

Zeitschrift: Entretiens sur l'Antiquité classique
Herausgeber: Fondation Hardt pour l'étude de l'Antiquité classique
Band: 46 (2000)

Artikel: The Roman revolution and material culture
Autor: Wallace-Hadrill, Andrew
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-660854>

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist die Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften auf E-Periodica. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Zeitschriften und ist nicht verantwortlich für deren Inhalte. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern beziehungsweise den externen Rechteinhabern. Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen sowie auf Social Media-Kanälen oder Webseiten ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. [Mehr erfahren](#)

Conditions d'utilisation

L'ETH Library est le fournisseur des revues numérisées. Elle ne détient aucun droit d'auteur sur les revues et n'est pas responsable de leur contenu. En règle générale, les droits sont détenus par les éditeurs ou les détenteurs de droits externes. La reproduction d'images dans des publications imprimées ou en ligne ainsi que sur des canaux de médias sociaux ou des sites web n'est autorisée qu'avec l'accord préalable des détenteurs des droits. [En savoir plus](#)

Terms of use

The ETH Library is the provider of the digitised journals. It does not own any copyrights to the journals and is not responsible for their content. The rights usually lie with the publishers or the external rights holders. Publishing images in print and online publications, as well as on social media channels or websites, is only permitted with the prior consent of the rights holders. [Find out more](#)

Download PDF: 03.04.2026

ETH-Bibliothek Zürich, E-Periodica, <https://www.e-periodica.ch>

VII

ANDREW WALLACE-HADRILL

THE ROMAN REVOLUTION AND MATERIAL CULTURE

The absence of an archaeological dimension from Syme's *Roman Revolution*, as indeed from the rest of his writing¹, might easily pass unremarked, especially by anyone trained in Oxford traditions of ancient history. Who would expect that the master of prosopography, epigraphy and the written text to turn to the evidence of material culture to expound his theme? At the outset, when invited to discuss a theme which Syme had not taken into consideration, it was my own interest in how the Augustan transformation of Italy can be seen in material culture that led me to propose my title, not any idea of identifying shortcomings in Syme. Yet, as I have looked into this almost intractable subject, I find myself increasingly intrigued by Syme's silences, and for two reasons. The first is that I have come to doubt that it was so obvious that an Oxford Roman historian in the 1920s and 1930s could regard archaeological evidence as simply irrelevant. The second is that his arguments seem almost to demand attention to this missing dimension.

From the perspective of the British School at Rome, it is far from obvious that an Oxford historian should show so strong an aversion to the archaeological. The foundation of the School in 1901 was due above all to the vision and efforts of two Camden

¹ Unless one counts "Neglected Children on the *Ara Pacis*", in *AJArch.* 88 (1984), 583-9, reprinted in *Roman Papers IV* (Oxford 1988), 418-30.

Professors, Henry Pelham (1889-1907) and his successor Francis Haverfield (1907-1919)². Together they visited Rome and discussed with Rodolfo Lanciani how to create a structure that would give British scholars better access to the extraordinary discoveries coming out of post-risorgimento Italy³. The vision was articulated most clearly by Haverfield, who was later instrumental in setting up the Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies, a society distinguished from the first by its equal attention to the archaeological and the historical. His inaugural address, a clarion call for the professionalization of the discipline along continental lines, gives pride of place to archaeology as the prime source of new understanding of the Roman world⁴. He reverses the judgment of a reviewer of Pelham who was dismissive of his use of archaeology instead of literary sources:

The more I study the ordinary written materials, the harder I find it to learn the truth from them... I would sacrifice all that tract of Arrian which Professor Pelham was discussing, for a little appropriate archaeological evidence⁵.

Thomas Ashby, the School's first scholar (1901) and the man who as director (1906-25) gave it its definitive archaeological shape, was Haverfield's pupil⁶. Henry Stuart Jones, the School's second director (1903-05), cataloguer of the sculptures of the Capitoline, was Haverfield's successor in the Camden chair (1920-27)⁷.

² On Pelham, see F. HAVERFIELD's memoir in *Proceedings of the British Academy* 3 (1907-08), 365-70, and his introduction to *Essays by Henry Francis Pelham* (Oxford 1911); on Haverfield, the memoir by G. MACDONALD, in *Proceedings of the British Academy* 9 (1919-20), 475-91. MacDonald (p.484) cites a characteristic aphorism of Haverfield: "To-day the spade is mightier than the pen; the shovel and the pick are the revealers of secrets".

³ T.P. WISEMAN, *A Short History of the British School at Rome* (1990), 2-3.

⁴ F.J. HAVERFIELD, "An inaugural address delivered before the first Annual General Meeting of the Society, 11th May 1911", in *JRS* 1 (1911), pp.XI-XX.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p.XVI.

⁶ See the memoir by A.H. SMITH, in *Proceedings of the British Academy* 17 (1931), 515-41; WISEMAN, *Short History* (cit. n.3), 3.

⁷ See the memoir by J.L. MYRES, in *Proceedings of the British Academy* 26 (1940), 467-78.

What had happened to this optimistic vision of a united historico-archaeological discipline by Syme's day? Since Syme published one of his most notable contributions to the theme of the rise of Italians to the senate in the *Papers* of the School⁸, and particularly since this paper adumbrates the key theme of the *Roman Revolution*, I thought it worth asking what his connection was to the institution Pelham launched. The Haverfield vision was in fact not without its impact. Having taken his final examinations in 1927, Syme lost little time in turning to explore Italy. He spent the second six months of 1928 in the School, studying, according to the Annual Report, "Roman imperial history, in particular the reign of Domitian"⁹. But he evidently did not close his eyes to his surroundings, for the Report continues

He also made a study of the topography of ancient Rome, and of the historical geography of Italy. For the latter purpose he spent a month travelling in central Italy, between the limits of Orvieto and Naples.

He returned more briefly the following year, freshly elected to his Fellowship at Trinity, writing charmingly to the Director that he wished to study republican history since he would now have to teach it. But why in Rome? The Annual Report states more precisely that he was making a study of the period of the Gracchi¹⁰, and at this point it becomes relevant to ask who else was studying in Rome at the time, and what influence they might have had on him.

Edward Togo Salmon, for instance, had been busy working during Syme's first visit, not on the Samnites, but on pre-

⁸ "Caesar, the Senate, and Italy", in *PBSR* 14 (1938), 1-31, reprinted in *Roman Papers I* (Oxford 1979), 88-119.

⁹ *The British School at Rome, Faculty of Archaeology, History and Letters, 29th Annual Report to Subscribers* (1928-29), 3. This work underlies "The Imperial Finances under Domitian, Nerva, and Trajan" published in *JRS* 20 (1930), 55-70, reprinted in *Roman Papers I* 1-17.

¹⁰ *The British School at Rome, Faculty of Archaeology, History and Letters, 30th Annual Report to Subscribers* (1929-30), 3.

Gracchan Latin and Roman colonisation, and visited the sites, noting especially differences between citizen and Latin colonies¹¹. If Syme wanted to learn to see Roman history from an Italian perspective, those like Salmon could have given him useful clues. One may be struck too by the persistent interest among the students of the day in historical topography, the regional archaeology of Italy, and social and economic history. So Isobel Munro (later Henderson) was studying as Craven Fellow from Oxford "Roman life and archaeological remains, with a view to comparing kindred phenomena in the provinces", Diana Lucas of Somerville, Oxford, and Pelham Student, was studying the history and antiquities of the Etruscans¹². Two historians in particular were benefiting from the frenzy of excavations of fascist Italy. R.C. Carrington (of Queen's Oxford) was busy working on Campania and Pompeii. One can see in his interest potential seeds for growth in Syme: looking through epigraphy at the composition of the population ("how far native Oscan families continued to play a part in political life")¹³. But there is also a pronounced stamp of Rostovtzeff in the socio-economic emphasis of Carrington's work of the time, not only on *villae rusticae* and agriculture, but also on the urban economy ("the process of industrialisation which took place during the late republican and early imperial age"). The first edition of the *Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire* belongs immediately before, in 1926, a work notable for its extensive use of archaeological evidence, coupled with a novel view of the Augustan age as one of social and economic revolution. Closely allied were the interests of Frederick Wilson of Keble Oxford, working on Ostia (a trail blazed by Russell Meiggs as Pelham Student of 1925). Again, he was interested in the social composition of the population, the *ordo*, the *collegia* and the freedman society¹⁴. Wilson published

¹¹ *Annual Report* (1928-29), 3.

¹² *Annual Report* (1929-30), 2-3.

¹³ *Annual Report* (1929-30), 2.

¹⁴ *Annual Report* (1929-30), 3.

a series of significant papers on Ostian society and economy in the *Papers* of the School shortly before the war.

I am tempted to conclude that Syme's visit to Italy in 1928, propelled in some remote sense by a vision of Pelham and Haverfield, actually did have an impact on the formation of his thinking. The interest in the regional topography and archaeology of Italy, the epigraphic study of the composition of its local elites, coupled of course with the contemporary background of the new self-awareness of fascist Italy, have their contribution to make to the image of the Roman revolution as being about local Italian elites. But equally, it is clear that Oxford of the 1920s *was* concerned with social and economic history, and *was* engaged with archaeological evidence as providing access to it. If Syme absorbed some aspects, he rejected (or 'eschewed') others.

