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My motivation to write a classic play about Cincinnatus, the famous Roman consul of 458 B.C., arose from my awareness that playwrights and poets through the centuries have seemed to bypass the great achievements of this important Roman consul. His legacy has been overshadowed by the accomplishments of other Roman heroes such as Julius Caesar, whose triumphs in my opinion did not rise to the same level as what Cincinnatus attained in Roman history. In his Early History of Rome, Titus Livy stressed the unparalleled importance of this consul who answered his nation’s call to duty when Livy said, “What followed merits the attention of those who despise all human qualities in composition with riches, and think there is no room for great honors or worth but amidst a profusion of wealth.”1 If the poets and playwrights would acknowledge Livy’s statement concerning this dutiful consul,

---

1 Livy: with an English Translation in Fourteen Volumes, II of Books III—IV, 89.
they will observe that he deserves more than the monuments dedicated to his honor that one finds in Italy, Britain, and even in the United States of America. 

Hoping to give Cincinnatus his due regards, I have used Aristotle’s rhetorical theory on philosophical dialogues to compose a classic play befitting this Roman hero in order to further immortalize his legacy as the one who established the Roman values and ideals on which pax Romana (peace of Rome) was based. As part of his reforms to establish pax Romana, Augustus drew on the model of Cincinnatus and on the writings of Livy generally. The play incorporates the principles and qualities of Roman politics, focusing on leaders of the Roman republic who founded the Roman political theater.
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Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

*Purpose of writing Cincinnatus, model of Roman political theater*

*Cincinnatus* is a Roman political play written in free verse. My intention in explaining this section of Titus Livy’s Early History of Rome in free verse is to arouse the sensations, which are usually suppressed by the narrative style of writing history. The play employs the features of Aristotelian theory of Greek drama to develop the concealed values and virtues of Roman culture in the story. These hidden facts are sometimes bypassed as contemporary historians convey details about the experience of a group of people to audiences who are not familiar with a particular culture. *Cincinnatus* is blended with dexterity of plot construction, artistic poetic lyrics, and tragicomedy that are distinctive of Romans of early Republican culture. Livy’s persuasive storytelling technique is remixed with arrangement that divides the story into acts and scenes, which describe the values and virtues of Romans of the early republic.

Contents in chapters one, two, and three are independent articles designed to accompany the play. These articles are intended to provide background information that will be helpful to readers in understanding the story. Chapter one explains the purpose of writing Cincinnatus. Chapter two explicates Livy’s historiography; the preamble of the events of 458 B.C.; and the narrative of Livy’s story adapted into drama. Chapter three provides the information on how the play sticks to the original
source; the character sketches and functions of the actors of Roman political theater; and how I have used Aristotle’s theory of catharsis to achieve the adaptation.

P. G. Walsh indicates that Livy’s purpose for writing history is not merely to instruct and edify, but also to affect his readers with ‘pity and fear’; this is what Hellenistic historians intended.¹ Livy divided his narratives into episodes constructed according to Aristotelian principle governing tragedy; they have a beginning, a middle, and an end.² Livy made use of Hellenistic rhetorical style by translating history with narrative style instead of poetry. He carefully articulated history in appropriate chronological contexts to characterize the historical figures, and to signify the importance of the occasions in which the speeches were uttered.³ He wrote his texts as a historian by avoiding dramatic effects of poetry which could be misread by readers.⁴ Archibald W. Allen supports this view when he defines Livy’s position as a literary artist and as a historian, because Livy tried to avoid error of distortion which could arise through the method of implicating a story with poetry. Allen also indicates that Livy’s history “is something more than a source of information; it is also an interpretation of Roman history.”⁵

Allen further observes that Livy’s writing style should be understood from his preamble, where he indicated that he wrote the history of Rome for purpose of study

---

² Ibid.
⁴ Ibid., 178.
without regard to his position as an artist and as a historian. Livy is known as an accomplished stylist trained in rhetoric; he was aware of style as a means of persuasion. With the same purpose, I have written *Cincinnatus* to educate and to entertain readers. I hope that my complementary technique of communication does not affect or distort readers’ choice of facts and arrangement of materials which outline the events being narrated. At the same time, I wrote my adaptation to arouse readers’ understanding of history. *Cincinnatus* is composed with allusions and metaphors that adorn words and do not distort the facts in Livy’s text. I have tried to gain readers’ attention through poetry that prompts emotions which are necessary for dramatic effect without distorting the essential historical facts.

Herodotus is an example of a great historian who first embellished history in order to stimulate readers’ ways of comprehending the past. Some other examples of historians are Theopompus and Ephorus who attended the best among the schools of rhetoric in their days; these students were talented and devoted in their field of discipline as historians while also being orators and public speakers. Marcus Tullius Cicero’s style of writing also followed this creative style of writing history; he was categorized as one of the ancient historians who regarded history as the most artistic form of prose.

Homer’s *Iliad* and *Odyssey* were written before the historical period, but nonetheless assumed to be historical by the ancients. They tell of legendary events

---

6 Ibid
9 Ibid.
stemming from the Mycenaean period. These works appeal to readers’ own judgment and comprehension of the culture of the early Greeks. According to Allen, these examples will help to illuminate Livy’s works “in terms of historical content on the one hand, and literary technique on the other. If these features do not completely clarify Livy’s writing style, what we need is study of Livy as literature which will also help us in understanding Livy as history.” Misunderstanding Livy in this perspective is why literary critics do approach his style of writing with skepticism. It is not uncommon for some of them to understand only one aspect, the historical or the literary, before writing commentaries on it—whether positive or negative. Allen observes that “the value of such study of Livy will be that we can see his distortions not as faults but as the creative work of the historian who finds meaning in the facts he records.”

Following this tradition of presenting history, I was inspired to write *Cincinnatus* with special effects of historical events by treating Livy’s source with the freedom of a poet who incorporates the work of others into new structure. As a playwright, some of the facts of the original story have been suppressed while writing the play, and the exact meaning of some of the virtues and values of Roman *pietas* have been altered through the use of poetic license, but these distortions are not meant to mislead readers; they are to provoke a thoughtful understanding of the religious nature of the story. These are the procedures I applied to compose the dramatic

---

11 Ibid.
adaptation of *Cincinnatus* as I demonstrate the Romans’ confidence in their *pietas* through the bravery of Lucius Quinctius Cincinnatus.
Chapter 2

SOURCES

This section explains how Livy has accumulated records which he used to tell the story of Cincinnatus. This is achieved through examining Livy’s historiography. The chapter also explains how the Augustan period influenced his history of the early Roman republic; his use of Aristotle’s theory of catharsis and purification of the soul; and his dramatic technique of writing history dividing the books into pentads.

*Titus Livy’s Early Years in Patavium*

Livy was born at Padua in northern Italy between 64 and 59 B.C., and his birthplace was certainly Patavium Padova. As to Livy’s level of education, little is known about this great historian, probably because his city of Padua suffered from civil wars which could have destroyed valuable facts about him and his family. His incredible genius of writing was not restricted to his own intellectual gift; he also passed this talent to his two sons. One of them composed a treatise on geography, and the other inherited his talent in speech-making. According to Seneca the Younger, Livy undertook the study of philosophy at home himself by writing philosophical dialogues and on other traditional subjects. Through self-discipline, he dedicated his career to writing the history of Rome, which comprised 142 books, thirty-five are still extant; 150 are probably structured from the foundation of Rome down to 9 B.C. His works are dated as a series of books which set forth Rome’s history from the

---

13 Ibid.
14 Ibid.
foundation of the city to the death of Drusus in 9 B.C.—a period of seven hundred and forty years. Among the books that survived are “I-X and XXI-XLV, which cover the years 753-293 B.C. and 219-167 B.C.”\textsuperscript{15} The existing books do not extend the narrative past 167 B.C., a hundred years before Livy was born.\textsuperscript{16}

Despite the scanty evidence of Livy’s personal history, it is believed that he must have received his education in Patavium and not in Rome. His early life was influenced by the morality inherent in the culture and activities of Patavium, which was largely free of the corruption which dominated Rome. Walsh asserts the impact which disparities in values and virtues of these two cities must have had in the upbringing of Livy as an historian whose theme for writing the history of Rome is moral decadence. Walsh states:

\begin{quote}
It would be difficult to overestimate the importance of this early environmental influence in Transpadane Gaul. This region became increasingly the proverbial repository of the ancient Roman virtues, and Patavium, in contrast to Rome, retained much of the strict moral outlook of older days.\textsuperscript{17}
\end{quote}

However, the influence which the city of Patavium had on Livy’s early life is considered similar in other ways to that of Rome, because the city of Patavium was also a flourishing commercial city like Rome. The conservatism of manners and pro-senatorial attitude of Patavium might have given Livy’s history a traditionally pro-

\textsuperscript{15} P.G. Walsh, \textit{Livy: His Historical Aims and Methods}, 5.
\textsuperscript{16} Ibid., 1.
\textsuperscript{17} Ibid.
Republican outlook with an emphasis on the strict moral code which regulated the lives of the great Republican leaders.\textsuperscript{18} This traditional pro-Republican system must have changed the city of Patavium into an illustrious woolen producing city, and this made it the home of abundant wealth, more so than any other city in Italy with the exception of Rome. Because Livy received his early education in Patavium, this exposure nurtured his internalization of the culture of the city which is said to have had “venerable history claiming to rival the capital in the antiquity of its foundation.”\textsuperscript{19} The traditional feeling of this humble city was not stalled by the tragedy which Julius Caesar caused by invading Italy. However, Walsh assumes that this crisis did not have an undesirable effect on the upbringing of Livy. Efforts to avoid exposing the curiosity of young Livy to “the considerable physical and moral dangers which both the journey and the disordered life in Rome have produced” \textsuperscript{20} were believed to have originated from his parents.

Canter argues a different view of Livy’s beginning and environmental exposure. Canter asserts that it was not only the training and echoes of Rome which Livy had in his early years in Patavium that influenced his career as an orator; he also witnessed the chaotic political condition which was characteristic of Rome during his boyhood years. Canter states that “fourteen years old at the death of Caesar, he was in early life familiar with scenes of revolution and bloodshed, himself an eyewitness of the last struggles for liberty in the Roman state.”\textsuperscript{21} This became a fruitful source of

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{18} P.G. Walsh, \textit{Livy: His Historical Aims and Methods}, 2
\textsuperscript{19} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{20} Ibid., 2-3.
\end{flushright}
communication for his writing career. Also accompanying his growth was the influence of the great generation of public orators which Rome produced. For example, these orators were all gifted in philosophy and public speaking, an essential feature of education for a young Roman.\textsuperscript{22}

Livy demonstrated the experiences of his early life in his history of Rome when he described the “beginning of Antenor’s landing at the head of the Adriatic at about the same time as Aeneas was settling in the south.”\textsuperscript{23} Walsh contradicts Canter’s view on Livy’s transformation when he asserts that Livy continued to discover the humble events of life in Patavium with innocence and unassuming focus until the age of twelve. He claims that it was at this age that Livy faced his first test of life whereby he had to discard his childhood innocence and ordinary view of life. He experienced a “preliminary grounding in the basic subjects at home or at the \textit{ludi}; he presumably went to the local secondary school, where the \textit{grammaticus} supervised the reading of the Greek and Roman poets and historians, and gave instruction in the correct use and pronunciation of words.”\textsuperscript{24} This new method of training attracted the focus of young Livy and he acquired the correct usage and pronunciation of words. His success earned him the respect of his teacher who encouraged his brilliance for the study of history.\textsuperscript{25} Walsh asserts that after this improvement in Livy’s life, he was expected to proceed to Rome for the final stage of his schooling under the \textit{rhetor}—this being the next level of the educational ladder when a child reached the age of sixteen.

\textsuperscript{22} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{23} P.G. Walsh, \textit{Livy: His Historical Aims and Methods}, 2.
\textsuperscript{24} Ibid., 2.
\textsuperscript{25} Ibid., 3.
Contrary to Canter’s claim that the young Livy witnessed the death of Caesar and the scenes of revolution and bloodshed that ravaged the Roman state, Walsh states that “Livy probably remained in his native city.”\(^{26}\) His reason for making this assertion is that at the time Livy was supposed to move to Rome, the Civil War was in progress. Walsh bases his assertion on Jerome’s chronology, which states that during this period the disturbance that followed Caesar’s death was spreading towards the northern part of Rome; therefore, Livy probably remained in his home in Patavium and did not move to Rome as Canter had indicated. \(^{27}\)

Walsh further specifies that in the traditional standard of education in the Greco-Roman world of that period, very often a Roman student would round off his formal education within a year or two in Athens or Rhodes. The curriculum included lectures on the works of outstanding philosophers and rhetoricians of the day. He argues that we cannot be certain whether Livy studied abroad because that period was not the most favorable years for students going abroad. The seaways of transportation were dangerous in the years after 40 B.C. Despite these interruptions, young Romans managed to cross over to Greece. Walsh doubts that Livy ever crossed these obstacles and actually witnessed the sites which he claimed, while conceding that “in general his vagueness of geography might suggest that he traveled a little in these formative years.” \(^{28}\)

\(^{26}\) P.G. Walsh, *Livy: His Historical Aims and Methods*, 3.
\(^{27}\) Ibid.
\(^{28}\) P.G. Walsh, *Livy: His Historical Aims and Methods*, 3.
Walsh contends that even if Livy had traveled to Greece during wartime, his writings show that he possessed no military experience, and he lacked military skill in strategy and combat operations; “he can never have thrown a *pilum* in anger.” 29 Walsh therefore assumed that Livy must have stayed at home in Patavium and read on his own to pursue his interest in philosophy and history. Walsh’s view is similar to Seneca’s view which indicated that Livy undertook the study of philosophy at home on his own by writing philosophical dialogues and about other traditional subjects. 30 Through self-discipline, Livy committed his career to writing the history of Rome.

**How the Augustan period influenced Livy’s History**

After his early years in Patavium, Livy’s aims and methods of writing developed into a philosophical idealism that was ready to be applied to Rome’s political and religious history during the Augustan period in which he lived. According to Hans Petersen, Livy appeared to apply traditional principles to compose Roman history.

