

ANCIENT ROME – Political History

Frederic Will, Ph.D.

Contents

Part I : Government

Part II : Military

GOVERNMENT

Overview While it is simplistic to characterize Roman government, which lasted for two millennia, as a static unit, one can say that for much of that period there was at least the semblance of stable consistent institutions. These institutions were put in place, more or less exactly, in 509 B.C.E., at the overthrow of the Roman monarchy, and the origin of the Roman Republic, and (though in debased form for many centuries in the Christian era), survived until the fall of the Roman Empire in the middle of the 15th century C.E.

The Roman Republic The Roman monarchy (753 B.C.E.--509 B.C.E.) was, by mythical account, founded by Romulus--of Romulus and Remus and the she-wolf--and bore little resemblance, in its absolutism, with the Roman Republic (509 B.C.E.--27 B.C.E.) Though passing through various stages, living through the internal conflicts of a major state, warding off pernicious enemies like the Carthaginians, the Republic laid down the basic regulating principles that were to dominate Roman society throughout its existence. The huge caveat that must be made, however, is that in 27 B.C.E., when Augustus had himself declared 'the first of the citizens,' namely the Emperor, the institutions of governments were virtually absorbed and taken over by the will of the dictator.

The institutions of government From the beginningg of the Republic, the Romans conferred regulatory power on two **consuls**, holding power for one year, who exercised control of the army. (Their power-supporters were the patrician landholding families, who had been behind the scenes dominants even during the Monarchy.) Throughout the Republic, at least, these chosen officials were of lofty influence. **Tribunes** were chosen, as representatives and defenders of the people, while the Roman equivalent of a Constitution, The Twelve Tables, were promulgated in 450 B.C.E., codifying statutes securing the little man's rights. Concurrently, a **Senate** was chosen. Initially with 100 members (later with 1000 then with 600, under decree of the Emperor Augustus.) The function of this body of lifetime state servants was advisory, to provide their collective wisdom on state finances, foreign affairs and negotiations; many of Rome's movers and shakers--Cato the Younger, Brutus, Cicero--cut their political teeth in this office. Finally there were a number of lesser offices, which could however prove to be immensely potent steps on the **cursus honorum** (step ladder of honors, leading ever higher in national government). These were the offices of the **aedile** (in charge of public works), the **quaestor** (chief financial officer, collector of government taxes), and the **praetor** (who presides over the senate.)

Afterthought The practice of democracy was slowly won as the Roman Republic matured, but rapidly compromised when the system of Emperors took over. Nonetheless, even in the times when democracy was most seriously debased, in the later Empire, the Romans held on to at least the shadow of their Republican past.

Readings

Eck, Werner, *The Age of Augustus*, Oxford, 2003.

Flower, Harriet, *Roman Republics*, Princeton, 2009.

Discussion questions

How do you explain the emotional hold of the Roman Republic over the Roman people, even after centuries of de facto dictatorship?

What kind of substitute for a Constitution were the Twelve Tables? What kind of security did they provide for the man on the street?

What influence from the Roman government does the government of your state reveal? Can you trace ways in which your own life has been impacted by the government of ancient Rome?

MILITARY

Romans and the military. The Roman army, a powerful component of the Roman state, one on which perhaps fifty per cent of the national budget was spent, in the early Empire. If the influence of Rome is dominant throughout the ancient ‘civilized world,’ from Parthia to Northumbria, it is largely because the Roman army was omnipresent in that extent of the globe.

The Roman army. What was this Roman army? It was the protective arm of the Roman state, and carried with it both an aggressive/dominative function and a policing capacity; once alien armies were defeated, semi-militarized occupation forces were left to organize the new territory—though on certain occasions compliant or useful foreign areas were given the privilege of organizing and policing themselves. At the peak of its power the army comprised 45 to 120 million members, all men, all citizens; it is estimated that fifty percent of the national budget went into military expenses, in the first two centuries of the Empire. All candidates for the army—in theory anyway—were thoroughly vetted as appropriate for military work. The recruiters worked on basic principles, preferring military candidates who were around 18 years of age, strong and loyal to the state—depending on the time period in question—and fully prepared for teamwork, for severe group spirit was mandatory in the Roman army.