It is at this point that my second concern becomes pressing. Given the argument Syme was developing, would he have benefited from developing rather further the interests of historians of his generation like Carrington, Meiggs, Salmon and Wilson? Initially, the answer appears to be not. In so far as traditional political and military history never did, and even subsequently has not begun to, make more than incidental use of archaeology, the Tacitean Syme naturally aligns with the branch of history to which such evidence remained of tangential interest, leaving archaeology for the Rostovtzeffs.

Yet the paradox of Syme's revolution is that it is not political but social¹⁵. The political revolution is notoriously minimised by the collapse of all constitutions into oligarchy: "the old framework and categories subsist: a monarchy rules through oligarchy"¹⁶. In dismissing so abruptly a story of political revolution that made sense to the generation brought up on Mommsen, he opts for a social revolution that might seem

¹⁵ Cf. my discussion, "*Mutatio morum*: the idea of a cultural revolution", in *The Roman Cultural Revolution*, ed. by T. HABINEK and A. SCHIESARO (Cambridge 1997), 3-22 at 4-6.

¹⁶ *The Roman Revolution* (Oxford 1939), 8.

more familiar to Marx — or even to Rostovtzeff. “In the Revolution the power of the old governing class was broken, its composition transformed. Italy and the non-political orders in society triumphed over Rome and the Roman aristocracy”¹⁷. Indeed, he remains conscious that the new Italian elite are as firmly rooted economically in land-ownership as their noble predecessors, and that the effect of the Revolution was to secure their property (“the rich were in power — conspicuous in their serried ranks were hard-headed and hard-faced men like Lollius, Quirinius and Tarius Rufus. With such champions, property might rest secure”)¹⁸.

But that does not deter him from referring, surely provocatively, to the “Italian bourgeoisie”: “The Principate itself may, in a certain sense, be regarded as a triumph of Italy over Rome... The Italian bourgeoisie had their sweet revenge when the new State was erected at the expense of the *nobiles*, as a result of their feuds and their follies”¹⁹. When he explicitly parts company with Rostovtzeff, it is not over the appropriateness of the term, but over its applicability to recruits to the legions²⁰. He does not, for instance, reveal whether he would wish to challenge Rostovtzeff’s characterisation of the bourgeoisie of Pompeii as business men like Trimalchio, but only exceptionally of servile origin. Syme’s use of the term, unaccompanied by discussion of its economic component, thus invites the confusion it has indeed provoked, in which the tides of opinion are neatly summed up by the shift from the title of the Centre Jean Bérard conference of 1981, *Les bourgeoisies municipales italiennes* to that of its 1991 successor, *Les élites municipales de l’Italie*²¹.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*

¹⁸ *Roman Revolution*, 452.

¹⁹ *Roman Revolution*, 453.

²⁰ *Roman Revolution*, 457 n.2.

²¹ *Les “bourgeoisies” municipales italiennes aux II^e et I^{er} siècles av. J.-C.*, Centre Jean Bérard, Institut français de Naples, 7-10 décembre 1981, éd. par M. CÉBEILLAC-GERVASONI (Paris-Naples 1983); *Les élites municipales de l’Italie péninsulaire des Gracques à Néron*, Actes de la table ronde de Clermont-Ferrand (28-30 novembre 1991), sous la direction de M. CÉBEILLAC-GERVASONI (Naples-Rome 1996).

Here, then, seems to me the paradox at the heart of the Syme thesis. If you are going to say that the Augustan revolution is the victory of the "Italian bourgeoisie" over the metropolitan nobility, be it a municipal bourgeoisie or the local elites, the thesis requires you not merely to name the members who penetrate to the centre of power and draw profit thereby, but to understand the composition and economic basis of those elites, and the transformations of their local societies that assimilation to Rome both presupposed and engendered²². These are precisely the questions which those like Carrington and Meiggs were struggling with, however crudely, in the 1920s and round which a vast debate has rumbled ever since, and on the basis of material which is inescapably archaeological. We have only to think of the sequence of international conferences on Roman Italy, from the classic *Hellenismus in Mittelitalien* (1974)²³, through *Les bourgeoisies municipales* (1981) and *Les élites municipales* (1991)²⁴ to the École Française conference on *L'Italie d'Auguste à Dioclétien* (1992)²⁵ to realise how central Syme's theme has remained to the main debates on the archaeology of Roman Italy. And we have only to reflect on the tenuous British presence at those debates²⁶ to see the extent to which British historians have remained on the margins of that debate²⁷.

²² Questions which subsequent British historians have not shirked, notably T.P. WISEMAN, *New Men in the Roman Senate 139 BC-AD 14* (Oxford 1971); M. FREDERIKSEN, *Campania* (Rome 1984); also J.R. PATTERSON, "Settlement, City and Elite in Samnium and Lycia", in *City and Country in the Ancient World*, ed by J. RICH and A. WALLACE-HADRILL (London 1991), 147-68.

²³ *Hellenismus in Mittelitalien*, Kolloquium in Göttingen vom 5. bis 9. Juni 1974, hrsg. von P. ZANKER, I-II (Göttingen 1976).

²⁴ See above n.21.

²⁵ *L'Italie d'Auguste à Dioclétien*, Actes du colloque international (Rome, 25-28 mars 1992), Coll. Ec.Fr. Rome 198 (Rome 1994).

²⁶ Martin FREDERIKSEN at *Hellenismus*, Michael CRAWFORD and Peter WISEMAN at *Les bourgeoisies*, Emma DENCH at *Les élites*, Dick WHITTAKER and John PATTERSON at *L'Italie*.

²⁷ At the same time, we can observe the legacy of Pelham and Haverfield: four of those five British participants are Oxford ancient historians who held scholarships at the British School. It is British *archaeology* as a discipline which is totally absent.

There is a further aspect, which is of particular interest to me, and that is the question of cultural identities implicit in the *Roman Revolution*. Syme firmly grasped that his revolution had major implications for Roman identity, and the two chapters (XXIX “The national programme”, XXX “The organization of opinion”) in which he discusses this are among his most subtle. The claims of the new regime to moral superiority are dissected mercilessly (what delicious irony that the descendent of the Samnite rebel Papius should be the bachelor who gave his name to the marriage legislation)²⁸. Yet beyond the “strong suspicion of fraud”, Syme grants that the new morality might be important in defining the identity of the new ruling class. He contrasts the old-fashioned morality of the Italian towns represented in the Caesarian party with the cynical immorality of the nobility (“avidly grasping the spoils of conquest, wealth, luxury and power, new tastes and new ideas”). The Augustan moral reform thus is driven by municipal morality:

The Roman noble sneered at the municipal man — he was priggish and parsimonious, successful in business life [so Rostovtzeff was right??], self-righteous and intolerably moral. The Italian bourgeoisie had their sweet revenge...²⁹

Augustus is thus represented as tapping into the authentic municipal morality of his supporters in creating a new public morality, which however fraudulent, at least satisfied the way his supporters would like to think of themselves, the image they would wish to project.

The picture is seductive, and fraught with problems. Its attraction lies in the way it draws on a series of literary passages contrasting old-fashioned municipal rectitude to the luxury of the capital, from Tacitus’ descriptions of reactions to Nero’s theatrical antics to Pliny’s letters of recommendation³⁰. But

²⁸ *Roman Revolution*, 452.

²⁹ *Roman Revolution*, 453.

³⁰ Cited *Roman Revolution*, 455.

though Syme rejects the Horatian image of the tough Sabine farmer and the Virgilian *Itala virtus* as a mythical projection on the past (the real peasant was “narrow and grasping, brutal and superstitious”)³¹, he does not hesitate to retroject the morality of Flavian Italy on a period a century before. To attribute any sort of coherent identity or morality to the cities of pre-Augustan Italy, except insofar as it is a common identity produced by Roman control itself, begs enormous questions.

It is precisely at this point that archaeology can help, for one of the issues it can most clearly illuminate is the degree of local diversity among the regions of Italy, and the timing of a movement towards homogeneity. The Augustan age surely does emerge as a turning point in this respect, but as an effect of the imposition of central control, not as the product of a victory of the peripheries over the centre. Equally, the “spoils of conquest, wealth, luxury and power, new tastes and new ideas” which are attributed to the nobility lend themselves superbly well to archaeological analysis; and though we can certainly identify them frequently with the metropolitan aristocracy, they are a common currency too for the Italian ‘bourgeoisie’, and we may ask whether they were not precisely a means by which a common cultural identity was formed, rather than the hangover of what lost out at Actium.

In the second part of my paper, I wish to go on to develop some of these ideas in more detail, and look at the story which material culture may be telling of the Roman Revolution. But with reference to Syme, my point is this: that if he eschews the archaeological, it is not because it was immaterial to his argument, nor that it was in any way unthinkable for a historian of his generation to use such material. I can only suppose that it was a matter of personal choice.

³¹ *Roman Revolution*, 453. On the Roman construction of Samnite/Sabine toughness, see Emma DENCH, *From Barbarians to New Men. Greek, Roman, and modern perceptions of peoples in the central Apennines* (Oxford 1995).

II

What we still desperately need is a major synthesis of the archaeology and epigraphy of Italy, region by region. I confess myself too overwhelmed by the scale and disparity of the material even to start to guess what that synthesis might look like. Instead I will focus my observations on some issues of cultural identity that seem to me to arise from Syme. We can take as read by now that the Augustan age represents the culmination of a long process of the gradual incorporation of the communities of Italy into the central systems of Roman power, which moves with different rhythms in different areas depending on the local pattern of historical contact with Rome, and that this process sets the model for progressive incorporation, and failure of incorporation, of the provinces. But the price of incorporation is a massive redefinition of identities, not only for the communities pulled into the Roman orbit, but for Rome herself. One basic point to make at the outset is the inadequacy of the language we have for describing this phenomenon, and by implication the inadequacy of the models of cultural change we take for granted³².