Livy not only referred now and then explicitly to his own times in certain passages of his narrative, he merely alludes, in somewhat veiled manner, to contemporary, or at any rate near-contemporary, events. Thus, when he says in his preface that the Romans of his times could endure neither their

---

29 Ibid., 4.
30 Titus Livy, *Rome and Italy*, 11.
own corruption nor its corrective, he seems to allude to the law concerning marriage which Augustus had proposed in the year 28 B.C.\textsuperscript{31}

The state of affairs which Augustus inherited was corruption and devastation of the Roman state, and Augustus’ attempt to correct this problem might have influenced Livy’s idealization of the way of life of the early Republicans. This concern was manifested in the close attention which Livy paid to Augustan views, and much more as he promoted the emperor’s policies.\textsuperscript{32} W. Liebeschuetz shares this observation and acknowledges that Livy’s argument is in favor of morality which he might have acknowledged from the Augustan period. This is indicated in his observation of \textit{fides} (reliability and trust) in private, public, and international concerns. However, Liebeschuetz is cognizant that Livy did not place absolute value on moral issues.\textsuperscript{33}

Walsh presents a similar view about Livy’s history and Augustan tradition; he believes that Livy’s Early History of Rome started in an atmosphere of renewed hope for Rome. For example, the crisis and the restoration that took place during the time of Augustus in the years 29-27 B.C. can be considered similar to the story of the crisis with the Aequians and the Sabines, 467-458 B.C., a crisis resolved when until Cincinnatus gave the Romans hope and victory. This event suggests that 467-58 reflects the hope which came “after two decades of horrors of fratricidal war; the years 29-27 saw the introduction of peace both at home and abroad…”\textsuperscript{34} These two similar

\begin{itemize}
\item[32] Ibid.
\item[34] P.G. Walsh, \textit{Livy: His Historical Aims and Methods}, 10.
\end{itemize}
periods of restoration ushered in the enthusiasm and willingness of rebuilding Rome, and they gave the nation the greatness and strength of revitalization which Cincinnatus and Augustus had for the new generation of their respective periods. Reconstruction work envisioned by the two heroes was not only manifested in architectural works but also in a new spirit of Republican government.

Walsh observes that the eagerness of Augustus toward the renewal of the Republican tradition and its leadership was not adequately acknowledged in Livy’s aims and methods. Walsh suggests that Livy “must have welcomed Augustus as the second founder who was needed to put a halt to the progressive degeneration, political and moral, to which Sallust and others had draw attention.”35 Livy did not appear to give prominence to the impact of the new Republican tradition of the senators of the Augustan period. Rather, he portrayed Augustus through his description of heroes such as Cincinnatus, and not the character of the entire Republican system which controlled the state of affairs in Rome during that period.36

Walsh also subscribes to the idea of the heroic fame given to Cincinnatus; he indicates that this must have been conceived from the impression of Augustus as a second Romulus. Augustus’ great impact as an emperor was strongly current in Rome after the final defeat of Brutus and his conspirators by Mark Anthony in the battle of Philippi.37 Livy also suggests Augustus through his depiction of Cincinnatus from Livy’s discussion of *spolia opima*. According to Harriet Flower, *spolia opima* was the

35 Ibid.
36 Ibid., 10-11.
most exalted military respect a Roman commander could desire. The spoil was
dedicated to a Roman general who could kill the enemy leader in battle and strip the
corpse of its armor.38 Petersen emphasizes that Livy’s discussion of the *spolia opima*
of A. Cornelius Cossus is also connected with the event of “Augustus’ refusal to allow
M. Licinius Crassus who had with his own hands killed the Bastarnian chieftain Deldo
in 29 B.C.”39 Another correlation between the past and the Augustan period in Livy’s
history is the oration in which Camillus implored his fellow Romans to migrate to *Veii*
and not to leave Rome. This could reflect the skepticism surrounding Anthony’s plan
to transfer the citadel of Rome to Egypt in 33 B.C. during the second triumvir as
conflict erupted between Octavius and Anthony. 40

Anthony’s story could have influenced Livy, when Livy wrote of the
dissatisfaction of the tribunes concerning the dictatorship powers given to Cincinnatus
by the senate. Livy reproduced Augustus’ criticism of Anthony’s dissension when
Livy said that the tribunes proved true to form by trying to obstruct the raising of
troops; this parallels Anthony’s attempt to obstruct the work of Augustus when
Pompey was taking over the interest of Rome. Livy confirmed this when he stated in
the story of Cincinnatus that the tribune “might indeed have succeeded had not a fresh
cause for alarm presented itself in an unexpected move by the Sabines.” 41 Therefore,
Livy’s aims and methods concerning the consulship of Cincinnatus could be seen as a
tool of Augustan propaganda. Walsh acknowledges that Livy’s History was

38 Harriet I. Flower, “The Tradition of Spolia Opioma: M. Claudius Marcellus and Augustus,”
40 Ibid.
encouraged by the government and especially by the emperor, and that Livy understood the emperor. Livy’s connection with the government is similar to Virgil and Horace who also wrote during the Augustan period.\textsuperscript{42}

Despite Walsh’s skepticism concerning Livy’s historical references, Walsh is reluctant to absolutely classify Livy as a crusader for Augustus. Walsh explains that it is seemingly probable for Livy not to be a campaigner of Augustus, noting that “Titus Livy…praised Cnaeus Pompey to such heights that Augustus called him a Pompeian…”\textsuperscript{43} It is surprising that this did not destroy the friendship between Augustus and Livy. Scholars suggest that Augustus might have organized the friendship for his own political advantage. Livy’s historical reference about the rebellious character of Brutus and Cassius toward Caesar is also in doubt, because as Walsh observes, Livy sometimes portrayed both conspirators as men of distinctions as in the case of Cincinnatus to Minucius.\textsuperscript{44} In any event, Walsh prefers not to categorize Livy as a campaigner of Augustus because publications of his first decade contained emphasis on restorations of religious observances which had taken place long before “the other manifestations of concern with religion—the \textit{Ludi Saeculares} in 17 B.C., and many revivals of obsolete ceremonials introduced after Augustus became Pontifex Maximus in 12 B.C…”\textsuperscript{45}

These and many other proofs are assessed by various critics to invalidate earlier suspicion about Augustus’ political influence over Livy and many other

\textsuperscript{42} P.G. Walsh, \textit{Livy: His Historical Aims and Methods}, 11.
\textsuperscript{43} Ibid., 12.
\textsuperscript{44} P.G. Walsh, \textit{Livy: His Historical Aims and Methods}, 13.
\textsuperscript{45} Ibid., 13-15.
influential writers of that period. Unlike many assessors of Livy’s work, Walsh distinguished his views by indicating that it is not possible to prove a direct connection between Augustus’ period of reformation with the work of this famous historian. Walsh believes that Livy constructively set forth the Republican public policy with his resourceful approach to history, instead of sedulously ornamenting it.46

Livy and the use of Aristotle’s theory of catharsis and purification of the soul

Livy’s ingenious approach to composing history makes use of Aristotle’s theory of catharsis, or moral and intellectual purification of the soul. Leone Golden describes Aristotle’s theory as

a form of moral purification through which proper discipline is placed on the audience’s reaction to pity and fear; a structural development in which the expansion of a plot or the plot of a story purifies the tragic deed of its moral pollution, and thus allows the audience to experience the emotions of pity and fear; and a form of intellectual clarification in which the concepts of pity and fear are clarified by artistic or poetic representation of them.47

Livy’s aim of creating the mysterious character of Cincinnatus to purify the tragic history of early Roman from moral pollution enabled Livy to gain the attention of his

46 Ibid., 14.
readers, and to increase their level of consciousness. Livy used this method by narrating the events of 458 B.C. with distinct plot construction. He started to heighten the mood of readers from the beginning (preamble to the battle of Mount Algidus 467-458 B.C.) to the peak (the call of Cincinnatus from his Quinctian Meadow’s farm 458 B.C.) on to the end or resolution (the victory of Romans through Cincinnatus).48

Liebeschuetz identifies Livy’s use of the tragic method of catharsis for purification of the soul in the narrative of the Caudine Forks disaster through the retribution earned by Romans for arrogant refusal of a Samnite offer of peace. Livy’s major theme was to teach the Romans a lesson through the tragedy of war.49 The Samnite conflict evoked in the character of the Romans an arrogant attitude coupled with injustice of their cause, and they attained retribution for it. Livy was concerned that the Romans did not gain the moral purification of catharsis, which is to learn a lesson from their tragic actions and purge their souls with emotions of pity and fear. He stated that the Romans’ reaction to disaster and humiliation gave an impressive example of the Roman character; this being “pride and sense of honor which made the Samnites’ rejection of the advice of Herennius Pontius a disastrous mistake.”50 Also, the disaster which necessitated the need to call Cincinnatus as dictator to rescue Rome in 458 B.C. did not produce any lesson from war in the patricians; but the plebeians have learned from the war. Livy indicated that the plebeians and their tribune representatives expressed their feelings on the tragedy of war through their unhappy

---

48 P.G. Walsh, *Livy: His Historical Aims and Methods*, 42.
50 Ibid.
reaction to Cincinnatus when he arrived in Rome: “He was then escorted to his residence through streets lined with great crowds of common folk [the plebeians] who, be it said, were by no means so pleased to see the new Dictator, as they thought his power excessive and dreaded the way in which he was likely to use it.” 51 These examples show that Livy’s purpose of writing history is not merely to teach and edify, but also to purify his reader’s souls with ‘pity and fear’; this is what many Hellenistic historians aimed at in writing history. 52

Liebeschuetz further observes from Livy’s tragic method of writing history that readers would be fully convinced that a group of people such as the Romans could not possibly live at peace even after suffering great humiliation from their enemies, such as in the Samnite war and the Aequi wars. The Romans believed that they were strong, courageous, and humane, if not morally justified in their actions. 53 This kind of conduct could have encouraged Livy to restrict the use of rationalism for portraying Romans’ actions. Instead, he used inexplicable ideas when he cited “many examples of the social use of religion to keep the people in order, or to oppose political change, and gives no indication that he considers this an abuse.” 54

Other examples of cathartic methods which Livy referred to as having kept the Romans in order to avoid tragedy is sorting out the lot or throwing a coin and thus determining the outcome of an event. This system is called sortitio; it helped the

52 P.G. Walsh, Livy: His Historical Aims and Methods, 177-178.
54 Ibid., 49.
Romans to overturn the intensity of competition by making it easy to divide the duties and privileges of office. “Sortes picked the highly influential *centuria praerogativa* and apportioned provinces, armies, and a variety of other tasks among consuls and praetors…” 55 With lots they matched *quastors* with magistrates, and scribes with *quastors*. The lot was also used to establish the method of selecting the *princeps senatus*. By the end of the republican period this system was used to select the senate’s representatives. At the *comitia tributa* or the *concilium plebeis* the lot made it easy to organize how each tribe voted on legislation, and how the Latins exercised their rights to vote in Rome. 56 *Sortitio* enabled the Romans to decide the order in which the presiding officer announced each tribe’s choice when the assemblies elected minor magistrates. The system served as a tie-breaker in an election when a candidate could not win a landslide victory and clearly emerge as the winner. *Sortition’s* contribution to the conduct of public business was critical in areas of various pious duties—the military, the criminal courts, and colonization.

*Sortition* as a religious restraint was highly necessary in the Roman political system which was based on struggle for greatness and nobility. As a result, firm limits were required upon the pursuit of these noble ambitions so that the state and its rulers could be protected from dangers that came with nobility. 57 Another example of how religion or moral purification was important for limiting human desire is implied through Varros’ speech in which he stated that “the superstitious man fears the gods

---

56 Ibid., 43-44.
57 Nathan Rosenstein, “Sorting out the Lot in Republican Rome,” 43-44.
but the truly religious person reveres them as parents.”58 It is not certain whether Livy developed an idea of natural religion for moral purification in his writing, but his Books 1-14 show the use of rudiments of religious virtues for moral purification. This is observed in the events of the capture of Veii by the Romans, and the capture of Rome by the Gauls. Livy used these two events to describe how the insolent act of the conquered and the devout act of the victors have recorded. Livy referred to this subject of moral purification after the tragedy of the capture of Veii:

And now the games and the Latin festival had been repeated; now the water had been let out from the Alban Lake upon the fields, and now her fate was seeking Veii out. Accordingly, the leader fated to bring out destruction of that city and to save his country, Marcus Furius Camillus, was appointed dictator. The change in command instantaneously changes the entire situation.59

The capture of Veii by the Romans, and the capture of Rome by the Gauls are deemed similar to the chaos of 467-459 B.C. before restoration came through Cincinnatus in 458 B.C. Livy could have presented all these tragedies to incriminate the impact of the flagrant breach of pietas. Liebeschuetz emphasizes that “Before the disaster, the Romans replaced a deceased censor, took no notice of a divine warning, and expelled their ablest general Camillus.”60 Livy acknowledged that the Romans regarded these events as just literal accounts of the way the gods reward piety and

59 Ibid.
60 Ibid., 50.
punish impiety. Romans saw themselves as a people of common destiny; they regarded themselves as providential in whatever decision they took. Another example of moral purification in Livy’s tragic history occurs in Livy’s account of the events of 467-459 B.C. when the defiant Aequians and the Volsciains were about to attack the Romans; surprisingly, the enemies attacked each other. This act of self-defeat put upon the enemies of Rome was providential for the Romans whether their decision was just or unjust. Rosenstein observes another point which made the Romans consider themselves fortunate irrespective of moral obedience to the gods: “as one might have expected, therefore, the Romans ran their *res publica* without allowing the gods a central role in their decision making…But the Romans expected the gods, too, to respect the limits the *pax* laid down and not intrude into public business that fell outside these parameters.

Liebeschuetz indicates that Livy might have emphasized moral purification in traditional Roman religion because of the Stoic philosophy which was especially manifested by Cicero in his *De Natura Deorum*. Cicero explained:

That Reason, which according to Stoic doctrine pervades all nature, might be personified, as Ceres on land, for instance, or Neptune in the sea, and could thus be thought to provide a rational justification of the gods of the city state. Stoic doctrine could also provide a new basis for morality in that man by virtue of his share of the universal reason was in a position to
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harmonize his conduct with the end towards which the world was
tending.  

