

LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS

HANS BECK, McGill University, Montreal, Canada
FRANCISCO BELTRÁN LLORIS, Universidad de Zaragoza, Spain
WOLFGANG BLÖSEL, Universität Duisburg-Essen, Germany
PAUL BURTON, Australian National University, Canberra, Australia
MICHEL CHRISTOL, Université de Paris 1 Panthéon Sorbonne, France
CLAUDE EILERS, McMaster University, Hamilton, Canada
ANGELA GANTER, Goethe Universität, Frankfurt am Main, Germany
ESTELA GARCÍA FERNÁNDEZ, Universidad Complutense, Madrid, Spain
ENRIQUE GARCÍA RIAZA, Universitat de les Illes Balears, Palma de Mallorca, Spain
FRÉDÉRIC HURLET, Université de Paris Ouest Nanterre La Défense, France
MARTIN JEHNE, Technische Universität Dresden, Germany
FRANCISCO PINA POLO, Universidad de Zaragoza, Spain
JONATHAN R. W. PRAG, University of Oxford, United Kingdom
CRISTINA ROSILLO-LÓPEZ, Universidad Pablo de Olavide, Sevilla, Spain
MICHAEL SNOWDON, York University, Toronto, Canada
ARNAUD SUSPÈNE, Université d'Orléans, France
CLAUDIA TIERSCH, Humboldt-Universität Berlin, Germany
FERNANDO WULFF ALONSO, Universidad de Málaga, Spain

INTRODUCTION

Martin Jehne / Francisco Pina Polo

For more than fifty years, Badian's *Foreign Clientelae* has been the standard reference book for the relationships between Rome and foreign states or individuals in the provinces of the Empire during the Republic. In his Ph.D. dissertation Badian followed in the footsteps of scholars such as Fustel de Coulanges, Premerstein, Gelzer, Syme and Harmand (although his book was published too late to be taken into account by Badian). All had previously published on *clientelae* in Rome and in the provinces, and had thus been responsible for shaping a particular view of the subject. Badian took most of his fundamental ideas from his predecessors, but as an innovation he developed a methodology to identify provincial *clientelae* globally across the whole of the Mediterranean, mainly through the onomastics contained in the epigraphy of the Early Empire. According to Badian, the abundant client-patron ties that were formed between provincials and prominent Roman citizens during their time in the provinces were the basis of Roman control after military conquest. This client-patron network had a double impact, on international politics and on Rome's internal politics. Although some of Badian's statements have been challenged, his main conclusions have influenced scholarship deeply for decades, and indeed to the present day.

A conference on the topic of 'Provincial *clientelae* in the Roman Empire: A reconsideration' was held at the University of Zaragoza (Spain) on 14–15 March 2013.¹ This book collects the contributions presented at the conference. It intends to proceed beyond the paradigm that has dominated scholarship since the publication of Badian's *Foreign Clientelae*, and even earlier. Understandably, Badian is very much present in most of the articles, generally from a critical point of view. This volume aims to review the political role played by foreign *clientelae* in Italy and the provinces as well as in Rome during the Republican period, with the exception of the last paper, which focuses on the High Empire. To this end, the relationship between Roman *imperatores* or governors and provincials is explored in the Western Empire (Hispania, Gaul, North Africa) as well as in the Eastern Mediterranean. How foreign *clientelae* were perceived in Rome and to what extent they

1 The conference was the last step of the project 'Provincial *clientelae* in the Western Roman Empire' (HAR2010–16449), financed by the Spanish Ministerio de Economía y Competitividad. The project was based at the University of Zaragoza and was coordinated by Francisco Pina Polo. The colloquium was also sponsored by the Fritz Thyssen Stiftung and the Institución Fernando el Católico.

The editors would like to thank Charlotte Tupman for checking the English version of several articles included in the volume, as well as María García Magán (Zaragoza) and Fabian Knopf (Dresden) for their collaboration in the edition and for the indices.

could influence internal politics, are likewise scrutinised. One paper focuses on the significance of *clientelae* for military service. Finally, the last contributions explore the role of provincial *clientelae* beyond the Republic.

The volume begins with a section that serves as a methodological introduction: *Clientela at Rome and in the provinces: Some methodological and historiographical remarks*. Consequently, the first two articles are in a sense complementary. Francisco Pina Polo first makes a historiographical introduction to the topic of foreign *clientelae*. He then rejects the methodology used by Badian to identify provincial *clientelae* globally through onomastics, since it has led to a distorted view of the expansion and significance of provincial *clientelae*. Pina Polo consequently argues for a re-evaluation of the phenomenon as a necessary means to understand with greater clarity the relations between Roman aristocrats and provincials. On the basis of Dionysius of Halicarnassus' definition of *clientela*, Angela Ganter then deconstructs the historiographical approaches to urban *clientelae* at Rome as a comparison with the similar process for foreign *clientelae*. Her contribution challenges the prevailing perception of the history of Republican *clientelae* as a process of decline, and instead proposes to read the ancient authors as witnesses of contemporary mentalities rather than echoing their conceptions of Roman history in a literal manner.