It is too easy to speak of the 'romanization' of Italy as if there was a self-explanatory set of indices by which an Italian community became more Roman (and by implication less Italian, or perhaps less local in a specific regional sense). For sure, there is a progressive erosion of regional diversity. And for sure, the motor of change is Roman power and its tendency to assimilation. But in what does making a community 'more Roman' consist? In terms of material culture, it is strangely difficult to answer this question. It is relatively easy to trace

³² On problems of the concept of 'romanization' in provincial contexts, see e.g. M. MILLETT, *The Romanization of Britain: an essay in archaeological interpretation* (Cambridge 1992); J. METZLER, M. MILLETT *et alii* (Eds.), *Integration in the Early Roman West* (Luxembourg 1995); G. WOOLF, *Becoming Roman: the Origins of Provincial Civilization in Gaul* (Cambridge 1998), 4-7.

Romanization at a linguistic, institutional and legal level. Michael Crawford's chapter on Roman Italy in the first century BC can chart with considerable precision the collapse of the local languages, particularly Etruscan and Oscan, after the Social War, while underlining the vital contrast with the fortunes of the Greek language in Magna Graecia, closely allied to the survival of Greek civic institutions³³. Equally, the diffusion of municipal charters on a Roman model, and of Roman law in general, is familiar ground, and its 'Roman' stamp is evident³⁴. But when we turn to the archaeology of material culture (as opposed to inscriptions), where, except by association, is the spread of the 'Roman'? *Hellenismus in Mittelitalien* was correctly named: as Zanker's introduction rightly observes, in many areas of Italy, the encounter with hellenistic culture was equivalent to Romanization. Hellenismus, then, not Romanismus³⁵.

This equivalence of Romanization and Hellenization creates great difficulties on both sides of the equation. What can Hellenization be if it does not involve and conscious and wished for assimilation of a *Greek* way of life? Yet the Roman frequently defines itself in antithesis to the Greek. What can Romanization be unless there is a conscious and willed adoption of Roman forms? The pace of cultural transformation at the centre in Rome is as rapid as in the cities of Italy, and not necessarily leading the way. It is not at all clear, for instance, whether the city of Rome or the cities of Campania play the leading role in architectural innovation, or whether the trend-setters in luxury are always the Roman nobility rather than the mixed groups of Roman and Italian *negotiatores* on Delos and elsewhere who called themselves *Italici*.

³³ M.H. CRAWFORD, "Italy and Rome from Sulla to Augustus", in *Cambridge Ancient History X* (Cambridge 1996), 425-6, 981-5.

³⁴ CRAWFORD, "Italy and Rome", 421-3.

³⁵ ZANKER (Hrsg.), *Hellenismus in Mittelitalien* (cit. n.23), I 14. Cf. N. ZORZETTI, "Il modello romano di cultura in età repubblicana: riflessioni sull'ellenismo romano", in *La città nell'Italia settentrionale in età romana. Morfologie, strutture e funzionamento dei centri urbani delle Regioni X e XI*, Atti del convegno, Trieste, 13-15 marzo 1987 (Trieste-Roma 1990), 225-50.

A second, and even more formidable problem, lies in the attempt to locate the emergence of a specifically *Italian* identity. The victory of Italy over Rome implies some sort of distinguishable and coherent identity for the Italian not simply defined by proximity to Rome (how else can it win over the Roman?). But the story that emerges is of the diversity of pre-Roman Italy, from the Celtic north to the Greek south to the Punic west, sacrificing local identity without a gain of any strong common identity that is not in the broadest sense Roman. Here Andrea Giardina's *Storia di un'identità incompiuta* seems to me to hit the mark³⁶. Neither in fact nor in myth did Italy succeed in evolving a common identity. Despite the Greek norm of representing bonds of proximity or union as ties of blood, Rome notably avoids the myth of consanguinity, stressing in its Trojan origins distance from its Italian neighbours not proximity. I draw attention too to the concluding words offered by Jean-Paul Morel to the same conference: while the historians Eck and Nicolet offer a picture of an Italy that is more or less a unity at the administrative, political, fiscal level, the picture that emerges from the archaeology is of diversity, or at least of a two-lane Italy, with only some areas advancing on the fast track³⁷. Since the focus of the conference was on imperial Italy, we are left with the suggestion that regional diversity is not so much a phenomenon of pre-Roman, or pre-Social-War Italy, but an abiding condition. In that case, we must look beyond the appearance of homogeneity lent by municipal charters, or the official use of Latin, or the construction of predictable bath-buildings, and learn to see how common cultural traits could be appropriated in order to reaffirm local identity and difference (something we are willing enough to do when we talk about the Romans themselves).

³⁶ A. GIARDINA, *L'Italia Romana. Storia di un'identità incompiuta* (Bari 1997), 3-116, originally as "L'identità incompiuta dell'Italia romana", in *L'Italie d'Auguste à Dioclétien* (cit. n.25), 1-89.

³⁷ *L'Italie d'Auguste à Dioclétien* (cit. n.25), 412.

Despairing, then, of any attempt to sum up Italy in its full diversity, I shall focus in general on three of aspects of the transformation of material culture, urbanization, private housing, and consumer goods. To my mind, the issue is this. If Syme is right about the character of the Roman Revolution, Augustus' victory should mark the collapse of a traditional form of Roman identity, and the ascendancy of a new identity that embraces Italy too. When challenged by philologist colleagues to locate a Roman cultural revolution in the literary sphere, I pointed to a shift in the construction of the authority that defined Roman identity³⁸. One definition of the power of a ruling class is its ability to redefine common identity, and I suggested that the Roman nobility had already lost its power to define Roman customary practice, morality, law, religion, the calendar and language, before the victory of Augustus. The establishment of a new order lay in his ability to create a new structure of authority for defining the Roman way with his own power at the centre of it. An analogous argument in the sphere of material culture would present many difficulties. Nevertheless, it is perhaps worth considering some of the ways in which the late republic is marked by a collapse of the ability to define physically what being Roman consists in, and the reign of Augustus marks a new coherence of definition.

Urbanization

The spread of Roman control, Roman institutions, the Latin language and a Roman way of life, is closely associated with patterns of urbanization. We all know this, not only because Tacitus tells us as much in the *Agricola*, but because it has been demonstrated repeatedly in detail by the archaeology of Roman Italy and the provinces³⁹. Specifically for Italy, one can demonstrate a surge of urbanization in the aftermath of the Social

³⁸ "*Mutatio morum*: the idea of a cultural revolution" (cit. n.15).

³⁹ See works cited above n.32.

War. Gabba pointed to archaeological evidence of an upsurge of public building activity in central Italian cities in the period between the Social and the Triumviral wars as support for his thesis of a major shift from village to urban settlement as a result of municipalization⁴⁰. Frederiksen equally stressed the changes in pattern of settlement brought by the creation of the municipal system, from dispersed settlement in *pagi* to concentrated settlement in which *vici* survive only as legally subordinate parts of *municipia*⁴¹. In this sense, Syme's "municipal bourgeoisie", far from representing the traditional Italy, is the outcome of developments in the generation immediately preceding the Augustan settlement.

The issue I wish to raise is that of cultural identity: if the Roman citizen was now defined as an urbanised animal, how did he succeed in defining his urban environment as specifically Roman? The problem, of course, is that Italy had been urbanised for centuries, and the faces of its urbanism were as diverse as its history⁴². What the Greek colonies of the south looked like we know fairly well; of what Etruscan cities looked like we know astonishingly little, and Marzabotto has to work hard to fill the gaps in our knowledge of central Etruria. Recent excavations have cast much light on the Latin colonies, specifically Cosa, Fregellae and Paestum. That there is already an urge in the third century BC to give a specifically Roman stamp to a Latin colony emerges from the common formula in these cities of dominant Capitolium, rectangular forum with divisions for voting, and circular comitium.

To what extent by the period after the Social War was it possible to associate municipalised Italy with a specifically Roman

⁴⁰ E. GABBA, "Considerazioni politiche ed economiche sullo sviluppo urbano in Italia nei secoli II e I a.C.", in *Hellenismus in Mittelitalien*, II 315-26; "Urbanizzazione e rinnovamenti urbanistici nell'Italia centro-meridionale del I sec. a.C.", in *Studi Classici e Orientali* 21 (1972), 73-112.

⁴¹ M. FREDERIKSEN, "Changes in the pattern of settlement", in *Hellenismus in Mittelitalien*, II 341-55.

