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Barbarians Can Be Romans Too

It has been previously disputed whether or not there is any element of justification for war in Julius Caesar's *De Bello Gallico*; even the scholars who agree that Caesar includes elements of justification for his waging of war can not agree on the degree to which he tries to assert the “justness” of his campaign in Gaul. Andrew Riggsby, in his chapter “Empire and the 'Just War’” claims that Caesar makes “serious efforts” (157) to justify his conquest. Riggsby examines the ways Caesar builds upon the “ethnic characterization” of the Gallic people to portray them as a clear and present danger to the Romans, needing to be destroyed before they could attack Rome (173). By portraying the Gauls as a violent, aggressive people, a people who posed a threat to not only the safety, but also the dignity of all Rome, Riggsby illustrates Caesar's methods of characterizing the tribes, a characterization which he then employs as a justification for his conquest. Although Riggsby's analysis uncovers Caesar's main agent for justification, there is another element to his strategy that Riggsby, as well as many other scholars, fail to properly appreciate. Caesar's explicit portrayal of the Gauls as “barbarians” makes them seem physically threatening; however, Caesar also re-imagines the “barbarians” as archaically Roman, capable of presenting a threat to the Roman people and customs if they are left alone to evolve the same as Rome. Caesar accomplishes this element of characterization by employing politically charged idiom in the Gallic context, to imply the political threat the Gauls could become; furthermore, he couples this with Stoic models of thought familiar to his audience to turn the Gauls into proto-Romans. I will explore this concept through the examination of one such word Caesar plays upon, *auctoritas*. I will demonstrate the typical political meaning of the word in Caesar's time using the orations of Cicero and another one of
Caesar's works, *De Bello Civili*. I will then go on to explore his specific usage in *De Bello Gallico* and how it gives political agency to the Gauls. Finally, I will explicate the Stoic models of thought that underlie Caesar's diction and work to complete his implicit characterization. In this examination, I will not only be exploring one important element of Caesar's strategy of justification, but I will also be providing a method for future analysis of his discourse.

*Auctoritas* is typically translated in English as “authority” or “prestige” (Oxford Latin Dictionary, 226). What this definition does not immediately convey, however, is the political weight and distribution of *auctoritas*. Rather than being purely a matter of social standing, *auctoritas* is something with a direct application. As a senator contemporaneous with Caesar's conquest in Gaul, Cicero gives us an impression of the typical political usage of the word in Roman society. I will examine one of his orations, *In Catilinam*, for this purpose. Phrases like *quorum auctoritate [adduco]* (influenced by whose authority2, 1.12) appear numerous times, both in this oration and throughout Cicero's writing. In this type of phrasing, *auctoritas* causes action in others; it causes people to do different things and it changes the way people think. Expanding our earlier example, Cicero tries to explain a crowd defending Catiline, saying that:

*quorum auctoritate multi non solum improbi verum etiam imperiti, si in hanc animadvertissem, crudeliter et regie factum esse dicerent*

(influenced by whose [the men's] authority men, and they not only wicked, but also ignorant, if I punished him would say that I had acted cruelly and tyrannically, 1.12)

Here we see that *auctoritas* is able not only to sway a person, but to ideologically pull them, to alter their beliefs and command their allegiance. It can also be used to repel others; Cicero states
his intention to use the auctoritas of the Consuls to cause the departure of Catiline (Catilinae profectione, 1.13). If unable to command a person, it still works as a tool that can be used against them. Auctoritas, then, is not simply a measure of communal respect, but also something deployable. It is a type of authority that can command, even without any explicit orders.

