virgil's audience comprised of much more than just the people of the city of Rome. Rather the identity of this *populus Romanus* was significantly expanded by the time of the *Aeneid's* publication and further serves to solidify the point of this third chapter. That through the writings of these Golden-era Latin writers we can see the existence of the expanded *populus Romanus* as their target audience.

Virgil's *Aeneid* has several demonstrations of the expanded identity of the *populus Romanus*. In the opening lines of the epic Virgil states that he is recounting the foundation of the Roman nation. Later in book five he goes on to demonstrate that the Sicilians are also Roman in his foundation myth, thus further exemplifying that his target audience, the *populus Romanus*, is significantly larger in identity than just the city of Rome. Within book six Virgil outlines that all of Italy is awaiting to be reborn into a new Roman nation that Aeneas will found. Finally, it is within book eight that we can see how

---

<sup>200</sup> Vergil. *Aeneid*. Theodore C. Williams. trans. Boston. Houghton Mifflin Co. 1910. *The Aeneid*, 8.678-8.728

Virgil outlines that all of the conquered will become part of the *populus Romanus* and serve in equal standing within Caesar's march. This directly demonstrates how the identity of the *populus Romanus* by the time of Virgil had expanded significantly, far outside the confines of the city.

### Livy's *Ab Urbe Condita*

Titus Livius, or Livy, was a Roman historian whose only surviving work is his *Ab Urbe Condita* (*From the Founding of the City*). We know that Livy wrote other works on oration and philosophy due to mentions by Seneca the Younger, but unfortunately none of these works have been found or survive.<sup>201</sup>

Livy's *Ab Urbe Condita* charts the history of the Roman people from the traditional foundation of the city in 753 BC up through his contemporary time during the reign of Augustus. Livy himself was friends with the imperial household and according to Tacitus was close friends with the Emperor Augustus.<sup>202</sup> Because of this imperial friendship Livy's magnum opus, the *Ab Urbe Condita*, was heavily promoted throughout the empire. Pliny even recounts a story of an avid fan of Livy traveling from Southwest Spain to Rome just to meet the famed historian.<sup>203</sup>

Much like his contemporaries Horace, Virgil, and Ovid, Livy would give recitations of his work before both the *populus* and members of the Senate.<sup>204</sup> So popular was the

---

<sup>201</sup> Seneca the Younger. *Moral Letters to Lucilius*, 100.9

<sup>202</sup> Tacitus, *Annales*. IV. 34

<sup>203</sup> Pliny. *Epistulae*, II.3

<sup>204</sup> Syme, Ronald. "Livy and Augustus." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 64 (1959): 27–87.

*ab Urbe Condita* that Suetonius recounts that occasionally Augustus himself would be present for the recitals.<sup>205</sup>

Popular for poets and writers during Livy's time was to write their work in a way to allow for declamation before large crowds.<sup>206</sup> Livy's *Ab Urbe Condita* however was written in an annalistic style where Livy was free to write in a fashion where he could freely express his own rhetorical devices.<sup>207</sup> This would have been uncommon for Livy's time as dictation of an analytic style narrative would not have been very popular amongst the *populus* of the time as they would have been more familiar with traditional rhetorical tools such as *exempla*.<sup>208</sup>

Regardless, Livy's public presentations of his *Ab Urbe Condita* would have resounded within the *populus Romanus* who would have either read or listened to it. This is because Livy strategically presents allegories to explain to his contemporary readership/audience how their current Roman society came to be. A prime example of this can be seen in Livy's seventh book of the *Ab Urbe Condita* where Livy uses gendered language to explain Rome's gendered civic participation roles.<sup>209</sup>

Reading Livy's *Ab Urbe Condita* presents a wealth of information on the social structure of his contemporary Rome. Livy grew up and lived during the reign of Augustus, he was a friend of Augustus, and his work reflects this close proximity to the

---

<sup>205</sup> Suetonius, *De vita Caesarum*, Tiberius, 61.3; Dio, LVII, 24.3

<sup>206</sup> Declamation can be best described as a theatrical reading of a written piece by the author. Rayment, Charles S. "Three Notes on the Roman Declamation." *The Classical Weekly* 45, no. 15 (1952): 225–28.

<sup>207</sup> McDonald, A. H. "The Style of Livy." *The Journal of Roman Studies* 47, no. 1/2 (1957): 155–72.

<sup>208</sup> Poel, Marc van der. "The Use of *exempla* in Roman Declamation." *Rhetorica: A Journal of the History of Rhetoric* 27, no. 3 (2009): 332–53

<sup>209</sup> Clark, Jessica H. "The-People-Who-Are-Men: Livy's Book 7 Construction of the *Populus*." *Syllecta Classica* 31 (2020): 39-63.

fledgling regime. An example of this can be seen in Livy's recount of Romulus, who is painted as always working to benefit the people of Rome.<sup>210</sup> I do not weigh in on the ongoing propaganda debate, but simply wish to demonstrate that Livy is presenting a story to his target audience, the *populus Romanus*, that would relate to their contemporary time.