⁴² See P. GROS and M. TORELLI, *Storia dell'urbanistica. Il mondo romano* (Roma 1988).

model of urbanism? Zanker's analysis of the changes of public space in the Italian city takes Pompeii as exemplary⁴³. Already in the second century, the Oscan town becomes richly 'hellenised', while the space of the Forum seems to reflect the image of a Latin colony, with its axial temple (perhaps of Jupiter), and its basilica. The thesis of 'self-romanization', of a process whereby the Pompeians in alliance with Rome voluntarily assimilate a Roman model, finds support in the inscription 'HAVE' at the entrance of the finest house in town, the Casa del Fauno, at a time when Oscan is the language of public inscriptions⁴⁴. The impact of the Sullan colony is dual: on the one hand, the 'Roman' affiliations of the Forum become explicit in the new temple to Jupiter Capitolinus; on the other, particular emphasis is given to places of public entertainment, with the construction (by the same pair of Sullan profiteers, Quinctius Valgus and M. Porcius) of the *spectaculum* (amphitheatre) and the *theatrum tectum*; and with the extension and restructuring of the Stabian baths. Here we already have the components of what is to become a familiar formula across the empire. The most significant Augustan addition to the formula, in the case of Pompeii, is in the creation of imperial cult buildings, though the rebuilding of the large theatre in marble, and the building of an aqueduct with immediate implications for the improvement of the baths and public fountains further develop the importance of leisure amenities. Finally, for Zanker it is significant that after the earthquake, priority was given to reconstruction of the baths and restoration of the amphitheatre, in contrast, he maintains, to the Forum area which was virtually left in ruins.

⁴³ Originally published as *Pompeji. Stadtbilder als Spiegel von Gesellschaft und Herrschaftsform* (Mainz 1988); now revised as *Pompeii: Public and Private Life* (Boston, Mass. 1998), 27ff.

⁴⁴ ZANKER, *Pompeii*, 59. For the inscription, F. ZEVI, in *MDAI(R)* 105 (1998), 24.

Elsewhere⁴⁵, Zanker develops, partly on the basis of this case-study, a thesis of an overall shift in the conception of public space in the Roman city. Building on Nicolet's observation of the symbolic shift from Forum to theatre and amphitheatre as the critical locations for assembly of the citizen body, he points to a generalised shift of activity away from construction in the traditional focus of citizen life in the Forum, at the expense of alternative *loci* of social interaction, theatres, amphitheatres, baths and private assembly places like *collegia*. The shift may be overschematised⁴⁶. In any case, it is beyond doubt that the Forum still played a crucial role in the imperial city for ceremonial display and processions, the erection of honorific statues, and the conduct of legal business. But what remains unaffected is the key point that under the empire theatres, amphitheatres and baths have become so central to urban life that they define the city just as much as Forum, Capitolium and *comitium* used to in the Latin colony.

But at this point, the timing of the emergence of this formula as definitive becomes particularly interesting. The problems of seeing Republican Rome as a suitable model for urbanism are familiar. It is not merely its tangle of winding streets, and unplanned chaos of buildings which make it seem unsuitable to hold its head up among the cities of the hellenistic east⁴⁷. Indeed, we should not underestimate the fervour of building in the late Republic, or the impressiveness of the now lost second-century censorial predecessors of the basilicas on the Forum, or other major utilitarian constructions, roads, aqueducts, warehouses and docks, let alone the innumerable temples, increasingly in marble, erected by *triumphatores* and

⁴⁵ P. ZANKER, "Veränderungen im öffentlichen Raum der italischen Städte der Kaiserzeit", in *L'Italie d'Auguste à Dioclétien* (cit. n.25), 259-84.

⁴⁶ John Dobbins' work on the Forum of Pompeii has challenged the conventional wisdom on the postearthquake neglect of the Pompeian Forum, demonstration major reconstruction activity along the entire eastern side. See now ZANKER, *Pompeii*, 131-3.

⁴⁷ Thus P. ZANKER, *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus* (Ann Arbor, Michigan 1988), 18-25.

others. Nevertheless, however much we revise our image of the republican city, there are certain absences that would simply rule out its role as a model of the type of city Zanker describes before the reign of Augustus. There is no solid theatre before 55 BC, no solid amphitheatre before that of Statilius Taurus in 29 BC, no public (as opposed to private) *thermae* until Agrippa's gymnasium in the 25 BC. If amphitheatres and baths were to become the two distinctive building-types of the Roman city, the model was not one developed in the city of Rome.

It is precisely this bizarre observation that Rome's first theatres, amphitheatres and baths were preceded by the first examples in Pompeii that led Ward-Perkins to stress the role of Campania in developing characteristic Roman architectural forms⁴⁸. In the case of theatre and baths, Pompeii merely follows long South Italian tradition, and we are troubled again by the paradox that if hellenization is equivalent to romanization, it is not at clear how the stamp of Roman identity comes into the equation. In the case of the amphitheatre, Kathryn Welch has argued rightly that Pompeii's building comes out of specifically Roman usage, and should not be seen as a Campanian tradition⁴⁹. Even so, the inhibitions about erecting permanent theatres at Rome, and the tenacity of the tradition of temporary wooden structures, resulted in the development outside Rome, at Pompeii and a number of other Campanian cities, of what became the most distinctive building type of the cities of the Roman empire. The question remains how Rome could lay claim to the identity of these architectural types as 'Roman'.

The key text, as ever, is Vitruvius. Here, if anywhere, we find a definitive statement about cultural identity. The importance

⁴⁸ A. BOETHIUS and J.B. WARD-PERKINS, *Etruscan and Roman Architecture* (Harmondsworth 1970), 170-71; cf. P. GROS, *Architecture et société à Rome et en Italie centro-méridionale aux deux derniers siècles de la République*, Coll. Latomus 156 (Bruxelles 1978), 43-44.

⁴⁹ K. WELCH, "The Roman Arena in Late-Republican Italy: A New Interpretation", in *Journal of Roman Archaeology* 7 (1994), 59-80.

of the *De architectura* is not so much as a statement of architectural practice of the day — indeed, scholars repeatedly suffer agonies of difficulties in trying to reconcile Vitruvian prescriptions, for instance on the theatre, to realities on the ground. Far more significantly, it is an attempt to articulate what the Roman city ought to be, and what makes it Roman⁵⁰. It is a text not about the work of the architect, but about urbanism. It ranges over all aspects of urban development — the choice of sites, including haruspicy, the building of walls, the layout of streets, the situation of public buildings, the construction of temples, *fora*, other public buildings, dockyards, private houses, and water-supply, not to speak of time-measuring and engineering. The range could not be more appropriate for a period at which Rome was building and rebuilding more cities than ever before.

If we think about how he lays claim to a specific cultural identity for the 'ideal city' he prescribes, we can observe a continuous and delicate negotiation with the hellenic. Of course his text is profoundly indebted to the theory and practices of hellenistic architecture, just as much as other Latin technical works are indebted to Greek manuals, whether on rhetoric, or medicine, or natural science, but like them (I think of many from the *ad Herennium* to the elder Pliny's *Natural History*)⁵¹, it combines an overt display of familiarity with Greek treatises with an anxiety to maintain a cultural distance, and reassure the Roman reader of a superiority. What is particularly interesting to observe is the interplay between Greek, Roman and Italian⁵².

⁵⁰ See essays in *Le projet de Vitruve. Objet, destinataires et réception du De architectura*, Actes du colloque international (Rome, 26-27 mars 1993), Coll.Ec.Fr.Rome 192 (Rome 1994); *Munus non ingratum. Proceedings of the International Symposium on Vitruvius' De Architectura and the Hellenistic and Republican Architecture* (Leiden 1989).

⁵¹ See my comments in "Pliny the Elder and man's unnatural history", in *Greece & Rome* 37 (1990), 80-96.

⁵² See further: "Vivere alla greca per essere Romani", in *I Greci. Storia Cultura Arte Società. 2. Una storia greca. III. Trasformazioni*, ed. S. SETTIS (Torino 1998), 939-63; "To be Roman, go Greek. Thoughts on Hellenization at Rome",

So when he adapts the Hippocratic doctrine of the effect of climate on temperament, it is the *populus Romanus* that occupies the happy position of moderation that permits world conquest (6.1.10). But the *populus Romanus* is rapidly elided with the land of Italy. Those who enjoys the perfect temperament between strength and intelligence are the *in Italia gentes*, and it is *Italia* which enjoys the *invictas laudes*, thanks to which the *populus Romanus* holds sway over the world. The same elision of Italian and Roman comes out in his attempt to set up two parallel systems of public building, the Greek and 'ours'. So the forum: the *Graeci* plan the forum on a square, but one cannot use the same design *Italiae urbibus* because of the tradition (*a maioribus consuetudo tradita est*) of staging gladiatorial games there. The description of porticos with places for the *argentarii* and balconies for rent, *maeniana*, above them, coincides very precisely with descriptions of the *forum Romanum*, and one might have imagined that the *maiores* who had established the tradition of gladiatorial games in the forum were precisely the Roman nobility from Junius Brutus Pera onwards. The choice of the phrase *Italiae urbes* has the effect of attributing a common ancestry to all Italian cities, and a common need to shape public space to social custom.

Similarly, when we turn to theatres⁵³, the long disquisition on acoustics and bronze sounding boxes let into the construction provokes the question of relevance to Rome: many theatres are built every year at Rome each year without acoustic devices, because their wooden seating already acts as a sounding board

in *Modus Operandi. Essays in Honour of Geoffrey Rickman*, ed. by M. AUSTIN, J. HARRIES, Chr. SMITH, Bull. of the Institute of Classical Studies, Suppl. 71 (London 1998), 79-91.

⁵³ On Vitruvius' theatre see H.P. ISLER, "Vitruvius Regeln und die erhaltenen Theaterbauten", in *Munus non ingratum* (cit. n.50), 141ff.; Ed. FRÉZOULS, "Aspects de l'histoire architecturale du théâtre romain", in *ANRW* II 12,1 (Berlin 1982), 343ff.; D.B. SMALL, "Studies in Roman Theatre Design", in *AJA* 87 (1983), 55ff.; F. SEAR, "Vitruvius and Roman theatre design", in *AJA* 94 (1990), 249-58; G. TOSI, "Il significato dei disegni planimetrici vitruviani relativi al teatro antico", in *Le projet de Vitruve* (cit. n.50), 171-85.

