

[Slides 2 & 3 & 4 just talk through]

**[Slide 4]** *Concordia* provides a useful gateway into interlinking questions about late republican religion, politics, and social hierarchy, but most especially the Roman ability to mythologize expedient ideologies. Our evidence ranges from the textual, to the iconographic, to the topographical and archaeological. The ideological force of *concordia* is derived from the symbolic potency embedded in it by Cicero and his contemporaries. This potency is generated at the level of language - how the word itself comes to be connoted - but also at the narrative, or mythic, level, how familiar historical episodes are recast, reinterpreted, reiterated until they become conceptual exemplars.

Thus today, I begin at the level of language, before proceeding to the mythic. We'll proceed from Cicero's use of the rhetoric of *concordia*, to at the possible mythic origins of his conception of *concordia* and the pre-conceptions of his contemporary audience, then finally to reframings of those myths.

**[Slide 5]** Obviously, to understand what Cicero means when he refers to *concordia* it is not enough simply to render the Latin word itself into English, as concord or harmony or some other synonym. The various connotations of our own terminology obscure the original force of the Latin, and consequently distort our understanding of the historical signification of the concept.

**[Slide 6]** Cicero himself was building on a well-established tradition with nuances of its own. Thus we ought to see him not just as an author, a generator of unstable language, but also a dynamic reader of myth, a meaning-maker.

**[Slide 7]** In chronological terms, Cicero began to emphasise the importance of *concordia* in public affairs during his consulship of 63 BC and continued to use the language as he reframed the Catilinarian conspiracy after his return from exile. Those are the first two peaks on the timeline: each red dot represents one instance of the word *concordia* in the extant corpus, for a total of 96 instances over the whole corpus. However, as you can see, the rhetorical framework of *concordia* served his objectives so well that he returns to the concept throughout his later political career with particular peaks during later crises, especially Caesar's march on Rome and the period following his assassination. However, the meaning of *concordia* is not stable over this period: the same signifier acquired new significations in the dynamic political landscape.

**[Slide 8]** In his *Tusculan Disputations*, composed around the year 45 BC, Cicero gives an etiological explanation of *concordes* (1.8). It comes within his discussion of the location of the human soul: he points out that it is the soul's association with the heart - *cor, cordis* in Latin - which led to the creation of a number of compound words. He gives the basic meaning *concordes* as 'being of one heart', which perhaps can be rendered more naturally in English as 'being of one mind'. As a base meaning, or denotation, this isn't too far off common Latin usage across multiple periods.

**[Slide 9]** However, the inadequacy of this basic meaning to capture the totality of *concordia* has trouble translators and scholars of the last hundred years. A French scholar of the mid-20<sup>th</sup> century, Jal, proposed that it might be best to translate *concordia* as *pax civilis* or civil peace. A remarkably large number of the Loeb Translators prefer the English 'harmony' as their rendering of *concordia*.

**[click forward]** This use of harmony recalls the parallels in antiquity between Greek *homonoia* and Latin *concordia*. More recently, Emmanuele Curti, has argued that the origins of Roman *concordia*, particularly the introduction of the cult of Concord, should be seen as part of the overall Hellenistic influences on Rome during the fourth century. In this he echoes the earlier assertions of Momigliano.

**[click forward]** However, Momigliano was still keen to differentiate *homonoia* from *concordia*: he saw the Greek concept as reflecting a re-assertion of the status quo, whereas he felt the Latin concept was rooted in social change. Yet, Momigliano was focusing on the received historical tradition of the fourth century BC from the imperial historians, primarily Livy, and there is a not insignificant school of thought that view the importance given to *concordia* in these narratives is the result of anachronistic interpretations of the past in light of contemporary developments. Thus we are left to return to the Ciceronian corpus to provide its own immediate context.

The connotations of the term for Cicero are in part revealed by those ideas which he regularly associates with *concordia*.

**[Slide 10]** In the first passage under number one on the handout and the top passage on the screen Cicero is reporting in a letter to Atticus early in 61 BC the topics which he covered in a recent speech to the Senate. At this meeting of the *Patres* Pompey had been pressed for his opinion on the Bona Dea Scandal, and answered with his endorsement of senatorial authority. Cicero spoke particularly with an eye to cultivating Pompey's good will.

His list of topics appears loosely to follow Roman social hierarchy, in descending order. First Cicero told the senators how important their own authority was, then he reminded them of their common ground with the equestrians and the men of Italy. By mentioning *Italia* Cicero does not mean the

small landholders or free labourers, but men such as his own father, men he often terms *domi nobiles*, those who of noble standing within their own communities.