The subsequent papers focus on Italy: *Rome and Italy: Interstate relations and individual connections*. Hans Beck analyses how the family connections between Roman elite and Italian aristocracies forged by intermarriage had a significant impact on the relationship among communities during the early and middle Republican period. Accordingly, Beck emphasises the importance of the human factor as a means of explaining the relations between Rome and its allies, as well as the specific role played by women. Fernando Wulff Alonso makes a profound and very detailed dissection of Badian's view of Rome's changing relations with Italy throughout the Republic, notably of how after the Hannibalic war *clientela* was, in Badian's opinion, a key factor for the consolidation of Roman control over Italy and increasingly over the provinces. Wolfgang Blösel, for his part, focuses in particular on a passage of Livy (28.45) that he claims to be fictitious. As a result, Livy's story cannot be used according to Blösel as evidence for the existence of extensive foreign *clientelae* in Italy acquired by the Scipio family as early as the end of the third century B. C.

The third section is devoted to three territories in the Western Roman Empire: Hispania, Gaul and North Africa. The first three papers in this section refer to Hispania. Estela García Fernández discusses the relationship between *clientela* and Latin onomastic dissemination in Hispania, providing an alternative historical explanation for this phenomenon. Upon reviewing the evidence, she argues that there may have been a larger number of communities in Hispania with Latin status during the Republic than had previously been assumed. Therefore, supposed examples of name imitation would actually be instances of populations with Latin status making legal use of Latin names. Enrique García Riaza analyses the diplomatic relationships between Rome and Hispanic communities from the Hannibalic war until 133 B. C. In contradiction to Badian, he states that Roman expansion in Hispania was

not supported by individual connections that could be characterised as client-patron ties. From the beginning of the conquest there was rather a significant Roman institutional factor perceived as a reality by the indigenous population, to some extent because of the legacy of the organised Punic presence in the Iberian Peninsula. Finally, Francisco Beltrán Lloris focuses on the institution of *hospitium publicum* granted by provincial cities to prominent Romans. He claims that this legal institution was something more than a mere appendix of *patronatus*. To this purpose, Beltrán Lloris uses as a case study the appointment of Balbus the Elder as *hospes publicus* in Gades in southern Hispania, which is the earliest known example of *hospitium publicum* bestowed upon a Roman citizen by a provincial city. The case of Balbus and Gades reveals the differences between *hospitium* and patronage in the first century B.C., and shows that *hospitium* was not simply an instrument for the control of provincials.

Michel Christol aims to go beyond Badian's catalogue contained in Appendix B of his *Foreign Clientelae*. Christol analyses the dispersion and exact location of names of Republican *imperatores* such as Marius, Domitius, Valerius and Pompeius in Transalpine Gaul, as well as their significance for the integration of provincial elites in the Roman Empire. The next two articles are focused on North Africa. Frédéric Hurllet examines, from the creation of the province of Africa in 146 until the Augustan age, the relationship between Roman governors and provincials as a possible source of *clientelae*, as well as their territorial extension and durability. Hurllet takes the critical use of North African onomastics in relation to the known governors and the granting of Roman citizenship to provincials as a starting point. Although the identification of North African clients comes with great methodological difficulties, to Hurllet it is plausible that the presence of Roman governors resulted in the creation of individual and collective *clientelae* in the province. However, it is highly uncertain whether such *clientelae* can be characterised by their long fidelity to specific patrons. Arnaud Suspène uses numismatics as his principal source of evidence, in particular the coinage of King Juba II of Mauretania. Suspène explores the personal way in which Juba II was able to exhibit and emphasise his friendship with Rome through the carefully designed monetary politics that he developed. Juba's strategy strengthens the idea of *amicitia* and *societas* being the best terms to describe the different relationships established between kings and Rome in the Roman Empire, instead of the generalised and ambiguous use of the term *clientela*.

The fourth section of the book considers the Eastern Mediterranean: *Amicitia and foreign clientelae in the Eastern Mediterranean*. One of the main points refers to the debate about the definition of interstate and personal relations within the semantic field of *amicitia*, or rather *clientela* as used by Badian in a broad sense. Michael Snowdon focuses on the documentary material preserved in the epigraphic record as the best source to study the interactions between Rome and other states, for epigraphic texts are, in his words, real "artefacts of the functioning Empire." This approach allows us to understand the real significance of the word friendship when used in a Roman senatorial decree or in a Greek civic decree. Friendship was not, as Badian argued, a polite word preferred in order to avoid the supposedly more