Within this section I analyze the first book of *Ab Urbe Condita* not as a historical fiction but rather as a social commentary. Within the first book of the *Ab Urbe Condita* Livy recounts the dramatized history of the founding the Roman people. Over the course of the first book there are several instances of Rome's *populus Romanus* assimilating outside Latin people to create one expanded identity, the same expanded identity that was forming during Cicero's orations. This is important to this thesis because it would clearly demonstrate to Livy's audience, the *populus Romanus*, that their identity from the beginning of the Republic constituted a body of people far beyond the confines of the city, an action which would help to explain their contemporary expanded identity.<sup>211</sup>

Livy would routinely use his fictional audience within his works to represent how a Roman should act during a similar situation. Andrew Feldher's work *Spectacle and Society in Livy's History* presents this thesis that Livy would use the reaction of his literary audience to prime or prepare his contemporary audience, the *populus Romanus*,

---

<sup>210</sup> Stem, Rex. "The Exemplary Lessons of Livy's Romulus." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* (1974-) 137, no. 2 (2007): 435–71.

<sup>211</sup> Livy had a particularly special ability to be both a bad historian and an amazing historical writer at the same time. His ability to provide dramatic history that would captivate the *populus Romanus* is superb and as a result much of his work can be seen as entertainment. For evidence of this see Walsh, P. G. "Making a Drama out of a Crisis: Livy on the Bacchanalia." *Greece & Rome* 43, no. 2 (1996): 188–203.



on how to react to their own life situations and history.<sup>212</sup> This is important to this thesis because we can see through Livy's recounts his view upon his contemporary society and his audience, the *populus Romanus*, which at this point had expanded in identity far beyond the confines of the city.

To demonstrate that the *populus Romanus*, Livy's audience, had expanded in identity to include 'Romans' far beyond the confines of the city I will be analyzing the introduction to the preface and the first book of *Ab Urbe Condita*. It is within his first book that Livy has to contend with the myth of Aeneas, the foundation of Rome under Romulus, and the establishment of Roman superiority in the Italian peninsula. This book would have been performed before an eager crowd. Livy understood this and provided several instances within his first book that helped to explain Roman values and virtues that should be emulated by the *populus Romanus* at large.<sup>213</sup>

Livy starts his book by stating that not even he knows everything about the Roman people's history but that this is the most accurate account he could give "If from the very beginning of the city I have written down the affairs of the Roman people, I do not know enough, nor do I know enough."<sup>214</sup> Livy then appeals his audience, the *populus*, that while they might find the foundation of the city of Rome boring and wish to skip ahead to the more modern time, it is within this foundation of the city that they will find stories of the brave and courageous to answer the turmoil's<sup>215</sup>

---

<sup>212</sup> Feldherr, Andrew. *Spectacle and Society in Livy's History*, Berkeley: University of California, 1998.

<sup>213</sup> Stem, Rex. "The Exemplary Lessons of Livy's Romulus." *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, 137, no. 2 (2007): 435–71.

<sup>214</sup> Livy 1.1.

<sup>215</sup> Livy does this in his fourth and sixth sentence of his introduction by stating "*festinantibus ad haec nova, quibus iam pridem praevalentis populi vires se ipsae conficiunt.*" Livy 1.4-1.5. Books I and II with an

Within the preface of the first book of the *Ab Urbe Condita* Livy presents the following passage.

Latin	English
<i>"hoc illud est praecipue in cognitione rerum salubre ac frugiferum. omnis te exempli documenta in inlustri posita monumento intueri; inde tibi tuaeque rei publicae quod imitere capias, inde foedum inceptu foedum exitu quod uites."</i> <sup>216</sup>	There is this exceptionally beneficial and fruitful advantage to be derived from the study of the past, that you see, set in the clear light of historical truth, examples of every possible type. From these you may select for yourself and your country what to imitate, and also what, as being mischievous in its inception and disastrous in its issues, you are to avoid. <sup>217</sup>

Here we can see that Livy creates a narrative hook for his audience to engage with. It is within the first couple pages of the *Ab Urbe Condita* that we see Livy presenting a reason why his audience, the *populus Romanus*, should pay attention and emulate the following stories. This passage is important to this thesis because it further solidifies that his work was not just a piece of historical fiction but more importantly was supposed to provide guidance for his contemporary audience, the *populus Romanus*, on how to live and help explain their current world. As we will see in the coming pages this passage becomes more important because Livy constantly presents stories from the founding of Rome that would help to explain to the members of the *populus Romanus* that don't live within the physical confines of the city of Rome why they too are members of the *populus Romanus*.

Over the next chapters Livy then presents the story of Rome's mythological hero Aeneas and his wars to secure land to build a city. Within the following passage Aeneas

---

English Translation. Cambridge. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press; London, William Heinemann, Ltd. 1919.

<sup>216</sup> Livy. Books I and II with an English Translation. Cambridge. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press; London, William Heinemann, Ltd. 1919. *Ab Urbe Condita*, 1 pr.10

<sup>217</sup> Livy. History of Rome. English Translation by. Rev. Canon Roberts. New York, New York. E. P. Dutton and Co. 1912. *Ab Urbe Condita*, 1 pr.10

is afraid of losing support from the Aboriginal allies during their war against Turnus in Italy.