While Liebeschuetz argues that the Stoic doctrine might have provided Livy the
metaphysical framework for his entire historical narrative, and has explained the moral
purification that should be learned from excessive religious limitation, Walsh asserts
that “Livy’s ethical teaching did not of itself demonstrate any definite adherence to
Stoic beliefs." Walsh explains that Livy could not be a Stoic because he did not lay
much emphasis on the influence of impersonal Fate. Also, his history reveals that
human capabilities are recurrently shaping the course of history. The Roman
viewpoint on Stoicism is highlighted by their own traditional regard for ethical
concern: “The man who respects the rights of gods and men, who bases his religious,
political, and private life on the virtues which the Stoics uphold, is regarded as living
with Fate.” Walsh further clarifies that the moral qualities of Livy’s contemporaries
is to make it clear to his readers that his argument on Roman history was to look at
their moral qualities, which the Stoics happened to criticize as “greediness, soft living,
lust, and base ambition.” Historians such as Sallust and Tacitus were also influenced
by this moral tradition which came to be a fundamental part of Roman historiography.
Overall, Livy’s use of moral purification of catharsis is exceptional in his aim to
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communicate his cosmological and mysterious views, especially with his use of rhetoric and poetry to embellish facts.⁶⁷

*Livy’s dramatic technique of writing using the pentad division of account*

Livy’s writing style through which he presented Roman history originated in his training as a philosopher, orator, and poet. This dramatic style of writing is demonstrated in his “attempt to get inside the speaker, and to present, through the words attributed to him, a psychological portrait of his qualities.”⁶⁸ Livy employed this dramatic method with caution by blending his stories with artistic connotation that explained their argument with corresponding issues. At the end of each story, he converted the tension generated to form a desired conclusion.⁶⁹

As Livy composed history by using dramatic method to achieve his purpose, he also narrated history through direct method of approach (narratives style). Dramatic method of expression saved him from the labor of making further explanations on his views. Instead, he left the explanation of issues concerning characters in his story to the reader. In the dramatic technique of writing, poets and playwrights write in first person singular and plural (using I, me, and we) and second person singular (you, and thou). Commentaries or censure are made to clarify the issues referred to in the first and second person singular and plural. Critics use third person singular and plural (he, she, it, they) to write their commentaries on such speeches. According to Walsh,
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Livy’s dramatic lyrics create opinions for critics in a unique way—the theatrical speeches which he puts into the mouths of the characters give the reader an insight or knowledge to judge that person’s character. 70 This first stage of Livy’s dramatic speech is usually salutation or seeking gratification; this gives Livy the poetic advantage to influence the critic’s viewpoint of the issue presented. The second stage of the speech is the introduction of the topic to be discussed; the critic is able to make sense of the qualities and ideas presented—if the issue to be discussed is rational or irrational. The third stage is the complete focus of the issue being presented, and the critic can easily form an impression about the character or the issue by describing the mental reactions of the actors in the story. 71 All these lead to accumulation of knowledge for readers of literature. According to Ann Vasaly’s “The Quinctii in Livy’s First Pentad: The Rhetoric of Anti-Rhetoric,” this rhetorical style of speechmaking had enabled great Roman politicians such as Cincinnatus and Capitolinus to advance the political strategy of Rome through persuasive communication.

As earlier indicated, Livy’s speech style is based from Aristotle’s rhetorical theory; this speech-making style is distinguished into three types of oratory. *Genus iudiciale* is a judicial style of speech appropriate for speaking in the law courts. However, Livy’s historical account is rarely concerned with law courts or formal ceremonial speech. Almost all his speeches were expressed in *genus deliberativum* or deliberative category. *Genus deliberativum* is a speech delivered in councils,
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assemblies, and on the battlefield. It also represents earnest advice (exhortation) or opposition such as the opposition of the tribunes against the patricians. An example is the deliberative speech of Quintius Fabius to the tribunes and especially Terentilius, who had threatened the senate’s ruling on the affairs of Rome during the escalating disturbances between the Aequians and the Sabines in 462 B.C.:

It is you other tribunes…whom we beg to reflect, as a matter of the last importance, that your power was obtained for the purpose of assisting individuals, not for the destruction of us all; that you were elected tribunes of the plebs, not enemies of the senate To us it is a source of sorrow, to you of odium, that the state should be attacked in the absence of its defenders…

Another deliberative speech arose from the escalation of the battle between the Aequians and the Romans in 460 B.C. This happened when a conspiracy was suspected to have been formed through the exiles including Caeso and the slaves. The conspirators entered Rome with the Sabines under the command of Appius Herdonius and seized the Capitol and the citadel. When Publius Valerius was informed that the men were laying down their arms and were quitting their posts, he spoke to the tribunes in genus deliberativum:

Are you going to overturn the state under the leadership and auspices of Appius Herdonius? Has he who could not arouse the slaves been so
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successful in corrupting you? With the enemy over your heads can you choose to quit your arms and legislate? If you feel no concern, Quirites, for your City, or for yourselves, yet fear your gods, whom the enemy hold captive. Jupiter Optimus Maximus, Queen Juno, Minerva, and the other gods and goddesses, are beleaguered; a camp of slaves is in possession of the tutelary deities of your country; does this seem to you a healthy polity? All these foes are not merely within our walls, but in the citadel, above the Forum and the Curia;…should not every patrician and plebeian, the consuls, the tribunes, gods, and men, all have drawn the sword and helped; have rushed upon the Capitol; have brought liberty and peace to that most august house of Jupiter Optimus Maximus…”

When Quintus Servillus was sent to the Aequians, Quintus Fabius and Titus Quinctus took over the administration and continued the battle. Romans’ words of threat against the Aequians did not present the conflict from escalating into a renewed battle with them. Livy moved his readers’ admiration towards acknowledging the impact of the event through the battlefield example of deliberative speech as one Aequian soldier came out to address the enraged Roman army:

This, Romans, is making a parade of war, not waging it. When night is about to fall, you draw up your battle-line; we need more hours of daylight for struggle which is close at hand. To-morrow at sunrise form your battle-line again; there will be opportunity for fighting,
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never fear.  

*Genus demonstrativum* (demonstrative) is considered the epideictic oratory applicable for praise singing and censure in a formal ceremony; an example of praise singing is Thucydides’ account of Pericle’s funeral oration in Athens.  

When Cloelius Gracchus, the leader of the Aequian forces who broke the peace treaty with Rome and escalated the battle of Mount Algidus, Gracchus spoke to the senate’s messengers in deliberative speech style saying, “Give the Senate’s message to that tree there, I happen to be otherwise engaged.” As the Roman envoys turned to go back and give the message to the senate, one of them replied Gracchus in a censure version of demonstrative speech:

> May this holy tree and whatever gods there are hear me when I declare that it is you who have broken the treaty between us; may they listen now to our words, and give strength to our hands when, as soon we shall, we avenge the violation of all that should be sacred to God and man.

Although Livy’s historical account was rarely concerned with the style of speech used in law-courts, he often divided his judicial or kingly speech into four divisions. First is the introduction of the client before the king or judge in order to gain the goodwill or gratification (*exordium* or *prooemium*) of the king, the judge, the jury, and the audience. Second is the statement of the argument or core issues which is the
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focus of the speech which instructs the listeners about the policy to be adopted. Third is discussion of the argument; the prerogative is to move the emotion of the king or judge through its passionate exhortation. And fourth is the conclusion (conclusio).\(^78\)

However, not all the logical processes of judicial style are required in deliberative oration because of the non-gesture or zealous characteristic of deliberative speech. Gesturing is usually needed to address the king and the judge or to make eulogy when pleading before such dignitaries. \(^79\)

Livy was fortunate in displaying his great talent for dramatic style of speech in an atmosphere in which Augustus permitted freedom of speech and activities. This could have enabled Livy to revitalize his childhood suppressed emotion of the late republic of Julius Caesar and combine this with the peaceful atmosphere which came with the new constitution of Augustus. Livy defined his mission as a historian, and he used his dramatic skill of writing and sense of judgment to reform the old principles which was needed to reflect distinctive Roman character. In this way he was able to efficiently change the fundamentals of Roman society which were stalled under the old republic. \(^80\) Augustus opened the way for Livy to demonstrate his eloquence as an orator, and he also helped him to idealize his early inclination to manifest Roman piety, justness, and power through the art of poetry.

Canter agrees with Walsh that Livy’s writing seems to reflect works of literature than that of history. This is because his style of writing possesses the quality

\(^{78}\) P.G. Walsh, *Livy: His Historical Aims and Methods*, 221.
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of philosophy that is meant to spark an instinctual urge in readers. It is unlike historical narrative which is meant to remind people about the past for solving problems of today. Canter acknowledges that Livy’s history “is in harmony both with the literary convention of his day and with that general conception of history in antiquity which sought to interest and entertain readers by striking qualities of style.”

He also agrees that Livy tried as much as possible to minimize the use of dramatic style of writing of the ancient period—the ancients used oration more than narrative for expression. As a result, Livy preserved distinct Roman culture with careful impulsive effect of poetry to explain his ideas without excessive embellishment and extravagant description. Canter adds that Livy did not ordinarily portray and describe his characters just for illustration; rather, he described them to move readers’ admiration towards their sense of acknowledging who the characters were, and what they had done. For example after Cincinnatus had finally defeated the Aequians in the battle of Mount Algidus, he addressed Consul Minucius and the consular army by describing their attitudes to war. “You shall have no share, soldiers, in the spoils of that enemy to whom you almost fell a spoil; and you, Lucius Minucius, until you begin to have the spirit of a consul, shall command these legions as my lieutenant.”

Poetic style of dramatic method of writing is signified by Livy’s deliberate use of second person pronouns for stressing Cincinnatus’ commands to Minucius; this is in contrast to the narrative style which uses the third person pronouns.
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These kinds of speeches were performed in various settings, such as the senate floor before the people, addresses of ambassadors, and rebukes of generals to their armies. Livy’s style of writing is recognized as second to none in the ways by which he expressed the feelings of patriotism, devotion, duty, sorrow, joy, and friendship among the Romans. Livy is reported to have compiled about two thousand orations. His existing thirty-five books are composed of four hundred and seven speeches—colloquia and exhortations. Livy always reflected his ideals in his speeches no matter the character he was speaking through, whether an Aequian or a Roman, a patrician or plebian. Also, “He does not strive to imitate the spirit of time in which the speech is given, or pretend to reproduce the words actually spoken on the occasion and in the exact form given by the person so represented.” Canter observes that if he had used the exact words that the speaker voiced at that time, this would have broken the unity of his work and would “have given far less opportunity for presenting strong rhetorical arguments and emotional appeals; a purpose that artistic historians never lost sight of in incorporating speeches in their works.” Livy’s works have the same quality and quantity of speech as those of Dionysius of Halicarnassus. Livy’s works have the value of argument that gives special connections to political, social, and religious movements.

As Livy wrote his stories with direct and indirect style, he also arranged them in pentads (units of five books). This can be associated with the way drama is divided
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into acts and scenes. According to Walsh, “Livy’s work should be read in pentads, as it is clearly written in pentads.” 88 Livy has been criticized by many scholars who have failed to appreciate the greater complexity of events described in the subdivision of his pentads. These scholars expect a more consistent division of most important events of the stories like the pentads of earlier books. The scholars observed this inconsistency in his arrangement of Civil Wars articulated in his earlier books where source information was largely restricted to subjects about consecutive wars. Scholars believe that he was inconsistent with his earlier method of arrangement for an unplanned procedure. Walsh observes that Livy must have changed from his earlier arrangement as he started to broaden his topic with political and civil matters, probably due to expanding Roman territories. His subject matter then featured wars being fought at the same time when important civil developments were taking place. 89

An example is the passage in which Livy described the conditions of consuls Minucius and Nautius on the warfronts of the Aequie and the Sabines in 458 B.C. Livy concurrently described how the patricians and the tribunes were arguing other political matters in the senate during this war. He points out that Livy could have arranged his pentad by postponing the treatment of a major event such as the appearance of Cincinnatus in the segment of the story of the battle of Mount Algidus, so as to have an arresting topic for the beginning of a new section in the pentad. Walsh cites another example of shift in arrangement from “the capture and destruction of Carthage described in LI; the capture of Jugurtha in LXVI; and the murder of Julius
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Caesar in CXVI." 90 Despite criticisms of inconsistency in Livy’s style of arrangement, Walsh agrees that there are sufficient indications that Livy’s history was planned and constructed carefully and creatively with the pentads as the essential units. 91
Preamble to the battle of Mount Algidus 467-458 B.C.

The Romans, who were divided by conflict between the plebeians and the patricians, were also trying to secure their place in central Italy at a time when they were challenged by other Italic peoples. According to Livy, Cincinnatus’ victory in the battle of Mount Algidus, which transformed the city of Rome into a sovereign and stronghold city among the Via Latina nations, was preceded by this lengthy period of crisis and warfare. It was a period of continuous crises between the Romans and their Italian antagonists, the Aequians, Sabines, and Volsci. Allies who fought along with the Romans in the conflict were the Tusculi, Hernici, and Latins. Troubles between the two rivals escalated as the Aequians often broke their peace treaty with Rome. To make matters more complicated, the patricians were faced with internal political struggle against the plebeians and their tribune leaders because of the plebeians’ sympathetic attitude to war—the tribunes could not hold on to fight the war until victory was achieved.

According to Livy in Book III of his Early History of Rome, after the capture of Antium, Titus Aemilius and Quintus Fabius were the consuls of 467 B.C. At that time a renewed conflict erupted because a considerable territory had been conquered from the Volsci. The Aequians implored Quintus Fabius, who had invaded their country, to grant them peace. But the Aequians broke the peace treaty as they raided the Latin territory of the Tusculi who were allies of the Romans. These conflicts dragged on into a third year, when Quintus Fabius and Titus Quinctius were given the command to launch a new attack against the Aequians without the customary drawing
of lots. The Romans were surprised as the Aequians fought bravely to win the war and stop their ambition to triumph. The battle continued on both sides; the “Romans fought with exasperation and hatred, while the Aequians were conscious that the danger in which they were involved was due to their own fault, and this, with their despair of ever being trusted again, incited them to the last degree of daring and exertion.”

The Romans were not able to defeat the Aequians; as a result, the city of Rome was raided. The country people started to run and tumble into gates to escape the pillagers and small bands of Aequian raiders who invaded their territory. Fabius came to the city to calm the citizens and informed them that the “enemy they dreaded had been conquered.” After the conflict had subsided for a while, Quinctius reopened the suspension of the courts, and a census was taken. 104,714 Roman citizens were registered. The next consuls were Aulus Postumius Albus and Spurius Furius Fusus. The consuls made preparations for war against the Aequi, and trusted the Volsci for help. But the Hernici quickly warned the Romans against such a dangerous move. This was because the Aequians had earlier appealed to the Ecetranian Volsci for help. Furius took the warning and set out to war against the Aequi.

