ABSENCE OF A GENUINE URBAN ATTITUDE IN REPUBLICAN ROME
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In the record of antiquity, it is often tempting to interpret events of the Roman world in the light of similar occurrences among the Greeks. The temptation is natural since between the two peoples there was a certain continuity of the cultural pattern which sprang from an early artistic and intellectual dependence of the Romans upon their more illustrious Greek predecessors. Parallelisms in the historical record of each people must be carefully weighed, however, since investigation will often reveal an unsuspected originality in the Roman point of view. While the Greeks (largely) and the Romans viewed the city-state as the most acceptable form of political organization, it is yet worth-while to examine closely the general role played by the city in the life of the people of classical Greece and the Hellenistic period on the one hand, and, on the other hand, the place it occupied among the earlier Romans, both locally, and as an element in the imperial organization.

In making a beginning with the Greeks it must first of all be pointed out that the urban principle was by no means dominant among all the Greek people. In many parts of Greece, as Thucydides (I, 5) indicates for his own day, folk continued to be organized in simple, non-urban communities. Even the city was dependent upon its lands and the labor of many of its citizens who lived thereon, active in the basic industry of agriculture. But, conversely, the city itself, which was the physical expression of the city-state principle, achieved among not a few elements of the Greek people an ideal position and became, as it were, the symbol of their greatest cultural aspirations. This idealistic attitude toward the city in its articulateness produced by the fifth century scientific methods of city-planning. It is further significant that this new development took place probably along independent lines.1

The continuity of this Greek view of the city and its form is
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represented in the literary sources from the classical period to the second century of our era. For the earlier period Aristotle is our best guide since his reflections on the city in abstract have their basis in actual Greek practice.

Worthy of note in a prefatory way are Aristotle’s remarks on the cultural aspects of the *polis*. In his opinion the *polis* came into being for the good of men and existed for the good life (τὸ ἐν ἔννοια). It alone furnished the proper milieu for the intellectual and social activity of man. In no other environment could man’s best instincts find complete development. On the material side Aristotle’s view of the true *polis* comprehends a regular city provided with walls, both a free agora and a regular business section, temples for its gods, administration buildings and buildings for the use of its magistrates, messes (συνόρια) for the official groups, gymnasia, palaestrae, etc. Aesthetic considerations, moreover, were, according to him, to determine the building sites. Only as a thoroughly urban center could Aristotle’s city perform its fundamental functions in the intellectual, spiritual, and political spheres of everyday life.

If, for objective appraisal, we seek evidence other than the philosophic for the place of the *polis* in the life of the classical Greeks, the city of Athens deserves some notice. It cannot of course be looked upon as a typical Greek city. In point of fact, in the Greek world of its own heyday it stood supreme and alone in its grandeur. But it warrants attention in that it reveals, in exalted manner, basic aspects of the Greek urban tradition.

Fowler has said that Athens more nearly realized for its citizens Aristotle’s τὸ ἐν ἔννοια than any other Greek state. In the well-known funeral oration, the magnificent tribute to Athens is uttered by Pericles, but surely there are represented here the sentiments of Thucydides himself—an Athenian and an objective observer of the passing scene. In the words of Pericles Athens was no work-a-day place; it provided many recreations of the spirit—contests and sacrifices throughout the year, beauty in its public buildings to cheer and delight the mind and eye, and a life of refinement and grace. The amenities which Athens provided for its

---
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citizens, we know, were abundant. The Peisistratids had made of her a city of the Muses and the new democratic state had not been slow to follow their example. The present remains of Athens' magnificent public buildings are eloquent of the city's abundant way of life as is also the record of her Dionysiac and Panathenaic festivals and attendant contests.

Megalopolis perhaps represents more typically Greek urban idealism at the culmination of its development in the classical era of Greece. The city, founded under the aegis of Epaminondas as the center of the Pan-Arcadian Confederacy, was intended as a strong defensive unit against the power of Sparta. Its site was very important strategically. From the economic point of view it was further significant as the center of a highly fertile territory and as the junction of a number of important trade routes in the peninsula. But from its very foundation it stood revealed as a thoroughly urban center, providing in characteristic Greek fashion all the amenities for the manifold aspects of the life of its inhabitants. Pausanias' description of the site in his own day and the excavations of Gardner, Loring, et al. disclose to us a semi-planned city, astride the Helisson, containing in its northern half a regular agora almost completely enclosed by elegant temples, public buildings and porticos, a gymnasion, and the magnificent temenos of Zeus Soter. The southern portion of the city contained, inter alia, the great Thersilion, its portico, and the famous theater, all artistically arranged as part of an architectural unit. Our sources also indicate a stadium in this southern section. Adequate living space seems to have been provided by its planners since the city had a circumference of fifty stades.

