ROMAN PERSPECTIVES ON THE *SALUTATIO*

PRIMA LUCE: ROMAN PERSPECTIVES ON THE *SALUTATIO*

By MEGHAN FEE, B.A.

A Thesis Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts

McMaster University MASTER OF ARTS (2011) Hamilton, Ontario (Classics)

TITLE: *Prima luce*: Roman perspectives on the *salutatio* AUTHOR: Meghan Fee, B.A. (Carleton University) SUPERVISOR: Prof. C. Eilers NUMBER OF PAGES: viii, 90

ABSTRACT

The aim of this thesis is to explore the Roman *salutatio*. The morning ritual was reiterated daily throughout the Republic and Empire, and was a fundamental facet of Roman interactions between citizens of varying status. This thesis moves beyond the traditional interpretation of the ritual as a manifestation of Roman patronage, and rather examines the asymmetrical social relationships that existed at the *salutatio* within the context of the applicable socio-political ideologies of the Republic and Empire. As a ritual that was enacted on a daily basis for centuries, the *salutatio* is a useful conduit to understand the complexities of social interaction in Roman society.

Much of the traditional scholarship on the *salutatio* has interpreted the *salutator*/salutatee relationship essentially as a system of social acquiescence, where the salutatee was able to accrue significant social esteem, and the *salutator* was merely a humble *cliens* or social inferior. This thesis dissects the abundant, yet fleeting references to the social practice in the ancient sources to analyze how participation in the *salutatio* impacted individual social status within the greater Roman collective, which was inherently hierarchical. The sources consequently suggest that the ritual was not a system of social subordination, but was rather an accepted behavioural practice which served as a mechanism to promote or establish a distinct 'Roman-ness' within the collective Roman identity, irrespective of status. This study furthermore considers influences which prompted significant adaptations of the *salutatio* over time, which consequently illuminates greater complexities of the Roman social structure.

This thesis ultimately presents the *salutatio* as a Republican ritual which was monopolized by the emperor after the substantial socio-political shift that ensued from the political modification of Republic to Empire. The ritual of the *salutatio* is therefore a manifestation of the instabilities of the Roman social structure.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to acknowledge and thank the many people who have contributed to the success of this thesis. Firstly, I would like to thank my supervisor, Prof. C. Eilers for suggesting this topic, as well as for prompting me to look at this evidence through a new lens. His continual patience and insightful guidance is greatly appreciated. Gratitude is also owed to my supervisory committee, Profs. E. W. Haley and M. Beckmann for their valuable input. I thank the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, the department of Classics and the School of Graduate Studies at McMaster University, as well as the E. T. Salmon fund in Roman Studies for the financial support that I received throughout my degree. I wish to extend my gratitude to my fellow graduate students in the department of Classics for their friendship and determined competition, as well as Carmen Camilleri for her assistance during my time at McMaster University. A sincere thank you to Dr. I. Lockey, whose everlasting counsel and encouragement contributed a great deal to the completion of this work. Recognition is also owed to Cameron Crompton who proofread the many copies of this thesis, and provided continual support. Lastly but certainly not least, thank you to my mother, father and sister, whose unwavering support has always promoted my confidence and encouraged my success.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AE	L'année épigraphique
BCAR	Bulletino della Commissione Archaeologica Comunale di Roma
CIL	Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum
FIRA	Fontes Iuris Romani Antiqui
HEp	Hispania antiqua epigraphica
ILS	Inscriptiones Latinae Selectae
JRA	Journal of Roman Archaeology
JRS	Journal of Roman Studies
LTUR	Lexicon Topographicum Urbis Romae
PIR^2	Prosographia Imperii Romani
RM	Mitteilungen des deutschen archäologischen Instituts, Römische Abteilung
PLRE	Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire

DECLARATION OF ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

The author declares that the content of this research has been completed by Meghan Fee, with recognition of the contributions of the supervisory committee comprising of Dr. Claude Eilers, Dr. Evan W. Haley, and Dr. Martin Beckmann during the research and writing process.

INTRODUCTION

The problem of the *salutatio*

Roman identity is a multifarious conception. The way that Romans identified themselves as distinctly 'Roman' was not necessarily dependent on ethnicity, geographic location, or speaking the Latin language. Rather to be Roman involved behaving in a distinctly 'Roman' manner. Adhering to the behavioural and moral conventions established by the *mos maiorum* both generated and reinforced a manifestly 'Roman' collective identity, which intensified over centuries throughout the Republic and Empire. Situating and asserting one's position within that collective was a fundamental aspect of what it meant to be 'Roman.' To be accepted as a Roman, one had to be validated within the collective through public display. In this status-conscious society, status was thus perpetually negotiated through visual assertions and communicated by means of different tangible and symbolic media. One such symbolic visual expression of status was the social practice of the *salutatio*. The pronounced asymmetrical nature of this daily ritual displayed the status of both the *salutator* and salutatee.

The ubiquity of the ancient sources render no cause to doubt the continued existence of the ritual throughout the Republic and Empire, yet the sources are for the most part problematic, as many times we are told of the *salutatio* in a descriptive context to denote the time of day:

> *ὁ γὰρ Νωρβανὸς ὁ ὕπατος σάλπιγγι ἀεὶ προσκείμενος, καὶ ἐρρωμένως τὸ πρᾶγμα ἀσκῶν,* ***ἠθέλησε καὶ τότε ὑπὸ τὸν ὄρθρον, πολλῶν ἤδη πρὸς τὴν οἰκίαν αὐτοῦ.***

> The consul Norbanus had always been devoted to the trumpet, and as he practiced on it assiduously, he wished to play the instrument on this occasion, **also, at dawn, when many persons were already near his house**.[1]

Passages such as this do little to impart any substantial insight into the *salutatio* in a socio-cultural context. Yet these references do elucidate substantial rudimentary aspects of the *salutatio*. Primarily, these brief references indicate that the *salutatio* persisted throughout the Republic and Empire. The perpetuation of the ritual despite the drastic social, political and even demographic changes over time in the Empire consequently suggests that the *salutatio* was an essential facet of Roman society. This is furthermore reinforced when considering that the numerous fleeting references to the ritual ultimately indicate that the phenomenon was familiar enough to the Romans that references to the ritual need not be accompanied by any context.

The relatively small corpus of sources that do provide more explicit insight into the *salutatio* furthermore perpetuates misunderstandings of the ritual for modern scholars. Martial's epigrams, for instance, have been continually cited as indications that the *salutatio* was an arduous task for the *salutatores*, and ultimately an exercise of social humiliation:

> *Mane domi nisi te volui meruique videre,*
> *Sint mihi, Paule, tuae longius Esquiliae.*
> *Sed Tiburtinae sum proximus accola pilae,*
> *Qua videt anticum rustica Flora Iovem:*
> *Alta Suburani vincenda est semita clivi*
> *Et numquam sicco sordida saxa gradu,*
> *Vixque datur longas mulorum rumpere mandras*
> *Quaeque trahi multo marmora fune vides.*

[1] Cass. Dio 57.18.3, trans. E. Cary.

> *Illud adhuc gravius, quod te post mille labores,*
> *Paule, negat lasso ianitor esse domi.*
> *Exitus hic operis vani togulaeque madentis:*
> *Vix tanti Paulum mane videre fuit.*
> *Semper inhumanos habet officiosus amicos:*
>
> If I did not wish, as well as deserve, to find you at home this morning, may your Esquiline mansion, Paulus, be removed still farther from me! But I live close to the Tiburtine column, near the spot where rustic Flora looks upon ancient Jove. I must surmount the steep path from Subura with its dirty stones and steps never dry, while I am scarcely able to break through the long trains of mules and the marble blocks you see hauled by many a rope. Worse than all this is, that after a thousand toils, your door-keeper tells me, fatigued as I am, that you are not at home. This is the end of my useless labour and dripping toga: even to have seen Paulus at home in the morning was scarcely worth so much. Always the complacent man has inhuman friends.[2]

Consequently, a number of modern Classicists have understood the ritual to be a ritual of subjugation for the *salutatores*. However, if this was the universal case, we must ask *why* the Romans were inclined to participate in this daily custom? Indeed the ancient sources also provide us with contradictory viewpoints, as participation in the *salutatio* is also celebrated. Pliny, for instance, describes Trajan's *salutatio*:

> *Itaque non ut alias attoniti, nec ut periculum capitis adituri tarditate, sed securi et hilares, quum commodum est, convenimus.*
>
> So we gather round you, no longer pale and terrified, slow of step as if in peril of our lives, but carefree and happy, coming when it suits us.[3]

These inconsistencies in the ancient sources render substantial ambiguities in our understanding of an important component of the Roman social system.

[2] Mart. *Ep.* 5.22, trans. R. Pearse.
[3] Pliny *Pan*. 48, trans. B. Radice.

Modern Scholarship on the *salutatio*

With the increasing interest of the study of Roman social history and social interactions in recent decades, there have been a notable number of modern scholars who have articulated the need for a substantial study on the *salutatio*.[4] Previous to Goldbeck's recently published *Salutationes: Die Morgenbegrüßungen in Rom in der Republik und der frühen Kaiserzeit*,[5] a detailed study of the *salutatio* is non-existent.

The early twentieth century work of Friedländer on the *salutatio* is surprisingly extensive considering the time period in which *Roman Life and Manners Under the Early Empire* was written. While obviously his account only relates to the Imperial *salutatio*, he nevertheless provides a fairly detailed description of when and how the ritual was observed.[6] Subsequent to Friedländer, there is little scholarship which discusses the *salutatio* at length until very recently. Surprisingly, Florence Dupont's *Daily Life in Ancient Rome* includes only slight recognition that the *salutatio* occurred, but virtually lacks description of the ritual.[7]

Recent decades have witnessed a heightened interest in the study of Roman social history, and thus the *salutatio* has begun to be recognized as an important aspect of Roman social relations. In particular, scholarship on Roman patronage in the 1980's began to acknowledge the importance of the ritual within the confines of the *cliens*/*patronus* relationship. Most notable are Richard Saller's *Personal Patronage*

[4] Eg. Hölkeskamp (2010); Winterling (2009).
[5] Goldbeck (2010).
[6] Friedländer (1968/1908), 195-202; 207-212.
[7] Dupont (1989), 96.

Under the Early Empire,[8] as well as his collaboration with Peter Garnsey, *The Roman Empire: Economy, Society and Culture*,[9] and Andrew Wallace-Hadrill's anthology, *Patronage in Ancient Society*.[10] While these works acknowledge the importance of the *salutatio*, very little time is devoted to an attempt to analyze the ritual even within the context of patronage. These works do acknowledge that the ritual was a manifestation of the social hierarchy,[11] and admit that the *salutatores* were not exclusively *clientes*;[12] however, for the most part, the *salutatio* is simply valued as a convenient apparatus to demonstrate the subjection of the *clientes*.[13]

Jon Hall's 1998 article, *The Deference-Greeting in Roman Society* discusses the accepted standards of asymmetrical communication, specifically the appropriate manner in which a greeting should occur. In this article, he outlines the *salutatio* as a significant and concrete example of social acquiescence towards the aristocracy in Roman society, and also accepts the symbolic importance of the relationship maintained at the *salutatio* in terms of status.[14] Harriet Flower has furthermore emphasized the importance of display at the *salutatio*, both in terms of the salutatee's atrium display as reiterating connections to the *mos maiorum*, as well as the display of those waiting to gain admittance.[15]

Goldbeck's laudable 2010 monograph on the *salutatio* is the first comprehensive study on the ritual, and has thus deeply contributed to our understanding of the *salutatio*.

[8] Saller (1982).
[9] Garnsey and Saller (1987).
[10] Wallace-Hadrill (1989).
[11] Saller (1989), 57; Garnsey and Saller (1987), 122.
[12] Saller (1982), 129.
[13] Garnsey and Saller (1987), 151; 153; Saller (1982), 11, 128.
[14] Hall (1998), 418-19.
[15] Flower (1999), 220.

A large part of his methodological study discusses the *salutatio* within the context of the Roman patronage system, yet nevertheless considers the ritual to encompass important aspects of society that do not correspond to patronage relationships.[16] Goldbeck's underlying view of the *salutatio* as an interaction system highlights the importance that the daily ritual held in maintaining communication between groups of varying status. His ultimate goal is to understand how the social practice changed from the Republic into the middle Empire. After his thorough introduction on the *salutatio*,[17] the book is divided into two sections, the first of which is devoted to ascertaining concrete details on the ritual. This section considers such aspects as who participated,[18] the time of day the ritual was enacted,[19] the space in which the *salutatio* took place,[20] and the types of communication that occurred.[21] The second section is organized chronologically, where he attempts to define the changes that occurred between the Republican and Imperial *salutationes*.[22] Goldbeck is fundamentally concerned with defining the ritual, and identifying in which ways this definition changed over time, and he intentionally avoids discussing ancient opinions toward the *salutatio*.

Thesis Premise

The aim of this thesis is therefore to reconcile the contradictory ancient attitudes towards participation in the *salutatio* that the sources present. Doing so provides a further

[16] Goldbeck (2010), 189.
[17] Ibid. 14-58.
[18] Ibid. 60-105.
[19] Ibid. 106-118.
[20] Ibid. 119-146.
[21] Ibid. 147-187.
[22] Ibid. Republic: 225-262; Empire: 263-281.

layer of complexity to our understanding of public and private relationships in the Republic and Empire. The daily reiteration of the *salutatio* suggests that the ritual was a standard of Roman behaviour, and thus provided a visual and symbolic assertion of 'Roman-ness'. The *salutatio* was a visual indication of one's place within the greater Roman social hierarchy. Understanding the *salutatio* to be a daily manifestation and reassertion of individual status within an overtly hierarchical society, my research aims to gain a deeper understanding of Roman attitudes towards the pronounced social inequalities that persisted through Roman history.

While Goldbeck's monograph examines the performative, instrumental and symbolic dimensions of the *salutatio*, it is fundamentally an historical analysis of the ritual over time. This thesis contrastingly focuses on abstractions of the Roman social structure, and how the *salutatio* contributed to promoting or reducing social status, thereby illuminating further complexities of Roman social differentiation. The evidence for such a task poses some significant restrictions, as the viewpoints that are left to us are predominantly from the elite. Therefore, we cannot be certain of how Roman citizens of the lowest strata viewed this system of interaction. However, in examining evidence for the *salutatio* that permeates various genres and time periods, we can ascertain some broader social outlooks on participation in this ritual.

Chapter Outline

At the outset of this research, I envisioned a study that was thematically rather than chronologically based. However, upon deeper examination of the evidence, it became clear that the Imperial *salutatio* was a much different practice than its Republican

ancestor. It has therefore been necessary to separate the Republic from the Empire, which has consequently necessitated a comprehensive inquiry into the socio-political ideologies of each respective period. Therefore, chapter one, "Concrete Communication: the *salutatio* in the Republic," is concerned with evidence from the late Republic, which is predominantly restricted to Cicero. In this chapter, the communicative aspect of the political system is emphasized, which thus highlights the importance of maintaining social associations with varying status groups. In this light, the *salutatio* is in essence interpreted as a microcosm of the greater socio-political atmosphere. Chapter two, entitled "Futility and Function: the *salutatio* in the Empire," proceeds to the Imperial period. This chapter emphasizes how the onset of a patriarchal system of government contributed to the drastic reorganization of the Roman social structure. During the Empire, maintaining social associations with anyone other than the emperor essentially lost any kind of real significance. Evidence for the *salutatio* is examined in this context, and ancient outlooks towards the futility of the Imperial *salutatio* are explored. Chapter three is exclusively concerned with epigraphic evidence for the *salutatio*, where we are able to ascertain authentic and relatively unbiased viewpoints of the ritual. This chapter is furthermore concerned with deciphering the categorization of *salutatores*.

Ancient evidence for the *salutatio* is largely confined to the city of Rome, and therefore this thesis is restricted within these geographic limits, with the distinct exception of a fourth century North African inscription analyzed in chapter three. While this inscription is discernibly discordant with the major substance of this research, the descriptiveness of the edict communicates invaluable evidence for the evolution of the

salutatio. This inscription furthermore retrospectively uncovers developments of its early Imperial ancestor.

It should be noted that nowhere in this thesis is a discussion of the *salutatio* within the context of the Roman patronage system. While *clientes* would undoubtedly attend the *salutatio* of their *patroni*, the ritual's principal importance was not purely patronal. Asymmetrical social associations pervaded all aspects of Roman society: *cliens*/*patronus*, citizen/magistrate, voter/politician, soldier/general. Certainly the *salutatio* provided a venue in which these associations could be cultivated, but evidence suggests that it was never confined to only one social objective.

Summary and Aim

This thesis ultimately aims to understand the social organization of Roman society from the Republic through the Empire. As a social ritual that was enacted daily for centuries, the *salutatio* is a useful conduit to understand intricacies of Roman society. The *salutatio* is a manifestation of the Roman inclination to designate social status within its highly calibrated hierarchies. As an accepted behavioural standard, the *salutatio* can thus be interpreted as one of the many mechanisms in which citizens could promote or establish their own 'Roman-ness' in the collective identity. Understanding how the *salutatio* evolved over time, as well as the influences that prompted these changes, illuminates the complexities of the Roman social structure. Understanding ancient mentalities towards participation in the *salutatio* are furthermore illustrative of important social attitudes towards the shaping of public and private relationships.