Besides the sheer force of auctoritas politically, it also has a unique distribution of agency in the Roman context. Rather than be confined to individuals, auctoritas is often applied to entire groups of Roman people; in fact, looking again to the writings of Cicero, we often see moments where all of Rome shares a common sense of auctoritas. For example, Cicero rhetorically asks Cataline huius tu neque auctoritatem verebere nec iudicium sequere nec vim pertimesces (will you neither feel awe of her [Rome's] authority, nor deference for her judgment, nor fear of her power, In Catilinam, 1.7). Rome as a collective body is shown to possess authority in the same way we would normally conceive of an individual holding authority; the concept is not reserved for individuals alone. One of the most common pairings of auctoritas is actually with the Roman Senate (e.g. 1.2). Furthermore, things produced by groups possessing auctoritas are also imbued with the same authority, such as the auctoritas ordinis (authority of an order, 1.1) that Cicero summons at the start of his speech. We have seen then, two important facets of auctoritas: first, that it carries a tremendous amount of agency, and second that this agency is not limited to individuals, but can be applied to entire Roman groups, as well as the products of those groups. The disbursement of auctoritas is generally to groups of Roman citizens, and they possess their authority over other Roman citizens and other peoples. It is a type of collective power and prestige. Auctoritas is best thought of, then, as a tool, a tool usable by groups and institutions.
The same usage of *auctoritas* is readily apparent in other Rome centered works of Caesar as well. For example, in *De Bello Civili*, Caesar, in trying to negotiate with the Roman Senate, tells them *debere eos Italiae totius auctoritatem sequi potius quam unius hominis voluntati obtemperare* (they ought to be swayed rather by the authority of all Italy, than to follow the will of one particular person3, 1.35). Caesar, in this particular usage, applies *auctoritas* in the same way as Cicero; it is something held mutually among the Romans, something which is meant to be engaged as a tool to sway others. Between the two choices Caesar presents to the Senators, it also seems the “positive” choice, the one more natural.

Caesar also establishes the auctoritas of others as an opposing force. Throughout *De Bello Civili* Caesar constantly tries to lessen the *auctoritas* of Pompey (*auctoritatem ... minueret*, 3.43). Caesar is only interested in combating the *auctoritas* of others because he understands the way it can be deployed. He sets it up as an element in the war, a tool that can turn the rest of Rome against him. In trying to lessen the leverage *auctoritas* gives his enemies, Caesar further establishes its political role. From these examples we can both conclude that a common definition of *auctoritas* is being used in Caesar's time, as well as construct an idea of the combination of connotation and denotation of the word would have for the Roman audience.

Operating with this proper predicate understanding of its Roman context, I will now examine the way Caesar uses the word *auctoritas* in terms of the Gauls. Many of the core concepts are the same; *auctoritas* is still used as a tool, able to sway groups of people into action. For example, near the beginning of his commentary, Caesar notes that the Helvetians are prompted to leave their homes *auctoritate Orgetorigis permoti* (influenced by the authority of Orgetorix4, *De Bello Gallico* 1.3). The largest difference presented in this example is in the distribution; instead of a large group possessing *auctoritas*, a single man is exerting it over a
group. A similar case exists for a man named Lucterius, who Caesar tells us *semper auctor novorum consiliorum magnam apud barbaros auctoritatem haberet* (always being the author of new projects had considerable authority among the barbarians, 8.32). In both cases, a single man is able to employ the exact same tools we earlier observed being used by the Romans and their institutions, including even the Roman Senate. Caesar details the way that an individual can rise to possess political status among these “barbarian” tribes. But there is another, more complex element presented when Caesar discusses inter-Gallic relationships. Even Caesar differentiates between the different “Gallic” peoples, taking several pauses to discuss the distinct customs of the varying peoples. Caesar notes that one tribe, the Senones, *est civitas in primis firma et magnae inter Gallos auctoritatis* (is a state eminently powerful and of great influence among the Gauls, 5.54). At first glance, this seems like a typical deployment of the word; however, the very fact that the word is used typically conveys a message about the organization of the tribes. There is enough advancement among these “barbarians” to recognize relationships between their various groups. Caesar creates that relationship not just between different states, but also through individuals amongst those states. When trying to convince the Briton tribes to enter into formal relationships with the Romans, Caesar selects a local official whose *auctoritas in his regionibus magni habebatur* (influence ranked highly in those countries, 4.21). Even if the messenger is sent by Caesar and from a different people, his *auctoritas* is recognized in a multitude of separate places.

In terms of denotation, Caesar's usage of *auctoritas* is not largely variant from the definition established reading Cicero and Caesar's other, more Rome-oriented work. Still, Caesar's consistent usage of the word *auctoritas* in this strikingly similar manner raises one large question: what does the usage do to the connotation of the word, or is there meant to be
any change at all from the Roman sense? If the literal meaning of the word has not
unrecognizably shifted in Caesar's writing, are we as readers supposed to view the Gauls in the
same way Cicero or Caesar would have us view the Romans?