The Greek urban ideal was the natural issue, among an aesthetic people, of a number of influences which cumulatively tended to focus interest locally. The peculiar nature of the geographical pattern in Greece and its isolating effects abetted a local point of view. Greece, moreover, from an early period had been beset with land hunger. A too intensive cultivation of the available soil tended to aggravate the critical land situation. Under such circumstances outsiders were scarcely welcomed into the various communities to share their limited lands and the meager subsistence
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therefrom. Thus, the attitude, on economic grounds, tended to remain exclusive and local.\textsuperscript{9} The inevitable processes of natural overpopulation and soil deterioration of course eventually called for remedies in the agricultural industry. Many of the small Greek farmers were compelled to abandon their local interests and allegiances and to seek new lands through overseas colonization. But many, on the other hand, found economic salvation in commercial and industrial activity at home. The Greek industrial emphasis is reflected early at Athens in an enactment of Solon according to which a father had to see to it that his son was taught a trade or else forego claims of filial support in his old age.\textsuperscript{10} Commercial and industrial enterprise was concentrated in the cities, a circumstance which further tended to magnify in each case local claims of importance.

We may note in passing that, while Greek economy was based upon the institution of slavery which by tradition, at least, supplied, outside respectable toil on the land, the worker class, the free Greek citizen, on being forced to turn to industrial labor, does not seem to have suffered any abject social degradation thereby. For, though the meaner manual tasks fell generally to slaves, the citizen could find a certain occupational dignity in the more highly skilled trades which servile labor by no means controlled. The Greek citizen and artisan faced competition, of course, in his profession from the metic, the unenfranchised foreign sojourner, conspicuous in the social structure of so many Greek states. But the metic at least was generally a freeman and thus a social equal, and his competition in industry, though keen, seems to have left room for the citizen-tradesman. Plato, for example, makes the observation (Rep., VIII, 565 A) that in democracies the artisans form the most influential and numerous class in the assembly. Certainly the citizen-tradesman, by virtue of his exclusive political rights, had the opportunity to enact legislation preferential to citizen labor, but on such legislation our
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\textsuperscript{10} Plutarch, Solon, 22. Among the well-to-do of course such a regulation could have little point. In fact snobishness on the part of the wealthy toward those who had to work for a living was not unknown in Athens. Cf. the taunts of Demosthenes (son of a wealthy armorer) against Aeschines who, as a boy, had to work for a livelihood. (De Corona 255).

On the industrial activity of Athenians see Solon, frg. 12 (in K. Freeman, The Work and Life of Solon, pp. 209–11); Thucydides, 2, 40; and Xenophon, Memor., 3, 7, 6 (great variety of tradesmen in the Athenian assembly).
sources are notably silent. Moreover, in an imperial democratic state such as fifth-century Athens, the heavy civic obligations of the citizen-tradesman and the distractions they imposed helped the cause of outside labor.\textsuperscript{11}

The tendencies outlined above helped to foster in the Greek city-states a particularist point of view. Although gradually evolved, particularism had become a marked feature of Greek urban life in the fifth century B. C.—the great age of urban culture in classical Greece. In the physical development of the Greek city we doubtless have represented the overtones of particularism under political influences. The fifth century witnessed the full flowering of democracy in most of the Greek city-states. In this same century the city-wall, the final feature of the Greek urban form, began to appear regularly at Greek city-sites. In the city-wall we may see the external symbol of the independence\textsuperscript{12} of the new democratic state, and in it we may discern, perhaps, a token of the political seclusion of the folk who lived within its shadow. Even internally, the political reflections of particularism in the Greek city-states are not difficult to perceive. The right of the local citizenship and franchise seems to have been jealously guarded in the various \textit{poleis} in the period of their vigor and generally was not extended either to resident-alien groups or freed slaves.\textsuperscript{13}

Finally, evidences of particularism are apparent in the moral sphere. Greek morality was oriented first around the individual and in broadening circles it successively embraced his nearest kin, and the members of his phratry, deme, tribe, and city. Its furthest and weakest extension allowed it to comprehend, through sentiment or utility, Greek allies and all Greeks, but the limit of its most practical vigor was the \textit{polis} wall.\textsuperscript{14}