It is only after addressing these aristocratic topics that Cicero proceeded to speak about popular issues such as the remnants of the Catilinarian uprising and the price of grain. The pairing of *concordia* with Senatorial authority is not just a nod to Pompey on this occasion; it is thematic throughout Cicero's writings, as you can see from the other two passages. These passages suggest an intimate link in Cicero's thinking between senatorial control and *concordia*.

Could *concordia* then simply signify the acquiescence of the lower social orders in the oligarchic rule of the Senate?

[Slide 11] We can perhaps modify this interpretation by considering how Cicero felt *concordia* could be achieved, or more specifically what must be done by the senatorial order to preserve *concordia*. I have collected the references to the most relevant passages under number two on the handout with brief summaries.

From these examples it becomes clear that for the sake of *concordia* Cicero will condone actions which in themselves he does not consider honourable. As in so many cases, it is a *Letter to Atticus* which is most explicit about the contrast between Cicero's public stance and his own personal morals. Here Cicero expresses his abhorrence at the dishonourable request of the *publicani* to have their original contract for tax farming in the province of Asia cancelled, but speaks with optimism as to his chances of securing this so as to preserve the existing *concordia*.

In the other two examples, from a letter to Lentulus Spinther and the *pro Balbo*, the contradiction between Cicero's actions and his desires is only implied, although he does make explicit that his primary motivation for each course of action, reconciliation with Crassus on the one hand and support of Caesar's legislation on the other, is *concordia*.

From these concrete examples we have a clear view of some of the situations in which Cicero felt compromise was appropriate so as to promote *concordia*: he was willing to make concessions to the equestrian order and to political opponents in positions of power. This begins to situate *concordia* into a hierarchy of relative social values: to imbue this abstract ideological stance with the moral authority to justify otherwise transgressive or liminal acts.

However, to properly situate *concordia* within a frame this hierarchy of values, we also have to ask what wouldn't Cicero do for *concordia*? Or more specifically, is senatorial authority really as integral to *concordia* as the earlier examples suggested? Or may it too be sacrificed at Concord's altar?

Here we need some insight from Cicero's theoretical writings. A relevant passage is found in the *de officiis*, after condemning those who destabilize their communities by proposing 'popular legislation' on agrarian reform or debt cancellation, he uses Aratus of Sicyon as an exemplary politician who resolved disputes over land. Aratus satisfied the claims of returning exiles and the present landholders by borrowing from King Ptolemy so as to offer compensation to whichever party would set aside its claim to the territory.

Here we see Cicero acknowledging that agrarian issues need to be addressed, but holding firm to the property rights of the occupants. Thus Cicero has a line he will not cross, but still extols flexibility in politics, as we see in the rhetoric of the *pro Plancio*.

**[Slide 12]** It is in the *de re publica* that we finally find resolution between Cicero's ideal of political flexibility and his alignment of *concordia* with senatorial authority. He has Scipio, his primary interlocutor, trace the champions of citizens' rights from the regal period onward, particularly highlighting the right of *provocatio*, that is the right of appeal to the people against capital sentences. This fairly liberal discussion is only fully understood when we come to the concluding analysis, and I've set out this rather remarkable passage on your handout as the last lines on side one:

This was a man of no mean ability, in my view, who, by granting to the people moderate freedom, more easily maintained the authority of the leading men in the state.

Cicero sees reasonable concessions to the lower orders within the state as the primary means of securing the continuing respect and authority of the oligarchy, and thus Cicero's *concordia* is a feature of the ideal state in which the aristocracy makes appropriate and wise concessions to the wider population, and the population in turn acknowledges and concedes the right of the aristocracy to rule.

**[Slide 13]** If we are now fairly confident about what Cicero meant by language of *concordia*, we ready to give some thought to the myth of *concordia*. As Barthes tell us, it is the reader that makes the myth. By the act of reading abstract concepts are married to images, landscapes, historical exempla. These signs become signifiers of social values though shared communal experiences and re iterations. Or, to put it in simpler terms, Cicero's *concordia* gains its significance from how his contemporary audience nuanced its historical context and contemporary connections.

[Slide 14] As already alluded to, Momigliano believed that particular significance can be found in the fourth-century conditions surrounding the first temples to Concordia, namely that in both cases the dedications followed concessions by the aristocracy to the plebs: first, the temple of 367 BC which is remembered as a thank offering for the resolution of the turmoil preceding plebeian admission to the consulship, and the second smaller aedicule which was said to have been dedicated after key calendrical and legal information was made public.