It is intentional that we adopt this view of the Gauls, but only to a certain degree.
Although, as I stated, the denotation of *auctoritas* has not become unrecognizable, it is still not
*quite* the same. In just the same sense, we should not begin reading the Gauls as Romans, but
rather as bearing a similarity to the Romans. There is a clear, constructable political organization
among the Gauls. This construction is reflected in the usage of *auctoritas*, which is both being
applied in unexpected places, like in an individual in a “barbarian” tribe, and in rather
unexpected ways, like between two of the “barbarian” tribes. The first example shows the
political agency of a person; the second shows the political organization of a place. Both of
these ideas would be shocking and alarming. For places believed to be filled with “barbarians,”
Caesar implies a large amount of organization, community, and diplomacy. There are many
qualities that Caesar's portrayal of the Gauls *share* with the Romans; the Roman diplomacy
with their Italian neighbors is one such similarity, one that would be likely to stick in the minds
of Roman readers. Despite Caesar's detailed efforts to illustrate the “barbarian” traits of the
Gauls, under the surface are brewing undeniable similarities between Gaul and Rome; these
similarities contribute to the overall characterization of the Gauls.

But if we are to believe that the “ethnic characterization” of the Gallic people is meant to
classify them as barbarians, and in doing so provide justification for Caesar's campaign, what is
Caesar's purpose in promoting the condition of the Gauls?

Riggsby explains that the key to Caesar's attempt to justify his expedition is illustrating
that his reasons for war are “preemptive and preventative” (159). It would be easy to say that,
since Caesar says the Gauls are barbarians, they are naturally dangerous and any warfare with them is preventative; this viewpoint, however, is also a little myopic, as it does not pay due attention to what Caesar can accomplish by giving the Gauls an elevated state. There is no reason to believe that the Gauls being dangerous and also being more than “barbarians” are mutually exclusive ideas.

Proof of this concept can be found by examining Stoic models familiar to the Roman audience. Stoic thinker Poseidonius is said to have thought that conquerors “make war and subdue others, taking along with their captives whatever was useful and beautiful in them to imitate; precisely what the Romans did in earlier times” (Deipnosophistae 229). The stoic philosophy of thinkers like Poseidonius was brought to Rome by conquered Greeks who served as tutors to the Roman elite (Griffin 1989: 3). The models of these Stoic thinkers became incredibly popular; Cicero himself claimed to have brought it “into the forum and almost on to the battlefield itself” (Griffin 11). There are two of these models which Caesar is employing in his characterization of the Gauls. The first model is the one presented by Poseidonius; civilizations like Rome were the result of expansion over time; as time passed, they consumed the places around them, growing up to be great and powerful. Rome, by the time of Caesar, had become as large as it had by the conquest of the Latins, and with its expansion came some of its governmental refinements. Rome was, at one point, ruled by kings. Now, as a “Republic,” with a growing empire beneath it, Roman thinkers were alert to the fact that they themselves had come from primitive, almost “barbarian,” roots. But there is a second, equally important idea working in conjunction; the second model describes “human history as cyclical” (Boys-Stones 2001: 29), a series of primitive societies becoming more advanced, being destroyed, and replaced by new primitive societies from the outer parts of the world (36).
In this model of history, moving out geographically becomes synonymous with moving back through time. Thus, from this outlook, the Gauls Caesar is warring with can represent a type of Proto-Roman people. They are seen as less advanced, but they are still developing, growing, and becoming more refined over time. There are more threatening elements to the Romans than mindless savages, namely, savages who are following the same trajectory Rome once did. By deploying these models within the framework of his characterization of the Gauls as possessing some political agency and likeness to Rome, Caesar invokes the silent fear that the Gauls are not just mindless, but developing barbarians with forward momentum. If we are to believe that Caesar's end goal is to justify why preventative measures must be taken against the Gauls, these Stoic ideas provide an excellent model for explaining the terror that could be created by characterizing the Gauls in a more advanced condition.