\textsuperscript{11} On Greek citizen-labor see Tod, \textit{C. A. H.}, 5, pp. 5, 15; and Michell, \textit{The Economics of Ancient Greece}, pp. 1–18, 125.
\textsuperscript{13} This at least seems to have been the pattern in the fifth century. The growth of an exclusive policy on citizenship was, however, a slow one. Solon, for example, admitted many foreign artisans to the franchise at Athens. Moreover, the Athenian law on the restriction of citizenship rights to those who could claim Athenian parentage on both sides was not in vogue in the day of Cleisthenes. He had a Sicelian mother.
The Greeks thus found their interests confined and concentrated locally. Through their peculiar spiritual endowment they expressed materially these intense local interests in an elegant and highly artistic manner. This material expression was the regular polis with its magnificent public buildings and monuments, its general urban amenities, its facilities for training in music and athletics, so integral a part of the best Greek educational tradition, and so peculiarly Greek. It may perhaps be noted that the numerous competitions in these arts throughout Greece helped considerably to strengthen an intense community spirit in the several poleis.\textsuperscript{15}

The Greek polis thus enjoyed a role which was at once vital and positive in the lives of its citizens and became the focus of their attention and their highest culture in the classical Greek era.\textsuperscript{16}

The career of Alexander and the activities of the Successors shed light on the role of the polis in the later Greek world. Alexander was a great city-builder. Much remains obscure regarding the numerous cities which he founded. Undoubtedly commercial, military, and economic motives all played a part in his urban program. But, in the view of modern scholars, his cities cannot be divorced from his larger cultural policy. As the apostle of Hellenism he meant to carry the glorious Greek cultural tradition to the far corners of his mighty empire. The instrument of this design was the polis—the essence of Greek civilization. The new cities which he built and peopled with Greek colonists were, in their broader aspects, to furnish the means for a gradual Hellenization of the East, and to offer models which the natives might imitate.\textsuperscript{17}

All the Successors caught something of Alexander’s spirit and inspiration and all did some building.\textsuperscript{18} The promotion of Greek civilization through colonization and the founding of cities had become part of the royal prerogative. The Seleucids were particularly faithful and energetic in following Alexander’s example. As city-founders they fashioned and peopled centers of some magnificence, such as Antioch on the Orontes, Seleucia on the Tigris,
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and Laodicea on the Sea. Our sources describe the latter as a most beautifully-built city.\textsuperscript{19}

Among the lesser dynasts of the period following the death of Alexander the phihellenist Attalids were active city-builders.\textsuperscript{20} Philadelphia in Lydia, a foundation of Attalus II, played a significant role in Anatolian history from its inception to the end of antiquity. Its distinctive appellation, 'Little Athens,'\textsuperscript{21} in the late period illustrates the continuity of its fine urban traditions. The magnificence of the Attalid capital, Pergamum, made it one of the outstanding cities of the Hellenistic world. Among the many amenities it afforded its citizens was the strict regulation of matters pertaining to public health.

Historically speaking, the Greek \textit{polis} was the hallmark of the best Greek way of life and wherever Hellenism took root it tended to manifest itself in a form most characteristic of the Greek cultural tradition, that is the regular city.

The Greek view of life centered ideally in the \textit{polis} was, however, a rather narrow one. It did not take into adequate account those parts of the world which had been settled by wandering free peoples who were in search of land and whose way of life and interests remained intimately bound up with the soil. The Indo-European peoples who began to penetrate Italy about two thousand years before the Christian era found an abundance of good land (the object of their quest here as elsewhere, of course) successively in the Po valley, in Tuscany, in the plain of Latium, and, to a lesser extent, in the southern reaches of the peninsula. A continuing supply of good land kept the early settlers of the Roman Campagna, with whom we are chiefly concerned, on their farms, relieved of the economic obligation of industrial pursuits, and rendered unnecessary a turn to the sea and its commerce as an economic expedient. This experience had been forced upon their kinsmen in other parts of Europe which were less richly endowed with productive acreage.

The pristine organization of this Italic farm folk was villatia. The changes which first came about in this organization were
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\textsuperscript{21} Cf. Ioannes Laurentius Lydus, \textit{De Mensibus}, 4, 58.
scarce due to natural predispositions. In Latium, for example, an incipient concentration of the scattered villagers into defensive towns seems to have occurred. But this was apparently occasioned by the danger from the new foreign element to the north—the Etruscans. It was these invaders in fact who introduced formal urbanization into Italy. After establishing regular city-states in Etruria they penetrated Latium where their presence and influence gave real substance and embellishment to the rude and practical aspects of the incipient town movement. The new urban principle, introduced by non-natives, was given added vitality by the example set by another foreign element, the Greeks, in their urban, colonial foundations.

