

Borrower: TXM
(TXM-TN: 140182)
Lending String: *TJC,VYF,WEL,ILU,DKC
Trans.Date: 7/18/2007 09:41:48 AM

Patron: Clark, Victor

Journal Title: Studies in the Romanization of Etruria /

Volume: Issue:

Month/Year:

Pages: I don't know the pages

Article: Patrick Bruun; The Roman Census and Romanization under Augustus

Imprint: Roma ; G. Bardi, 1975.

ILL Number: 32312203



Call #: PA2019.F5 I523 v.5

Location: CENTRAL STACKS

ODYSSEY: 161.45.205.112

Ariel

Maxcost: Free

Billing Category: Exempt

Charge:

Shipping Address:

Middle Tenn. St. Univ. Lib

ILL

Box 13/1500 Greenland Drive

Murfreesboro, TN 37132

****VIA ATHENA COURIER****

Fax: (615) 898-5551

Odyssey

ARIEL: 161.45.205.82 OK

Notes

TXM --- ATHENA

TJC-TN: 289655



Needed: 7/23

7/18
MW

CONTENTS

	Page
1. INTRODUCTORY NOTES	439
1.1 ETRUSCANS IN ROMAN SOCIETY NO PROOF OF THE ROMANIZATION OF THEIR HOME TOWNS	» 439
1.2 THE LATINIZATION AND THE CONCESSION OF CITI- ZENSHIP IN THE LIGHT OF THE FUNERARY INSCRIP- TIONS	» 442
1.3 THE ATTRACTION OF THE <i>IUS PROVOCATIONIS</i>	» 444
1.4 THE LATINIZATION OF THE NAME FORMS IN ETRURIA	» 444
2. THE LATINIZATION AND THE IMPACT OF THE LOCAL CENSUS	» 446
2.1 THE TRADITIONS OF THE LOCAL CENSUS: ROMAN INTERFERENCE EXCEPTIONAL	» 446
2.2 THE LOCAL CENSUS IN ALLIED STATES AND IN CITI- ZEN COLONIES	» 448
2.2.1 THE CENSUS OF THE ALLIED STATES	» 448
2.2.2 THE CENSUS OF THE CITIZEN COLONIES	» 449
2.3 THE CO-ORDINATION OF THE LOCAL CENSUSES AFTER THE GRACCHAN COLONIZATION	» 451
2.4 THE GRACCHAN ERA AND THE LANGUAGE SHIFT	» 454
2.4.1 THE EPIGRAPHIC EVIDENCE OF A GRADUAL CHANGE	» 455
2.4.2 THE PALEOGRAPHIC EVIDENCE OF A GRADUAL CHANGE	» 456
2.4.3 ONOMASTIC INTERFERENCE AT PERUSIA	» 457
2.4.4 The <i>Liberti</i> of CLUSIUM	» 457
2.4.5 THE CASE OF FERENTUM AND THE CONSERVATION OF THE FEMALE <i>Praenomen</i> AT CAERE	» 459
2.5 START OF THE CO-ORDINATION OF LOCAL CENSUSES DURING THE GRACCHAN PERIOD	» 459
3. THE CENSUS AND THE WAY TO AN INTEGRATION OF ALL OF ITALY	» 461
3.1 THE PROGRAMME OF INTEGRATION ACCORDING TO THE <i>TABULA HERACLEENSIS</i>	» 461
3.2 THE FRANCHISE OF THE ITALIANS: A POLITICAL ISSUE	» 462
3.2.1 THE CONCESSIONS OF THE SOCIAL WAR AND THE INCOMPLETE CENSUSES OF THE POST-WAR YEARS	» 463
3.2.2 POMPEY'S CENSUS OF 70/69 B. C.	» 466
3.2.3 THE AFTERMATH OF POMPEY'S CENSUS: REPETITION UNDESI- RABLE	» 468
3.3 THE CENSUS OF 70/69 B. C.: INCOMPLETE STATE OF THE INTEGRATION OF THE PENINSULA	» 471
4. OCTAVIAN'S CENSUS OF 29/28 B. C. AND ITS AIMS	» 475

4.1	THE LANGUAGE SHIFT AT VOLATERRAE UNDER AUGUSTUS	Page 477
4.2	THE POLITICAL ATTITUDE OF THE VOLATERRANS TOWARDS ROME	» 479
4.3	THE CENSUS FIGURES OF 29/28 B. C.	» 483
5.	REGISTRATION OF EXTRA-URBAN POTENTIAL CITIZENS	» 485
6.	THE DEMOGRAPHIC DEVELOPMENT FROM 70/69 TO 29/28 B. C.	» 489
7.	THE BASIS OF CALCULATIONS: THE POPULATION OF 225 B. C. AS COMPARED WITH THE CENSUS FIGURES OF 70/69 B. C.	» 492
8.	ROMANIZATION: A POLITICAL EXPEDIENT UNDER AUGUSTUS	» 496
9.	THE ROMANIZED ETRUSCANS: AN EPILOGUE	» 501
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	» 503

1. INTRODUCTORY NOTES

1.1 ETRUSCANS IN ROMAN SOCIETY NO PROOF OF THE ROMANIZATION OF THEIR HOME TOWNS

Gathering together the threads of the preceding inquiries, the results of the individual studies seem to be in conflict. The narrative sources of Roman origin suggest that Roman citizenship was extended to many important Etruscan towns at an early juncture. Similarly, men of Etruscan origin had established themselves in Roman society to the extent of acquiring seats in the Senate prior to the Social War¹. Others, justifiably or not, termed *equites* such as the Caecinae of Volaterrae, were obviously men of substance with influential friends in Rome². The existence of these early and successful forerunners to the final Romanization appears to be at odds with the evidence of both the epitaphs of Etruria and, in particular, the cinerary urns of Volaterrae. This evidence can be illustrated by the following points:

(1) The Volaterran Aulus Caecina in Mr. Hohti's case study appears as a thoroughly Latinized, if not Romanized, Etruscan of Cicero's time. He is a very influential man at home³; his roots remain in Etruscan soil. He has not lost his interest in the culture of his native country, but he appears to move with the greatest of ease in the Roman world. On the other hand, the evidence of the inscriptions suggests that the Latinization of Volaterrae was completed under the early Empire. Mr. Kaimio refers

¹ In addition to Caere, Nepes, Tarquinii and Perugia are known as the original home towns of senatorial *gentes* in the second century B. C., cf. M. TORELLI, 'Senatori etruschi della tarda repubblica e dell'impero', *DialArch*, 3 (1969), 342 f.; T. P. WISEMAN, *New Men in the Roman Senate 139 B. C.-14 A. D.*, Oxford 1971, lists the "Origins of new men" in the Appendix II, 184 ff.

² Cf. recently W. V. HARRIS, *Rome in Etruria and Umbria*, Oxford 1971, chapter V. 5 "Acquisition of Roman Citizenship Before the Social War", 192-201, and the critical Appendix "Etruscans who acquired Roman Citizenship before the Social War", 319-328. HARRIS assumes that it is "unlikely that there were any citizens of the *civitates foederatae* resident in their towns who possessed the Roman citizenship, at least until the time of the Lex Repetundarum". According to HARRIS, the Etruscans with Roman citizenship before the war were all domiciled at Rome.

³ Cf. above p. 417.

it to the later part of the first century B. C. and to the early part of the first century A. D., Mrs. Nielsen can in exceptional cases only refer any Latin urn inscription to this century¹—an epitaph recording a Roman official, a *quattuorvir*²—and notes that the epitaphs in the Etruscan language were frequent even at the beginning of the first century A. D., i. e. almost up to the moment when the Volaterrans ceased to employ the miniature sarcophagi as receptacles of the ashes of their dead.

(2) The known dates concerning the franchise of the Etruscan towns and the consequent Romanization of the urban communities of Etruria are also at variance with the conclusions of the epigraphists. Volterrae is probably the most striking example. The city may have obtained the *civitas Romana* before the Social War³; Cicero's arguments concerning Caccina's citizenship⁴ show Volterrae as enjoying at least the *ius Latinum*, the town having been demoted to this status or, according to Cicero, to the *ius Ariminensium*, from full franchise. Harris⁵ argues that the franchise was restored both to Volterrae and Arretium in the 70/69 B. C. census. The quattuorviral inscription⁶ by Mrs. Nielsen dated not later than 30 B. C. (80-30 B. C.) proves Volterrae to have been a *municipium* anew at least in the very last years of the Republic, yet its burial customs and its onomastic habits as expressed in the epitaphs appear to have remained unchanged for many decades.

Caere was the first among the Etruscan towns to receive Roman citizenship⁷. A close neighbour to Rome, this town shows a different pattern of development than Volterrae, yet even Caere, where the Latinization starts earlier than in other Etruscan communities, according to the epitaphs⁸, bears witness to the basic correspondence as to the behaviour of Volterrae: the old Etruscan burial customs were maintained towards the end of the pre-Christian era, notwithstanding the status of the city within the Roman

¹ Cf. 3, 3 above.

² *CIL* XI 1744 — the text of the lid numbered Volterra 177 above.

³ Cf. RUOFF, p. 457 above.

⁴ Cf. HOHTI, pp. 423-427 above.

⁵ 282 f.

⁶ *CIL* XI 1744.

⁷ For the incorporation of the *ager Veientanus* and the case of Capena, cf. RUOFF, pp. 40-43 above, for the latter also HARRIS, 42 f.

⁸ Caere is the earliest of the Etruscan towns to be Latinized. Even so, the chronological difference between the Latinization of Caere and other Etruscan towns has to be counted in decades only. The language shift begins in the late second century B. C. (cf. KAIMIO, p. 195 above), and not in the fourth century (cf. e. g. KAIMIO, p. 194).

commonwealth¹, and the same applies to Tarquinii, where one of the necropoleis was in use in the reign of Tiberius².

Arretium is another case in point. The town is represented in the Roman senate during the early days of the Empire³, yet as late as 40 B. C. an Etrusco-Latin bilingual inscription was incised in this very town⁴.

Comparing the narrative sources with the epigraphical evidence, it is easy to see that these two kinds of material reflect different, comparatively narrow, aspects of Etruscan society. We should, furthermore, remember that when the narrative sources transmit glimpses of social life in Etruria, they are incidental to the main purpose of the story, in the depiction of Roman history. The insight we gain with regard to the Etruscans is to a large extent based on deductions from narratives dealing with a different subject than the one investigated. In contrast, the inscriptions are remnants of Etruscan social life. This in no way postulates the fact that the conclusions drawn from the different types of sources would conflict. On the contrary, we should assume that they are supplementary, and that, primarily, we should look for an explanation which would cover all the facts at our disposal, and all the deductions made.

The picture of the general development in Etruria illustrates, on the one hand, how some members of the nobility of the Etruscan towns try to acquire a foothold in Roman society, on the other, that the majority of the population, probably without any ambitions outside their own community, remains faithful to local tradition, even continuing to use the old language in funerary inscriptions. The Volaterran material shows that during the process of the unification of Italy under Augustus the burial customs remained unchanged although the production of cinerary urns decreased and seems to have been discontinued completely under his successors.

The nobles who wanted to make a career in Rome were Roman citizens; in many cases their home towns were franchized. Virginate grants of citizenship were exceptional in the Republic⁵, at least before the Social War;

¹ Cf. KAIMIO, p. 220 f.

² Cf. *Introduction*, p. 25 n. 2.

³ TORELLI, *DialArch*, 3 (1969), 291 ff., 342 f., and WISEMAN, *New Men*, 278, no. 516.

⁴ *TLE* 930; cf. KAIMIO, p. 189 above, and, generally for Arretium, T. P. WISEMAN, 'The Potteries of Vibienus and Rufrenus at Arretium', *Mnemosyne*, 16 (1963), 275-283.

⁵ For such cases, cf. A. N. SHERWIN-WHITE, *The Roman Citizenship*, Oxford 1939, 128 and further 189, 191 concerning those who had obtained citizenship

normally the franchise was extended to *populi*¹. But in contrast to the early Romanized Etruscans, their contemporaries, who stayed at home, appear unaffected by the fact that their town had obtained the franchise. At any rate, in the tombs, their Etruscan names and name forms were still in use. The picture of the Romanization of Etruria should comprise the "influential upstarts from all over the country" *ex tota Italia delecti*², who competed with the old *gentes* in the capital as well as those who at home gradually succumbed to the forces of change. How the latter process was carried out has been established by Mr. Kaimio³ in his study of the epitaphs. The reasons for the change will be subject of the subsequent notes.

1.2 THE LATINIZATION AND THE CONCESSION OF CITIZENSHIP IN THE LIGHT OF THE FUNERARY INSCRIPTIONS

Before considering the reasons for the language shift, something should be said about the value of the evidence of the funerary inscriptions. It may be assumed:

(1) that the name forms used in most cases were those which had been employed for the deceased, in life, by himself, and/or by his family. This must have been the general rule when the epitaph together with the deceased or his ashes was secluded in the tomb and out of view to

through service in the auxiliary forces of the army. In the last few years three scholars, M. TORELLI, T. P. WISEMAN and W. V. HARRIS (in the studies mentioned above) have concerned themselves with the advancement of non-Romans in Roman society. TORELLI and WISEMAN have examined the cases of those who reached the highest social and political level, the senatorial aristocracy; HARRIS, however, is more interested in the enfranchisement proper. "It was not Roman policy to make citizenship available to large numbers of individual member of Italian allied states at any time during this period" (i.e. from the conquest to the Social War), he remarks (192). In an Appendix (319-328) he discusses the cases of *singillatim civitate donati* and concludes (328) by listing eleven individuals of Etruscan origin enfranchized before the Social War (cf. also TORELLI, diagram, 342 f.). Five of them acquired citizenship before the Gracchan age (i.e. before the *lex Repetundarum* and the tenure of magistracies in towns with *ius Latii* opened a new way to the *civitas Romana*). They were all domiciled in Rome (HARRIS, 197).

¹ SHERWIN-WHITE, 131; cf. also RUOFF, pp. 40 f., 43 ff. above.

² SHERWIN-WHITE, 179.

³ 2, 3 above.

all except the family. At Caere, however, where the epitaphs were incised on *cippi* standing in front of the tombs, the publicity of the inscriptions may have prevented flagrant deviations from the officially accepted name forms¹. In addition to the *cippi* exposed to the public, the bilingual inscriptions are an exception to the general rule; they illustrate the language shift and the fact that parallel name forms could be used at times.

(2) that the language of the epitaph, in contrast to the name form, may at times represent a relapse to usage not current any more at the time of the burial. Particularly in cases of resentment or of opposition to the Romanization, conservative or patriotic Etruscans may have reacted in this way. In such cases, the language of the epitaphs would not correspond to the one used in the society of the time². Conceivably the Latin language first gained ground in official contexts, for instance in dealing with Roman authorities. *Civitates foederatae* and *municipia sine suffragio*, not to speak of franchized communities, must have been more or less regularly in touch with the Romans. Documents of both an official and a private character were certainly exchanged with increasing frequency. The closer the Etruscan towns were tied to Rome, the more important became the Latin language. The effect of the municipal reforms after the Social War certainly implied that the Etruscan language was gradually pushed back to the retreat of private homes. Consequently, the last Etruscan epitaphs may well have been executed at a time when, for all practical purposes, the town in question was a Latin-speaking community.

These considerations regarding the evidence value of the funerary inscriptions enhance the conclusions reached above, viz. that the process of Latinization mapped out by Mr. Kaimio was not a result of compulsion caused by the concession of citizenship or the conferment of the status of *municipium*. The "man in the street", or, rather the Etruscan who did not want to break out of his home environment was not compelled to Latinize his name or to change his traditional way of life or the burial customs of his family on these grounds. We may here, as an instance of Roman indifference to the language employed in unofficial contexts, refer to the *tabula Bantina*. It shows that ethnic minorities translated into their own language, and possibly on their own initiative³, a selection of Roman

¹ KAIMIO, 3, 3 above.

² The pattern of behaviour may have differed greatly from place to place and in different social strata; cf. 3, 3 above.

³ As suggested by H. GALSTERER, 'Die *lex Osca Tabulae Bantinae* — Eine Bestandsaufnahme', *Chiron*, 1 (1971), 211. Previously M. TORELLI, in ADAMESTEANU, D.-M. TORELLI, 'Il nuovo frammento della tabula Bantina', *AC*, 21 (1969),

laws of some consequence for their everyday life. The *municipium* of Bantia was constituted in 80-60 B. C. according to Torelli¹.

1.3 THE ATTRACTION OF THE *IUS PROCVOCATIONIS*

Now, the explanation that the Latinization and the Romanization was a natural, slow and evolutionary process brought about without any special efforts or policy on the part of the Romans is scarcely satisfactory. The Romanization gained momentum through the fact that in a world politically dominated by the Romans, Roman citizenship was becoming an increasingly valuable asset, in most cases less because of the political vote it included than because of the protection, the *ius provocationis*, granted to all Romans².

If we are to believe the inscriptions, and similarly the census returns, which will be dealt with in the sequel, the *ius provocationis* does not seem to have been a very strong incentive with regard to the enrolment as citizens. There is no evidence of a sudden registration *en masse* in newly franchized Etruscan towns; although the *civitas* was granted to *populi* and *civitates*, it would seem that it was left to individuals to decide whether or not they wanted to make use of the opportunity to acquire the Roman citizenship³.

1.4 THE LATINIZATION OF THE NAME FORMS IN ETRURIA

Now, there is a remarkably small difference between the Etruscan towns in the North and in the South with regard to the progress of Latinization⁴.

15 ff., had shown that the Oscan text was of a later date than the Latin one, and probably incised in Rome on a bronze tablet, the text of which was obsolete, and which therefore could have been sold at a bargain.

¹ In ADAMESTEANU-TORELLI, *AC*, 21 (1969). GALSTERER, 193 and n. 10 suggests a slightly earlier date, 80 B. C. or some years later.

² As to the importance of the *ius provocationis*, cf. SHERWIN-WHITE, 127.

³ T. P. WISEMAN, 'The Census in the First Century B. C.', *JRS*, 59 (1969), 60 remarks that after Marius' reform, the censors no longer insisted that every qualified citizen should be enrolled. Though "savage penalties had been inflicted on *incensi* by the early censors", Cic. *l'err.* 1, 104 "shows that by the late Republic they must have been obsolete". The pressure on potential citizens, members of franchized communities, who had never been entered in the census lists, must have been much weaker.

⁴ KAIMIO, 3. 3 above.

The towns in southern Etruria, particularly those located along the main Roman roads, in this case especially the Via Aurelia, must have experienced the vicinity of the Urbs strongly and continuously. It is fair to assume that the need for the protection offered by the *civitas* here was much greater than in the North. At the same time the possibilities of acquiring the individual franchise by means of enrolment during the census were much greater. At least for the Caeretans the distance was of no great consequence. The closer to the capital, the stronger was the pressure exerted by the Roman environment, and consequently the more obvious the tendency towards self-Romanization, a phenomenon noted by Sherwin-White¹ although in a different context.

Is this sufficient to explain the results which emerge from a study of the epitaphs, mainly from an analysis of the name forms? The answer, most likely, is in the positive. Although the Roman name was the mark of citizenship², a name written in the Latin language could by no means always be regarded as such. The Clusine material suggests that the Latin elements crept in gradually in the Etruscan name forms—gradually being used here to mean "in the course of a certain period of time"³ during which the name forms more and more began to resemble the orthodox Roman name forms. This is generally speaking true of the whole of Etruria⁴.