CHAPTER ONE: Concrete Communication: The *salutatio* in the Republic

Introduction

One of the many accusations that Cicero makes against the conspirators in his Catilinarian Orations is that of an assassination attempt on himself. He claims that after the depraved meeting at Laeca's house during the night of November 7th, two Roman *equites* were sent to kill him at his house under the pretence of attending his *salutatio*. As with many allegations that Cicero makes, it is right to be suspicious of the historicity of this claim. Considering his position of consul at the time, such an event would have undoubtedly brought about plenty of attention. However, the details as presented by the supposed victim himself are vague and indecipherable. In the speeches most closely applicable to the event, namely the Catilinarian Orations and his *Pro Sulla*, he is unclear about the details of the incident. The first time he makes mention of this attempt on his life, he simply relates that

> *Reperti sunt duo equites Romani qui te ista cura liberarent et se illa ipsa nocte paulo ante lucem me in meo lecto interfecturos esse pollicerentur.*
>
> Two Roman knights were found to deliver you from this anxiety, and to promise that very night, before daybreak, to slay me in my bed. [23]

In the second Catilinarian Oration, the details are even more obscure, when he claims that

> *quin hesterno die, cum domi meae paene interfectus essem, senatum in aedem Iovis Statoris convocavi, rem omnem ad patres conscriptos detuli.*
>
> Yesterday when I had been all but murdered at my own house, I convoked the senate in the temple of Jupiter Stator, I related the whole affair to the conscript fathers.[24]

[23] Cic. *Cat.* 1.9, trans. C. D. Yonge.
[24] Cic. *Cat.* 2.12, trans. C. D. Yonge.

It is not until 62 BC, when the conspiracy had already been quelled, that he provided actual details of the event, and the name of one of the perpetrators:

> *… iam ex memoria quas mihi ipsi fecerat insidias deponerem, ut iam immissum esse ab eo C. Cornelium qui me in meis sedibus, in conspectus uxoris ac liberorum meorum trucidaret obliviscerer.*
>
> …I banished from my recollection all the plots which he had laid against me myself; that I forgot that Gaius Cornelius had been lately sent by him for the purpose of killing me in my own house, in the sight of my wife and children.[25]

And, again later in the same speech, he provides the most detail of the event when he relates that Gaius Cornelius

> *… id quod tandem aliquando confitetur, illam sibi officiosam provinciam depoposcit ut, cum prima luce consulem salutatum veniret, intromissus et meo more et iure amicitiae me in meo lectulo trucidaret.*
>
> … as he afterwards confessed, begged for himself that especial employment of going the first in the morning to salute me as consul, in order that, having been admitted, according to my usual custom and to the privilege which his friendship with me gave him, he might slay me in my bed.[26]

The vagueness of the details presented render the veracity of Cicero's claims unconvincing, and we will likely never discover whether this accusation is fabrication or fact. Nevertheless, Cicero's emphasis on the fact that this episode took place during his *salutatio* helps to elucidate the ways in which this social ritual related to the larger Roman Republican culture.

Cicero's stress on the *salutatio* in the Catilinarian Orations indicates that by the late Republic, the ritual was already embedded in Roman culture. The daily routine

[25] Cic. *Sull.* 18, trans. C. D. Yonge.
[26] Cic. *Sull.* 52, trans. C. D. Yonge.

consisted of clients and other friends congregating at the doors of a prominent citizen in the early hours of the morning to pay their respects. Seneca relates that the ritual was in existence by the late second century BC when Gaius Gracchus and Livius Drusus classified their followers in the manner of Hellenistic kings:

> *Apud nos primi omnium C. Gracchus et mox Livius Drusus instituerunt segregare turbam suam et alios in secretum recipere, alios cum pluribus, alios universos. Habuerunt itaque isti amicos primos, habuerunt secundos, numquam veros.*
>
> With us, Gaius Gracchus and, a little later, Livius Drusus were the first to set the fashion of classifying their followers, and of receiving some in privacy, some in company with others, and others en masse. These men, consequently, had chief friends, ordinary friends, never true friends.[27]

This passage demonstrates Seneca's philosophical attitudes towards the term *amici*, which appear to be problematic for him. For Romans, *amicus* could be someone of equal or unequal status, but the essence of the definition was reciprocity; the distinguishing feature of 'friendship' was a mutually beneficial exchange.[28] It is apparent in a number of Seneca's works that he disapproved of the profitability that was inherent in the Roman concept of friendship.[29] Seneca's philosophy, however, is inconsequential to the current discussion; what is significant is what Seneca's treatises inform us about the functioning of the *salutatio*, namely that visitors were received in regulated groups. His first list of divisions separates visitors into three categories: *alios in secretum, alios cum pluribus,* and *alios universos*. His second list of divisions also *appears* to be tripartite: *amicos primos, secundos, numquam veros*. These divisions, however, do not correspond to one

[27] Sen. *De Ben.* 6.34, trans. J. W. Basore.
[28] For more on language and ideology of *amici*, see Saller (1982), 11-15; Eilers (2002), 14-15; Brunt (1988), 351-361.
[29] For examples related to the *salutatio*, see *De Brev. Vit.* 14.3; *De Tranq. An.* 12.6-7.

another. The essence of this passage is that a friend is not a friend if one has to categorize him. Seneca's disapproval of *any* such friends is apparent elsewhere:

> *Non sunt isti amici, qui agmine magno ianuam pulsant, qui in primas et secundas admissiones digerentur.*
>
> These are not friends, who, in a long line, knock at your door, who are divided in first and second admittances.[30]

Thus, we are to understand a *sed* just prior to *numquam veros*, which would signify that the first and second friends are both included in the 'false' friend category. Consequently, although this passage is often cited as an explanation as to how the *amici* were grouped and received at the *salutatio*, Seneca does not provide any concrete information on the administration of the ritual. There are three manners to be admitted in, but only two categories of 'friends,' both of which are not genuine. This passage therefore should not be regarded as an explanation that the *amici primi* were necessarily received first or in private, and so on. It does, however, signify that some form of *salutatio* was in existence in the Roman Republic, and became such a prevalent ritual that there was a need to regulate the admittances of the *salutatores*. Consequently, visitors were categorized in some manner or another. While there may be an inclination to assume that social status was the distinguishing mark of these separations, no ancient evidence exists to support this claim.[31]

---

[30] Sen. *De Ben.* 6.33, trans. M. Fee.

[31] For instance in the Imperial period, see *CIL* VI.41111, where the *cursus* of a senator advertises his participation as a *secundos* in the *salutatio* of Antoninus Pius, compared to *CIL* VI.2169, where a lower class equestrian is a *primos* in an unspecified *salutatio*, although it has been suggested that this refers to the *salutatio* of either Augustus or Tiberius: further explored in Chapter 3 of this thesis.

In fact, there is no ancient evidence which presents any sort of overt explanation of exactly *who* the morning visitors actually were, or how they were divided up, and thus our understanding of the ritual is rather speculative. However, the numerous fleeting references to the *salutatio* in the sources are themselves informative, as they confirm the pervasiveness of the ritual within the greater Republican culture. What is apparent is that the practice of the *salutatio* was re-enacted on a daily basis, and was an integral element in civic life. Consequently, the *salutatio* cannot be altogether understood without also considering the Republican socio-political ideology. While Goldbeck's recent work has diligently woven together this sparse information to gain an understanding of the functioning of the *salutatio* over time,[32] the concern of this chapter is to situate the *salutatio* within the socio-political framework and civic ideology of the late Roman Republic. It will be seen that the *salutatio* was a manifestation of civic virtue, and was a highly visible ritual which was instrumental in displaying and sustaining the Roman collective identity. In a highly stratified society where displays of status held great prominence, the *salutatio* was ultimately a method to maintain social relations between the varying echelons of social rank.

The Socio-political Landscape of the Republic

The applicability of the *salutatio* to the greater Republican culture requires an evaluation of the socio-political atmosphere during the last centuries before the Empire. In recent years, modern scholarship has brought to light the previously understated democratic element present in Republican Rome. A number of modern scholars have

[32] Goldbeck (2010).

argued against the standard interpretation of an oligarchic political system, and adopted a representative approach to Republican political life.[33] Fergus Millar and his conception of the Roman Republic as a "face to face" political system is perhaps the most influential. Millar's concepts are largely derived from interpreting the spatial context and physicality of political life in Republican Rome, where open-air culture necessitated a political structure which was reliant on social interaction.[34] Understanding the *salutatio* within this framework elucidates the significance of the social ritual within this system. The broad distribution of power amongst the aristocracy generated perpetual competition between the *nobiles* of traditional aristocratic families, and ensuring popular support was central to this competition. This structure was consequently reliant on the collective participation of *all* citizens in the political structure of Republican Rome. Thus, what is of crucial importance in understanding the *salutatio* in the Republic is the social quality of political and public life. The socio-political atmosphere in the Republic was one which heavily relied on social interaction and negotiations between different echelons of status. This becomes clear when examining Roman topography and civic rituals within the city's public spaces.

The topography of Rome determined its political activity, as political communication occurred in and amongst its public urban spaces. Recollection of the past

[33] The primary scholars involved in the debate: Those who support the representative view: Millar (Millar (1984, 1986, 1989, 1998, 2002), Hölkeskamp (2010), Brunt (1988), Hopkins and Burton (1983), Beard and Crawford (1985); Mouritsen (2001) is the primary scholar who argues against the representative aspect of the Republic.
[34] See esp. Millar (2002), 85-108; (1998), 38 – 44; (1989).

was integral to legitimizing Rome's authority in the present.[35] Throughout the Republic, and especially during Rome's Imperial expansion in the third and second centuries BC, the spaces in the city where public activity took place began to be densely occupied by different structures. Civic, religious, economic and political activity was therefore concentrated in specific public areas, namely the *forum Romanum*, the *comitium*, the *capitolium* and the *campus Martius*.[36] The backdrop of these civic centres consisted of monuments, temples, statues and public buildings which, in accordance with the customary Roman inclination to recall the past, were conspicuously charged with historical symbolism, and ultimately upheld established social and political etiquette. Through their reiteration of the past, these structures validated accepted standards of Roman behaviour, thereby validating the Republican political system. However, this ideology presents a peculiar paradox within the socio-political framework of the Republic, as, at one and the same time, reaffirming the collective Roman identity legitimized its differentiated social and political structure. Thus, these monuments established and reiterated the homogeneity and heterogeneity of Roman society simultaneously. Members of the upper echelons of the social and political classes could claim accountability for past Roman successes, as it was their guidance that accomplished such feats. This notion consequently perpetuated status divisions. The structures that filled the forum displayed only those achievements of those members in the upper echelons of the Roman social hierarchy, and thus were ultimately manifestations of status

[35] Hölkeskamp (2010 [esp. 53-75], 2006) Patterson (2006); Hölscher (2003).
[36] Eg. Coarelli (1983); Dupont (1992), 160-176; Patterson (2006); Hölkeskamp (2010), 72-72.

differentiation.[37] Therefore, essential to the definition of a Republican collective identity are considerable differentiations in status. Asymmetrical relationships permeated social, political, religious and economic spheres, thereby creating a complex web of varying social associations. Consequently, perpetual social negotiations between these varying levels of status were fundamental to the Republican political system.

Intrinsically linked to Republican Rome's topography were the civic rituals that occurred in and among the city's monumental structures. The public spaces of Rome were the centre of social, political and economic activity, and thus the setting for countless political rituals, religious observances and military triumphs. Monumental structures became the permanent backdrop for many public activities where social negotiations between varying statuses occurred. The urban landscape of Rome consequently became a vital aspect of the socio-political fabric of the Republic. Participating in the civic function of Rome ensured the continuity of its empire, and at the same time reaffirmed Rome's collective identity as a distinct society. It was not only those of higher status that participated in these activities, but also the multitude of the ordinary Roman citizens. Simply by their presence in these public spaces, each citizen participated in the literal and symbolic performance of civic activity. In his *De Amicitia*, Cicero makes an unequivocal parallel between theatre and political activity:

> *In scaena, id est in contione*…
> On stage, that is at a *contio*…[38]

[37] Flower (2006), 51-55.
[38] Cic. *De Amic.* 97, trans. F. Millar.

In a society where visibility was of utmost importance, these open civic spaces can be metaphorically understood as a kind of political theatre, where social and political rituals were publicly enacted.[39] The Roman way of thinking was reinforced on a visual and symbolic level through the activities that were carried out in public under the gaze of the *populus Romanus* as both audience and addressee of socio-political messages. Civic rituals and public performances reinforced the Roman collective identity with unmistakable visibility, while at the same time provided venues for hierarchical communication.

The public spaces of Rome were thus the setting for countless rituals such as triumphal processions, public funerals, and civic activity, such as the *contiones*. The *contio* was a fundamental characteristic of the communicative aspect of the Republican political culture.[40] No political decisions were made at the *contio*, rather this public meeting was the venue where all citizens engaged in political debate. In this manner, the *contio* was institutionalized and provided every citizen, regardless of status, the opportunity to fulfil their own social role in the political system. The meeting was presided over by magistrates or tribunes who would stand upon the *rostra* and address the *populus Romanus* as potential voters. The structure of the *contio* itself is indicative of the hierarchical communication in the Republican socio-political system; the interactions and negotiations between the political class and the people reaffirmed individual status in the overall hierarchies and simultaneously asserted a communal identity.

[39] See especially Flower (2004).
[40] See especially Pina Polo (2011) 286-303; Hölkeskamp (2010) 102-103; Tan (2008), 163-201; Millar (2002), 143-182; (1993), 73-123; (1986), 1-11; (1984), 1-19.

Therefore, on a daily basis, public spaces in Rome served as the setting for the 'performance' of politics, religious activity, as well as imperial celebration. These countless rituals and activities were thus symbolically and procedurally charged with assertions of Roman behaviour, virtue and morality. Ultimately, the Roman collective identity was both continually generated and promoted by means of the social negotiations that took place in communal public spaces. Plautus provides a comprehensive description of those people that would fill the public space of the city.[41] Of course, inherent with comedy are amplifications of historical truths; however, Plautus' description nevertheless renders a vivid sketch of the dynamic activities and types of people that would feasibly be present in the public spaces of Rome. Although not historically accurate, some degree of social reality can be extracted from this account. These public spaces were thronged with people from varying echelons of status, participating in varying visible activities, and therefore provided opportunities for every Roman citizen to fulfil their individual social roles in the Republican Roman system. The physical space of the city provided a concrete network where social relationships were defined and confirmed. Political, social, legal, economic and religious activity became ritualized within this context. Participation in these civic rituals was at one and the same time a manifestation of collective Roman identity, and an instrument of communication. These social and political negotiations within the civic spaces of Rome reaffirmed individual statuses within the socio-political system. With its horizontally based power structure, the aristocracy thus relied on these social associations with the *populus Romanus*. Although high status was hereditary in

[41] Plaut. *Curc.* 462-85.

many cases, social esteem was a prerequisite for holding office, and holding office was likewise a prerequisite for gaining social esteem. In this way, the aristocracy depended on social associations with the voting citizenry.

Ultimately, the topography of Rome and the ritualized civic activities that took place within public spaces played a fundamental part in hierarchical communication. The socio-political ideology of Republican Rome can thus be interpreted as a complex system of social interaction and negotiation. The *salutatio*, and the social associations that it reinforced, can therefore be interpreted as a basic element of this Republican socio-political landscape.

The *Salutatio* in the Republic

Sources from the late Republic leave no room to doubt the existence of the ritual at that time, but none of these sources offer explicit accounts of exactly what this ritual was, or how it functioned. What is clear, however, is that the physical space that the ritual would take place within is essential to our understanding of the *salutatio*. The *domus* was the setting of countless rituals, both public and private, and was therefore integral in reinforcing individual status. Cicero expounds the importance of the house in terms of the *salutatio* in his *De Officiis*:

> *Oranda enim est dignitas domo, non ex domo tota quaerenda, nec domo dominus, sed domino domus honestanda est, et, ut in ceteris habenda ratio non sua solum, sed etiam aliorum, sic in domo clari hominis, in quam et hospites multi recipiendi et admittenda hominum cuiusque modi multitudine, adhibenda cura est laxitatis.*
>
> The truth is, a man's dignity may be enhanced by the house he lives in, but not wholly secured by it; the owner should bring honour to his house, not the house to its owner. And, as everything else a man must have

> regard not for himself alone, but for others also, so in the home of a distinguished man, in which numerous guests must be received, care must be taken to have it spacious.[42]

That the house was a vital aspect of social status has long been studied, most notably and recently by Hales and Wallace-Hadrill.[43] At its most basic level, the house can be considered as a microcosm of Rome. Just as the urban landscape of the city served as a visual vocabulary of Rome's grandeur through reverence of the past, the house was a conduit to publicize the family's connection to their own *mos maiorum*, thereby promoting their own place in the Roman collective identity. As previously discussed in this chapter, the physical space of the city carried great importance in the socio-political framework of Republican Rome, and thus so too did the physical space of the house. Textual and visual evidence suggest that the atrium was a public place in the house that displayed the ancestral art to celebrate the family's status.[44] When it comes to interpreting social space in Roman domestic architecture, social rank and visibility are central, as the spatial differentiation of the Roman house can be seen as a direct product of Roman social relations.[45] The importance of having a house suitable to social station is outlined in Vitruvius:

> *item feneratoribus et publicanis commodiora et speciosiora et ab insidiis tuta, forensibus autem et disertis elegantiora et spatiosiora ad conventus excipiundos, nobilibus vero, qui honores magistratusque gerundo praestare debent officia civibus, faciunda sunt vestibula regalia alta, atria et peristylia amplissima, silvae ambulationesque laxiores ad decorem maiestatis perfectae; praeterea bybliothecas, pinacothecas, basilicas non dissimili modo quam publicorum operum magnificentia*

[42] Cic. *De Off.* 1.139, trans. W. Millar.
[43] Hales (2003); Wallace-Hadrill (1994).
[44] Flower (1996), 185-222.
[45] See Hales (2003), 11-60; Wallace-Hadrill (1994), 3-16.

