The Roman Republic. **The problem**...The Roman state was the most successful political system in the pre-modern period. Although it began as a *city*-state, and originally had a constitution much like that of a *polis*, it evolved into a *world-*state, one that could claim the allegiance of people from many different ethnic and religious backgrounds. What was the form of government and what were the values of that state? How can we account for the expansion of Rome from a city-state to a world-state?

1. **What factors** contributed to Roman success **in Italy during the Republic** (and eventually overseas)?
	1. The **social structure, especially the concept of patronage, allowed for assimilation.**
		1. To understand the working of patronage we need to understand also two related concepts:
			1. *Familia*
				1. *patria potestas*. Full power over descendants, but still obligation to consult with elders. [*Imagines*](http://www.uoregon.edu/~klio/im/re/roman65.gif)
				2. extended household patriarchal, actual blood ties less significant; dependency relationships as important
				3. state as an extended '*familia*'
				patriarch=king=magistrates
				council of elders=senate
				dependentts=*plebs*, *populus*, citizens
			2. [Status](http://www.uoregon.edu/~klio/im/gen/soc_str.jpg): No Roman ever met his equal. Status defined the place of individuals and of communities.
		2. How patronage / clientele served to unite society:
			1. *Do ut des* (a Roman aphorism).
			2. Mutual and moral obligation / services between two parties of unequal status. "It was the duty of the patrons (patricians) to explain to their clients the laws...to take care of them...doing everything for them that fathers do for their children (*familia*)...defend them...to secure for them...tranquillity (status; obligation). It was the duty [obligation] of the clients to assist their patrons in providing doweries...pay ransom...to make good and losses in private suits...making these contributions not as loans by as thank-offerings (status, mutual services) ... accordingly connections between patrons and clients continued for many generations **differing in no wise from the ties of blood relationships**..."(Dionysius of Hallicarnasus, II 11). A more cynical [example](http://www.uoregon.edu/~klio/godfather.html). Significance: patronage allowed outsiders to be incorporated into the Roman state.
		3. Religion: typical polytheistic, but more stress on formalism (showing respect) and contract (if you do this..., then we will give you that...).
	2. **Consensual government and the rule of law** (Table XII: "Whatever the People (= the body of citizen-soldiers) has last ordained shall be held as binding by law." Also, see below III). As with the Greek polis the Roman constitution was based on consensual government, on the principle "those who fight, vote" = citizenship; and on the rule of law. Note these passages from the historian Dionysius.
		1. whenever the citizens were to give their votes...the consuls assembled the under their centurions and arms...the class of citizens that voted first consisted of those who had the highest property rating and who stood foremost line of battle...
		2. the poorest of the citizens...voted last and had but one vote [of 193] but were exempt from military service and taxation.
		3. Significance: the use of status, privilege and responsibility.
	3. The **stability** of the Roman [Constitution](http://www.uoregon.edu/~klio/maps/rr/const_system.jpg) "SPQR" = "Senate and People of Rome". **The Roman contribution was particularly effective in the areas of limited government / checks and balances**. The central idea of limited government...
		1. [Constitutional checks and balances](http://www.uoregon.edu/~klio/tx/source2/rep-docs.htm) (esp. the analysis of Polybius, Doc 5) Such then are the powers of each of the parts of government **both to oppose one another and to work in conjunction**. In unison they are a match for any and all emergencies, the result being that it is impossible to find a constitution that is better constructed. For whenever some common external danger should come upon them and should compel them to band together in counsel and in action, the power of their state becomes so great that nothing that is required is neglected, inasmuch as all compete to devise some means of meeting the disaster... The result is that their unique form of constitution comes to be unconquerable and successfully achieves every goal upon which it resolves.)
			1. annuality and interval
			2. *par potestas* (*equal power*) and *veto*(*I forbid it*)
			3. *cursus honorurm* (one must advance to the highest office through a prescribed sequence)
			4. [membership](http://www.uoregon.edu/~klio/im/rr/republican.jpg) in senate for all magistrates and former magistrates
		2. Divisions: Magistrates, Senate, Assemblies ("the nation at arms"; "those who fight, vote") in its original conception. Note the duplication of *familia*, status and implicitly patronage in the structure.
2. Expansion...Imperialism and Expansion --from city-state to world state ...
	1. On the process in [Italy](http://www.uoregon.edu/~maphist/english/EU/EU02-01.html) (for the dates, see the outline in next lecture):
		1. 750 BC: [foundation](http://www.uoregon.edu/~klio/im/rr/early%20republic/capitol_wolf.gif) of city; [regal](http://www.uoregon.edu/~klio/im/idea-images/Rape_of_the_Sabine_Women-1635.jpg) period
