Auszug aus:

Spoils in the Roman Republic Boon and Bane

Edited by Marian Helm and Saskia T. Roselaar

Table of Contents

Introductions

| Spoils and the Roman Republic | 13 |
|--|-----|
| SASKIA ROSELAAR / MARIAN HELM | |
| Clobal Spails on a Local Stage | |
| Global Spoils on a Local Stage | 31 |
| The Case of Republican Rome HANS BECK | |
| HANS BECK | |
| Spoils and the Roman Military | 35 |
| NATHAN ROSENSTEIN | |
| | |
| Comparative Section | |
| Homeric Society and the Bane of Raiding | 17 |
| STEFAN FRASS | т/ |
| OTBINIT I RAISO | |
| The Macedonian Approach to Spoils | 59 |
| MICHAEL KLEU | |
| | |
| Spoils in the Early Roman Republic | |
| Spoils in Early Rome | 75 |
| From the Regal Period to c. 390 BCE | /3 |
| JEREMY ARMSTRONG | |
| - | |
| The Art of Acquisition | 101 |
| Land Distribution as Spoil and Its Impact on Agriculture in the Fourth | |
| to Early Third Centuries BCE | |
| DETER VANDEDRIV | |

| Spoils, Land and Colonization from the Latin War to the End of the Third Samnite War |
|--|
| AUDREY BERTRAND |
| NORE I BENTAND |
| Born to Plunder |
| Rome's Shift towards Predatory Warfare in the Fourth Century BCE |
| MARIAN HELM |
| |
| Spoils in the Middle Republic – Value and Impact |
| The Changing Nature of Spoils in the Middle Republic |
| |
| The Grand Strategy? |
| Spoils and Colonization in the Fourth and Third Centuries BCE |
| SASKIA T. ROSELAAR |
| C 1 14 AB |
| Spoils and the Allies |
| Roman Warfare and Coinage Production in Italy before the End of the First Punic War |
| MARLEEN K. TERMEER |
| MAKUBEN K. IEKHEEK |
| Tributum and Spoils in the Middle Republic |
| MICHAEL TAYLOR |
| |
| Roman Spoils and Triumphs, 218–167 BCE |
| JOHN RICH |
| N. 1. (7) |
| Modes of Extraction |
| Markets on the Move |
| The Commercialisation of Spoils of War in the Roman Republic |
| MARTA GARCÍA MORCILLO |
| |
| Spoils, Army Wages and Supplies in Rome's Early Military |
| Intervention in Hispania |
| GERARD CABEZAS-GUZMÁN / TONI ÑACO DEL HOYO |
| The Revenues of Asia and the Evolution of the Res Publica |
| BRADIEV JORDAN |
| |

Impact of Spoils on Roman Italy

| Problems and Opportunities of Warfare in Allied Territory | |
|---|-----|
| in the Second Punic War | 309 |
| SIMON LENTZSCH | |
| Spoils, Infrastructure and Politics in Rome and Italy | 325 |
| | 323 |
| JOHN R. PATTERSON | |
| The Human Spoils of the Roman Republic | 341 |
| KATHARINE P. D. HUEMOELLER | |
| Plunder, Common Soldiers, and Military Service in the Third and | |
| Second Centuries BCE | 355 |
| FRANÇOIS GAUTHIER | |
| | |
| Symbolic Dimension of Spoils | |
| The Self-Fashioning of the New Elite | 251 |
| Spoils as Representation of Victory | 3/1 |
| KARL-J. HÖLKESKAMP | |
| RAKE J. HOLKESKAMI | |
| Sicily, Rome, and the Communicative Power of Spoils | 385 |
| LAURA PFUNTNER | |
| D 1 1 4 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 | |
| Praeda, Latini and Socii | 401 |
| The Movement of Spoils in Italy in the Second Century BCE | |
| MICHAEL P. FRONDA | |
| Bibliography | 425 |