> *<habeant> comparatas, quod in domibus eorum saepius et publica consilia et privata iudicia arbitriaque conficiuntur.*
>
> For capitalists and farmers of revenue, somewhat comfortable and showy apartments must be constructed, secure against robbery; for advocates and public speakers, handsomer and more roomy, to accommodate meetings; for men of rank who, from holding offices and magistracies, have social obligations to their fellow citizen, lofty entrance courts in regal style, and most spacious atriums and peristyles, with plantations and walks of some extent in them, appropriate to their dignity. They need also libraries, picture galleries, and basilicas, finished in a style similar to that of great public buildings, since public councils as well as private law suits and hearings before arbitrators are very often held in the houses of such men.[46]

Unlike the sharp distinctions of public and private space in our own society, the Roman house was a constant focus of public life.[47] Rituals associated with birth, marriage, and death all occurred largely within the public part of the house. The foremost room of the house, the atrium, was visible from the threshold at the street, and during domestic rituals, the passer-by would easily recognize the event that was taking place. The layout of domestic structures lent themselves to the functioning of the *salutatio* from the open space of the atrium directly inside the house, to the benches outside the doors of houses presumably constructed for the convenience of those waiting for admittance to the morning ritual.[48] The existence of the benches is indicative of the continual enactment of the ritual. Unlike other *periodic* domestic rituals, such as births, deaths and marriages, the ritual of the *salutatio* reinforced the public and civic function of the *domus* on a *daily* basis. In a highly visible manner, these domestic rituals ultimately demonstrated that the family was living according to the civic traditions of Rome. Cicero's account of the

[46] Vitr. *De Arch.* 6.5.2, trans. M. H. Morgan.
[47] See especially Wallace-Hadrill (1994), 17-37.
[48] Wallace-Hadrill (1994), 12.

reaction to a – conversely – empty house from the threshold is particularly indicative of this notion. Cicero notes the negative comments that could be proclaimed if a larger house was seen from the street as empty:

> *aliter ampla domus dedecori saepe domino fit, si est in ea solitudo, et maxime, si aliquando alio domino solita est frequentari. Odiosum est enim, cum a praetereuntibus dicitur: "o domus antiqua, heu quam dispari dominare domino!"*
>
> But if it is not frequented by visitors, if it has an air of lonesomeness, a spacious palace often becomes a discredit to its owner. This is sure to be the case if at some other time, when it had a different owner, it used to be frequented: 'Oh aged house, alas! How different the owner who now owns you!'[49]

The lack of visibility proves to be equally as conspicuous as the 'conspicuous' crowd. Therefore, while the *salutatio* could provide social prestige through the prominence of a crowd of callers, social prestige could be just as easily diminished in the absence of a crowd of callers.[50] In a number of his surviving works, Cicero accentuates the importance of a multitude of callers at his own *salutatio*. He writes to Manius Curius in August of 46 BC that his morning *salutatio*…

> *…fit hoc etiam frequentius quam solebat, quod quasi avem albam videntur bene sentientem civem videre.*
>
> …is more crowded than it used to be, precisely because they imagine that in a citizen of honest sentiments they see a rare bird of good omen.[51]

The suggestion Cicero makes to Manius Curius is that his *salutatio* is more crowded than it used to be for no reason other than he is perceived as an honest, and thus 'good' citizen; something that had become a rarity in contemporary Rome. In the same year and month,

[49] Cic. *De Off.* 1.139, trans. W. Millar.
[50] See also Goldbeck (2010), 217-224.
[51] Cic. *Ad Fam.* 7.28, trans. W. G. Williams.

he writes to Lucius Papirius Paetus in Naples of his usual daily custom which begins with the *salutatio*:

> *haec igitur est nunc vita nostra: mane salutamus domi et bonos viros multos, sed tristis, et hos laetos victores, qui me quidem perofficiose et peramanter observant. Ubi salutatio defluxit, litteris me involvo, aut scribo aut lego ; veniunt etiam qui me audiunt quasi doctum hominem, quia paulo sum quam ipsi doctior.*
>
> So this is my way of life nowadays: in the morning I receive not only a large number of good men, gloomy, but also these happy conquerors, who observe me very respectfully and very lovingly. When the *salutatio* has ebbed, I wrap myself up in my books, either writing or reading. There are also some visitors who listen to my discourses under the belief of my being a man of learning, because I am a trifle more learned than themselves.[52]

While these two passages don't afford much insight into the logistics of the ritual, they do suggest some social realities of the time. Cicero's emphasis on such virtuous words as *bonos viros*, and perhaps even *victores*[53] to describe his morning visitors suggest that he believed his visitors to not simply be a faceless *multitudo* of people, but rather a group of upstanding men of respectable status. This suggests, at least for Cicero, that as the social standing of the receiver increased, so did the social calibre of his visitors. Therefore we can understand that the relationships with citizens of varying status that were maintained at the *salutatio* varied in respect to the relative social position of the salutatee. Furthermore, we can understand that the higher the amount of social significance a person attained, the more visitors would attend his *salutatio*. In fact, in a letter to Brutus written

[52] Cic. *Ad Fam.* 9.20, trans. W. G. Williams.
[53] Likely a reference to Caesar's men in the recent civil war.

in 43 BC, the onslaught of visitors at Cicero's *salutatio* seems to almost be a nuisance, as he attends to his letter-writing

> *…in turba matutinae salutationis.*
> …in the midst of the turmoil of my morning *salutatio*.[54]

The emphasis on the turmoil of his *salutatio* can likely be interpreted as a method of flaunting his generous attendance, thereby discreetly displaying an augmented social esteem. Gaining social prestige through one's attendees is emphatically reinforced by Quintus Cicero's *Commentariolum petitionis*, or handbook on electioneering. While the authenticity and date of the work has been variously debated, it is commonly accepted to have been written in the mid first century BC, either before or shortly after Cicero's consulship, and offers valuable insight on electoral behaviour in the late Republic. Throughout the work, Quintus emphasizes the types of social relations a man in hopes of attaining the consulship should maintain, where the visibility of followers is especially important:

> *Et, quoniam adsectationis mentio facta est, id quoque curandum est ut cottidiana cuiusque generis et ordinis et aetatis utare; nam ex ea ipsa copa coniectura fieri poterit quantum sis in ipso campo virium ac facultatis habiturus. Huius autem rei tres partes sunt: una salutatorum [cum domum veniunt], altera deductorum, tertia adsectatorum.*
>
> And now that I have mentioned attendance, you must take care to have it daily, from all sorts of ranks and ages, for the very numbers will give an idea of the resources of strength you will have at the poll itself. This subject falls into three parts: the first, callers at your house; the second, escorts from your house; the third, attendants in general.[55]

[54] Cic. *Ad Brut.* 2.4, trans. D. R. Shackleton Bailey.
[55] Q. Cic. *Comm. Pet.* 34, trans. D. R. Shackleton Bailey.

While accounts of the *salutatio* from lower ranked citizens remain nonexistent, Quintus Cicero offers compelling insight into the types of people that might plausibly attend the *salutatio* in the late republic as *salutatores*. And thus, although elites would certainly participate in the ritual, it is clear that it was not restricted to elite members of society. Ultimately, this is indicative of the communicative requirements of the socio-political structure of the Republic. Maintaining social relationships was vital to accumulating public esteem. Quintus expresses his anxiety throughout the work that Cicero must capture the masses,

> *ut de nocte domus compleatur, ut multi spe tui praesidi teneantur, ut amiciores abs te discedant quam accesserint, ut quam plurimorum aures optimo sermone compleantur.*
>
> …so as to fill your house before dawn, to hold as many people in hope of your protection, to send them away better friends than they came in, to fill as many ears as possible with excellent reports of you.[56]

The emphasis on always having a crowd of attendees calls into discussion the importance of the visibility of the *salutatio* within the Republican socio-political framework. The visibility of the multitude appears to have augmented the social prestige in primarily two ways: (a) the outright conspicuous attention that the multitude would provoke to outsiders, and (b) the crowd might implicate the salutatee member of society worthy of calling on. This can furthermore be seen in Marcus Cicero's *De Senectute*, written in 44 BC, where the associations between crowd of followers and honour is conveyed:

> *haec enim ipsa sunt honorabilia, quae videntur levia atque communia— salutari appeti decedi assurgi deduci reduci consuli, quae et apud nos et in aliis civitatibus, ut quaeque optime morata est, ita diligentissime observantur.*

[56] Q. Cic. *Comm. Pet.* 49, trans. D. R. Shackleton Bailey.

> For those very things, that seem light and trivial, are marks of honour – the morning visit, being sought after, being made way for, having people rise at one's approach, being escorted to and from the forum, being asked for advice – civilities most scrupulously observed among us and in every other state in proportion as its morals are good.[57]

Therefore, we can understand that the crowd of *salutatores* serves to display the salutatee's moral rectitude, and is a manifestation of that salutatee's participation in the political and social systems of Republican Rome.[58]

The attendees of the *salutatio* provided a visual expression of the receiver's status by filling the atrium and the areas around the entrance to the house. Perhaps just as important was the necessity of the *salutator* to be clad in a toga, as numerous epigrams and satires of Martial and Juvenal attest.[59] The toga was itself a symbol of Roman-ness, as it was reserved for Roman citizens only.[60] Consequently, not only did the throngs of attendees at the morning *salutatio* provide a physical presence in and around the house, as well as a visual commotion, but their presence was a fundamentally Roman one. The receiver was able to accumulate social prestige by the horde gathered in and around the public areas of his house, and through participation in the *salutatio*, the Roman status of the attendees was visible to those other passers-by who were excluded from the ritual, likely those in the lowest and excluded echelons of the Roman social system such as the *peregrini* and servile populations. Associations maintained at the *salutatio* thus confirmed individual status in the Roman social hierarchy, simultaneously reaffirming the

[57] Cic. *De Senec.* 63, trans. W. A. Falconer.
[58] See also Goldbeck (2010), 225-246.
[59] Eg. Mart. *Ep.* 3.30; 3.36; 5.22; 9.49; 9.100; Juv. *Sat.* 1.95-96; 3.126-130.
[60] See Edmondson (2008), 21-46.

Roman collective identity. Those who were excluded from these associations were denied any affiliation into the Roman collective identity, and ultimately in modern terminology were designated as the 'other'.

Republican Conclusions

The ritualistic practice of the *salutatio* in the Roman house provided a visual assertion of Roman-ness. In a social system where displays of status assumed great significance, the *salutatio* by the time of Cicero can thus be seen as a manifestation of civic virtue, which echoed the larger socio-political Republican ideology. That Roman societal structure was highly stratified is also intrinsic to understanding the ritual. In a city that was otherwise dominated by strong status divisions, most notably in the political sphere and the ruling elite, the *salutatio* provided a method of communication between citizens from the different social strata. Although we are lacking written evidence for the *salutatio* from those citizens in the lower social strata, the ritual can nevertheless be seen as a daily reiteration of civic virtue and Roman collective identity. The lack of explicit written material to outline exactly how the ritual functioned has posed a number of problems for modern scholars; namely how one gained admittance to a certain *salutatio* in the first place, as well as how the attendees were received. The lack of detailed evidence, yet at the same time the ample fleeting evidence for the ritual, has resulted in countless interpretations of the *salutatio*. For some, it is the materialization of electoral bribery[61]; for others it is a single practice of patronage[62]; for others still, it is a method of

[61] See, for instance, Morstein-Marx (1998).
[62] See especially Saller (1982); Garnsey and Saller (1987).

social subordination serving to reinforce status divisions[63]. And while certainly, these different interpretations likely constituted elements of the ritual at different times, they are not mutually exclusive. There is no evidence to suggest that the *salutator*/salutatee relationship was *necessarily* equated with a *cliens*/*patronus* relationship. Furthermore, a salutatee of a *salutatio* must not *necessarily* have been a campaigning politician at all times. The daily reiteration of the ritual suggests that it is something else altogether during the Republic, and that at various times was employed in different capacities. That political relations, as well as personal relations were maintained in this ritual is indicative of Roman society, where there existed a constant blurring of lines. Where past and present times conflated, public and private spaces coalesced, so too did political and social associations amalgamate.

Ultimately, the *salutatio* in Cicero's time was a manifestation of Roman civic ideology, which served to visually display and augment civic virtue and 'Roman-ness'. The daily routine was a fundamental aspect of what it meant to be Roman during the Republic. The *salutatio* was a significant method of ensuring social connections in a social structure that was essentially based on differentiation. In this sense, we can return to Cicero's invective on his supposed assassins in the Catilinarian conspiracy. The emphasis he places on this assassination attempt, and specifically under the *pretence* of the *salutatio*, is indicative of the assailants' immorality. By perverting a deeply Roman practice into an ambush, Catiline and his fellow conspirators are further relegated to traitors. Their distorted involvement in such an episode detracts from their own Roman

[63] See, for instance, George (2008).

virtue, and alienates them from participating in the continuation of Rome. Thus, their lack of virtue and morality is an overt demonstration of their impiety and civic disloyalty.

CHAPTER TWO: Futility and Function: The *salutatio* in the Empire

Introduction

In his *Divus Augustus*, Suetonius describes an assassination attempt similar to the one made on Cicero discussed in the previous chapter of this thesis. Suetonius relates:

> *…et Quintum Gallium praetorem, in officio salutationis tabellas duplices ueste tectas tenentem, suspicatus gladium occulere, nec quicquam statim, ne aliud inueniretur, ausus inquirere, paulo post per centuriones et milites raptum e tribunali servilem in modum torsit ac fatentem nihil iussit occidi prius oculis eius sua manu effossis…*
>
> … And when Quintus Gallius, the praetor, came to the attendance of his salutatio with a double tablet under his cloak, suspecting that it was a sword he had concealed, and yet not venturing to make a search, lest it should be found to be something else, a little later he caused him to be dragged from his tribunal by centurions and soldiers, and tortured like a slave, and although he made no confession, ordered him to be put to death, after he had, with his own hands, plucked out his eyes…[64]

This account presents some significant differences from the assassination attempt on Cicero at his *salutatio*. While Suetonius' account is similarly unsubstantiated, this episode is indicative of the socio-political shift that accompanied the transformation from Republic to Empire. In contrast to Cicero, who claimed that he merely closed down his *salutatio* after suspicions of an assassination attempt, as the most powerful citizen in the Roman state, Augustus alternatively put Quintus Gallius to death, and without any sort of legal ratification. This is indicative of the vertical structure of society that accompanied the onset of an autocratic rule. The emperor was at the top of the religious, social, political and legal structures, and he could thus act at will.

[64] Suet. *Div. Aug.* 27.4, trans. A. Thomson, modified by M. Fee.

This account is also characteristic of the evidence from the Empire for the *salutatio*, as the majority of Imperial sources for the ritual appear in conjunction with the practices of different emperors and their respective *salutationes.* Attestations of the *salutatio* from the Imperial period are much more abundant than those from the Republic, and thus provide us with a greater understanding of the ritual, albeit only in its Imperial context. Pertinent to this thesis in particular is the evidence that presents us with ancient attitudes towards participation in the *salutatio*, an aspect that is almost altogether lacking in the Republican sources. Unfortunately, however, these sources are for the most part philosophically charged with personal bias. What is nevertheless clearly evident in the Imperial evidence is the ritual's ingrained connection with the new Roman Imperial socio-political ideology. It is therefore essential to consider the drastic socio-political changes that took place with the onset of the patriarchal political system.

The Socio-political Landscape of the Empire

Although some scholars may regard Octavian's victory at Actium in 31 BC as the decisive moment when the Republic transformed into an Empire, in reality there was no single event which revolutionized the Republic into essentially a monarchical political system. Rather, the gradual accumulation of influence that Augustus obtained systematically undermined the long-standing traditions of the Republic. The political system of the Republic witnessed considerable aristocratic competition, where numerous noble families competed with one another for political and social supremacy. In this sense, the socio-political structure of the Republic was heavily reliant on social

interaction and hierarchical communication.[65] This competition was augmented by its own perpetual renewal, as political offices were held for restricted periods of time in an effort to prevent a monarchy. The Imperial political system stood in structural contrast to this. The new political structure engendered a system with one undeniable holder of power whose position was indeterminate and only ceased by death. As a consequence, political and social status was promulgated only through the influence of one man. This major shift was understandably accompanied by significant changes in the socio-political atmosphere of Rome.

Paradoxically, the new Imperial structure - which was in fundamental opposition to the old system - was only legitimized through Republican institutions. This is most apparent in the rule of Augustus and the initial rise of the Empire. In his *Res Gestae*, Augustus proclaimed:

> *rem publicam ex potestate in senatus populique Romani arbitrium transtuli… post id tempus auctoritate omnibus praestiti, potestatis autem nihilo amplius habui quam ceteri qui mihi quoque in magistratu conlegae fuerunt.*
>
> I transferred the Republic from my authority to the dominion of the senate and the Roman people… After that time, I exceeded all in influence, but I had no greater power than the others who were my colleagues in each magistracy.[66]

While Augustus presented a careful construction of his image as being equal to other *nobiles*,[67] the reality was that he held asymmetrical and unprecedented power through the

[65] Millar(2002),85-108; (1998), 38-44; (1989); Hölkeskamp (2010), 71-75; 98-106.
[66] Aug. *Res Ges.* 34, trans. F. W. Shipley.
[67] The bibliography of Augustus' self-representation is substantial. A small number of these sources in relation to this thesis include Flower (2011), 275-280; Lowrie (2009), 279 -326; Kuttner (1995), 35-68; Zanker (1983).

monopolization of military, political, religious and ultimately, social power. Although Augustus emphasized his involvement in the preservation of the Republic, in reality, his position of power was - by definition - incompatible with the Republican system. In this sense, he essentially revolutionized the very system which he claimed to have restored. The expropriation and adaptation of Republican institutions and customs, as well as Augustus' designation of a new political system within the terminology of Republican values are thus fundamental to our understanding of the new socio-political structure. As will be seen in what follows, this is evident in Augustus' perpetual distortion of the traditional Republican structure.