(5.5.7). If we wish to observe acoustics in theatres of solid construction, there are no examples at Rome, and we will turn to the *Italiae regiones* and the Greek cities. His prescription of how a theatre should be built (6) is immediately followed by another underlining the contrast with Greek theatres that have a fundamentally different rationale. But though he has already indicated that the most blatant contrast is between the tradition of temporary wooden theatres, so cherished by the Roman aristocracy, and a tradition of solid theatres in which the regions of Italy necessarily offer no more than variations on Greek tradition, not least in the cities of Magna Graecia like Pompeii⁵⁴, instead he invents a new category, the *theatrum latinum*, to which he attributes a specific planning rationale, namely a circle divided by four triangles instead of three squares (5.7.1). Whether we follow those who see this rationale as a spurious Vitruvian construct, or those who see at least some contact with contemporary practice⁵⁵, what is clear is that the text succeeds in distancing the Latin theatre at a theoretical as well as pragmatic level from the Greek. It is no coincidence that a translator like Granger render *latinum* as 'Roman'. Vitruvius has just succeeded in inventing a 'Roman' tradition of theatre construction which embraces the Italian and shuns the Greek.

Finally with baths⁵⁶, he appends a chapter on the Greek palaestra *tametsi non sint italicae consuetudinis* (5.11). Again, the aim seems to be to set up Italian and Greek usage as parallel and alternative systems (both, interestingly, are endowed

⁵⁴ On the links with South Italian tradition, see H. LAUTER, "Die hellenistische Theater der Samniten und Latiner in ihrer Beziehung zur Theaterarchitektur der Griechen", in *Hellenismus in Mittelitalien*, II 413-30.

⁵⁵ FRÉZOULS (in *ANRW* II 12,1, 343ff.) sees no contact between Vitruvian prescriptions and actual Roman practice. SEAR, "Vitruvius" (cit. n.53) argues plausibly for a reasonable degree of contact between theoretical prescriptions and current practices of the late first century BC.

⁵⁶ On the relationship of Roman baths to Greek predecessors, Inge NIELSEN, *Thermae et Balnea. The Architecture and Cultural History of Roman Public Baths* (Aarhus 1990), 25-36; F. YEGÜL, *Baths and Bathing in Classical Antiquity* (Cambridge, Mass. 1992), 6-29.

with the sweating rooms he calls *Laconica*), though of course the possibility remained open to make the palaestra an adjunct to a bath, or a bath an adjunct to a palaestra, and the tendency in both east and west was towards convergence.

Despite a persistent impression that Vitruvius inhabits a timewarp (how can he speak of wooden theatres without reference to the theatre of Pompey, particularly when he is aware of its attached portico, and how can he speak of gladiatorial games in the forum and give no hint of the development of the amphitheatre?), he is surely articulating a shift in cultural identity that takes place precisely between Pompey and Augustus, as Rome acquires those permanent public buildings that already characterise many of its colonies and Italian municipalities, and so produce a model of the city that is simultaneously Roman and Italian. Oddly enough, one could characterise this precisely as the victory of the Italian municipalities over the Roman nobility. I regard the recruitment of the *maiores* to the Italic city as particularly significant. One might say that the persistent refusal to create permanent public structures for popular entertainment, theatres, amphitheatres and baths is the outcome precisely of the need of the Roman nobility to maximise its opportunities for access to popular acclaim. They could justify this by reference to their *maiores*, so monopolising for the nobility the authority by which public space was shaped. On my argument, the authority for defining what a Roman city looks like passes with Augustus on the one hand to the professional architect like Vitruvius, and on the other to his own massive power to set the model through architectural patronage.

Private Housing

On private housing, I have in this context less to say. I wish to develop one simple point from what has been said above about urbanization, and make a tentative suggestion. If we return to Vitruvius and ask how he negotiates the relationship

between Greek, Roman and Italian in the field of housing, the answer is surprisingly similar. Indeed, it is in his discussion of housing more than anywhere else that he is concerned to set up a series of contrasts between 'them' and 'us'⁵⁷. His chapter on the Greek house is quite explicitly phrased to underline difference. So the chapter opens with the text-book indicator of attempts to define cultural difference, a statement of what some is *not*. *Atriis Graeci quia non utuntur, neque aedificant...* (6.7.1). It goes on to point out the diversity of social practice which underlies architectural choice: they have rooms for men to dine in because it is *not* their custom for the *materfamilias* to recline with the guests, a contrast which Cicero and Nepos too in significant passages use as the marker of cultural distance. Finally, symbolic value is given to a contrast in linguistic usage. The Greek call the men's dining rooms *andronas* whereas 'we', 'nostri' use this word for corridors (a usage which has astonishingly survived into modern Italian). To ensure the point is not missed, it is repeated for another word, *xystus*. 'They', the Graeci, used it for covered walks, 'we', *nostri*, for open ones.

If Vitruvius' house is so self-consciously about 'us' and 'them', it becomes the more interesting to consider how he defines 'us'. In virtually all the literature on the Roman house, it is assumed that Vitruvius is talking about the Romans. His classic description of the social practices of patronage and magistracy that underpin the organization of the house is assumed to refer quite specifically to the Roman aristocracy, and indeed, it has been questioned whether his prescriptions have any relevance for Campanian houses which should not be affected by the social practice of the metropolitan aristocracy. It is the

⁵⁷ See also "The villa as cultural symbol", in *The Roman Villa: Villa Urbana*, ed. A. FRAZER (Philadelphia 1998), 43-53. For the difficulties of reconciling Vitruvius with the surviving evidence, see F. PESANDO, *Oikos e Ktesis. La casa greca in età classica* (Perugia 1987), 175-97; J. RAEDER, "Vitruv, de architectura VI 7 (*aedificia Graecorum*) und die hellenistische Wohnhaus- und Palastarchitektur", in *Gymnasium* 95 (1988), 316-68; K. REBER, "Aedificia Graecorum. Zu Vitruvs Beschreibung des griechischen Haus", in *ArchAnz* 1988, 653-66.

more relevant, then, that Vitruvius chooses to speak of Italian, not Roman, practice. At the end of his chapter on the Greek house, with all its 'us' and 'them's, he concludes:

quibus consuetudinibus aedificia italico more et Graecorum institutis conformantur, exposui...(6.7.7)

Italico more: here too the *mos maiorum* has become a common property of the Italians. The same contrast is found in the description of the rooms of the house:

fiunt autem non italicae consuetudinis oeci, quos Graeci cyzicenos appellant. (6.3.10)

By implication, all the other rooms he has described, *atria*, *tablina*, *fauces*, *triclinia* and so on, represent an *italica consuetudo* not merely a Roman practice.

At the least, Vitruvius' language is a confirmation of the thesis that Augustus' *tota Italia* could think of itself and present itself as having an overriding cultural unity consisting in something more than mere submission to Roman practice. They could think of themselves as having common ancestors and a common lifestyle. As Giardina says, citing Ernst Renan on the modern nation-state, a historical loss of memory is necessary to make a nation⁵⁸. It must acquire common ancestors. But we might also ask whether Vitruvius may not in some sense be right. Are we so sure that the Roman house is something developed by Rome and its ancestors, and is not a common Italian heritage? I simply want to float the suggestion that it may be less Roman, and more Italian, than we normally assume. There is, of course, a long debate on the Etruscan origins of the *atrium* pattern of spatial disposition. Not only did the Romans themselves apparently attribute the form to the Etruscans, referring to the *atrium Tuscanicum*, and offering an etymology of *atrium* from Etruscan *Adria*, but opinion among Etruscologists has recently swung sharply in favour of seeing the atriate house as an archaic Etruscan phenomenon. The T-shaped

⁵⁸ GIARDINA, *Storia di un'identità incompiuta* (cit. n.36), 54.

courtyards of Marzabotto are now seen as roofed *atria* with *impluvia*, and Donati's 'Casa dell'Impluvio' at Roselle and the houses of Regisvillae are seen as pushing the form back to the seventh century⁵⁹.

An Etruscan, rather than Roman, origin for the form will help to explain its widespread diffusion in Italy. Of course, it is easy to invoke a Roman model from the third century onwards even in cities without colonial status. The third and second century *atrium* houses recently excavated by Coarelli at Fregellae, or by Fentress at Cosa, may only reinforce the idea that Latin colonies presented themselves as little Romes. But even Oscan Pompeii, where the atrium house is the norm from the first moment we can see, perhaps not much before the late third century, but certainly from then onward, might, if we wanted, be seen as modelling itself on the dominant power to which it was allied, and perhaps also on nearby Roman colonies⁶⁰.

I do not wish to deny this, but only to pause for thought. Domestic architecture develops rapidly right across Italy from the early second century onwards. Since the generals commanding Roman armies had greatest opportunity for profit, they are assumed to have been the trend-setters. The truth is that we cannot demonstrate this archaeologically, since the remains of late republican housing in the City itself are pretty limited, even after Carandini's excavations on the slopes of the Palatine, the fragments that remain are not spectacular, and even the plot sizes Carandini finds, of the order of 900 square metres, are far from palatial⁶¹. Our main reason for supposing that the late republican aristocracy lived in splendid houses

⁵⁹ G. COLONNA, "Urbanistica e architettura", in M. PALLOTTINO (ed.), *Rasenna. Storia e civiltà degli Etruschi* (Milano 1986), 371-530; L. DONATI, *La Casa dell'Impluvium: architettura etrusca a Roselle* (Roma 1994); cf. "Rethinking the Roman atrium house", in *Domestic Space in the Roman World: Pompeii and Beyond*, *JRA Suppl.* 22 (1997), 219-40.