Latin	English
<i>Aeneas aduersus tanti belli terrorem ut animos Aboriginum sibi conciliaret nec sub eodem iure solum sed etiam nomine omnes essent, Latinos utramque gentem appellauit;</i> <sup>218</sup>	Aeneas, that he might win the goodwill of the Aborigines to confront so formidable an array, and that all might possess not only the same rights but also the same name, called both nations Latins; and from that time on the Aborigines were no less ready and faithful than the Trojans in the service of King Aeneas. <sup>219</sup>

Livy in the above passage states something very peculiar, something that would have resounded across the expanded identity of the *populus Romanus*. That Rome's mythological hero Aeneas was afraid of losing support of his Italian allies during the war against Turnus that he spoke to his allies as equals referring to both the Trojans and Italians as the same, as Latins.

This is tremendous as the audience of Livy's time undoubtedly included the Latins, however Livy was writing a history of the founding of the city of Rome for the *populus Romanus*. The fact that Livy mentions the mythical hero Aeneas as fearing that the proto-Italian allies would leave him and thus refers to both the Trojans and Italians as Latins demonstrates that Livy was presenting a history for a *populus Romanus* that had a significantly larger identity than existed during the start of the late Roman Republic.<sup>220</sup> The next passage demonstrating that Livy's audience, the expanded

---

<sup>218</sup> Livy. Books I and II with an English Translation. Cambridge. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press; London, William Heinemann, Ltd. 1919. *Ab Urbe Condita*, 1 2.4

<sup>219</sup> Livy. Books I and II with an English Translation. Cambridge. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press; London, William Heinemann, Ltd. 1919. *Ab Urbe Condita*, 1 2.4

<sup>220</sup> Cicero's initial orations in chapter one makes a clear distinction between the Italian allies and the *populus Romanus*. Here Livy is demonstrating that from the beginning both the people of the city of Rome and the Italians were the same. The truth of this statement does not matter, what matters is the fact that the audience of Livy, the *populus Romanus*, would have identified with this story.

*populus Romanus*, can be seen through the *Ab Urbe Condita* comes from the chapter where both the Sabines and Romans form into, according to Livy, one Roman nation.<sup>221</sup>

Latin	English
<p><i>Movet res cum multitudinem tum duces; silentium et repentina fit quies; inde ad foedus faciendum duces prodeunt. nec pacem modo sed civitatem unam ex duabus faciunt. regnum consociant: imperium omne conferunt Romam.</i><sup>222</sup></p>	<p>It was a touching plea, not only to the rank and file, but to their leaders as well. A stillness fell on them, and a sudden hush. Then the leaders came forward to make a truce, and not only did they agree on peace, but they made one people out of the two.<sup>223</sup></p>

This above passage is important because it demonstrates that instead of killing each other the Sabines and Romans formed into a treaty to merge into one state. To Livy's *populus Romanus* this would have indicated that from the beginning of the Republic the *populus* of the city of Rome would have constituted of a citizen body that included both Trojans (Romans) and outside Italians (Sabines).

Since Livy is presenting a moral history of the founding of the City of Rome, where in the beginning of his work he mentions that Romans should seek to emulate these stories, we can see the expanded identity of the *populus Romanus* existing. To the Roman interacting with Livy's work this passage would help to explain why the identity of the *populus Romanus* was far larger than just the people of the city of Rome. This passage directly demonstrates that Livy was writing for a *populus Romanus* whose identity is far larger than just the direct citizens of the city and as such is important to this thesis that over the course of the late Roman Republic and into the early Empire the identity of the *populus Romaus* drastically expands.

---

<sup>221</sup> The Sabines were a tribe of people who were engaged in a war with the Romans due to the Romans stealing and raping their women. They existed northeast of Rome around modern Rieti.

<sup>222</sup> Livy. Books I and II with an English Translation. Cambridge. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press; London, William Heinemann, Ltd. 1919. *Ab Urbe Condita*, 1 13.4

<sup>223</sup> Livy. Books I and II with an English Translation. Cambridge. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press; London, William Heinemann, Ltd. 1919. *Ab Urbe Condita*, 1 13.4

The next passage demonstrating that Livy was writing for an expanded *populus Romanus* can be seen in legend of the Roman king Tullus assimilating the Italian tribe of Alba into the *populus Romanus*.<sup>224</sup>

Latin	English
<p>Roma interim crescit Albae ruinis. duplicatur ciuium numerus; Caelius additur urbi mons, et quo frequentius habitaretur eam sedem Tullus regiae capit ibique habitauit. Principes Albanorum in patres ut ea quoque pars rei publicae cresceret legit, Iulios, Seruilios, Quinctios, Geganios, Curiatios, Cloelios; templumque ordini ab se aucto curiam fecit quae Hostilia usque ad patrum nostrorum aetatem appellata est.<sup>225</sup></p>	<p>Rome, meanwhile, was increased by Alba's downfall. The number of citizens was doubled, the Caelian Hill was added to the City, and, that it might be more thickly settled, Tullus chose it for the site of the king's house and from that time onwards resided there. [2] The chief men of the Albans he made senators, that this branch of the nation might grow too. Such were the Julii, the Servilii, the Quinctii, the Geganii, the Curiatii, and the Cloelii. He also built, as a consecrated place for the order he had enlarged, a senate-house, which continued to be called the Curia Hostilia as late as the time of our own fathers.<sup>226</sup></p>

In the above passage Livy presents the story of when the Trojan colony/city of Alba was conquered by the third Roman king Tullus. To Livy's audience this story would demonstrate that from the very start of the Republic the surrounding Italians were being brought into the *populus Romanus* and given places of authority so that they could grow with the Republic.