		2. 509: [republic](http://www.uoregon.edu/~klio/im/rr/gen/forum.jpg) established
		3. by 285 Rome directly controls central [Italy](http://www.uoregon.edu/~klio/maps/rr/B270MED.gif)
		4. by 240 Rome administers Sicily, Sardinia, Corsica; most of central Italy has Roman citizenship.
		5. by 200 directly controls Italy south of the Po, governs southern Spain
		6. by [80 BC](http://www.uoregon.edu/~klio/maps/rr/B86EU.gif) directly controls Balkans, present day Tunisia, most of Spain; indirect control of the rest of the Mediterranean
	2. Already in 200 BC, Rome possessed the best-trained and largest army in the Mediterranean; she administered directly SE Spain and the islands of Sicily, Sardinia and Corsica; indirectly she dominated the remaining states through alliance throughout the western Med. Within 100 years ([by 60 BC](http://www.uoregon.edu/~klio/maps/rr/B52EU.gif)) she had conquered all the Hellenistic states in four decisive battles. **How had this been achieved (factors)**? The core concepts are mentioned above ( I.); here we look at some **specific applications** of those principles (based on I A 1 above).
		1. Generous policy toward defeated. Defeated always allowed to *retain property* (or most of it). Her Italian allies paid *no tribute* and allowed *local autonomy*; but must enter alliance and fight under Roman leadership against *common enemies*. (Cf. **Sallust** (below) on these points; idealized but still valid). Roman treaty with the Aequians of Central Italy concluded after the former had defeated the latter: ...the Aequians should be subject [*status*] to the Romans without being disposed either from their cities or from there territories, and that they should not be obliged to send anything to the Romans except troops [Rome as *patron*]...to be maintained at their own expense (Livy).
		2. Generous policy of citizenship (more in a later lecture) expanded her resources and made her an even more formidable power. By 78 BC all communities in Italy have Roman citizenship (*familia*). [Documents 2 and 3](http://www.uoregon.edu/~klio/tx/source2/rep-docs.htm). After defeating a revolt of their Latin neighbors and allies: The people of Lanuvium, Aricia, Nomentum received full citizenship...The rest of the Latin cities were deprived of intermarriage, trade, and common councils with each other...Capua (and other cities) was granted citizenship without the suffrage (right to vote or stand for office). [Demographics](http://www.uoregon.edu/~maphist/english/EU/EU02-02.html).
	3. As she became involved with **non-Italian speaking peoples**, the solutions adopted for the Italian people could not be easily implemented. Hence, **hegemonial** vs. **annexational** imperialism. *A word of caution...next week we will see how non-Italian peoples "Romanized" and eventually acquired Roman citizenship in the period after Augustus*
3. **Problem of Imperialism**: Expansion, given the power to do so, requires no explanation, but Rome was however [reluctant](http://www.uoregon.edu/~klio/wc/12-romanrep.htm#reluctance) [see the table below] to assume the responsibility for direct governance in the areas she had conquered and typically delayed doing so for generations. The reason? those conquered 'overseas' were considered "too different" to be assimilated, and not capable of becoming part of *familia*.
	1. Roman strengths...factors in her dominance:
		1. Consensual government and use of hoplite system; note that Rome had a more flexible variant of latter*.*
		2. significantly greater size of her armies -- a consequence of a generous policy of **inclusion** / **assimilation** towards allies and extension of citizenship in Italy( *familia*) as well as technical and [tactical](http://www.uoregon.edu/~klio/maps/rr/enemies-of-rome_files/enemies-of-rome_data/legion-macedonians.jpg) superiority.
		3. Internal weaknesses and division of enemies; they hated each other more than they hated Rome.
	2. Policy: Instead of direct rule as did the Brits or incorporation as Rome had practiced in Italy, Rome relied on patronage.
		1. To re-establish a defeated king or to allow a defeated state to retain territory and constitution was a gift and one which carried expectations (gift of life and property created permanent obligation to show respect).
		2. As patron Rome claimed the right to intervene to keep defeated 'ally' from becoming too powerful, yet
		3. the client state must be strong enough to help protect Roman interests.
		4. Contradictory policy destabilized their client-allies, and eventually led to direct rule
4. Conclusions and Significance. Consensual government and a readiness to incorporate one-time enemies provided the vitality and manpower to support Roman expansion. But the cost was high --as will be clear in the next lectures.

Roman reluctance to assume responsibility

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Land (modern equivalent) | Decisive Action  | Formal Annexation  |
| Spain | 207  | 197  |
| Narbonensis (Provence) | 215  | 120  |
| Sicily; Sardinia-Corsica | 241  | 239  |
| "Africa" (Tunisia) | 202  | 146  |
| Macedonia (Greece)  | 196, 167  | 146  |
| Cyrene | 155  | 74  |
| Egypt | 88  | 31  |
| "Asia" (Turkey) | 189  | 133  |
| Syria | 189  | 63  |
| The 'decisive action was in some cases a military victory; in other cases it was a legacy to the Roman people. 'Formal annexation' means that Rome assumed the direct administration of a duly constituted province and sent a governor |