The Romans were defeated and the Hernici brought home the news of the defeat. The war dragged on, and the enemy was defeating Rome: “they were besieging the camp, a part of their army was sent to devastate Roman fields and attack the City
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itself, should an opportunity offer.”

Lucius Valerius was left to defend the city, while Consul Postumius was sent to protect the frontier from pillage. But the Romans were still no match for their opponents, either in confidence or in strength. They tried to renew their strength by recruiting foreign troops of the Latins and the Hernici, but they still incurred heavy losses. Valerius Antias ventured to specify the total of casualties:

The Romans lost five thousand eight hundred in the country of Hernici;
that of the Aequian marauders who were roaming about and pillaging within the Roman borders, two thousand four hundred were slain by Aulus Postmarius, the consul and the rest of the expedition, which stumbled upon Quinctius as they were driving off their booty, got off by no means so slightly, for their killed amounted, so he says, with minute particularly, to four thousand two hundred and thirty.

This situation called for special prayers on the part of the Romans, and so a three-day session of prayers was called: “All the shrines were crowded with a throng of men and women beseeching the pardon of the gods.” After the prayers, the allied forces, comprised of Latins and the Hernici, were thanked by the senate for their service and were later sent off on a mission. New elections were held and Lucius Aebutius and Publius Servilius became the consuls. The situation only became more horrible as a plague afflicted both humans and beasts. The Aequians and the Volscians

---

95 Ibid., 15.
96 Livy: with an English Translation in Fourteen Volumes, 19.
97 Ibid., 21.
persisted in their anger against Rome and joined forces by establishing a camp in Romans’ territory and devastating it with an enormous army. The enemy continued to launch their assault against the allied forces as well as the Roman fields. Livy asserted that the commonwealth had been saved by tutelary gods. The Romans believed their devotion limited the powers of the enemy to mere plunder of things rather than capturing the walls of Rome.

Ravages of the disease continued in Rome and the people crowded the shrines again: “everywhere were prostrate matrons, sweeping the floors of the temples with their hairs, while they besought the angry gods to grant them pardon and end the pestilence.”\(^{98}\) The plague disappeared then, but the Romans could not establish the reason for its disappearance—they thought it was either due to the power of prayers or that the illness had run its course, and that perhaps the disease was seasonal virus.

The enemy continued to intrude upon Roman borders and the struggle persisted. Quintus Fabius was in charge of the city again and he defended the city from the enemy’s threat. Lucretius encountered the enemy in a fight, and the Volsci were almost annihilated: “Thirteen thousand four hundred and seventy fell in the battle and the flight, and seventeen hundred and fifty were taken alive, and twenty-seven military standards were brought in.”\(^{99}\) However, the Volsci and the Aequi united their forces again, and Rome also gathered her forces together and called the court to resume meeting. But the tribunes were tired of the war and were partisan in decision
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making by not supporting the patricians. This angered Fabius that he wished the city of Rome to be conquered by the enemy. Lucretius embarked on another campaign against the enemy, and he seemed to have won. According to Livy, in the following year, signs and wonders were seen as the heavens blazed, and the earth was shaken with a prodigious quake. Livy reported that a cow was believed to have spoken and there occurred a rain of flesh which did not rot for several days.\textsuperscript{100} The Sibylline Books were consulted, warning that danger was looming from a foreign place, and as a result, the patricians and the tribunes must be united in making decisions concerning the affairs of the state. Despite this warning, war broke out between both factions; this led to the expulsion of some plebeians from the city. After this disturbance, the tribunes pretended to keep unity with the patricians.\textsuperscript{101}

In these circumstances the tribunes and the patricians were busy handling the case made against Caeso the son of Cincinnatus. Caeso was charged with arrogance and thwarting people’s liberty. There were many who agreed with the charges brought against him. “They complained of the beatings they had received, and freely urged the tribune to see the business through.”\textsuperscript{102} Caeso’s father, Cincinnatus, was among the advocates who interrogated him. “He did not dwell on Caeso’s praises, lest he should add to his unpopularity; but craving indulgence for his errors and his youth, he begged them to acquit the son as favor to the father.”\textsuperscript{103} All attempts to obtain mercy for the youngster seemed not to work. Caeso finally went into exile, living with the Etruscans.
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When he was supposed to stand for trial, Caeso could not be found. As a result, his father had to pay the bail for his absence from the law court. Cincinnatus sold all his properties and paid the bail. Cincinnatus later resorted to the other side of the Tiber, “like one banished, in a certain lonely hovel.”104

Legislations and trials of citizens became the major concern of the senate at this period. Based on Caeso’s trial, the tribunes were confident of their ability to promulgate and enforce the law. But the youngsters who were of Caeso’s age developed bitterness against the plebeians. They pounced upon the tribunes with force. The plebeians stereotyped them as men of Caeso’s temperance. Amidst this struggle, Caeso eventually reappeared in Rome. The patricians conspired to kill the tribunes, and there was a slave riot. Added to this confusion, “exiles and slaves to the number of twenty-five hundred, led by Appius Herdonius, and the Sabines came by night and seized the Capitol and the Citadel. They at once put to the sword those in the Citadel who refused to conspire and take up arms with them.”105 This situation led to suspicion among the people—some feared the conspiracy might have been perpetrated by the slaves: “everyone suspected that he had an enemy in his own household, whom it was safe neither to trust, nor from want of confidence to refuse to trust, lest his hostility should be intensified; and it seemed hardly possible that even co-operation between the classes should arrest the danger.” 106
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It hardly seemed possible to the people that cohesion could protect them from slave conspiracy. The tribunes refused to believe that war had taken over the Capitol; instead, they took the disturbance for a false alarm of war which was meant to distract the plebeians from thinking about the law.\textsuperscript{107} The people of Tusculum later arrived in the city and were almost mistaken for the enemy. Later, they were recognized as friends, joined forces with those of the Romans, and regained the citadel from the invaders. Many of the exiles stained the temples with their blood, and many were taken alive; Herdonius their leader was slain. Romans expressed their gratitude for the cooperation of the Tusculi, and the Capitol was purified and ceremonially cleansed.

After the Romans regained their citadel, the patricians appointed Lucius Quinctius Cincinnatus as the consul in 460 B.C. The plebeians however were filled with dismay at the prospect of a consul angry against them and strong in the favor of the senate. They also accused Cincinnatus of overrating his competence, and that of his three sons. The temperament of Caeso was not considered different to that of his three sons.\textsuperscript{108} The city continued to reorganize the state of affairs; in arriving at decisions for the growth of the state, they thought of consulting the augury or to take a vote. The tribune wished that everybody should vote as Cincinnatus had earlier advised, but they were alarmed when Cincinnatus told them that he would not conduct any consular election. He indicated to them that “the disease of the commonwealth was not one that could be cured by ordinary remedies; the nation needed a dictator…”\textsuperscript{109}
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After the end of Cincinnatus’ consulship, the patricians were eager to re-elect him as the next consul, but the tribunes were not. Cincinnatus said to the tribunes, “You yourselves impair it, when, because the people have disregarded the senate’s resolution regarding successive terms, you desire to disregard it yourselves…” \(^{110}\) He reproached them with the adage that “it is more fickle and light-minded to nullify one’s own decrees and resolutions, than those of others.” By “those of others,” he meant the will of the senate and the founding fathers. Cincinnatus also assured them that he would not endeavor to make himself a consul against the senate’s resolution. He warned Gaius Claudius to “restrain the Romans from their act of lawlessness; and for my own part I assured, I shall not feel that your action has stood in the way of my election.” \(^{111}\) These words did not change the tribunes’ mind from their decision not to vote for Cincinnatus. They threatened that “if any man should do so they would disregard his vote.” \(^{112}\) The people elected as consul Quinctius Fabius Vibulanus for the third time. The second consul was Lucius Cornelius Maluginesis. Trouble raged on between the Aequie, the Sabines, and the Volsci. As usual, the senate faced internal battle with the tribunes, who were always discontented with decisions of the patricians. In 458 B.C. Lucius Minucius and Gaius Nautius were chosen to be the next consuls, and they inherited the problems left behind from the preceding years.

*Plot of Cincinnatus as told by Titus Livy in his History of early Rome*
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After a period of recurrent conflicts between the Romans and their antagonists, the Aequi, Sabines and Volsci, the Aequi in 458 B.C. once again rose up to do battle against Rome. In doing this they broke the peace treaty with the Romans. To undertake this action the Aequi assigned command of their armed forces to Cloelius Gracchus. Gracchus led them to raid the territory of Labici and Tusculum, and they later camped on Mount Algidus. Rome, under the leadership of Fabius, lodged a complaint against them, but the Aequi replied with arrogant words, asking them to recite their message to an oak tree: “Let both this sacred oak and whatever gods there are hear that the treaty has been broken by you…” 113 The Romans were provoked to declare a fresh onslaught against the Aequi. The Romans’ offensive was led by Minucius. A second military force was drafted against the invasion of the Sabines under Nautius. None of these two command posts seemed to achieve a winning victory for Rome. Minucius’ strategy was poorly schemed as he had moved too close to the enemy’s camp.114

The enemy caught up with Minucius’ soldiers unaware and attacked the Roman camp at night, and encircled them with missiles. Luckily for the Romans, five soldiers on horses escaped through the enemy’s post and rushed to Rome with the news of the attack. This news caused an uproar in the city of Rome. The senate envisaged that Nautius was not capable of controlling this battle as his forces were also having difficulty securing victory on his front. The situation moved the senate to call for a dictator in order to contain this disaster. They then unanimously agreed on
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the nomination of Lucius Quinctius Cincinnatus as a dictator to quell this fire. A team of soldiers on horses headed to Quinctian Meadows to seek out the nominated dictator. Cincinnatus was on his farm digging ditches as the envoys of Rome exchanged greetings with him. In astonishment he cried, “Is all well?” They delivered the senate’s message, and quickly, he asked his wife Racilia to fetch him his toga from his house.

As he put on his toga and wiped off the dirt and sweat from his face, the “envoys hailed him the Dictator, congratulated him, and summoned him to the city, explaining the alarming situation of the army.” He traveled in a boat provided by the state to Rome and was greeted on arrival by his three sons, other close relatives and friends, and later by the senate. As could be expected, the plebeians were not very enthused to receive him because they thought that the authority given him could worsen the conflict if he misused it. On the following day, Cincinnatus named Lucius Tarquitius, a man of patrician birth, to be the trainer of his horse. He ordered shops to be closed and no manufacturing was allowed. Men of military age were drafted to appear in the Campus Martius, each bringing with him enough food to last for five days. They were also asked to bring twelve stakes each. Cincinnatus led the army onward to the battlefront. Soldiers urged each other to quickly step forward in order to reach their colleagues on time and provide immediate rescue. They replied to each
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other in high spirits and shouted, “Make haste, Faster standard-bearer!..Follow me men.”

Soon, they arrived at Mount Algidus and camped some distance away from the enemy line to set up their strategy. Cincinnatus ordered the tribune commander to inform the combatants to drop their packs and return only with their arms and stakes. When they returned, all took positions within their ranks and files. Orders were carried out as commanded. Following this, he told the soldiers to make a loud noise of war as they surrounded the enemy’s camp; he also asked each one to dig a ditch in front of his position and erect a pole. These war signals reached the ears of the Roman forces entrapped in the enemy’s circle; they perceived the signals as a sign of victory, while the Aequi acknowledged them as a sign of death and destruction from the indomitable Romans. Consul Minucius did not delay “to threaten the enemy with attacks from their pickets and outposts.” The battle raged on through the night between the enemy and the entrapped army of Minucius; Minucius fought bravely with the hope that Cincinnatus’ forces had also engaged the enemy in combat. But Cincinnatus’ army was busy with the task of surrounding the enemy’s camp to make sure none of them escaped the onslaught of his strike.

The Aequi were unsure whether to prevent Cincinnatus’ army from shutting them in or to engage the entrapped Romans in battle. The Aequi were forced to resist being entrapped in their own city and turned to fight Minucius’ forces. The battle lasted until daybreak. When Cincinnatus’ forces made sure the Aequi were locked in
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their own city, his forces battered their fortification. The Aequi could neither break through the assault of Minucius’ forces nor stop the disaster of Cincinnatus’ offensive. They were left with the hope of begging Minucius for compassion as the Romans gained total control of the assault. Minucius was not in the position to answer their plea for mercy; he had to tell them to appeal to the dictator. The dictator requested that their leader Gracchus and the other captains be brought to him in chains, and that the town of Corbio should be emptied forthwith. He later decided to grant them mercy on the condition that they swear an oath of allegiance to Rome by passing beneath a yoke fashioned with two spears fixed on the ground, and a third laid across. 119

Cincinnatus then divided the spoils of war among his forces and rebuked Minucius and his consular army: “You shall have no share, soldiers, in the spoils of that enemy to whom you almost fell to obliterate; and you, Lucius Minucius; until you begin to have the spirit of a consul, shall command these forces as my lieutenant.”120 Minucius then relinquished his consulship and remained an ordinary soldier. The soldiers thanked Cincinnatus and presented him with a golden chaplet. At Rome, the senate under the leadership of Fabius, the city’s prefect, arranged for Cincinnatus to be given a triumphant entry to Rome. His chariots were led by the officers of the enemy forces. Then came the soldiers accompanied with booty from the war. Romans celebrated the glorious entry as they spread tables for feasting in all houses. They sang songs of joy and made customary jokes while following the chariots and the troops.
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Cincinnatus would have given up his powers as dictator immediately if not for the trial of Marcus Volscius, a false witness against his son Caeso, which caused him to delay his resignation. Volscius was condemned and went to exile at Lanuvium. On the sixteenth day Cincinnatus resigned his post as the dictator after he had held it for six months. At that period, Consul Minucius fought a victorious battle at Eretum with the Sabines. Fabius was posted to Mount Algidus to take over from Minucius. During this reformation “the senators insisted that no proposal should be laid before the people; plebs were triumphant in electing the same tribunes for the fifth time. It is said that wolves were seen on the Capitol pursued by dogs.”
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CHAPTER 3

BACKGROUND INFORMATION ON CINCI NNATUS 458 B.C.

This chapter gives information for understanding the values and virtues which
the Romans of the early republic upheld. This is achieved through notes on character
sketches of the actors of Roman political theater; the functions of these actors in
Roman political theater; and how the objectives of the play were achieved.