Global Spoils on a Local Stage The Case of Republican Rome

HANS BECK

In the 1850s, British botanist Richard Deakin conducted extensive site research in the Colosseum in Rome. The building was in ruins, the type of monumental rubble that had inspired artists like Giovanni Piransi a century earlier. The stones were dead, so to speak, but the Colosseum's flora was very much alive. Among the ruins Deakin detected over 400 species of plants, most of them common in Italy: cypresses, capers, thistle, many plants of the pea tribe, and an extensive range of grass. Other plants presented a conundrum; they were found nowhere else in Italy. When Deakin published his findings in his seminal book Flora of the Colosseum of Rome (1855), he entertained an intriguing explanation. The foreign plants were brought into the arena as seeds on the fur and in the stomachs of animals – lions, tigers, giraffes, and the like. As the Romans transported those animals from various destinations in their Mediterranean imperium, they carried with them the lifeblood of distant lands. When the animals were exposed to the Roman crowd, usually to fight and die in the arena, they left their botanical imprint on the place. In Deakin's days, and according to his reading, they had overtaken the building. In his own words, the plants of the Colosseum grew to "flourish, in triumph, upon the ruins" (vi). Nature had prevailed over culture.

It is difficult to prove, or disprove, this ingenious interpretation. But the metaphor reminds us of a vexed interplay that is innate in Roman political culture. The local horizon of Rome, its urban centre and the city itself was couched in a dense network of translocal, regional, and global extensions. Each one of these arenas of local and global interaction was malleable, changing over time. The global was subject to an ongoing expansion of the imperium and a corresponding intensification of cultural contact. At the height of the process, the urban population of Rome had access to an enormous market economy that provided them with material and immaterial goods from a global network. Such omnipresence of the global in the local naturally invited calibrations of the local itself. Rome's local world of the fourth century BCE was not the same as that of, say, the first century BCE. The city, its urban layout and design, its demography, populace, and structures to administer both, in short, the entire human and spatial on-

32 HANS BECK

tology was in persistent flux. Add to this a dramatic dynamic of increase – of all types of material resources and of the practices of competition they inspired – and we begin to see the local global-helix of Roman political culture taking shape.

One lead to the intricate entanglement of local and global vectors of Roman culture is the influx of praedae into the local horizon of the city: loot, spoils, plunder from abroad, with all fine-grained semantic distinctions in related practices of extraction. The articles assembled in this volume document how spoils added a distinct flavour to the experience of the republic. Speaking to the changing nature of *praedae* – changes of economic and symbolic value, of impact, and of distribution – the authors unravel an intriguing script of cultural mediation, political as well as military trajectories, and corresponding discourses about war and empire. War spoils tie these investigative directions together in an almost congenial manner. If the transformation of republican Rome was determined by an accelerated dynamic of the urban design, the influx of spoils provided the single most important impetus to this development. As much as they altered the cityscape of Rome, they also visualized and, effectively, recalibrated Roman ideas about conquest, expansion, and plunder. In the most marked variant of the interaction between money and power, spoils themselves inspired a culture of more spoils. The urban aesthetics of Rome turned the act of acquiring loot and plunder into an unchallenged, obligatory communal practice. In other words, plunder became part of the Roman DNA.

The reading of spoils as both foundational and inspirational to the political culture of the republic is supported by the fact that *praedae* entered the public sphere of Rome in a highly charged ritual. Countless literary traditions bear testimony to the very moment when the spoils came to and in the city. For instance, in Livy's depiction of T. Quinctius Flamininus' triumph from 196 BCE (34.52), we learn how on the first day "arms, weapons, and statues of bronze and marble" were displayed in the *pompa triumphalis*. On the second day, gold and silver was showcased, minted and unminted (the latter would imply all sorts of objects from precious metals). On the last day, this continued with the display of golden crowns and unspecified gifts (*dona*) from Greek cities, as an expression of gratitude for their liberation, we would suppose. The crowns were followed by the perpetrators of Greek freedom: noble prisoners and hostages, including the sons of two kings, from Macedon and Sparta. It is easy to see the inherent logic of the three-legged arrangement: first military spoils, then financial assets, then mostly human personnel, live spoils, as it were, that attested to the triumphator's ultimate victory on the battlefield.

Once these spoils entered the world of the Republic, each category was on a different trajectory: the people were thrown into prison or given hostage status; sooner or later they perished. Financial assets ran into the Roman economy to support the GDP. More concrete in its manifestation was the subset of military spoils and robbed objects, many of which were on display in the public sphere. The spectacle of the tri-

umph as such was an ephemeral matter; and so were, ultimately, the lives of captives. Beyond the day, triumphal generals minted and circulated high-value coins to herald their fame and achievements more permanently. The dedication and display of material spoils allowed for a similar permanency. Showcased in the public sphere – not only *in* temples, buildings, altars etc., but also *on* them – their symbolism permeated both the imagination of the Roman people and their urban culture.

