

## Interstate Kinship and Roman Foreign Policy\*

Sue Elwyn  
Brigham Young University

We know of fewer than twenty occasions on which the Romans advanced or recognized a claim of kinship with another state, using such specific terms as *fraternitas*, *cognatio*, or *consanguinitas* in Latin, ἀδελφία, συγγένεια, οἰκειότης, or ὁμοφυλία in Greek. These occurrences range in date from the mid-third century B.C. to the first century A.D. The majority may be thought of minor importance in Roman foreign policy, although a few are associated with such significant events as the start of the First Punic War and Caesar's invasion of Gaul. Interstate kinship apparently played only a small role in Rome's expansion and foreign policy. This cannot be taken as an indication, however, that the Romans were unaware of or uninterested in matters of kinship, their own origins, or their relations to other peoples. The very titles of Cato's *Origines* and Varro's *De gente populi Romani* and *De vita populi Romani* suggest the contrary. While Virgil's *Aeneid* is the best-known work on Rome's Trojan origins, many other references to that particular line of descent survive, and the topic was one of considerable interest to the Romans, as it remains for modern scholars.<sup>1</sup> Although the Trojans provided the most famous and the most popular descent-legend for Rome, other origins were proposed—including descent from the Achaeans, from Odysseus, and from Evander—which found at least partial acceptance among the Romans.<sup>2</sup>

---

\*I would like to thank R. E. A. Palmer, who first encouraged me to investigate the function of interstate kinship in the Roman world, and the editor and reviewers of *TAPA* for their constructive criticisms. An earlier version of this paper was presented at the 1992 CAMWS meeting in Austin, TX.

<sup>1</sup>The alleged descent of Rome from the Trojans, and the story's social, cultural and political ramifications, have been the subject of much discussion, e.g. Perret; Alföldi; Galinsky; Momigliano 1984: esp. 384-88 and 437-62; Gabba 1-22; Farrow; Gruen 1992: 6-51; Linderski.

<sup>2</sup>Gabba 12-151; 116-17; Gruen 1992: 8-21. In Gabba's view, Virgil for all his promotion of the Trojan, non-Greek, identity of Aeneas, accepted the notion of "the Greek nucleus of the Roman people" espoused by proponents of the Greek origin of Rome, notably Dionysius of Halicarnassus (116-17). The theory has since been challenged by Linderski.

The relative lack of evidence would imply, however, that treaties of kinship were not inherently a Roman phenomenon, but were borrowed from elsewhere. Such adoption of foreign institutions has been observed by other scholars, notably Erich Gruen, who has successfully argued that, in moving into the Hellenistic world, the Romans made use of a number of Greek diplomatic practices, including *φιλία*, third-party arbitration for the settlement of international disputes, and such slogans as “freedom of the Greeks.”<sup>3</sup> This paper will argue that treaties of kinship were also Greek in origin, and that, in using them, the Romans were for the most part responding to foreign initiatives or adapting Greek diplomatic practice to their own ends.

In contrast to the limited use of interstate kinship terminology in Roman contexts, the evidence for Greek use of these terms is abundant. Over 100 epigraphic examples of such usage survive from late Classical and Hellenistic times, most of them dating to the third and early second centuries B.C.<sup>4</sup> We also have literary references to interstate kinship, ranging in date from the late fifth century B.C. to the third century A.D.<sup>5</sup> Where grounds for interstate kinship can be established, the great majority of relationships look to a common mythological ancestor. Thucydides’ discussion of the relationships between those fighting on either side of the battle for Syracuse in 413 B.C. bases kinship on descent from the eponymous heroes of the great ethnic divisions of the Greek race; Ion, Dorus, Aeolus, etc. (7.57-58). One decree from among the large series of inscriptions from Magnesia-on-the-Maeander recognizing the festival of Artemis Leucophryene (*Inscr. Magn.* 16-87) says explicitly that the basis of kinship between Magnesia and Cephallenian Samê is common descent from Aeolus through Magnes, eponym of Magnesia, and Cephalus, eponym of Cephallenia (*Inscr. Magn.* 35); legendary relationships can be traced for the

<sup>3</sup>For *φιλία*, Gruen 1984: 13-53; for arbitration, Gruen 96-131; for slogans and propaganda, Gruen 132-57.

<sup>4</sup>This discussion of kinship terminology in Hellenistic diplomatic contexts derives from an ongoing study of the topic: a preliminary analysis has appeared as a doctoral dissertation (Elwyn). Among the earliest attestations of interstate kinship terminology are *SEG* XXXIV 282, *Staatsverträge* III 453 and *Inscr. Prien.* 5, all of which date to the last quarter of the fourth century B.C.; among the latest, the series from Acraephia (including *IG* 4138, 4139, 4141 and 4142), dated to the late second century B.C. (but note a late, archaizing inscription from Argos, recording *συγγένεια* between Argos and Aegeae discussed by Robert 120-28, which dates to the second century A.D.).

<sup>5</sup>Thus Thuc. 5.104; 108 and 7.57-58; Cassius Dio 11.10-12; and between these two chronological extremes—a representative, but by no means complete list of references—Isoc. *Plataicus* 51, *Panegyricus* 43; Polyb. 4.54.6, 8.33.9; D.S. 5.25.1, 12.83.1; D.H. *Ant. Rom.* 1.17.1, 3.2.28, 5.26.3; Str. 3.2.15, 4.3.2, 5.3.2; and J. *AJ* 9.288-91, 11.340-41.

remainder of the states which issued decrees in the Magnesian series, and for almost all instances where kinship terminology is used of interstate relations. Less frequently, colonization forms the tie between two states: for example, Phintian Gela and Camarina seemed to have claimed kinship with Cos on the grounds that both had been colonized by Coans during Timoleon's resettlement of Sicily,<sup>6</sup> and kinship between the Aetolian League and a city known only as Heraclea was based on the status of the Heracleotes as colonists of the Aetolians (*IG IX* 1<sup>2</sup> 173).

Almost all claims of interstate kinship obtained between two or more Greek cities. In the series from Magnesia, thirty-one inscriptions contain kinship terms. The names of six of the states recognizing kinship have been lost, but all the others can be identified as Greek.<sup>7</sup> We know of a few instances where non-Greeks claimed kinship with Greeks or with other non-Greeks,<sup>8</sup> but such claims are relatively unusual, and at times depart from the patterns to be discerned in the Greek treaties.<sup>9</sup> Recognition of kinship between Greek states is to be found throughout the οἰκουμένη, from as far west as Massalia—which, as we shall see below, recognized ἀδελφία claimed by Lampsacus (*SIG*<sup>3</sup> 591=*Inscr. Lampsakos* 4)—to Cyrene in the south (*IG XII* 5.814), Persis in the east (*Inscr. Magn.* 61) and in the north at Sinope on the south coast of the Black Sea (*IG XII* 9.1186).

In the epigraphic record, the subject-matter of treaties which contain kinship terminology tends to fall into one of several broad categories. Interstate kinship is associated with treaties granting polity or isopolity to an entire community,<sup>10</sup> with treaties recognizing the establishment or reorganization of

<sup>6</sup>*SEG XII* 379, 380; Herzog 45; Seibert 129-32; Asheri; Talbert 150, 204-205.

<sup>7</sup>*Inscr. Magn.* 16, 25, 26, 31-38, 41-48, 52, 53, 61, 70, 72, 80; *SEG XII*.217b. The six lost are *Inscr. Magn.* 49, 56, 57, 64, 73b, 79.

<sup>8</sup>For example, Mylasa, a Carian city, claimed kinship with Miletos (*Staatsverträge* III 539), Tyre with Delphi (*SEG II* 330) and the Maccabees claimed kinship between the Jews and the Spartans (*I Maccabees* 12.1-23).

<sup>9</sup>For example, Josephus records ὁμοφυλία between the royal family of Adiabene and the Jews (*AJ* 20.17); this seems to be based solely on the conversion of that family to Judaism. Although Greek claims of kinship are clearly associated with religious matters, I know of no other instance where joint worship is the only requirement to establish such a bond.

<sup>10</sup>Among others, *SEG XXXIV* 282 (in which Argos granted polity to Aspendus); *IG XI* 1<sup>2</sup> 173 (in which the Aetolians grant polity to Heraclea and promise to approach King Ptolemy on behalf of the city); *Staatsverträge* III 539 (contains two decrees, one from Mylasa and one from Miletus, which exchange citizen-rights between the two communities).

religious festivals,<sup>11</sup> with the recognition of certain types of territorial *ἄσυλία*,<sup>12</sup> and with requests for foreign judges to act as arbiters of a boundary dispute between two cities<sup>13</sup> or of some internal matter.<sup>14</sup> A few deal with requests for legal redress or legal rights in a foreign state.<sup>15</sup> Two elements seem to be common to almost all these compacts: an element, however remote, of religious worship and a certain inequality between the states involved. The religious element in the recognition of religious festivals speaks for itself. The type of territorial inviolability associated with the recognition of interstate kinship seems always to involve either a sanctuary (*SEG* XII 369) or the dedication of the inviolable territory to a deity (for example, *Inscr. Cret.* I v 52\* [pp. 25-26]). Where boundary disputes or legal matters are concerned, the religious aspect may seem more remote, but we should remember that, for the Greeks, boundaries came under divine protection, and much of law itself looked ultimately to the gods for its authority. Much the same can be said of treaties involving a grant or exchange of citizen-rights. Polity in a Greek city-state was closely involved with kinship and kinship with religion; citizens were required to participate in rituals dedicated to the civic deities, rituals from which outsiders were frequently excluded. To be a citizen, in other words, was, at least in part, to participate in civic religion.