Character sketches of the actors of Roman political theater

Cincinnatus is a play involving Roman political history. It demonstrates the
distinctive Roman character of the early Republican period. Its characters are sincere
to the values and virtues inherent in Romans’ method of divination and conduct of
public business, and they recognize firm clear lines dividing religious issues (res
divinae) from human issues (res humanae). The characters are: consuls, senators,
state leader or city prefect, dictator, pontifex maximus, patricians, plebeians,
tribunes, paterfamilias, materfamilias, commanders, soldiers, and citizens of Rome.
According to George Willis Botsford, these characters descended from the Roman
gentes. The Roman family clan was defined by Cicero as constituted of individuals
who had the same name; they were born of free parents, none of whose ancestors had
experienced slavery, and they must have not been stripped of legal status or legal
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rights. Romans’ ancestors had never been enslaved and their misdeeds had never been probed by stripping of legal rights.\textsuperscript{123} There are a number of controversial views about the Roman \textit{gentes}; these are held in whole or in large part by most scholars of Roman history: [1] that it was exclusively patrician; [2] that the clients were dependents of the association as a whole, that they bore the gentile name of their patron, shared in the gentile \textit{sacra} and were in a subordinate capacity members of the \textit{gens}; [3] that the \textit{gens} was a corporation with a formal chief; [4] that there were once exactly three hundred patrician \textit{gentes}, whose membership was sufficiently numerous to make up the entire citizen body; and [5] that they were older than the state, which was formed by their aggression.\textsuperscript{124}

Botsford disputes that the Roman \textit{gentes} were exclusively patrician; he explains this by noting that the \textit{patriciate} was not an essential qualification for the senate, kingship, or the most important priestly offices. As a result of this requisite, the original hundred senators of the late origin of the \textit{gentes} were not patricians, and none of the kings were born in that rank with the possible exception of the last. He emphasizes that “Romulus and Tatius remained non-patrician, and the idea that Numa, Tarquinius Priscus and Servius Tullius were granted the \textit{patriciate} has all the appearance of the late origin.”\textsuperscript{125} This is buttressed by the fact that the names of most kings are definitely plebeian, and not even one of them could have been a patrician. Israel Shatzman supports this by deducing from R.E.A. Palmer’s viewpoint that a
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consulship held before 366 B.C. cannot be taken as conclusive evidence of patrician status; added to this was that after 342 B.C., only one consul was a patrician. Botsford points out that “Attus Navius the augur was not a patrician; and the non-patrician kings performed officially most important religious functions.” These explanations clarify that even though there was a culture of nobility among the Romans, it did not distinguish the class of patricians from the plebeians.

Controversy also arose on the legality of an alien who received Roman citizenship or became a member of the gens through the influence of a Roman citizen. Although an alien could receive citizenship and obtain the title of gentilicium, sources offer no suggestion of the validity of gentile relationship between the new citizen and his sponsor. This is because the Romans believed the members of the gens normally to have been offspring of a common ancestor. Exception was given to blood relatives who entered a gens by marriage or adoption. Still, this blood relative must not have suffered any degree of little caput which could have caused total loss of gentile rights, such as becoming a captive of war, being sold into slavery, or being transferred from one gens to another.

Further reason for skepticism concerning exclusive patrician status is that the title of the gentes is not uncommon for addressing the patrician and the plebeian
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classes of the Roman society. An example is taken from a document that mentions several plebeian *gentes*, including Minucia, (probably Consul Minucius, the Roman commander captured in the Aequi battlefront in 458 B.C.), Octavia, Lutatia, Calpurnia, Domitia, Fonteia, Aurelia, and Licinia.\(^{132}\) There is also evidence of some *gentes* who were from both patrician and plebeian families; these were Cassia, Claudia, Cornelia, Manlia, Papiria, or Poplilia, Aebutia, and Servilla.\(^{133}\)

Livy condemned the patrician attitude that “it would seem an affront to the gods for honors to be vulgarized and for distinctions between *gentes* to be confused at *auspicated comitia* (the election of plebeians to the consular tribunate).”\(^{134}\) An argument between Cicero and Clodius also explained why distinction between *gentes* can only mean definition of patricans and plebeians in Roman *gentes*. This is signified when Cicero said to Clodius, “You have disturbed the *sacra* and contaminated the *gentes*, both the one you have deserted and the one you have defiled.”\(^{135}\) A *sacrum* that is contaminated could stand for either patrician or plebeian, while the one deserted could also stand for either of the two *gentes*. This could clarify the argument that *gentes* in Roman origin consisted of both patricians and plebeians. Another reason which might have caused the patricians to want to obscure the authenticity of the plebeians in Roman *gentes* was due to patrician act of nobility which usually
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emphasized family pride abroad. Such noble attitude always enabled the patricians to keep their lineage or family connections intact wherever they traveled to.\textsuperscript{136}

Ann Vasaly’s response to the distinctiveness of Roman \textit{gentes} is that the \textit{gens} is characteristic of gentile stereotype; that is, people with the same name in Roman society often act in the same way. She demonstrates the validity of her observation by reference to the personality of Apii Claudii and the Quinctii. Accounts of both people illustrate such family clan stereotype. The virtue of ideal aristocratic leadership is exemplified in the family of Lucius Quinctius Cincinnatus, his son Caeso Quinctius, and his brother or cousin T. Quinctius Capitolinus Barbatus.\textsuperscript{137} Livy narrated the story in which Capitolinus’ consulship of 465 B.C. and his pro-consulship of 464 B.C. have produced good military leadership for the Romans to suppress the Aequians and rescue Rome from destruction. Good aristocratic leadership is also depicted in the story of Caeso’s behavior and “the false witness who had deprived an innocent man of the power to plead his cause.”\textsuperscript{138} The exclusive Roman trait of Quintian aristocratic stereotype depicted in the character of Quinctius Cincinnatus, suffect consul of 460 B.C., dictator in 458 B.C. and 439 B.C. Cincinnatus became the champion of \textit{concordia} as he transcended partisan politics “by being no less energetic in criticizing the senate than the people.”\textsuperscript{139} Cincinnatus’ speech during his consulship of 460 B.C., and his famous story whereby he was summoned from his Quinctian Meadows farm to
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help transform the dragging war against the Aequians into victory, also depicts this aristocratic stereotype. However, the attribute of gentilicum in the Roman gens is the opposite in Appius as his behavior is the reverse of the great virtue inherent in the Quinctii. For example, Appius appeared as “undisciplined, passionate, and savage,” while Capitolinus, whose family is from the Qunctii gens or gentilicium, “plays the role of peacemaker.” Capitolinus demonstrated this aristocratic character as he “soothes the raging plebs who were maddened by Appius.” Capitolinus saved the Roman state from anarchy, and he received appreciation from the senate for this virtuous act, while Appius’ character brought to the Romans a disastrous campaign against the Volsci. The virtue in Cincinnatus and Capitolinus brought success in domestic politics.

Cincinnatus prepared Rome for the forthcoming pax Romana when he responded to Rome’s call and defeated the Aequians in 458 B.C. Livy commended this action when he said, “What follows merits the attention of those who despise all human qualities in comparison with riches, and thinks there is no room for great honors or for worth but amidst a profusion of wealth.” Cincinnatus exhibited selfless virtue of duty more than Capitolinus even though Capitolinus also made no attempt to use his high office to increase his own power. Also common to both Quinctii is the courage demonstrated in dealing with the Aequians. Their courage is not like that of “Consul Minucius, who through timidity (rather than rashness, as had
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been the case with Sp. Furius in 464), allows himself and his troops to be surrounded and besieged by the Aequians in a camp at Mount Algidus.” 144

Vasaly also explicates the striking parallel of skill and oration characteristic in the trait of Quinctius Capitolinus and Quinctius Cincinnatus. As suffect consul in 460 B.C., Cincinnatus opposed the actions of the tribunes who took no action when the Capitol was sized by Herdonius. Cincinnatus called the tribunes “sowers of the seeds of discord (semina discordium), men who exercised a kind of tyranny through their speeches and accusations, and who had succeeded in severing one part of the state from the other.” 145 According to Livy, the plebeians were inspired rather than infuriated by this speech. Like Cincinnatus, Capitolinus made a versatile speech in 446 B.C. when the Aequians and the Sabines almost conquered Rome because of Romans’ disunity (discordia ordinum) among them; this attitude gave the enemy the confidence to attack Rome. Capitolinus addressed the plebeians; “While I am conscious of no fault of my own, yet I come before you with the greatest shame…I had enough honor, I had had enough, and more than enough, of life; death ought to have come to me in my third consulship…” 146 He also addressed the patricians who tried to abuse the plebeians in the period of crisis; “True moderation in the defense of political liberties is indeed a difficult thing…our anxiety to avoid oppression leads us to practice it ourselves.” 147 Vasaly indicates that Livy’s depiction of the Quinctian gens shows the passion of these two courageous men in confronting the excesses of the plebeians
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when Rome was in trouble. It also controlled the excesses of the patricians, who experienced political conflict with their fellow plebeians.

Another controversy among scholars involves the fact that the terms “clients” and “patrons” are used to address the Romans. It has been suggested that it is confusing to use the word “client” to represent the gentes of the plebeians. The question arose as to whether in any sense the plebeians were clients, and whether they were at one time distributed among the leading men known as the patricians. An example pointing in this direction is taken from Cicero, who stated that “Romulus distributed the plebeians in clientage among the leading men.”148 Another example is from Dionysius of Halicarnassus: “Romulus placed the plebeians as a trust in the hands of the patricians, allowing each of the plebeians to choose whatever patrons he wished.”149 Botsford argues that a patron or a client is an individual and not a family or gens. He clarifies that clients did not bear the gentilicium of their patron, and therefore could not according to Scaevola’s definition share gentilicium with their patron.150

Pater familias is the head of a Roman household. Richard Saller, quoting from E. Sachers in the Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft about the term pater familias, indicates that “reverence and obedience toward the pater familias ‘lay the characteristic foundation for the greatness of ancient Rome.’”151 Other definitions distinguish pater familias as the firm patriarch whose power defined the
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Roman family, while the most common meaning was estate owner without reference to familial (parental) relations. Familial relations, however, are more relevant to its definition because of the way today’s historians explain the patriarchal family-characteristic of Rome. A prime example is taken from F. Dupoint’s chapter on the family in *Daily Life in Ancient Rome*, in which he states: “Family in its Latin sense, *familia*, covered every member of the household subject to the power of the father of the family; *pater familias*: children, slaves and sometimes (depending on the type of marriage he had contracted), the wife.”

The power (*potestas*) of the *pater* involved many dimensions of authority; his wife was subjected to his *potestas* only if she was in *manum*. But his *potestas* was dominant upon his children, human chattels or slaves, and his family’s property.

Botsford indicates that *gens* was just a general family name in the Roman sense; the organization of the society was ruled by the *pater familias*. However, several patrician *gentes* did not progress to the place of *pater familias*, while there were even *gentes* which had two or more families.

The *pater familias* was distinguished from the leader of the entire state or *gentes*; the *pater familias* had the right to choose a particular form of government for his household.

Adjectives often used to describe the *pater familias* are *diligens paterfamilias*, and *bonus pater familias*; they are also addressed as *prudens* and *idoneus*. A popular phrase used to demonstrate the function of *pater familias* stated: “There was no
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defense for a guardian (tutor) who failed to do for his ward (pupillus) what a pater familias idoneus would do in estate management.”\textsuperscript{156} Diligentissimus pater familias describes the responsibility expected of someone who borrows an item for use, and the item is to be returned. If a slave has broken his leg before being bought by a new owner, the seller would be held responsible if the buyer had ordered the slave to do something dangerous that a prudens et diligens pater familias would not have ordered.\textsuperscript{157} Bonus is used to qualify virtue in men (bonus pater familias) as well as good virtue in women (bonus mater familias). Pliny the Elder stated that as farmers in the past were judged by the quality of their produce, so was a worthless mater familias judged by the unworthy condition of her husband’s garden. In the story of Cincinnatus, when the Roman envoys came to him in his Quinctian Meadows farm to summon him to Rome as a dictator, Racilia his wife was helping him to take care of his farmland. Livy demonstrated this virtue of bonus mater familia in Racilia when he said: “they asked him to put on his toga, to hear and might good come of it to himself and the republic! the mandate of the senate. In amazement, he cried, ‘Is all well?’ and bade his wife Racilia to quickly fetch out his toga from the hut.”\textsuperscript{158} This signifies the values of a bonus mater familias in Racilia; she acted as a diligent and valuable mater familias who helps her husband to plow the soil and sustain his estate.

Another scholarly disagreement involves inappropriate usage of paterfamilias. Saller’s research from sheds some light on this. He observes
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different aspects of *pater familias* as ‘head of household,’ here again, property ownership was primary; ‘fatherhood,’ as a meaning was so secondary that the term simply does not appear at all in most Roman discussions of family relations, even those about paternal severity.\(^{159}\)

The words of Cato the Elder, Cicero, and Pliny the Younger, help to clarify this controversy of fatherhood or property ownership status of *pater familias*. Cato the Elder said that the *pater familias* is the “man who pastures well and sows well.”\(^ {160}\) (Serv., ad *Aen.* 7. 539). Cicero defined *pater familias* as “the man experienced in cultivation, building, and keeping accounts.”\(^ {161}\) In his letter to Pompeius Falco, Pliny the Younger stated that by riding around and attending to his estate, a person is performing the role of *pater familias*.\(^ {162}\) Livy’s view of Cincinnatus is similar to that of Cato the Elder. Livy described the diligence of a farmer in Cincinnatus: “Lucius Quinctius cultivated a field of some four acres across the Tiber, now known as the Quinctian Meadows, directly opposite the place where the dockyards are at present.”\(^ {163}\)

Saller explains the legal meaning of *mater familias*, the wife of the *pater familias* in Roman society. He asserts that the role of *mater familias* was a legal role in Roman society, as was that of *pater familias*. This is because Roman women had the
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legal right to own houses, estates, instrumenta, and slaves. Mater familias is defined as the mistress of a household, a respectable married woman, a matron. Mater familias is a woman who is independent of the potestas of her father and with a capacity to own property. However, in Roman society, mater familias did not have the same function in the law court—the gender bias of the jurist in favor of males accounted for this.164 Another definition of mater familias is taken from Cicero’s words echoed by Aulus Gellius; he claimed that mater familias was a subset of all uxores who were in the manum of their husbands. Other Republican writers used mater familias of wives without restriction to manus-marriage, and most especially to matrimonium iustum of citizens.165

The concept of one man, one wife was the legal definition of pater familias and mater familias; only one pater familias was allowed to dominate a familia. A juristic definition limited one materfamilias as the wife of the head of household in order to avoid the conceptual disorderliness of having more than one wife in the family. Exemption was given to the wife of a filius familias and the widow living with her son, if the son became a paterfamilias irrespective of his age following the death of his father.166 But in another definition, Ulpian indicated that the mater familias was a woman who did not live shamefully. This kind of character distinguished her from ignominious women irrespective of her status as a widow. Living as a widow would not qualify a single woman for the role of a mater familias; she has to displays good
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character. Child-bearing, rank, or property rights also did not distinguish a woman as a mater familias; the status of a mater familias is to be of honorable character. The virtue of honorable character of the mater familias is defined in contrast to a concubine or prostitute (meretrix, paelex or ancilla). The mater familias should not be such a woman. Cicero explained how the sanctity of matrons was violated by Clodia. Cicero said “Clodia lived in an immoral domus in ‘which the mater familias lives in the style of a prostitute.’” The dignity of the materfamilias was protected against forcible entry into her dominion. Shouting at a materfamilias in public or corrupting her slave attendant was an infringement of the honor of the materfamilias. To avoid such assault in public, a materfamilias was required to dress properly.