Now, the elements and the composition of the Roman name form was codified by the censors. The *tabula Heracleensis*, which should be referred to the second part of the first century B. C., demonstrates the rigidity of the rules appertaining to the census. The varying modes and degrees of Latinization discernible in the Etruscan towns are incompatible with the enactment of the census, with the registration of Roman citizens and their enrolment in tribes and centuries. Yet, there seems to be a common denominator behind the different evolutionary processes, namely the Roman name form, which would have served not as a yard stick, but as a model. Consequently, in the different Etruscan towns, we find local adaptations of the same rule as expressed in the Roman name form.

¹ 168.

² KAIMIO, p. 161 above.

³ KAIMIO, p. 220 above, suggests "roughly fifty years as a period of transition".

⁴ KAIMIO, table, p. 187 above.

2. THE LATINIZATION AND THE IMPACT OF THE LOCAL CENSUS

2.1 THE TRADITIONS OF THE LOCAL CENSUS: ROMAN INTERFERENCE EXCEPTIONAL

Local census represents an administrative expedient of long standing in the Roman commonwealth — as a note in Polybius¹ for the year 225 B.C. shows. "The government of each ally state kept its own census of men qualified for active military service"². Such censorial activities were, of course, of little concern to the Roman authorities, although the local census lists may have been dispatched to Rome³. However, other pieces of evidence indicate that the Roman censors at times must have influenced the registration of citizens in allied states. The case of the twelve Latin colonies, which remonstrated against Rome in 209 B.C. and were punished in 204 B.C., belongs to the reiterated topics of the history of the Second Punic War. These colonies were forced to undertake a census in order to show *quantum numero militum, quantum pecunia valerent*⁴ and this should be done *ex formula ab Romanis censoribus data: dari autem placere eandem quam populo Romano*⁵. The lists ought to be dispatched to Rome, where they had to be made public: *deferrique Romam ab iuratis censoribus coloniarum, priusquam magistratu abirent... ut publicis tabulis monumenta extarent*. Pieri⁶ rightly regards these provisions as a kind of precedent to the *tabula Heracleensis*, but concludes that "on a progressivement soumis au même régime toutes les colonies latines et les cités alliées". This can scarcely be correct⁷. There seems to be little justification for Pieri's general conclusion of the gradual extension of this kind of control of the local censuses. Toynbee⁸ correctly emphasizes the fact that the orders of the Roman government were infringements of the sovereign rights of the Latin colonies. In practice they implied a more rigid control of the property evaluations and consequently of the payment

¹ 2, 23, 9.

² A. TOYNBEE, *Hannibal's Legacy* I, Oxford 1965, 426; cf. Plb. 6, 21, 4-5.

³ G. PIERI, *L'histoire du cens jusqu'à la fin de la république romaine*, Publ. de l'Institut de droit romain de l'Université de Paris, 25, Paris 1968, 170.

⁴ Livy 29, 15.

⁵ Livy 29, 37, 7.

⁶ 171.

⁷ Cf. WISEMAN, *JRS*, 59 (1969), 67 f.

⁸ I, 429 f.

of the *tributum*—something tax-payers always and everywhere are likely to resent¹—and of the obligations for military service. They were imposed on the recalcitrant colonies under duress, as punishments. It is hard to conceive the punishments as assuming a permanent character, i. e. the order of the Senate remaining in force after the census of 204 B.C., and after the war, and even more to accept Pieri's conjecture that they were extended to the loyal allies. In addition, as a reform of the censorial organisation, it would have created a complicated system for the purpose of controlling a relatively modest number of Roman citizens domiciled in allied states. The situation was radically changed after the *lex Iulia de civitate Latinis et sociis danda*, although at that time, the abolishment of the *tributum* and the recruitment of the legions among the *proletarii* from the point of view of the Roman State had diminished the need for the registering and keeping a check on the citizens. The census, then, for the individual citizens, had ceased to be a social burden.

The case of the Twelve Colonies should, therefore, be regarded as an exception, a punishment of a temporary nature, which, despite detailed instructions from Rome were, significantly enough, left to be carried out by local magistrates². On the other hand, other evidence of the organization of the local censuses should be studied with particular attention to the possibility that the Social War, or rather the extension of citizenship during and after the war, created a new situation which necessitated new methods of citizen registration³.

In addition the case of Capua presents unusual features. It suggests that at one time the Campanians had been registered locally, that after the reconquest of 212 up to 188 B.C. uncertainty prevailed with regard to the proper procedure, and that after 188 B.C. according to a decree of the Roman Senate, the Romans of Capua were registered in Rome⁴. However, the question of the census of the Campanians constitutes another exception. Capua and the secessionist Campanians were severely punished by the Romans, the corporate personalities of their communities were abolished and Capua did not become a juridical corporate body again till 59 B.C.⁵. Consequently, the *praefecti Capuam Cumas* would have been

¹ We should also note that no Latin colony had paid tribute to Rome previously; cf. E. T. SALMON, *Roman Colonization under the Republic*, London 1969, 183, n. 151.

² SHERWIN-WHITE, 99; SALMON, 90 f.

³ SHERWIN-WHITE, 86, n. 4 stresses BELOCH's observation that the *censores* in *municipia* all come from the communities incorporated before the Social War.

⁴ PIERI, 170, n. 137 with further references.

⁵ TOYNBEE I, 474.

locally responsible for the census in Campania in the censuses of 209/8, 204/3, and 194/3¹. From the census of 189/8 B.C. onwards, the Campanians had to register in Rome². Toynbee³ thinks that the Senate here departed from current practice still wanting to punish the secessionists of the Punic War. Generally speaking, however, this particular problem is unimportant from the point of view of this particular study; according to individual views of censorial practice, it could be maintained either that the Senate was vindictive, or wanted to revert to normality.

These two cases are the only ones known to us of the Roman authorities actively regulating the censuses outside Rome. Both cases present unusual features. Therefore, they cannot be used as proofs of regular interference in local censuses. We have, in fact, evidence showing that a censor, too actively engaged in local matters, was regarded with disapproval⁴. Such activities could be regarded as attempts to build up a personal following of clients⁵.

2.2 THE LOCAL CENSUS IN ALLIED STATES AND IN CITIZEN COLONIES

When considering the extra-Urban local censuses two different cases should be taken into account; on the one hand, the allied states, which with the passing of time acquired citizenship, and on the other, the Roman citizen colonies.

2.2.1 THE CENSUS OF THE ALLIED STATES

The registration of the citizens in *civitates* allied to Rome was obviously required in order that they might contribute their contingents *ex formula togatorum*⁶. Censorship and census were, however, not peculiar to Rome.

¹ P. A. BRUNT, *Italian Munrover from 225 B.C. to A.D. 14*, Oxford 1971, 20; TOYNBEE I, 457, 475. T. FRANK, 'Roman Census Statistics from 225 to 28 B.C.', *CIPH*, 19 (1924), 330 f., holds that the Campanians were not included in these censuses at all.

² Livy 38, 28, 4.

³ I, 457.

⁴ Flaccus in 174 B.C.: Livy 41, 27, 11, and SHERWIN-WHITE, 67, 80.

⁵ SALMON, 186, n. 181.

⁶ For this cf. TOYNBEE I, Annex IX, 424-437 and BRUNT, Appendix 6, 545-548.

They seem to have been indigenous among the Etruscans¹ and among the Oscan peoples². These institutions must normally have been found in the Etruscan and Oscan communities which received the Roman franchise, as is stressed by Brunt³. We have no reasons to believe that the Romans made any fundamental changes in the existing system. "Neither the grant of the *civitas sine suffragio* nor the subsequent grant of the vote disturbed the local self-government of the *communes affectae*"⁴.

2.2.2 THE CENSUS OF THE CITIZEN COLONIES

The members of the Roman citizen colonies might be expected to have been excused from personal attendance at the census in Rome, particularly when they constituted garrisons in exposed border zones⁵. This must have been the rule in the coastal colonies in Italy, but also, for instance, in Narbo Martius, to mention one colony remote from the capital. A colony founded with the express purpose of defending the frontier by land and by sea could not very well send away all its members *sui iuris* for the census. We must, therefore, assume some sort of local registration⁶: it may well be that the original register including all the colonists of a certain colony was drawn up when the colony was established⁷ and subsequently served as a basis to be supplemented later if the need arose. From the point of view of the Roman census, which was a means of registering those who could serve in the legions, the colonists did not constitute a serious problem; they did garrison duty and were excused from legionary service.

Thus we can expect to find local registration in the allied states and in the Roman citizen colonies. The inscriptions record a high number of censors and *quinquennales* in such communities. Unfortunately our possibilities of dating them are limited. In exceptional cases only, can we discern the development in the individual communities, particularly when the community in question changed status in the course of time.

¹ Cf. H. RIX, *Das etruskische Cognomen*, Wiesbaden 1963, 350, 380 for official control of names.

² Below pp. 450 f.

³ 40.

⁴ BRUNT, 534.

⁵ "They must be on perpetual duty at their post" (TOYNBEE I, 185).

⁶ BRUNT, 40.

⁷ Cf. WISEMAN, *JRS*, 59 (1969), 68.

The sample below exclusively serves to illustrate this diversity, but with preference given to instances of censurs of an early date and to communities where, in the Republican period, the local census was in charge of differently named officials. Conclusions regarding the general development should be avoided because local traditions seem to have played an important part in shaping the local administration. In many cases we can see that a local censor is superseded by a *quinquennalis*, but we cannot say how old the office and the title of the censor is, nor when and why they disappeared.

The allied states, subsequently franchized, offer considerable variety. We have a censor at Alatrium¹ in an inscription to be dated to the period 130-90 B. C.; Praeneste, a *civitas foederata* to 90 B. C.² had both a censor³ and a *duumvir quinquennalis*⁴ in the Republican period; Cora, a similar case, correspondingly a censor⁵ and a *quattuorvir quinquennalis*⁶; Copia (Thurii) a censor⁷ and a *duumvir quinquennalis*⁸, and Ferentinum censurs of the Sullan age⁹.

Sherwin-White¹⁰ draws attention to the citizen colonies and their tendency to copy the Roman constitution in the Republican period. One instance of this is the appearance of a censor e.g. in Fabrateria Nova¹¹, where the office subsequently disappears in favour of the *duoviri quinquennales*. This censor must be dated after 124 B. C. and before the time when the instructions of the *tabula Heracleensis* were formulated¹². On the other hand, Abellinum, another citizen colony, had censurs in the Augustan age¹³.

In other cases, the origin of the title itself may not be certain; hypotheses regarding both its Latin and its Oscan origin can be defended¹⁴. The Italic tradition could be manifest either in the title of the censor

¹ CIL I² 1529.

² SALMON, 50 ff.; cf. 173, nn. 60, 62.

³ CIL I² 2439.

⁴ CIL I² 1464.

⁵ CIL I² 1509.

⁶ CIL I² 1514.

⁷ CIL I² 1694.

⁸ CIL I² 2542.

⁹ CIL I² 1522-1525.

¹⁰ 86.

¹¹ CIL X 5390.

¹² SHERWIN-WHITE, 86, n. 6.

¹³ CIL X 1130, 1134; cf. SHERWIN-WHITE, 86, n. 3.

¹⁴ SHERWIN-WHITE, 122; ERNOU-NEILLET¹, 112 f.

or in his functions. On the one hand, the title, as it appears in our Latin sources, may be a Latinization of an indigenous Italic title, on the other, the functions resembling those of the Roman censurs, may have been labelled in Rome as censorial. However, regardless of the linguistic origin of the word, the duties of these censurs and their position in society can be expected, in the course of time, to have been influenced by the corresponding institutions in Rome.

In conclusion, as far as the local censurs are concerned, it could be said,

(1) that a kind of census was carried out in the allied states of Rome, and that they possibly originated in the agreements regulating the co-operation between the two sovereign states, Rome and its ally. The details of these censurs would nevertheless have been worked out in accordance with local requirements.

(2) that the only cases known of direct Roman interference with other communities are to be regarded as punitive (the Twelve Latin colonies, the case of the Campanians).

(3) that in the later Republic there was a tendency to project a copy of Roman institutions on the administration of citizen colonies, but that local censurs of this description are no proof of centrally directed censurs.

(4) that municipal censurs at times may be local officials whose duties may originate in an indigenous tradition. Their titles may be Latinized versions of the original ones.

2.3 THE CO-ORDINATION OF THE LOCAL CENSUSES AFTER THE GRACCHAN COLONIZATION

Having established the general rule of local census taking at least in the first century B. C., we should now consider how far the local censurs were co-ordinated with the official census taking in Rome. Were the rigid regulations later formulated in the *tabula Heracleensis* in fact applied much earlier? Discussing the census in the light of the *tabula Heracleensis*, Brunt¹ rightly emphasizes that all the clauses of the table need not be Caesarian or novel. The innovations of the table may in reality be only matters of

detail and drafting¹. For the table as such, the enfranchisement of Heraclea under the *lex Iulia* about 89 B. C. remains a *terminus post quem*²; the date of origin of the single clauses may, however, be earlier.

Now, was there any necessity in the course of the second century B. C. to change the policy of non-intervention in the affairs of the allied states, touched upon above, and to readjust the negative reaction to censorial interference in the large new-type citizen colonies of Potentia and Pisaurum in 174 B. C.³? Was there any reason for a more severe surveillance of the colonies in peninsular Italia? Apparently not till the Gracchan period.

In 177 B. C. the citizen colony of Luna was founded⁴. This implied a cessation of colonization for almost 50 years⁵ due to military and political stability on the peninsula⁶. Simultaneously the Roman expansion in the Mediterranean world was a heavy drain on Italian manpower.

The demographic data of the latter part of the second century B. C. include an unexpected increase of the census returns from 131/0 to 125/4 B. C. by roughly 75,000, although the correctness of the recorded figures is open to some doubt⁷. The alternative manuscript reading would give us a decrease of the population by 25,000, a development which would have been unwarranted, judging from the general political and economic trend of the Gracchan period. The census figures of the latter part of the century indicate a slight decrease in the number of Roman citizens⁸. At the same time the recruitment of the legions posed increasing demands on the population⁹. Under these circumstances the censors responsible for registering all those fit for military service must have done their utmost in order to limit the number of *incenti*. It should also be remembered that

¹ Ibid.

² BRUNT, Appendix 2 on the table of Heraclea, cf. 522.

³ Livy 41, 27, 11.

⁴ Cf. TOYNBEE II, 533 ff.

⁵ The following foundation was probably Auximum in 128 B. C.; cf. SALMON, 112 f., who gives good reasons for not accepting 157 B. C. as the year of foundation, and also, 188, n. 194. BRUNT, 534, inaccurately refers Auximum to the same period as Potentia and Pisaurum, founded in 184 B. C., and Heba, which probably belongs to the Gracchan period: cf. SALMON 188, n. 202.

⁶ SALMON, 112.

⁷ BRUNT, 78.

⁸ Cf. BRUNT, 70, table VI.

⁹ BRUNT's analysis, loc. cit., shows that in 163 B. C. 11,000 served with the legions abroad, in 158 similarly 11,000, in 153 16,500, in 146 55,000, in 141-135-130 27,000 and, finally, in 124 38,500.

the lack of manpower was one of the chief reasons for the Gracchan land reform. Brunt¹ calculates that the Gracchan land commissioners turned 75,000 *proletarii incenti* into *assidui* included in the census figures of 124 B. C.² Organizational and administrative delay explain why the reforms of Tiberius Gracchus did not affect the figures of the preceding census of 131/0 B. C.³

The Gracchan colonization included a great number of virgane settlements. In such cases, and also in cases when new colonies were founded on allied territory, a great many Roman officials and commissioners moved about in search of land suitable for colonization⁴. The commissioners met with strong resistance in the countryside, with questions of treaty-rights and ownership of land at stake. Allied states in many cases seem to have had justified claims on the Roman *ager publicus*. Toynbee⁵ suggests that the interest of the allies "was substantial enough to constitute a formidable obstacle to the allotment of still unallotted *ager publicus*." Thus the Romans were forced to inaugurate a policy of appeasement, or of bargaining. Roman citizenship seems to have been offered to the allies in consideration of their abandoning their opposition in 126/5 B. C.⁶ or as an alternative, if they wished to retain their sovereign independence, the *ius provocations*⁷ against the acts of Roman officials. How topical the issue was is shown by Fulvius Flaccus' bill *de civitate sociis danda*, and the revolt of Fregellae in 125 B. C., which broke out as a result of the rejection of the bill⁸. The question was by no means settled when, probably in 124 B. C., a bill was passed granting the Roman citizenship to the annually elected public officers of the Latin states⁹.

In all, there seems to be three factors which explain the sudden increase of the census figures over the period 131/0-125/4, namely

¹ 78.

² BRUNT obviously assumes that the entire increase was due to the Gracchan reforms. This can scarcely be the case, cf. p. 460 below.

³ BRUNT, 79 f.

⁴ For details, cf. TOYNBEE II, 548. Note that this created unrest, regardless of the fact as to what extent the commissioners were subsequently able to carry out their plans.

⁵ II, 549.

⁶ J. GÖHLER, *Röm und Italien*, Breslau hist. Forsch., 13. Breslau 1939, 132 and further TOYNBEE II, 549, n. 2.

⁷ This right seems to have been added to the *ius Latii* as suggested by a fragment of the *lex Acilia* of 123 B. C., cf. SHERWIN-WHITE, 105, n. 4.

⁸ For a more detailed discussion, cf. RÜOFF, p. 71 above.

⁹ Cf. G. TIBILETTI, 'La politica delle colonie e città latine nella guerra sociale', *Rend. Ist. Lomb.*, 86 (1953), 58.

(1) that a great number of *incenti* received virgane allotments of land and that they were duly registered by the censors. Similarly, the foundation of citizen colonies increased the number of *assidui*.

(2) that the enforcement of the Gracchan reform increased the number of citizens of franchized communities, who had earlier omitted to make use of their right to be registered as Roman citizens, but now, threatened, or at least disturbed by the land commissioners, took recourse to their constitutional rights and to the indemnity of Roman citizenship.

(3) that the wide distribution of the Gracchan colonists increased the demand on the efficiency of the local census. It is possible that the expediency of *absens censori*¹ was tried for the first time in this context. We should remember that the recruitment of the Roman army was jeopardized and that one of the most important functions of the censors was to make an inventory of the available manpower; only in 107 B. C. did Marius' reform create an entirely new situation.

Finally, it should be stressed that the extending of the *ius adipsendi c. R. per magistratum* created a new category of citizens residing in allied states. Registration at the census was a pre-requisite for their newly won privileges. They cannot have been included in the 125/4 B. C. census, but their existence and their personal interests required a local census which corresponded to the demands of the censors in Rome.

2.4 THE GRACCHAN ERA AND THE LANGUAGE SHIFT

We have now seen that the citizen colonies as well as the allied states, and the latter also after having been franchized, knew and employed a census institution. We have further seen that the Roman census figures rose comparatively steeply in 125/4 B. C., although we cannot say whether or not they include returns of the local censuses also. In addition, we have noted that the political situation in the Gracchan age was likely (a) to demand a more efficient registration of citizens in the countryside; they were unable to travel to Rome for the census, and (b) to make citizens of franchized communities utilize their right to register with the Roman censors in greater numbers than earlier.