This passage is important because it demonstrates that Livy's audience, the expanded *populus Romanus*, included surrounding Italian villages and cities long before the social war gave enfranchisement to the Italian allies. Livy here is presenting a story of how the ancient city of Alba along with its people was eventually assimilated into the *populus Romanus* of Rome and even given seats within the governing body. This would

<sup>224</sup> The Albans were from the ancient city of Alba Longa, which legend states was founded by the son of Aeneas, Ascanius. This city existed southeast of Rome.

<sup>225</sup> Livy. Books I and II with an English Translation. Cambridge. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press; London, William Heinemann, Ltd. 1919. *Ab Urbe Condita*, 1 30.1-30.2

<sup>226</sup> Livy. Books I and II with an English Translation. Cambridge. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press; London, William Heinemann, Ltd. 1919. *Ab Urbe Condita*, 1 30.1-30.2

have resounded across Livy's cotemporary audience and directly demonstrates that the *populus Romanus* of Livy's time was comprised of an identity that was drastically expanded past the confines of the city of Rome.

Livy in his *Ab Urbe Condita* presents a history of the Roman people and the founding of the city of Rome. While the exact history that Livy presents is often fabricated and dramatic it does present a window from which academics can peer into the social world of the *populus Romanus* of the early Empire.

From which we can see that the identity of this *populus Romanus* extended far beyond the confines of the city of Rome. This is a far cry from the time of Cicero where his early orations clearly demonstrate that the *populus Romanus* only existed within the city.

This study of Livy's first book is important to the thesis because it demonstrates that Livy was writing a book that would either be read to an audience or alone. That this book helped to explain why the *populus Romanus* of Livy's time included cities and people from outside the city, and that through this we can see the evidence of this expanded *populus Romanus*.

### Conclusion to Chapter 3

The golden era Latin writers of Ovid, Horace, Livy, and Virgil were writing during a time of transition. During their lifetimes the government of the *respublica* was changing from a Republic governed by Senatorial elite to a monarchy ruled by a Emperor. This transition would not have been lost on the *populus Romanus* of the early Empire.

Each one of the Latin writers would have had to create their works to relate to their target audience, the *populus Romanus*, which by this point had an identity that comprised of people from far outside the physical confines of the city. While theories exist on the whether or not these authors were utilized for propagandic purposes the main aim of this chapter is to demonstrate that a target audience, the *populus Romanus*, not only existed but that its identity was abstract and significantly larger than what existed under the time of Cicero.

## CONCLUSION

Over the course of the late Roman Republic and early Empire the group identity that constituted the shared identity of the *populus Romanus* shifted from just meaning the people of the city of Rome to eventually coming to mean the whole of those under Roman hegemony.

Over the past half century historians and academics studying the late Roman Republic and early Empire have wrestled with the concept of the *populus Romanus*. From this questions of democracy, power, and identity have emerged all with different ideas. Instead of pinning down a firm identity this research has been targeted at demonstrating that over the course of the late Roman Republic and early Empire this identity, which previously was presented as static, is actually dynamic and lexically shifts from meaning just the people of the city of Rome to all those under Roman rule. This shift begins during the late Roman Republic as evidenced through the public *contios* of Cicero where he attempts to convince a body of people, his *populus Romanus*, to take an action. Over the course of Cicero's orations how he addresses the identity of this crowd gathered before him completely changes. During his *Pro Lege Manilia* (66 BC) Cicero clearly identifies the large mass of people before him, the *populus Romanus*, as just the people of Rome who would clearly benefit from having Pompey as sole commander of the Roman military in the east. Three years later during Cicero's *De Lege Agraria* (63 BC) we can see Cicero's *populus Romanus* as expanding as he positioning the Italians of the countryside along with the people of the city of Rome as part of the *populus Romanus* who should vote against their best interests against land redistribution to the poor. The same year (63 BC) Cicero uncovers a plot to



overthrow the republic by Cataline. In his oration before the *populus Romanus*, *Oratio in Catilinam Secunda Habita ad Populum*, Cicero clearly combines the people of the city and the rest of an abstract country to demonstrate how grave a threat Cataline is to both. Finally, it is within his oration upon returning from exile, *Post Reditum ad Quirites/Populum* (57 BC), that Cicero combines both the abstract *populus Romanus* and the direct people of the city of Rome to show that at this point the identity of the *populus Romanus* has evolved from just meaning the people of the city of Rome to all those under Roman hegemony.