Caroline Vout explains that for a materfamilias to dress properly was to wear the toga. The toga also meant to cover (tegere) and to protect. It displayed the status of responsibility for a materfamilias or a paterfamilias. “To be a Roman woman was to be stolata, but only if she had those virtues demanded of a Roman matron such as pudicitia and fides (modesty and reliability). If found to be a meretrix or an adulteress, she was forced to wear the toga.” The toga was a ceremonial dress of the Romans; it was not only a garment but also an edifying symbol. “the term togati was synonymous with Romani; it defined them as a nation separate from the Greeks or Palliati; from the Gauls and the rest of the world.”
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mark of a Roman *vir*—it was the mark of a citizen who had the opportunity to participate fully in the political life of Rome. The toga was a garment worthy of the masters of the world because of its affluence. However, the charismatic toga is seen as stylish with the over-complication of its arrangement and the highly emphatic appeal in the tumult of its folds. Questions arose as to why the Romans “wore the toga draped...without fastenings; it is hardly safe to depend upon the present day wearer to do so.”

Dictatorship is a political office which the Romans sometimes use to solve problems, for example when there was conflict between the patricians and the plebeians, or when there was a plague. According to D. Cohen, a Roman dictator such as Cincinnatus was appointed for discharging a specified function—to conquer the Aequi in the war of Mount Algidus; he was expected to resign office when his task was completed after six months. Cohen emphasizes that the constitution of Rome was designed to prevent this one man from gaining total control of the state power. But his post became unavoidable in Roman politics as Romans saw that the magistrates or the consuls elected by the people were sometimes incapable of solving problems of the state. They were also restricted by their obedience to opposition, which usually obstructed their responsibility to the senate and the people. For example, when Cincinnatus was appointed dictator in 458 B.C. to deal the threat of the
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Aequi in the battle of Mount Algidus, the tribunes and the plebeians wished that they could restrict his duty by opposing his polices. They “were by no means so rejoiced at the sight of Quinctius, because they thought that not only was his authority excessive, but that the man was even more dangerous than the authority itself.”

Romans did not use the dictator’s authority solely for the purpose of conquering their enemies. They used the dictator’s power to cure diseases. For example, was in 363 B.C. a plague was raging fiercely in Rome. Livy’s account does not quite explain how this plague was conquered. This is because he told two conflicting stories that explained the occurrence of a plague and how it was terminated. One story gives details about driving a nail on account of the plague, while the other tells of consul who was specially appointed for that occasion. Dictators appointed *clavi figendi causa* for putting the key in the door of the Temple of Jupiter in an annual ceremony. However, “Livy found no dictator *clavi figendi causa* in the Fasti, except only in some fatal years when the appointment of such a dictator was due to a plague or some other calamity.”

Mommsen acknowledges this possibility by noting the fact that a dictator could be appointed due to a plague or other calamity. Cohen clarifies this issue by examining it with the religious custom of other peoples whose cultures reflect that of the Romans. He observes that “In case of a disease or other calamity some people drove, and still drive, a nail or a piece of wood into a tree or a stake in order to keep the evil power under restraint and thus to prevent it from
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escaping and doing harm.”\footnote{Ibid., 306.} Rome testified to this ritual as a nail was “driven into the place where the head of an epileptic had struck the earth and where, I presume, blood from his head had been shed.”\footnote{D. Cohen, “Origin of Roman Dictatorship,” 306.} Another fact pointing to this “is the belief in Antonius Pius’ time that the pestilence could have been capable of infusing the whole world in consequence of the soldiers having perforated the wall in the cella of a temple at Seleucia, where the disease had been confined.”\footnote{Ibid.}

Evidence shows that the \textit{praetor maximus sit} who drove the nail into the tree was the magistrate who possessed an \textit{imperium maximum} and was charged with performing the ceremony.\footnote{Ibid.} H. Wagenvoort further clarifies the power of the dictator as the “ability to transmit energy and, consequently, this energy itself was regarded as the exclusive attribute of the king having \textit{imperium}, and we must with him explain \textit{imperium} as the \textit{mana}.”\footnote{Ibid., 307.} \textit{Mana} is defined through the belief of primitive peoples as an “inner power which raised its possessor above other men.”\footnote{Ibid.} Cohen suspects that Rome did not make use of such dictatorship power to drive away the pestilence that occurred in 463 B.C. during the successive wars between the Aequians, Sabines and Volscians. But Livy’s history suggests the existence of a dictator who helped to impose divine sanction on the pestilence as people were crowded in the shrines. “Everywhere were prostrate matrons, sweeping the floors of the temples with their
hairs, while they besought the angry gods to grant them pardon and end the pestilence.”

The dictator’s ability to transmit force through the exercise of *imperium* was given to Cincinnatus in 458 B.C. when he took control of power through the mandate of the senate. Livy said that he “proclaimed a suspension of the courts; ordered the shops to be closed all over the City; and forbade anybody to engage in any private business. He then commanded all those who were of military age to come armed, before sunset, to the Campus Martius, bringing each enough bread to last five days, and twelve stakes…” The *imperium* given to Cincinnatus would have provided him with great powers; it would enable him not only to foster the prosperity of the state but even to frighten and beat the enemies—the Aequi. Consuls and ex-consuls could be summoned as dictators. But in most cases, an ex-consul was appointed to this post because he had earlier proved his ‘inner power’ combined with *felicitas*. As a result, the ‘inner power’ of his life only needed to be amplified through the dictatorship authority of the senate. However, despite being a consul or an ex-consul, any person could be summoned to use *imperium maximum* if he was considered to be most suitable for performing the task.

The dictator, whether an ex-consul or not, was endowed with inner power that was considered to be so great and his appearance alone was capable of frightening enemies or even other magistrates. This could be the reason why Livy stated that the
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tribunes and the plebeians were afraid of Quinctius Cincinnatus. Livy indicated this when he said that the plebeians “were by no means so rejoiced at the sight of Quinctius…” Cohen is skeptical of Livy’s predilection or fondness for this powerful aristocratic magistrate as he thinks that Livy may be tempting people by exaggerating the power of this mysterious icon. Cohen is at last convinced that Livy was right with reference to comparable events in Etruria and elsewhere where priests had tried to cause panic with their garments and their gestures. The Emperor Augustus was also identified as being able to inspire Romans with fear by his appearance.

Cohen continues to challenge the validity of Livy’s characterization of the office of this dictator, because the dictator was forbidden to mount a horse. He states that “the exceptional position of the office was indistinguishably realized, and religion prohibited anything to be altered in it.” Cohen later observes that the dictator had this in common with flamen Dialis, the virgines Vestales, and the rex sacrorum. Livy made reference to this religious credibility given to Cincinnatus after he defeated the Aequi. Livy said, “At Rome the senate, being convened by Quinctius Fabius, the prefect of the City, commanded Quinctius to enter the gates in triumph, with troops that accompanied him. Before his chariot were led the generals of the enemy; the military standards were borne ahead…” Ernst Meyer points out the reason why the dictator was prohibited from mounting a horse. This is confirmed from archeological sources which proved that the horse was also introduced in Europe at a relatively late
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date, and as a riding horse in Rome still later. Added to this religious taboo was the fact that the *flamen Dialis* was forbidden to touch iron, and this custom came into use only in the Villanovan epoch. If this taboo were to be violated, it could diminish the power of the dictator, or put an end to his power.\textsuperscript{195}

The method of appointing a dictator is different from the method of choosing a magistrate. In contrast to the procedure of initiation which required a magistrate to observe the *auspicia* at night, a dictator was not required to talk of *auspicia* at night, but of a *dictio*.\textsuperscript{196} A dictator was made to go through the procedure whereby certain words must be heard in the silence of the night. If no sound was heard, the dictator would be deemed acceptable for the appointment. This sound or signal was to be sent by the gods. According to Cohen:

Such a signal, of course, would be sent by the gods; it does not indicate who has to be chosen, it is only negative to give warning, to prevent a bad choice. Therefore, if no sound is heard, the gods are believed to give their assent, and their goodwill is on the side of the newly chosen dictator.\textsuperscript{197}

Of the dictators known in Roman tradition, only six were initiated owing to discord between the ruling consuls. Among these six were three which took place in the period of the tribune *militum consulari potestate*.\textsuperscript{198}
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According to Cohen, ‘forty-two’ dictators had to be nominated in Roman history, and six of them were appointed due to lack of agreement between the opposing political characters on issues concerning security and progress of the state. This statement obviously has an implication for the characters of the Roman politicians. Due to partisanship among the tribunes and the patricians, Cincinnatus had to be appointed as a dictator by the senate under the leadership of Quinctius Fabius. Fabius was driven by the need to appoint a dictator to rescue Rome in the face of the tribunes’ unwillingness to continue the war. Nathan Rosenstien, quoting from Lily Ross Taylor, states that it was unavoidable for Romans to impose several religious sanctions upon the politicians to move the state forward. Aside from the religious sanction of a dictator, rituals such as sorting out the lot, augury, and many others had to be introduced to control Roman politicians. Sorting out the lot is defined as a method of casting lots by throwing the coin, while the *urna* of the coin determines the lot with the *lituus*.\(^{199}\) Augury is a method of sanctioning orderliness among Romans through a religious act whereby “Roman priests with special expertise in determining the will of the gods—the science of divine signs, and defining sacred space on earth…”\(^{200}\) Sorting out the lot was needed in a political system with characters such as the Roman elites whose interest was to “struggle for glory, honor, and authority derived from political and military success…”\(^{201}\) This situation indeed called for firm
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limits upon the pursuit of such noble desires. As a result, it was very necessary to protect both the state and its rulers from the dangers that accompanied the partisan actions of Roman politicians.

Rosenstein emphasizes that sorting out the lot helped to calm the intensity of competition by providing a system of dividing the duties and responsibilities of political office. The system was more effective for decision-making than the partisan procedure used on the senate floor. This non-political method of selecting officials made it possible to avoid political leanings among the opposing characters—the patricians and the plebeians who had preconceived notions about each other. Sorting out the lot made it possible to avoid taking sides in the nomination of a consul, a centurio praerogativa, priests, and jurors who hear criminal cases. It is very efficient for the selection of a dictator who is capable of undertaking an important war such as the battle of Mount Algidus. The lot helped Romans to diffuse the political battle that characters with aggression for prominence would have generated to ignite civil strife and split into warring camps.\(^{202}\) The lack of cooperation among the tribunes and the plebeians in the events of 467-458 B.C. before Cincinnatus was called to conquer the Aequi is a prime example of what necessitated the need for whatever restraint was available for the political class to impose upon itself.\(^{203}\)

Unlike the sacred nature of augury used for sanctioning the will of the gods, the religious nature of the lot is questioned by many historians. Taylor asserts that if the Romans understood lot or sortilege as an act “whereby Jupiter and the other gods
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communicated their will to mortals, then the Romans’ piety will have made such consultation imperative, and they would have imparted legitimacy and authority to its results. 204 When magistrates cast lots in some public matters, their colleagues in the senate hoped for encouraging results through an expression of divine will. 205

Another reason for divine sanction in the act of casting of lots is discernible from the fact that Romans cast lots within the templum, which was subject to the authority of the augurs. Beard, North, and Price define templum “as an area of the sky within which divine signs were observed; a place on earth from which signs in heavens might be observed; a piece of ground formally marked out by the augures.” 206 Actions usually performed in the templum were the passing of laws, holding of elections, and discussions of the senate. When performing the ritual, the magistrate would commence the meeting by taking the auspices. Augury made correct performance of ritual procedure—religio for obtaining valid public decisions. 207 Pliny the Elder referred to religio as a meticulous religious observance whereby Romans upheld the importance of repeating certain prescribed formulae of prayers or sacrifice without any alteration or omission. 208 All public procedures in Rome were usually performed within the sacred area of the augury. This was done according to the laws governing the province of the augurs. Augural processes were pertinent to the relations
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between the Romans and the gods, and the authenticity of the administration of the state.209

R.J. Goar states that originally the formal procedure for performing augury was the observation of the flight activities of the birds, but this process was perceived to be slow and conditional in observing signs from heaven. As a result, it was replaced by the feeding of special sacred chickens; the omen was determined from the eating of the corn by the chickens, and it was known as signum ex tripudiis. Also, augury came to be regarded as a system of interpreting signs such as lightning and thunder in order to cancel elections.210 Later, this system had to yield its place to haruspicy in Cicero’s time. Haruspicy was the examination of entrails by the haruspex. Along with reading the entrails, haruspices were also concerned with every kind of communication with the gods. They were the ones consulted in the interpretation of prodigies, and the reading of the entrails of sacrificial victims.211

Despite all the strict religious observances demonstrated in the actions of the Romans, it is surprising that they ran their res publica (business of the people) to a large extent without allowing the gods a central role in their decision making. However, this firm clear line drawn between res divinae (religious issues), and res humanae (human issues) did not distinguish Romans as a people who are impious or irreligious.212 In solidifying the fundamental relationship between human issues and religious issues, the pax deorum (peace of the gods) recognized the rights and
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responsibilities of god and man. Romans tried to maintain peace with the gods so as to avoid anger of the gods, and receive the good things from them. This was manifested by the fact that the Romans observed what the gods required of them; they offered exact worship and sought divine sanction for their undertakings. Romans did not hesitate to appease the gods whenever they saw that they had displeased them.213

Roman appeasement of the gods is exemplified in an event of 464 B.C., during a new outbreak of war between the Aequi and the Romans. Aulus Postumius Albus and Titus Quinctius were the consuls. The war which broke out between the Aequi and the Romans turned to catastrophe for the Romans as Valerius was captured by the enemy and his head was about to be severed from his body. Quinctius quickly appeared on the scene to interrupt the disaster, and they successfully rescued the dead commander from being mutilated. Romans suffered a death toll of 5,200 soldiers, while the Aequi suffered the loss of 2,400 soldiers. Livy included from other sources that the number of the enemy’s causalities even amounted to about 4,230. This disastrous incident was followed by a symbol from heaven. At Rome, “lights blazed in the sky, and many other inexplicable phenomena were either seen or perhaps, imagined by frightened people.”214 Livy said that Romans reacted to these unusual events with respect for the gods as they declared three days of prayers. “Shops were shut, the courts closed, and all work forbidden, while every shrine and temple was, throughout the period, packed with men and women praying for the pardon of
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heaven.” Also, Romans accepted the gods’ influence in canceling the proceedings of elections at any time. Each consul or praetor had to seek the permission of the gods before marching off to his province.