¹ WISEMAN, *JRS*, 59 (1969), 61.

2.4.1 THE EPIGRAPHIC EVIDENCE OF A GRADUAL CHANGE

Confronting these conclusions regarding the local censuses on the one hand with, on the other, both Mrs. Ruoff's assertion that at least some of the most important Etruscan towns were franchized before the Social War¹, and Mr. Kaimio's dating of the beginning of the language shift as mirrored in the epitaphs², we note that the impact of unrest in Italy caused by the Gracchan land commissioners precedes the language shift roughly by a generation³. Taking into account the fact that, normally, some time passes between the time when the Etruscans assumed a Latin name, and the date when this name appeared in an epitaph, it seems to me that the evidence of the beginning of the language shift in Etruria chronologically coincides well with the upheaval of the Gracchan period.

This coincidence does not, however, imply that we have established the causal relationship between these two phenomena, though the probability of a connexion exists.

The bulk of our epigraphical material shows the Latinization of name forms. At the census, citizens were basically registered according to their names. If the census registration required specific name forms, for instance in accordance with the clauses of the *tabula Heracleensis*, the Latinized name should be expected to follow the established pattern. The picture drawn by the analysis of the Latin epitaphs of the necropoleis of Etruria, is not compatible with a rigid application of exactly formulated demands; there is no sudden change from Etruscan usage to Roman. On the contrary, the Latinization process has proved to have been slow, advancing by degrees⁴.

¹ Veii, Caere, Volsinii, Arretium, Tarquinii and Faesulae together with Capena and Faleri, cf. pp. 40-56 above.

² pp. 220-221 above.

³ It is, of course, impossible to generalize for all the Etruscan territory. The closer to Rome an Etruscan community was located, the greater the influence of the capital and its officials, and the swifter the Latinization. The pattern of the development in northern Etruria is definitely different from the one in the South. We should further remember that "the beginning of the Latinization" in actual fact means "the emergence of Latin elements in the epitaphs". With this in mind we may note that Mr. KARVO indicates the beginning of the process, for Caere at the end of the second century B. C., for Tarquinii and Tuscania in the late second and early first century B. C., for Ferentium, Volsinii, Clusium, Perugia and Arretium in the first century, and in addition emphasizes that the language shift was nowhere effectuated in a few years: "more probably it took about two generations to complete".

⁴ KAIMIO, p. 187 above, table.

2.4.2 THE PALEOGRAPHIC EVIDENCE OF A GRADUAL CHANGE

Mrs. Michelsen's study of the paleography confirms the impressions afforded by the linguistic investigation, although Clusium and Perugia are the only towns to yield a material sufficiently rich for an analysis of the interference phenomena as far as the script is concerned.

Of the letter forms examined above¹ A was the first to be Latinized at Clusium, probably very soon after the reversal of the direction of the script. A single instance of interference concerning this letter remains². The letter E came next; we encounter the Etruscan character in the groups (I) and (II A)³ nine times, generally in inscriptions employing other Etruscan characters as well. Subsequently, the Etruscan letters T (13 cases) and S (24 cases) seem to have disappeared. These too occur, as a rule, in conjunction with other Etruscan characters. On the other hand, a great number of inscriptions showing these letters in their Latin versions, comprises Etruscan forms of other letters. The Etruscan letters L and, above all, P are the most long-lived in the epitaphs. The former appears in every third inscription, the latter in two inscriptions out of five. It can be said with a high degree of certainty that an inscription containing the letter P in its Latin form does not comprise any Etruscan characters at all. We should further stress that of 122 Clusine inscriptions in Latin studied by Mrs. Michelsen, 61, i. e. fifty per cent, comprise at least one Etruscan character⁴.

Certain features of the Etruscan influence on the Latin letter forms are easy to explain, but in other cases the internal order of the disappearance of the Etruscan letters is inexplicable. The Etruscan P obviously survives for so long because in Latin inscriptions, too, the P with an open loop is fairly common up to the end of the Republic. In Etruria however, this form of P should be regarded as due to Etruscan influence. This is shown by the fact that the relation of the figures in the (a) and (b) columns of the table⁵ is a proper fraction, i. e. the character with the open loop has survived the other Etruscan letters, but the variety

¹ pp. 249 ff.

² p. 259.

³ p. 259 above.

⁴ In the group (II A), the material of which was formed by the drawings of CIE, the number of corresponding inscriptions was comparatively small, 51 out of 149. This may be due to Mrs. MICHELSEN'S caution in accepting the value of the evidence contained in the copies.

⁵ p. 154 above.

with the closed loop only rarely appears together with the Etruscan characters of other letters.

The comparatively rapid disappearance of the Etruscan forms of T and E can apparently be explained as a technical solution caused by the reversal of the direction of the script. A right-handed stone-cutter was able to cut, with considerable ease, strokes running obliquely downwards from right to left when the script ran *sinistrorsum*, but this was changed when the direction of the script was reversed. At this juncture, the horizontal transversion rapidly superseded their oblique Etruscan counterparts¹.

2.4.3 ONOMASTIC INTERFERENCE AT PERUSIA

Reverting to the study of the language and reassuming some of the pertinent conclusions of Mr. Kaimio, we may note the interesting fact that at Perugia² we find numerous instances of interference in the field of onomastics, whereas interference phenomena in the purely linguistic field are restricted to Clusium. The Perusine epitaphs give the overall picture of the Roman onomastics of the first century B. C.³, and the appearance of certain purely Latin names on Etruscan monuments in inscriptions with instances of interference, point to the probability that the Latin names had been adopted with the express purpose of acquiring Roman citizenship⁴.

2.4.4 THE LIBERTI OF CLUSIUM

At Clusium, the Etruscan town and the Roman colony, which has yielded the richest crop of inscriptions, the language shift was shown to

¹ The early disappearance of the Etruscan A may depend on the fact that at the same time new forms of the letter, probably developed by the Romans, were introduced (Λ, Α and Α). On the other hand, it is hard to explain why S and above all L retained their Etruscan forms for so long. The use of the angular S may be due to technical circumstances; the Etruscan character was easier to cut into tiles with a *stilus*. In contrast, the italicized variety is more common on the cinerary urns.

² The Perusine material is too sparse to allow us to draw any definite conclusions. The Etruscan P disappears as the last, A as the first letter. The Etruscan S is almost as infrequent in the Latin inscriptions as A. This suggests that the survival of the angular S at Clusium is due to the technique of inscription or incision.

³ And elsewhere, cf. p. 209 above.

⁴ KAIMIO, p. 212.

⁵ pp. 174, 178, 213 above.

proceed gradually, though at times, within single families and tombs, in an apparently irrational way¹. The picture of the over-all development, however, shows the influence of Rome first in the change of the alphabet, then in the linguistic Latinization (obviously a pre-requisite for making, say, a name intelligible for the Romans), and finally, in the onomastic Romanization². Mr. Kaimio notes that the Clusine freedmen in many cases employ the old individual name as a *cognomen*, a usage introduced in Rome round about 100 B.C.³ However, the very existence of *liberti* using the Latin name forms demonstrates the impact of the Roman census⁴. The freedmen of an unenfranchized non-Roman followed his patron's name and citizenship⁵. In a community not yet franchized the *libertus* must have obtained his liberty by way of registration with the local authorities. In franchized communities a *libertus* of a Roman citizen was himself *ipso facto* a Roman citizen⁶. In all the formal procedures of *manumissio*, i. e. *manumissio vindicta*, *manumissio censu* and *manumissio testamento*, *libertas* and *civitas* were closely connected⁷ and the participation of the state necessary⁸. Thus, it is a fair inference that censorial regulations exerted a strong influence on the name forms of the *liberti* entered in the official lists⁹. This tallies well with the general picture of the background of the Latinization of Clusium¹⁰. It should be added that the *liberti* are of particular interest because their Latinization cannot have been due to the Roman census; they cannot as a rule have been expected to travel to Rome for the registration. Politically, they would have gained little as long as the urban tribes were the only ones accessible to them, and

¹ Cf. KAIMIO, pp. 206-210.

² p. 208 above.

³ This does not automatically mean that the Clusine usage was later or, at any rate, noticeably later than at Rome, if in both cases it can be traced back to instructions or regulations issued by the censors, i. e. to a common source.

⁴ These freedmen have nothing to do with the Roman colony at Clusium as Mr. KAIMIO's analysis of the name forms shows, cf. 2. 2. 1. 5 above.

⁵ S. TREGGIARI, *Roman Freedmen during the Late Republic*, Oxford 1969, 273, Appendix 8: "The Position of Freedmen in the Italian Communities which had not Acquired the Roman Franchise".

⁶ "servos...persaepe libertate, id est civitate, publice donari videmus", Cic. *Balb.* 24: cf. *Caec.* 96 and also TREGGIARI, 37.

⁷ TREGGIARI, 20.

⁸ The informal *manumissio inter amicos*, which left the manumitted legally a slave, is a comparatively late phenomenon of little consequence in this context, cf. TREGGIARI, 29 f.

⁹ For registration of freedmen, cf. TREGGIARI, 41.

¹⁰ Cf. KAIMIO, p. 210.

economically such a journey would have put a strain on their meagre purse. The Latinization of the *liberti* can therefore be assumed to have reflected the impact of the local census.

2.4.5 THE CASE OF FERENTUM AND THE CONSERVATION OF THE FEMALE *Praenomen* AT CAERE

Two more cases can be adduced to show the influence of the census on the Latinization process. Ferentium with a dated inscription of 69 B.C. of the gens *Salvia*, illustrates the Latinization of language and name forms while otherwise adhering to the Etruscan traditions¹. Caere, finally—in many respects an exception—has preserved a number of inscriptions recording the female *praenomen*². This particular feature characteristic of Etruscan nomenclature was not affected by censorial regulations and was therefore able to survive³.

2.5 START OF THE CO-ORDINATION OF LOCAL CENSUSES DURING THE GRACCHAN PERIOD

Summing up the arguments concerning the local census we can say that the census institution had its roots deep in the Italic tradition. States

¹ KAIMIO, p. 203 above.

² KAIMIO, pp. 188 f., 195 f. above.

³ We have a corresponding case at Ateste in Cisalpine Gaul, where the traces of Venetian name forms in inscriptions recording male persons disappear comparatively early whereas the female name forms adhere to local linguistic usage, cf. J. UNTERMANN, *Die venetischen Personennamen*, Wiesbaden 1961, 59. The language shift at Ateste can be referred to the latter part of the first century B.C.: the final texts in the Venetian alphabet belong to the middle of the century (UNTERMANN, 3). The language shift, therefore, appears to commence after the concession of the *ius Latii* to Cisalpine Gaul after the Social War (G. E. F. CHILVER, *Cisalpine Gaul*, Oxford 1941, 7 f.). For the Cisalpine towns it was important that the *ius Latii* included the right to acquire Roman citizenship *per magistratum*, cf. Asconius, *in Pisonianam*, 2-3: "Pompeius enim...veteribus incolis...ius dedit Latii ut possent habere ius quod ceterae Latinae coloniae, id est ut petendo magistratus civitatem Romanam adipiscerentur". The full franchise was granted to the Cisalpine towns in 49 B.C. through the *lex Roscia* (CHILVER, loc. cit.). This suggests, as has been stressed above, that the local census, co-ordinated with the census in Rome, must have been established in order to humour the local aristocracy, whose loyalty was important to the Roman generals using the *civitas* as a means of increasing their own *clientela*. The date of the language shift at Ateste shows that the *ius Latii* (and not the full *civitas* of 49 B.C.) and the local census were the point of departure of the Latinization of Ateste.

allied with Rome carried out the registration of their citizens in accordance with their sovereign rights¹. Roman interference was exceptional. The allies may well have forwarded certain data to the Roman authorities according to individual clauses in single agreements between Rome and the allied states. We have, however, no means of determining how far the requirements of Rome, which should be considered against the background of the *formula togatorum*, were likely to influence the modelling of the local censuses, and possibly assisting in streamlining them. On the other hand, when the process of Latinization starts, the material from the single towns suggests that they had been free to work out the details in accordance with local requirements.

Studying the initial phases of the Latinization in the different towns of Etruria we could discern two features common to most of the cases, namely

(1) that certain features of the male name forms seem to have been affected at an earlier stage of the Latinization than the corresponding parts of the female name forms, and

(2) that excepting Caere, a close neighbour to Rome, and Volaterrae, the northernmost town of Etruria proper, all the Etruscan towns seem to have been Latinized in roughly the same period, namely the first century B. C. with the beginning of the century as a point of departure. Caere precedes the other towns but little, Volaterrae is insignificantly later.

Behind these two phenomena we could, it seems, discover the economic and social upheaval of the Gracchan period, caused by the land reform or by the threat it constituted to communities and individuals. The extension of the citizenship *per magistratum* to the holders of *ius Latii* on the one hand, and the attraction of the citizenship as a protection against the arbitrariness of Roman officials on the other, together with the settlement of Gracchan colonists increased the need of and the demands on the local censuses, which must have been charged with the duty of supplying Rome with the necessary demographic data. At this juncture, the co-ordination of the local censuses cannot as yet have been very strict if we are to trust the epigraphic material, although it must have given an impetus to the Latinization of the name forms.

¹ Cf. W. DAHLHEIM, *Struktur und Entwicklung des römischen Völkerrechts, Vestigia* 8, München 1968, 118.

3. THE CENSUS AND THE WAY TO AN INTEGRATION OF ALL ITALY

3.1 THE PROGRAMME OF INTEGRATION ACCORDING TO THE *TABULA HERACLEENSIS*

In the course of the first century, which for the majority of the Etruscan towns was a period of transition from Etruscan to Latin, a programme of integration of the local censuses with the Roman census was worked out. The details are known through the clauses of the *tabula Heracleensis*, or rather, the part of it which has frequently been identified with certain provisions of the *lex Julia municipalis*¹. This document expressly prescribes what component parts the official name forms should comprise. The dates appertaining to the name form and required by the *lex* were *nomina praenomina patres aut patronos tribus cognomina*². The law further stated that the census in *municipia, coloniae* and *praefecturae* should be carried out *ex formula census quae Romae ab eo, qui tum censum populi acturus erit proposita erit*³. The local registers should be dispatched to be censors in Rome over 60 days before the census was completed⁴.

The aim of these provisions must have been to standardize the census procedure throughout Italy, and to facilitate the increasingly burdensome task of the censors. At the same time, the instructions regarding the name forms in addition to the control exerted by the central authorities in Rome, were apt to unify the nomenclature all over the peninsula.

The part of the *tabula Heracleensis*, which deals with the census, seems to be the youngest of the legal fragments contained in the tablet. It can very likely be dated to some time shortly after Caesar's assassination⁵. The words *cum censor aliusve quis mag(istratus) Romae populi censum aget*⁶, it would seem, have correctly been taken as reference to Caesar's *censoria potestas*⁷.

¹ *CIL* I² 593, ll. 142-158.

² l. 146.

³ ll. 147-148.

⁴ ll. 149-151.

⁵ Cf. E. SCHÖNBAUER, 'Die Tafeln von Heraklea in neuer Beleuchtung', *Anzeiger der öst. Akad. Wiss., phil.-hist. Kl.*, 89 (1952), 131 f.

⁶ ll. 143-144.

⁷ Cf. E. MUTTELSEE, *Untersuchungen über die Lex Julia Municipalis*, Freiburg, 1913, 15 with reference to VON SAVIGNY, *Vermischte Schriften* III, 411; in contrast BRUNT, 522, holds that "the census section has on clear connection with the time of Caesar" (cf. also 104, n. 3 and, in addition, 42, where he takes the Caesarian date for granted without denying "that local registration was practised

in 46 B. C. The reorganization of the census suggested by the *tabula Heracleensis* would therefore originate in the middle of the long period of 41 years without any census at all (70/69 B. C. - 29/28 B. C.). The text itself does not tell us whether the stipulations of the text ever became effective.

There is no doubt that the *lex Iulia*, or the provisions of the *tabula Heracleensis* if rigorously applied in practice would have exerted a profound influence on the name forms of the Roman citizens of all *municipia*, *coloniae* and *praefecturae*. We should, therefore, examine the problem of what actually was done, and when, in order to make the Italians really partake of the privileges inherent in the Roman citizenship during the first century B. C. and pay special attention to the steps and measures taken in order to incorporate new citizens into the Roman body politic. This incorporation was identical with the census.

3.2 THE FRANCHISE OF THE ITALIANS: A POLITICAL ISSUE

The question of extending Roman citizenship to the Roman allies in Italy, is one of the most important political issues of the first century B. C. It was fought on two levels, at first making part of the foreign policy of the Senate, i. e. the senatorial policy regarding the world at large, and then becoming the focal point in the struggle between the opposing factions of the Senate. The former aspect is brought to a head by the Social War, the latter is illustrated by the efforts of the contending senatorial parties to enlist or neutralize the political power of the Italians.

The key to the understanding of the nature of senatorial politics is the *clientela* institution. "All the great noble houses had great numbers of clients in their service. Crassus and Pompey each had a band so large that he could raise an army in Sulla's service".¹ The ties of *clientela* crossed geo-

well before Caesar") and that nothing in the contents can be shown to be essentially novel. It is easy to agree with Brunt about the inconclusiveness of the chronological references contained in the five sections of the *tabula*. His second point, if not proved, will be at least supported by the subsequent discussion of the 70/69 B. C. census, a fact which in its turn speaks in favour of SCHÖNBAUER's suggestion (*Anzeiger*, 89 (1952), 131) that the law texts originally were conceived in the period of conservative politics after the death of Sulla. With regard to Brunt's first point, we have to give him the benefit of the doubt because the connexion is not clear; even so, in my opinion, the reference to the townships in *Italia* certainly reflects Caesar's political intentions much better than any preceding Roman politician's (cf. p. 476 below).

¹ L. ROSS TAYLOR, *Party Politics in the Age of Caesar*, Sather Classical Lectures 22, 44.

graphical boundaries. "The client class went far beyond the bounds of the city. It included inhabitants of towns, and in fact whole regions, over which nobles assumed patronage because they or their ancestors had conquered them in war, or aided them in obtaining citizenship or other advantages".¹ It is, as Lily Ross Taylor remarks² quite clear that extension of citizenship was a favourite method of adding to one's clients. In the first decade of the first century B. C., on the threshold of the Social War, we have an extraordinary document showing the enthusiasm created by the tribune Marcus Livius Drusus' attempt to enfranchise all the Italians, namely the oath of fealty that the Italians took in Drusus' name.³ The following passage of the oath is very significant: "If I become a citizen by the law of Drusus, I shall consider Rome my country and Drusus my greatest benefactor. This oath I will transmit to as many citizens as I can".⁴ Significantly, the murder of Drusus gave the impetus to the outbreak of the Social War.⁵

3.2.1 THE CONCESSIONS OF THE SOCIAL WAR AND THE INCOMPLETE CENSUSES OF THE POST-WAR YEARS

The concessions made to the Italians during the war were certainly not preconceived parts of a definite plan to regulate the position of the former allies in the Roman commonwealth, but *in casu* solutions, at times based on decisions of commanding generals directing the campaigns.⁶ Consequently, the steps taken in order to pacify the adversaries of the Republic do not form a consistent pattern, as a brief summary of the decrees and the decisions made shows.