The matter of inequality between two signatories to a specific treaty manifests itself in a number of ways. When one state recognizes and agrees to participate in a religious festival held by a second state as at, for example, Magnesia-on-the-Maeander, the first state is granting a favor which is, by its very nature, essentially unilateral. Although one might say that the state recognizing the festival is acting piously, and will thus be pleasing to the gods,

---

<sup>11</sup>Among others, the recognition decrees for the Leucophryena at Magnesia-on-the-Maeander (*Inscr. Magn.* 16-87), for the Asclepieia at Cos (*SEG* XII 368-83), and reorganization of the festival of Apollo at Actium (*IG* IX 12 583).

<sup>12</sup>The series for Magnesia (*Inscr. Magn.* 16-87) and Cos (*SEG* XII 368-83), and the two series for Teos which include, among others, *SIG*<sup>3</sup> 563, and *Inscr. Cret.* I v 52\* (pp. 25-26) and 53\* (pp. 27-28).

<sup>13</sup>For example, *OGI* Suppl. 335 I-III (a dispute between Pitana and Mytilene settled by judges from Pergamum); *SIG*<sup>3</sup> 683 (dispute between Messenia and Lacedaemon settled by Milesian arbiters).

<sup>14</sup>*Inscr. Prien.* 50 (an honorific decree for a Prienean who judged an internal dispute for Erythrae); *Inscr. Lampsakos* 33 (honorific decree for a Lampsacene who settled a dispute for Colophon).

<sup>15</sup>Including many of the Teian series, e.g., *Inscr. Cret.* I xiv 1\* (Istron) and *SIG*<sup>3</sup> 563 (the Aetolians); and *IG* XII 2.15 (a grant of legal rights by the Aetolians to the people of Mytilene).

the fact remains that the state holding the festival will benefit far more than the state acknowledging it. Territorial ἀσυλία is also innately one-sided. A specific city will ask for recognition of its territory as sacred and inviolable, usually in response to a divine epiphany and/or an oracle (e.g. *Inscr. Magn.* 16). There can be no question of reciprocity. A request for foreign arbitration is similarly non-reciprocal, since the need for arbitration will not apply to the state asked to stand in judgment. In these cases, the inequality is one of circumstance. The states granting the request may be more powerful or less powerful than the state making the request; the situation provides that the latter will benefit more than the former if the request is fulfilled.

Treaties of polity and treaties granting legal rights operated rather differently, since both could be reciprocal. Kinship terms tended to be associated with such matters when a grant was unilateral,<sup>16</sup> when there was considerable difference in power between the state making the grant and the recipient,<sup>17</sup> when other benefits, also one-sided, accompanied the polity or legal rights and claim of kinship,<sup>18</sup> or when there was no over-riding reason, other than kinship, for the grant.<sup>19</sup> In these cases, the claims of kinship appear to have been advanced by the less important party, the one likely to receive the greater benefit from the compact. When both signatories benefit equally, or when there are other important considerations accompanying the grant of polity,<sup>20</sup> we see no sign of kinship terms.

The literary evidence paints a rather different picture, to some extent because of its different purposes. Civic inscriptions, which provide the great majority of our information about interstate kinship in the Greek world, were intended in part to provide a record but also to glorify the state which erected them. Consequently, our epigraphic documentation tends to record, or at least imply, successful negotiations. Literary evidence not infrequently records *unsuccessful* allusions to interstate kinship. While Thucydides records thirteen

<sup>16</sup>For example, *GDI* 5182, a unilateral grant of πολιτεία at Erannos to the people of Teos.

<sup>17</sup>*SEG* XVIII 245, recognizing a grant of Aetolian citizen-rights to the people of Chios; *IG* XII 2.15, a grant of legal rights in Aetolia to the people of Mytilene.

<sup>18</sup>*Inscr. Prien.* 47, which mentions isopolity and kinship as reasons for sending a foreign arbiter.

<sup>19</sup>*Staatsverträge* III 537, which contains reciprocal decrees recognizing isopolity and kinship between Miletus and Seleuceia-Tralleis.

<sup>20</sup>Meiggs-Lewis 94, a grant of polity to the Samian demos for its continued support of Athens at the end of the Peloponnesian War, the main concern of which is to establish a συμμαχία between the two states; or *Anadolu* 9 (1965) pp. 37-40, no. II, lines 90-107, where the Teans extend citizen-rights to the people of Antiocheia-by-Daphne, Seleuceia-Pieria and Laodicea-by-the-sea at the behest of Antiochus III.

instances where a claim of kinship is associated with positive results (1.26.3; 1.71.4; 1.95.1; 3.2.3; 3.65.3; 3.86.3 [two separate incidents]; 6.6.1; 6.50.4; 6.77.1; 6.88.7; 7.58.3; 8.100.3), he records fourteen where interstate kinship was ignored or met with a negative response (1.34.3; 4.61.2; 4.63.4; 5.104; 5.108; 6.6.3; 6.20.3; 6.46.2; 6.76.2; 6.79.2; 6.80.2; 6.82.2; 6.82.4; 7.57.7). Isocrates' references to interstate kinship show much the same pattern: some allusions to the positive effects of kinship (*Plataicus* 51, *Panegyricus* 43), others to its ineffectiveness (*Philippus* 126, *Panathenaicus* 94, 207, 220), all reflecting a seldom-realized ideal in which kinship between nations, like kinship between individuals, should lead to harmony and mutual aid, but frequently does not. Unlike the epigraphic evidence, in which kinship terminology is seldom connected with requests for military or diplomatic intervention,<sup>21</sup> Classical literature seldom connects interstate kinship with anything else.<sup>22</sup> Unfortunately, most of our examples come from Thucydides; little or nothing is found in such authors as Herodotus, Xenophon or Demosthenes.<sup>23</sup> Polybius uses kinship terms rarely: on three occasions, he mentions interstate kinship between Greek states in passing, glorifying one state by recalling its kinship with a more famous one (4.54.6; 5.76.11; 8.33.9), and only twice connecting it to diplomatic negotiations (9.42.5; 21.24.10-11). The pattern in later writers is similar. In Diodorus Siculus, Campanians consider sending military aid to fellow-Campanians for the sake of kinship, but decide against it on grounds of military expediency (16.67.4); in Tacitus, the Lydians recall their kinship with the Etruscans in pursuit of a favor from Rome, which is denied (4.55). Suetonius tells us that Nero successfully gained exemption from tribute for Ilium, by advancing the city's claim of kinship with Rome (*Cl.* 25.3; *Nero* 7.2). There is no particular connection with religion in the literary evidence, but the pattern of inequality seen in the epigraphic material can be discerned, in that kinship is most frequently adduced when the state making the request is weaker than the state being addressed (e.g. Thuc. 4.105; Polyb.

---

<sup>21</sup>*IG IX 1*<sup>2</sup> 173, in which the Heracleotes asks the Aetolians to approach King Ptolemy on their behalf, is a rare example of such a request.

<sup>22</sup>On one occasion, Thucydides refers to interstate kinship to explain a practice common to both the Ionians and the Athenians (1.6.3); all the other references cited above have to do with specific military actions or diplomatic negotiations.

<sup>23</sup>Herodotus makes no use at all of the kinship terminology we have been discussing. Xenophon uses extra-familial kinship terms only twice (*An.* 7.2.31; 7.3.39), each time to refer to kinship between Seuthes, who was to become king of the Odrysian Thracians, and the Athenians; Demosthenes, only once, to decry the Thebans' treatment of their Boeotian kindred, the Orchomenians (*Against Leptines* 109).

21.24.10-11), when the advantage gained from successful negotiations would apply more to the state advancing the claim (e.g., Thuc. 6.20.3; Polyb. 9.42.5), or when a relatively insignificant state may be glorified by its association with its greater kin (Polyb. 4.54.6). Although the literary evidence is admittedly meager, it seems that interstate kinship was not infrequently introduced in diplomatic negotiations of various sorts as early as the late 5th century B.C., and that the theme continued in use through the first century A.D. and beyond.