According to Goar, Early Roman worship centered upon gods of war and agriculture who were worshiped in the field and grove. Originally, Romans thought of their gods as *numina*-powers which had no human characteristics. These *numina* represent particular places.” The earth was associated with Tellus and Terra Mater, and Vesta was the goddess of the hearth; both were constituted with perpetual fire. The forest was connected with the god Silvanus. Planting of corn was the function of Saturnus. Storage of grain was associated with Consus. These gods and goddesses were not represented by any pictorial or artificial symbols. With the exception of Vesta, who was believed to require a temple “because the sacred fire on her hearth could not be exposed, only simple altars were made for some of them” Jupiter and Mars had wide jurisdiction over divination in the Roman pantheon; they were gods of war, storm, and many other functions. *Fetiales* and *Salii* carried these two gods with them as they performed rights and duties to them in the presence of the people in the community. Worship in the fields was directed at appeasing a number of numinous powers connected with fields, crops and flocks—Pales, Robigus, Ceres, and many
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others. They also include the deities of one’s own property—Terminus and the Lares.\textsuperscript{221}

Over time, the Capitoline triad of Jupiter, Juno, and Minerva, which was instituted in late fifth century B.C. overshadowed the former chief triad of Jupiter, Mars, and Quirinus. New deities that came in from foreign lands were Diana, the goddess of the moon, the hunt and chastity; she came from Aricia, and her temple was built on the Aventine. Minerva was the virgin goddess of warriors, medicine, and wisdom; she was involved with weaving of crafts and inventing music. Her temple was situated on the Aventine Hill in the 490s.\textsuperscript{222} In 484 B.C., the Dioscuroi were brought in from Tusculum; and Hercules came from Tibur early fourth century B.C. Juno-Regina entered Rome through \textit{evocatio}. \textit{Evocatio} was the calling forth of a deity of the enemy, convincing it through promise of horrors to join with the Romans. The ceremony concerned the summoning away of a god of another land. During the process, the Roman general would offer the enemy god a cult and a temple in Rome.\textsuperscript{223} Domestic worship was the essence of divination of the deities of Vesta, the Penates, and the Lar familiaris; and their chief place of worship was the hearth.\textsuperscript{224}

Romans manifested the inspirations derived from their religious and political activities with language that is specially articulated in poetry and the oratorical style of speechmaking. This is derived from Aristotle’s rhetorical style of speech discussed earlier in Livy’s style of writing. As the Romans related the will of the gods of their
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ancestors through various religious institutions, they also accumulated several
principles from their religious, political, and private activities over time. Walsh lists
these virtues and values:

1, *Pietas*, having due observance for the will of the gods of the ancestors.
2, *Fides*, willingness to accomplish the gods’ treatises and fulfilling promises solemnly made to them.
3, *Concordia*, harmonious cooperation in body politic with due reference to authority both in military and civic disciplina.
4, *Prudentia*, the application of foresight.
5, *Ratio*, to have reason in politics and war.
6, *Clemencia*, the exercise of mercy when appropriate at an individual level.
7, *Pudicitia*, maintenance of chastity and of courage.
8, *Dignitas*, the need to comport oneself in accordance with one’s status.
9, *Gravitas*, to honor ones duty, and be responsible.
10, *Frugalitas*, to espouse a simple way of life without luxury
11, *Humanitas*, to demonstrate creativity and tradition.
12, *Penates*, the symbol of continuity in a world without end.

These may perhaps be translated as the “Twelve Commandments of the Seven Hills of Roman Capitol.” Walsh remarks that these abstract qualities should be the guiding light of the leaders of each generation, and they are to be the real and enduring qualities of the heroes of history of Rome.225

*Dramatic adaptation of Cincinnatus*

*Cincinnatus* is divided into three acts and three scenes as Livy’s pentad is divided into five books. Each scene is focused on the particular subject addressed in sections 25-29 of book 3. 24. 10-25.5—29. 7-30.5 of Livy’s *Ab Urbe Condita*. Act One demonstrates the renewed struggle between the Romans and their antagonists—
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the Aequi, the Sabines, and the Volsci. The act highlights the Romans’ movement as they faced their antagonists in a vicious battle. Act Two integrates the heightening of the tension and anger which the rebellion of the Aequi and the Sabines had provoked in the Romans, and the Romans renewed strategy to combat the situation through Cincinnatus the dictator. Act Three depicts the resolution and the release of tension in the Romans as Cincinnatus turned the tide of the clash against the Aequi in the battle of Mount Algidus.

Scene One of Act One demonstrates the emotion and fury which the Aequi and the Sabines provoked in the Romans as they broke the peace treaty which they made the previous year. Roman Consul Minucius expressed these feelings to members of his army as they marched along the way to Mount Algidus in their attempt to close up the enemy’s threat:
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In advancing and besieging the city of Aequi, we shall divide our forces into two units. Commander Hernicius shall annul the odds against our offensive by leading the infantry and attacking the city on the left side. His troops shall troop out from the hidden valley of the hill that lies two hundred yards away from their city. You shall dominate your front with the skill of the Hernici’s heritage that’s integrated into the Roman army from our alliance with the Hernicis. Commander Quincius from Quinctia gens shall erase the remaining threat of the foes as we pour in our troops from the other end of the valley, and bring victory to the senate.229

Scene Two of Act One demonstrates the scene of battle in the early hours of the following day as Minucius finally dispatched the Roman army to war with the Aequian forces. Unfortunately, the enemy caught up with the Romans unawares, and they surrounded their position with armaments. Hernicius, who was in command of the Roman infantry, tried to give courage to his troops and said:230

Advance, advance, the vantage is to your favor, the swords of the enemy are before you. Erase the odds. And raise your wailing swords before the blade of death massage your souls into the world of the dead. Endure, soldiers, and fight the adversary to surrender. Trade and commerce of Roman civilization cannot be compromised by the invasion of the Volscis and their rebellion; and the Aequians evasive demands
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Scene Three of Act One demonstrates the frustration of the commanders in their efforts to successfully mobilize the Roman forces to conquer the Aequians. The Aequian forces overpowered them and surrounded their camp. Consul Minucius could not but surrender his troops to the victorious Aequian army. He said to Gracchus, the Aequian commander, “Great leader of the Aequian people, indeed the ranking of the Romans in the battlefield has turned into an advantage for a clique of Aequian bandits.”

Scene One of Act Two presents the state of affairs in Rome as the senate met during their regular session. They conversed about the victorious expectation of the war with the Aequians and the Sabines. As they were discussing, Consul Minucius and Gracchus exchanged harsh words with each other in Corbio. Suddenly, five horsemen who escaped through the war camp rushed to Rome to spread the news of the Roman defeat. Before they entered the gates of Rome, Quinctus Fabius, the senate leader, was busy addressing the patricians and the tribunes.

Senators of the strength and wealth of Rome … With thy enabling hand thou hast built the city that’s not susceptible to the usurping power of the mob of Italian nations. The Volsci’s craft of the oldies art of combat cannot permeate the hazard of Roman culture of defense. The Sabines’ attitude and their un-soothing ethics of
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relation with us cannot obliterate the virtues of Roman strength.

The Aequians’ unceasing rebellion against the spear of Roman’s defense is currently being extinguished by Noble Consul Minucius and Nautius in the cities of Corbio and Sabines.²³⁵

Fabius was speaking about the senate’s great expectations when the horsemen entered the Capitol to inform the senators about the impending doom awaiting Rome. This was because Consul Minucius and his forces had been surrounded by the assault of the Aequian soldiers. A soldier spoke to the senate members: ²³⁶

O ye senators, Consul Minucius and our forces are soon to be food for the vultures in the land of the Aequi. For Rome has fallen, and the city of Corbio is about to become the coffin of the forces of Rome. The battle was hot, and the battle was wrought when the swords turned against Rome and her fearlessness in combat. Oh prudent senators that illuminate the darkness of the nights and turn it to the light of the day, war is about to besiege the city of Romulus, and make us scorn of people among the clan of Italian warlords. Oh thou senators …General Minucius is a Consul of courage indeed, and not a coward to the dictates of war and its weariness. In his courage, we have cunningly escaped the sight of the enemy, and exit the door of torture and death. This being the end that awaits the forces of Rome and
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his Consul as they consult with Cloelius Gracchus of Aequi for the ransom or ruin of their lives.\textsuperscript{237}

The news of the alarm from the warfront disoriented the people of Rome as if the enemy was already in their territory. The senate took courage, and they were not much terrified as the people in the city. They thought of redeploying Commander Nautius who was battling with the Sabines on the second front. But they foresaw that his command was not capable of handling his own battlefront, and it would not be proper to redeploy him to tackle the more outrageous Aequians. They unanimously decided to send for Commander Cincinnatus as they realized his capability to handle the situation. A senator put forward this suggestion: \textsuperscript{238}

Senators, I swear to Jupiter, the Rex Excellence of our legacy in battle, who else but Cincinnatus can bring an end to this horror that approaches Rome? The ruler of the gods shall bend the swords of the enemy of Rome through Cincinnatus and give victory to the heroes of Rome.\textsuperscript{239}

Fabius, who could not but acknowledge the consent of his senators on this suggestion said, “If Rome shall speak in one accord to ordain Cincinnatus for this task, then let five soldiers on the chariot-wheels be appointed by the Commander to the farm of Quinctian Meadows, and mediate the tenets of the senate to the person of Cincinnatus without waiting…” \textsuperscript{240}
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When the senate envoys reached Quinctian Meadows, they found Cincinnatus and his wife Racilia on his farm digging ditches and plowing. The envoys exchanged greetings with him and asked him to put on his toga. After he has wiped off the dust and sweat from his face, the soldiers congratulated him and hailed him dictator as they informed him of the alarming situation in the battlefront.241

Noble Cincinnatus, it is well with Rome and the heroes, but it is hell with Rome without the courage that Jupiter has bestowed unto thee. Indeed, the God of thunder and storm would seek for thy thundering hand at this hour to rescue Rome from the storm of the Aequians and the Sabines. Their blizzard of battle is about to strike Rome’s stronghold, and Rome is about to become the home of the conquered.242

Cincinnatus replies with words of courage:

The city raised and enacted by the piety of Romulous for the progress of nature shall not be phased out by warring nations. I swear to Jupiter Strator, Feretrius and victor of his people; to Jupiter-Jove in heaven, and the mighty hand of Mars in warfare; Rome shall be fortified from the hand of her foes. (Turns to Racilia) Racilia, arise with haste, run into the house, and fetch me my toga. For henceforth I shall set forth my feet upon Rome with the errands of the senate, and I shall answer the call of my duty to God and man. 243
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Scene Three of Act Two portrays the entrance of Cincinnatus into Rome. The Romans, including his three sons, lined up the road to salute him and welcome him to Rome. The senate, his kinsmen, and his friends also came out to receive him. He was “attended by this throng and preceded by his lictors, he was escorted to his house.”

These feelings were reflected in the orations of aesthetics of pleasure rendered by a Roman bard:

Most noble warrior of Rome, Cincinnatus, the torch bearer of the god of Jupiter and Mars that land in the battlefield and eliminate the antagonists of Rome. Thou arth a great general and a farmer who consolidates the strategy of the foes into confusion. Cincinnatus, you shall foil the enemy’s offensive into formless aggression. When Cincinnatus torments the actions of the enemy, Rome re-assembles the leftovers into new nations. When Jupiter rides in the clouds with the rush of the storm, Cincinnatus waves the spear and javelin to victory for the gods. O thou great warrior that routs the horror of the days into a shower of booty for Rome. Cincinnatus, thou arth the chosen one for the assembly that awaits thee in the Roman Senate.

The next day, Cincinnatus moved into action as he named Lucius Tarquitius, a man of patrician birth, but one who had served as a foot-soldier because of poverty.

Cincinnatus addressed the Romans in front of the Capitol:
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Romans, with thee I shall dispense the core of dictatorship powers granted unto me by the senate. With the elite forces of the regular combatants of the Roman army, two contingents of battalion forces and mounted soldiers shall be selected for my command. The mounted forces shall be moved into the battle-field by Lucius Tarquitius, while the land forces shall be screened into our route by Tiberius Festus. All men of military age shall be selected by the elite forces and assigned to various duties. Each men assigned shall bring with him twelve stakes. Tomorrow we shall move towards the city of Corbio. To inspire the soldiers marching to war, legal businesses are to be suspended in all factories of Rome as we march towards the city of Corbio. There we shall align with Consul Minucius and his forces entrapped, and move Rome again into the line of victory.\textsuperscript{247}

However, there were some tribunes who thought that the dictator’s power was too much and that he would abuse it. A tribune demonstrated his feelings to the crowd and said: \textsuperscript{248} “No, Romans, rise ye not to his tension full of pretensions, listen to the instincts of the Tribunes—the senate decision is overdone. The power of the dictator is excessive.”\textsuperscript{249}

Scene Two of Act Three depicts the movement of the Romans as they departed to Corbio and engaged the Aequians in battle. On their way, the soldiers exchanged

\textsuperscript{247} Festus Ogunbitan, \textit{Cincinnatus}, 49.
\textsuperscript{248} Livy: \textit{with an English Translation in Fourteen Volumes}, 91.
\textsuperscript{249} Festus Ogunbitan, \textit{Cincinnatus}, 48.
words of courage to urge their fellows to move faster towards Corbio and deliver the message of the senate before the Aequians with a big fight.\textsuperscript{250} They sang along:

Onward Roman soldiers launching on to war. Raise up banner of victory and rouse thy souls to war. For Jupiter-strator stands in front of you. March on Romans (2x), march on to victory. Onward Roman soldiers, marching on to war. Look unto Jupiter, Rex in front of you.\textsuperscript{251}

When the forces finally reached Corbio, Cincinnatus ordered the troops to camp in a territory nearby so as to prepare their military strategy. He directed the tribune commander to ask the soldiers to drop their packs in one place and return with their arms and palisades in rank and file: \textsuperscript{252}

In a new model of retreat from the Aequians’ attack, each one of you shall rush not to battle, but shall each dig a trench and build a palisade in front of your position. Thus shall you also encircle and hostage the city of Corbio with the wall of palisades. Thou shall barricade them all from escaping the Romans’ great onslaught as soon as we decide to pierce and puncture their hinterland.\textsuperscript{253}

Consul Minucius could not wait to attack the Aequians as he acknowledged the signal from his colleagues who came to help. He felt “the shout not only signified that their friends were come, but that they had begun to fight; and it would be surprising if they
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were not already assailing the enemy’s camp from without.”