(1) In 90 B. C., the consul Julius Caesar proposed a bill passed by the Senate conferring Roman citizenship on all the Latins⁷ and on all

¹ Ibid.

² *PP*, 45.

³ Cf. ROSS TAYLOR, *PP*, 46 and the discussion concerning the authenticity of the incident, 198, n. 67, and in A. VON PREMERSTEIN, *Vom Werden und Wesen des Prinzipats*, Abh. Bayer. Ak. Wiss., Phil.-hist. Abt., N. F. 15 (1937), 27 ff.

⁴ Diod. 37, 11, translation according to F. R. WALTON.

⁵ Cf. Mrs. RUFF's comments above, p. 77.

⁶ SHERWIN-WHITE, 131 ff.

⁷ "Ipsa denique Italia, qua lege civitas est sociis et Latinis data, qui fundi populi facti non essent civitatem non haberent", Cic. *Balb.* 21. The *lex Iulia*, passed late in 90 B. C., was probably preceded by a *lex Calpurnia* (cf. HARRIS, 230). Both laws can be regarded as "hasty war measures designed in the first place to reduce the number of the insurgents" (SHERWIN-WHITE, 133).

the allies who did not take part in the uprising, or had surrendered in time¹.

(2) In the following year, 89 B. C., the tribunes of the plebs M. Plautius Silvanus and C. Papirius Carbo proposed a bill, which permitted all the citizens of allied communities domiciled in Italy when the bill was approved, to obtain Roman citizenship "si intra LX diebus apud praetorem essent professi"². These stipulations apparently regarded as exclusive citizens of Italian communities residing in Rome³; otherwise it would have been unrealistic to ask those concerned to register with the praetor within sixty days. Obviously this registration was to be completed before the conclusion of the census, i.e. before the *lustrum* was performed⁴. Nevertheless, it is conceivable that this legislation was not intended to promote the enfranchisement of the Italians decisively, but to create a false impression as to the aims of Roman policy⁵.

(3) In the year 87 B. C., the Senate granted Roman citizenship to all those who had surrendered in the Social War⁶.

Censors were elected in 89 B. C. to make the legal provisions effective, i.e. to perform the census and to register those Italians who wanted to acquire citizenship. As Pieri has pointed out⁷, the fact that censors were elected immediately after the *lex Iulia de civitate* had been approved of, and that one of the censors was the sponsor of the law, demonstrates both the connexion between the law and the census, and that the law concerning citizenship required registration of the new citizens to become effective (from the new citizens' point of view). It is, in fact, noteworthy that the political struggle in Rome after the appeasement as expressed in formal concessions, focussed on the census. In plain language, the issue of the day was: how should the promises of war times be kept?

The census of the year 89 B. C. became an empty gesture⁸ as was to be expected considering the conditions existing in Italy. The decision of

¹ Vellicus 2, 16, 4 "recipiendō in civitatē... qui arma aut non ceperant aut deposuerunt maturius". This is a general reference to all the measures taken in conjunction with the war.

² Cic. *Arch.* 4, 7.

³ SHERVIN WHITE, 132 f.; cf. also PIERI, 163, n. 99.

⁴ Cf. TIBILETTI, 117 f., particularly n. 90.

⁵ TIBILETTI, loc. cit.

⁶ Livy *Per.* 80 "Italicis populis a senatu civitas data est".

⁷ 164.

⁸ Cic. *Arch.* 5, 11 "Iulio et Crasso nullam populi partem esse censam". TIBILETTI, 119 regards it as fictitious: "it never took place, but was carried out in form".

87 B. C. to extend the enfranchisement *Italicis populis*, providing the Italians with an opportunity to obtain citizenship by request, similarly presupposed a new census without delay. The censors were appointed in 86 B. C. and they performed the *lustrum* in 84 B. C.¹ 463,000 citizens were registered. Livy records² that the Senate confirmed the results of the census: "novis civibus senatus consulto suffragium datum est"³.

The Latinization of Etruria is normally regarded as the outcome of the Social War⁴. This view can scarcely be correct. I have tried to point out above that there is no automatic connexion between the concession of civil rights to a town and the Latinization of its population. Several Etruscan towns had in fact been franchized before the Social War; the Latinization seems in fact to have commenced at least at Caere, Tarquinii and Tuscania before the war without our being able to establish a connexion between the concession of citizenship and the start of the Latinization⁵. The case of Caere positively shows that such a relationship did not exist.

However, in the case of those Etruscan towns which have yielded the richest epigraphical material (above all Clusium), the *lex Iulia de civitate sociis danda* and the census obviously play an important part with regard to the language shift. Nevertheless, it must still have been possible for individual towns to reach independent decisions concerning the application of the clauses of the law. This is clearly shown by a comparison of the different patterns of Latinization in Etruria. Arretium and Volaterrae, the latter possibly, the former certainly franchized before the Social War⁶, and both after the war punished by Sulla, illustrate that the census was in no case an obstacle to the survival of the Etruscan language. At Arretium three Etrusco-Latin bilingual inscriptions have been preserved, the earliest of which can be dated to the year 40 B. C.⁷ Contemporaneously, there is a strong Latin tradition in the town, evident in the inscribed stamps⁸ which should be dated to the later part of the first century B. C. at the earliest. Again, the tenacity of the Etruscan language

¹ TIBILETTI, 121, n. 102.

² *Per.* 84.

³ Mrs. RUOFF, p. 80 regards this as a decision for placing the new Italians in the rural tribes.

⁴ Cf. KAIMIO, p. 226 above.

⁵ For the three towns mentioned, cf. KAIMIO, pp. 195, 199 and 200 f. above, and his conclusions, pp. 217 f.

⁶ RUOFF, pp. 50 ff., 56 ff. above.

⁷ KAIMIO, p. 213 above.

⁸ *Ibid.*

at Volaterrae has been demonstrated by Mrs. Nielsen's chronology of the cinerary urns¹.

Now no connexion can be found between the 86/84 B. C. census and the Latinization of Etruria, the census figures being exceptionally low² if we consider that citizenship had been extended *Italicis populis*.

The explanations for this fact differ³. That the census was taken and the *lustrum* performed is beyond doubt, likewise that the registration could in no case have comprised all Roman citizens or all those entitled to Roman citizenship; the political division of Italy prevented this. On the other hand, there is no conclusive proof that the figure 463,000 appertains to the census of 86/84 B. C., although, as compared with the figures of 115 B. C. (alternatively 125 B. C.) and 70/69 B. C. it very much corresponds to what would have been expected considering the circumstances. We should remember that the census 86/84 B. C. was a political measure taken in order to pacify the Italians. This is confirmed by the exceptional and, it would seem, formally superfluous decree of the Senate to concede the vote to the new citizens.

3.2.2 POMPEY'S CENSUS OF 70/69 B. C.

The census of 86/84 B. C. can be said to have been the fulfilment of the promises given to the Italians, but for the reasons stated above, it did not achieve its maximum. Regardless of the physical obstacles limiting the activity of the censors, we may also be assured that the censors, both

¹ pp. 387-389 above.

² Cf. PIERI, 164 ff.

³ If the census covered a limited field only, the limitations could have been either geographical - Italy south of the line Ancona-Capua being controlled by the Sullans, and consequently not willing to accept the magistrates of Rome, cf. PIERI, 166 - or social ("les citoyens plus modestes, dont le vote dans l'assemblée centuriate comptait peu, n'auraient alors pas éprouvé le besoin de faire le voyage à Rome pour s'y faire recenser", PIERI, loc. cit.). CARCOPINO's refusal to accept the figures as an outcome of a regular census ("Sur un passage de la chronique de Saint-Jérôme", *Mélanges Fr. Martroye*, Paris 1940, 73-79) represents an ingenious solution (the figure recorded by Hier. *Chron.*, *Abr.* 1932, "Descriptio Romae facta inventa sunt hominum CCCCLXIII milia" who contrary to his own usage does not speak of *census...civium*, would refer to the population of the Urbs. The figure should be considered in conjunction with the figure of 57 B. C., 486,000, regarding the Romans subject to the *cura annonae*. For the difficulty of reconciling the conflicting data of our sources, cf. also WISEMAN, *JRS*, 59 (1969), 63 f.), hard both to accept and to exclude or refute.

supporters of Cinna, used the opportunity offered by the census to promote the interest of the *populares*¹. Sulla, the dictator, when repealing a part of Cinna's legislation, may have reacted adversely to the recently performed *lustrum*². At any rate, he reacted strongly to the whole censorial institution, and suspended the office of the censor³. After Sulla's abdication and death, the pendulum swung back, but fairly slowly, with the *optimates* jealously guarding their privileged position, and their control of the state. In 70 B. C., however, the young successful general Gnaeus Pompeius with an army of his own in the background, forced the Senate to suspend the Sullan laws. He also had himself elected to the consulship although he had refused to make a senatorial career and, anyway, was too young for this office. As consul in this year he restored the office of the censor and "brought about the election of two of his henchmen as censors"⁴.

Pompey, in the same way as his father, possessed large estates and enjoyed wide influence in Picenum⁵. He had in the past seen how important to a politician the support of the Italians could be. There were not only the local nobles who, endowed with Roman citizenship, could influence the voting in the *prima classis*, but also those men of slender means who "have only one way of earning favors from our order or of paying us back and that is by helping us and following us about in our campaigns for office"⁶. He could, therefore, very well understand the *populares'* demand for a new census⁷. It goes without saying that the outcome of this census would be in favour of the Italians, and the figures corroborate that this was the case. 910,000⁸ were registered. This time it was most certain that many who during the previous censuses had been prevented from registering, were able to get attributed to tribes and classified accordingly to centuries, thereby being admitted to the political vote and acknowledgement of their citizenship.

¹ TIBILETTI, 120 f.

² TIBILETTI, 121 f., who notes that "the censoria potestas certainly formed part of the unlimited powers; hence it is natural to think that he consecrated and made the new (citizen) lists definite with a *lustrum*".

³ ROSS TAYLOR, *PP*, 52; T. FRANK, *Economic Survey of Ancient Rome I. Rome and Italy of the Republic*, Baltimore 1933, 255; H. LAST in *CAH* IX, 300.

⁴ ROSS TAYLOR, *PP*, 52; cf. also R. SYME, *The Roman Revolution*, Oxford 1939, 66.

⁵ SYME, 28 f.; ROSS TAYLOR, *PP*, 45.

⁶ *Cic. Mur.* 71-72; cf. ROSS TAYLOR, *PP*, 42.

⁷ Cf. *Cic. Div. in Caec.* 8, delivered in January, 70 B. C.

⁸ 900,000 according to Livy *Per.* 98.

For the Romans proper, the members of old senatorial *gentes* and the inhabitants of the Urbs, the enormous increase of political voters, as compared with the figure of 84 B. C. (if we accept it as genuine) must have been a shock although the *optimates* could have had little reason to expect anything auspicious from two plebeian censors, both of them supporters of Pompey¹.

3.2.3 THE AFTERMATH OF POMPEY'S CENSUS: REPETITION UNDESIRABLE

The outcome of the census denotes that the political significance of the Italian element, i. e. of the non-Urban voters, increased considerably. This seems to have influenced the political life in the capital. Wiseman² has drawn attention to the rush of legislation of the sixties showing that *ambitus* and bribery was a particularly acute problem at that time; the different political groups tried to find supporters among the new citizens³. Again, the canvassing of the Italians suggests that many of them belonged to politically influential groups of the local municipal societies. To them the political vote could have been an instrument of power; they would probably be referred to the first class of citizens⁴, the one casting its votes first⁵.

The census employed as a political weapon was amply illustrated in 70/69 B. C. The increasing opposition to the man, Pompey, who had made the registration of citizens serve his own political ends, ruined the attempts to renew the census after the customary interval of five years, in 65 B. C. The censors were Q. Lutatius Catulus of a plebeian *gens*, but with family relations which made him a member of the *optimates*, and

¹ J. SCOLAHITI, *The Roman Censors. A Study on Social Structure*, Annales Acad. Scient. Fenn. B. 117, Helsinki 1963, 463; the censors removed 64 members of the Senate, Livy *Per.* 98.

² *JRS*, 59 (1969), 66.

³ TOYNBEE has observed that on two occasions the addition of new tribes to the *ager Romanus* was followed by laws on bribery, probably because politicians in an unseemly manner started courting the new citizens, cf. TOYNBEE I, 488, n. 9 and WISEMAN, *JRS*, 59 (1969), 67.

⁴ 46 L. ROSS TAYLOR, *The Roman Voting Assemblies*, 105, and PIERI, 166.

⁵ We may here recall that the Italians were strongly opposed to the provisions of the *lex Iulia de civitate* of 90 B. C., that they should all be referred to the new tribes to be constituted (cf. ROUFF, pp. 77 ff. above), the reason for their attitude being that in the *comitia tributa* they would have cast their votes after the 35 old tribes, and consequently in vain, cf. PIERI, 164.

M. Licinius Crassus of an old senatorial *gens*¹. Crassus wanted to extend the citizenship to the Transpadanes, obviously in order to increase his own adherents². Catulus opposed this extension, and consequently the censors could not reach agreement, nor perform the *lustrum*³.

The following year a new attempt was made with L. Aurelius Cotta as one of the censors⁴. Vetoed by the tribunes of the plebs they resigned without accomplishing anything. The disagreement of the censors and the tribunes most probably had a political background, although the details are unknown⁵. The censorial college of 61 B. C. was very similar to the previous one⁶; they did not complete the census—although preparations were far advanced⁷.

In 55 B. C. with Pompey and Crassus as consuls and with their veterans in the background, the patrician, M. Valerius Messalla Niger and the plebeian, P. Servilius Vatia Isauricus were elected censors. This is the year after the meeting of Luca, which had confirmed the co-operation between Pompey, Crassus and Caesar. The choice of censors must represent an agreement between the three in Luca⁸; therefore the fact that they did not accomplish the census seems inexplicable. There must have developed a rift in the triumphal camp whereby conflicting allegiances could have forced the censors to resign without having completed their task.

Five years later, when the relations between Pompey and Caesar were very close to the breaking point, the endeavour to carry out the census was repeated. The consuls for the year, L. Aemilius Lepidus Paullus and C. Claudius Marcellus, represented different camps⁹, and so did the censors. Ap. Claudius Pulcher, the patrician, was the father-in-law of Pompey's eldest

¹ Cf. SCOLAHITI, 464–471.

² ROSS TAYLOR, *PP*, 122.

³ TIBILETTI, 105, n. 35.

⁴ SCOLAHITI, 474, who deduces that the other was Mam. Aemilius Lepidus Livianus.

⁵ Cf. Dio 37, 9, 4. The dispute regarded the admission of the Transpadanes to the citizenship.

⁶ The censors are not known for certain.

⁷ SCOLAHITI, 476, and TIBILETTI, 105, n. 37. For the political tension in Rome at that time, after Pompey's return to the capital, cf. SYME, 33.

⁸ It is hard to agree with SCOLAHITI's roundabout judgement, 482 f., that "Niger possibly owed his election to the service he had rendered to Pompey in the consular election, while Servilius owed it to his great popularity". Both censors seem to have been connected with Caesar; for Servilius, cf. SYME, 64, n. 5, and ROSS TAYLOR, *PP*, 224, n. 23; for Messalla, *ibid.*, 226, n. 54.

⁹ SYME, 66.

son, L. Calpurnius Piso was Caesar's father-in-law. It is difficult to believe that they would have been able to reach an agreement with regard to the census proper as, somewhat surprisingly, they did with the *lectio*¹. If the Civil War had not intervened. At this juncture, Caesar seems to have contemplated the incorporation of the Transpadanes with the citizen body² in order to increase his personal political backing. Pompey could not be expected to approve of these plans.

With Caesar supreme and attending to some duties of the censors in person after 49 B. C., the censors and the censorship became superfluous. In 46 B. C. he assumed the *ensoria potestas*. He may have carried out the census, although without performing the *lustrum*³. The extension of the civil rights to the Transpadanes in 49 B. C.⁴ must surely have induced Caesar to take steps towards a revision of the citizen lists, and the registration of the new citizens. From this point of view, the concession of citizenship did not take full effect until the enrolment had been carried out, and the Transpadanes were able to exercise their potential political power.

Two years after the assassination of the dictator, a year after the proscriptions, and in the year of the defeat of the Liberators at Philippi, the political situation demanded new censors. Obviously a revision of the senatorial list was urgently required. Two reliable supporters of the new triumvirs were elected in 42 B. C., the uncle of Antony, the triumvir, C. Antonius Hybrida, and the patrician P. Sulpicius Rufus, later probably married to a relative of Caesar's⁵. They saw to it that followers of the triumvirs were admitted to the Senate in sufficient numbers. Thus, they raised the membership of this body to over a thousand. This must, in the eyes of the collegiate rulers of the Roman world, have been regarded as their main task. They did not complete the census or perform the *lustrum*, which would have been impossible in the prevailing circumstances.

Subsequently, as far as we know, no effort was made to codify or to revise the citizen register until Octavian in 29 B. C. assumed censorial powers. He performed the *lustrum* the following year, and thus confirmed the first census in 41 years, registering a total of 4,063,000 Roman citizens.

¹ SUOLAHTI, 488.

² SCHÖNBAUER, *Anzeiger*, 89 (1952), 114; cf. also ROSS TAYLOR, *PP*, 154.

³ Cf. TIBILETTI, 125.

⁴ Dio 21, 36; cf. SCHÖNBAUER, *Anzeiger*, 89 (1952), 114.

⁵ SUOLAHTI, 494.

3.3 THE CENSUS OF 70/69 B. C.: INCOMPLETE STATE OF THE INTEGRATION OF THE PENINSULA

The *tabula Heracleensis* and its clauses aiming at an integration of the enrolment of citizens in *Italia* were the point of departure of the preceding account for the struggle for Italy. This struggle developed into a fight for the political franchise of the Italians dependent on the endeavour of diverse Roman political groups and individual politicians to gain supporters and power. The *Italia* of the *tabula Heracleensis* refers to the age of Caesar, or more properly, to Caesar's political aspirations after 49 B. C., when the notion was created with reference to Cisalpine Gaul, too.

The date of this notion and of the table¹ does not exclude the possibility² that many of the clauses could be much older than the table itself.

The stipulations of the *tabula Heracleensis*, if rigorously applied in all the *municipia*, *coloniae* and *praefecturae* of *Italia*, would indubitably have unified the name forms, at least the male ones, within a very short span of time. The impact of the unifying clauses could be estimated to have been considerable because absence at the census must have been penalized regardless of where the enrolment took place³. The question of how far individual members of franchised communities, despite the rigid clauses of the *tabula Heracleensis*, were free to decide whether or not they wanted to accept the civil rights offered by the Romans, is not easily answered. The problem will be discussed below⁴.

At the 89 and 86/84 B. C. censuses the unifying stipulations of the *tabula* do not seem to have been in force⁵, i. e. they are in fact of a later date. What about the census of 70/69 B. C.?