To sum up, epigraphic documents referring to interstate kinship are relatively common in the Greek world from the late fourth to the late second century B.C.; their primary purposes included grants of polity, matters of international law, and religious affairs. The literary evidence extends our knowledge to claims of kinship associated with requests for military, diplomatic, and financial assistance, and indicates that such requests failed as often as they succeeded. Both types of evidence indicate that the use of kinship terms tended to originate with the party likely to benefit most from the primary concerns of the treaty, while the epigraphic evidence alone implies that interstate kinship was of great importance when religion was involved. Finally, a close study of treaties of kinship indicates that the Greeks perceived themselves as connected by an intricate web of kinship, based partly on colonization, but far more on descent from mythological figures like Aeolus, Hellen, and the like. This network of legendary relationships allowed each city-state to find self-definition in a world of increasing contacts with non-Greeks and to develop, with its fellow-Greeks, a way to overcome the parochial nature of the Classical polis and expand on a panhellenic system of international relations.

We must now examine the evidence for claims of interstate kinship with Rome to see whether or not they follow the Greek pattern. The earliest claim of kinship with Rome that can be considered historically valid is that advanced by the Mamertines in 264 B.C.<sup>24</sup> During the 280s, a group of Campanian mercenaries, once in the service of Agathocles of Syracuse, had seized the Sicilian town of Messana and for some time maintained their rule without difficulty. By 264, however, with their fellow-Campanians dispossessed of Rhegium and Hiero of Syracuse pressing them from the south, they appealed both to Rome and to Carthage for assistance (Polyb. 1.7-10). The request for help to Rome was accompanied by a claim that the Mamertines were ὁμόφυλοι of the Romans. Polybius' discussion of the Roman debate makes it clear that

---

<sup>24</sup>The reasons for and consequences of this act have been discussed at some length elsewhere, e.g., Hoffmann; Molthagen; Hampl; Scullard 537-45.

kinship had little to do with Rome's decision to intervene in Sicily (1.10-11). Why then should the Mamertines have included the claim? Although the Romans eventually received considerable benefit from their interference in Sicilian affairs, it is likely that at the time the request would have seemed of advantage only to the Mamertines. Since Rome was by far the more powerful of the two states, the Mamertines may well have alluded to their kinship with the Romans to add an element of moral or emotional pressure to their petition.

The basis for the claim of ὁμοφυλία between Rome and the Mamertines, though nowhere specifically mentioned in the ancient sources, seems fairly obvious. As Walbank (57 *ad* 10.1) has pointed out, the Mamertines' status as Campanians allowed them to assert the relationship. The people of Campania had been granted the *civitas sine suffragio* by Rome in 338 B.C., after the second phase of the Latin Revolt.<sup>25</sup> Although the precise significance of this status is still a matter of some controversy,<sup>26</sup> by the time of the Capuan revolt during the Second Punic War it is clear that the Campanians were considered Roman citizens.<sup>27</sup> According to Livy's account of the settlement of the Capuan revolt (in 211 B.C.), the Capuans considered themselves *cognati* of the Romans "ex conubio vetusto iuncti" (26.33.3); the *conubium* will have been one element of the *civitas sine suffragio* conferred on them in 338.

The Mamertines, as Campanians, may well have been Roman *cives sine suffragio* by descent.<sup>28</sup> Certainly they will have had relatives with that status, and will, by 264 B.C., have had relatives married to Roman citizens. This would have been sufficient to make them ὁμόφυλοι of the Romans. Such a concrete basis for a claim of kinship is something of a departure from the most common grounds for interstate kinship among the Greeks—mythological descent and, less frequently, colonization. It is not, however, without an analogue in Greek practice. In *Plataicus* 51, Isocrates clearly attributes συγγένεια between Athens and Plataea to intermarriage and an earlier grant of Athenian citizenship to the Plataeans.<sup>29</sup>

Our next instance is of somewhat dubious historicity—Silius Italicus' claim that the Saguntines, when approaching Rome for aid against Hannibal in 220 B.C., adduced kinship based on Saguntum's descent from the Rutulians of

<sup>25</sup>Liv. 8.14.10, and cf. Sherwin-White 40; Frederiksen 192.

<sup>26</sup>Sherwin-White 40-53, cf. Frederiksen 191-98; 221-32.

<sup>27</sup>Liv. 23.5.9; cf. Sherwin-White 41.

<sup>28</sup>But against this, see Frederiksen 223.

<sup>29</sup>For the grant of citizenship and its circumstances, see [Demosthenes] 59 (*Against Neaera*) 104-105; Osborne 11-16.



Ardea (*Punica* 1.608, 655). Both Livy (21.6.2) and Polybius (3.15.1) knew that the Saguntines had sent envoys to Rome asking for help against the Carthaginians; neither makes any mention of kinship or says that the Saguntines included a claim of kinship with their request for aid. In 21.7.2, Livy tells us that Saguntum (Greek Ζάκανθα) had been founded by the island of Zacynthus, “mixtique etiam ab Ardea Rutulorum quidam generis.”<sup>30</sup> The Saguntines might thus have claimed kinship with the Romans through the Latin town of Ardea. Whether Polybius makes no mention of this because the myth had not yet developed or because, as he said elsewhere (9.1.4-5), he has no interest in writing a history *περὶ τὰς ἀποικίας καὶ κτίσεις καὶ συγγενείας*, we cannot say. The basis for a claim of kinship may thus have existed in the third century B.C. and was certainly known to Livy in the first century B.C., but the first (and only) mention of an actual claim of kinship between the two peoples is Silius’ account, dating to the late first century A.D.

When the Saguntine envoys, on their journey to Rome, reached Laurentum at the mouth of the Tiber, Silius writes “hinc consanguineae subeunt iam moenia Romae” (1.608). Less than 50 lines later, in his speech before the Roman Senate, the Saguntine Sicoris asks his audience if they would not hold out to Saguntum *consanguineam dextram* (653-55). There seems no doubt that Silius’ use of explicit kinship terminology in these passages reflects his antiquarian interests and his desire to root his epic in both mythic and historical past.<sup>31</sup> We must ask, however, whether there is any possibility that

---

<sup>30</sup>The basis for the false etymology by which Ζάκανθα is derived from Ζάκυνθος is obvious; the connection with Ardea was apparently derived from a similar confusion of sounds, since Saguntine coins carried the name “Arse” or “Arseken” (Lazenby 26).

<sup>31</sup>For Silius’ antiquarian concerns, and his purpose in combining history and myth, see Santini 1-2, 5-62. As for the antiquarian nature of claims of kinship, the majority of such claims, whether epigraphic or literary, date to the first four centuries B.C.; a further indication that Silius is here looking to the glorious past of Rome is to be found in the section immediately succeeding the second mention of *consanguinitas*, 662-65. In these lines, Sicoris, still speaking, mentions first Zancle (Messana) and then Capua as cities the Romans have saved from ravaging foes. Although no kinship terminology is used in this section, we have seen that both Messana (i.e. the Mamertines) and Capua had claimed kinship with the Romans. As a further element, it should be noted that Silius, through Sicoris, is describing Rome’s aid to the Capuans in the first Samnite War; since this predates the settlement of the Latin Revolt, and the grant of *civitas sine suffragio* and *conubium* to which Livy attributes the kinship between Capua and Rome, we are forced to look for a mythological basis for the relationship, which may be found in Capua’s putative foundation by the Trojan Capys (Verg. *A.* 10.145). Since the tie between the Mamertines and Rome depends on the tie between Rome and Capua, the effect of the passage is to remind its readers both of Rome’s aid to her kindred and the legendary basis for

Silius was preserving a genuine historical tradition to the effect that the petition of the Saguntines had included an appeal to their alleged kinship with the Romans.

Both of our “historical” sources—Polybius and Livy—use interstate kinship terminology rarely. They may well have known that the Saguntines claimed kinship, but decided not to include the claim in their narratives; it is equally possible, however, that such a claim was not in fact included in the Saguntines’ appeal, and that the use of kinship terminology here is Silius’ invention. The best solution is probably that sometime between the late third century B.C. and the late first century A.D., the general notion that there was some connection, through settlement, between Saguntum and the Latins, including Rome, solidified into an actual claim of kinship which was associated, historically or by rumor, with the opening of the Second Punic War.

Whether or not the claim was actually made by the Saguntines or invented by Silius or one of his sources, we may briefly discuss the possible purpose for which it was advanced. Without going into detail about the causes of the Second Punic War and the precise implications of the Treaty of the Ebro, it is clear that Saguntum, like Messana some forty years earlier, was in a strategically important but very precarious position. Like Messana, facing the enmity of Syracuse, Saguntum, given an ultimatum by Hannibal, appealed to a distant power, Rome, for whom the result of a positive response appeared problematic; a request for assistance might well be met with resistance or refusal. We may believe, then, that the claim of kinship added a level of persuasion to what might otherwise be seen as a dubious petition. In either case, it still fits quite well into the general model of Greek claims: a small state, desiring unilateral assistance from a much larger state, puts forward a claim of kinship based on mythological descent.