While the second chapter dealing with Cicero demonstrates how the identity of the *populus Romanus* evolves during the late Roman Republic it is within the third chapter on the golden era Latin writers where we can see further evidence of the continued existence of this expanded identity during the early Empire. Each of the Latin writers compile their work to be both read privately and aloud before a crowd. While each author incorporates their own literary devices their works are designed to relate to the *populus Romanus* at large. Because of this when read critically Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, Horace's *Odes*, Virgil's *Aeneid*, and Livy's *Histories* each present stories that would help to explain to their audience, the expanded *populus Romanus*, why their social identity now comprised of groups of people that less than a century before they would have seen as the 'other.'

The concept of empire before Empire is the main driving force that guides this thesis. Undoubtably the Roman Empire officially did not start until 27 BC when Octavian received the title of *Augustus* ("Illustrious one") and *Principis* ("First in order/Citizen") from a now power stripped Roman senate. However, what is apparent is that long

before the reign of Augustus the people of Rome, the *populus Romanus*, was starting to expand in identity to include not only the Italian allies but also the other 'Romans' under Roman rule. For you, the readers of this paper, this presents an interesting argument that long before the Roman Empire the identity of the people of the late Roman Republic, the *populus Romanus*, started to expand to create a group of people who believed that those they have never met, nor could ever meet, have a similar shared identity, the collective identity of the people of Rome, the *populus Romanus*.

### Further Research

This entire thesis serves to present the argument that previous work surrounding the late Roman Republic and early Empire has not properly incorporated the shifting identity in the *populus Romanus*.

This paper should serve not as a condemnation of the historiography surrounding the late Roman Republic but rather as a useful stepping stone from which further research can start to address several important questions surrounding the late Roman Republic. Instances of further research utilizing this thesis could include concepts of gender history, power and politics, military history, and finally concepts of group formation and identity taking place in antiquity.

## REFERENCES

### Primary Sources

- Cassius Dio, *Historia Romana*. Digitized online copy, published 2018, last accessed March 15<sup>th</sup>, 2022. Penelope.Uchicago.Edu.  
[https://penelope.uchicago.edu/Thayer/e/roman/texts/cassius\\_dio/home.html](https://penelope.uchicago.edu/Thayer/e/roman/texts/cassius_dio/home.html).
- Horace, *Epistles*. Digitized online copy, published 2015, last accessed March 15<sup>th</sup>, 2022. TheLatinLibrary.com. <http://www.thelatinlibrary.com/horace>
- Livy, *Ab Urbe Condita*. Books I and II With An English Translation. Cambridge. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press; London, William Heinemann, Ltd. 1919.
- Marcus Tullius Cicero, *In Catilinam*. Digitized online copy, published 2017, last accessed March 15<sup>th</sup>, 2022. Latin.Packhum.Org. <https://latin.packhum.org/loc/474/13/0#0>.
- Marcus Tullius Cicero, *In Verrem*. Digitized online copy, published 2018, last accessed March 15<sup>th</sup>, 2022. Latin.Packhum.Org. <https://latin.packhum.org/loc/474/5/0#0>.
- Marcus Tullius Cicero, *Post Reditum ad Populum*. Digitized online copy, published 2013, last accessed March 15<sup>th</sup>, 2022.. Latin.Packhum.Org.  
<https://latin.packhum.org/loc/474/18/0#0>.
- Marcus Tullius Cicero, *Pro Lege Manilia*. Digitized online copy, published 2018, last accessed March 15<sup>th</sup>, 2022. Latin.Packhum.Org. <https://latin.packhum.org/loc/474/9/0#0>.
- Ovid, *Metamorphoses*. Tr. Sir Samuel Garth, John Dryden, et al. 1703, Classics.mit.edu.  
<http://classics.mit.edu/Ovid/metam.html>.
- Pliny, *Epistulae*. Digitized online copy, published 2016, last accessed March 15<sup>th</sup>, 2022. Pages.Pomona.Edu. [https://pages.pomona.edu/~cmc24747/sources/plin\\_1-5.htm](https://pages.pomona.edu/~cmc24747/sources/plin_1-5.htm).
- Publius Vergilius Maro, *Aeneid*. Digitized online copy, published 2018, last accessed March 15<sup>th</sup>, 2022. Latin.Packhum.Org. <https://latin.packhum.org/loc/690/3/0#0>.
- Quintilian, *Institutio Oratoria*. Digitized online copy, published 2017, last accessed March 15<sup>th</sup>, 2022. Perseus.Tufts.Edu.  
<http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A2007.01.0060%3Ab ook%3D1%3Achapter%3D1#:~:text=I%20would%2C%20therefore%2C%20have%20a,t he%20groundwork%20of%20his%20education>.
- Seneca, *Ad Lucilium Epistulae Morales*, Letters 70, 77, 78, tr. Richard M. Gummere, New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1920, Vol. 2, pp. 57–73, 169–199.
- Suetonius, *Twelve Caesars*. Digitized online copy, published 2013, last accessed March 15<sup>th</sup>, 2022. Penelope.Uchicago.Edu.  
<https://penelope.uchicago.edu/Thayer/E/Roman/Texts/Suetonius/12Caesars/home.html>.