A large part of the overall “ethnic characterization” takes place overtly in Caesar's comments that the Gauls are savage and cruel; however, the implicit portion, delivered through his use of Roman political idiom in the Gallic context, brings out the much more frightening aspect of the Gauls, the possibility that they are expanding and growing. Rome came from savages, and the Gauls are represented by Caesar as bearing all the qualities the early Romans once did; although Caesar takes time to call them barbarians, he also establishes the fact that they are advancing, growing, and therefore present a real threat to the Roman people.
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Appendix:

Usage of Auctoritas in Ancient Sources

Use of Auctoritas in Caesar's De Bello Gallico:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book 1, Chapter 3:</th>
<th>Induced by these considerations, and influenced by the authority of Orgetorix, they determined to provide such things as were necessary for their expedition...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>His rebus adducti et auctoritate Orgetorigis permoti constituerunt ea quae ad proficiscendum pertinent comparare...</td>
<td>whose influences with the people is very great, who, though private men, have more power than the magistrates themselves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book 1, Chapter 13:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quorum auctoritas apud plebem plurimum valeat, qui privatim plus possint quam ipsi magistratus.</td>
<td>Caesar could, either by his own influence and by that of his army, or by his late victory, or by name of the Roman people, intimidate him</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book 1, Chapter 31:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caesarem vel auctoritate sua et exercitus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
vel recenti victoria vel nomine populi Romani
dettere posse

Book 1, Chapter 33:
magnam se habere spem et beneficio suo et
auctoritate adductum Ariovistum finem
injuris facturum.

Book 2, Chapter 4:
qua ex re fieri uti earum rerum memoria
magnam sibi auctoritatem magnosque
spiritus in re militari sumerent.

Book 2, Chapter 13:
Quod si fecerit, Haeduorum auctoritatem
apud omnes Belgas amplificaturum.

Book 3, Chapter 8:
Huius est civitatis longe amplissima
auctoritas omnis orae maritimae regionum
earum

Horum auctoritate finitimi adducti

Book 3, Chapter 23:
Quorum adventu magna cum auctoritate et
magna [cum] hominum multitudine bellum
gerere conantur.

Book 4, Chapter 13:
et cognita Gallorum infirmitate quantum iam
apud eos hostes uno proelio auctoritatis
essent consecuti sentiebat

Book 4, Chapter 21:
cuius et virtutem et consilium probabat et
quem sibi fidelem esse arbitrabatur cuiusque
auctoritas in his regionibus magni habebatur,
mittit.

Book 5, Chapter 4:
tum magni interesse arbitrabatur eius
auctoritatem inter suos quam plurimum
valere, cuius tam egregiam in se voluntatem
perspexisset.
... magnae inter Gallos auctoritatis cognoverat.

Tum Tito Balventio, qui superiore anno primum pilum duxerat, viro forti et magnae auctoritatis... utrumque femur tragula traicitur.

Tamen Senones, quae est civitas in primis firma et magnae inter Gallos auctoritatis... 

Ac tantam sibi iam his rebus in Gallia auctoritatem comparaverat ut undique ad eum legationes concurrerent, gratiam atque amicitiam publice privatimque peterent.

qui summam auctoritatem eorum judicio habere existimantur, quorum ad arbitrium judiciumque summa omnium rerum consiliorumque redeat.

... neque, aliter si faciat, ullam inter suos habet auctoritatem.

Hos illi diligenter tuebantur: ita et novam et repente collectam auctoritatem tenebant.

His autem omnibus druidibus praeest unus, qui summam inter eos habet auctoritatem.

Itaque ut reliquirum imperatorum res adversae auctoritatem minuunt, sic huius ex contrario dignitas incommodo accepto in dies...
contra, his dignity increased daily, although a loss was sustained

...that it rested with his activity and influence to prevent it.

...that the rest were held in check by [the Aedui’s] authority.

Litavicus had been admitted by the Aedui into Bibracte, which is a town of the greatest importance among them.

Embossies are sent by them in all directions: as far as they can prevail by influence, authority, or money, they strive to excite the state [to revolt].

He sprung from the noblest family among the Arverni, and possessing great influence, says, "I shall pay no attention to the opinion of those who call a most disgraceful surrender by the name of a capitulation; nor do I think that they ought to be considered as citizens, or summoned to the council.

Influenced by the example of the Carnutes...

...and being always the author of new projects, had considerable authority among the barbarians.

Two he detached to the Aedui, knowing them to have a very powerful influence throughout all Gaul.

And though he was frequently told that Labienus was solicited by his enemies, and was assured that a scheme was in agitation by the contrivance of a few, that the senate...
neque contra senatus auctoritatem ut aliquid faceret potuit adduci.