In 211 B.C., the Capuans made a claim of kinship with Rome as part of a plea for clemency. The historical circumstances of that claim are provided by Livy. In 216, shortly after the catastrophic defeat of the Roman armies at Cannae, the Capuans decided to go over to Hannibal (Liv. 23.6.1-10.13). In the early days of Capua’s new allegiance, a pro-Roman Capuan, Decius Magius, suggested that his fellow-countrymen atone for their wrong-doing in having revolted “a vetustissimis sociis consanguineisque” by killing the members of the Carthaginian garrison recently installed by Hannibal (Liv. 23.7.6). In 211,

---

that kinship. Such mythologizing is reminiscent of the Hellenistic attitude toward interstate kinship and very different from Livy’s more pragmatic account.

after Capua had been recaptured by the Romans, the Capuan embassy sent to ask for clemency before the Roman Senate included among their pleas the point noted above, that Campanians and Romans had, through much intermarriage, become kin (26.33.3). This argument held no weight with the Senate; indeed it might be argued that the very kinship adduced by the Campanians made both their “crime” in deserting Rome, and that crime’s punishment, all the more severe.<sup>32</sup>

As we saw in our discussion of the Mamertines, the most likely grounds for kinship between Rome and Capua was the Capuans’ status as *cives sine suffragio*,<sup>33</sup> which is reminiscent of the relationship between Athens and Plataea.<sup>34</sup> The failure of the Capuans’ claim of kinship does not echo the epigraphic evidence for Greek claims. It is not, however, dissimilar to an incident in Thucydides where the Athenian Euphemos defends Athens’ subjection of their “kindred,” the Ionians, on the grounds that the Ionians had been first to offend against kinship by joining in Xerxes’ expedition against Greece—and particularly Athens, the “metropolis” of Ionia—in 480 B.C. (6.82.4).

We come now to a claim of kinship between Rome and Phrygia. Herodian, writing in the early third century A.D., informs us that, when the Romans sent an embassy to Pessinus in 204 B.C. to fetch back to Rome the “statue” of Magna Mater,<sup>35</sup> the envoys brought up their συγγένεια with the Phrygians, based on their descent from the Phrygian Aeneas, to persuade the priests of Pessinus to give up the sacred image of the goddess (1.11.3). According to both Livy and Ovid, the Roman envoys enlisted the aid of Attalus of Pergamum, then suzerain of the area, in convincing the Phrygians to give up their “black rock”; neither, however, makes any mention of a claim of kinship. Herodian, on the other hand, says nothing of Attalus, and attributes the ease with which the Romans accomplished their mission to their claim of kinship.

This instance bears a certain resemblance to that adduced by Silius Italicus for Saguntum and Rome. Since the earlier sources for the incident make no mention of kinship, we are left to wonder whether the claim was made at the time alleged, or whether it was the invention of a later date. As with Saguntum, it is at least conceivable that the claim was in fact introduced by the Roman envoys; E. Hall has shown that the Greek identification of Trojans with Phrygians

<sup>32</sup>For the response of the Romans, Senate and People, and the punishment meted out to the Capuans, see Liv. 26.33.4-34.13.

<sup>33</sup>Liv. 23.5.9 and cf. 8.14.10; Sherwin-White 40-53; Frederiksen 191-98, 221-32.

<sup>34</sup>Isoc. *Plataicus* 51; [Dem.] 59 (*Against Neaera*) 104-05; cf. Osborne 11-16.

<sup>35</sup>In 204 B.C.; cf. Liv. 29.10; Ov. *Fast.* 4.247-349, esp. 263-72.

probably dated back at least to the fifth century B.C. As with Saguntum, it is also impossible to know for sure. Unlike the instances we have already discussed, the claim is said to have been advanced by Rome. There is a similarity to the earlier cases, however, in that the petitioners (in this case the Romans) are asking a favor which they are in no position to reciprocate. Neither the Mamertines, the Saguntans, nor the Capuans were capable of matching Rome's military capacity, or of returning favor for favor; in this case, the Romans could hardly offer the Phrygians a new goddess in return for the one they were removing. If we compare this occurrence to the Greek use of kinship terms, we find a close match. The Greeks frequently adduced kinship when allowing non-citizens to participate in civic cults (e.g. *Inscr. Magn.* 16-87). Although no Greek example can be cited where a deity is actually removed from one state to another, *IG IX* 1<sup>2</sup> 583 tells us the circumstances under which the Acarnanian League took on responsibility for the cult of Apollo at Actium, removing it from the authority of the Anactorians; in justifying their action, the Acarnanians referred to the kinship between Anactorium and the Acarnanian League.

At some point in the Hellenistic period, possibly in the third century B.C., a certain Demetrius returned some captured pirates to Rome, protesting that Rome should curb the piratical tendencies of the Etruscans and the people of Antium because of the *συγγένεια* that obtained between Rome and the Greeks (*Str.* 5.3.5 C232). Without a clear identification of Demetrius, neither date nor specific circumstances of the claim of kinship can be established with any certainty.<sup>36</sup> The basis of the claim is less obscure, at least from a Greek standpoint. The Romans much preferred the legend tracing their descent from the Trojans, rather than the Greeks, but perhaps as early as the fifth and certainly by the fourth century B.C., the Greeks were attempting to bring the Romans within their sphere of understanding by making them descendants of Odysseus or the Achaeans.<sup>37</sup> As we might expect from a claim of kinship

---

<sup>36</sup>Demetrius was identified, without discussion, by Jones II: 390-91 n. 1 as Demetrius Poliorcetes; apparently this identification was followed (with equal lack of discussion) by Momigliano 1977: 52-53 and n. 63 and Gruen 1984: 318 and n. 10. If the Demetrius in question was indeed Poliorcetes, this event must date to his adulthood, i.e. sometime after 317 and before 283 B.C.; even this range, however, seems somewhat reckless given the uncertainty of the attribution. Although it seems almost certain that the incident dates to the Hellenistic period (and probably to the third or early second century B.C., when Greek use of kinship terminology was at its height), this does little to clarify matters.

<sup>37</sup>For the fifth century B.C. (Hellanicus of Lesbos, *FGrH* 4 F 84), see Gabba 12-14, but for the fourth century, Gruen 1992: 17-18; for further discussion, Gruen 8-21.

advanced by a Greek ruler, the circumstances of the claim, so far as we can determine them, fit nicely into the Greek pattern of kinship terminology. It seems almost certain that the basis for the claim of kinship was mythological—the putative descent of the Romans from Odysseus or some such legend. Since we cannot be certain of the identity of Demetrius, we cannot establish the relative significance of the Greek state vs. the Roman, but certainly Demetrius was asking a favor of the Romans, and one of potential difficulty—suppression of piracy, however limited the sphere. This calls to mind the use of kinship terminology in the Teian documents (e.g. *SIG*<sup>3</sup> 563; *Inscr. Cret.* I v 52\* [pp. 25-26]), which also call for a cessation of piracy, on that occasion by specific Greek states.

*Inscr. Lampsakos* 4 (= *SIG*<sup>3</sup> 591) is an honorific decree which describes the successful embassy, in 196 B.C., of one Hegesias of Lampsacus to, first, the Isthmus of Corinth, then to Massalia (where the Massaliotes agreed to Hegesias' request that they, as long-time allies of Rome, send an embassy to support the Lampsacenes) and finally to Rome. In Rome, Hegesias requested an alliance between Lampsacus and Rome and Roman protection against Antiochus the Great, who was then in the process of moving across the Hellespont into Thrace.<sup>38</sup> Two levels of kinship are mentioned: ἀδελφία with Massalia,<sup>39</sup> and συγγένεια and οἰκειότης with Rome (lines 21, 25, 30-31, 56). The basis for the kinship with Rome is not immediately apparent, until we remember that it was not unusual for both Greeks and Romans to consider inhabitants of a particular area descendants of earlier inhabitants, whether that connection had any historical validity or not. Lampsacus was located in the area known as the Troad, and was a member of the Ilian Federation. It thus may well have been considered kin to Ilium and through Ilium to Rome.<sup>40</sup> We see a number of familiar elements in this document: a relatively small city in need of military and diplomatic assistance (Lampsacus) appeals first to a 'sister-city' (Massalia) in the name of ἀδελφία, and then to a 'kindred' state (Rome) in the name of συγγένεια. The first claim is based on colonization, the second, so far as can be determined, on mythological descent from the 'original' inhabitants of the Troad, the Trojans. In both cases, the claim of kinship accompanies what must

<sup>38</sup>*Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 591. For a thorough discussion of the political and military situation that led Lampsacus to this request, see Frisch 1978: 21-26; somewhat earlier, Magie 17-18 and 756-57, notes 51 and 53; more briefly, Gruen 1984: 542-43.

<sup>39</sup>Lines 26, 55; both Massalia and Lampsacus were founded by the Phocaeans (for Lampsacus, Steph. Byz. p. 4, line 14 Meineke; for Massalia, Isocrates 6.84), and were thus sister-cities looking to the same mother; cf. Magie 903 n. 118.

<sup>40</sup>See Magie 869-71 n. 53 and 943-44 n. 40; Will 185.

be a unilateral request: Lampsacus cannot immediately or specifically reciprocate Massalia's assistance at Rome, nor has she sufficient strength herself to enter into a treaty with Rome that would be of equivalent benefit to Rome. Finally, it is clear from the inscription itself that Rome, as Will (1982: 185) has pointed out, has only "indifférence polie et bonnes paroles" for this kindred state; the claim of kinship has little effect on Rome's policies and actions in the Greek East.