But, despite the foreign innovation, the old Italian outlook which sprang from a life and environment next to the soil remained strong. The Romans entered upon their Republican history as a nation largely of small farmers governed by a land-owning aristocracy. They were destined to cling for some time to the old rustic tradition and rural point of view. The same attitude was to prevail with some vigor among the natives of the peninsula generally.

The slow growth of Italian towns is indicative of this fundamental aspect of Italian culture. Exclusive of Etruria, Umbria, and Latium, where Etruscan power and influence were markedly manifest, we find, as late as 270 B.C., that all central Italy was cityless. Among the peoples of this large area—the Vestini, Marsi, Paeligni, Marrucini, and Frentani—village life persisted and the old tribal organization remained intact. The same vigorous stability of the rural, tribal organization is to be found among the main portion of the Samnites and among the Hirpini, Lucanians, and Bruttians. In Picenum, Sabinum, and among the Aequi the city form of organization is beginning to emerge but dimly at this rather late date.²²

At Rome, the tardy introduction of coinage is a revealing fact in our connection.²³ Furthermore, the Roman religious practices of the early period, so closely associated with agricultural life, persisted, under the nimbus of pietas, among the native element during the Republic, despite sophisticated and cosmopolitan innova-
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²³ Even in Varro’s day Roman fines continued to be assessed in terms of oxen or sheep, as well as in money. Cf. Varro, R. R., 2, 1, 9.
tions which marked the worship of a later day, and formed the basis of the new organization of the state religion under Augustus. 24

The farmer-landowner was deliberately given a favored position in the earliest organization of the Roman body politic. The active role of the centuriate assembly during the Republic vouchsafed him this favored status, even after the democratic reform of the third century. The political predispositions which are revealed in the early organization of the tribal assembly persist somewhat obstinately, though not undimmed, in the later history of this elective and legislative body. The original tribal organization embraced but four urban tribes, into which the city proletariat was compressed, and seventeen rural tribes. The membership in these seventeen consisted of farmers who owned a few acres of land in districts not far from the city. Under the Roman group-voting system the urban plebs had little chance at this time of competing with the rural, landowning group which could readily come to the city to exercise its franchise. In the ensuing period of Roman expansion and the extension of the citizenship the number of tribes necessarily increased from time to time and reached a maximum of thirty-five in 241 B.C. But the increase was reflected only in the rural tribes while the number of urban tribes remained static, despite a gradual but cumulatively heavy increment in the urban masses. Historically, the distinguishing feature of membership in a rural tribe continued to be, even down to the final century of the Republic, property ownership, usually in the form of land.

Geographic circumstances and economic developments played an important role in adjusting somewhat the political disparity between the urban proletariat and the rural landowners in the tribal assembly. The extension of the citizenship to districts further and further afield from Rome meant that the members of the newly-created rural tribes were handicapped by geographical reasons in the exercise of their franchise in the city. On the economic side, the small-landholder class in Latium, the mainstay of the original rural organization, experienced a stark depletion of its

ranks through an enclosure movement which, following in the wake of soil exhaustion in this former cereal land, gave rise to large estates owned by a few capitalists. These estates were given over to ranching and worked by slave labor which, of course, lacked the franchise. Moreover, the continuous wars of the third and second centuries B. C. wrought great financial havoc among the small landowners generally, a class which by Roman property traditions bore the chief burden of military obligation until the last century of the Republic. Many of the bankrupt farmers drifted to the city where, by a curious censorial apathy, they were allowed to retain their original rural registration. But only by aligning their sympathies with those of the urban plebs and voting for the socialist programs of its radical tribunes could this impoverished group secure a measure of economic relief. Last has calculated (perhaps too liberally) that by the latter part of the second century the rural representation which this impoverished farmer-group in the city was able to muster could seriously influence the general tribal vote, unless, of course, precautions were taken beforehand to assure proper representation from the thirty-one rural tribes. But whatever the degree of political exaltation enjoyed by the urbani, it was apparently the vicarious result of a changed economic and geographical situation. It hardly represents the manifestation of a new policy of political preference.

The Italian allies of Rome fought for and gained the right of the citizenship in the Social War (91–89 B. C.). To incorporate the new citizens in the state Rome distributed in systematic fashion all Italian communities south of the Po among the various rural tribes and registered the residents of each community in the rural tribe to which the community had been assigned. Only at this late date in Republican history do we find that free birth becomes the feature of membership in a rural tribe, not property-ownership. Yet a remark of Cicero’s made some years later would seem to imply that property-ownership—i.e., in land—was still commonly assumed for rural tribesmen.25

While the urban proletariat, through peculiar circumstances, thus became more effective politically in the late Republican period, the means were not lacking to utilize more fully the political power

---

of the conservative element in the state which consisted mostly of Italian landholders. The presiding magistrate could call for legislative purposes, the timocratic centuries (the group which enjoyed the privilege of electing the higher magistrates). Or, in the case of a radical proposal before the tribal assembly, an unsympathetic magistrate could, by the use of obstructionist devices such as the veto and, particularly, obnuntiatio, secure a temporary postponement in order to assure a more equitable representation in the rural tribes.  