As Augustus altered the political landscape, the urban landscape of the city of Rome was simultaneously and unmistakably transformed. Suetonius reports that Augustus could justly claim that..

> *...gloriatus marmoream se relinquere, [urbem] quam latericiam accepisset.*
> …he had found it [the city] built of bricks and left it in marble.[68]

Certainly Augustus placed his seal on the public spaces of Rome, which were hitherto laden with Republican historical symbolism.[69] From the Augustan period onward, the vocabulary of the urban fabric of the city pronounced Augustus' 'restoration' of the Republic. The culmination of Augustus' self representation in the *forum Augustum* was his so-called "Hall of Fame," where statues of selected great Romans from the past, or the

[68] Suet. *Div. Aug.* 28, trans. A Thomson; See also Cass. Dio 56.30.3.
[69] For the significance of the urban landscape of Rome in the Republic, see chapter 1 of this thesis.

summmi viri, stood in niches on either side of the grandiose temple of *Mars Ultor*.[70] The clear aim of the gallery was to situate Augustus and his family within the inventory of virtuous members of the Republican past, and thus to assert the new emperor's role in the 'restoration' of the Republic. In the same manner that Republican monuments and buildings in the public spaces at Rome perpetuated the legitimacy of traditional Roman society, Augustus' new additions to the urban landscape of Rome perpetuated and further legitimized his own political success. The unmistakable visible connections made to the Republic in his building program are yet again indicative of the paradoxical acceptance of his position as supreme ruler. In the very 'Roman' manner of erecting monuments which recalled the past and its traditional Republican system, thereby legitimizing the present system, Augustus' transformation of the urban landscape of Rome both maintained and denied this tradition.

The usurpation of the military triumph, which began during Augustus' reign, is another symptom of the paradoxical foundation of patriarchal power through Republican traditions. In its Republican context, the ritual of the military triumph was the apex of a high-ranking member of society's political and military career.[71] The triumphal procession allowed him to display his honour and status to and for the *populus Romanus*. With the onset of the Empire, however, the privilege of obtaining a military triumph perished. Cornelius Balbus was the last Roman citizen outside of the Imperial family to

[70] The bibliography on the *forum Augustum* is substantial. See for instance: Zanker (1990); Valentin Kockel, "Forum Augustum," in LTUR 2, 289-295; Anderson (1984) 65-100; Gowing 138-145; Luce (2009) 399-416; Evans (1992) 109-188.
[71] See, for instance, Livy *Ab Urbe Cond.* 30.15.12.

celebrate his own military triumph in 19 BC after his African victory.[72] After this time, victorious military generals were still given the *ornamenta*, or triumphal insignia, but were denied the pomp and spectacle of the procession in Rome. The limitations that were put down on the triumph are undoubtedly indicative of the political and social significance that the ritual maintained during the Republic. The refusal for anyone but the emperor or his family members to gain this kind of political and social significance is symptomatic of the new socio-political framework of the Empire. Through the monopolization of an overtly Republican tradition, Augustus essentially distorted the significance of the military triumph and its social prestige.[73]

It is well documented in modern scholarship that the *contio* was a central element of the face-to-face political atmosphere of the Republic.[74] The institutional assembly provided a venue for hierarchical communication and social negotiations between status groups. It is therefore noteworthy to mention that this was the venue where Octavian proclaimed himself to the people as the only legitimate heir to Caesar.[75] It is not surprising that the frequency of the *contiones* appears to have declined after the onset of the one-man-rule system.[76] Once again, this is an instance of how Octavian made use of traditional Republican institutions to generate and legitimize his authority, which thereby diminished their significance.

---

[72] On the conquests of Balbus: Pliny *Maior* NH 5.35-7.
[73] For general bibliography on the triumph, see Beard (2007).
[74] See especially Pina Polo (2011) 286-303; Hölkeskamp (2010) 102-103; Tan (2008), 163-201; Millar (2002), 143-182; (1993), 73-123; (1986), 1-11; (1984), 1-19.
[75] Cic. *Att*. 14.21.4; 15.2.3.
[76] Pina Polo (2011): 293-301.

In retrospective terms, Augustus' exploitation of Republican institutions and customs at the early onset of the Empire is evident. His discernible purpose was to maintain the semblance of the traditional Republican system in order to conceal the reality, namely his monarchy. In doing so, the socio-political atmosphere of Republican Rome continued only in conjunction with the new and fundamentally contradictory ideology that surfaced. Winterling has aptly proposed that the contradictions between the traditional Republican political structure and the Imperial patriarchal structure have been largely overlooked in modern scholarship.[77] This is because of the widespread evidence of senators and equestrians that still advanced through the traditional political structure of the Republican *cursus honorum*.[78] The result of simulating the traditional Republican ideology within the new Imperial political structure rendered two irreconcilable systems that coexisted by means of their dependence on one another, yet at the same time were two separate and uncompromising structures. This dichotomy produced social consequences that impacted the Roman collective identity in the Empire, and profoundly influenced social associations within that collective.

While Senators and Equestrians of the Imperial period still maintained the highest *dignitas* through the offices and titles obtained in the traditional *cursus honorum,* these titles no longer necessarily reflected political authority in real terms. This is particularly evident in a letter of Pliny which discusses a contravention of the traditional social hierarchy. After coming across the inscription on the tombstone of the emperor Claudius' freedman, M. Antonius Pallas, Pliny emphasized his indignation at the freedman's receipt

[77] Winterling (2009), 2.
[78] Winterling (2009), esp. 1-5.

of *ornamenta praetoria*.[79] What is equally disgraceful for Pliny is Pallas' presentation of himself as an *exemplum* for future generations to emulate:

> *maxime tamen hic me titulus admonuit, quam essent mimica et inepta quae interdum in hoc caenum, in has sordes abicerentur, quae denique ille furcifer et recipere ausus est et recusare atque etiam ut moderationis exemplu posteris prodere.*
>
> Principally, however, this inscription reminded me how ludicrous and ill suited are the things that are sometimes thrown away upon this filth, this dirt – things that that rogue was so brazen as to accept and refuse, and even to present himself to posterity as an *exemplum* of moderation.[80]

Pliny was so outraged at this notion that he later searched for the original record of the decree, and consequently came to the conclusion that the honours bestowed on an ex-slave by the senate were unsurprising, since the senate was 'slavish' in their service to the emperor:

> *Mitto quod Pallanti servo praetoria ornamenta offeruntur – quippe offeruntur a servis…*
>
> I pass by the circumstance that the praetorian insignia are offered to Pallas, a slave, - inasmuch as they are offered by slaves…[81]

The high appointment of Pallas is thus indicative of the new Imperial hierarchical structure which was determined by proximity to the emperor, as he had ultimate authority and could confer status and prestige on his own accord. However, this instance simultaneously outlines the emperor's attempt to maintain the façade of the traditional hierarchy: for Pallas' real power to be accepted by society, he needed to ascend in status vis-à-vis the conventional approach. The Republican *cursus honorum* was thus affirmed

[79] Sherwin-White (1966), 453-455; Oost (1958), 113-39; Roller (2001), 270-272; Winterling (2009), 27-28.
[80] Pliny, *Ep.* 7.29.3, trans. J. D. Lewis, modified by M. Fee.
[81] Pliny, *Ep.* 8.6.4, trans. J.D. Lewis.

precisely through its violation. Whether Pallas had been conferred the *praetoria ornamenta* or not, his close relationship with the emperor is what ultimately granted him his prestige. In this way, the two incompatible hierarchical structures are exposed. The emperor was unable to abolish the traditional system, and paradoxically relied upon it in the creation of the new incompatible social hierarchy.[82]

It is evident then, that a new hierarchical structure emerged which centred around the Imperial court. The emperor was able to confer power upon whomever he pleased, and therefore initiate new social inequalities that ran counter to the traditional Republican hierarchy. There is evidence to suggest that, especially in the early Empire, high-ranking senatorial officials were perceived as potential rivals to the emperor's influence, and consequently were denied access to close associations with the emperor for the most part.[83] Plutarch comments on Galba:

> *ἐπέμφθη δὲ ὑπὸ Νέρωνος Ἰβηρίας ἄρχων, οὔπω δεδιδαγμένου φοβεῖσθαι τοὺς ἐν ἀξιώμασι μεγάλους τῶν πολιτῶν.*
>
> By Nero he was sent out as governor of Spain, before Nero had yet learned to be afraid of citizens who were held in high esteem.[84]

Hence, rivalry of status played a substantial part in the construction of the new Imperial social order. High-ranking members of the old traditional system were essentially at the bottom of the new hierarchy based on proximity to the emperor. Tacitus is particularly emphatic about the suspicion and distrust that emperors held towards men of high rank,

[82] Winterling (2009), 26-33.
[83] Winterling (1999), 188-91; (2009) 31-32, 90-91; Lendon (1997) 108-113.
[84] Plut. *Galba* 3.3, trans. B. Perrin.

which is thus indicative of this notion. Of a particular incidence of Vitellius summoning his troops at the recommendation of his freedmen, Tacitus relates:

> *nam amicorum eius quanto quis clarior, minus fidus*.
> For his friends were the less faithful the more distinguished their rank.[85]

There is furthermore evidence that during the Empire, men of high rank would become aware of the dangers that their status posed to the emperor. Fearing persecution or even death by the emperor, it was not uncommon that high standing officials would drastically alter their behaviour in order to decrease their own standing. Tacitus discusses Agricola, for instance, after his success as a military general:

> *ceterum uti militare nomen, grave inter otiosos, aliis virtutibus temperaret, tranquillitatem atque otium penitus hausit, cultu modicus, sermone facilis, uno aut altero amicorum comitatus, adeo ut plerique, quibus magnos viros per ambitionem aestimare mos est, viso aspectoque Agricola quarerent famam, pauci interpretarentur.*
>
> In this situation, he endeavoured to soften the glare of military reputation, which is offensive to those who themselves live in indolence, by the practice of virtues of a different cast. He resigned himself to ease and tranquillity, was modest in his garb and equipage, affable in conversation, and in public was only accompanied by one or two of his friends; insomuch that the many, who are accustomed to form their ideas of great men from their retinue and figure, when they beheld Agricola, were apt to call in question his renown: few could interpret his conduct.[86]

At the same time, it appears that emperors were not threatened by men of lesser rank:

> *ad hunc motum comprimendum cum exercitu ampliore et non instrenuo doce, cui tamen tuto tanta res committeretur, opus esset, ipse potissimum delectus est ut et industriae expertae nec metuendus ullo modo ob humilitatem generis ac nominis.*

---

[85] Tac. *Hist.* 3.58, trans. A. J. Church and W. J. Brodribb; See also, for instance, Tac. *Hist.* 1.85; Tac. *Ann.* 1.13, 4.13.
[86] Tac. *Agric.* 40.4, trans. J. Aikin; for other examples of withdrawing from public life to prevent jealousy of the emperor, see (Seneca) Tac. *Ann.* 14.52; (Vitellius) Cass. Dio 59.27.5-6.

> As the suppression of this revolt appeared to require a stronger force and an active general, who might be safely trusted in an affair of so much importance, he himself [Vespasian] was chosen in preference to all others, both for his own activity, and on account of the obscurity of his origin and name, being a person of whom there could be not the least jealousy.[87]

On that account, men of lower status were able to gain unprecedented esteem in the new social structure that was based on proximity to the emperor, while high-ranking senatorial members of society were often times kept at the bottom of this structure. Yet, this structure coexisted with the traditional hierarchical structure of the *ordines*, which was essentially the inverse. These two incompatible systems were fundamentally reliant on one another for their own respective sustenance. The coexistence of these structures had significant social consequences, and thus remarkably altered personal relations.

The drastic socio-political shift that occurred with the transformation from Republic to Empire produced substantial changes in methods of communication and attempts to accumulate social status. No longer was it necessary to maintain a complex web of social associations among varying status groups, as social prestige could in reality only be conferred by the emperor. In this way, the Roman socio-political ideology shifted from a face-to-face communicative structure to an exclusive and linear structure that was geared upwards. Consequently, the maintenance of complex social associations with varying higher and lower status groups became inconsequential, and instead, regardless of status or rank, all aspirations of political and social success were directed towards one man. The Empire thus perpetuated a unidirectional and vertical system of social interaction, which triggered significant changes in the social ritual of the *salutatio*.

[87] Suet. *Div. Vesp*. 4.5, trans. A. Thomson.

The *salutatio* in the Empire

The ubiquity of sources that document the *salutatio* in the Empire offer no reason to doubt the maintenance of the ritual after the Republic. However, as with the Republican evidence, we are still left with substantial ambiguities as to how the ritual was administered. Yet, despite this lack of information, we are still able to obtain considerable insights into the *salutatio* during the Imperial period. Given the emperor's monopolization of political, military and social influence, it is not surprising that many of the sources appear in conjunction with the *salutatio* of the emperor.[88]

The emperor's conduct at his *salutatio* was scrutinized, as evidenced by the propensity of ancient writers to characterize the emperor through his behaviour at the ritual. In this way, a great deal of evidence for the *salutatio* comes to us through character sketches of various emperors. A large part of book 80 of Dio's Roman History is devoted to describing the overall depravity of Elagabalus. In this description, Dio includes Elagabalus' ill-manners when receiving guests at his *salutatio*:

> *[ἀσπαζόμενος…]καὶ πολλάκις καὶ κατακείμενος τοὺς βουλευτὰς.*
> And he often reclined while receiving the salutations of the senators.[89]

From his own personal experience, Dio furthermore relates Caracalla's audacious tendency to ignore those waiting to greet him at his *salutatio:*

> *κατεκράτησε. καὶ ὁ μὲν ἔμελλέ που δίκην ἐπὶ τούτῳ δώσειν ὥσπερ καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι οἱ ἐνδείξαντές τινας: ἐκεῖνος δὲ ἐπήγγελλε μὲν ὡς καὶ μετὰ τὴν ἕω αὐτίκα δικάσων ἢ καὶ ἄλλο τι δημόσιον πράξων, παρέτεινε δὲ ἡμᾶς καὶ ὑπὲρ τὴν μεσημβρίαν καὶ πολλάκις καὶ μέχρι τῆς ἑσπέρας, μηδὲ ἐς τὰ*

[88] See also Goldbeck (2010), 263-281.
[89] Cass. Dio 80.14.4, trans. E. Cary.

> *πρόθυρα ἐσδεχόμενος ἀλλ᾽ ἔξω που ἐστῶτας: ὀψὲ γάρ ποτε ἔδοξεν αὐτῷ μηκέτι μηδ᾽ ἀσπάζεσθαι ἡμᾶς ὡς πλήθει.*
>
> He would send us word that he was going to hold court or transact some other public business directly after dawn, but he would keep us waiting until noon and often until evening, and would not even admit us to the vestibule, so that we had to stand round outside somewhere, and usually at some late hour he decided that he would not even exchange greetings with us that day.[90]

Rather than receive his *salutatores* as a virtuous emperor should, Caracalla rather indulged in his own personal inclinations, thereby indicating his self-indulgent character. Ultimately these sketches attempt to portray certain emperors as unvirtuous characters who were ultimately ill-suited to the position. Just as the character of an emperor could be defamed through his conduct at his *salutatio*, there are numerous instances of virtuous emperors who are praised through their *salutatio* etiquette. Pliny's *Panegyricus* is perhaps most evident of this, where he contrasts the agony of attending Domitian's *salutatio* with that of Trajan's:

> *ipse autem ut excipis omnes! ut exspectas! ut magnam partem dierum inter tot imperii curas quasi per otium transigis! itaque non ut alias attoniti, nec ut periculum capitis adituri tarditate, sed securi et hilares, quum commodum est, convenimus.*
>
> And you yourself – awaiting and receiving everyone in person – devote a large part of every day to so many cares of State, while preserving the unhurried atmosphere of a life of leisure. So we gather round you, no longer pale and terrified, slow of step as if in peril of our lives, but carefree and happy, coming when it suits us.[91]

While it must be remembered that the *Panegyricus* is accompanied by obvious bias, Pliny nevertheless demonstrates that conduct at the *salutatio* could, in Roman terms,

[90] Cass. Dio 78.17.3, trans. E. Cary.
[91] Pliny *Pan*. 48, trans. B. Radice.

authoritatively exemplify the emperor's overall character.[92] Utilizing Imperial conduct at the *salutatio* as a paradigm of character is ultimately indicative of the ritual's entrenched position in the socio-political fabric of Rome; members of the lowest and highest *ordines* alike would have all been aware of what conduct was acceptable or unacceptable.