A decree from Delos, which has been dated to 192 B.C. or later,<sup>41</sup> records the dispatch of an embassy to Rome to renew the kinship and friendship (οἰκειότης καὶ φιλία) between the two states. Unfortunately, the stone breaks off after a few lines, making it impossible to tell whether any other matters were raised by the embassy. The general thrust of Delos' diplomatic efforts in the early second century B.C., however, seems to have been establishing an inviolable commercial port on the island, and Baslez and Vial suggest that the embassy to Rome sought recognition of the sanctuary's ἄσυλία;<sup>42</sup> while no proof can be offered for this hypothesis, it would certainly fit in with the Greek practice of associating kinship terminology with recognition of inviolability.<sup>43</sup> No grounds for the claim of kinship are mentioned in the inscription; it is not unlikely that the Delians were alluding to the Greek tales of Roman descent from Odysseus or the Achaeans.<sup>44</sup>

In 188 B.C., the Rhodians sent ambassadors to the senatorial commission in Asia, requesting that Lycia, which had been a Seleucid ally during the war with Antiochus, be made subject to their control. The people of Ilium also sent an embassy, asking that the Lycians be forgiven their offences διὰ τὴν πρὸς αὐτοὺς οἰκειότητα (Polyb. 22.5.3). The response of the *decemviri* was sufficiently ambiguous that the Ilians were able to inform the cities of Lycia that they were free, while the Rhodians claimed Lycia as a subject. This episode also conforms nicely with standard Greek practice. The basis for the claim was mythological—the supposed descent of both the Romans and the Ilians from the Trojans. The initiators of the claim of kinship were requesting a favor of bene-

<sup>41</sup>*IG* XI 4.756; for 192 B.C., see Homolle 84-88; Roussel 3, note 4; Colin 267; Gruen 1984: 82-83; for a later date (perhaps in the 170s?), Gruen 1984: 737-38; Baslez and Vial 299 give a range of 200 to 171 B.C.

<sup>42</sup>For the diplomatic efforts in general, Baslez and Vial 305-12; for Roman recognition of ἄσυλία, 306.

<sup>43</sup>Cf. *SIG*<sup>3</sup> 563; *IG* IX 1<sup>2</sup> 4c; *SEG* XII 371; but note Sherk *RDGE* 34, a letter of the Roman praetor Valerius Messala, which recognizes Teos as inviolable without making any mention of kinship.

<sup>44</sup>See, for example, Gruen 1992: 10-11.

fit only to themselves (or, in this case, those for whom they were pleading). Given the reaction of the Rhodians, and the fact that Rhodes continued to control Lycia until 167 B.C., it would appear that the response of Rome to a claim of kinship was at least to some degree overridden by policy and expediency.

We turn now to a claim of interstate kinship between Rome and the Lycians. *ILS* 32, found in Rome in 1887, has been restored to read: [. . . *populum R]omanum, cognatum, amicum, sociu[m], / virtutis et benivolent[iae] benefique erga Lucios in comu[ne]*. It has been shown that this inscription once formed part of a joint dedication erected on the Capitoline by various peoples of Asia,<sup>45</sup> but its date has been a matter of some controversy. Degrassi (42-44) has placed the erection of the monument to sometime shortly after the Treaty of Dardanus (85 B.C.), which returned the Greek cities of Asia to Roman sovereignty. Magie (954-56 n. 67), followed by others, would prefer to date the monument to 167 B.C., when the Romans made a settlement of Asia following the war with Perseus. Degrassi's arguments, although not without their difficulties, seem more convincing; we will therefore accept a tentative date for the inscription of approximately 84 B.C.

Since the inscription is addressed by the Lycians to the Roman people, it seems reasonable to assume that the claim of kinship was advanced by the Lycians. No internal evidence survives as to the reason for the dedication, or the precise grounds for the appellations *cognatum*, *amicum*, *socium*. There is reason to believe, however, that this was not the first time the Lycians had claimed kinship with Rome. As we have just seen, the people of Ilium had claimed kinship with Rome in 188 B.C., while pleading on behalf of the Lycians. The passage in Polybius reads *παρὰ δὲ τῶν Ἰλίων ἦκον Ἱππάρχος καὶ Σάτυρος, ἀξιούντες διὰ τὴν πρὸς αὐτοὺς οἰκειότητα συγνώμην δοθῆναι Λυκίοις τῶν ἡμαρτημένων* (22.5.3). While this is generally taken as referring to the kinship between Ilium and Rome,<sup>46</sup> there is no particular reason to exclude the Lycians from the relationship, making the οἰκειότης a three-way tie, between Ilium and Rome on the one hand, Ilium and Lycia on the other. This relationship was almost certainly based on Lycia's descent from

<sup>45</sup>This particular stone was actually found in the vicinity of the Via Vittorio Veneto, but it seems clear that it is but one of a collection of inscriptions ascribed to a single monument, originally on the Capitoline (for discussion of this point, see Degrassi 39-41).

<sup>46</sup>Thus W. R. Paton's translation in the Loeb Classical Library edition, "and at the same time two envoys from the people of Ilium, Hipparchus, and Satyrus, came begging that, for the sake of the kinship between Ilium and Rome, the offences of the Lycians might be pardoned" 351-53.

the Trojan heroes Sarpedon and Glaucus,<sup>47</sup> and would therefore have provided the Lycians an excellent basis for their claim of *cognatio* with Rome. In this instance, the basis for kinship appears to be mythological descent, typical of the normal pattern.

As we have seen, what remains of the document gives no evidence as to why *cognatio* was mentioned on this particular occasion. It seems quite likely that the Lycians mentioned kinship in their various requests of Rome to free them from Rhodian rule, but there is no actual evidence for this besides the passage from Polybius, which makes clear that it was the Ilrians who brought up the claim of kinship on that occasion.

In 70 B.C., Cicero prosecuted C. Verres for his oppressive and corrupt conduct as proconsul of Sicily in 73-71. In the second *actio*, published after Verres had fled from Rome, Cicero makes several allusions to *cognatio* between Rome and Segesta, a Sicel town in western Sicily.<sup>48</sup> Cicero also records *cognatio* between Rome and Centuripe, another Sicel town about twenty miles north-west of Catana (2 *Verr.* 5.32.83). This latter relationship has often been overlooked, apparently because it has been assumed that the mention of *cognatio* applies only to Segesta, which is named in the same passage. In the early 1960s, however, G. Manganaro (= *Ann. Ép.* 1966, no. 165) published a Greek copy of a Lanuvian *senatus consultum* recording the “renewal” of *συνγένεια* between Centuripe and the Latin town of Lanuvium, which indicates that the kinship mentioned by Cicero in 2 *Verr.* 5.32.83 applies to Centuripe as well. The basis for kinship between Rome and Segesta is given by Cicero: Segesta, like the Latin town of Lavinium, mother-city of Alba Longa, and thus “grandmother” of Rome, was founded by Aeneas (2 *Verr.* 4.33.72). The grounds adduced for the relationship with Centuripe, nowhere mentioned in the ancient sources, are more difficult to determine. Manganaro (40) suggested a mythological basis, mentioning the legend of the two brothers, Italus and Siculus, the one ruling Italy, the other Sicily. It seems equally likely, particularly given the close connection between Centuripe and Segesta in Cicero’s passage, that some tradition once existed to the effect that Centuripe, like Segesta, was somehow of Trojan origin.

Cicero’s purpose in referring to these claims of kinship was to stir up opinion against the infamy of a man who could so outrage the bonds of blood. The Centuripan inscription breaks off at line 15; if the reasons for the

<sup>47</sup>See, for example, *Il.* 2.876; 16.667-75.

<sup>48</sup>Cicero, 2 *Verr.* 4.33.72; 5.32.83; 47.125.



“renewal” of kinship were ever recorded, they are now lost to us. If Manganaro is correct in his dating of the inscription, however, that may provide a clue. He proposes a date in the period of the Second Triumvirate, after the end of the war with Sextus Pompey (42-43). At that time a Sicilian town might go to considerable lengths to reinforce its ties with Rome and the Latin states, since it might otherwise appear to have been a willing and loyal supporter of the younger Pompey. Unfortunately, although Manganaro’s chronology is attractive for various reasons, there is no absolute proof (cf. *Ann. Ép.* 1966, no. 165, p. 42); we cannot be certain of either the date of the inscription or the reason for the claim of kinship.

For Centuripe, then, there is insufficient evidence to indicate whether or not the claim of kinship with Rome fits the pattern of Greek claims. It does seem clear that Centuripe’s initiation of a claim of kinship with Lanuvium in the first century B.C. was the act of a smaller state approaching a larger and more powerful one, but we cannot say with any certainty whether the basis for this kinship claim was mythological or otherwise. Nor have we any real indication as to the specific reason for the claim of kinship, and thus no way to analyze it. For Segesta, we can be quite certain that the claim of kinship was based on mutual descent from a mythological figure, thus conforming nicely to the Greek model. In Cicero’s account, however, there is no mention of the original reason for which Segesta advanced the claim (although he does imply that it was Segesta which initiated it, rather than Rome).