[Slide 15] Curti has recently gone even further, pointing out the proximity of the sacred precinct of *Concordia* to the Comitium. [Talk through the slide]

[Slide 16, again talk through depiction.] Curti draws a parallel with the positioning of the temples of *homonoia* in relation to the *bouleteria* in many Greek cities and suggests that the success of the cult of *homonoia* in Magna Graecia can be seen as a sign of a corresponding move to democratic forms of government, and that Rome was participating in this same shift. It is a tempting parallel, but our understanding of fourth-century Magna Graecia is much more advanced than our understanding of fourth-century Rome, for which we are still over-dependent on historical accounts from the imperial period. It is worth noting that archaeological remains at the site in the forum associated with the temples of concord have not yet produced any evidence of construction before the second century BC.

[Slide 17] The location of the temple which was vowed in 218 is also disputed, though the balance of scholarship at the moment seems to situate it on the Arx near the temple of Juno Moneta. For our purposes it is more important to note that Livy associates its foundation with the repression of a mutiny by L. Manlius as a praetor in Gaul. The temple fulfilled his vow to the divinity for allowing proper, hierarchical, order to be restored. This late 3<sup>rd</sup> century temple is much ideologically closer to the foundation of 121 BC, than the 4<sup>th</sup> century examples.

[Slide 18] After the execution without trial of C. Gracchus and his supporters, up to some 3,000 Roman citizens, the consul Lucius Opimius restored the temple of Concordia at the behest of the senate and also constructed next to it a Basilica that bore his name.

[Slide 19] [Just talk through slide – esp. change in the senate house]

By founding this temple and associating it with a building that bore his name Opimius set the conditions for his identity and these locations to be inextricably linked not only with *concordia*, but a concept of *concordia* borne out of the violent suppression of disruptions of social order. Plutarch tells

us someone crept up to the temple at night to add a apt graffito ‘The work of discord produces Concord’s temple’.

[Slide 20] In the interests of time I do not intend to do a point-by-point comparison of Opimius’ career with the development of Cicero’s use of Opimius in his writings, though you will find two timelines with fuller notations and references laid out under numbers 5 and 6 on the handout. The key points to observe are that before the Catilinarian conspiracy, Cicero was more interested in Opimius’ conduct in the aftermath of Fregellae than in the Gracchan episode [Click] and that in the crisis itself Opimius is held up as a positive example of decisive action in response to a senatorial mandate [Click], something he only again advocates in the chaos following Caesar’s demise 20 years later [Click]. It is only after Cicero’s own experience of exile and return that Opimius comes to be a recurrent example of a man whose patriot service is undervalued [Click], as well as useful didactic example of how judicial cases often hinge not on the facts of the case, but instead the legitimacy of the justification [Click]. Clearly, Cicero’s Opimius grows to suit Cicero’s own life experiences. But does this pattern undermine the idea that is invoked Opimius as a signifier of *concordia* as a social value? It might seem that way until we realize that Cicero chooses to ‘remember’ Opimius’ exile as the result not of his alleged corruption by Jugurtha, but instead a direct consequence of his violent suppression of the Gracchi. This version of events makes Opimius a martyr for *concordia*, one who gave the ultimate sacrifice. It also allows Cicero to personally identify with Opimius. It is certainly a mythologizing of Opimius. And the historian in me fears, even rejects, the fictionalization of the narrative past.

[Slide 21] Yet, here too Barthes can offer some guidance. Cicero is certainly living the Opimian myth and his highly personalized connection with this choice exempla is part of the unreality of the myth. But the high resonance of myth, the strength of its allure to Cicero and his audience is that it is also ground in the true: Gary Farney showed through a close reading and contextualization of *Brutus* 128 in his 1997 article that those condemned under the lex Mamilia were all *inimici* of the Gracchi, Opimius among them, and their prosecution harkened back to the earlier period. It is this motivated prosecution that Cicero emphasizes in order mythologize Opimius as *concordia*’s martyr, at the expense of the memory of his involvement in the Jugurthine controversies.

[Slide 22] Opimius’ legacy, especially his link to *concordia*, extends beyond the literary exempla. We need also to recall that it is not only the foundation of monuments, but also their later use and positioning which give them significance in the eyes of contemporaries. The temple of Concord - Opimius’ temple - was well used in the Late Republic for senatorial meetings on potentially controversial issues, particularly those with a degree of ‘class’ disagreement. When we realize how

close the Cornelia Curia is, that is the Sullan House **[click forward]**, it becomes obviously that the choice to forego the curia in favour of the temple of concordia could be only be a symbolic, not practical choice.

Cicero convened the Senate in Opimius' temple on the west end of the Forum at the foot of the Capitoline for that famous meeting of the Senate on December 3, 63 at which he revealed evidence about the Catilinarian Conspiracy. When the Senate wanted to put on mourning to show their concern at Cicero's exile, they met to discuss the matter in the temple of Concord. During the grain-supply crisis in 57 the consul Metellus called a meeting in this same temple to which the urban plebs flocked to express their fears. The temple was again used repeatedly for meetings of the Senate after the Ides of March when the future of the republic was under discussion.