⁶⁰ On self-romanization in Oscan Pompeii, see ZANKER, *Pompeii* (cit. n.43), 59.

⁶¹ A. CARANDINI and P. CARAFA (Eds.), *Palatium e sacra via I*, *Bollettino di Archeologia* 31-34 (Roma 1995, issued 2000).

derives from their moralizing protests, such as the row between the censors Domitius Ahenobarbus and Licinius Crassus over the value of a row of trees, or the allegation by Fenestella that the house of Aemilius Lepidus, in its day the finest in Rome, was within a generation not even in the top one hundred. What those protests document most securely is the strong resistance within Rome to the hellenistic elements defined as luxurious; the absolute degree of luxury cannot be judged, for all the anecdotes assure us that this was a relative perception, and yesterday's luxury became tomorrow's norm⁶².

If we turn, on the other hand, to Pompeii, and consider the Casa del Fauno, built and embellished in the mid to late second century, we may be struck by luxury that would stand up to any ancient mediterranean criteria. At over 3000 square metres, it is the largest documented town house in Pompeii, not for the second century, but for any period. I do not know of a larger non-imperial urban plot in Italy, and is comparable to the dimensions of hellenistic palaces⁶³. Its extraordinary collection of mosaics, recently made easier to see in their context by the studies of Fausto Zevi, are not only far superior to anything found elsewhere in Pompeii, but include the finest examples of *opus vermiculatum* found anywhere⁶⁴.

The owners of the house, the Satrii, are an important Oscan family. Their hellenization has been detected not only in their taste for mosaics, but their wit: for if the famous Faun is restored to his Greek identity as a satyr, he becomes the emblem of the Sat(i)rii⁶⁵, a pun repeated in the principle *cubiculum*, where a satyr makes love to a nymph. Zevi would like the Satrii to descend from an ancestor who fought as a

⁶² ZANKER, *Pompeii*, 35-36 similarly notes that restraints might be felt in Rome that did not apply outside.

⁶³ ZANKER, *ibid.*

⁶⁴ F. ZEVI, "Die Casa del Fauno in Pompeji und das Alexandermosaik", in *MDAI(R)* 105 (1998), 21-65; see also, with full illustrations, *I mosaici della Casa del Fauno* (Napoli 1998).

⁶⁵ ZEVI, "Die Casa del Fauno", 40 n.53.

mercenary for Alexander at Issus. But even without such a biographical reference, the Alexander mosaic is already eloquent: Satrius is swept away by the same Alexander *imitatio* as the Roman dynasts, and presents himself as a hellenistic king. The question is whether in doing so he is imitating Roman dynasts, or pursuing his own parallel imitation of hellenistic magnificence.

What I am suggesting is that rather than the convention pyramid model, whereby the *nobiles* lead, and the *equites* and *domi nobiles* follow, the intensity of imitation of hellenistic luxury may be due to the fact that a broad group had direct access to Greek models. One thinks, inescapably, of the Italici of Delos, and of the fact that the best known antecedents for Pompeian 'first style' are precisely from Delos⁶⁶. Lucullus is said by Cicero to have responded to criticisms of the luxury of his housing by replying that he had neighbours who were *equites* and freedmen who outdid him⁶⁷. Imagine a Roman nobility not confidently outshining the rest of Italy, but rather feeling the pressure of nobodies like the Satrii of Pompeii, rather less inhibited than they in their display by censorial reproof. On this model, it is not just the Roman nobility who "discarded without repining their ancestral virtues" but the municipal families too, with the result that by Vitruvius' day, it really is an *Italica consuetudo* to live in hellenised splendour. It is perhaps because when brought together in contexts like Delos mixed groups of Romani and Italici needed to define a common identity (as Italici) that distinguished them from the very Greek whom they were so avidly imitating, that the basis could have emerged by Vitruvius' day for a perceived common cultural identity, the *nostri* with their *mos italicus* against those Greeks.

⁶⁶ See *Delo e l'Italia*, a cura di F. COARELLI, D. MUSTI, H. SOLIN, Opusc.Inst.Rom.Finlandiae II (Roma 1982); F. COARELLI, "Il commercio delle opere d'arte in età tardo-repubblicana", in *Dial.Arch.* ser. 3,1 (1983), 45-53.

⁶⁷ Cic. *Leg.* 3.30-31. I here modify the model proposed in *Houses and Society in Pompeii and Herculaneum* (Princeton 1994), 143ff.

Consumer goods

Not only Braudel, but a series of historians of the early modern period have shown how a revolution in consumer luxuries helped to transform not only the economies but the social structures of Europe and America⁶⁸. I wish we were in a position to write the history of Roman consumer goods: of marble tables with lion's paw feet, *trapezophoroi*⁶⁹, ornamental marble craters, relief panels, or lunate *oscilla* to suspend in the intercolumniations of peristyles; of bronze couch feet, and the donkey-headed curved arm rests, *fulcra*, in bronze with enamel inlay⁷⁰; of bronze lamps and candelabra, vessels and ram-headed saucepans, and sieves and samovars⁷¹; or of the costly Babylonian fabrics that were spread over beds or suspended between columns, and which only survive in paintings of banquets; of all the stunning array of household goods that spread across Italy from the beginning of the second century⁷², and which we find in the great shipwrecks of Mahdia or Spargi⁷³, or scattered in astonishing profusion even in quite modest households of Pompeii AD 79⁷⁴.

⁶⁸ See e.g. N. MCKENDRICK, J. BREWER and J.H. PLUMB, *The Birth of a Consumer Society: the Commercialization of Eighteenth-Century England* (London 1982), and the important collection of essays, *Consumption and the World of Goods*, ed. by John BREWER and Roy PORTER (London 1993).

⁶⁹ See the unpublished dissertations of Robert COHEN, *Greek and Roman Stone Table Supports with decorative reliefs* (Diss. New York 1984); Christopher Frederick MOSS, *Roman Marble Tables* (Diss. Princeton 1988).

⁷⁰ Sabine FAUST, *Fulcra. Figürlicher und ornamentaler Schmuck an antiken Betten* (Mainz 1989); Beryl BARR-SHARRAR, *The Hellenistic and Early Imperial Decorative Bust* (Mainz 1987).

⁷¹ L. STEFANELLI and M. DI PUOLO, *Il Bronzo dei romani: arredo e suppellettile* (Roma 1990).

⁷² *Bellezza e lusso. Immagini e documenti di piacere della vita*, Mostra, Rome, Castel Sant'Angelo 31 marzo-14 aprile 1992 (Roma 1992).

⁷³ *Das Wrack. Der antike Schiffsfund von Mahdia*, hrsg. von G. HELLENKEMPER SALIES (Köln 1994).

⁷⁴ Best illustrated in the exhibition catalogues *Rediscovering Pompeii*, Exhibition by IBM-ITALIA New York City (Rome 1990), and *Pompeii. Abitare sotto il Vesuvio*, Ferrara, Palazzo dei Diamanti 26 settembre 1996 — 19 gennaio 1997 (Ferrara 1996). The best systematic study of a class of materials is *Il vasellame bronzeo di Pompeii*, a cura di S. TASSINARI, *Sopr.Arch.Pompei*, Cat.5 (Roma 1993).

Were we in a position to follow these, we might understand a bit better the rhythms by which in the cities of Italy men embraced “spoils of conquest, wealth, luxury and power, new tastes and new ideas”. But such is the skew of archaeological study of material culture that we can follow in detail few classes of material other than ceramics. Nevertheless, there are some helpful case-studies. Take bronze couches, *klinai*. A luxury import from the eastern Mediterranean, we are told by Pliny (*NH* 34.9) that Delos was the most famous centre for production of moulded bed-legs, and indeed, a mould has been duly found⁷⁵. The discovery of a series of such legs in the Mahdia wreck with serial numbers engraved has led to the inference of a production of two thousand couches per annum⁷⁶.

But for whom were they destined? The consensus among authors of the Mahdia volume is that they were headed for the luxury villa of some Roman aristocrat. But if we look at the distribution pattern of findspots of the far more elaborate bronze arm-rest attachments, *fulcra*, exhaustively studied by Sabine Faust, we may be struck by a marked diffusion across Italy from the early second century onwards⁷⁷. The most famous piece in the Capitoline museum, of the first BC, is from Amiternum in Umbria. Second-century findspots include Civitella d’Arno further north in Umbria, Palestrina, Lucera in Puglia, and even Sierre and S. Stefano di Cloz in the Alps. The pattern is even better attested for the ivory and bone couch ornaments which regularly used for funerals (the body might be burnt upon them). Cesare Letta charts the 114 examples from the late second/early first BC in Umbria (Arno and Spello), Ancona and Norcia; spreading in the first BC through central Abruzzo (Aielli and Corfinio) to extend by the end of the century from the Po valley (Cremona, Modena) to Puglia (Canosa, Ortona) and Taranto. The first AD brings a decline

⁷⁵ G. SIEBERT, “Mobilier délien en bronze”, in *Études déliennes*, *BCH* Suppl. 1 (Paris 1973), 555-87.