Tacitus, *Annals*. Digitized online copy, published 2016, last accessed March 15<sup>th</sup>, 2022.  
Penelope.Uchicago.Edu. Accessed March 15.  
<https://penelope.uchicago.edu/Thayer/e/roman/texts/tacitus/home.html>.

### Secondary Sources

Andrew J. E. Bell. "Cicero and the Spectacle of Power." *The Journal of Roman Studies* 87 (1997): 1-22.

Andrew J. E. Bell. "The Popular Poetics and Politics of the Aeneid." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* (1974-) 129 (1999): 263–79.

Barbara Weiden Boyd, "Virgil's Camilla and the Traditions of Catalogue and Ecphrasis," *American Journal of Philology* ,113 (1992).

Bauman, Richard. *Crime and Punishment in Ancient Rome*, London & New York: Routledge. P.23.

Bell, Andrew. "Cicero and the Spectacle of Power." *The Journal of Roman Studies*, no.87 (1997): 1-22.

Bell, Kimberly K. "'Translatio' and the Constructs of a Roman Nation in Virgil's 'Aeneid.'" *Rocky Mountain Review* 62, no. 1 (2008): 11–24.

Andrew J. E. Bell. "The Popular Poetics and Politics of the Aeneid." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* (1974-) 129 (1999): 263–79.

Bennett, Charles. *Horace: The Complete Works*, Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1901, pp. xvii-xii.

Botsford, George. *The Roman Assemblies, from their Origin to the End of the Republic*, New York: The Macmillan Company. 1909

Boyd, Barbara Weiden. "Still, She Persisted: Materiality in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*" *The Classical Journal* 96, no. 2 (2000): 228–33.

Canfora, Luciano, et al. *The People's Dictator*. Edinburgh University Press, 2007.

Cerutti, Steven M. "The Location of the Houses of Cicero and Clodius and The Porticus Catuli on the Palatine Hill in Rome." *American Journal of Philology* 118, no. 3 (1997): 417-426.

Clark, Jessica H. "The-People-Who-Are-Men: Livy's Book 7 Construction of the Populus." *Syllecta Classica* 31 (2020): 39-63.

Cohen, Edward E. *Athenian Nation*. Princeton University Press, 2010

Cole, S. *Cicero and the Rise of Deification at Rome*. Cambridge. 2013

Dench, Emma. *Romulus' Asylum: Roman Identities from the Age of Alexander to the Age of Hadrian*. Oxford University Press, 2005.

- Dobbin, Robert F. "Julius Caesar in Jupiter's Prophecy, 'Aeneid', Book 1." *Classical Antiquity* 14, no. 1 (1995): 5–40.
- Donlan, Walter. "The Foundation Legends of Rome: An Example of Dynamic Process." *The Classical World* 64, no. 4 (1970): 109–14.
- Dufallo, Basil. "Appius' Indignation: Gossip, Tradition, and Performance in Republican Rome." *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, 131 (2001): 119–42.
- Dunkle, J. Roger. "The Rhetorical Tyrant in Roman Historiography: Sallust, Livy and Tacitus." *The Classical World* 65, no. 1 (1971): 12-20.
- Dyck, Andrew. "Dressing to Kill: Attire as a Proof and Means of Characterization in Cicero's Speeches." *Arethusa* 34, 1 (2001): 119-30.
- Elmore, Jefferson. "Municipia Fundana." *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 47 (1916): 35–42.
- Feldherr, Andrew. *Spectacle and Society in Livy's History*, Berkeley: University of California, 1998.
- Jacobs, Mark; Spillman, Lynette (2005). "Cultural sociology at the crossroads of the discipline." *Poetics*, 33 (1): 1–14.
- Fowler, Don. "Virgil (Publius Vergilius Maro)." *Oxford Classical Dictionary*, Oxford University Press, 1996.
- Fraenkel, Eduard. *Horace*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1957, pp.5-7.
- Galasso, Vittorio Nicholas. "Honor and The Performance of Roman State Identity." *Foreign Policy Analysis* 8, no. 2 (2012): 173–89.
- Gelzer, Matthias. *Die Nobilität der römischen Republik*. Leipzig; Teubner, 1912.
- George Willis Botsford. "The Social Composition of the Primitive Roman Populus." *Political Science Quarterly* 21, no. 3 (1906): 498–526.
- Gesine Manuwald. "The Speeches to the People in Cicero's Oratorical Corpora." *Rhetorica: A Journal of the History of Rhetoric* 30, no. 2 (2012): 153-75.
- Gramsci, Antonio, Quintin Hoare, and Geoffrey Nowell-Smith. *Selections from the Prison Notebooks of Antonio Gramsci*. New York: International Publishers, 1972.
- Greenhalgh, Peter A. *Pompey*. London U.a.: Weidenfeld and Nicolson U.a., 1980., p. 107.
- Gruen, Erich Stephen. *The Last Generation of the Roman Republic*. Berkeley, Calif: Univ. of California Press, 1974.