A love of the country and a life on the land is consistently mirrored in the literary tradition of the Republic. Three technical works on agriculture were published before the close of the first century B.C. Cato, whose vigorous and lucid utterance gave to Latin speech its first artistic impetus, was wont as a speaker to draw upon the favored rustic scene for his vivid word-pictures. Horace continually extols his Sabine farm. Cicero, the meticulous arbiter of urbanity, was frank to acknowledge that there was no profession more delightful or respectable than agriculture. Perhaps this general feeling for the country was best captured and expressed once and for all in the lines from the Georgics of Virgil, too well-known to require repetition. This rustic bias which is evident in the literature is not surprising since most of the successful literary men of the Republic sprang from a background close to the soil.

The rural outlook has some interesting repercussions from the political point of view. One of these has been described as the Roman spirit of accommodation toward fellow-Italian neighbors and farmers. The Romans responded freely to the claims of affinity among these people and were quick to accord them generous
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26 A magistrate who intended to present legislation to the tribes had, through his own foreknowledge, opportunity to summon the rural groups for the vote if he so desired.

Of considerable interest is the senate's attitude toward the Lex Aelia et Fufia. A clause in this law forbade the convening of a legislative group, to pass upon a proposed law, during the twenty-four days preceding the elections in July. (I suspect the law, of 156 B.C., was enacted to forestall large-scale bribery at a time when so many citizens from all parts of Italy were readily accessible in the city for political solicitation.) On more than one occasion the senate found it possible to exempt the consul from the terms of the law in order to present legislation to the tribes. (See Cicero, ad Att., 1, 16, 13; 4, 16, 5; also Dio, 36, 39, and on the whole McDonald, J. R. S., 19 (1929), pp. 164–79, and Weinstock, J. R. S., 27 (1937), pp. 215–22.)

27 De Off., 1, 15; see also Cato Maior, 51.

28 Bk. II. ll. 458ff. The work was written with the small, independent farmer in mind, not the absentee landlord.
treatment. This liberal Roman attitude is early illustrated in the *foedus Cassianum*, an instrument which established, *inter alia*, a community of private rights between citizens of Rome and any Latin city, and which was almost immediately extended to cover Rome's relations with the Hernici. The continuity of the same liberal attitude is reflected on a similarly large scale in the later settlement of 338 B. C. whereby Latin states were admitted to the full or partial franchise or were accorded the dignified status of independent allies. The generous principle underlying this settlement formed the basis for Rome's later unification of Italy.

The importance of this liberalism toward Italians has a place in our discussion in that it tended to detract from an interest centered exclusively in the Roman city-state, and to abrogate the factor of local particularism. It may also be noted here that in comparison with the situation in Greece the claims of Italian geography could play no significant role in engendering a particularist point of view.

It may perhaps be objected that the liberal Roman disposition toward Italians did not later apply to conquered peoples outside Italy. This was an undoubted instance of Roman exclusiveness but a typically agrarian attitude of regional exclusiveness which the American Mid-Western farmers have so clearly revealed.

Further manifestations of granger sympathies and outlook are to be found in the history of Roman colonization. In Rome's early expansion in Italy there was quickly established the policy of a confiscation by the state of a portion of newly-conquered land. This land was used partly for distribution among a sturdy agrarian society whose birth-rate was high. Colonial groups were given allotments at points vital to the defense of the expanding Roman state. It is of considerable significance that the newly acquired land in these colonies was shared both by Latin allies and Romans. Up to 338 B. C. in fact the only type of colony in which Romans participated was Latin. By the year 209 B. C. there were thirty of these colonies in existence.

The citizen, maritime-type of colony was established in 338 B. C. at Antium. This type was much smaller in comparison and comprised usually three hundred men with their families. The need for but few participants in these colonies, and the unlikelihood of their developing into places of importance prompted their inauguration and the decision to organize them as integral parts
of the Roman state under Roman administration, and not as independent *res publicae* as were the Latin colonies. But it is worthy of note that Latins also had a share in these, and in some cases perhaps Samnites. Twenty-one maritime colonies had been planted by the year 184 B.C.