⁷⁶ S. FAUST, in *Das Wrack* (cit. n.73), I 573-606, at 599.

⁷⁷ FAUST, *Fulcra* (cit. n.70).

of this pattern in Italy, but an extension to the Alps, Narbonensis, Tarraconensis, and the Rhine frontier⁷⁸. If the metropolitan nobility were keen on such luxuries (and the evidence for that is literary, not archaeological), their tastes were widely shared.

The possibility to which I am pointing, as in the case of private housing, is the emergence from the second BC onwards of a sort of Italic *koine* of luxury consumer goods; one in which the central Roman elite doubtless play their part, but to which the emergent local elites of many Italian cities contribute enthusiastically. They are scarcely more sluggish in embracing the possibilities of stone funerary memorials, though it has been noted that in the second century, there is still a considerable degree of local individuality, whether in the Etruscan-influenced urns and chests of Umbria, or the quite specific local tradition of head-shaped headstones or *columellae* from Pompeii, a diversity that dies out by the first AD⁷⁹. All this *may* be conceived locally as an attempt to be more 'Roman' in terms of self-expression; but given that the cultural reference is normally to the hellenistic east, it might be better read as a general mediterranean language of success. On this hypothesis, it is the common interest of local elites to find expression for their status that creates a language in which Romani and Italici can converge as having a common identity.

It would be nice to be able to pull ceramics into this picture, because the evidence is so extensive and well-studied, though it is a little hard to make out what the evidence might tell us. An obsession with issues of production to the neglect of those of consumption makes it hard to gain a picture of how these

⁷⁸ C. LETTA, *Due letti funerari in osso dal centro italico-romano della Valle d'Amplero (Abruzzo)*, Monum. Antichi Acc. Naz. Lincei 52 (= ser. misc. III.3) (Roma 1984), 67-115; see also E. TALAMO, "Un letto funerario da una tomba dell'Esquilino", in *Bull. Commissione Archeologica Comunale in Roma* 92,1 (1987-88), 17-102.

⁷⁹ *Römische Gräberstraßen. Selbstdarstellung, Status, Standard*, Kolloquium in München vom 28. bis 30. Oktober 1985, hrsg. von H. VON HESBERG & P. ZANKER (München 1987), 17; cf. CRAWFORD, in *CAH X²* (cit. n.33), 429-33.

wares were used in daily life. Only at Pompeii can we begin to see how ceramics stand alongside luxury silver goblets, bronze jars and vessels, and glass. Doubtless there were still areas where the wooden cups that so appealed to the idylls of the poets were used. In this complicated pattern, pottery doubtless takes its place towards the bottom of the hierarchy; nevertheless, the gulf between the coarsewares and an Arretine goblet is vast, and the ambition of Arretine to offer the joys of hellenistic luxury are explicit. I can only say again that I detect the emergence of a remarkable homogeneous cultural language from the early second century onwards, which comes to fruition, so to speak, with Augustus in an astonishingly self-confident production which takes for granted that the language of hellenistic luxury, far from being the perquisite of the Roman nobility, belongs to everyone who can afford a ceramic goblet. The freedmen and petty traders who by the late first BC in notable numbers plaster their walls with their elegant third-style decoration and mythological paintings, or line the streets with their funerary portraits in togas, for all the world like the *maiores* of the nobility, can reach out to a common cultural language.

Conclusion

At first sight, then, it may appear that the archaeology of Italy tells a story opposed to that of Syme: of Rome's gradual elimination of local identity and imposition of its own aristocratic model. Many archaeologists, seemingly dazzled by the power and wealth of the Roman nobility, have tended to stress a pyramidal model by which imitation spreads from the centre outwards. That picture coincides too with the theses of Erich Gruen, who sees the Roman ruling class, despite all debates, as ultimately secure and in control of its own identity⁸⁰. I want to push for an alternative model which is much

⁸⁰ E.S. GRUEN, *Culture and National Identity in Republican Rome* (Ithaca, NY 1992).

closer to that of Syme: in which the new language of what materially constitutes 'the Roman', clearly articulated for the first time under Augustus, is the result of a dialectic between Rome and Italy; in which on the one hand the centripetal force of Rome extends, but on the other the cities of Italy play their active part in evolving a new urban model and a new ways of life, and the end result, neither totally a victory for the Roman nobility, nor their total displacement by the new municipal elites, at least represents assimilation into a common cultural identity. Italy appropriates Rome's *maiores*, and the result is a *mos Italicus*.

DISCUSSION

F. Millar: This paper makes a real contribution both to the intellectual background of Syme himself and to the question of Rome and Italy and their respective places in the Augustan revolution.

First, as regards the Oxford context in which Syme was first a student and then became, almost immediately, a Fellow of Trinity College and Tutor there in Ancient History: the emphasis given in the paper to the interest in Roman archaeology, and the support provided from Oxford for the establishment and development of the British School at Rome serves very clearly to underline that Syme, among all great Roman historians, was perhaps the one to whom Latin literature was most central. Indeed, his historical writing was precisely bounded by the classic period of Latin literature, from Cicero to Tacitus (with the *Historia Augusta* as an amusement, or obsession, of his later years). Tacitus was of course central to his conception of Roman history, and it could be said that his use of epigraphy was largely devoted to illuminating the backgrounds and careers of those who appeared in the pages of Tacitus, and also Pliny the Younger.

If we then turn to the major historical question posed in the paper, the respective roles of Rome and Italy in the 'revolution', was Syme justified in regarding it as in some way a victory of the non-political classes of Italy over the traditional holders of power in Rome? In this context it is certainly very illuminating to stress the degree to which Vitruvius goes out of his way to identify an Italian style of architecture, distinct from the Greek one. For, if we were disposed to wonder whether in fact the notion of an *Italian* identity has any substance in this period, here it is, explicitly expressed.

However, the question of whether we should be thinking of a domination and 'Romanization' of Italy, carried out by Rome, or of a victory of Italy over Rome, is inevitably going to receive an ambiguous answer. It is a commonplace, after all, that our understanding of 'Romanness' very largely depends on writers of the (broadly) Augustan period who came from different regions of Italy, not forgetting the Tiberian loyalist, Velleius Paterculus. Whose victory was that, Rome's or Italy's?

Looking back to Republican history, and developments in the Caesarian, Triumviral and then Augustan period, we could stress the earlier extension of the *ager Romanus*, and the importance of the *coloniae Latinae* founded by Rome; the profound importance of something which Michael Crawford has several times stressed, the incorporation of soldiers from all over Italy into the Roman legions in the period after the Social War; *perhaps* a programme of municipalization, and certainly the issuing of rules for the conduct of local communities of all types; and above all the scale, and profound effects, of the settlement of veterans and the foundation of *coloniae* in Italy, from Caesar to Augustus.

It could perhaps be argued that any awareness there was of a coherent 'Italian' identity was the effect of measures taken in Rome, symbolically completed by the Augustan censuses, and the creation of the *regiones* (whose only clearly-attested function was in the context of censuses).

Perhaps the clearest expression of the integration of the (in the Roman context) 'non-political' classes of the towns of Italy into the Roman, or Augustan, system is provided by the numerous local inscriptions of the *equites* whom Ségolène Demougin has studied, which characteristically show how men both held local office and served as centurions or equestrian officers in the Roman army. The *Roman Revolution* still serves to make us ask — and to use all available material evidence in asking — what patterns of social, economic and cultural development lay behind the emergence of 'Augustan Italy'.

A. Wallace-Hadrill: This paper does indeed risk raising questions too vast to settle in this context. The 'Romanization' of Italy still awaits an adequate synthesis of the endless epigraphic, legal and archaeological material that can be brought to bear on the theme. Fergus Millar offers a shopping-list of what would be some of the staples, in the shape of major public measures that inescapably changed the landscape of Italy: I would add, in tribute to the importance attached to the theme by scholars working at the British School at Rome, from Ashby through Wiseman to the latest book of my colleague Ray Laurence⁸¹, the impact of road-building. However, my focus is more precise, constrained by the question of how attention to material culture might illuminate Syme's theme of the triumph with Augustus of *tota Italia*. The gradual imposition of a central Roman model on the rest of Italy is perhaps too obvious a theme to have much to offer to a post-colonialist generation. The paradoxical twist the New Zealander offered, that by penetrating the establishment the peripheries could make the centre their own, still seems to offer a good deal of mileage. Oddly enough, my conclusion is not that Syme needed to study the archaeological evidence to reach his conclusions, but that those who study such evidence now might get more out of it if they started from Syme's insights.

As for Syme's devotion to literary sources, I am happy to believe that at a personal level his aversion to the archaeological was balanced by a passion for the literary. We are all entitled to our preferences. The problem only comes when those preferences become institutionalised. Is the privileging of the literary over the archaeological an embedded part of the Oxford School of Roman history? It is as much of a relief to me to discover that this was not so before Syme as to note that it is not so now, and that figures like Meiggs and (another splendid New Zealander) Frederiksen sustained an old tradition in the intervening period.

⁸¹ R. LAURENCE, *The Roads of Roman Italy: Mobility and Cultural Change* (London 1999).

T. Hölscher: Ihr reicher und stimulierender Beitrag wirft viele wichtige Fragen auf, von denen ich nur drei aufgreifen will: kurz zu Ronald Syme, kurz zu den archäologischen Befunden, etwas eingehender zu dem Konzept der 'Identität'.