- Hammond, Mason. "Hellenistic Influences on the Structure of the Augustan Principate." *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome* 17 (1940): 1–25.
- Hoffman, Richard. "Sallust and Catiline". *The Classical Review*. 1998, 48: 50–52.
- Hölkeskamp, Karl-J. "Friends, Romans, Countrymen: Addressing the Roman People and the Rhetoric of Inclusion." *Community and Communication*, 18, 2013.
- Hölkeskamp, K., & Heitmann-Gordon, H. *Reconstructing the Roman republic: An ancient political culture and modern research*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010.
- Hölkeskamp's, Karl-J., and Henry Heitmann-Gordon. *Reconstructing the Roman Republic: An Ancient Political Culture and Modern Research*. Princeton; Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2010.
- Horace. Horace, Odes and Epodes. Paul Shorey and Gordon J. Laing. Chicago. Benj. H. Sanborn & Co. 1919.
- Horace. The Odes and Carmen Saeculare of Horace. John Conington. trans. London. George Bell and Sons. 1882.
- J. A. North "Democratic Politics in Republican Rome", *Past and Present* 126 (1990), 3-21.
- Jehne, Martin (2013). "Feeding the Plebs with Words: The Significance of Senatorial Public Oratory in The Small World of Roman Politics". In Steel, Catherine; Van der Blom, Henriëtte (eds.). *Community and Communication: Oratory and Politics in Republican Rome*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. pp. 53–58.
- Joanna Kenty. "Congenital Virtue: Mos Maiorum in Cicero's Orations." *The Classical Journal* 111, no. 4 (2016): 429-62.
- Kajanto, Iiro. "Epigraphical Evidence of the Cult of Fortuna in Germania Romana." *Latomus* 47, no. 3 (1988): 554–83.
- Karl-J. Hölkeskamp. "Conquest, Competition and Consensus: Roman Expansion in Italy and the Rise of the 'Nobilitas.'" *Historia: Zeitschrift Für Alte Geschichte* 42, no. 1 (1993): 12–39.
- Kontonasios, Panagiotis. "Cicero's Brutus: a History of Rhetoric or a History of Politics?" *Etc: a Review of General Semantics* 71, no. 3 (2014): 227-38.
- Kočovska-Stevović, Svetlana. "On the Roman Concept of Natio", *Colloquia Humanistica*, 5, 2016.
- La Piana, George. "Foreign Groups in Rome during the First Centuries of the Empire." *The Harvard Theological Review* 20, no. 4 (1927): 183–403.
- Lacey, W. K. "Octavian in the Senate, January 27 B.C." *The Journal of Roman Studies* 64 (1974): 176-84.

- Laurence, Ray. "Rumor and Communication in Roman Politics." *Greece & Rome* 41, no. 1 (1994): 62–74.
- Levick, Barbara. "Morals, Politics, and the Fall of the Roman Republic." *Greece & Rome* 29, no. 1 (1982): 53–62.
- Levine, Martin D., and Mark S. Hyde. "Incumbency and the Theory of Political Ambition: A Rational-Choice Model." *The Journal of Politics* 39, no. 4 (1977): 959-83.
- Livy. Books I and II with an English Translation. Cambridge. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press; London, William Heinemann, Ltd. 1919.
- Lyons, Stuart. *Music in the Odes of Horace*. Aris and Phillips Classical Texts, 2010.
- Machiavelli, Niccolò. *Discourses on Livy*, Translated by Harvey C. Mansfield; Nathan Tarcov. University of Chicago Press, 2009.
- Macki, Nicola. "'Popularis' Ideology and Popular Politicians at Rome in the First Century B.C." *Rheinisches Museum Für Philologie* 135, no. 1 (1992): 49-73.
- Mackie, Nicola. "Popularis" Ideology and Popular Politics in Rome in the First Century B.C." *Rheinisches Museum Für Philologie* 135, no. 1 (1992): 49-73.
- Mattingly, Harold. "The Roman 'Virtues'." *The Harvard Theological Review* 30, no. 2 (1937): 103-17.
- McDonald, A. H. "The Style of Livy." *The Journal of Roman Studies* 47, no. 1/2 (1957): 155–72.
- Meir, Christian. *Res publica amissa*. Eine Studie zu Verfassung und Geschichte der späten römischen Republik: Steiner, Wiesbaden, 1966.
- Metaxaki-Mitrou, Fotini. "Violence in the Contio During The Ciceronian Age." *L'Antiquité Classique* 54 (1985): 180-87.
- Millar, Fergus. *The Crowd in Rome in the Late Republic*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1998.
- Millar, Fergus. "Ovid and the Domus Augusta: Rome Seen from Tomoi." *The Journal of Roman Studies* 83 (1993): 1–17.
- Mitchell, Thomas N. "Cicero, Pompey, and the Rise of the First Triumvirate." *Traditio* 29 (1973): 1-26.
- Mommsen, Theodore. *Römische Geschichte*, Leipzig; Reimer & Hirzel, 1854-1856.
- Morley, Neville. "The Transformation of Italy, 225-28 B.C." *The Journal of Roman Studies*, vol. 91, 2001, pp. 50–62.