As the holder of the ultimate position of political and social status, the emperor was able to essentially monopolize the social esteem that was previously able to be gained from the *salutatio*. There is no doubt that the ritual still occurred in the houses of the citizens during the Empire, however there is evidence to suggest that the emperor maintained essential control over the *salutationes* of the general *populus*. This is particularly evident in a passage of Suetonius that discusses reforms that Claudius made:

> *milites domus senatorias salutandi causa ingredi etiam partum decreto prohibuit.*
>
> He procured an act of the senate to prohibit all soldiers from attending senators at their houses to pay their respects.[93]

While we are not given any kind of direct reason for this prohibition, it can be reasonably assumed that this was done in an attempt to inhibit associations between military the and senatorial aristocrats. This is yet again indicative of the socio-political framework of the Empire, where the emperor usurped military, political and social power. This passage furthermore certainly demonstrates the influence that the *salutatio* maintained for building powerful alliances that threatened the emperor's monopolization of prestige. In order to maintain his own influence, the emperor had to impede traditional and emergent

[92] For other examples, (Marcus Aurelius) Cass. Dio 71.35.4; (Tiberius) Cass. Dio 57.11.1; (Nero) Suet. *Nero* 10.
[93] Suet. *Div. Claud.* 25, trans. A Thomson.

avenues for aristocrats to gain status. In a structure where military power signified political power, which ultimately translated to social status, Claudius' prohibition of certain social associations is indicative of the emperors' continued effort to maintain his authority by preventing the development of traditional and emerging avenues to gain status. Similarly, when Seneca came to be perceived by Nero as a person gaining too much influence, Seneca signalled his retirement from public life by discontinuing his own *salutatio*:

> *sed instituta prioris potentiae commutat, prohibet coetus salutantium, vitat comitantis, rarus per urbem, quasi valetudine infensa aut sapientiae studiis domi attineretur.*
>
> But he entirely altered the practices of his former greatness; he kept the crowds of his visitors at a distance, avoided the trains of followers, seldom appeared in Rome, as though weak health or philosophical studies detained him at home.[94]

The *salutatio* can thus be interpreted as a ritual that posed potential threat to the emperor's authority. Consequently, we can understand the *salutatio* to be a ritual where the *possibility* of maintaining important associations was still viable during the Empire. That associations at the *salutatio* could feasibly be perceived as threatening to the emperor's position is symptomatic of the verticality of the Imperial social structure. The increasing anxiety of the *princeps* vis-à-vis the *salutatio* can therefore be interpreted as a manifestation of the new socio-political atmosphere in Rome. Men of high rank who were hitherto able to amass substantial social and political authority through the traditional republican system were now essentially prevented from doing so.

[94] Tac. *Ann.* 14.56, trans. A. J. Church and W. J. Brodribb.

As the gradual usurpation of traditional republican institutions occurred, a new hierarchy based on proximity to the emperor surfaced. Certainly, the existence of the new societal organization is evident in the Imperial sources for the *salutatio*. Suetonius' pronounced reflection on Augustus' salutatore*s* is particularly indicative of this notion:

> *Promiscuis salutationibus admittebat et plebem, ….*
> He admitted to the *salutationes* even the plebs, in common (with people of the higher ranks) …[95]

While it is clear that the *salutatio* was administered with regulated admittances of visitors, there is no Republican or early to middle Imperial evidence[96] to suggest explicitly how these designations were allocated. A number of modern scholars have taken Seneca's explanation of Gaius Gracchus and Livius Drusus dividing their friends into groups as evidence for an order of admission based on rank.[97] However, upon closer examination of the semantics of Seneca's account, it is evident that he does not make any attempt to explain *how* friends or visitors were actually classified. Suetonius' brief description of Augustus' *salutatio*, however, suggests that admittance of plebs, equestrians and sentors *promiscuus*, or in common, was somewhat abnormal. Furthermore, the inclusion of *et* directly before *plebem* emphasizes the inclusion of the plebeians at the ritual, which highlights the great distinction in status between those plebeians and the emperor. Consequently, we may postulate that the inclusion of members of the faceless *multitudo* of low ranking plebeians at a high-ranking *salutatio* was not prevalent before Augustus.

---

[95] Suet. *Div. Aug.* 53, trans. A. Thomson, modified by M. Fee.
[96] There is one interesting inscription from 4th c. Numidia; discussed in chapter three of this chapter.
[97] Sen. *De Ben.* 6.34; also see Chapter 1 of this thesis; Winterling (2009); Crook, (1955), 68.

During the Republic, it was important to maintain associations with people of varying status, however the levels of rank that would make up the crowd at the *salutatio* were ultimately dictated by the salutatee's relative position in the social hierarchy. Therefore, it is unlikely that the *salutatio* of a very highly ranked member of society would include the lowest ranks of people in the social hierarchy. However, during the Empire, men of traditionally low rank were able to gain unprecedented social and political power, as they were not perceived as a threat to the emperor's influence.

Juvenal's first Satire includes a similar social commentary when he inveighs against the practice of allowing wealth to dictate the order of admittance at the *salutatio*. When a *nomenclator* wishes to admit the Praetor first and the Tribune second, a rich freedman declares that he should be admitted first on account of his great wealth. Juvenal comments:

> *... expectant ergo tribuni,*
> *vincant divitieae, sacro ne cedat honori*
> *nuper in hanc urbem pedibus qui venerat albis,*
> *quandoquidem inter nos sanctissima divitiarum*
> *maiestas, etsi funesta pecunia templo*
> *nondum habitas, nullas nummorum ereximus aras,*
> *ut colitur Pax atque Fides Victoria Virtus*
> *quaeque salutate crepitat Concodia nido.*
>
> Therefore, let the tribunes await their turn, let wealth conquer, let the sacred office give way to one who came but yesterday with whitened feet into our city, for no deity is held in such reverence amongst us as Wealth, though as yet, O baneful money, you have no temple of your own, not yet have we reared altars to Money in the like manner as we worship Peace and Honour, Victory and Virtue, or that Concord that clatters when we salute her nest.[98]

[98] Juv. *Sat*. 1.109-116, trans. G. G. Ramsay, modified by M. Fee.

Of course, we cannot accept this episode as a factually correct one, as inherent with satire are undeniable exaggerations and perversions of the truth. However, satire must centre on recognizable social conditions, as these must be perceivable to its contemporary audience in order for effectiveness. Therefore we can assume that this account reflects some social realities and recognizable attitudes of Juvenal's contemporaries.[99] Juvenal's affront at the admittance of a freedman before the traditional *nobiles* is thus indicative of the new socio-political atmosphere of Imperial Rome. While we cannot take Juvenal's commentary to signify that rich freedmen were admitted first to the *salutatio*, we can accept that changes to the administration of the ritual accompanied the political shift from Republic to Empire. There is no evidence of a freedman attending the *salutatio* in the Republic, however, during the Empire not only were men of very low status (in the traditional sense) included in the ritual, but they appear to have at times maintained prominent involvement at the *salutatio*.

Suetonius and Juvenal's accounts are primarily indicative of the new social hierarchy that was a product of the new political structure. The sweeping socio-political shift that accompanied the onset of the Empire created social inversions which affected social associations. As a result, evidence for the *salutatio* in the Empire suggests that low-ranking members of society were able to maintain associations at the *salutatio* with highly ranked members of society. The concerns of Juvenal and Suetonius in the above passages are not with presenting historical information with regard to a specific *salutatio*; rather, these passages highlight the greater socio-political atmosphere in the Empire.

[99] Saller (1980), 69-83; Hopkins (1993), 3-27; Fagan (2011), 469-771; Cloud (1989), 205-218; Feinberg (1967).

Examples with reference to varying *salutationes* are therefore merely conduits to elucidate the significance of these new social inversions.

Philosophical treatises from the Empire also present the *salutatio* as a channel for social commentary. The ritual was regarded in philosophical treatises as a meaningless and insincere tradition. Seneca is perhaps most apparent in his stoic discourses:

> *Isti, qui per officia discursant, qui se aliosque inquietant, cum bene insanierint, eum omnium limina cotidie perambulaverint nec ullas apertas fores praeterierint, cum per diversissimas domos meritoriam salutationem circumtulerint, quotum quemque ex tam immensa et variis cupiditatibus districta urbe poterunt videre? Quam multi erunt, quorum illos aut somnus aut luxuria aut inhumanitas summoveat! Quam multi qui illos, eum diu torserint, simulata festinatione transcurrant! Quam multi per refertum clientibus atrium prodire vitabunt et per obscuros aedium aditus profugient, quasi non inhumanius sit decipere quam excludere! Quam multi hesterna crapula semisomnes et graves illis miseris suum somnum rumpentibus ut alienum expectent, vix adlevatis labris insusurratum miliens nomen oscitatione superbissima reddent!*
>
> Those who rush about in the performance of social duties, who give themselves and others no rest, when they have fully indulged their madness, when they have every day crossed everybody's threshold, and have left no open door unvisited, when they have carried around their venal greeting to houses that are very far apart—out of a city so huge and torn by such varied desires, how few will they be able to see? How many will there be who either from sleep or self-indulgence or rudeness will keep them out! How many who, when they have tortured them with long waiting, will rush by, pretending to be in a hurry! How many will avoid passing out through a hall that is crowded with clients, and will make their escape through some concealed door as if it were not more discourteous to deceive than to exclude. How many, still half asleep and sluggish from last night's debauch, scarcely lifting their lips in the midst of a most insolent yawn, manage to bestow on yonder poor wretches, who break their own slumber in order to wait on that of another, the right name only after it has been whispered to them a thousand times! [100]

[100] Sen. *De Brev. Vit.* 14.3, trans. J. W. Basore.

Here Seneca renders the social associations in the Empire as essentially hollow, and this notion is primarily manifested in the ritual of the *salutatio*. This is ultimately symptomatic of the usurpation of political and social prestige of the emperor; for Seneca, there is no longer anything to be gained from such associations.

Lucian's diatribe on the city of Rome presents the same notions of the hollowness of associations maintained at the *salutatio*:

> *νυκτὸς μὲν ἐξανιστάμενοι μέσης, περιθέοντες δὲ ἐν κύκλῳ τὴν πόλιν καὶ πρὸς τῶν οἰκετῶν ἀποκλειόμενοι, κύνες καὶ κόλακες καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα ἀκούειν ὑπομένοντες.*
>
> They rise in the small hours of the night, to go on their round of the city, to have doors slammed in their faces by slaves, to swallow as best they may the compliments of "Dog," "Flatterer," and the like.[101]

His example of the *salutatio* to criticize the city of Rome is indicative of the ritual's ingrained position in Roman society. Similar to Seneca, Lucian presents the ritual as one which reinforces futile attempts to gain status, and ultimately renders the relationships maintained at the *salutatio* as meaningless.[102] While of course we must be shrewd in our interpretation of these philosophical treatises, as they are laden with partiality, it is nevertheless possible to extract some real ancient attitudes towards the *salutatio* during the Empire. Certainly to some individuals, the *salutatio* came to be a simple formality. The Republican significance of the *salutatio* was now lost, and in essence the ritual came be a mere vestige of the Republican structure. The important relationships that were maintained at the Republican *salutatio* were now obsolete, as the new social hierarchy

[101] Luc. *Nigr.* 22, trans. H. W. Fowler and F. G. Fowler, modified by M. Fee.
[102] For other examples of disapproval of the *salutatio*, see Luc. *Nigr.* 13; Colum. 1 pref. 9; Sen. *De Tranq An.* 12.6-7.

based on proximity to the emperor was the only structure that could dispense real political and social prestige. In this manner, the *salutatio* changed from an essentially social ritual to a bureaucratic formality.

This notion is particularly evident when examining sources which discuss instances of emperors' foundering power. Plutarch relates that at the end of Nero's reign, the authority of the prefect Nymphidius Sabinus was increasing, and thus posed a threat to Galba's influence:

> *ἃ δὲ ἡ σύγκλητος εἰς τιμὴν ἔπραττεν αὐτοῦ καὶ δύναμιν, ἀνακαλοῦσα εὐεργέτην καὶ συντρέχουσα καθ᾽ ἡμέραν ἐπὶ θύρας...*
>
> Moreover, the senate did much to enhance his honour and power, giving him the title of benefactor, assembling daily at his door…[103]

Similarly, while Tiberius was at Capri, the influence of Sejanus can be seen in the great crowds at his *salutatio*:

> *σπουδαί τε καὶ ὠθισμοὶ περὶ τὰς θύρας αὐτοῦ ἐγίγνοντο ἐκ τοῦ δεδιέναι μὴ μόνον μὴ οὐκ ὀφθῇ τις αὐτῷ, ἀλλὰ μὴ καὶ ἐν τοῖς ὑστάτοις φανῇ: πάντα γὰρ ἀκριβῶς, καὶ μάλιστα τὰ τῶν πρώτων, ἐτηρεῖτο καὶ τὰ ῥήματα καὶ τὰ νεύματα.*
>
> There was rivalry and jostling about the great man's doors, the people fearing not merely that they might not be seen by their patron, but also that they might be among the last to appear before him; for every word and look, especially in the case of the most prominent men, was carefully observed.[104]

These depictions explicate the lack of significance that relationships assumed in the Imperial *salutatio.* It was the impersonal attachment, rather than the personal relationship with the emperor – or person of ultimate authority – that was of fundamental significance.

---

[103] Plut. *Galb.* 8.3, trans. B. Perrin.
[104] Cass. Dio 58.5.2, trans. E. Cary; See also Tac. *Ann*. 4.74; for other examples of the waning influence of emperors and the display of authority at the next most powerful citizen, see Tac. *Hist.* 2.92; Cass. Dio 76.5.3-4.

The *salutatio* consequently transformed from a ritual where important social relationships were maintained into a bureaucratic formality. The machinery of the Empire thus produced sycophantic *salutatores* whose wavering allegiances were manifested in the *salutatio*. In the vertical social structure of the Empire, the significance of social associations that were maintained in the Republican *salutatio* was rendered inconsequential. It was rather the impersonal connection to authority that was important, as proximity to the emperor was vital in the new socio-political structure of the Empire.

Imperial Conclusions

The transformation from Republic to Empire was accompanied by substantial changes in methods of communication and efforts to accumulate social status. The Republican necessity of maintaining complex webs of social associations became inconsequential, as during the Empire it was the emperor who had the ultimate authority on designations of status. The socio-political structure was one that was exclusively geared upwards, rather than being based upon the face-to-face communicative structure that was maintained during the Republic. The Empire thus perpetuated a one-directional system of social interaction, and ultimately the ample evidence for the *salutatio* in Imperial sources is indicative of this socio-political reorganization. That most of the Imperial sources appear in conjunction with the *salutatio* of the emperor is particularly indicative of the emperor's monopolization of political and social status. Of explicit importance is the evidence which relates that lower-ranked members of society were included in high-ranking *salutationes*. This evidence is symptomatic of the new social hierarchy based on proximity to the emperor. The monopolization of social esteem by the

emperor is also manifested in the evidence for the *salutatio*, as the emperor was able to essentially control the prestige that citizens could gain through their own *salutationes*.

Imperial evidence for the *salutatio* indicates a substantial change in the ritual from its Republican ancestor. Nevertheless, evidence for the *salutatio* during the Empire reiterates the ritual's ingrained position within the socio-political ideology of Rome. The use of the *salutatio* to exemplify accepted or unaccepted behavioural codes, for instance, is symptomatic of the ritual's permanence in Roman society. However, as a result of the socio-political shift that occurred, evidence suggests that the ritual came to be perceived as a hollow and bureaucratic formality, where it was no longer the regular social relationships maintained at the ritual that were of importance, but rather the connection to the highest political authority. Yet, although Imperial evidence suggests that the ritual lost its overall significance in the Empire, there was still an inclination to live according to the long established customs of the *mos maiorum*, and thus the ritual persisted. The machinery of the Empire dismantled the original Republican significance of the *salutatio*, and in essence, the ritual only continued as a formality. Although its substance was essentially defunct, the ritual was still considered a deeply Roman practice, and thus continued even into the late Empire.

CHAPTER THREE: Epigraphic Evidence for the *salutatio*

Introduction

While literary evidence provides valuable information for the ancient social historian, the inherent biases that accompany the consistently elite writers lend difficulties in our understanding of ancient perspectives of those in the lower strata of society. Epigraphic evidence, although accompanied by its own problematic biases of 'intentionality', convey biographical information on members of society that span different social strata. The increase of epigraphic activity in the Roman world towards the end of the first century BC demonstrates the ancient propensity to display individual perspectives and values to viewers, and thus stresses the level of social anxiety of members of society to assert their place in the Roman world.[105] When studied individually, inscriptions can illuminate aspects of ancient life rarely available in other sources, and consequently provide insight for modern scholars into ancient attitudes on identity.

Considering the multitude of inscriptions that remain from the Roman world, what is most striking at the very onset of this study is the lack of epigraphic evidence for the *salutatio*. Despite the ritual existing from at least the late Republic all the way through to the fifth century AD, there are only four inscriptions that categorically mention the *salutatio*. These four vary considerably in geographic location, content and time period. Consequently, this small corpus is unable to illuminate broad social trends, but nevertheless provides individual perspectives on the *salutatio* that ought not to be

[105] Woolf, (1996), 22-39.

overlooked.[106] Certainly by the time of the middle Empire, the *salutatio* was entrenched in the Roman socio-political ideology, and thus the lack of epigraphic evidence for the ritual poses some interesting questions.

One of the surviving inscriptions is considerably damaged, and thus unfortunately the context of the reference to the *salutatio* can only, at best, be postulated.[107] The remaining three inscriptions that will be considered here refer to *honestiores* from varying social strata. This reveals that members of different social echelons were actively involved in the *salutatio*.