The Army as a Profession. Needless to say, this was a professional army; members signed up for 25 years. Their primary garrison was at Rome, although there were large, often permanent, military stations throughout the Empire. (We speak here chiefly of developments within the Empire, for it was not until the late Republic that the army began to take on its highly organized character—each detail of its provision, movement, and working condition being notoriously well planned from above, down to the hobnail pattern on the soldiers’ boots.)

The army’s fighting tactics. The fighting prowess of the Roman army was famously tied in to the matter of teamwork, and in being thus tied in was also defined as a highly regimented force. When it comes to technical developments, the Roman army changed remarkably little from early Republic to the end of the Empire; steel was not yet available during the Roman military period, so the weapons available to soldiers were made of bronze or, later in the Empire, of iron—thus were not of higher quality than the weapons of many of their foes.

The Superiority of the Roman Army. In balance for that, though, the Roman soldiery was significantly better trained than most—meaning those ‘barbarian’ forces whose military prowess was gradually growing, along the borders of the Empire. The new Roman recruit would train by fighting against robust wooden stakes—which would represent enemy infantry people—and would fight those mock enemy with wicker work shields and wooden swords. (These mock implements would be significantly lighter than the metal weapons used in actual combat.) The basic marching requirement was to cover 18.5 miles in five hours, that is at a firm marching pace; serious competence in swimming was also expected.

The Omnicompetent Roman Soldier. As this last pairing, of marching strength with swimming, might suggest, the Roman soldier was expected to be pretty omnicompetent on the job, and that in fact is where the surpassing capacity of the Roman army lay. The infantryman carried with him not only his sword (his *gladius*) and his *pila* (his much feared, armor-piercing javelins), but his shovel, for a variety of encampment logistics. The Roman soldier was prepared for a high variety of military engineering skills, ranging from road building—often necessary on the spot in the innumerable remote areas of the Roman Empire—through the construction of siege engines, through the rapid construction of vast encampments.

Logistics and teamwork. The brilliance and severity of the Roman military achievement can be encapsulated in a couple of points. The establishment of long supply chains reached great heights among the Roman armies. These chains—as say between the main Roman garrison in the capitol, and outposts on the Rhenish barbarian frontier—would often cross high mountains in freezing weather, then move to rivers like the Rhine or Donau, across which the Roman navy would move materiel, then there would be a transfer to military caravans which would continue the materiel transport to the north. For such achievements—which seem closely related to the Romans’ monumental architectural skills—discipline and the fear of punishment were indispensable. The Roman camp was not a boy scout camp, and military training among the Romans has been called, by one eminent military historian, like the training of the American marines, only ‘a lot nastier.’ The Greek historian, Polybius (3rd century B.C.) describes in the following terms the consequences of the cowardice of a cohort:

if ever these same things happen to occur among a large group of men... the officers reject the idea of bludgeoning or slaughtering all the men involved [as is the case with a small group or an individual]. Instead they find a solution for the situation which chooses by a lottery system sometimes five, sometimes eight, sometimes twenty of these men, always calculating the number in this group with reference to the whole unit of offenders so that this group forms one-tenth of all those guilty of cowardice. And these men who are chosen by lot are bludgeoned mercilessly...

Reading

Soldiers and Ghosts: A History of Battle in Classical Antiquity, J.E. Lendon (New Haven, 2005), pp. 163-315. A readable account of how the Romans actually fought.

Discussion questions

What was the role of teamwork in the Roman army? Why was so much emphasis put on teamwork? How were soldiers punished, who refused to participate in the team effort?

Why was the issue of supply lines, and the according logistics, so important to the Roman army? Does their logistical skill tie into other abilities characteristic of the Roman people? You might want to develop your responses in terms of mechanical and architectural skills in ancient Rome.

Why do you think the Roman state delegated to the army the job of organizing new colonies? Was the army good at that? What determined the occasional decision of the Roman government, to allow occupied territories to police and protect themselves?