Pompey's census was discussed above in terms of the political development. In this context we should evaluate the demographic implications of the census. The high figure 910,000 (as compared with the figures of the

¹ Cf. 7. 3. 1 above.

² As stressed by BRUNT, 38, 522.

³ For the consequences of omission to attend census, cf. Gaius 1, 159-163 with reference to the early Republic; Cic. *Caec.* 99 shows that the old laws were still observed in the first century B. C. (cf. further E. LEVY, 'Libertas und Civitas', *ZSS*, 76 (1961), *Rom. Abt.*, 160-166), *Att.* 1, 18, 8 that absence at census could be penalized in the late Republic, cf. WISEMAN, *JRS*, 59 (1969), 69.

⁴ pp. 485 ff.

⁵ Cf. 7. 3. 2. 3 above.

preceding censuses) can be explained with reference to several concurring circumstances. It was the result of single-minded political canvassing, aiming at nullifying the suspension of the census carried out by Sulla in order to promote the interests of the Senate¹. It was carried out by systematically rallying the Italians to the Pompeian cause². The figure doubtless comprises a considerable number of colonists³. Sulla's decision to expropriate land for his new colonies, selecting towns which had been on the losing side⁴ may have increased the sense of lawlessness among the non-Romans and consequently their inclination to seek refuge in the *ius provocationis*—regardless of the fact that Sullan policy struck at Roman citizens, too, if need be. Brunt suggests⁵ that Sulla intended to make the colonists settle on expropriated allotments in order to rule over the old inhabitants who, lacking Roman citizenship, could have shared local rights with the veterans. After Sulla this would have been one reason for the inhabitants of franchized towns to register at census. The extent of the Sullan colonization is in doubt. Appian's figure of 120,000 veterans to be settled has been regarded as "a paper figure for the complement of the 23 legions to whom lands were apportioned"⁶. A more cautious calculation gives 100,000⁷. Krawczuk considers that the effects of the Sullan colonization were probably smaller than what has usually been assumed. Some of the colonies were never founded (e.g. Volaterrae), others seem to have perished not later than in conjunction with the Catilinarian conspiracy. This would justify a still lower figure. On somewhat different grounds, Brunt⁸ arrives at the conclusion that 80,000 colonists would have been a maximum. However, these 120,000—80,000 colonists would have been included in the Pompeian census returns.

The reliability of the figure 910,000 (900,000) has been subject to many arguments, but I cannot see why it would be impossible or unlikely for the number of adult male Roman citizens to redouble in the 45 years

¹ FRANK, *ESAR* I, 225.

² As to Pompey's efforts to expand his *clientela*, cf. above p. 467.

³ Now, as in Gracchan times the colonization must have affected the census returns in two ways, cf. above 7. 2. 3.

⁴ Cf. BRUNT's comments, 305, to Appian's *B. C.* I, 94-104; further SALMON, 130.

⁵ 306.

⁶ BRUNT, 305.

⁷ Cf. A. KRAWCZUK, *Kolonizacja sullajska*, Polska Akademia Nauk, Kraków, Prace Komisji Nauk Historycznych 4, 1960, summary, 89 f.

⁸ *Loc. cit.*

from 115 to 70 B. C., considering the political development in Italy in these years¹.

In particular, Cicero's words about the great crowds present in Rome in 70/69 B. C. "comitiorum ludorum censendique causa"² has been regarded as proof that the census after the Social War had regularly been taken in Rome "and had enrolled only those who chose to make the sacrifice of time and effort to go there to register"³. I find this explanation impossible to accept⁴ and believe it to be due to a misunderstanding of Cicero's words. The census in this passing reference to the crowd in Rome does not specifically stress the census; such a negligence would have been impossible if within a short span of time close to a million male citizens had been present for registration in Rome, and, in addition, lodged and fed, more than 50 per cent of them ex-allies⁵, and, consequently, strangers in the capital. Clearly any taking of the census compelled citizens living in the outskirts of the city to come to Rome for enrolment. This would have increased the crowds in the streets. But if we reject the idea of registration by personal attendance in Rome for all Roman citizens, and I think we are forced to do so, the increased number of registered citizens is explicable solely in the light of a system of reports to be delivered to the censors in Rome. Such a system is in fact outlined in the *tabula Ilvacleensis*⁶ "eosque libros (sc. those containing the returns of the local census) per legatos, quos maior pars decurionum conscriptorum adeam rem legerei mitte censuerunt". These delegations from single communities from

¹ FRANK, *ESAR* I, 315 maintains that "the figures for 115 and for 28 being to full and accurate censuses; the others (i.e. the figures for 85 and 69) do not". His refusal to accept the figures for 69 is based on the one hand on the comparison with Octavian's census of 28 B. C., on the other, on two incidental references in Cicero (*Verr.* I, 54 and *Arch.* II) which show that the citizens were apparently compelled to journey to Rome if they wished to be enrolled; cf. also FRANK, *CIPh.* 19 (1924), 337. The number of actual and prospective citizens in 90 B. C. would therefore probably have been about 2,000,000 (*loc. cit.*). The subsequent discussion concerning the significance of the figure 910,000 has been focussed on these two points.

² *Verr.* I, 54.

³ FRANK, *CIPh.* 19 (1924), 334; cf. recently in support of this view WISEMAN, *JRS.* 59 (1969), 68.

⁴ As does BRUNT, 98 f. with many convincing arguments.

⁵ Cf. BRUNT's estimate, 97, table VIII.

⁶ II, 149-150.

all over Italy would certainly have been conspicuous¹ (according to the *tabula Heracleensis* they should all arrive in Rome before the expiry of the *censura*, and consequently be present in Rome at the same time); they would comprise local nobles with their trains longing to be seen, to participate in public and social life (*ludi* and *comitia*). It is much more probable that Cicero refers to them than to hundreds of thousands of ex-allies, who would have been a serious threat to law and order in the capital.

We cannot say how far the clauses of the *tabula Heracleensis* are an adaptation of a system employed in 70/69 B.C., or earlier. Alternatively the *tabula* may represent a complete reorganization of the earlier system of enrolment. Nevertheless it is quite clear that a census involving close to a million citizens to be registered, without some kind of reporting to the censors in Rome, would have been impossible. Here we seem to find a satisfactory explanation of Cicero's words in his speech against Verres.

To sum up: the above considerations suggest that there was a fairly well developed system of local census integrated with the census in Rome, in 70/69 B.C. We may well, with Brunt² suppose "that Rome gave 'full faith and credit' to the local census records". On the other hand, it does not follow that the co-ordination of the different local censuses, and the instructions given to the various *municipia coloniae praefecturae* were as detailed as they later were in the *tabula Heracleensis*. Here the funerary inscriptions of Etruria provide us with a check point. At Clusium, where they flow most abundantly, they suggest that there was no rigorous unification affecting the name forms about the middle of the first century B.C., or slightly later. The stipulations regulating the 70/69 B.C. census do not, therefore, seem to have influenced the process of Latinization decisively. On the other hand, it is clear that Latinization gains momentum when the number of Italians, utilizing the opportunities to obtain Roman citizenship, rises steeply. A corollary to these conclusions is that we should regard Sulla's colonization as a promoter of the Romanization of Etruria³ circum-spectively.

¹ According to the *tabula Heracleensis* they should arrive in Rome before the expiry of the *censura*, and consequently be present in Rome at the same time.
² 92.

³ Cf. SALMON, 131.

4. OCTAVIAN'S CENSUS OF 29/28 B.C. AND ITS AIMS

The *Res Gestae*¹ show that Octavian carried out the census in his sixth consulship when Marcus Agrippa was his colleague, and performed the *lustrum*. This paragraph allows for the deduction that Octavian assumed the *censoria potestas* the preceding year considering that eighteen months had normally been allotted for the censorial duties². "Quo lustrum civium Romanorum censa sunt capita quadragiens centum millia et sexaginta tria millia"³. The number of Roman citizens registered had consequently risen from 910,000 to 4,063,000 in 41 years.

The quadrupling (and more) of the census figures has been explained in many different ways, above all because scholars have found it very hard to accept a corresponding increase of the population in these 41 years. So Frank, to mention one instance, resorted to the expedient of declaring the census of 70/69 B.C. incomplete⁴, whereas others⁵ suggest that the entire basis of the census was changed so as to comprise women and children in addition to adult males.

The interpretation of the census figures is of considerable interest for our understanding of the process of the Romanization of Etruria, which seems to reach completion in, or shortly after, the reign of Augustus. It has on the preceding pages been possible to demonstrate the connexions between the local censuses and the varying degrees of the process of Latinization. We should, therefore, here continue by considering the impact of Octavian's census on the Romanization of Italy.

Frank thought that a major factor contributing to the high returns of Octavian's census was the inclusion of Cisalpine Gaul with Italy, when its status of province was abolished in 42 B.C.⁶ He actually calculated that 1/3 of the Italic population lived in Cisalpina, and that the male adults of this part of Italy were about 1 million⁷.

¹ 8.

² PIERI, 185 f.

³ *Res Gestae* 8.

⁴ *ESAR* I, 315.

⁵ K. J. BELOCH, *Die Bevölkerung der griechisch-römischen Welt*, Leipzig 1886, 456 and, most recently, BRUNT, 120 and *passim*.

⁶ CHILVER, 9; BRUNT, 167.

⁷ *ESAR* I, 315.

Now Frank seems to have exaggerated the populousness of Cisalpine Gaul¹; even if the figures had been correct, they could not account alone for the steep rise in the census figures. There must have been other reasons as well, and it is suggested here that the census procedure adopted by Octavian is one of the main reasons for the increase in the census returns.

It is reasonable to expect that the census was carried out in accordance with the provisions of the *tabula Heracleensis*. The reorganization of the census was a part of Caesar's heritage, which was codified as a part of the *acta Caesaris* in a *lex Antonia de actis Caesaris confirmandis* of 44 B. C.² Certainly we cannot expect Octavian to have adopted these principles in practice solely out of *pietas*, out of veneration for the memory of his adoptive father; the character of the *lex Antonia de actis Caesaris* which concerned also plans and designs, left the interpretation of the intentions of the assassinated dictator at the discretion of his heirs. Had the system outlined by the *tabula Heracleensis* been contrary to the interests of Octavian, it is evident that he would have discarded it or interpreted it in an appropriate way.

Behind the revisions of the censorial practice outlined in the *tabula Heracleensis* there is discernible Caesar's political idea of a unified Italy³, which would on the one hand form a stable basis for the Roman commonwealth, on the other, guarantee that the Italian stock in the Roman citizen body outnumbered or politically neutralized the earlier dominating population of the Urbs and, at the same time, gave him a host of followers. Octavian's aims were identical with those of Divus Iulius in this respect; the incorporation of Cisalpine Gaul with Italy demonstrates that he acted speedily and with purpose when carrying out his plans.

¹ Cf. BRUNT in his chapter on the population of Cisalpine Gaul, 166-203, and the section on the population in the first century B. C., 198-203.

² A. VON PREMERSTEIN, 'Die Tafel von Heraclea', ZSS, 43 (1922), *Rom. Abt.*, 45 f., and in greater detail his section V "Die rechtliche Anerkennung der Acta Caesaris nach dessen Tod", 129-145; for the *lex Antonia*, cf. also G. ROTONDI, *Leges publicae populi Romani*, Hildesheim 1962, 429 f.; with regard to the confirmation of the *acta Caesaris* also, of June 3, 44 B. C. the *plebiscitum de Caesaris actis cognoscendis cum consilio*, ROTONDI, 432 f., by VON PREMERSTEIN obviously identified with the *lex Antonia*, and finally, the *lex Vibia de actis Caesaris confirmandis* of 43 B. C., ROTONDI, 434: "Proposta ex auctoritate senatus dal console C. Vibius Pansa ai comizi centuriati, in sostituzione della abrogata *Lex Antonia de actis Caesaris confirmandis*".

³ I. 142: "quae municipia, coloniae, praefecturae civium) R(omanorum) in Italia sunt erunt".

It would, therefore, seem that a combination of piety towards Divus Iulius¹ and a carefully thought-out political strategy caused Octavian to try out the provisions of the *tabula Heracleensis* in his first census.

Wiseman² emphasizes that the census of 29/28 B. C. and the concluding *lustrum* was a necessary pre-requisite of the reconstitution of the *res publica* to be undertaken in 27 B. C. Considering the deeper meaning of the *lustratio*, this is a very appropriate remark. We may, therefore, rest assured that whatever was the subsequent development of the census, Octavian's first census was carried out according to custom, although it was rendered more efficient by the expedient of local registration "ex formula census, quae Romae ab eo, qui tum censum populi acturus erit, proposita erit". When Octavian emphasizes that the himself "legibus novis] me auctore [latis multa exempla maiorum exolecentia iam ex nostro [accullo] red[uxi]..."³, he sought to demonstrate that his policy aimed at guaranteeing a continuous and organic development because of his reverence for the traditional institutions of the Roman State⁴.

The psychological and political probability is that Octavian in the census of 29/28 B. C. did not fundamentally deviate from the provisions laid down in the *tabula Heracleensis* in order to cover the vast number of Roman citizens living outside easy reach of the capital. This does not exclude some modifications of the *formula census* of Caesar, but we have no means of establishing their extent and character except by considering the impact of the census such as it appears in the epitaphs of Italy, i. e., in our particular case, in Etruria.

4.1 THE LANGUAGE SHIFT AT VOLATERRAE UNDER AUGUSTUS

The language shift at Volaterrae started later than in any other town in Etruria according to the funerary inscriptions. The typological classification of the Volaterran cinerary urns has provided us possibilities of establishing certain chronological limits for a number of inscribed lids. All the relevant

¹ Not unseemly in the year of the inauguration of the temple of the Divus Iulius in 29 B. C.

² WISEMAN, *JRS*, 59 (1969), 71.

³ *Res Gestae* 8.

⁴ Cf. SYME, 321-325 for the notion of the restoration of the Republic.

Latin inscriptions can be placed within clearly defined and dated typological groups.

Generally speaking, a Romanizing artistic trend begins to be discernible about 100 B. C.¹ when it succeeds the Hellenistic influence prevailing in the preceding centuries. This happens roughly at the same time as Latinization in other Etruscan towns.² The cinerary urns characterized by their Romanizing style have been subdivided in the following way by Mrs. Nielsen³:

The Roman Style Phase about 100 B. C.—A. D. 20/50

- (1) The Transitional Group, about 100-80 B. C.
- (2) The Idealizing Group, about 80/60-30 B. C.
- (3) Some Isolated Lid Sculptures, about 80/60-30 B. C.
- (4) The Book-Scroll Group, about 50/40-20/10 B. C.
- (5) The Caecina Selcia Group, about 50/30-10 B. C.
- (6) The Diptych Group, about 20 B. C.—A. D. 10/20
- (7) Two Figures Lying on their Stomachs, A. D. 20/50.

Mrs. Nielsen concludes by stating that there is at least one lid sculpture⁴ which with reference to the female hair dress should be referred to the period A. D. 20/50, and that "no lid sculptures made in the Etruscan tradition can be dated later than that"⁵.

The inventory of the inscriptions⁶ shows that prior to the Roman Style Phase only two out of about 136 lid sculptures were inscribed. In the subdivision of the Roman Style Phase the number of the lid sculptures and the number of Etruscan and Latin inscriptions respectively, was as indicated in the table which follows⁷.

¹ NIELSEN, pp. 300, 380 ff.

² As to the date, cf. KAMMIO, pp. 220-221 above.

³ 5, 3, 1.

⁴ Volterra 241, cf. pp. 377 f.

⁵ NIELSEN, p. 382.

⁶ NIELSEN, pp. 397 f.: Index of Inscriptions.

⁷ I record the group numbers in the same way as above; the Latin epitaphs are recorded in NIELSEN, p. 387 n. 1. We may add that an altar-shaped cinerary urn was found in the Caecina tomb in 1739. The urn was inscribed in Latin (CIE 18, CIL XI 1763 Volterra, cf. NIELSEN, p. 320 above).

	No. of lids	Etr. inscriptions	Latin inscriptions
(1)	10	1	
(2)	c. 250	65	1
(3)	4	-	
(4)	50	13	7
(5)	11	6	1
(6)	29	13	1
	c. 354	98	10

It is not easy to be more specific with regard to the dates of single Latin inscriptions. The earliest Latin inscription¹ has to be referred to the period 80/60-30 B. C., eight epitaphs to the period 50/30-10 B. C., and one, finally, to the time 20 B. C.—A. D. 10/20. Nevertheless, the table reveals that the Etruscan inscriptions dominated strongly in the later groups also (4-6), with 9 Latin inscriptions against 32 Etruscan ones. The latest datable urn lid which can be given a fixed *terminus post quem*² shows the female hair dress used by Livia after the death of Augustus. The inscription³ is in Etruscan⁴.

Summing up, we can say that Latin was introduced comparatively late in the epitaphs of Volterrae, that the foreign language gains ground but slowly and that Etruscan was employed in the early Empire, it would seem, as late as in the reign of Tiberius, up to the time when the local Etruscan burial customs were discontinued.

4.2 THE POLITICAL ATTITUDE OF THE VOLATERRANS TOWARDS ROME

The conservatism of the Volaterrans as reflected in the Etruscan epitaphs is remarkable. It seems to be stronger than in other towns in the north of Etruria although, admittedly, the cemeteries of those towns have not supplied us with epitaphs datable with the same degree of certainty. This conserva-

¹ CIL XI 174 on the urn Volterra 177.

² No. 24 in the Diptych Group, cf. NIELSEN, p. 373.

³ CIE 109.

⁴ Mrs. NIELSEN, loc. cit., does not exclude the possibility that the lid sculpture could be slightly earlier than this hair-dress of Livia.

tism on the part of the local immobile population (in contrast, for instance, to the mobile and largely Romanized Caecinae), may well be interpreted as a protest or simply as a refusal to surrender national identity. The vicissitudes of the town in the first century B. C. discussed in different contexts above¹ seem to be a sufficient explanation of this attitude towards the Romans and their language. For the sake of clarity I venture to repeat the main points.

A possible *municipium* before the Social War², the town was reduced by Sulla to the state of *Ariminum*³, which seems to have equalled *ius Latii*⁴. There is no certainty about the time when the full franchise was regained, although Cicero in his speech *pro Caecina* may have succeeded in persuading the censors to register Aulus Caecina in the 70/69 B. C. census⁵.

Sulla made the whole territory of Volaterrae public land, but the colony planned was never founded. This did not imply that the inhabitants and the landowners of the pre-war time were freed from anxiety and uncertainty. Cicero defended the Volaterran lands against the bill of Flavius in 59 B. C.⁶ Not even Caesar seems to have settled the question of ownership despite Cicero's assertion to the contrary⁷; it may well be that Cicero's appeal to Q. Valerius Orca was in vain and that at least some land was found for Caesar's veterans at Volaterrae⁸.

The conclusions as regards the reluctant Romanization of the Etruscans was based on the evidence of the epitaphs. Are we able to gauge how far they represent Volaterran society?

¹ NIELSEN, p. 387 ff.; HOHTI, pp. 410 + 413.

² RÜOFF, pp. 56 f.

³ HOHTI, 6. 2.