These inscriptions also include perspectives from both sides of the social ritual. One inscription comes from the perspective of the salutatee, the other two from the socially inferior *salutatores*. As will be shown, the *salutatores* were not necessarily socially inferior vis-à-vis conventional society, but rather socially inferior in the context of the ritual of the *salutatio*.

Therefore, despite the small number of the components that make up the corpus of *salutatio* inscriptions, there are a variety of perspectives and attitudes towards the social ritual that can be considered and thus help to illuminate ancient attitudes towards participation in the *salutatio*.

[106] Something that is disregarded in Goldbeck (2010).
[107] *HEp* 3, 1993, 305.

Inscription #1: Lucius Plotius Sabinus, Rome, 2nd century, AD

The first inscription to be considered is a funerary inscription from Rome during the reign of Antoninus Pius that commemorates the life of Lucius Plotius Sabinus,[108] an elite member of society in Rome. The inscription of *CIL* VI.41111[109] reads:

Dis Genitoribus. |
L(ucio) Plotio C(ai) f(ilio) Pol(lia) Sabino, |
praetori,
sodali Titiali, |
aedili cur(uli),
seviro eq(uitum) R(omanorum), |
quaestori urb(ano),
trib(uno) laticl(avio) |
leg(ionis) I Miner(viae) p(iae) f(idelis),
Xvir(o) | stl(itibus iudic(andis),
habenti quoq(ue) |salutation(em) secundam | Imp(eratoris) Antonini Aug(usti) Pii. |
Sabinus praetor, magna res, Formis periit.

"To the originator spirits.
To Lucius Plotius Sabinus, son of Caius of the Pollia
voting tribe,
praetor,
sodal Titialus,
curule aedile,
member of the board of seven of Roman *equites*,
urban quaestor,
tribune *laticlavus*,
member of the first legion of Minerva loyal and faithful,
member of the board of ten *stlitibus iudicandis*,
also holding (the position) of the second *salutatio* of the
Emperor Antoninus Augustus Pius.
Sabinus the praetor, a great power, perished in form."

This monumental sepulchral inscription, measuring more than two meters wide and over one meter high is one of three inscriptions that commemorate Lucius Plotius Sabinus.[110]

[108] *PIR*^{2} P 517.
[109] *CIL* VI 41111 = *CIL* VI 31746 = *ILS* 1078.

These three inscriptions lend the possibility to gain a comprehensive understanding of this individual's social position through the offices he maintained.

Sevir equitum Romanorum reveals that Lucius Plotius Sabinus began his political career as a member of the equestrian *ordo*. The careers of many equestrians began with military posts,[111] and thus we can assume that Sabinus' membership in the first legion of Minerva was an entry point to his involvement in public service. Cassius Dio informs us that membership in the equestrian *ordo* in the time of Augustus required high birth, excellence, and wealth.[112] According to Pliny *Maior*, during the reign of Tiberius, two previous generations of free birth were also required.[113] The monetary qualifications for equestrian membership allowed fairly easy access for prosperous citizens, as this *ordo* wasn't limited in number as the senatorial *ordo* was after the time of Augustus. Because of its large size, the equestrian *ordo* was by no means a homogenous group, and there existed distinct positions within this rank, especially in the Imperial period.[114] Equestrian offices were relatively few, and available to only a minority of equestrians, and thus those that did maintain public offices were the 'aristocracy' of the *ordo*.[115] From here, entry into the senatorial *ordo* came from the quaestorship. Particularly prominent in this inscription is Lucius Plotius Sabinus' attainment of the office of praetor. The inclusion of this office at the beginning and the end of the inscription in question emphasizes this

[110] See *CIL* VI. 41112 and *AE* 1983, 142.
[111] Alföldy (1985), 125.
[112] Cassius Dio 52.19.4, trans. E. Cary.
[113] Pliny, *NH* 33.8, trans. J. Bostock.
[114] Equestrian hierarchy: Alföldy (1985), 122-126; Garnsey and Saller (1987), 118; Brunt (1983).
[115] Garnsey and Saller (1987), 123; Alföldy (1985), 122-126.

position, and signifies that this was the highest office that this individual attained before his death.

Scholars of the 19th century proposed that the strange inclusion of *magna res, Formis periit* at the culmination of the inscription likely signifies the death of a promising young man.[116] Given also that the *cursus honorum* of Lucius Plotius Sabinus did not advance past the post of praetor, this is a probable hypothesis. Cassius Dio indicates that the minimum age for the praetorship was thirty, but the *ius liberorum* allowed those younger than thirty to hold the office.[117] Thus, the inscription in question reveals a young man within the highest ranks of Roman society who attained substantial public prominence in the traditional *cursus honorum* in a short period, thereby augmenting his *dignitas*.

Funerary inscriptions which present a *cursus honorum* do so primarily to stress the posterity of the individual in question. In the ancient mentality, the assertion of the worth of the individual is precisely what assured posterity. Consequently, the mere mention of this individual proclaiming his participation in the *salutatio* as a *salutator* illuminates compelling information on the ancient mentality of the social ritual. While the Epigrams of Martial and the Satires of Juvenal portray the *salutatores* to be those lower-class

---

[116] Tomassetti (*BCAR* 1890, 103-106), and Gatti (*Notizie degli scavit*, 1890, 36; *Rendiconti dei Lincei* 1890, 195), believe *Formis* refers to the place of his death, Formiae; Huelsen (*RM* 5, 1890, 302) interprets this line as an epithet, similar to *CIL* VI 10098, emphasizing the premature death of L. Plotius Sabinus; Buccheler (*Rendiconti dell'Accademia dei Lincei* 1890, 547) believes the doubtful hypothesis that *Formis* refers to the individual's inclusion in the Imperial court, which thus conferred the admittance of his daughters to the *salutatio* of Antoninus Pius; Mommsen (*CIL* VI 2169) suggests *magna res formis* fortasse dicitur vir aquaeductuum instituendorum peritus.

[117] Age minimum of 30: Cassius Dio 52, 20, 1-2; *ius liberorum*, Pliny *minor, Ep. 7, 16;* Ulp. *Dig.* 4, 4, 2.

citizens whose arduous morning treks to the homes of their salutatees reflected the social subordination and even humiliation of the non-elites,[118] the inscription in question reveals an especially prominent member of the elite class as a *salutator*.

The significance of this inclusion is consequently associated with the interpretations of epigraphic bias; that is, the information selected to be inscribed was not solely determined by the desire to communicate what an individual wanted to communicate, but rather the kind of information that was deemed appropriate to communicate. Having been included in this *cursus* with other offices that are definitively meant to assert the individual's *dignitas* and thus social worth, the implications of the inclusion of his involvement in the second order of admittance to the *salutatio* of Antoninus Pius are unquestionable. Here it is given equivalence with other high designations of status and its inclusion intends to promote a favourable assertion of social worth.

The inscription of Lucius Plotius Sabinus has generated a considerable amount of commentaries in modern scholarship in relation to the ambiguities of the order of admission in the *salutatio*. It is apparent that the *salutatio* was administered with different classifications of *salutatores*, yet the manner in which these classifications were organized remains unclear. A number of modern scholars have accepted Seneca's account of Gaius Gracchus and Livius Drusus dividing their friends as evidence for the order of admission of *salutatores*.[119] However, upon examination of the semantics of

[118] See especially Juvenal, *Sat.* 1; 3; 5; Martial *Ep.* 2.18; 5.22; 9.6; 10.10; 12.29.
[119] Sen. *De Ben.* 6.33; Garnsey and Saller (1987), 122; Saller (1982), 61; (1989), 57; Friedländer (1979), 198-199; see also the discussion in this thesis in Chapter 1.

Seneca's language, it is clear that he does not make any attempt to elucidate this categorization. If we can rely on Seneca's sources, this passage rather offers insight that the practice of dividing friends began in the second century BC. Pliny the elder relates that the emperor Claudius granted 'free' admission to those whom he had given gold rings:

> *fuit et alia Claudii principatu differentia insolens iis, quibus admissiones liberae ius dedissent imaginem principis ex auro in anulo gerendi…*
>
> In the reign of Claudius, also, there was introduced another unusual distinction, in the case of those to whom was grated the right of free admission, that, namely, of wearing the likeness of the emperor engraved in gold upon a ring…[120]

This passage is often cited as evidence of orders of admission to the *salutatio* in the Empire,[121] however we cannot be sure if this is in reference to the access to the emperor in general or his morning *salutationes*. If this does in fact refer to the *salutatio*, the situation of granting free admission to those of the emperor's choosing appears to have ceased with Claudius' demise, as there is no other evidence to support this categorization. Talbert understands a line from Juvenal's fourth Satire as evidence that a fisherman was admitted to the *salutatio* before a senator, however it is unconvincing that Juvenal is referring to the *salutatio* here.[122] Pliny's *Panegyricus* alludes to the possible abolition of the practice of admitting *salutatores* based on grades, and in doing so, identifies the practice as degrading:

> *Nullae obices, nulli contumelarium gradus…*

[120] Pliny *NH* 33.41, trans. J. Bostock.
[121] Eg. Talbert (1984), 68; Crook (1955), 68.
[122] Juv. *Sat*. 4.64; Talbert (1984), 68.

> There are no barriers, no grades of affront…[123]

However, if this were in fact the case, the inscription of Lucius Plotius Sabinus would not include the designation of *salutationem secundam* of Antoninus Pius. Consequently, the inscription of Lucius Plotius Sabinus provides valuable insight into how the order of admittance to the *salutatio* was categorized. Here is an example of a member of the senatorial class, in other words the highest *ordo* in the traditional republican hierarchy, who promulgates his involvement in the second admittance in the emperor's *salutatio*. Therefore, if the inscription can be trusted, it consequently provides categorical evidence that the orders of admittance were not in fact based upon the traditional order of social rank. Rather, this inscription is indicative of the socio-political shift that occurred with the onset of the Empire, where the traditional republican hierarchy no longer dictated social status in real terms. Lucius Plotius Sabinus amassed a number of prestigious titles in his *cursus honorum*, yet his prestigious list of titles nevertheless did not grant him the closest proximity to the emperor. Winterling rejects the notion that this inscription refers to an order of admission, and rather interprets this to signify that Lucius Plotius Sabinus was likely greeted second at one specific *salutatio* of the emperor.[124] This interpretation is questionable, however, as there is no other evidence of the sort. Furthermore, Winterling's reasoning is somewhat flawed, as he comes to this conclusion because as a Praetor, to be in the second group of *salutatores* would not be an honour worth mentioning. However, it seems more probable that an individual might promulgate a *continued* connection to the emperor, even if it was in the capacity of the second group,

[123] Pliny *Pan.* 47.5, trans. B. Radice.
[124] Winterling (2009), 90 n. 69.

rather than a one-time meeting with the emperor. During the Empire, connection with the emperor was translatable to real social status.

Inscription #2: Caius Caesius Niger, Rome, 1st century, AD

The second piece of epigraphic evidence to be considered in the analysis of the *salutatio* is the shortest, and the individual commemorated is the lowest in the social hierarchy of the three individuals discussed in these three inscriptions. *CIL* VI. 2169 reads:

> *Dis Manibus sacrum | C(aio) Caesio Q(uinti) f(ilio) Ter(etina) Nigr(o) | ex prima admissione | ex qua[t]tuor decuri(i)s | curio(ni) minor | Caesia C(ai) l(iberta) Theoris | patrono | et sibi*
>
> "Sacred to the spirits of the dead, to Caius Caesius Niger, son of Quintus, of the Teretina voting tribe, from the first (order of) admission, *curio minor* from the four *decuriae*. Caesia Theoris, freedwoman of Caius (dedicated this) for her patron and for herself"

This inscription does not make an explicit mention of participation in any specific *salutatio*, however the inclusion of *ex prima admissione* is generally accepted to be a reference to the social ritual.[125] The inclusion of *ex quattuor decuriis* helps to date the inscription to after AD 4, when Augustus increased the *decuriae* from three to four groups, and before the reign of Gaius who added the fifth *decuria*, and henceforth these designations are seen only in variants of *ex quinque decuriis*.[126] The priestly title of *curio minor* designates him as a member involved in the *curiales* in Rome.

[125] Millar (1977), 111; Paterson (2007), 131, Winterling (2009), 90 n.69.
[126] Augustus and fourth *decuria*: Suet. *Div. Aug.* 32, 3; Gaius and the fifth *decuria*: Suet. *Calig.* 16, 2, Examples: *CIL* V.7375; VIII.7986; IX.5831; IX.5832.

The text presents us with a number of ambiguities which have left modern scholars puzzled. Caius Caesius Niger[127] is otherwise unknown, and thus prosopographical information is lacking for him. However, we can decipher from the inscription that he was affluent enough to have owned at least one slave, Caesia Theoris who erected the inscription. The designation of *ex quattuor decuriis* as well as the modesty of his *cursus* signifies that this individual was either an equestrian or a high-ranking sub-equestrian.[128]

Modern scholars have interpreted *ex prima admissione* to signify membership in the imperial *salutatio* of either Augustus or Tiberius.[129] This theory has thus prompted some discussion on the orders of admittance to the imperial *salutatio*, and has consequently been read in conjunction with the funerary inscription of Lucius Plotius Sabinus. It appears perplexing to some that an equestrian would be a member of the first admittance, and a senator a member of the second admittance. The lack of either *cohors* or *salutatio* in conjunction with *ex prima admissione* has furthermore encouraged confusion with the divisions of the Imperial *amici.*[130]

These perplexities diminish when we consider this inscription in conjunction with the drastic socio-political shift that occurred with the onset of the Empire. The emperor's monopolization of military, political and social authority in the Empire rendered him able

[127] *PIR*^{2} C 156.
[128] Mommsen, *StR* III, 101, 567-8; *CIL* VI 2169 (Mommsen); *RE Curio* 2 (Kubler). *ILS* 1320; *CIL* VI 41111; Millar (1977), 111; Crook (1955), 23; Winterling (2009), 90 n. 69.
[129] Esp. Winterling (2009), 09 n. 69; Millar (1977), 11; Crook (1955), 23.
[130] See especially Winterling, (2009), 90-93.

to designate status at his own will.[131] Evidence suggests that the emperor was hesitant to allow those in the traditional higher ranks of society to amass prestige that might consequently weaken his own. In this sense, the emperors tended to perceive those with high traditional status as potential rivals for power.[132] The result of this was the emergence of a new social hierarchy that allowed those of lower status to amass unprecedented amounts of social and political power, as these citizens were not perceived as threatening. Although Caius Caesius Niger was possibly an equestrian and thus a member of the traditional elite, it is apparent that he did not maintain a particularly high station in the traditional social hierarchy. In this way, he was permitted to gain proximity to the emperor, and was thus in the process of accumulating status through the new Imperial social hierarchy.

The designation of *ex quattuor decuriis* suggests that Caius Caesius Niger reached the age of twenty-five before his death, however his slight *cursus honorum* suggests that he likely did not live much longer past this. The minimum age to be eligible for the quaestorship was twenty five, and consequently, we might infer that Niger would have attempted to obtain the quaestorship soon after, yet he did not.[133] Thus, the sparse *cursus* included on Niger's tombstone likely suggests the death of a younger equestrian.

That Caius Caesius Niger's involvement in a *salutatio* is one of only three designations is of significance in our analysis of the *salutatio*. As seen with the inscription of Lucius Plotius Sabinus, the epigraphic bias presented displays information

[131] Millar (1977), 110-122; Winterling (2009), 9-33.
[132] Winterling (1999), 188-91; (2009) 31-32, 90-91; Lendon (1997) 108-113.
[133] Crook (1955), 23 n.9.

that was deemed appropriate enough to commemorate this individual in a socially beneficial manner. Therefore we can ascertain that involvement in the *salutatio* promoted social worth. It is peculiar that there is no reference to a specific *salutatio* here, yet it is generally accepted to signify the *salutatio* of either Augustus or Tiberius. We might expect that if this individual maintained a connection to either emperor, some kind of overt advertisement to the emperor would merit some mention. However, this is symptomatic of the ritual's embedded position in Roman society. The connection need not be advertised, as presumably the designation of *ex prima admissione* would be immediately interpreted as the first admission of *the* most prominent of all *salutationes.*

This inscription is therefore an early indication of the socio-political transformation that took place when the Republic was reorganized into a patriarchal power structure.

Inscription #3: Ulpius Mariscianus, Numidia, 4th century, AD

The third and final inscription that we will consider is a legal edict from the governor of Numidia, which has come to be known as the *ordo salutationis* in modern scholarship. The text itself reveals that it was erected between 361 and 363 AD, during the reign of Julianus. Out of the surviving *salutatio* inscriptions, this one presents the most information on the *salutatio*, however, it is only in a fourth century provincial context. The inscription nevertheless reveals significant aspects of the evolution of the *salutatio*. *CIL* VIII.17896 reads:

Ex au[ctori]tate Ulpi Mariscia|ni, v(iri) c(larissimi), consularis sexfascalis, | promoti primo a domino nostro | Invicto principe Iuliano, ordo sa|lutationis factus et ita at<d>perpetui|[t]atis memoriam aere incisus.
primo |
senatores et
comites et
ex comitibus | et
admin[ist]ratores
secundo
prin|ceps,
cornic[ul]ar[ius,
pa]latini
ter[t]io
co|ronati [provi]nc[iae
quart]o
promoti of\ficiales [et
magistra]tus cum ordi/ne
[qui]nt[o
of]ficiales ex ordine…

"By the authority of Ulpius Mariscianus, *vir clarissimus*, consular *sexfascalis*, having been the first (man) promoted by our Lord the Unconquered emperor Julianus, the order of the *salutatio* having been made and therefore having been inscribed to the memory of perpetuity in bronze.
The first (received are)
senators and
comites and
honorary *comites* and
administratores,
the second
the *princeps,*
cornicularius,
palatini,
the third
the *coronati provinciae*,
the fourth
officiales having been promoted and
magistratus cum ordine,

the fifth
officiales from the *ordo*…"[134]

The edict sets forth the stipulations of jurisdictional proceedings as ordained by the governor, Ulpius Mariscianus. The first twelve lines present a careful arrangement of the order in which he will receive officials in the time before his court proceedings. The remaining 39 lines establish the costs of making judicial appeals pertaining to specific levels of government, and in different geographical regions in the province.