Visibility was key. For one of the earliest instances of the display of spoils, it has been noted by many that the famous *rostra*, rams of warships captured in the Battle of Antium in 338 BCE, were mounted to the side of the speaker's platform in the Forum Romanum. The spoils were thus placed, literally, in the heart of the public discourse at Rome, wielding impact over all visible and audible expressions of politics. In doing so, the rams' communicative force was exemplary rather than exceptional. Gaius Duilius' naval column from 260 BCE, itself a permanent signifier of a triumph and adorned with Carthaginian rams, stood in close vicinity to the *rostra*. The intersignification between both monuments was obvious. To ensure this would not fade over time, the *columna Duilia* was renovated on at least two occasions, in the second century BCE and again under Augustus. Presumably, this included a touch-up to the spoils themselves.

Other places were under the spell of praedae, too. On the Campus Martius, muster station of the army and assembly point of the comitia centuriata, the close connection between society, warfare, and aggrandizement through spoils generated an all-new cultural aesthetics of plunder. The famous Altar of Domitius Ahenobarbus, dating to c. 122, suggests that much. There is a lively debate over the sculpted marble plaques that decorated the base of a statuary group. Among them are the famous census-scene and three panels of marine processions. Most recently, the traditional reading of these panels has found simultaneous endorsement and rejection from different scholars. No matter what side we pick, there is a consensus that the visual program praises the influx of riches from abroad – riches that were acquired in war and expansion. The language of the monument, beautifully carved and decorated with cornucopia and other expressions of communal well-being, thus subscribed to, and in turn fostered, a communicative culture of spoils. Spoils and loot were omnipresent in the public sphere; in fact, it was a particular trait of this public sphere that it was riddled with praedae from every corner of the imperium. In other words, spoils were not only an adornment or sublime urban décor; their presence in all media of the day *made* the public sphere.

This is by no means hyperbolic. The first clearing away of spoils happened as early as 179 BCE. Cassius Hemina (*FRH* 6 F 26) reports that it was initiated by the censor M. Aemilius Lepidus who ordered a sweep of the *area in Capitolio*, among other public places in town. Livy is more loquacious, saying that among the removed *signa militaria* were all sorts of spoils and trophies. The spoils were not objectionable as such. What had caught the censor's eye was, first, the fact that the *signa* were attached in a random, almost eclectic manner – on columns, *fornices*, temple walls, etc.; and second, that this

34 HANS BECK

was done without approval of the Senate. If we follow Hemina and Livy, the urban horizon of Rome was cluttered with objects that aestheticized the politics of plunder. Within less than two decades after Flamininus' pompous *pompa*, Rome's culture of spoils seems to have gone overboard already, so much so that the senate decided to intervene.

Karl-Joachim Hölkeskamp has described the political culture of Rome as subject to the omnipresent force of physical presence. The paradigm advances earlier conceptualizations such as the notion of a face-to-face society in that it fully thinks through the assumptions – and consequences – of localized interaction. In a nutshell, Hölkeskamp argues that the lead actors in Roman politics, along with those groups of society before whom the conduct of politics took place, were subject to the demands of a particular, immediate presence. Such a demand for physical interaction created a rather unique canvas for Roman political culture to play out, including strategies of seeking distinction, canvassing for office, or compensating defeat in elections. In this vein of inquiry, the manageable realm of Rome's local horizon was formative, comprehensive, and all-embracing. The spoils discussed in this book with so much detail, nuanced difference, and rich insight into context were critical to the ways in which Roman politicians navigated through the needs of physical presence. And, much like Deakin's dislocated animals, they left their imprint on place and practice. Removed from their former environment and transplanted to Rome, they tied into experiences and conversations about the benefits of expansion, hegemony, and the plunder that came from both. By extension, they fuelled attitudes about the transformation of Rome, city and empire alike, into an increasingly global community.

Hans Beck Westfälische Wilhelms-Universität Münster hans.beck@wwu.de