There are a number of indications that the original alliances and claims of kinship between these two Sicel towns and the Romans (or Latins) date to sometime before the first century B.C. The inscription tells us that the Centuripan envoys asked the Lanuvians “to renew” (ἀνανευνεῖωσθαι, line 3) the kinship between the two states;<sup>49</sup> Cicero says or implies at several points that the dealings between the two cities and Rome are of some antiquity, although no precise date for the first claim of kinship for either town is mentioned.<sup>50</sup> Manganaro has suggested that the original treaty and first claim of kinship in each case be dated to 215 B.C., the time of Hieronymus of Syracuse’s “revolt” against the Romans after Cannae, when Rome will have been actively seeking Sicilian allies against Syracuse (39). While this date seems quite reasonable, we might also mention Cicero’s claim at 2 *Verr.* 5.32.84 (made, certainly, for its

<sup>49</sup>Note, however, that particularly in the Hellenistic period, and particularly in diplomatic documents of that period, the word ἀνανεόμαι can mean ‘recognize’ and not simply ‘renew’ (LSJ<sup>9</sup>, *Supplement* p. 12, s.v.). This may carry a sense of renewal, but need not.

<sup>50</sup>For Segesta: 2 *Verr.* 4.33.72; 5.32.83; 5.47.125. For Centuripe: 5.32.83; 5.32.84.

inflammatory effect with perhaps not much regard for strict accuracy): “Ecquod in Sicilia bellum gessimus, quin Centuripinis sociis, Syracusanis hostibus uteremur?” This question without doubt brings to mind the year 215, but might it not also suggest the years 264-262, when Rome was first engaged in Sicily and at that time also against a hostile Syracuse? Dating the original claims of kinship to the third century B.C. is particularly attractive in light of the Greek use of kinship terminology, which apparently reached its peak at this period, and also of the earliest verifiable claim of kinship with Rome, which, as we have seen, was raised by the Mamertines, occupying the Sicilian city of Messina, in the mid-third century.

We come now to discussion of the “brotherhood” which obtained between Rome and the Aedui, and which Caesar advanced as an excuse for his invasion of Gaul in 59 B.C. We have a number of references to this relationship: Caesar mentions it four times (twice in speeches put into the mouth of Ariovistus),<sup>51</sup> Cicero mentions it twice (*Att.* 19 [60 B.C.]; *Fam.* 7.10.4 [54 B.C.]), while Tacitus (*Ann.* 11.25), Strabo (4.3.2 C192) and (almost certainly) Diodorus Siculus<sup>52</sup> all refer to it once. Unfortunately, none of these sources provides very much information. Nowhere are we told when or why the kinship was first recognized; nowhere are we told the basis for it (although this can be inferred from other sources); nowhere are we told who first advanced the claim.<sup>53</sup> All we really know is that the Aedui were allies of the Roman people by 121 B.C.,<sup>54</sup> and that between the time the treaty was made and Cicero’s first mention of the relationship in 60 B.C., they had acquired the title *fratres consanguineosque Populi Romani*.<sup>55</sup> Shackleton Bailey has pointed out that “the Aedui were the only Gallic tribe to receive this title..., if indeed any other

<sup>51</sup>*BG* 1.33.2 (a speech of Caesar); 1.26.5 (speech of Ariovistus), 1.43.6 (*necessitudines*; Caesar); 1.44.9 (Ariovistus).

<sup>52</sup>*DS* 5.25.1, where he says that Gaul is inhabited by many tribes ὧν ἔν ἐστι πρὸς Ῥωμαίους ἔχον συγγένειαν παλαιὰν καὶ φιλίαν τὴν μέχρι καθ’ ἡμᾶς χρόνων διαμένουσιν. Although he does not mention the Aedui by name, the context makes reference to them likely.

<sup>53</sup>The lack of discussion in the ancient sources is matched, not unnaturally, by near-silence among modern scholars. The only secondary references I have found have been a brief mention, without discussion, in Maier 37 and 41; two short notes by Shackleton Bailey 1965: 334 *ad* 1.19.2 and 1988: 82 n. 169; another passing mention by Harmand 16; and a very short discussion of the possible grounds for kinship in Rankin 82.

<sup>54</sup>*Liv. Peri.* 61; cf. Rice Holmes 3, who dates the treaty to 123 B.C. without discussion.

<sup>55</sup>Despite the natural assumption that the Aedui acquired both title and alliance at the same time, and the equally natural assumption of Rice Holmes that this occurred shortly before 121 B.C., Harmand 16 is correct in saying that the date(s) of each are unknown.

*community* was so honoured" (1965: 334, his emphasis) and attributes this unusual distinction to the fact that they were the first of the Gallic tribes to enter into an alliance with Rome (1988: 82 n. 169). If he is correct in his surmise, then we might expect the claim of kinship to have been associated with the original compact between the two peoples, but this conjecture, though attractive, cannot be verified.

Although no ancient source definitely refers to the grounds for the consanguinity, Rankin (82) has suggested, quite plausibly, that the Aedui claimed descent from Trojans fleeing the devastation of the Trojan war. Lucan speaks of "Arverni ausi Latio se fingere fratres / sanguine ab Iliaco populi;"<sup>56</sup> and Ammianus Marcellinus, discussing the original inhabitants of Gaul, says "aiunt quidam paucos post excidium Troiae fugitantes Graecos ubique dispersos loca haec occupasse tunc vacua" (15.9.5). By the first century A.D., obviously, there was a legend to the effect that the Celts were somehow descended from the Trojans. It is possible that the story was concocted as early as the first or even the second century B.C.

What we can conjecture about the use of kinship terminology in this instance seems to accord with Greek practice on two points. It appears likely that the basis for the claim of kinship was mythological, and it would seem from the various allusions in Cicero and Caesar that the Aedui approached the Roman Senate for help against the Suebi and the Helvetii—a weaker state adducing kinship in asking aid from a stronger.

The next specific claim of kinship between Rome and another state was advanced by Segesta in A.D. 25. According to Tacitus, the Segestans requested aid in rebuilding the temple of Venus Ericina, which was collapsing with age, "nota memorantes de origine eius et laeta Tiberio. suscepit curam libens ut consanguineus" (*Ann.* 4.43). It seems reasonable to presume that the Segestans made mention of their kinship with Rome while presenting their petition. Once again, we have a near perfect match with the Greek tradition: a small city adduces kinship in asking a non-reciprocal favor of a greater power. This would hold true whether the Segestans cited their supposed kinship with the city of Rome, or specifically with the emperor Tiberius, as Tacitus' phrasing would imply.<sup>57</sup>

<sup>56</sup>*BC* 1.427-28; for Lucan's confusion between the Aedui and the Arverni, see Getty xlii.

<sup>57</sup>In their translation of the *Annales* (Hadas 170), Church and Brodribb assumed that the *consanguinitas* obtained between Tiberius and the goddess Venus, through the emperor's putative descent from Iulus, grandson of Venus. The Latin, as we can see, makes no such implication;

In the following year, A.D. 26, Tiberius received a number of embassies from Asian cities, all contending before the Roman Senate for the right to build a temple to Tiberius, Livia Augusta, and the goddess Roma.<sup>58</sup> Eleven cities were contesting for the honor, all, according to Tacitus, “memorantes de vetustate generis” (*Ann.* 4.55.2). The envoys of Ilium “parentem urbis Romae Troiam referrent,” but nonetheless failed in their petition (*Ann.* 4.55.4).<sup>59</sup> This episode is also typical of Greek usage, a small city adducing alleged kinship with a larger in order to obtain a unilateral benefit. The failure of a plea accompanied by such a claim is not uncommon; for example, the Melians received no help from their Lacedaemonian “kinsmen,” although they claimed to be certain of Sparta’s support (Thuc. 4.105).

Suetonius tells us that Claudius granted perpetual freedom from tribute to the people of Ilium “quasi Romanae gentis auctoribus.” To support his decision, he read from an ancient letter addressed by the Senate and People of Rome to King Seleucus, in which the Romans agreed to friendship and alliance with Seleucus “si consanguineos suos Ilienses ab omni onere immunes praestitisset” (*Cl.* 25.3). The incident has been dated to A.D. 53 on the basis of Suetonius, *Nero* 7.2 and Tacitus, *Annales* 12.58.1, both of which refer to Nero’s first speech before the Senate (Bradley 60), in which he gave an eloquent description of Rome’s descent from Troy and the descent of the Julian line from Ascanius (Tac. *Ann.* 12.58.1). It seems likely (although never stated explicitly) that Ilium had appealed to Rome for exemption from tribute, and, due in part to her alleged kinship, in part apparently to Nero’s eloquence, and in part perhaps to Claudius’ antiquarian interests, met with success.