It is of course a well-known fact that after 184 B.C. Latin colonization ceased (with the single exception of Aquileia in 181 B.C.) and that henceforth the citizen type of colony was the rule. This, however, does not indicate exclusiveness on Rome's part. Salmon has shown that the reason behind Rome's failure to participate in further Latin colonization (and the consequent cessation of the latter) was due primarily to Latin agency. Rome could supply men for Latin colonies as long as her own liberal policy of extending to the Latins the right to immigrate to Rome and accept the franchise replenished her citizen rolls. When, during the period 265–177 B.C., Rome was forced by Latin pressure to restrict more and more this immigration, she could not, in the end, continue to supply men for Latin colonies without serious consequences to her own citizen complement. As a result Latin colonization ceased. With the exception of Aquileia citizen colonization thus becomes the standard from 184 to 177 B.C. The preference was clearly due to Rome's desire to maintain her citizen numbers and her own fighting strength. This was the period in which the large inland colonies of citizens were established at Parma and Mutina. But it should be noted that in the colonies of this period the Latins also had a share until even the restricted right of immigration was abrogated about 177 B.C.

Citizen colonization also ceased in this latter year until the time of the Gracchi since the dearth of immigrants left, finally, no marginal reservoir of manpower for colonial foundations even of the citizen-type. By the time of the Gracchi of course enough citizens were once more available to participate in colonies. But now, however, Roman citizenship had apparently become too valuable to surrender through membership in a Latin colony and hence citizen colonies are the rule. But it is of more than passing interest to find at this time that the colonists in Junonia, the Gracchan colony at Carthage, came from every part of Italy.

---

29 *J. R. S.* XXVI (1936), pp. 47–67 ("Roman Colonization from the Second Punic War to the Gracchi"), the chief source for the above remarks on the colonies.

30 *Applian, B. C.*, 1, 24.
What of the purpose of these colonies, Latin and citizen? The simple and practical nature of the maritime type provides clear testimony that these were established at easily defensible points on the coast for military purposes. The inland colonies of the Latin type were of course much larger. But this was due to the fact that military needs at internal points of strategic importance were much greater. The same circumstance accounts for the large number of colonists at the first great citizen colonies in the interior. Roman colonization up to the period of the Gracchi was motivated in fact solely by military considerations. And while the Gracchan regime demonstrated for the future the economic importance of colonies, it is still apparent that colonies under the Republic were not designed as romanizing agents.

The land for these early colonies was available through Roman expansion. Its availability kept Rome traditionally agricultural and devoted to the agrarian way of life, particularly at a time when the soil of Latium was beginning to show signs of deterioration. Similar soil exhaustion in Greece had early sent many Greeks across the Mediterranean in search of new lands. Or it had diverted them into commercial and industrial activity, a movement which brought great changes in cities such as Athens and Corinth. One might add that the social stigma, deep in the mores of the aristocracy-dominated Romans, attached to occupations such as commerce, banking, and industry, bolstered the traditional point of view.\(^{31}\)

An attitude which was non-urban in nature had marked the early centuries of Rome’s Republican history. During these important years her rise to greatness had been due to the vigor and strength of a society of small farmers who owned and worked the land on which they generally lived, and fought the wars. This group did not, however, continue to flourish.

Great social changes began at Rome in the second century. The primacy of the small farmer was eclipsed through the toll of continuous wars, and bankruptcy which faced many of those who survived the wars. In the face of the economic crisis not a few emigrated to the provinces or to the Po valley to begin life anew.\(^{32}\) Many drifted to the city to find industrial activity, which necessity

\(^{31}\) For a partial reflection of this view see the preface to Cato, *De Agri Cultura*.

might have prompted, largely closed to them by reason of its concentration in the hands of slaves or persons of servile origin.\textsuperscript{33} Commercial enterprise which might have beckoned was either precluded by lack of capital or generally preempted by outsiders more knowledgeable in the field.\textsuperscript{34} The apathy of an agrarian-minded senate toward native industry and commerce scarcely contributed to an amelioration of this grievous situation. Respectability left only state charity as a stimulus to the unfortunates’ urban consciousness, and a place in the growing urban proletariat.