⁴ SHERWIN-WHITE, 96 ff.; KRAWCZUK, summary, 89, notes that "Sulla ... accorda (sc. the town) l'indigénat latin de la plus haute catégorie, c'est à dire ius XII coloniarum".

⁵ HARRIS, 282 f., suggests that the censors in this census generally "accepted the registration of the Volaterrani and probably of the Arretines and any others who had suffered under the lex Cornelia". True enough, this would have been in keeping with Pompey's general policy, but it seems to me that the evidence of the *pro Caecina* is far too feeble a support for the annulment of the *lex Cornelia* (BRUNT, 306 says that the deprivation of the citizenship at Arretium and Volaterrae was mysteriously annulled by the courts, with reference to *Caec.* 97 and *dom.* 79). It was certainly easier to plead successfully the case of the *domi nobiles*, the support of which was politically important to Cicero, than that of whole communities.

⁶ *fam.* 13.4; cf. BRUNT, 306, n. 1 and 313.

⁷ HOHTI above; cf. *Cic. fam.* 13. 4 and BRUNT, 313, 323.

⁸ Cf. BORMANN, *CIL* XI, p. 325.

Generally speaking we are justified in ascribing them to the upper strata of the local society. Burials in stately family tombs in elaborately worked cinerary urns was certainly the privilege of the *domi nobiles*—for economic reasons. The tombs of the Caecinae of Volaterrae, of the Volunni and Rufi at Perugia correspond to those described by Timme in his study of the Clusine genealogies. For the Caecinae, the tombs of which have yielded so many cinerary urns, the connexions with the Etruscan as well as with the Roman aristocracy are well established¹. The landowning class most certainly belonged to this group, which must have resented the expropriation of territory and the uncertainty with regard to the future most acutely. The landowners, regardless of the size of their landed property, must have felt that they were dependent on Roman charity. Hence the refusal to yield to Romanism.

We may compare the development at Volaterrae with the situation at Arretium² and Clusium. The former town was punished by Sulla by depriving its inhabitants of citizenship. In addition the territory was expropriated and used for the settlement of colonists³. Now for Arretium the inscriptions illustrating the process are very scarce⁴. There are three Etrusco-Latin bilinguals, the earliest of which can be dated 40 B. C. "There were some people at Arretium which understood Etruscan and knew the old name system perhaps as late as the early Empire", Mr. Kaimio concludes⁵. Accordingly, there is a considerable difference between Volaterrae and Arretium.

The Clusine material provides a useful check-point because cinerary urns of the same type as those used at Volaterrae supply a high percentage

¹ HOHTI, pp. 414 ff.

² Cf. RÜOFF, pp. 50 f.

³ The *Arretini Fidentiores* of Pliny according to BRUNT, 306. Nevertheless, Cicero (*Att.* I, 19, 4), speaking about "Volaterranos et Arretinos quorum agrum Sulla publicarat neque diviserat" confirms that the two towns were more or less in the same position. When debating the vicissitudes of Volaterrae and Arretium, Mrs. RÜOFF recorded that Miss L. BANTI once in a discussion had questioned the correctness of using this passage as evidence for the Roman treatment of Arretium. The most important Mss. in fact contain *arretinos*, *Arretinos* thus being an emendation (Augustinus), cf. SHACKLETON-BAILEY's edition, I (Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries 3, Cambridge 1965), 180. The consensus of scholars has, however, accepted the emendation and I have to profess my inability to suggest a plausible alternative. Nevertheless, the doubts with regard to *Arretinos* persist.

⁴ KAIMIO, 3. 2. 9, pp. 214 f. above.

⁵ Loc. cit.

of the inscriptions. The urns of the leading families were richly decorated, whereas the urns of the "middle class", of professional people, were, as a rule, plain. The latter kind of urns as well as inscriptions mentioning different professions was absent at Volaterrae.

There is no easy and obvious explanation for the different pattern of behaviour at Volaterrae, Arretium and Clusium. A detailed comparison between Volaterrae and Clusium is made impossible by the fact that the Volaterran middle class is not in evidence in the epithaphs; the only unequivocal result of a comparison of these two is that the Clusine upper class is becoming Latinized earlier than their counterpart at Volaterrae, though aristocratic tombs are rare¹ and the classified urn groups few².

The above linguistic study has pointed out a basic resemblance between the inscriptions of Arretium and Volaterrae—in both towns the Latin names mostly occur on monuments of clearly Roman character³—although there is a difference in time between the beginning of the language shift in the two towns. Considering the similarity of the vicissitudes of these towns after the Social War, this is surprising. The explanation may be found in colonization, which to some extent (the *Arretini Fidentiores*) seems to have been carried out at Arretium at some date despite Cicero's words⁴, and the growing economic importance of the Arretine potteries. Wiseman⁵ has drawn the attention to the potteries of Vibienus and Rufrenus, two senators and contemporaries of Cicero, probably of Arretine origin, and suggested⁶ that C. Vibienus was one of the Arretine landowners defended by Cicero in 60 B.C. when he succeeded "to allow the people of Volaterrae and Arretium to retain in their holding their land which Sulla had made public land, but had not distributed"⁷.

Financial interests were at stake at Arretium, and a study of the pre-Arretine and early (plain) Arretine ceramics suggests that the industry was owned by Romans or Latinized Etruscans⁸. Thus the growth of the

¹ KAIMIO, p. 207.

² KAIMIO, p. 206.

³ KAIMIO, p. 225.

⁴ *Att.* I, 19, 4.

⁵ *Memosyne*, 16 (1963), 275-283.

⁶ 281.

⁷ *Att.* I, 19, 4, quoted according to the Loeb translation.

⁸ Chr. GORDINEAU, *La céramique Arretine lisse*, *MEFR*, Suppl. 6, Paris 1968, 332 shows that the inscribed pre-Arretine stamps employ Latin letters. This kind of ceramics was born around the middle of the first century B.C. (335). It succeeds, and partly overlaps with the black-glazed Etrusco-Campanian ceramics, which continue to be produced until the end of the century and which also

Arretine industry may decisively have speeded up the process of Latinization in contrast to the corresponding development of Volaterrae. The Volaterrans, in comparison, appear almost abandoned, although Roman monumental buildings erected in their town towards the end of the last century B.C.¹ are proof to the contrary². After the Sullan war Volaterrae was deprived of the full franchise and probably reduced to Latin status³. The reduced civil rights released neither feelings of enthusiasm nor a Latinizing wave in the Etruscan town, whereas in Venetia it appears that the *ius Latii* and the possibilities of obtaining the citizenship *per magistratum* gave an impact to Latinization⁴. This goes to show that the legal or juridical status of a community is not necessarily the decisive factor in the process of Latinization. The inner motivation of a society, its wish to identify itself with the Romans obviously was, or could have been, more important.

When Latinization finally starts at Volaterrae we can see that the Etruscan traditions do not survive for long. Romanization follows suit soon after, under Augustus. The reasons for this seem to be Augustus' policy of unifying Italy. As far as this policy is reflected in our material, it can be explained in terms of the census of 29/28 B.C.

4.3 THE CENSUS FIGURES OF 29/28 B.C.

In the *Res Gestae* Augustus records the outcome of the census of 29/28 B.C. as 4,063,000 *civium capita*. Nevertheless scholars disagree with regard to the significance of these figures. I should like to emphasize at once that the figures, in my opinion, stand for male adult Roman citizens (and not for all Romans, women and children included). Further, I maintain that these figures are comparable with the outcome of the 70/69 B.C. census. In this respect my views differ from the two conceptions which have hitherto dominated scholarly discussion concerning the demography of the Roman Republic. Beloch, whose main points have recently been sup-

employ similar stamps, some of them inscribed with combinations of letters similar to those found on the plain Arretine ware. Etruscan letters or words have been found on Etrusco-Campanian ceramics, but they are of earlier date, *ibid.*, 333, n. 4.

¹ Cf. HARRIS, 314 f.

² We may compare the development at Volaterrae with the corresponding one in Venetia. The Venetians were endowed with the *ius Latii* through the agency of Pompey and subsequently, in 49 B.C., with *civitas* (7. 2. 4 above, cf. p. 459, n. 3).

³ Cf. HORTI, pp. 411 f. above.

⁴ Above, p. 459.

ported by P. A. Brunt's impressive and imaginative research, represents one line of thought and Tenney Frank another.

Now, the comparison of the 29/28 B. C. census figures with the figures of the preceding and the subsequent census constitutes one of the crucial points for the understanding of the implications of the figure 4,063,000. Frank maintains that the figures of 70/69 and 29/28 record adult males and regards the figures of the latter census as correct because the census was taken at a time when no political disturbances could impede its reliability. Although he believes in a considerable increase of the population after the Social War, he finds it hard to accept a quadrupling of the population in 40 years. Consequently, he cannot regard the 70/69 census figures as correct.

Brunt's point of departure is that the 70/69 figures on the whole record the adult male citizens correctly. In a series of detailed studies, which seem to cover all possible aspects of the demographic development, Brunt demonstrates that Frank's theories concerning an increase of the population in the last pre-Christian century is fallacious; we have no reason to doubt the correctness of his conclusions on this point. Consequently, Brunt arrives at the general conclusion that the 29/28 census figures, the reliability of which must be accepted, are incompatible with the 70/69 figures. Thus Brunt is forced to reassume Beloch's theory that Octavian's census recorded men, women and children (but not infants) and not male adults alone.

With Brunt's recent contribution to the demographic discussion in mind, it is surely superfluous to repeat all the pertinent arguments in order to show the logic of his conclusion that there can scarcely have been any natural increase of the Roman population in the years 70/69 to 29/28 B. C. On the other hand, I cannot agree that the inference Brunt draws from his conclusion is inevitable, or that it is the only possible one. I do not believe that the censuses of 70/69 and 29/28 were taken according to fundamentally different principles¹.

Any consideration of the significance of the census figures has to depart from the fact that *Res Gestae*² record the formula "civium Romanorum censa sunt capita tot"³. This is the old formula for expressing the results of the census. From the methodological point of view we have to accept its meaning to be unaltered unless special circumstances speak in favour of a different interpretation⁴.

¹ Cf. p. 477, above.

² 8.

³ Noted by BRUNT, 114 with reference to the *Fasti Ostienses* also.

⁴ Cf. FRANK, *CIPH.*, 19 (1924), 338.

Beloch and Brunt, however, consider the quadrupling of the census figures as a serious difficulty because the increase of the registered population took place in a period, after the Social War, when all Italy was franchized and the only addition to the Roman body politic ought to have been Cisalpine Gaul. They both opine that once a community has been endowed with the *civitas* all of its citizens are registered as Roman citizens in the census. Brunt supports his view by showing how the local census worked.

Now, I find it very hard to approve of his supposition that the extension of the citizenship to a certain community automatically implied a registration of all its citizens. Regardless of the risk of repeating arguments presented above, it has to be emphasized that such a practice would have presupposed a system of central registration, in Rome, of all citizens. Again, this would have required detailed and rigorous instructions with regard to the name forms to be registered, and consequently universally accepted and uniformly applied instructions for all the local officials responsible for the censuses. The studies of the Latin inscriptions of Etruria suggest that such a uniformity did not exist—at least there—before 29/28 B. C.

5. REGISTRATION OF EXTRA-URBAN POTENTIAL CITIZENS

The most valuable and the most jealously guarded properties of Roman citizenship were the *ius suffragii* and the *ius honorum*. Single citizens of non-Urban communities cannot possibly have acquired these rights without being registered in Rome, where they were to make use of their prerogatives. On the other hand, for mass-enrollment we have earlier accepted¹ the possibility of registration by way of local census registers, thus excluding the necessity of personal attendance at the census in Rome; at the same time, however, it was apparent that the co-ordination of the local censuses, at least not during the 70/69 census, was not as detailed as the one later established by the *tabula Heracleensis*².

The *tabula Heracleensis* presupposes that all those registered use the Roman name form. The extension of the stipulations regarding the census in Rome to the entire peninsula also implies that absence from local registration would have been punishable³. It is obvious that such a system must

¹ Cf. p. 446, above.

² Cf. p. 473, above.

³ Cf. above, p. 471, n. 3.

have affected all the non-Latin communities which were within the sphere of action of the law. The local varieties of the processes of Latinization of Etruria imply that the censuses of 89, 86/84, and 70/69¹ did not influence the Latinization so decisively as to determine its course and certain of its external aspects. Only when the census is carried out everywhere according to the same stipulations (such as those of the *tabula Heracleensis*) can it be maintained that the citizens of the enfranchized communities really use, or are compelled to use, the possibilities of being registered as Roman citizens².

If we are to accept this explanation, we should be able to answer the following questions:

(1) How were the citizens of the various Italian communities registered if there was a local census but if no universally valid instructions were issued by the central authority?

(2) Why do the Romans prior to Caesar seem to have been but little interested in mass registration of Italians? (The *tabula Heracleensis* suggests that Caesar adopted a different policy in this respect.)

(3) What is the explanation for the lack of interest towards mass registration of citizens which, if the above supposition be true, would characterize the Italian communities?

(1) The enrolment of extra-Urban citizens seems to have been of relatively modest proportions until the time of the Gracchi³. It is only at that juncture that the increasing number of citizens of franchized communities looking for the protection of the Roman citizenship⁴ brings home the need for a local census which would also serve the registration of citizens in Rome. The majority of those interested in the *civitas* most certainly belonged to the propertied class, frequently, we may presume, familiar with the Roman way of life.

¹ Cf. pp. 471 f., 474 above.

² BRUNT, 92, maintains that "it appears certain that the assignation of a community to a particular tribe (referring to Cic. *Balb.* 21) meant that all its citizens thereby became voting members of that tribe". I would like to add: if they wanted to register as Roman citizens. Most certainly many omitted to do so.

³ Cf. p. 451, above.

⁴ The *ius provocations* may have been sufficient in many cases, cf. p. 452, above.

The Social War changed the situation in many respects. With regard to the censuses of 89 and 86/84 B. C. the Romans had to face the political necessity of letting the existing local census systems take care of the basic enrolment of new citizens and forward the reports to Rome. Yet these were not complete censuses. Only in 70/69 B. C., when Pompey's propaganda succeeded in convincing great numbers of new supporters of the benefit of enrolling as citizens is it possible to speak of a complete census. Completeness in this case refers to the simple fact that all citizens of franchized communities who wanted to register were able to do so. The remarkable increase of the number of enrolments must have shown¹ that with regard to the future censuses, detailed instructions for the local authorities were sorely needed. Later on the *tabula Heracleensis* illustrates one way of solving this technical and administrative problem. In this context it should be pointed out that the fact that no census was concluded between 69 and 28 B. C. does not necessarily mean that the normalizing effects of the census institution was in abeyance during the intervening 41 years. It has to be assumed that prior to each census taking instructions concerning the registration of citizens were issued to the *municipia* and the *coloniae* of Italy. Locally the registration may well have been carried out according to the instructions, although the censors in Rome subsequently were forced to resign without having performed the *lustrum*.

(2) We have no reasons to believe that the Romans were particularly interested in mass registration of the citizens of franchized communities, despite their lack of manpower until Marius' reform of the recruitment of the army. The senatorial nobility was interested in political support; the local aristocracies of Italy were able to supply it. To give the lower classes the protection of Roman citizenship against local oppression would most certainly have created a conflict between the Roman nobles and their Italian counterparts. The situation was changed only under Caesar and Augustus.

(3) Marius' army reform is generally thought to have eliminated the burden of compulsory military service, regarded previously and particularly by the majority of the non-Urban Roman citizens as the adverse side of the *civitas*. The Social War created a new political situation in Italy, but it did not imply the return of internal peace, nor did it revive the confi-

¹ As suggested by the Clusine onomastics, cf. KAIMIO, p. 209 above.

dence in Roman politics. It is hard to see why, at this juncture, the Italians would have rushed to get registered as Roman citizens¹. The lower classes without political importance must have been subject to continuous pressure during the last decades of the Republic owing to the fact that the local nobilities were tempted to, or forced to take sides in the feuds shattering and devastating the peninsula till the final victory of Octavian². Only under Octavian, at the census of 29/28, when Italy had been able to enjoy the blessings of peace during twelve years after the *bellum Perusinum*, and when the victory of Actium had shown Octavian to be the undisputed master of the Roman world, only then in the face of the new policy of unification did Italians give up their resistance to incorporation into the Roman body politic.

It seems to me that we here have found a natural explanation of the fact that the Romans before Caesar had little reason to organize a census that would have enrolled all the citizens of the franchized communities. Moreover, it is probable that, in numerous cases, such Italians consciously failed or refused to register because of the political situation in Italy, which fundamentally remained unchanged until the end of the *bellum Perusinum*. This implies that the not as yet centrally directed local censuses served the need of the Roman authorities well, at least until the census of 70/69 B. C.

Our next task is to check Brunt's calculations regarding the demographic development in Italy. My point of departure is that the enumerations of the 70/69 and 29/28 censuses are substantially correct, and further that in both cases the figures indicate male adults. Consequently they are directly comparable with one another. Thus they show that the number of registered male Roman citizens had more than quadrupled in the intervening 41 years, the figure rising from 910,000 to 4,063,000.

¹ In an admirable chapter on Conscription (391-415) Brunt i. a. shows that a great deal of compulsion was needed for recruiting the large armies of the last century of the Republic, from 90 to 41 B. C. (cf. particularly 408 ff.); most soldiers were in fact still conscripts. The levies raised by *dilectus* or *conscriptio* all implied coercion (cf. Brunt, Appendix 20 "The Meaning of the Term 'Dilectus'", 635-638).

² The social cleavage in the towns of Etruria, noted by S. MAZZARINO, 'Sociologia del mondo etrusco e problemi della tarda etruscità', *Historia*, 6 (1957), 113 and recently stressed by HARRIS (221 ff.) suggests that the lower orders in Etruria, oppressed by local nobles and Romans alike, were not interested in Roman citizenship.

6. THE DEMOGRAPHIC DEVELOPMENT FROM 70/69 TO 29/28 B.C.

It was assumed earlier that at the censuses prior to 29/28 B. C. a number of *civēs* of enfranchized communities were not registered. However, the instructions issued in conjunction with Octavian's first census¹ made it impossible or even dangerous to refuse to be registered². My next task is to calculate the number of Italians who had earlier refused to register as Roman citizens but who now, owing to the steps and measures taken by Octavian, were incorporated into the Roman body politic at the time of the 29/28 census. Also, I have to clarify how plausible such a development appears to be in the light of the available data. The census figures for 70/69 and 29/28 constitute my point of departure.

Clearly all demographic calculations regarding ancient Rome are highly uncertain. Frank³ calculated that the total population of Italy in 28 B. C. comprised 14 millions, four millions of which were slaves. Frank presupposes a considerable increase of the Italian population from 85 B. C. to 28 B. C. (from 1,500,000 to 4,063,000 male adults) whereas Brunt believes in a stagnation which implies⁴ that "the citizen population of Italy" in 28 B. C. and A. D. 14 "was probably no larger than the free population of 225 B. C."⁵, i. e. about 3,000,000 excluding Cisalpina. "Persons of citizen status, excluding infants, i. e. children under one year, probably numbered about 5,000,000 in 28 B. C. and about 6,200,000 in A. D. 14." Of these, according to Brunt, under 1,000,000 were living abroad in 28 B. C., and nearly 1,900,000 in A. D. 14. The number of slaves could be put at about 3,000,000 out of a total population of no more than 7,500,000, Cisalpina included⁶. Thus Brunt, relying to some extent on Bloch⁷ calculates that the population of Italy was about 50 per cent. of

¹ Probably largely copied on the *tabula Heracleensis*.