This complex inscription presents a number of significant aspects of the *salutatio* in its fourth century context, and thus in order to ascertain the function of the *salutatio* during this period the characteristics of the administration of the later Roman Empire and its provinces must first be examined.

The reforms of Diocletian and Constantine in the late third and early fourth centuries marked a substantial change in the administration of the provinces. Diocletian developed a system which consisted of provinces, dioceses and prefectures. This alteration resulted in an increase in the number of Roman provinces to approximately 100, and consequently a decrease in the geographic size of each.[135] Governors during the Republic and Empire spent a great deal of time travelling within provincial circuits to the different *conventus*, or assizes, to preside over their court cases.[136] Despite the smaller size of the provinces, governors during this period were still subjected to the same

[134] For inscription publication, see: CIL VIII.17896; AE 1948.118; 1949.133 = 1956.134; AE 1978.892; Mommsen (1882), 629-46; Poulle (1882), 401-06; Cagnat (1884), 257-68; Riccobono (1941), 331-32.
[135] Noethlichs (1982), 72; Slootjes (2006), 17.
[136] *Conventus* in Republic: Marshall (1966); in Principate: Burton (1975); Habicht (1975).

rigorous travel that their predecessors had been. The governors in the late Empire travelled shorter distances to the fewer assize areas, but more frequently.[137] The old assize areas maintained their importance within the new provincial divisions, and the governor retained his importance as the Imperial representative in the province. Thus, the governor of the later Roman Empire was a busy man; most of his time was spent fulfilling his jurisdictional obligations in different cities. It is within this administrative framework of the later Roman Empire that the *ordo salutationis* inscription was composed.

The inscription itself, in customary fashion,[138] begins with the phrase *ex auctoritate*. What follows is a series of status markers of the governor, which establish his rank and social position, and thus legitimize his authority. *Vir clarissimus*, a well-established senatorial epithet by this period, signifies his membership in the senatorial *ordo* as well as his rank of governor. By the fourth century, an evolving ranking system of governors existed which corresponded to the four titles of governors during this period: (in descending hierarchical order) *proconsul, consularis, corrector,* and *praeses.* During the later Roman Empire, the title of *proconsul* was only given to those governors of Africa, Asia and Achaea. These were the only governors who could claim the rank of *spectabilis*, opposed to the lesser *clarissimus*, as Ulpius Mariscianus.[139] The inscription reveals the title of Ulpius Mariscianus to be *consularis sexfascalis*. The title *consularis* during the early Empire signified an ex-*consul*, but by the third century was an established title of a provincial governor, regardless of whether he had held a previous

[137] Liebeschutz (1987), 459; Slootjes (2006), 31.
[138] Chastagnol (1960), 78 and 274.
[139] *Notitia Dignitatum*; Jones (1964), 528-529; Slootjes (2006), 19-25.

consulship or not.[140] *Sexfascalis* is an honorary title that appears to be unique to governors in Numidia, originally associated with the *fasces* of the *propraetors* of the Republic.[141] A number of other late fourth century Numidian inscriptions exist which attest the *consularis sexfascalis*,[142] but the honorary title is otherwise unknown and absent from literary documentation. A further indication of the high rank of Ulpius Mariscianus is his claim to have been the first man promoted by the emperor Julianus. Leschi proffers that this promotion refers to the additional title of *sexfascalis* to signify the importance of the province of Numidia and its administrators. He furthermore maintains that the promotion was the occasion for the publication of the edict; however this remains unsubstantiated as there is no explicit evidence for the exact cause for the issuance of the edict.[143] As the inscription reveals, it was originally inscribed in bronze, and is believed to have been displayed at the seat of government in the capital of Cirta.[144] The duplication of the inscription is indicative of Ulpius Mariscianus' different assize areas within the province. The edict thus served the same function in the different locations of his *praetoria*, or headquarters: to establish the set procedures of litigation.

Ulpius Mariscianus is attested in one other piece of epigraphic evidence, which he himself erected and dedicated to the emperor Julianus contemporary with the *ordo*

[140] Kubler, *RE* 4, 1138-42; Berger (1953), 411.
[141] Berger (1953), 468; Cotton (2000), 230 n. 48.
[142] *AE* 1888, 30; 1885, 108; 1902, 166; 1909, 220; 1911, 110 (=1946, 112); 1913, 23, 35; 1917/18, 58; 1936, 30 (=1937, 144); 1946, 107 (=111), 110; 1987, 1062, 1082, 1083 (=1911, 217); *CIL* VIII.7015, 7034, 7974 (=19852), 10870 (=1487), 19502.
[143] Leschi (1947), 569.
[144] *CIL* VIII.17896 Suppl Prov. Numidia, p. 1705; Mommsen, Eph Ep V, 633; Cagnat, 268; Kelly (2004), 107.

salutationis inscription.[145] However, these two inscriptions together don't render any considerable prosopographical information on the governor. He is the only individual with the *cognomen* of Mariscianus listed in both the *Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire* and Kajanto's compilation of Latin *cognomina*.[146] Despite the relatively scarce prosopographical information available for Ulpius Mariscianus, these two inscriptions show evidence of his high rank and social status in the fourth century.

Following the introduction of Ulpius Mariscianus is an itemized list of the *honestiores* in the region who were permitted admittance to the governor to discuss judicial affairs. Some of these are members of the governor's *officium*, while others are simply local elites or magistrates. Not every provincial citizen was granted direct access to the governor. The lower ranked provincials, or *humiliores*, would presumably maintain some form of relationship with an *honestior* who would advocate on his behalf at the governor's *salutatio* if necessary.[147] The *ordo salutationis* of Ulpius Mariscianus thus reveals the accessibility of the government to the *honestiores* and their internal gradation. The inscription is symptomatic of the social framework of the later Empire, when the hierarchical system became much more intricate and conspicuous than it had during the early Empire.[148] The admittances to the governor are broken up into five ranks, and most ranks, in turn, contain their own gradation of status within that classification. Following is an itemized explanation of the members in the *ordo salutationis* of Ulpius Mariscianus.

---

[145] *CIL* VIII.4771 = *CIL* VIII.18684.
[146] *PLRE* I, 561; Kajanto (1965), 334.
[147] Kelly (2004), 120-31; Slootjes (2006), 52-53.
[148] Garnsey-Humfress (2001), 83.

First Admittance:

The first of the *honestiores* to be received by the governor were members of the senatorial *ordo.* In the first admittance following those of senatorial rank were the *comites*. Mommsen declared, without doubt, that these are the *comites minores* or *inferiores* referred to in the Theodosian code of the early fifth century.[149] The *comites* were high officials, and acted as advisors to the governor, and three degrees existed in the later Empire: *primi, secundi* and *tertii*.[150] Cagnat accepted the *comites* mentioned here to be in the *primi ordinis* and of senatorial status.[151] Following the *comites* are the *ex-comitibus*, who were granted the honorary distinction of *comes* in the *tertii gradus*, without having officially served in the position.[152] Fourth in the first admission are the *administratores.* These were understood by Mommsen to be those at the head of provincial administration under the orders of the *praeses* of Numidia. The *administratores* are not of senatorial rank, nor members of the governor's *officium*, but are the most superior magistrates of the province.

Second Admittance:

The second grade of admittance consists of the highest ranked members of the governor's *officium*. The first, and highest ranked member is the *princeps*, who was the head of the governor's *officium*.[153] Next comes the *cornicularius*, whose duties mainly consisted of

[149] Mommsen (1882), 634; *Cod. Theod.* 7.11.1; 7.11.2.
[150] Berger (1953), 397.
[151] Cagnat (1884), 261.
[152] Mommsen (1882), 635; Cagnat (1884), 261.
[153] Berger (1953), 650; see also *Notitia Dignitatum.*

secretarial work for the governor.[154] The *palatini* acted as tax auditors and were not under the authority of the governor nor a particular province. They were sent to the provinces to ensure tax payments were being made to the governor, and if not, were given the authority to detain the governor at the culmination of his position.[155]

Third Admittance:

The third rank to be admitted was the *coronati provinciae*. These were prominent religious officials who presumably received their name on account of the crown or headdress they donned during this period.[156]

Fourth Admittance:

The penultimate grouping to enter the *salutatio* of Ulpius Mariscianus consisted of promoted officials and the highest ranked members of the local councils.

Fifth Admittance:

The remaining local councillors were permitted entrance to the governor last.

The inscription thus delineates the strict hierarchical structure in the administration of the late Roman Empire. Internal gradations, while here more explicit in the first orders of admittance, would have permeated this entire hierarchy. Thus, the rigidity of those mentioned in this *ordo salutationis* should not be overly emphasized, as within these ranks the gradations were not simply linear; there existed an ambivalent fluidity between the numerous positions in different ranks.[157]

---

[154] Poulle (1882), 404; Berger (1953), "*cornicularii"* 416.
[155] *Cod. Theod.* 1.10.2; Poulle (1882), 404; Mommsen (1882), 636; Cagnat (1884), 262; Delmaire (1989), 160-64; Slootjes (2006), 36.
[156] Mommsen (1882), 636-37; Cagnat (1884), 262.
[157] Garnsey and Humpfress (2001), 85.

The *ordo salutationis* is the only piece of ancient evidence that explicitly describes how the groups of *salutatores* were categorized. Significantly, this inscription confirms that in contrast to the early and middle Empire, access to this *salutatio* in the late Empire directly corresponded to social status. The publicity of the edict reiterated the strict hierarchical social structure, and furthermore emphasized the relationship between social and political status. No longer did the socio-political structure revolve around the emperor, rather, in the late Empire, the hierarchy was cemented through legal means.

The *ordo salutationis* of Ulpius Mariscianus is a manifestation of the bureaucratic organization of the later Roman Empire. The *salutatio* of the earlier Empire, which albeit even then was a public affair, was not restricted to business relationships. Furthermore, the Imperial ancestor of the *ordo salutationis* took place in the *domus* rather than the *praetoria*. Although gradually throughout the earlier Empire, the Imperial *domus* came to be increasingly recognized as a public building,[158] the *ordo salutationis* inscription indicates that this *salutatio* of the fourth century is fundamentally public. The social foundation of the *salutatio* in the Republic and earlier Empire is now absent in this fourth century edict and thus this administrative *salutatio* presents considerable differences from its social ancestor. Kelly suggests that as power became more centralized in the later Roman Empire, the dependence upon mutual obligations decreased.[159] The fundamental principles of the social *salutatio* of the early Empire were mutual social obligations between the *salutator* and salutatee. Consequently, as the increasing bureaucratic and hierarchical organization of the later Roman Empire gradually emerged, perhaps the

[158] Winterling (1999); Winterling (2009), 59-102.
[159] Kelly (2004), 108.

social *salutatio* evolved in the same manner. Written documentation for the *salutatio* in its social context is absent for this period; that is not to say, however, that it did not exist alongside this new form of *salutatio*.

Epigraphic Conclusions

The distinguishing quality of inscriptions in the Roman Empire is the insinuation of a "sense of audience," as MacMullen has established.[160] The act of erecting an inscription implies a sense of posterity for the individuals and institutions commemorated. Woolf attributes the epigraphic habit of the Romans in conjunction with the expansion of Roman society as an anxious need to define one's identity.[161] Through epigraphic activity, individuals were able to assert their assimilation into a larger society, and thus assure the continuation of their memory in the future within that society. The promulgation of identity warranted individuals to publicly entrench particular views of the self. Inscriptions were not only meant to preserve the memory of the commemorated individual, but also to publicize achievements, as Roman society dictated that the measure of one's worth was intrinsically linked with public involvement.[162]

Consequently, the content chosen to be included in inscriptions of the Roman Empire can be construed as important information from the Roman perspective. The mere existence of the three inscriptions evaluated here illuminates significant aspects of the social importance of the *salutatio.* As indicated in this epigraphic evidence, participation in this social ritual thus carried with it beneficial social prestige. Two of the

[160] MacMullen (1982), 223-246.
[161] Woolf (1996), 22-39.
[162] MacMullen, *op. cit.*

three individuals presented promulgate their involvement in a lower, socially inferior capacity as an accolade of their lifetime achievements. Ulpius Mariscianus promotes his superior social standing through the display of the social inferiors that attended his own *salutatio*, all of whom maintained elevated social rank themselves.

It is advantageous to examine these three inscriptions in conjunction with one another, however it is important to note that the edict of Ulpius Mariscianus in the fourth century is categorically different from the epigraphic evidence for the *salutatio* in the earlier Empire. The overtly public edict of Ulpius Mariscianus is fundamentally concerned with the administration of Numidia, rather than an attempt to promote posterity. It nevertheless provides valuable evidence for the adaptations of the *salutatio* from its Republican and early Imperial ancestors. It furthermore presents a manifestation of the strict hierarchy of the time in terms of the *salutatio,* and in so doing, promulgates the status of Ulpius Mariscianus as a high-ranking governor in the fourth century. The two surviving inscriptions from the earlier Empire are funerary and thus their functions are emphatically distinct from the later edict. It is significant to note as well that both Lucius Plotius Sabinus and Caius Caesius Niger were 'socially deficient' at the times of their respective deaths, as evidence suggests that they both perished prematurely. Considering the lack of epigraphic evidence for the *salutatio* amidst the ritual's prominent social function during the Republic and Empire, this suggests that these two mentions of the *salutatio* may have been included as a result of the inadequacies in their respective *cursus honorum* to augment their social prestige.

Lucius Plotius Sabinus presents his involvement in the Imperial *salutatio* as an illustrious promotion. Consequently, the *salutatio* can be seen as a mechanism in upward social mobility in a highly status-conscious society.

The high visibility of displays of status obviated the distinctions between the traditionally higher and lower ranked members of society. In an overtly status-conscious society, those members in the lower echelons would make an attempt to substantiate their position within society. Thus Caius Caesius Niger, a low-ranking *eques* or high-ranking sub-*eques*, proclaimed his own social worth through his membership of a first admittance of a *salutatio*. In a society where social worth was associated with public involvement, the *salutatio* can thus be seen as a method to augment social status. While Caius Caesius Niger presumably never accumulated more honours than are inscribed in his brief *cursus*, the necessity to promulgate the information asserts what social prosperity he maintained.[163]

Ultimately these inscriptions reveal that the *salutatio* was a ritual which encompassed participants from varying spectra of the higher social strata. It can be seen that participants of the ritual included members of society that were ranked so high as to claim connection with the emperor, high ranking municipal officials, as well as virtually unknown equestrians. Participation in the ritual of the *salutatio* pervaded the diverse strata of the Roman social hierarchy. Furthermore, the ancient perceptions of participation in the *salutatio* between these members are evidently congruent despite social differentiations. Although references to the *salutatio* in inscriptions is by no means

[163] See Meyer (1990), 74-96; Saller and Shaw (1984), 124-56.

predominant, epigraphic evidence thus presents fundamental information on ancient attitudes regarding the *salutatio* as a positive manifestation of social status in the Roman Empire.

CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

While there is no ancient evidence that outlines exactly when or how the daily ritual of the *salutatio* surfaced, it is clear that it was entrenched in Roman society by the time of the late Republic. The Republican political system relied on communication between varying echelons of status, and thus the *salutatio* was a venue where these social associations could be maintained and promoted. The benefit to status that the salutatee gained is evident. The many visitors to his atrium signified his elevated status in Roman society to those included and excluded from the ritual. There is no evidence to suggest that being the inferior, i.e. the *salutator*, was associated with social subordination in the Republic. Rather, the *salutatores* were able to foster relationships with men of power, which consequently augmented their own status. Furthermore, the Republican *salutatio* was a distinctly 'Roman' practice, and thus participation in the ritual in any capacity asserted one's position within the collective Roman identity. To be 'Roman,' one had to adhere to certain behavioural and moral practices. The *salutatio* was one such practice which promoted civic, and ultimately 'Roman' virtue.

The reorganization of the political structure in the Empire generated significant changes in social associations. With the advent of a patriarchal political system, associations with inferior members of the traditional hierarchy were ineffectual, as no longer did the elite require votes. In this way, the social hierarchy became geared exclusively upward toward the emperor. As a result of the shift in socio-political ideology, a new hierarchy based on proximity to the emperor surfaced. In this new

structure, the traditional elite could be seen as potential rivals to the emperor's *auctoritas*, and thus were denied access to political and social power. For these reasons, members of the traditionally lower echelons of the social strata were given unprecedented social and political power, as they were not perceived as threatening. These social circumstances precipitated significant changes in the administration of the *salutatio*, as well as ancient mentalities on the practice. The majority of the Imperial evidence appears in conjunction with the emperor's *salutatio*, which is indicative of the monopolization of political and social power. The use of the *salutatio* in ancient evidence to exemplify accepted or unaccepted behavioural codes is indicative of the ritual's embedded position within society. That the *salutatio* increasingly revolved around the emperor's court indicates that the ritual became increasingly public, and consequently evidence suggests that the ritual came to be perceived as a hollow formality. The maintenance of social relationships were no longer of importance in the Empire, rather it was the impersonal connection with the emperor that held significance. However, ritual persisted in spite of its inconsequentiality, as there was still an inclination to live according to the behavioural practices established by the *mos maiorum*.