By the middle of the second century B. C. the Roman proletariat was beginning to show clearly the heavy taint of foreign blood. The great mass of slaves imported as a result of the Hannibalic and Eastern wars soon began, through Rome’s liberal policy on manumission and the franchise, to swell the ranks of the citizen body. To the more enterprising of these foreigners, particularly the Orientals, the city offered wide possibilities for their astuteness and versatility and they flocked thither in great numbers. It has been plausibly suggested that the first appearance in Roman politics of bloodshed and violence during the Gracchan period was due to the presence at Rome of large groups of foreign origin and foreign ways. It may be recalled that Scipio Aemilianus in his aristocratic contempt saw fit to remark that he had brought to Rome in chains the hordes who were clamoring for the reforms of Tiberius Gracchus in the urban \textit{contiones}.\textsuperscript{35} This foreign element, so alien in its tastes to Roman traditions, was rapidly becoming more and more articulate. Rome in fact was becoming cosmopolitan.

But despite these social changes something of the traditional view remained. The work of the Gracchi placed perhaps some 75,000 urban indigents back on the land on individual lots. The great majority of the Italians admitted to citizenship after the Social War were small farmers living in villages. Of course, the wealthy nobles, in whose hands much land was concentrated, practiced capitalistic farming on a large scale and spent their time in the city. But their outlook remained essentially aristocratic and agrarian; their chief public preoccupations were imperial, not urban.


Something of the new cosmopolitanism is however reflected in the city itself at this period. Rome, which up to the close of the third century B. C. was but an overgrown country town, began to take on a new form. There was considerable building activity in the city during the second century under the influence of Hellenistic architectural ideas. In the early part of the first century Sulla carried through an ambitious program for the beautification of the city. But even at this late date the physical appearance of the city belied any real urban idealism on the part of the Romans. Moore has well said: "The view of Rome in the age of Sulla, in spite of Sulla's many improvements, would have been very disappointing to a traveler from Greek lands. Rome had much to learn from every Hellenistic city." Pompey caught something of Sulla's building spirit. Caesar did much to transform the city. But it remained for Augustus and his friends to carry forward and complete a building program which would give Rome the material aspects of a capital worthy of a great empire.

Greek aestheticism in its civic fervor had generally employed marble in its public buildings whenever possible. At Rome the native, rather ugly tufas furnished the common material. The one concession to the aesthetic was the early adopted practice of covering tufa walls with stucco. It should be noted, however, that stucco veneer served the practical purpose of protecting the poor-weathering tufa. Travertine, which was not a tufa, was discovered during the second half of the second century B. C. It was a stone of pleasing appearance and offered the further advantages of good weathering qualities, and an ability to carry heavy loads. But it did not come in for extensive use until the time of Augustus. It was not until the closing years of the Republic that marble began to be used in quantity. Although Luna marble was first used in Rome in 48 B. C. it seems unlikely that the Romans were not familiar with it previously. Blake, for example, states that the quarries at Luna probably supplied the material for some Etruscan statues (though not for building). Rome founded a col-

36 The Roman's World, p. 378.
37 On the marble tradition among the Greeks see M. E. Blake, Ancient Roman Construction in Italy from the Prehistoric Period to Augustus, p. 51.
38 On travertine see Blake, op. cit., pp. 46–47; T. Frank, Roman Buildings of the Republic, pp. 32–33.
39 The first dateable use is mentioned by Pliny, N. H., 36, 48.
ony at Luna in 177 B. C.\textsuperscript{41} and according to this same writer the quarries seemed to have remained the property of the colony until the time of Tiberius. It was due to the accessibility\textsuperscript{42} and relative cheapness of Luna marble that Augustus was chiefly able to effect his boasted beautification of the city.\textsuperscript{43} In architectural materials the Republic had hardly caught the spirit of urban aestheticism.

The domestic conditions of the late-Republican city scarcely reflect an ideal urban attitude. The majority of the lowly element lived in multi-storied tenements under conditions starkly primitive. Due to high rental costs recourse was often had to subletting by apartment lessees of individual rooms in their flats, not infrequently to the maximum degree. This resulted in terrible overcrowding. The lack of water and sanitary facilities in the flats above the ground floor made for great inconvenience and unhygienic living conditions for the tenants. Open cess-trenches in the neighborhood provided, as late as the first century B. C.,\textsuperscript{44} a means of disposal for refuse but added a most unhealthy factor to city life. In this same century the unsubstantial nature of the concrete construction in the apartment houses, due to the avarice of builders and owners, left the poor tenants in continual dread of the collapse of the buildings. Or the fragile interiors of the insulae, the presence in them of innumerable, movable stoves and open lamps involved, in the absence of water conveniences, the risk of serious fires which were in fact all too frequent.\textsuperscript{45} Even the more fortunate among the common urban element who were able to own their own homes experienced perils to living comforts and to life. Dio\textsuperscript{46} reveals that a flood of the Tiber in 54 B. C. caused these humble dwellings, made of sun-dried brick, to collapse. The danger from flood was one of the reasons underlying Augustus’ reputed transformation of Rome from a city of sun-dried brick to one of marble.\textsuperscript{47}