² Cf. pp. 471, n. 3, and 486, above. I do not believe that such a refusal to comply with the pertinent instructions should be regarded as a case comparable with the *evasio* mentioned by Brunt (115). Such *evasiones* were punishable refusals by previously registered persons to attend the census.

³ *ESAR* I, 315.

⁴ 121.

⁵ According to the figures given by Polybius (2, 24): cf. also A. AFZELIUS, *Die römische Eroberung Italiens (340-264 v. Chr.)*, Acta Jutlandica, Aarskrift for Aarhus Universitet, 14, 3 (1942), 98 f.

⁶ Brunt, 124.

⁷ Cf. Brunt, 125 f.

the figures given by Frank. According to him, the free male population at Octavian's first census was 1,422,000, corresponding to 35 per cent of the entire population, and in reality, considering a correction amounting to 20-25 per cent of the census figures, 1,706,000-1,777,000¹.

Comparing the calculations of Frank and Brunt we find:

	Frank	Brunt
Adult male citizens	4,063,000	1,422,000 ³
Total free Italian population	12,000,000 ²	4,063,000 ⁴
Citizens abroad	2,000,000	1,000,000
Slaves in Italy	4,000,000	3,000,000

Both scholars accept a certain development in the fifty years preceding Octavian's first census. According to Frank the sum for 28 B. C. consisted of the following components:

Male adult citizens in 70 B. C. ⁵	1,800,000
Transpadanes ⁶ (franchized in 49 B. C.)	1,000,000
Increase of population ⁷ , colonization, inclusive of manumissions, which may have amounted to 500,000 ⁸	1,200,000

¹ BRUNT, 117.

² As a result of a deduction based on the census figures. Considering the possible margin of error of 20-25 per cent, the corrected figures would be 1,706,000 - 1,777,000.

³ FRANK, *ESAR* I, 315, calculates, in accordance with Dionysius 9, 25, 2 that to one male adult corresponded three women and children, cf. *CIPH*, 19 (1924), 340; "In his (i. e. Dionysius') day the census was taken scientifically, the women and children recorded on subsidiary lists, and the number of slaves appeared on the property list. Hence the total population is known".

⁴ BRUNT excludes infants.

⁵ As interpolated from the figures of 85 B. C., i. e. 1,500,000 (loc. cit.) considering an annual increase of 1.3 per cent (as noted by BRUNT, 103).

⁶ FRANK, *CIPH*, 19 (1924), 339 (sheer guesswork according to BRUNT, 100).

⁷ *CIPH*, 19 (1924), 339 f. FRANK calculates with an annual increase of 0.5 per cent in the years 90-28 B. C., i. e. close to one million in all. In the years 70-28 B. C. this increase would amount to 700,000, and make the manumissions account for the remainder of the total of 1,200,000.

⁸ *ESAR* I, 315; cf. BRUNT, 100 ff.

Brunt calculates the demographic development from 70/69 to 29/28 B. C. in the following way (considering his minimum and maximum estimates):

	minima	maxima
Free male adults 70/69	910,000	910,000
Citizens overseas	120,000 ¹	200,000 ²
Transpadanes	300,000	1,000,000 ³
Manumitted	150,000	500,000 ⁴
Male adult citizens 29/28	1,480,000	2,610,000

There is no need to specify in detail the uncertainties of the calculations both of Frank and Brunt. I have stressed above that Frank's disqualification of the 70/69 census figures cannot be correct. Correspondingly, it is clear that Brunt unconsciously seems to prefer the lower estimates, for instance for the Transpadane population; he suggests 300,000 adult males⁵ but admits⁶ that "our only course is to make an estimate that best fits the census data. Since we must adopt Beloch's view of the Augustan figures..." Thus we can see that he is looking for an explanation which fits into his point of departure. On the other hand, Brunt's painstaking analysis of a number of factors affecting the demographic development⁷ has clearly shown that Frank's optimistic view of the increase of the Italic population is unfounded.

¹ This corresponds on the whole to BRUNT's estimate (117) of the male citizens of new *municipia* and *coloniae*, 110,000 with the addition of 30,000 new citizens in the army. It should be noted that almost 70,000 serving in the army 70/69 were not included in the census figures of that year.

² 101, cf. Chapter XV.

³ Cf. 198.

⁴ BRUNT shows (Appendix 7, 549 f.) that FRANK's point of departure, his deduction from the amount of money found in the *aerarium* in 49 B. C., is fallacious, and cannot be used as a base for the calculations of the number of manumissions. Nevertheless, without any substantial proofs, he gives 500,000 as an alternative to his tentative figure of 150,000 (102).

⁵ 117.

⁶ 202.

⁷ See, for instance, the sections of the Chapter XI, 131-155 on Reproductivity in Ancient Italy; Expectation of Life; Nuptiality; The Limitation of Families; Fertility of Freedmen and Freedwomen; Modes of Family Limitation; Emigration.

If we now try to reconcile Brunt's calculations with the assumption that the census figures of 29/28 B. C. represent adult male citizens, we are faced, considering the two extremes mentioned above, with an unaccounted-for figure of considerable magnitude, namely

$$\begin{array}{r} 1,480,000 = 2,573,000 \\ 4,063,000 - \quad \quad \quad = 1,453,000 \end{array}$$

The discrepancy would according to the views expressed above be explained by the registration of non-Urban citizens who hitherto had refused to accept the blessings of Roman citizenship.

7. THE BASIS OF CALCULATIONS: THE POPULATION OF 225 B. C. AS COMPARED WITH THE CENSUS FIGURES OF 70/69 B. C.

Brunt tries to show that the population of Italy remained more or less on the same level from 225 B. C. to 70/69 B. C.¹ Against 940,000 male adults in 225 stand 981,000 in 69, including 70,000 soldiers overseas who were not registered. In addition Brunt reckons with 20-25 per cent *incensi* in 69 B. C. among the ex-allies (and somewhat less among the Romans), the total number of those not registered being about 175,000.

"Scrutiny of the data Polybius provides (i. e. for 225 B. C.) can thus yield only a plausible hypothesis. At best we do no more than venture to conclude that the free population of Italy, including Greeks and Brutians, lay between 3 and 3½ millions, and that the total population (including slaves) may easily have approached or exceeded 4 millions... These provisional results must be judged by their coherence with whatever seems the most likely view of later demographic developments"².

Now the Polybian figures³ seem to record the troops which the Roman allies *ex formula togatorum* put at the disposal of the Romans if the need arose. They do not represent population statistics or all of those fit to carry arms. Scholars generally agree that the figures refer to *imiores*⁴ and represent the minimum number of troops required by the treaty with

¹ 50, 97; see also AFZELIUS, 108 f., 115.

² 60.

³ 2, 24.

⁴ Cf. BRUNT, 57 f., AFZELIUS, 98 f. in accordance with BELOCH, 354.

the Romans¹. Afzelius² assumes that the original figures were rounded off twice and lowered by approximately 10 per cent each time. Consequently, we get the exact number of the *imiores* of the allies by increasing the figures recorded by Polybius by 20 per cent. Using a formula based on a study of the demographic conditions in Italy in 1931, Afzelius calculates the number of the *seniores* of each allied state, and also the number of boys and of persons of the female sex, i. e. the entire free population³.

Now two points seem to speak against these formulas and arithmetical calculations. In order to be correct they would presuppose

(1) that the allied states showed a considerable degree of loyalty towards the Romans. The allies faithfully reported the number of their *imiores* (rounding off the figure by about 10 per cent) and then the Romans generously reduced the numbers by 10 more per cent. I find it very hard to believe in the existence of such ideal co-operation, all the more so as scholars agree that these *formulae togatorum* were based on *foedera iniqua*⁴. I would not hesitate to describe them as mutually codified dictates. If a *foedus iniquum* has to have any significance at all from the point of view of the weaker party, it must comprise a protective clause, a kind of guarantee. Otherwise the Romans would have been able to paralyse their ally entirely by requisitioning all his troops also for campaigns, which were of no direct concern of the ally in question. Consequently it is logical to regard the figures determined by the *formula togatorum* as *maxima*, as resultants of a bargaining process. It is clear that the allies must have tried to lower their contingents of troops as much as possible. Therefore it seems quite natural that the *foedera aequa*, concluded when Rome was on equal footing with the allied state, would not have comprised any stipulations regarding auxiliary forces *ex formula togatorum*. Thus two points suggest that the Polybian figures are too low: (a) the fact that the individual figures should be regarded as *maxima*⁵,

¹ AFZELIUS, loc. cit.; BELOCH, 367 and BRUNT, Appendix 6, *Formula Togatorum*, 545-548, who argues against TOYNBEE's view (cf. TOYNBEE I, Annex IX, The Formula Togatorum, 424-437) of the figures as *maxima*.

² 100.

³ BRUNT, 56 ff., on the whole agrees with AFZELIUS despite certain adjustments of his figures suggested by methodological considerations.

⁴ TOYNBEE I, 424 f. appears to have a higher sense of political realities on this point. He excludes those allies who had concluded *foedera aequa* with the Romans from the calculations based on the Polybian figures.

⁵ As *maxima* they could represent different degrees of bargaining with regard to the Roman desiderata; they may, for instance, stand for 50 per cent of the *imiores*.

and (b) the fact that the allies with *foedera aequa* very likely were not included in the figures.

(2) that the allied accounted for their manpower even more scrupulously than the Romans themselves. All the *proletarii* in Rome were registered in the last *centuria*. They were enlisted in the army in exceptional cases only, until the reform of Marius. The auxiliary troops formed *ex formula togatorum* had to be fully equipped and ready for action¹. It is scarcely conceivable that the Romans would have accepted any poorly equipped rabble if of sufficient strength numerically, as a fulfilment of the treaty obligations imposed on the allied state by the treaty. I suggest that at least before the Hannibalic war, the *proletarii* of the allies were excluded from the estimates concerning the allied manpower. All the numerical calculations based on the Polybian figures should therefore, in addition to their being regarded as *maxima*, be supplemented by an uncertain number of *proletarii*. De Sanctis in *Storia dei Romani*² declares that the *proletarii* and certain other groups of citizens could not have been included in the allied contingents³, the proletarians because they could not have been relied upon during the Gallic war. I believe that we have to exclude them from our numerical calculations for the general reasons suggested above, and in addition because the lower orders in Etruria, as illustrated by the case of Volsinii⁴, in many cases were hostile to the Romans and could therefore scarcely be trusted as allied soldiers.

The above considerations indicate that the Polybian figures could be very much misleading, and much too low without our being able to assess the margin of error. Cicero in a wellknown passage⁵ records that the *proletarii* of Rome numerically were the dominating component of the free population of the Urbs, but this is valid for his time only, when the general process of urbanization had considerably increased the population of Rome. Clearly we cannot apply this statement directly to preceding periods or to small allied city states of Italy. Nevertheless, it is feasible that the *proletarii* constituted a fairly high percentage of the population.

Projecting our conclusions on the comparison of the population figures of the years 225 and 70/69 B. C. and accepting the fairly well established

¹ Cf. Livy, 27, 10, 3.

² 3: 1², 321.

³ BRUNT, 58 f. does not approve of this view.

⁴ Cf. RUOFF, pp. 47 ff. above, and further, HARRIS, 116 ff. with regard to the merciless suppression of the rebellion in 264 B. C.

⁵ *Rep.* 2, 40.

view that the free population of Italy on the whole remained numerically on the same level during the 145 intervening years, we find that behind the figures of the 70/69 B. C. census must be hidden a numerous free population not recorded anywhere in the Roman registers. This population was caught by the reformed census system of Octavian, which in 29/28 B. C. registered 4,063,000 adult male citizens. The size of the previously uncounted population may seem surprisingly large (1.5-2.5 million if we are to trust Brunt's calculations referred to above). On the other hand, the modest size of the population of Italy, the conqueror of the Mediterranean world, would have been equally surprising if Brunt's and, above all, Beloch's calculations be trusted. At any rate, I find it possible to explain the quadrupling of the number of male adult citizens¹ with reference to the probability that a considerable part of the Romans enlisted as citizens for the first time in 29/28 B. C. were Italians, who previously had refused or simply omitted to be registered at the census and thus to acquire the citizenship legally within their reach.

Leaving population statistics aside, we should now consider why Octavian's first census was so much more effective than all the preceding ones. One reason has been mentioned in passing: twelve years after the *bellum Perusinum*, when one man was unchallenged master of the world, the risks of registering, the risks of being in view, the risks of being discovered possibly as belonging, by chance, to the wrong side in the Italy of internal feuds, had ceased to be a reality of everyday life. On the other hand, Octavian's census should also be regarded as an outcome of the new master's conscious policy of unifying all Italy, in concordance with the political aspirations of Caesar. The new and enlarged *Italia* was going to be the basis of a new ruling class, which, connected with Octavian-Augustus by ties of personal loyalty, was to counterbalance the Urban aristocracy. Regarded in this light, the Romanization of Italy assumes the character of a political programme of considerable importance².

Romanization was carried out with recourse to a system of social and political control. The instructions regarding the census were but a part of this controlling machinery. In what follows, we shall therefore discuss the policy of Romanization as one facet of the general policy of Augustus.

¹ The increase of their numbers from 910,000 in 70/69 to 4,063,000 in 29/28 B. C.

² I cannot agree with SALMON (144) "Conscious romanization may not have been his (i.e. Augustus') deliberate, much less his principal aim, but romanization was his undoubted achievement", at least not as far as Augustus' political intentions are concerned.

8. ROMANIZATION: A POLITICAL EXPEDIENT UNDER AUGUSTUS

Different studies carried out within the frame-work of this volume have indicated that according to the epitaphs, the Latinization of Etruria starts towards the end of the second and in the early first century B. C., Volaterrae¹ being an exception². In this context, however, it should be noted that our studies were concerned with a particular kind of material, with monuments generally speaking belonging to the domestic sphere. As such they give no indication of whether, and possibly, to what extent, Latin was spoken in Etruria at the time when the monuments in question were erected.

The Romanization follows in the wake of the Latinization. This more recent change implies in this context and according to the criteria employed in these studies that for their own burial grounds and burial customs the Etruscan substitute Roman ones. This concludes the long process of Romanization in Etruria as well as, *mutatis mutandis*, in all of Italy during the reigns of Augustus and Tiberius³.

As emphasized above⁴, Romanization constituted one of the means employed to unite and unify Italy. The Romans cannot be regarded as nationalists in the modern sense of the word⁵ since *populus Romanus* from the very beginning was a political and not an ethnic concept. Therefore, Romanization was never a process of conscious or even systematic denationalization⁶, although it could be said that "die freiwillige Übernahme des römischen Lebensstils war jedoch immer äusserst erwünscht"⁷.

The political aims of Romanization can be found on a different level. Caesar had with artful singlemindedness developed the experience of the political leaders of the earlier generations: to engage the Italians in the

¹ Discussed above, pp. 220 f.

² The finds of Asciano, located not very far from Volaterrae, appear to correspond closely to those of Volaterrae. They should probably be referred to a *villa rustica*. For Asciano, cf. above p. 218 and HARRIS, 179 f., 314 f.

³ Cf. pp. 22 ff., 26 above.

⁴ p. 229.

⁵ Cf. KAIMHO, p. 100 above.

⁶ FR. VITTINGHOFF, *Römische Kolonisation und Bürgerrechtspolitik unter Caesar und Augustus*, Akad. Wiss. u. Lit. (Münch.), Abh. der Geistes- u. Sozialwiss. Kl., 1951, 14, 9.

⁷ Ibid.

struggle for power in Rome. He brought new men from across the Po and even from across the Alps to serve the commonwealth, but they were all under personal obligations to him personally for their advancement¹. But Caesar went further and "attempted to bind to himself in a kind of superclientela all the senators and citizens alike"². The Senate legislated that all citizens should take an oath³ to his Genius, and Lily Ross Taylor⁴ notes that the pertinent passages in Suetonius⁵ and Appian⁶ indicate that everyone took it, although there was not time before Caesar's death to administer the oath universally. The oath was "much like the oath the Italians took to Livius Drusus⁷, and also like the oaths of allegiance later taken to the emperors... By this oath, actually taken or to be taken by all Romans, Caesar was accepted as the patron or rather the *pater* of the whole state and the old relationship of *fides*, the tie that bound patron and client or father and son, united him with all the citizens"⁸.

Augustus realized the importance of creating such a relationship between the political leader and the population, and although he maintains that *tota Italia, sua sponte* "took an oath of allegiance to me and demanded me as its leader in the war that I won at Actium"⁹, Ross Taylor¹⁰ is certainly correct in assuming that "there were doubtless efficient gaulceiters to whip up the 'spontaneity'"¹¹.

¹ ROSS TAYLOR, *PP*, 174.

² Ibid., cf. also 197, n. 41.

³ VON PREMIERSTEIN's *Vom Werden und Wesen des Principats* is of fundamental importance for the understanding of the new kind of relationship between the political leadership and the population as reflected in the oath of allegiance and in the titles such as *parens* or *pater patriae*. L. ROSS TAYLOR, quoted in several instances in the text, expressly acknowledges her indebtedness to the German scholar (*PP*, 174).

⁴ Loc. cit.

⁵ *Id.* 84, 2; 85.

⁶ *BC* 2, 124; 137; 139; 145.

⁷ For which, cf. above p. 463, and RUOFF, pp. 72 ff. - PREMIERSTEIN, 29 f., in his discussion of the authenticity of Diodorus' account of this oath (37,11) notes that even if the entire incident were to be regarded as spurious, it would be highly significant "für die in der endenden Republik den Parteiführern von ihren Gefolgschaften geschworenen Eide". Otherwise, a forgery would have been meaningless.

⁸ *PP*, 174 f.

⁹ *Res Gestae* 25.

¹⁰ *PP*, 177.

¹¹ For the importance of the oath in general, see SYME, 284 f., 288 f. and PREMIERSTEIN, "Die Gefolgschaftseide für die Parteiführer der ausgehenden Republik", 26-32, and "Der Treueid für den Diktator Cäsar vom Jahre 44 v. Chr.", 32-36.

In addition to associating to him personally *tota Italia* by a solemn oath, Augustus carried out the Caesarian programme, when in 2 B. C. he was named *pater patriae*. In a brilliant analysis of Augustus' acceptance of this title or rather, as shown by Suetonius¹, of this *cognomen*, A. Alföldi² regards it as a real Augustan masterpiece of political cunning and staging. He points out its main features with reference to the pertinent texts³. The three first of these are of a certain relevance to us in this context, namely, (1) the initiative taken by the people with emphasis on the totality of the population, (2) the consensus of the plebs with the higher strata of the population, and (3) the free will of the citizens in taking the decision.

The properties of the *cognomen pater patriae*⁴ are in fact those "einer Herrscherbezeichnung, eines kaiserlichen Monopols"⁵. The character of the *patria potestas* implies supreme command and consequently nullifies the voluntary subordination⁶ suggested by the ceremony. Subsequently, the *cognomen patris patriae* becomes an important factor in the legal theory of the Principate, and an instrument of absolutism⁷.