Minucius said to the captured Roman army, “Attack them, advance, advance, and attack them, brave Romans, victory is at your hand. Speed up your movements with your Achilles tendons, and taunt their territory with the terry spears in your hand.”

Finally, Cincinnatus conquered the Aequians’ threats against the Romans as he started a new battlefront on them while they were trying to abate Consul Minucius’ offensive. When Gracchus realized that he could not make the victory a massacre against the Romans, he commanded his troops to put down their arms and beg the Romans to let them go. In response to this order to surrender, a group of Aequian soldiers begged Minucius for mercy:

Sir, we beseech thee to have mercy upon us. Thy subjects do not direct the movements of this battle. We are misdirected by those who stir our hands for war. May it please thee to befit thy authority by desiring our quest for mercy to go into our homes.

Minucius replied to the captives that he was unable to answer their question at that hour; he had to appeal to the wishes of the dictator who was in control of the battlefield.

My authority at this hour permits me not to grant thee right to life.
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or death for being misdirected by leaders who crave to be at war with Rome. Your right to life or death shall be dictated by the one who is ahead of my moves in battle. Soldiers, round them up, move them ahead of us to the camp of Cincinnatus.259

Cincinnatus did not grant the enemy’s plea for clemency. Instead, he imposed on the Aequians and especially their leader Gracchus to be brought forward to him in chains for breaking the peace treaty with Rome: 260

As for the prisoners of war, Rome does not trust captives and their promiscuous appeal for mercy. Let the soldiers hunt the city for the rest of the captives, else we make them villains to our victory. Gracchus shall not be walked before me on his feet unless he slouches here under chains and bounds. Go, soldiers, and arrest the remaining captives of war until all things fall apart and the focus cannot stick together. 261

Despite the dictator’s wishes to punish the Aequians, he later changed his mind to grant them mercy as they swore to an oath of allegiance. He did this because he saw it unfit to “require the blood of the Aequians; they could go; but…they should pass beneath the yoke as they depart.”262

Blood is shed when the power of the antagonist is conquered, but life is kept when the foe pledges to respect the law of the victorious. Great
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is God Jupiter, the Conservator Orbis who safeguards to conserve the life of the Romans. The peace of Romans is to respect the virtues of the *pater familias*. The foundation of the *patria* is the *penates* of our symbol of continuity…In upholding these beliefs would I bestow the mercy of our gods and goddesses upon thee and spare thy lives from bloodshed.\footnote{Festus Ogunbitan, *Cincinnatus*, 68.}

Cincinnatus then ordered a yoke to be erected with three spears; two of them were to be fixed on the ground, while the third was to be laid across. The captives were asked to pass under this and swear to an oath of allegiance to Rome. It was repeated by a commander.\footnote{Livy: *with an English Translation in Fourteen Volumes*, 97.} “Great is God Jupiter, and safe is his mercy upon us. Your Gods we shall serve—your laws we shall obey. We shall not pay any allegiance to any foreign prince or any foreign king or any other powers. So help us Jupiter.”\footnote{Festus Ogunbitan, *Cincinnatus*, 68.}

In Scene Three Act Three, the dictator addressed the consular army and most especially Consul Minucius; he rebuked Minucius for his ignoble conduct in battle as he almost gave Rome into the hand of the enemy: “until you begin to have the spirit of a consul, you shall command these legions as my lieutenant.”\footnote{Livy: *with an English Translation in Fourteen Volumes*, 99.} After that, Minucius relinquished his consulship, and remained as a lieutenant. Cincinnatus addressed him:

With the authority given to me by the senate as the dictator of Rome in time of emergency, Consul Minucius, I hereby withdraw your powers and authority as commander and Consul of the Roman consulship. Rome shall henceforth forbid consulting with thy weak senses of strategy and
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\footnote{Festus Ogunbitan, *Cincinnatus*, 68.} \footnote{Livy: *with an English Translation in Fourteen Volumes*, 97.} \footnote{Festus Ogunbitan, *Cincinnatus*, 68.} \footnote{Livy: *with an English Translation in Fourteen Volumes*, 99.}
At Rome, the news of joy and victory reached the ears of all the people including the senate. Immediately, Fabius summoned the people to prepare a triumphant entry for the soldiers and the dictator. Cincinnatus was ushered into Rome in a chariot draw by four horses.  

268 Fabius said, “Without waiting let the victory banner fly in front of the forum. With all haste, let the rostrum be trimmed and re-painted to glorify the excellence of Cincinnatus. Without mincing words, let the mounted soldiers go into the markets and the enclaves to sound the joy of triumph to all Romans.”

After the celebrations and ratifications of the pending cases in the courts, Cincinnatus resigned his office as dictator before the sixth month of his consulship, and he returned to his farm in Quinctian Meadows.

Objectives of the play, and how I achieved them.

Leon Golden describes Aristotle’s purification theory of catharsis as a “particular event of a story and the universal condition of human existence, which sets a fundamental limitation to the human intellect in dealing with unfathomable mystery that surrounds divine purpose.”

271 I wrote Cincinnatus to create an intellectually entertaining and learning experience from the events of 458 B.C. The ideas which I
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used in writing the play are based on Golden’s explanation of Aristotle’s theory of catharsis. They are stated in three different ways: (1) “a form of intellectual purification through which proper discipline is placed on the audience’s reaction to pity and fear; (2) structural development in which the expansion of a plot of a story purifies the tragic deed of its moral pollution, and thus allows the audience to experience the emotions of pity and fear; (3) and a form of intellectual clarification in which the concepts of pity and fear are clarified by the artistic or poetic representation of them.”

In the first explanation, Golden acknowledges that Aristotle’s theory of catharsis can be functionally defined as intellectual clarification, instead of defining it as purgation of the soul. He is skeptical of Bernays’ definition of catharsis as being “moral purification or medical purgation.” Golden claims that Aristotle would have conceived the essential pleasure of tragedy which arose from pity and fear as “intellectual rather than physical or moral…” Robert E. Lane defines the theory as cleansing either in a medical way or in a spiritual sense (from guilt). I found Golden’s definition of catharsis to be more applicable than Bernays’ or Lane’s definition. This is because I intended the play to represent the destiny of the Romans with intellectual clarity. It is not written to probe into moral justification of the Roman
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aggression against the Aequi and the Sabines who broke the peace treaty with the Romans. Livy also stated this as a genuine factor that escalated the unrest between Rome and the two factions: “that same year the Aequi sought and obtained peace…But the Aequi did not suffer it to remain long at rest; breaking the treaty which they made with the Romans the year before…”

According to Walsh, Livy’s idea of writing Roman history was to demonstrate how

The Romans were confronted with continuous difficulties from without and within. The whole of early Roman history is thus depicted as a period of trial, in which the military and civic virtues of the Roman people are thoroughly tested so that they may become physically and morally capable of world-leadership.

The struggle which the Romans experienced through the test of military and civic strategy with their antagonists is what Aristotle described as being catharsis of pity and fear. Golden emphasizes this viewpoint by clarifying that the tragedy which arose from imitation of pity and fear is an essential pleasure of tragedy, just as the essential pleasure of imitation is learning. In a similar manner, the tragedy of Livy’s narrative about Cincinnatus inspired me to write the story.

According to Aryeh Kosman, the art of poetics used in writing a story is *mimesis* (imitation), an idea originally set forth by Aristotle. I used the mimetic
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method to write the play by impersonating the actions of the Romans. As a result, I reflected the Romans’ values and virtues to achieve the political and heroic dialogues of the play.\textsuperscript{280} I applied the unique features of writing drama to create immediate and obvious resemblance of the plot presented in Livy’s history along with his strategy of the battle of Mount Algidus. Poetry enables me to reproduce pity and fear, and this leads to “imitating action by action, or actual representation of catharsis in the story.”\textsuperscript{281} It is this principle of drama that creates the tragic experience of fear and pity in catharsis.

Having imitated the instinct of pity and fear on the side of the Romans in the story, the pleasure which Aristotle attributed to \textit{mimesis} becomes the pleasure through which I applied creative writing to compose the play. Golden asserts, drawing upon Aristotle’s theory, that “All forms of \textit{mimesis}, whether epic or tragedy, must manifest this essential pleasure of imitation.”\textsuperscript{282} Intellectual purification made it possible for me to imitate pity and fear and create vivid poetry that defends the Romans as the winning side in the play. Justifying the Romans’ action enabled me to use poetic composition with logical argument based on their virtues and values. Emphasizing the moral purification aspect of catharsis would not have made it possible for me to develop an argument for plot construction of the play; it would only lead me to quickly judge either the Romans or their antagonists as being right or wrong for assaulting each other.
Golden’s translation of Aristotle’s theory of catharsis sees tragedy as a concept which helps to trigger “an imitation of a noble and complete action having magnitude,” This concept is characteristic of the battle of Mount Algidus, and it motivated me to use poetic lyrics which are artistically enhanced with military or command language. Golden and James Hogan hold opposing views on the effectiveness of tragedy and epic in motivating military or commanding poetry. Hogan upholds the view that catharsis would take place more effectively in epic than in tragedy. His reason is that epic would provide an expansion of the subject in the story being told, and it would help the reader to contemplate the insight offered by the work of art. This would then lead to a full enrichment of the learning process involved in catharsis. But Golden maintains that Aristotle’s theory clearly stated that tragedy is more effective for creating works of art than epic. Golden defines the difference between both styles and states that tragedy and its concentration is preferred for works of art, while epic is diluted by its extension in creating works of art. He emphasizes that concentration or shock created by tragedy pertains to clarity of the events in a story. Tragedy creates a shorter version of a story, and it can continuously hold the attention of the reader without interrupting the extensive imaginative experience in epic.

Golden indicates that Hogan contradicts himself when he mentions that tragedy is more effective than epic in telling a story. According to Hogan as quoted by Golden:
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The more concentrated structure of tragedy permits the attention to be fixed securely on the essential point of the work, as the plot is developed from beginning, to middle and to end under the laws of necessity and probability. The more rambling structure of epic provides many opportunities for the essential point of the work to be obscured by the development of subsidiary themes and plots.  

Hogan’s inconsistency in his interpretation of the effective style for purification led Golden to observe that Hogan is in full harmony with the idea that tragedy is more effective than epic in achieving purification. However, I applied both styles of purification methods in writing *Cincinnatus*; both helped me to fully express what the Romans recognized as firm clear lines dividing religious issues from human issues. I demonstrated religious issues with epic or extensive explanation style. It has helped to adequately articulate how the Romans upheld the will of the gods through the ritual of *hecatomb* (killing of one hundred cattle for cleansing of the swords) before Cincinnatus approached the warfront. I used tragedy or concentration style to portray the vigorous argument of partisanship between the tribunes and the patricians as they antagonized each other before reaching the final decision to initiate Cincinnatus as a dictator. Roman political theater is usually divided between these two classes of politicians—the patricians and the plebeians—with the plebeian population represented by the tribunes. Golden states that even though both tragedy and epic aim
at a catharsis of emotion through pity and fear, the shortness and direct \textit{mimesis} of drama give the theory an intrinsic advantage.\textsuperscript{286}

Imitating the different political ideologies of the tribunes and the patricians generated in me the pleasure of learning for writing the play. I used previous information gathered on Roman culture to create strategies for arguing the political claims of both sides. But the tense and confused orientation of the tribunes against the proposals of the patricians about the war led to “illumination of the tragic action that is brought about by \textit{anagnorisis} or recognition.”\textsuperscript{287} I recognized the patricians’ ideal to appoint a dictator to fight the dragging war to its end as the better ideology against that of the tribunes. Golden calls this “Character, i.e., human beings who are either better than, worse than or like, the norm.”\textsuperscript{288} Livy’s conclusion dictated to me the final resolution of the course of the argument between both sides as the senate resolved to “have a dictator to restore their shattered fortunes; they agreed unanimously on the nomination of Lucius Quinctius Cincinnatus.” Cincinnatus finally turned the Roman defeat into victory in the battle of Mount Algidus, and the play ends in comedy.\textsuperscript{289}

\textit{Conclusion}

Livy’s history about Cincinnatus and the various characters that featured in the political theater of the early Roman Republic is a classic story of willpower and courage. Livy’s narrative and poetry is combined with effects of epic and tragedy to
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motivate the mind of the reader from a state of despair to a wealth of knowledge about
the virtue of conformity and saving one’s nation. Livy used effective plot construction
of tragicomedy to create a sense of how persistence can lead to hope in the face of
despair. He achieved this idea of hope through Cincinnatus’ courage and risk taking as
well as self-restraint. In the same manner, I have tried to adapt Livy’s ideas of courage
and hope through Aristotle’s method of plot development and imitation of pity and
fear. I focused the play to catch readers’ attention, and educate them on how to
overpower the impossible through the early Roman experience. This experience is
illustrated with poetic lyrics that draw attention to the characters of two starring
actors—Minucius and Cincinnatus. What was impossible for Consul Minucius
becomes possible for Cincinnatus through his bravery. I hope the dramatic adaptation
will create an everlasting memory of this unique event of 458 B.C. in early Roman
History, and widen the Greco-Roman theater of tradition and creativity.
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