Die Vernachlässigung der archäologischen Zeugnisse bei Ronald Syme sollten wir wohl nicht — auch nicht unbewußt — nach den Möglichkeiten beurteilen, die die Fragestellungen und Methoden der *heutigen* Archäologie für Symes Thema geboten hätten. Wenn man die verherrschenden Tendenzen der klassischen Archäologie in den 30er Jahren insgesamt betrachtet, so wird es meines Erachtens leicht verständlich, warum Syme die archäologischen Zeugnisse nicht nur absichtlich ausklammerte, sondern warum er tatsächlich keine wesentliche Einsichten davon versprach.

Was die urbanistische Gestalt der städtischen Zentren und die Kultur der privaten Wohnsitze betrifft, so stimme ich völlig zu, daß der große Aufschwung in vielen Gebieten Italiens seit dem 2. Jahrhundert v.Chr. nicht einfach als Rezeption und Imitation von Vorbildern aus Rom zu verstehen ist, sondern eine parallele, zum Teil sicher kompetitive Übernahme allgemeiner hellenistischer Kulturformen darstellt. Dennoch scheint mir kein Zweifel möglich, daß der große Reichtum privater Wohnsitze in Rom während der späten Republik nicht nur ein ideologisches Konstrukt der augusteischen Kritik, sondern historische Realität ist. Die Jahrhunderte der Republik sind in Rom durch Grabungen besonders lückenhaft erschlossen, vor allem fehlen auch die Nekropolen. Einzelne schriftliche Quellen und archäologische Zeugnisse enthalten aber genügend konkrete Hinweise auf sehr hohe kulturelle Standards.

Große Schwierigkeiten habe ich mit dem Begriff und Konzept der 'Identität'. Es ist meines Erachtens ein nebulöser Begriff, der vor allem in problematischer Weise zu pauschalen und monolithischen Interpretationen geführt hat. Die holistische 'Identität' von Personen, Gruppen, Völkern ist ein Phantom, es gibt nur partielle Identitäten: kulturelle Identität der Lebenskultur, soziale Identität gesellschaftlicher Gruppen,

kommunitäre Identität von definierten Gemeinschaften, politische Identität von Parteien oder Staaten, religiöse, sprachliche, berufliche und sonstige Identitäten. Man sollte den Begriff nur im Plural gebrauchen. Die einzelnen Individuen haben viele verschiedene Identitäten, und insgesamt sind Identitäten oft nicht kongruent: eine Gemeinschaft mit kommunitärer Identität kann Mitglieder mit verschiedener kultureller Identität umfassen, eine übergreifende kulturelle Identität kann von verschiedenen Gemeinschaften mit kommunitärer Identität gebildet werden, und die politischen Konstellationen und Identitäten können wiederum ganz verschieden davon sein. Die partiellen Identitäten können koinzidieren und sich verstärken, sie können einander widersprechen und zu Krisen führen, sie können aber vor allem auch kontingent nebeneinander liegen, ohne zu Widersprüchen zu führen. Die Forschung ist mit monolithischen Konzepten von Identität oft zu sehr schematischen und forcierten Ergebnissen gekommen. Denn der Begriff hat Konsequenzen.

Was die Forschung feststellen kann, ist zunächst kulturelle Homogenität oder Distinktion. Es ist schon unklar, ob solche Befunde immer auch als kulturelle Identität interpretiert werden könnten. Wenn man meint, dazu berechtigt zu sein, ergeben sich Fragen zu untergeordneten Phänomenen und Begriffen. Was bedeutet Imitation? Sie kann Selbstunterwerfung, Partnerschaft oder Konkurrenz anzeigen. Was bedeutet Competition? Wenn mein Nachbar einen Porsche fährt, kann ich entweder auch mit einem Porsche oder aber mit einem Jaguar — durch Ausgleichung oder durch Distinktion — konkurrieren. Die Kluft zwischen den konkreten Phänomenen und dem Konzept der 'Identität' ist groß und methodisch schwierig zu überbrücken.

Karthago hat seit dem 4. Jahrhundert v. Chr. durch Rezeption griechischer Elemente ein Stück griechischer kultureller Identität angenommen, gleichzeitig aber wohl seine kommunitäre Identität nicht geändert und seine politische Identität in immer stärkerer Opposition zu Rom (mit dem kulturell griechischen

Unteritalien und Sizilien!) entwickelt. Pompeji hat im 2. Jahrhundert v.Chr. das Forum mit einem Tempel für Juppiter und einer Basilica ausgestattet, wie sie in Rom das Stadtzentrum beherrschten — aber es bleibt offen, ob die vielfach akzeptierte Deutung als 'Selbst-Romanisierung' zutrifft oder es ein Akt der Selbstbehauptung gegen Rom ist, ob dies politisch der Ausdruck einer römischen oder pompeianischen Identität ist.

Diese Überlegungen stellen Ihre Ausführungen nicht in Frage, aber sie können vielleicht helfen, die Fragen der Hellenisierung und Romanisierung zu klären, die Sie so pointiert aufgeworfen haben.

A. Wallace-Hadrill: I warmly welcome these rich and suggestive reflections on the concept of identity: which emerges from Tonio Hölscher's clear and nuanced analysis as complex and many-layered ('nebulous', I would say, perhaps applies better to the concept of 'culture'). Among those many layers, I find that language is particularly interesting, both for its strong potential in marking identity, and for the possibility of multiple identities that it opens (I have suggested that Roman bilingualism allowed a deliberate exploitation of ambiguity of identities through 'code-switching').

Above all, we are nowadays more sensitive than in the 1930s to the way that 'national identities', far from being monolithic or a given, are an arena of contest and conflict. It is striking to note the extent to which not only Syme, but his predecessor Hugh Last⁸², though far from the ideologies of national socialism or fascism, nevertheless accepted the possibility of a genuine Italian 'national identity', forged, however fraudulently, by Augustus. Andrea Giardina's vision of the *identità incompiuta* of Augustan Italy reflects contemporary perceptions of the inadequacy of nationalism in circumscribing definitions of identity.

It is particularly true that the appearance of homogeneity in the archaeological record can lead us astray into imagining a

⁸² H.M. LAST, in *CAH X* (Cambridge 1934), ch.14: "The social policy of Augustus", 425-64.

homogeneity of cultural identity. People may wear the same clothes and eat off the same ceramics without feeling communality. The spread of similar forms of urbanism and a common material culture across first century BC Italy surely precedes the political unification and extension of access to political privilege which was not achieved without the crisis represented by the Social War. But what I wish to say is that material culture is not a neutral sphere that reflects what is going on elsewhere. It is itself an arena of conflict and competition, of assertion of identity in a context of challenge. The staggering building schemes of the cities of central Italy in the second century BC, from Palestrina to Tivoli to Terracina to Alatri or Ferentinum, are vigorous assertions of local pride and identity. The denial of access to political equality at the centre surely sharpened the need for such assertions, and in so doing helped to reformulate the language by which being 'Roman' could be redefined.

J. Scheid: Les grands lieux de culte comme celui de Fortuna Primigenia constituent l'un des signes matériels spectaculaires de l'extraordinaire richesse des cités et des élites italiques. Or, ces lieux de culte d'importance supra-régionale jouent, dans le processus de la 'romanisation', un rôle significatif. Depuis la Guerre sociale, les grands lieux de culte, quand ils ne sont pas purement et simplement fermés (Pietrabbondante), deviennent des colonies romaines, souvent réduites à un territoire minimal (Diana Tifatina, Lucus Angitiae, Lucus Feroniae), ou bien sont attribués à des colonies (Fortuna Primigenia, sanctuaire des sources du Clitumne attribué par Auguste à Hispellum). Rome intervient donc lourdement pour contrôler ces lieux symboliques des identités italiques, et réorganiser par ce biais les structures régionales. En même temps, les cultes eux-mêmes s'inscrivent dans le cadre du droit sacré romain colonial et deviennent partie du patrimoine religieux 'romain'. On peut donc parler de romanisation du patrimoine symbolique des italiques, et d'une victoire de Rome sur l'Italie.

Mais la situation est plus compliquée. Qui sont les colons qui forment l'instrument de cette romanisation? Ce sont des vétérans originaires, en grande partie, de l'Italie. Après la décision initiale de la réduction de colonies, la romanisation de l'Italie est effectuée par des Italiques qui n'étaient, d'ailleurs, pas nécessairement originaires de la région concernée, de telle sorte que l'on doit aussi parler d'une victoire de l'Italie sur l'Italie, sur une autre Italie.

A. Wallace-Hadrill: Another good example of the brutal suppression of local cult-places after the Social War has recently emerged near Stabiae, where a sanctuary of Minerva, with rich offerings that stretch between the fourth and second centuries, terminates abruptly in the early first century BC, and becomes incorporated in a private estate⁸³. The determination with which such sanctuaries were suppressed or brought under control underlines the key role of religion as a focus for local identity: I take the Roman suppression as confirmation of their effectiveness in the previous century in asserting identity. Of course, it is only in the period of the Social War itself that an assertion of local identity acquires its new colour as a denial of Roman identity (since the two were previously compatible, as they would be later).

As for the role of Italian veterans in recolonising and re-identifying Italy, we are reminded again of the crucial role played by population movements within the peninsular, reaching its peak under the triumvirs, in breaking down the old fabric of diversity.

⁸³ P. MINIERO *et alii*, "Il santuario campano in località Privati presso Castellammare di Stabia. Osservazioni preliminari", in *Rivista di Studi Pompeiani* 8 (1997), 11-56.