The strong connection between the temple of Concord and the suppression of the Gracchan reforms makes the use of the space in the late republic intimately linked with the conservative, anti-populist approach. And it is this link which Cicero exploits by using the temple during the Catilinarian conspiracy, as well as by using the rhetoric of concord in his political discourse.

**[Slide 23]** It is no coincidence that the goddess *Concordia* first becomes iconographically enshrined on the coinage in the year after Cicero's consulship.

The young moneyers of 62 were elected in 63 BC and were on good terms with Cicero. One was Lucius Aemilius Lepidus Paullus, the future consul of 50 BC and the brother of triumvir Marcus Aemilius Lepidus. The other was Lucius Scribonius Libo the future consul of 34 BC. Their coinage not only recalls Cicero's emphasis on *concordia* but also supplies us with further conceptual contextualization.

The series blend images associated with both moneyers to create a more unified program of images than is often seen in the republican coin series. The parallel obverse type with *concordia* is *bonus eventus*. **[click]** The 'good outcome' is regularly interpreted as the suppression of the Catilinarian Conspiracy.

The reverse design on some of these coins may also be relevant. **[click]** It shows the 'puteal', a monument on the opposite end of the forum from the temple of Concord. 'Puteal' is usually translated into English as 'well-cover', but this is not wholly accurate as in a religious context the puteal is an altar-like structure used to mark a point which has been struck by lightning.

The Puteal in the Roman Forum had not only a religious significance, but in the late republic and early empire took on also a judicial association, being the point to which delinquent debtors would be summoned by their creditors to be held to account at the nearby praetors' tribunal. Given the association of popular uprisings like that of Catiline's with the issue of debt, it is possible that the reverse as well as the obverse has contemporary political significance. Of course, reverse and obverse need not necessarily always have a connection, as is seen in the case of the third coin of this series with *concordia* on the obverse, but which simply displays on the reverse historical subject matter, the triumph of the moneyer's ancestor, Aemilius Paulus, over Perseus the king of Macedonia. Unless, and I propose only as a fanciful speculation, this reverse represents the securing of *concordia* through the imposition of correct social order, Rome establishing dominion over the foreign kingdoms.

[Slide 24] So far, the comparative material of the temple foundation and usage and numismatic iconography seems to support our conclusions that *concordia* has connotations related to the reinforcement of social hierarchy and even the suppression of popular uprising. But it is reasonable still to doubt that a term like *concordia* which seems so tied to unity and oneness can really imply an unequal partnership. Can inequality be a social value codified in myth?

[Slide 25] At first, these hesitations may seem to be confirmed by a simple reading of the *de re publica*. In Scipio's summary of the arguments in favour of democracy he seems to suggest that equality is synonymous with *concordia*. However, as always with Cicero's dialogues, we must be careful not to take each statement as necessarily Cicero's own view. As we read further, we find Scipio undermining the values of the democratic state, so as to show the superiority of Rome's mixed constitution.

[Slide 26] And in the next book we even find an explicit statement that concord is actually the balancing of unequal and dissimilar elements within a state. [Read out from Slide]

[Slide 27] Likewise at the forceful conclusion of his fourth Catilinarian, Cicero recalls the patriotic sentiments of each part of the Roman state, in descending order of status. The excerpt I give makes explicit that *concordia* is actually derived from the willingness of the equites to concede the authority of the senate.

[Slide 28] The compatibility of *concordia* with social inequality can be demonstrated in other ways, such as through examples from social history and also again iconographic representations. In a domestic context *concordia* is regularly used by the Romans to describe the marriage state at its best;

I hope I need not convince any of you that the Romans held the position of women to be inferior to that of their male protectors.

**[Slide 29]** And finally, there is just a little more iconography to consider; This coin was struck in 70 BC. You can see from the later comparative pieces I've illustrated that it uses the visual language of *concordia* in the clasping of hands of the two figures. This symbolic language is borrowed from Greek representations of *homonoia*. However, what I would like you to notice on the reverse design is the depiction of the two figures. On the left is Italia dressed in feminine clothing, offering a cornucopia to Roma on the right. Roma is in military dress with her foot resting on the globe. She stands taller than Italia and is clearly the dominant partner. This coin was minted in the aftermath of the Social War and well before Cicero developed his rhetoric of *concordia* in response to the Catilinarian Crisis. The reverse design clearly indicated the 'appropriate' relationship of *Italia* to the Roman state. The two are united in a common purpose, but Rome is always dominant. This is also part of *concordia*'s myth.

**[Slide 30]** Some have pushed the analysis of this myth back to mythic foundations of the city.

**[Slide 31]** Others forward into the imperial period.

**[Slide 32]** But for today I've said more than enough. Thank you.

[3,806 words]