appropriate but embarrassing term *clientela*. *Amicitia* fits perfectly the relationship between Rome and the Greek cities looking for a balance between traditional Greek freedom and increasing Roman hegemony. Paul Burton analyses the war launched in 195 by Flamininus against the Spartan King Nabis. He does not see it as a mere war of aggression in the broader context of Roman imperialism, but rather as a moral response that ought to be understood within the prerogatives and obligations of international friendship, in this case the Roman-Spartan *amicitia*. Finally, the process by which the province of Cyprus was created in the year 56 B.C. is the topic addressed by Claudia Tiersch in her article. Direct provincialisation was often rejected by the Roman senate, because it necessitated the installation of a magistrate with largely uncontrolled military resources. During the Late Republic this strategy of refusal could no longer work, because the security of several regions became problematic as a consequence of deficient administration. For all of this, the process of the provincialisation of Cyprus, inspired only by the aim of using the province's income to bolster the Roman state treasure, with no concern for administrative responsibilities, can nonetheless illustrate that Roman internal interests alone shaped provincial policy. No substantial differences between *optimates* and *populares* could be established in this aspect of policy.

One of Badian's conclusions was the indisputable political impact, in his opinion, that provincial *clientelae* had in Rome. According to Badian, some politicians, most notably Pompey, took advantage of their more or less extensive connections in the provinces in order to gain a privileged position in Roman society and politics. The next section of the book is devoted to some aspects of this subject, as well as to the possible influence of foreign *clientelae* on military service: *The impact of foreign clientelae in Rome: political and military aspects*.

Cristina Rosillo-López reconsiders the widely acknowledged view that foreign *clientelae* were a source of status for Roman politicians, especially during the first century B.C. According to her, the existence of foreign clients was difficult to communicate to other members of the elite and to the people within the city of Rome. Furthermore, the sources suggest that the existence of such clients was unpopular among non-elite citizens, due to the association of the former with extortion trials and the undue enrichment of the elite. In contradiction to the *communis opinio*, Rosillo-López concludes that foreign *clientelae* did not constitute a source of prestige for senators in the city of Rome.

To what extent did the relations between Roman and non-Roman elites facilitate military service of provincial soldiers (*auxilia externa*)? This is the question addressed by Jonathan Prag. The role of such military service was undervalued by Badian, except in relation to the dynasts of the civil war period. Direct evidence for recruitment through client networks is lacking, but military service of this sort, according to Prag, was generally facilitated by elite interpersonal relationships. Such relationships may be categorised in terms of *amicitia*, but other ways of constructing a relationship with the Roman state were no less important, such as grants of citizenship. However, even if such military service should not be examined in terms of client-patron relationships, it nevertheless remains the case that the interpersonal

elite relations that military service generated could provide the basis for the development of personal patronage on the part of elite Romans.

The last section of the book (*Foreign clientelae beyond the Republic*) deals with the changes experienced during the last decades of the Republic and the beginning of the Principate. It is widely accepted that the great Roman war heroes of the late Republic won great *clientelae* in the Empire and that the *princeps* Augustus surpassed them all, obtaining a dominant position as patron of all his subjects. Yet this view was called into question by Claude Eilers, who examined the evidence for city patronage and found that Augustus seems to have become more and more reluctant to accept this honour and that his successors no longer became city patrons. Building upon the research of Eilers, Martin Jehne looks at the reasons for a change in attitudes towards patronage from Pompey to Augustus. Since patronage is inherently particularistic, the idea of the emperor as a universal patron is difficult, as his obligations to a client would permanently be in conflict with his obligations to the client's competitor, who was also the emperor's client. In fact, there are relatively clear indications that shortly after Actium Octavian/Augustus had already begun to switch from the partisan argumentation of the patronage system to universalistic argumentation based on rational criteria. Yet patronage continued to act as an important system of distribution and was an unquestioned way of thinking in the Roman Empire, so it could not be eliminated. The Emperor had to establish himself as a fair distributor of justice, one who was above partisanship. Consequently, he had to be considered by all people across the Empire as *pater*, not as *patronus*.

The volume ends with Claude Eilers' article, which focuses on the much-debated question of the possible decay of civic patronage during the early Empire. During the Republic, city patrons were exclusively senators. Under the Empire, by contrast, patrons were increasingly drawn from the sub-senatorial orders. In his paper Eilers argues that this phenomenon was part of a set of changes best characterised as decline, and opposes Nicols' assertion that patronage remained vital.

To conclude, this book challenges the way in which foreign *clientelae* have been detected through provincial onomastics. Doubts are raised about the political role played by foreign *clientelae* at Rome as a source of prestige, and in the provinces as a means of subjugation. The usual interpretation of *amicitia* as a word concealing a real client-patron relationship is questioned. The thesis of Augustus as a universal patron for all inhabitants of the Empire is rejected. A complex picture of social relations between Rome and provincials is depicted through examples taken from both the Western and the Eastern parts of the Empire. In short, this volume gives a new perspective that facilitates a reconsideration of the traditional approach to the topic of foreign *clientelae* in the Roman Empire.