The reference to the letter to King Seleucus is of considerable interest, although its authenticity is questionable (e.g. Gruen 1984: 64). The king has been identified as Seleucus II, who reigned from 247-226.<sup>60</sup> Many Greek claims of interstate kinship can be dated to this period (e.g. *SEG* XII 372; *Delphes* III (3) 215; *IG* IX 1<sup>2</sup> 583), so that element of the letter is acceptable at first glance, and Gruen finds the possibility of “a loose relationship of *amicitia* . . . not incongruous” (1984: 64) even at that relatively early date. What is somewhat

---

the consanguinity referred to may have been as much a result of Rome’s supposed kinship with Segesta as of Tiberius’ alleged ancestry.

<sup>58</sup>The cities of Asia had voted this temple some three years previously, in A.D. 23 (Tac. *Ann.* 4.15.4).

<sup>59</sup>The Lydians, who also failed to be awarded the temple, also made a claim of kinship in their presentation—kinship not with Rome, but with the Etruscans (*Ann.* 4.55.7).

<sup>60</sup>Holleaux 47; Rizzo 85-87.

incongruous is the notion that Rome advanced a claim of kinship to promote the interests of a politically insignificant Greek state at this time. In all the instances known to us of claims of interstate kinship with Rome, only once is Rome said to have advanced the claim herself (with Phrygia, in 304 B.C.); if that claim was made at all (the evidence for it is late and somewhat doubtful, as we have seen), it was done a quarter of a century after Seleucus II's death. We know of only one claim of kinship with Rome prior to 226, and that was advanced not by Rome but by the Mamertines. Furthermore, Rome had little contact with the Greeks until the end of the third century B.C., and, as Gruen has said, her "interests across the Aegean developed in halting steps, unsystematically, and late" (1984: 529). In terms of date, it would be somewhat more credible to identify the recipient of the letter with Seleucus IV, who reigned with his father from 189 and on his own from 187 until 175 B.C. This was a period in which Rome acknowledged her kinship with Ilium several times, and was closely involved with affairs in Asia Minor. It seems unlikely, however, that there would be any need for Rome to intercede with a Seleucid monarch on behalf of Ilium after 188.

Another, perhaps more likely, alternative is to assume that the letter was a forgery which had found its way into the official records of Ilium. Forged documents were not uncommon in the ancient world, and at least one such contained a claim of kinship. *Inscr. Magn.* 21 purports to be a Cretan foundation decree for Magnesia-on-the-Maeander, and recognizes kinship between Magnesia and the Cretan *koinon*. It is clearly a Hellenistic fabrication, but was nevertheless engraved among the authentic documents recognizing the games of Artemis Leucophryene at Magnesia.

Setting aside the authenticity of the letter, let us consider the circumstances under which it may have been written. As quoted by Suetonius, the use of kinship terminology in the letter to Seleucus is not without parallel. The Ilians used a claim of kinship in interceding for the Lycians in 188 B.C., and in *IG IX* 1<sup>2</sup> 173, the Aetolians agreed to speak to King Ptolemy on behalf of their 'kinsmen,' the Heracleotes. If the Aetolian approach to Ptolemy had survived, it might not be very different from the letter to King Seleucus.<sup>61</sup> On the basis of the latter example, we might conjecture that (were the letter genuine) the Ilians approached the Romans, asking their help with Seleucus, and the Romans wrote to the monarch in response to that request. The basis of the claim of

<sup>61</sup>Although this last point might be used to argue that the letter is genuine, it must be remembered that forged documents, to be convincing, must have the appearance of validity. It should not be surprising that a claim of kinship in a forged document accorded with genuine usage.

kinship would have been, of course, mutual descent from the Trojans. Whether or not the letter was a forgery of the Ilrians or some other group, it would seem to fit well enough into the tradition of Greek claims of kinship.

If we consider the letter to Seleucus authentic, it brings the number of times we have seen kinship claimed between Rome and Ilium to four, ranging in date from the mid-third century B.C. to the mid-first century A.D.; if it is not genuine, we have only three, starting in the early second century B.C. The first episode involved Ilium's appeal on behalf of the Lycians in 188 B.C., which the Ilrians considered successful; the second, Ilium's petition to be allowed to build a temple to Tiberius, Livia Augusta, and Roma in A.D. 26, which failed in its objective. The third, of course, was the exemption from tribute granted by Claudius in A.D. 53. Each of these incidents involved the type of kinship terminology mentioned at the start of this article and in each the use of kinship terminology was part of official diplomatic negotiations between the two states. A number of other incidents are worth noting here, although they do not fall into precisely the same categories as the instances already discussed.

In 190 B.C., Lucius Scipio stopped at Ilium to sacrifice to Minerva "et Iliensibus in omni rerum verborumque honore ab se oriundos Romanos praeferentibus et Romanis laetis origine sua" (Liv. 37.37.2). This clearly refers to the kinship between the two states, although it does not contain the precise language we have been investigating, nor does it carry with it any specific and immediate profit to either. It seems clear, however, that it could do no harm for a small Greek city to claim kinship with a major power, nor could it hurt the forces of a foreign state interfering with Greek affairs to be related to one of the more famous cities of the Greek world. We might also compare this scene at Ilium with an earlier one there: when Alexander crossed the Hellespont to war against Persia, he offered sacrifice to Athena (Plu. *Alex.* 15) and adorned the city (Str. 13.1.26 C593); it might well have been propitious for L. Scipio, leading a Roman army against Antiochus, to associate himself not only with Rome's Trojan ancestor, but with the hero and liberator of the Asian Greeks, Alexander the Great. That this was a deliberate attempt to imitate Alexander becomes all the more likely in view of Strabo's mention of συγγένεια between Ilium and Alexander (13.1.27 C594).

In 85 B.C., during the later stages of the First Mithridatic War, the Roman general Fimbria besieged Ilium in the course of his invasion of Asia Minor. According to Appian, the Ilrians appealed to Sulla, who promised to come to their aid and advised them, in the mean time, to tell Fimbria that the city was under Sulla's protection. Fimbria responded by saying that, as they

were friends of the Roman people, and he was a Roman, they should let him in, and added an ironical remark about the *συγγένεια* between Rome and Ilium. Once he was within the walls, he demolished the city (12.8.53). This episode adds little to our knowledge of interstate kinship, only confirming that the putative kinship between Rome and Ilium was generally recognized, as was the general theme of interstate kinship in dealings between states.

In addition to the attention paid to the alleged relationship between Rome and Ilium, three pieces of evidence show that kinship with Ilium figured in the propaganda of the Julian line. Strabo tells us that Caesar increased the territory of the city and granted it freedom and immunity from taxes on the basis of the descent of the Romans from Aeneas and more particularly, his own family's descent from Ascanius (Iulus) from which derived his *συγγένεια* with the Ilians (13.127 C594-595). An inscription from Ilium honors Marcus Agrippa as *συγγενῆς καὶ πατρῶν τῆς πόλεως καὶ εὐεργέτης*.<sup>62</sup> As we saw above, Nero's first speech in the Senate spoke of the descent of the Julian line from Ascanius as well as Rome's descent from Troy (Tac. *Ann.* 12.58.1).

The number of occasions for which we have evidence of the claim of kinship between Rome and Ilium is unusual, as is the association of a claim of kinship between a state and an individual. Evidence for Greek usage provides only one example of a repetition of a claim between the same two states,<sup>63</sup> and only one apparent claim of kinship between a city and a ruler: *TAM* II.i.266, which records *συγγένεια* between Xanthus and (apparently) Antiochus III. Given the importance, however, to both Greeks and Romans, of Rome's alleged descent from Troy, and given Rome's dominance throughout this period, it is hardly surprising to see so many occurrences, nor is it surprising that evidence of them should have survived. The Julio-Claudian attention to their Trojan heritage is also comprehensible, especially in light of the Augustan propaganda about Rome's descent from Troy.

We have now examined fifteen official claims of kinship between Rome and another state (sixteen if we include the possible forgery addressed to King Seleucus), and discussed four other occasions associated with such claims. They all appear to accord with the Greek tradition, literary or epigraphical, of

<sup>62</sup>*Inscr. Ilion* 86=SIG<sup>3</sup> 776. According to Frisch 1975: 187 and, more recently, Roddaz 441-42 and notes 124 and 127, the kinship will have been traced from Iulus (Ascanius) to his descendants the Julii, thus to Julia, daughter of Augustus, and through her to her husband, Agrippa.

<sup>63</sup>A claim of kinship between Chios and the Aetolians was advanced on two separate occasions, recorded in *SEG* XVIII 245 and *Delphes* II (3), no. 215.

claims of interstate kinship.<sup>64</sup> For the most part, the grounds for the claim of kinship appear to be legendary descent; when not, as was the case with Capua and the Mamertines, a Greek parallel can still be found. In almost every episode, the claim of kinship appears to have been advanced by a smaller state asking a favor of a larger one. When a stronger state (Rome) seems to have approached a weaker one (Phrygia), we find that the favor requested by the Romans was non-reciprocal, and that it involved the appropriation of a deity. This too is familiar from strictly Greek practice. It would seem likely, then, that, as far as the diplomatic use of interstate kinship is concerned, the Romans were responding to a Greek practice—one which touched a chord with them, since kinship was of equal importance there, but which was not in any sense indigenous to Rome. Like so many other institutions which the Romans made use of as they moved into the East (Gruen 1984: 13-157), the origins of such claims are to be found within the Greek world.