\textsuperscript{41} Livy, 41, 13, 4.
\textsuperscript{42} Strabo describes the ease with which it was brought from the quarries and transported to Rome (5, 2, 5).
\textsuperscript{43} Cf. Suetonius, Aug., 28; Blake, op. cit., p. 53.
\textsuperscript{44} Lucretius, De Rerum Natura, IV, 1026.
\textsuperscript{46} 59, 62, 2.
\textsuperscript{47} See M. E. Blake, op. cit., p. 280. The danger from flood must have been an added peril to apartment life in the second century when multi-storied tenements were made of sun-dried brick, with walls two to three feet thick. Such wall construction was of course prohibited by statute about the end of this
City life in its external aspects was equally devoid of many refinements in comparison with Greek cities. Rome did not get its first permanent stone theater until 55 B. C.\textsuperscript{48} The first of the great baths was erected only in Agrippa’s time.\textsuperscript{49} The first permanent amphitheater was not built until 29 B. C.\textsuperscript{50} The Romans moreover were slow to follow the lead of the Hellenistic kings who established the great libraries at Alexandria and Pergamum. Caesar had planned two libraries but these plans were never realized. The first public library at Rome was built by Asinius Pollio, in celebration of his victory over the Dalmatians, in 39 B. C.\textsuperscript{51}

The interests of public security were inadequately served in Rome. Unlike Alexandria, the Republican city could not boast a well-organized police force. The establishment of an efficient police service was due to the work of Augustus, as was also the creation of a respectable fire-fighting corps.

This brief survey has attempted to show that among the Greeks of the classical period the material city played a role which was at once vital and positive in daily life, and that it was upon the city that the interests and ideal life of its citizenry were centered. This great significance which the Greek city had attained was carried far afield in the Hellenistic age and maintained in its pristine vigor. Among the Romans of the Republic, whose interests were directed primarily toward the country and the soil, the city enjoyed a role which was less real and absorbing.

The divergence between the Greek and Roman view of the city is well illustrated in the Latin word \textit{civitas}. This word is at times indicative of a true \textit{polis} or regular city. It very frequently, however, denotes simply a rural area perhaps with a small, central village for its administrative center. Because of the singleness of terminology and from political considerations, an area of this type is described in the Greek sources as a \textit{polis}. Many of the rural, tribal districts in Spain had early been organized by Rome into century. But this restriction was imposed for reasons of economy of space. Walls of this thickness, necessary to sustain more than one story, would, in the aggregate, require too large an area. (See Fiechter, P.—W., 1A [second series] coll. 998–90 ["Romisches Haus’]; Ebert, P.—W., 12, col. 901, ["Later’’]; Vitruv., \textit{De Arch.}, 2, 8, 17; M. E. Blake, \textit{loc. cit.})

\textsuperscript{48} Vell. Pat., 2, 48, 2; Tacitus, \textit{Ann.}, 14, 20; Dio, 39, 38.
\textsuperscript{50} Dio, 51, 23; Suetonius, \textit{Aug.}, 29; Cal., 18; Tacitus, \textit{Ann.}, 3, 72; Strabo, 5, 3, 8.
\textsuperscript{51} Suetonius, \textit{Iul.}, 44; Platner—Ashby, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 56.
such civitates for administrative purposes. There were 114 of these non-urban communities in Hispania Tarraconensis in Augustus’ time, as may be seen from Pliny’s list.\textsuperscript{52} The motives behind their creation obviously do not reflect the cultural aspects of the Hellenistic foundations.

The above distinction must be kept in mind in evaluating, for example, the urbanizing activity of Pompey in the late Republic. Pompey founded a number of cities in the interior of Pontus after the overthrow of Mithridates. Careful examination reveals that these were rural communities.\textsuperscript{53}

\textsuperscript{52} \textit{N. H.}, 3, 18. The evidence for these has been carefully examined by A. Schulten in ‘‘Die peregrinen Gaugemeinden des rom. Reiches’’, \textit{(Rhein. Mus.}, 50 [1895], pp. 489 ff.), and J. J. Van Nostrand, Jr., in ‘‘The Reorganization of Spain by Augustus,’’ \textit{(University of California Publications in History}, vol. 4, pp. 120ff.). See also J. S. Reid, \textit{The Municipalities of the Roman Empire}, pp. 238ff.

\textsuperscript{53} See the writer’s ‘‘The Pontic Cities of Pompey the Great’’ in \textit{T. A. Ph. A.}, 70 (1939), pp. 17–29.