Book 8, Chapter 54:
Sic enim existimabat tutissimam fore Galliam, si Belgae, quorum maxima virtus, Aedui, quorum auctoritas summa esset, exercitibus continerentur.

should interpose their authority to deprive him of a part of his army; yet he neither gave credit to any story concerning Labienus, nor could be prevailed upon to do any thing in opposition to the authority of the senate.

For he thought that Gaul would be most secure, if the Belgae, a people of the greatest valor, and the Aedui, who possessed the most powerful influence, were kept in awe by his armies.

Use of Auctoritas in Cicero's In Catilinam:
Speech 1, Chapter 1:  
habemus senatus consultum in te, Catilina, vehemens et grave, non deest rei publicae consilium neque auctoritas huius ordinis.

Speech 1, Chapter 2:  
at vero nos vicesimum iam diem patimur hebescere aciem horum auctoritatis.

Speech 1, Chapter 7:  
huius tu neque auctoritatem verebere nec iudicium sequere nec vim pertimesces?

Speech 1, Chapter 8:  
neque hi solum quorum tibi auctoritas est videlicet cara, vita vilissima...

Speech 1, Chapter 12:  
quorum auctoritate multi non solum improbi verum etiam imperiti, si in hunc animadvertisset, crudeler et regie factum esse dicerent.

Speech 1, Chapter 13:  
polliceor hoc vobis, patres conscripti, tantam in nobis consulibus fore diligentiam, tantam in vobis auctoritatem, tantam in equitibus Romanis virtutem, tantam in omnibus bonis consensionem ut Catilinae profectone

For we have a resolution of the senate, a formidable and authoritative decree against you, O Catiline

But we, for these twenty days have been allowing the edge of the senate's authority to grow blunt, as it were.

And will you neither feel awe of her authority, nor deference for her judgment, nor fear of her power?

And not they alone, whose authority forsooth is dear to you, though their lives are unimportant...

...influenced by whose authority many, and they not wicked, but only ignorant, if I punished him would say that I had acted cruelly and tyrannically.

I promise you this, O conscript fathers, that there shall be so much diligence in us the consuls, much authority in you, so much virtue in the Roman knights, so much unanimity in all good men, that you shall see everything made plain and manifest by the departure of Catiline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use of Auctoritas in Caesar's De Bello Civili:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Book 1, Chapter 1:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sin Caesarem respicient atque eius gratiam sequatur, ut superioribus fecerint temporibus, se sibi consilium capturum neque senatus auctoritati obtemperatum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>But if they regarded Caesar, and affected to court his friendship, as had been the practice for some time past, he knew, he told them, what he had to do, and was determined to disclaim their authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book 1, Chapter 32:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>legatos ad Pompeium de compositione mitti opertet, neque eo reformatore, quod in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That in the mean time it would be proper to</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Book 1, Chapter 1:

But if they regarded Caesar, and affected to court his friendship, as had been the practice for some time past, he knew, he told them, what he had to do, and was determined to disclaim their authority. That in the mean time it would be proper to send a deputation to Pompey, to treat of an accommodation: nor was he frightened at the difficulty Pompey had started some time before in the senate; that to send deputies was to acknowledge the superiority of him to whom they were sent, and a sign of timidity in the sender.

...but to be swayed rather by the authority of all Italy, than the will of one particular person.

And assembling the soldiers, put them in mind of what advantage their steadiness and zeal had been to Caesar at Corfinium, and how serviceable towards the conquest of the greatest part of Italy.

Having been therefore twice indebted to him for his life, and being also much in Pompey's esteem, Caesar thought him a proper person to negotiate between them.

… and lastly, to lessen the great reputation and high idea entertained of Pompey.

Because they dreaded presenting them to Scipio's authority to be such, as not only privileged him to advise freely, but even to enforce his counsels, and compel the obstinate to hearken to reason: that he was possessed of an independent command, and had an army at his disposal to give weight to his interposition.

… and not suffer him to be deceived by depending on the general's honour …

… to send some persons of the greatest authority to Achillas …

… who had both been ambassadors at Rome,
Caesar took care to secure the king's person, and in great credit with Ptolemy, the father of whose name would authorise his proceedings.

Caesar effect, magnam regium nomen apud suos auctoritatem habere existimans

and in great credit with Ptolemy, the father...