---

<sup>64</sup>It should, however, be noted that, while the practice is Greek, several of the states which claimed kinship with Rome were not. Lampsacus, Delos, and Ilium were all Greek cities, and Demetrius clearly was a Greek ruler. The Mamertines, Saguntum, Capua, Phrygia, Lycia, Segesta, Centuripe and the Aedui were not Greeks, but all seem to have had some exposure to the Greek world, and most were thoroughly Hellenized by the period under discussion. For the Greek influence on the Campanians, Frederiksen 141-48; the Mamertines, themselves Campanians, had been in the service of the Greeks of Syracuse before taking over the Greek city of Messana; for Hellenization of the Lycians, Magie 523-24; of the Sicilians, Finley 22-24; for Greek influences on Phrygia, Magie 456, 458, 759. The Aedui were by no means as thoroughly Hellenized as the Sicilians and the peoples of Asia Minor, but they lived some 200 miles up the Rhône river from the Greek city of Massalia, which, as we have seen, recognized and responded to at least one claim of interstate kinship in the early second century B.C. We can see the influence of the Greeks in their coinage, their artifacts, their art, and in their use of the Greek alphabet, though not apparently in their language. Saguntum, in Spain, was furthest from Greek influence, but even there the Massaliotes and other Greeks had been trading for some centuries. Given the degree of Greek influence on these various states, it does not seem surprising that they should make use of one of many standard Greek diplomatic practices.



## Works Cited

In addition to the standard abbreviations of *LSJ*<sup>9</sup> and *OLD*, I have employed the following short titles, keyed to the works below:

- Inscr. Ilion* = Frisch 1975.  
*Inscr. Lampsakos* = Frisch 1978.  
 Meiggs-Lewis = Meiggs 1969 (1975).  
*Staatsverträge* = Schmitt 1969.

- Alföldi, A. 1957. *Die Trojanischen Urahnen der Römer*. Basel.  
 Asheri, D. 1970. "Note on the resettlement of Gela under Timoleon." *Historia* 19: 618-623.  
 Bailey, D. R. Shackleton (ed.) 1965. *Cicero: Epistulae ad Atticum*, Vol. I. Cambridge.  
 \_\_\_\_\_. 1988. *Cicero: Letters to his Friends*. Atlanta, GA.  
 Baslez, M.-F. and C. Vial. 1987. "La diplomatie de Délos dans le premier tiers du II<sup>e</sup> Siècle." *BCH* 111: 281-312.  
 Bradley, K. R. 1978. *Suetonius' Life of Nero: An Historical Commentary*. Collection Latomus 157. Brussels.  
 Colin, G. 1905. *Rome et la Grèce de 200 à 146 avant Jésus Christ*. Paris.  
 Degrassi, A. 1951-52. "Le dediche di popoli e re Asiatici al popolo Romano e a Giove Capitolino." *Bull. Comm.* 74: 19-47.  
 Elwyn, S. 1991. *The Use of Kinship Terminology in Hellenistic Diplomatic Documents: An Epigraphical Study* (Diss. U. Pennsylvania).  
 Farrow, J. G. 1992. "Aeneas and Rome: Pseudepigrapha and Politics." *CJ* 87: 339-359.  
 Finley, M. I. 1979. *Ancient Sicily*, 2nd ed. Totowa, NJ.  
 Frederiksen, M. 1984. *Campania*, ed. N. Purcell. Rome.  
 Frisch, P. 1975. *Die Inschriften von Ilion*. Bonn.  
 \_\_\_\_\_. 1978. *Die Inschriften von Lampsakos*. Bonn.  
 Furneaux, H. 1907 [rept. 1951]. *The Annals of Tacitus*, Vol. II, 2nd ed., rev. H. F. Pelham and C. D. Fisher. Oxford.  
 Gabba, E. 1991. *Dionysius and The History of Archaic Rome*. Berkeley.  
 Galinsky, G. K. 1966. *Aeneas, Sicily, and Rome*. Princeton.  
 \_\_\_\_\_. 1983. "Aeneas in Latium: Archäologie, Mythos und Geschichte," in *2,000 Jahre Vergil. Ein Symposium*, ed. V. Pöschl. Wiesbaden. 37-55.  
 Getty, R. J., ed. 1940 [rept. Salem, NH, 1984]. *M. Annaei Lucani De Bello Civili*. Cambridge.  
 Gruen, E. S. 1992. *Culture and National Identity in Republican Rome*. Ithaca, NY.  
 \_\_\_\_\_. 1984. *The Hellenistic World and the Coming of Rome*. Berkeley.  
 Hadas, M. (ed) 1942. *Complete Works of Tacitus*, transl. A.J. Church and W.J. Brodribb. New York.  
 Hall, E. 1988. "When did the Trojans turn into Phrygians? Alcaeus 42.15." *ZPE* 73: 15-18.  
 Hampl, F. 1972. "Vorgeschichte des ersten und zweiten punischen Krieges." *ANRW* I.1: 412-41, esp. 412-27.  
 Harmand, J. 1984. *Vercingétorix*. Fayard.  
 Herzog, R. 1928. *Heilige Gesetze von Kos*. Berlin.  
 Hoffmann, W. 1969. "Das Hilfesuch der Mamertiner am Vorabend des ersten punische Krieges." *Historia* 18: 153-80.  
 Holleaux, M. 1935. *Rome, la Grèce et les monarchies hellénistiques au III<sup>e</sup> siècle avant J.-C. (273-204)*. Paris.

- Holmes, T. Rice. 1911 [rept. New York, 1971]. *Caesar's Conquest of Gaul*, 2nd ed. Oxford.
- Homolle, Th. 1884. "Les Romains à Délos." *BCH* 7: 75-158.
- Jones, H.L., ed. 1929 [rept. 1949]. *Strabo's Geography*. London/Cambridge, MA.
- Lazenby, J. F. 1978. *Hannibal's War: A Military History of the Second Punic War*. Warminster, UK.
- Linderski, J. 1992. "Virgil and Dionysius." *Vergilius* 38: 3-11.
- Magie, D. 1950. *Roman Rule in Asia Minor to the End of the Third Century After Christ*. Princeton.
- Maier, U. 1978. *Caesars Feldzug in Gallien (58-51 v.Chr.) in ihrem Zusammenhang mit der stadtrömischen Politik*. Bonn.
- Manganaro, G. 1962. "Un senatus consultum in Greco dei Lanuvini e il rinnovo della cognatio con i Centuripini." *Rend. Acc. Arch. Lett. Bell. Arti Napoli* n.s. 37: 23-44.
- Meiggs, R. and D. Lewis. 1969 [rept. with corrections 1975]. *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions*. Oxford.
- Molthagen, J. 1975. "Der Weg in den ersten punischen Krieg." *Chiron* 5: 89-127.
- Momigliano, A. 1977. *Essays in Ancient and Modern Historiography*. Middletown, CT.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1984. *Settimo Contributo alla Storia degli Studi Classici e del Mondo Antico*. Rome.
- Osborne, M. 1982. *Naturalization in Athens, Vol. II*. WLSK jaarg. 44, no. 101. Brussels, D1. 11-16.
- Paton, W. R. 1926 [rept. 1978]. *Polybius: The Histories*. London.
- Perret, J. 1942. *Les Origines de la légende troyenne de Rome*. Paris.
- Rankin, H. D. 1987. *Celts and the Classical World*. London and Sydney.
- Rizzo, F. P. 1974. *Studi Ellenistico-Romani*. Palermo.
- Robert, L. 1977. "Documents d'Asie Mineure." *BCH* 101: 43-142.
- Roddaz, J.-M. 1984. *Marcus Agrippa*. Rome.
- Roussel, P. 1916. *Délos, colonie athénienne*. Paris.
- Santini, C. 1991. *Silius Italicus and his View of the Past*. London Studies in Classical Philology 25. Amsterdam.
- Schmitt, H.H. 1969. *Die Staatsverträge des Altertums, III: Die Verträge der griechisch-römischen Welt von 338 bis 200 v. Chr.* Munich.
- Scullard, H.H. 1989. "Carthage and Rome." *CAH* 7.ii, 2nd ed. Cambridge. 486-569.
- Seibert, J. 1963. *Metropolis und Apoikie: Historische Beiträge zur Geschichte ihrer gegenseitigen Beziehungen*. Würzburg.
- Sherwin-White, A. N. 1973. *The Roman Citizenship*, 2nd ed. Oxford.
- Talbert, R. J. A. 1974. *Timoleon and the Revival of Greek Sicily, 344-317 B.C.* Cambridge.
- Walbank, F. 1957. *Commentary on Polybius*, vol. 1. Oxford.
- Will, E. 1979 [Vol. I], 1982 [Vol. II]. *Histoire politique du monde hellénistique*, 2nd ed. Nancy.