- Morstein-Marx, Robert. *Mass Oratory and Political Power in the late Roman Republic*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Mouritsen, H. *Politics in the Roman Republic*. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press, 2017.
- Mouritsen, Henrik. *Plebs and Politics in the Late Roman Republic*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- M. Tullius Cicero. *M. Tulli Ciceronis Orationes: Recognovit brevique adnotatione critica instruxit Albertus Curtius Clark Collegii Reginae Socius*. Albert Curtis Clark. Oxonii. e Typographeo Clarendoniano. 1908.
- M. Tullius Cicero. *The Orations of Marcus Tullius Cicero, literally translated by C. D. Yonge*, B. A. London. Henry G. Bohn, York Street, Covent Garden. 1856.
- Murgia, Charles E. "Review Article: Analyzing Cicero's Style." *Classical Philology* 76, no. 4 (1981): 301-13.
- Nippel, Wilfried. *Public Order in Ancient Rome*. Cambridge, Uk: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- Ovid. *Metamorphoses*. Brookes More. Boston. Cornhill Publishing Co.
- Ovid. *Metamorphoses*. Hugo Magnus. Gotha (Germany). Friedr. Andr. Perthes
- P.J.J Vanderbroeck. *Popular Leadership and Collective Behavior in the Late Roman Republic (CA. 80-50 B.C)*. Amsterdam; Gieben, 1987.
- P.O. Mark and Lenardon, Robert. *Classical Mythology*, Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Poel, Marc van der. "The Use of exempla in Roman Declamation." *Rhetorica: A Journal of the History of Rhetoric* 27, no. 3 (2009): 332–53.
- Purcell, Nicholas. "Literate Games: Roman Urban Society and the Game of Alea." *Past & Present*, no. 147 (1995): 3–37.
- Radin, Max. "Roman Concepts of Equality." *Political Science Quarterly* 38, no. 2 (1923): 262–89.
- Rayment, Charles S. "Three Notes on the Roman Declamation." *The Classical Weekly* 45, no. 15 (1952): 225–28.
- Rehak, Paul. "Aeneas or Numa? Rethinking the Meaning of the Ara Pacis Augustae." *The Art Bulletin* 83, no. 2 (2001): 190–208.
- Richard A. Grossmann and William E. Metcalf. *Roman Coins*. Yale University Art Gallery, 2001.

- Rose, Charles Brian. "The Parthians in Augustan Rome." *American Journal of Archaeology* 109, no. 1 (2005): 21–75.
- S. M. Savage. "The Cults of Ancient Trastevere." *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome* 17 (1940): 26–56.
- Skinner, Alexander. "Political Mobility in the Later Roman Empire." *Past & Present*, no. 218 (2013): 17–53.
- Stem, Rex. "The Exemplary Lessons of Livy's Romulus." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* (1974-) 137, no. 2 (2007): 435–71.
- Sumner, G. V. "Cicero, Pompeius, and Rullus." *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 97 (1966): 569-82.
- Syme, Ronald. *The Roman Revolution*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1939.
- Syme, Ronald. "Livy and Augustus." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 64 (1959): 27–87.
- Tan, James. "Contiones in the Age of Cicero." *Classical Antiquity* 27, no. 1 (2008): 163-201.
- Tatum, W. Jeffrey. *The Patrician Tribune: P. Clodius Pulcher*. Studies in the History of Greece and Rome. University of North Carolina Press, 1999.
- Taylor, Lily Ross. *Roman Voting Assemblies from the Hannibalic War to the Dictatorship of Caesar*. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan Press, 1990.
- Thompson, E. P. "Patrician Society, Plebeian Culture." *Journal of Social History* 7, no. 4 (1974): 382-405.
- Thorley, J. "The Development of Trade between the Roman Empire and the East under Augustus." *Greece & Rome* 16, no. 2 (1969): 209–23.
- Toll, Katharine. "Making Roman-Ness and the 'Aeneid.'" *Classical Antiquity* 16, no. 1 (1997): 34–56.
- Vance, Eugene. "Warfare and the Structure of Thought in Virgil's Aeneid." *Quaderni Urbinati Di Cultura Classica*, no. 15 (1973): 111–62.
- Vergil. *Bucolics, Aeneid, and Georgics of Vergil*. J. B. Greenough. Boston. Ginn & Co. 1900
- Vergil. *Aeneid*. Theodore C. Williams. trans. Boston. Houghton Mifflin Co. 1910
- Walsh, P. G. "Making a Drama out of a Crisis: Livy on the Bacchanalia." *Greece & Rome* 43, no. 2 (1996): 188–203.
- Wheeler, Stephen. *A discourse of wonders: audience and performance in Ovid's Metamorphoses*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1999.

Wiseman, T. P. "Legendary Genealogies in Late-Republican Rome." *Greece & Rome* 21, no. 2 (1974): 153–64.

Yakobson, Alexander. "Traditional Political Culture and the People's Role in the Roman Republic." *Historia: Zeitschrift Für Alte Geschichte* 59, no. 3 (2010): 282–302.