The two incidents, on the one hand the administering of the oath to Octavian and, on the other the conferring of the name of *pater patriae* on Augustus, besides showing the first *princeps* as a master of political tactics, prove that he really paid heed to the masses of the population and not to the nobles only. This is, then, in a way a support of the views expressed with regard to Octavian's first census⁸.

After the victory of Actium political propaganda depicted the war as a national Italian war, as "a spontaneous and patriotic movement"⁹. The propaganda served a twofold purpose. On the one hand, it emphasized the role of Augustus as the *dux* and saviour of all Italy in a moment of terrible danger; on the other, it exalted the *Italia virtus* "ingrained in the Sabines of old and in Etruria, when Etruria was martial"¹⁰. It is true that this latter moment indirectly implied also boasting of Roman valour

¹ *Aug.* 58, 1.

² *Der Vater des Vaterlandes im römischen Denken*, 93-97.

³ *Res Gestae* 35; *Suet. Aug.* 58, 1-2; *Fasti Praenestini*, and *Ovid. Fast.* 2, 127 f.

⁴ Which represents a higher degree of the honorary title of *parens patriae* accorded to Caesar; cf. *PREMERSTEIN*, 167 ff.

⁵ *Alföldi*, 97.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 96.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 97.

⁸ Cf. p. 476, above.

⁹ *SYME*, 440.

¹⁰ *SYME*, 449; cf. *Verg. Georg.* 2, 532 ff., and also 2, 167 ff.

because Rome had, after all, conquered Italy; nevertheless, the most important message was addressed to all the ethnic groups of Italy which now, united as a nation, had carried the day at Actium.

The oath of allegiance, a political expedient conceived by Caesar, and fully exploited by Augustus, required a political organization in order to be translated into terms of political reality. "Efficient gauleiters to whip up the 'spontaneity'" to quote L. Ross Taylor once more, cannot have been sufficient. To administer the oath to all Italians presupposes a control of the population, possibly not very different from the machinery later actuated for the purposes of the census.

In fact, we can see in many different contexts that rule by Augustus was based on rigid controls¹ and registrations of different kind. Pliny² records some of the work done by Augustus "urbesque (sc. Italiae) enumerabimus, quae in re praefari necessarium est auctorem nos divum Augustum secuturos discriptionemque ab eo factam Italiae totius in regiones XI..." It would seem that Augustus both listed the towns of the Italian tribes and divided Italy into eleven regions³. Again, Augustus' list is a geographical inventory containing a list of the towns in the individual parts of the Roman Empire, in the provinces as well as Italy, as suggested by Thomsen⁴, who in agreement with previous researchers notes that the lists are connected with the Roman census⁵. Obviously we can go a step further and regard them as based on the Roman census⁶.

The division of Italy into regions, also mentioned by Pliny, cannot be dated with certainty. The regions were no doubt to a great extent used as geographical units in the administration of Italy⁷. Thomsen has emphasized the likelihood that they were created about A. D. 6 when the *vicesima hereditatum* was introduced⁸. This Augustan reform appears to be yet another example of the connexion of the census, or rather, of the registration implying control, and the efficiency of the Augustan administration.

¹ Apart from the supervisions carried out by various officials, Augustus' programme of colonization may have been an efficient physical control of the activities of the Italian tribes; cf. *HARRIS*, 313 f.

² *NH* 3, 46.

³ R. THOMSEN, *The Italic Regions from Augustus to the Lombard Invasion*. *Classica et Mediaevalia*. Dissertationes 4, København 1947, 32.

⁴ 33.

⁵ The lists have in fact been named *tabulae censoriae*. They may represent the statistics of the Empire; cf. THOMSEN, 34.

⁶ THOMSEN, 42, 45.

⁷ THOMSEN, 311.

⁸ 29; cf. also 150 ff., 178 f.

Dio¹ records that Augustus in A. D. 4 decided to register all Italians who had a fortune of over 200,000 sesterces. Brunt² regards it as a probable preparation for the introduction of the new tax³.

The registration of A. D. 4 is one proof of the fact that censuses under Augustus could be of different kinds and serve different purposes. We may add to those mentioned above the provincial censuses⁴, which were mainly employed with regard to taxation. We know today that Roman registration by birth according to Egyptian papyri was established by Augustus in the *lex Aelia Sentia* of A. D. 4 and by the *lex Papia Poppaea* of A. D. 9⁵ although we do not know how rapidly the employment of the *commentarii civitate Romana donatorum* was instituted in the provinces of the Empire.

We have demonstrated above that the unification of Italy was a crucial point in the political programme of Augustus, and as such a direct continuation of the policy of Caesar. To be realized it required uniformity, i.e. in our case Romanization. The traditional Roman census offered a means of carrying these plans into effect. It is natural to assume that Octavian, using the Caesarian stipulations of the *tabula Heracleensis* as a point of departure, modified the forms of the census taking so as to meet his particular requirements.

The census, however, was also of considerable importance for the policy of Octavian in other respects. It could be regarded as a corner-stone for the system of controls based on exact information regarding the Roman commonwealth, which the first principles gradually developed. This is one additional item of support for our supposition above that the census of 29/28 B. C. was taken with all possible care and thoroughness—to the extent that the numerous *incensi* of the Italian tribes finally were eliminated⁶. It would make no wonder if the outcome of this census would have been one of the reasons for Augustus' *cura legum et morum*⁷ and for his legislation aimed to rectify the prevailing demographic trend in Rome and in Italy.

¹ 55, 13, 4.

² 115.

³ THOMSEN suggests that the districts of tax-collection were formed on the basis of the regions (150).

⁴ As different from the census of the Roman citizens in the provinces, cf. H. BRAUNERT, 'Der römische Provinzialzensus und der Schätzungsbericht des Lukas-Evangeliums', *Historia*, 6 (1957), 197-200.

⁵ F. SCHULZ, 'Roman Registers of Births and Birth Certificates', *JRS*, 32 (1942) and 33 (1943); cf. *JRS*, 32 (1942), 80.

⁶ For this, cf. also p. 495, above.

⁷ *Res Gestae* 6.

9. THE ROMANIZED ETRUSCANS: AN EPILOGUE

With the Pax Romana established in Italy both because of, and followed by Augustan propaganda, the consequences of the emphasis on the virtues of the old days and also on the *Italia virtus* become apparent¹. The political controversies of yesterday are forgotten. Unified Italy remembers the individual components of the struggle of the day before yesterday, the components which had all been integrated in the vast and mighty Roman commonwealth.

The initiative is, of course, Roman. The Augustan poets play an important part in showing the way², but in addition definite steps were taken in order to increase the selfconsciousness of the integrated peoples. Such a policy was not dangerous any more. The antiquarian pursuits of Augustus, demonstrated by *Res Gestae* also, most certainly had political implications. We are probably justified in saying with Syme³ that the newborn Italo-Roman nationalism, coming to a head in the myth of Actium, also had religious aspects. This is shown by the revival of old cults and of the old colleges of priests⁴, an intrinsic part of the general policy of the early Principate.

In Etruria the political traditions are brought to new life, but at the same time their course is diverted into religious channels. The Etruscan League is resuscitated, but as an exclusively religious association. There had been a *silath mexl rasnas* at the head of the League⁵. At the head of the new league stood annually elected *aediles*, from the time of Hadrian a *praetor Etruriae*, the emperor himself being the first holder of this office.

The date of the revival of the League is in doubt. It has been connected with Augustus' division of Italy into regions because the seventh region

¹ Cf. *Res Gestae* 8: "[m]ulta exempla maiorum exolescentia iam ex nostro [sic]cullo red[uxi et ipse] multarum rer[um] exempla imitanda pos[teris tradidi]".

² Cf. J. GAGÉ, 'Les Étrusques dans l'Énéide', *MEFR*, 1929, 141 ff. conjecturing Vergil's and Augustus' way of thinking; G. DUMÉZIL, 'Grandeur et décadence des Étrusques chez les poètes Augustéens, Propertiana II', *Latomus*, 10 (1951), 293-296; B. LIOT, *Praetores Etruriae XV populorum*. (*Étude d'épigraphie*). Collection Latomus, 106, 86.

³ 448.

⁴ *Res Gestae* 7.

⁵ LIOT, 94 f.; the last one known is from the second century B. C. At that time the League was of no consequence politically.

was made to coincide with the territory of Etruria¹. This would certainly have been consonant with the general policy of Augustus². There are, however, also reasons for referring the renaissance of the Etruscan league to the reign of Claudius³, who was particularly interested in things Etruscan⁴. His reformist activities in this field are recorded by Suetonius⁵. Claudius had revived or reorganized the old order of *haruspices*⁶, and there is a certain analogy between this reorganization and the reconstruction of the League of the Etruscan cities⁷.

The emperors of the early Principate, or at any rate, some of them, seemed to pursue a conservative policy with regard to Etruria and the Etruscans once unified Italy was safely under control. How did the Etruscans react to the imperial patronage?

The new antiquarian traditions created by Augustus, by Claudius, and by Hadrian, appear to have met with the approval of the Etruscans and their local nobilities. Suffice it to record a few points in support of this view.

Roman officials of Etruscan origin or ancestry settling down in their native city, accepting honorary appointments as *aediles* or *praetores Etruriae* and in many cases thereby crowning a distinguished career in the service of the Empire⁸, prove that the reforms were approved of. Moreover, a Caceretan relief⁹ referred to the reign of Claudius¹⁰ shows the *populi Etruriae* offering their thanks to the emperor for the revival of the League¹¹. Their attitude would not have been very different from the one of the Sabines or the Samnites¹².

¹ Cf. E. BORMANN, 'Der Städtebund Etruriens', *ArchEpigrMittÖst.-Ungarn*, 11 (1887), 118 ff., and LIOU, 92.

² LIOU, 86, 95.

³ H. H. SCULLARD, *The Etruscan Cities and Rome*, London 1967, 282 f.

⁴ Cf. LIOU, 95 f.; HARRIS, 27-30.

⁵ *Claud.* 22, 1.

⁶ J. HEURGON, *Daily Life of the Etruscans*, London 1964, 233 ff., with reference to his earlier study 'Tarquinius Priscus et l'organisation de l'ordre des haruspices sous l'empereur Claude', *Latomus*, 12 (1953), 402-415.

⁷ LIOU, 95.

⁸ LIOU's conspectus of the *praetores Etruriae*, 79, and of the *aediles*, 81.

⁹ Illustrated by LIOU, Pl. XI.

¹⁰ Cf. LIOU, 96 with reference to L. CANINA's publication of 1840. The relief was the point of departure of BORMANN's study, mentioned above; cf. BORMANN, 104, and it was commented upon by GAGÉ also, 144.

¹¹ An interpretation proposed by SCULLARD, 283 f., and accepted by LIOU.

¹² G. DEVOTO, 'La romanisation de l'Italie médiane', *Cahiers d'histoire mondiale*, 3 (1956), 459 f., discussing the reaction to the Romanization in the Osco-Umbrian

Of approximately the same date as the relief are the *elogia Tarquiniensia*¹, which testify to the endeavours of Roman families of Etruscan origin to revive the glorious past of their native country². Seen against this background it is quite remarkable that the Etruscan language fell into disuse and was forgotten³, although this fact should be regarded as a highly significant indication of the success of the Augustan Romanization of Etruria.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ADAMESTEANU D., - M. TORELLI, 'Il nuovo frammento della tabula Bantina', *AC*, 21 (1969), 1-17.
- ATZELIUS A., *Die römische Eroberung Italiens (340-264 v. Chr.)*. Acta Jutlandica. Aarskrift for Aarhus Universitet, 14: 3 (1942).
- AUFÖLDI A., *Der Vater des Vaterlandes im römischen Denken*. Darmstadt 1971.
- BELOCH K. J., *Die Bevölkerung der griechisch-römischen Welt*. Leipzig 1886.
- BORMANN E., 'Der Städtebund Etruriens', *ArchEpigrMittÖst.-Ungarn*, 11 (1887), 103-126.
- BRAUNERT H., 'Der römische Provinzialzensus und der Schätzungsbericht des Lukas-Evangeliums', *Historia*, 6 (1957), 192-214.
- BRAUNT P. A., *Italian Manpower from 225 B.C. to A.D. 14*. Oxford 1971.
- CARCOPINO J., 'Sur un passage de la chronique de Saint-Jérôme', *Mélanges Fr. Martroye*, Paris 1940, 73-79.
- CHILVER G. E. F., *Cisalpine Gaul*. Oxford 1941.
- DAHLHEIM W., *Struktur und Entwicklung des römischen Völkerrechts im 3. und 2. Jahrhundert v. Chr.* Vestigia 8, München 1968.
- DEVOTO G., 'La romanisation de l'Italie médiane', *Cahiers d'histoire mondiale*, 3 (1950), 443-462.

regions, remarks: "Les citoyens des terres sabines ou du Samnium, tout en parlant latin, tout en étant citoyens romains, tout en acceptant plus tard le christianisme, gardent les caractéristiques spirituelles ancestrales, des usages juridiques et économiques qui ont survécu".

¹ Cf. HARRIS, 28 n. 5 with bibliography; LIOU, 84, n. 6.

² Regarded in this light, it is of no consequence whether or not the historical statements of the *elogia* are authentic.

³ I agree with HARRIS, 183 f. that MAZZARINO, 98 f., cf. also 120, has not succeeded in demonstrating that Gellius (*Noct. Att.* 11, 7, 4) would be *proof of the survival* of Etruscan as a living language in the time of Marcus Aurelius or even later. Gellius may have referred to some unintelligible religious formula still used by the haruspices. The *agrestis sermo* of Etruria may well have preserved a number of words and expressions alien to the literary *élite*, but this does not prove that "l'etrusca lingua si conservò...fino al 2° secolo d.C.". With regard to the extinction of Etruscan in urban culture, there is no disagreement.

- DUMÉZIL G., 'Grandeur et décadence des Étrusques chez les poètes augustéens. Propertiana II'. *Latomus*, 10 (1951), 293-296.
- FRANK T., *Economic Survey of Ancient Rome I. Rome and Italy of the Republic*. Baltimore 1933 (= FRANK, *ES-AR I*).
- FRANK T., 'Roman Census Statistics from 225 to 28 B.C.'. *CIPh*, 19 (1924), 329-341 (= FRANK, *CIPh*, 19 (1924)).
- GAGÉ J., 'Les Étrusques dans l'Énéide'. *MEFR*, 1929, 115-144.
- GALSTERER H., 'Die lex Osa Tabulae Bantinae Eine Bestandsaufnahme'. *Chiron*, 1 (1971), 191-214.
- GÖHLER J., *Rom und Italien*. Breslau hist. Forschungen, 13. Breslau, 1939.
- GOUDINEAU CHR., *La céramique Arétine lisse*. Fouilles de l'École Française de Rome à Bolsena (Poggio Moscini) 1962-1967, IV. *MEFR*, Suppl. 6, Paris 1968.
- HARRIS W. V., *Rome in Etruria and Umbria*. Oxford 1971.
- HEURGON J., *Daily Life of the Etruscans*, transl. J. Kirkup. London 1964.
- HEURGON J., 'Tarquinius Priscus et l'organisation de l'ordre des haruspices sous l'empereur Claude'. *Latomus*, 12 (1953), 402-415.
- KRAWCZEK A., *Kolonizacja Sulańska*. Polska Akademia Nauk, Kraków, Prace Komisji Nauk Historycznych 4, 1960.
- LEVY E., 'Libertas and Civitas'. *ZSS*, 76 (1961), *Rom. Abt.*, 160-166.
- LIOT B., *Praetores Etruria XV populum*. (*Étude d'épigraphie*). Collection Latomus, 106, Bruxelles 1969.
- MAZZARINO S., 'Sociologia del mondo etrusco e problemi della tarda etruscità'. *Historia*, 6 (1957), 98-122.
- MUTTELSE E., *Untersuchungen über die Lex Julia Municipalis*. Freiburg 1913.
- PIERI G., *L'histoire du cens jusqu'à la fin de la république romaine*. Publ. de l'Institut de droit romain de l'Université de Paris, 25, Paris 1968.
- PREMERSTEIN (von) A., 'Die Tafel von Heraclea'. *ZSS*, 43 (1922), *Rom. Abt.*, 45-152 (=PREMERSTEIN, *ZSS*, 43).
- PREMERSTEIN (von) A., *Vom Werden und Wesen des Prinzipats*. Abh. bayer. Akad. der Wiss., phil.-hist. Abt., N.F., 15 (1937) (=PREMERSTEIN).
- RIX H., *Das etruskische Cognomen*. Wiesbaden 1963.
- ROTONDI G., *Leges publicae populi Romani*. Hildesheim 1962.
- SALMON E. T., *Roman Colonization under the Republic*. London 1969.
- SANCTIS G. DE, *Storia dei Romani* 3:1². Firenze 1967.
- SCHÖNBAUER E., 'Die Tafel von Heraklea in neuer Beleuchtung'. *Anzeiger der öst. Akad. Wiss., phil.-hist. Kl.*, 89 (1952, Wien, 1953), 109-132.
- SCHULZ F., 'Roman Registers of Births and Birth Certificates'. *JRS*, 32 (1942), 78-91; 33 (1943), 55-64.
- SCULLARD H. H., *The Etruscan Cities and Rome*. London 1967.
- SHERWIN-WHITE A. N., *The Roman Citizenship*. Oxford 1939.
- SUOLAHTI J., *The Roman Censors. A Study on Social Structure*. Annales Acad. Scient. Fenn. B, 117. Helsinki 1963.
- SYME R., *The Roman Revolution*. Oxford 1939.
- TAYLOR L. ROSS, *Party Politics in the Age of Caesar*. Sather Classical Lectures, 22. Univ. of California, 1949 (=TAYLOR, *PP*).
- TAYLOR L. ROSS, *The Roman Voting Assemblies*. Ann Arbor 1966.
- THOMSEN R., *The Italic Regions from Augustus to the Lombard Invasion. Classica et Mediaevalia*. Dissertationes, 4, København 1947.

- TIBILETTI G., 'La politica delle colonie e città latine nella Guerra Sociale'. *Rend IstLomb*, 86 (1953), 45-63.
- TORELLI M., 'Senatori etruschi della tarda repubblica e dell'impero'. *DialArch*, 3 (1969), 285-363.
- TOYNBEE A., *Hannibal's Legacy I-II*. Oxford 1965.
- TREGGIARI S., *Roman Freedmen during the Late Republic*. Oxford 1969.
- UNTERMANN J., *Die venetischen Personennamen*. Wiesbaden 1961.
- VITTINGHOFF FR., *Römische Kolonisation und Bürgerrechtspolitik unter Caesar und Augustus*. Akad. der Wiss. und der Lit. (Mainz). Abh. der Geistes- und Sozialwiss. Kl., Jhrg. 1951, 14.
- WISEMAN T. P., *New Men in the Roman Senate 139 B.C. - 14 A.D.* Oxford 1971 (=WISEMAN, *New Men*).
- WISEMAN T. P., 'The Census in the First Century B.C.'. *JRS*, 59 (1969), 59-75.
- WISEMAN T. P., 'The Portraits of Vibienus and Rufrenus at Arretium'. *Mnemosyne*, 16 (1963), 275-283.