Epigraphic evidence is able to illuminate aspects of Roman life that are rarely available in written sources. The inscriptions of Lucius Plotius Sabinus and Caius Caesius Niger clarify ambiguities in relation to the classification of *salutatores*, and demonstrate that admission to the *salutatio* was not categorically related to the traditional hierarchy. These inscriptions corroborate the socio-political shift that occurred with the onset of the Empire and the new social hierarchy that surfaced. Ultimately, epigraphic

evidence suggests that participation in the emperor's *salutatio* was a positive measure of social worth. That epigraphic evidence for the *salutatio* predominantly appears in conjunction with an emperor's *salutatio* can perhaps be construed as an indication that the ritual lost prominence in the houses of regular citizens during the Empire. The inscription of Ulpius Mariscianus from the fourth century is symptomatic of the gradual 'publicness' of the *salutatio* through the Empire. The legal edict indicates that the *salutatio* in the late Empire is categorically different from its social ancestor. Here, it is an overtly public affair which takes place in a public building. It is furthermore representative of the bureaucratic organization of the late Republic, as it indicates that admission to the *salutatio* of the governor of Numidia was directly related to legal status, unlike the *salutationes* of the earlier emperors.

The *salutatio* can be conclusively defined as a Republican institution. The daily enactment of the ritual was ultimately an important behavioural code which asserted 'Roman-ness.' The social relationships that were maintained at the *salutatio* are essential to understanding its significance. It cannot wholly be defined as an assertion of only one type of asymmetrical association, such as patronal or electoral. Rather, a number of asymmetrical relationships were maintained at the *salutatio*, which suggests the significance of the ritual was situated within the hierarchical structure of Roman society, where asymmetrical relationships were customary. Perspectives on the *salutatio* from the Republic suggest the ritual to be a manifestly positive assertion of status, no matter the capacity of involvement in the ritual. Individual acceptance of social inequalities at the *salutatio* signified an acceptance of one's place within the greater hierarchical social

structure of Rome. However, Imperial evidence indicates that the fundamental importance of the *salutatio* was no longer extant. The Imperial ritual evolved into a venue of Imperial connection rather than a venue to maintain important social associations. In this sense, the Imperial *salutatio* can be interpreted as a fundamentally different ritual than its Republican ancestor. It is therefore yet another instance of the emperor's monopolization of Republican institutions to legitimize his ultimate authority. The *salutatio* is thus a Roman practice which indicates the precarious nature of the social structure of Rome.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alföldy, G. (2001) *The Social history of Rome*. Trans. D. Braund and F. Pollock. London: Croom Helm.

-------- *The Social History of Rome*. Trans. David Braund and Frank Pollock. London: Croom Helm (1985).

-------- "Die Stellung der Ritter in der Führungsschicht des Imperium Romanum," in *Chiron* 11 (1981): 169-215.

Allen, W. (1951) "Cicero's *Salutatio* (in *Catilinam* 1.9)," in *Studies Presented to David Moore Robinson on his seventieth birthday*. Ed. G. Mylonas (Saint Louis: Washington University): 707-710.

Anderson, J. C. (1984) *The historical topography of the imperial fora.* Brussels: Latomus.

Ando, C. (2011) "From Republic to Empire," in *Social Relations in the Roman World*. Ed. M. Peachin. Oxford: Oxford University Press: 37-66.

-------- (2000) *Imperial Ideology and Provincial Loyalty in the Roman Empire.* California: University of California Press.

Beard, M. (2007) *The Roman Triumph*. Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

Bell, A. (1997) "Cicero and the Spectacle of Power," in *JRS* 87: 1-22.

Berger, A. *Encyclopedic Dictionary of Roman Law.* Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society (1953).

Bruns, *Fontes iuris Romani antiqui* I (1909): 280-281 n. 103.

Brunt, P.A. (1988) *The Fall of the Roman Republic*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

--------(1983) "Princeps and Equites," in *JRS* 73: 42-75.

Burton, G.P. "Proconsuls, Assizes and the Administration of Justice under the Empire," in *JRS* 65 (1975): 92-106.

Cagnat, M.R. "L'Ordonnance du Gouverneur de Numidie Ulpius Mariscianus," in *Recueil des notices et memoires de la Société archéologique de la province de Constantine* 23 (1884): 257-268.

Chastagnol, A. *La prefecture urbaine à Rome sous le Bas-Empire*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France (1960).

Cloud, D. (1989) "The client-patron relationship: emblem and reality in Juvenals's first book," in ed. Wallace-Hadrill, A. *Patronage in Ancient Society*. London: Routledge: 205-218.

Coarelli, F. (1983) *Il Foro Romano*. Rome: Quasar.

Coleman, K. M. (2011) "Public Entertainments," in *Social Relations in the Roman World*. Ed. M. Peachin. Oxford: Oxford University Press: 335-357.

Connolly, J. (2011) "Rhetorical Education," in *Social Relations in the Roman World*. Ed. M. Peachin. Oxford: Oxford University Press: 101-118.

Cotton, H.M. "Cassius Dio, Mommsen and the quinquefascales," in *Chiron* 30 (2000): 217-234.

Crook, J. *Consilium principis: imperial councils and counselors from Augustus to Diocletian*. Cambridge: University Press (1955).

Delmaire, R. *Largesses sacrées et res privata: l'aerarium imperial et son administration du IVe au Vie siècle*. Roma: Ecole française de Rome (1989).

Dupont, F. (1992) *Daily Life in Ancient Rome*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Eck, W. (2009) "The Administrative Reforms of Augustus: Pragmatism or Systematic Planning?" Trans. C. Nader. in ed. Edmondson, J. *Augustus*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press: 229-249.

-------- (1995) *Die Verwaltung des Römischen Reiches in der Hohen Kaiserzeit: Ausgewählte und erweiterte Beiträge.* Basel: F Reinhardt.

Edmondson, J. (2008) "Public Dress and Social Control in Late Republican and Early Imperial Rome," in *Roman dress and the fabrics of Roman culture*. Ed J.C. Edmondson and A. Keith. (Toronto: University of Toronto Press): 21-46.

Edwards, C. (1996) *Writing Rome: Textual approaches to the city.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Eilers, C. (2002) *Roman Patrons of Greek cities.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Evans, J. D. (1992) *The Art of Persuasion: political propaganda from Aeneas to Brutus*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Fagan, G. G. (2011) "Violence in Roman Social Relations," in *Social Relations in the Roman World*. Ed. M. Peachin. Oxford: Oxford University Press: 467-495.

Feinberg, L. (1967) *Introduction to Satire*. Ames: Iowa State University Press.

Flower, H. (2011) "Elite Self-Representation in Rome," in *Social Relations in the Roman World*. Ed. M. Peachin. Oxford: Oxford University Press: 271-285.

-------- (2006) *The Art of Forgetting: Disgrace and Oblivion in Roman Political Culture*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press.

-------- (2004) "Spectacle and Political Culture in the Roman Republic," in *The Cambridge Companion to the Roman Republic*. Ed. H. Flower. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press): 322-343.

-------- (1999) *Ancestor masks and aristocratic power in Roman culture.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Friedländer, L. (1968/1908) *Roman Life and Manners Under the Early Empire, 2nd Ed*. Trans. L. Magnus. London: Routledge.

Fuhrmann, M. (1992) *Cicero and the Roman Republic*. Trans. W.E. Yuill. Oxfod: Blackwell.

Garnsey, P. and C. Humfress. *The Evolution of the Late Antique World*. Cambridge: Orchard Academic (2001).

Garnsey, P. and R. Saller (1989) *The Roman Empire: Economy, Society and Culture*. London: Duckworth.

George, M. (2008) "The Dark Side of the Toga," in *Roman dress and the fabrics of Roman culture*. Ed J.C. Edmondson and A. Keith. (Toronto: University of Toronto Press): 94-112.

Goldbeck, F. (2010) *Salutationes: die Morgenbegrüssungen in Rom in der Republik und der frühen Kaiserzeit*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.

Gowing, A. M. (2005) *Empire and Memory: the representation of the Roman Republic in imperial culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gruen, E. (1992) *Culture and National Identity in Republican Rome*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Habicht, C. "New Evidence on the Province of Asia," in *JRS* 65 (1975): 64-91.

Hales, S. (2003) *The Roman House and Social Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

-------- (2000) "At Home with Cicero," in *Greece & Rome* 47, no. 1: 44-55.

Hall, J. (1998) "The Deference-Greeting in Roman Society," in *Maia* 50, 413-426.

Hölkeskamp, K. (2010) *Reconstructing the Roman Republic*. Trans. H. Heitmann-Gordon. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

-------- (2006) "History and Collective Memory in the Middle Republic," in *A Companion to the Roman Republic*. Ed. N. Rosenstein and R. Morstein-Marx. (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing): 478-495.

-------- (2004) "Under Roman Roofs: Family, House and Household," in *The Cambridge Companion to the Roman Republic*. Ed. H. Flower. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press): 113-138.

Hölscher, T. (2003) "Images of War in Greece and Rome: Between Military Practice, Public Memory, and Cultural Symbolism," in *JRS* 93: 1-17

Hopkins, K. (1993) "Novel Evidence for Roman Slavery," in *Past and Present* 138: 3-27.

Horstkotte, H. "Das Album von Timgad die Bindung von Staatsbeamten an die Kurie," in *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 75 (1988): 237-246.

Jones, A.H.M. "The Roman Civil Service (Clerical and Sub-Clerical Grades)," in *JRS* 39 (1949): 38-55.

-------- "The Elections under Augustus," in *JRS* 45 (1955): 9-21.

-------- *The Later Roman Empire 284-602: a social, economic and administrative survey.* Norman: University of Oklahoma Press (1964).

Kelly, C. *Ruling the Later Roman Empire.* Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press (2004).

Kuttner, A. L. (1995) *Dynasty and empire in the age of Augustus: the case of the Boscoreale Cups*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Lendon, J.E. (2011) "Roman Honour," in *Social Relations in the Roman World*. Ed. M. Peachin. Oxford: Oxford University Press: 377-403.

-------- (1997) *Empire of Honour: The Art of Government in the Roman World*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Leschi, L. "L'album municipal de Timgad et l'<<*ordo salutationis*>> du consulaire Ulpius Mariscianus," in *Comptes-rendus de séances de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres* 91 (1947): 563-570.

Liebeschuetze, J.H.W.G. "Government and administration in the Late Empire," in J. Wacher (ed.), *The Roman World,* vol. I. London: Routledge, (1987), 455-69.

Lomas, K. (1997) "The idea of a city: Elite ideology and the evolution of urban form in Italy, 200 BC – AD 100," in *Roman Urbanism*, ed. H. Parkins (London: Routledge): 21-41.

Lowrie, M. (2009) *Writing, Performance and Authority in Augustan Rome.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Luce, T. J. (2009) "Livy, Augustus, and the *Forum Augustum*," in ed. Edmondson, J. *Augustus*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press: 399-416.

MacMullen, R. "The Epigraphic Habit in the Roman Empire," in *The American Journal of Philology* 103 (1982): 233-246.

-------- "Personal Power in the Roman Empire," in *The American Journal of Philology* 107 (1986): 512-524.

-------- (1974) *Roman Social Relations, 50 BC to AD 284.* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Marshall, A. "Governors on the Move," in *Pheonix* 20.3 (1966): 231-246.

McGuire, B.P. (2010) *Friendship and Community: The Monastic Experience, 350-1250*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Meyer, E. "Explaining the Epigraphic Habit in the Roman Empire: The Evidence of Epitaphs," in *JRS* 80 (1990): 74-96.

Millar, F. (2002) *Rome, the Greek World, and the* East. Vol 1: *The Roman Republic and the Augustan Revolution*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press.

-------- (1998) *The Crowd in Rome in the late Republic*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

-------- (1986) "Politics, Persuasion and the People before the Social War (150-90 BC)," in *JRS* 76: 1-11.

-------- (1984) "The Political Character of the Classical Roman Republic, 200-151 BC," in *JRS* 74: 1-19.

-------- (1977) *The emperor in the Roman world 31 BC – AD 337*. New York: Cornell University Press.

Momigliano, A. "An Interim Report on the Origins of Rome," in *JRS* 53 (1953): 95-121.

Mommsen, M. "Ordo Salutationis Sportularumque Sub Imp. Iuliano in Provincia Numidia," in *Ephemeris Epigraphica* V (1884): 629-646.

-------- *Römisches Staatsrecht.* Leipzig: S. Hirzel (1888).

Morstein-Marx, R. (1998) "Publicity, Popularity and Patronage in the *Commentariolum Petitionis*," in *Classical Antiquity* 17, no. 2: 259-288.

Mouritsen, H. (2001) *Plebs and Politics in the Late Roman Republic*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Noethlichs, K.L. "Zur Entstehung der Diözesen als Mittelinstanz des spätrömischen Verwaltungssystems," in *Historia* 31.1 (1982): 70-81.

North, J. (1990) "Politics and Aristocracy in the Roman Republic," in *Classical Philology* 85: 277-87.

O'Neill, P. (2003) "Going Round in Circles: Popular Speech in Ancient Rome," in *Classical Antiquity* 22, no. 1: 135-176.

Oost, S. I. (1958) "The Career of M. Antonius Pallas," in *The American Journal of Philology* 79: 113-39.

Paterson, J. (2007) "Friends in high places: the creation of the court of the Roman emperor," in A.J.S. Spawforth (ed.), *The court and court society in ancient monarchies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 121-156.

-------- (2006) "The City of Rome," in *A Companion to the Roman Republic*. Ed. N. Rosenstein and R. Morstein-Marx. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing: 345-364.

Peachin, M. (2011) "Introduction," in *Social Relations in the Roman World*. Ed. M. Peachin. Oxford: Oxford University Press: 3-36.

Pina Polo, F. (2011) "Public Speaking in Rome: A Question of *Auctoritas*," in *Social Relations in the Roman World*. Ed. M. Peachin. Oxford: Oxford University Press: 286-303.

Poulle, M. "Nouvelles Inscriptions de Timgad, de Lambèse et de Marcouna," in *Recueil des notices et memoires de la Société archéologique de la province de Constantine* 22 (1882): 401-406.

Purcell, N. (1987) "Rediscovering the Roman Forum," in *JRA* 2: 156-66.

Raaflaub, K. A. (2009) "The Political Significance of Augustus' Military Reforms," in *Augustus*. Ed. J. Edmondson. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press: 203-228.

Riccobono, *FIRA I*, Firenze (1941): 331-332, n. 64.

Robinson, A. (1994) "Cicero's References to His Banishment," in *The Classical World* 87, no. 6: 475-480.

Roller, M. B. (2001) *Constructing autocracy: aristocrats and emperors in Julio-Claudian Rome*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Rüpke, J. *Fasti sacerdotum: a Prosopography of pagan, Jewish, and Christian religious officials in the city of Rome, 300 BC to AD 499*. Oxford: Oxford University Press (2008).

Saller, R. (1989) "Patronage and friendship in early Imperial Rome: drawing the distinction," in ed. Wallace-Hadrill, A. *Patronage in Ancient Society*. London: Routledge: 49-62.

-------- (1983) "Martial on Patronage and Literature," in *The Classical Quarterly* 33.1: 246-257.

-------- (1982) *Personal Patronage under the early Empire.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

-------- (1980) "Anecdotes as Historical Evidence for the Principate," in *Greece & Rome* 27:69-83.

Saller, R. and B. Shaw. "Tombstones and Roman Family Relations in the Principate: Civilians, Soldiers and Slaves," in *JRS* 74 (1984): 124-156.

Sherwin-White, A. N. (1966) *The letters of Pliny: a historical and social commentary*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Slootjes, D. *The Governor and his subjects in the later Roman Empire.* Leiden: Brill (2006).

Steward, P. (2008) *The Social History of Roman Art.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Syme, R. (1939) *The Roman Revolution*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Talbert, R. J. (1984) *The Senate of Imperial Rome.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Tan, J. (2008) "*Contiones* in the Age of Cicero," in *Classical Antiquity* 27.1: 163-201.

Treggiari, S. (1998) "Home and Forum: Cicero between 'Public' and 'Private'," in *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 128: 1-23.

Usher, S. (2008) *Cicero's Speeches: The Critic in Action*. Oxford: Aris & Phillips.

Vasaly, A. (1993) *Representations: Images of the World in Ciceronian oratory*. California: University of California.

Verboven, K. (2011) "Friendship among the Romans," in *Social Relations in the Roman World*. Ed. M. Peachin. Oxford: Oxford University Press: 404-421.

Wallace-Hadrill, A. (1994) *Houses and society in Pompeii and Herculaneum.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

-------- (1989) "Patronage in Roman society: from Republic to Empire," in ed. Wallace-Hadrill, A. *Patronage in Ancient Society*. London: Routledge: 63-88.

Winterling, A. (2009) *Politics and Society in Imperial Rome*. Malden: Blackwell Publishing.

---------- (1999) *Aula Caesaris: Studien zur Institutionalisierung des römischen Kaiserhofes in der Zeit von Augustus bis Commodus*. Munich: Oldenbourg Wissenschaftsverlag.

Woolf, G. "Monumental Writing and the Expansion of Roman Society in the Early Empire," in *JRS* 86 (1996): 22-39.

Zanker, P. (1983) *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.