

HANNAH ČULÍK-BAIRD

## Archias the Good Immigrant

*Abstract:* Cicero's *Pro Archia* has historically been taken as a *bona fide* expression of humanism. In this article, I demonstrate how this reading of the *Pro Archia* has allowed the political and cultural tensions in the speech to remain hidden. Cicero's vision of Archias as an idealized amalgam sanitizes both the poetic and the cultural identity of his Syrian client in favour of a projection which combined generic "Greekness" with a politicized invocation of the Roman poet, Q. Ennius. Contextualizing the *Pro Archia* within its contemporary political moment reveals that Cicero is consciously constructing a narrative of Archias as a "good immigrant."

Keywords: Cicero, oratory, poetry, xenophobia, immigration

I

n 62 BCE, Cicero stood before an audience of jurors and on-lookers and sang the praises of poetry (*Arch.* 19):

sit igitur, iudices, sanctum apud uos, humanissimos homines, hoc poetae nomen, quod nulla umquam barbaria uiolauit. saxa et solitudines uoci reponent, bestiae saepe immanes cantu flectuntur atque consistent: nos, instituti rebus optimis, non poetarum uoce moueamur?

May the name "poet," judges, be held sacred among you as men of great culture. No foreign land has ever violated this name. Stones and deserts respond to voice, monstrous beasts are turned and stop at the sound of song. Shall we, educated in the best things, not be moved by the voice of the poets too?

---

I would like to express my enormous gratitude to Joel Christensen, John Dugan, and James Uden for their comments on early drafts of this article.

---

*Rhetorica*, Vol. XXXVIII, Issue 4, pp. 382–410. ISSN: 0734-8584, electronic ISSN: 1533-8541. © 2020 by The International Society for the History of Rhetoric. All rights reserved. Please direct all requests for permission to photocopy or reproduce article content through the University of California Press's Reprints and Permissions web page, <http://www.ucpress.edu/journals.php?p=reprints>. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1525/rh.2020.38.4.382>

Invoking the prototypical mythic bard, Orpheus, whose song charmed wild animals and enticed even rocks and trees to follow where he led, or Amphio, whose lyre enchanted stones to build the walls of Thebes, Cicero asks his Roman audience to believe, at least for a moment, in the divine power of the poet.<sup>1</sup> The *Pro Archia* presents itself as a meditation on the importance of poetry in the life of humankind: poetry educates (*Arch.* 1; 5), refreshes the mind (12), and monumentalizes human achievement (21). Indeed, it is precisely the image of the *Pro Archia* as a *bona fide* defense of humanism and the elevation of the human spirit which was accepted by its later readers. These poets and orators took Cicero's praise of divine poesis as a sincere manifesto and claimed the *Pro Archia* as a programmatic text for their own systems of thought. Yet, the *Pro Archia* is not a straightforward exhortation towards a "liberal arts" education. The speech is the defense of a foreigner, a Greek-speaking Syrian named Archias, whose claim to the Roman citizenship had been brought into question by a hostile prosecutor. Cicero's rhetoric of elevated humanism papers over a more complicated set of political and social concerns relating to the status of immigrants and their identity in late Republican Rome. In this article, I argue that Cicero constructs a narrative of the "good immigrant" for the Syrian poet, Archias, which carefully avoids the realities of his ethnic and poetic identity, and instead projects an image of the poet as an acceptable "Greek" stereotype. Reframing the *Pro Archia* in such a way reveals it to be implicated within and responding to evolving discourses regarding citizenship at Rome. Contextualized within such a discourse, the *Pro Archia* reveals itself to be a carefully constructed script which capitalizes on the idealization of poets who service empire, and thereby masks Archias' own poetic self-fashioning. I here begin with a brief analysis of how Cicero's *Pro Archia* persuaded modern audiences of its own rhetorical stance, thereby successfully occluding its more complex motives.

#### THE IMPACT OF CICERO'S *PRO ARCHIA*

On 8 April 1341, Petrarch delivered an oration commonly known as the *Collatio laureationis* (*Coronation Oration*),<sup>2</sup> before a crowd of

---

<sup>1</sup>Orpheus: Apollodorus 1.14, 1.111, 1.135, 2.63; Hyginus 14.1, 14.27, 14.32, 251, 273.11. Cicero elsewhere (*Nat. Deor.* 1.107) refers to Orpheus as a construct. Amphio (Greek Amphion): Apollodorus 1.93, 1.95, 3.41–48, 3.111; Hyginus 7–11, 14.14, 76, 97.5, 155. Cicero (*Div.* 2.133) refers to the famous debate between Amphio and his twin brother, Zethus, quoting Pacuvius' *Antiopa*.

<sup>2</sup>Its full title is *Collatio edita per clarissimum poetam Franciscum Petrarcam Florentinum, Romae in Capitolio, tempore laureationis sue*. See A. Hortis, *Scritti inediti di*

luminaries on the Capitoline hill at Rome on the occasion of his crowning as poet laureate. Petrarch's oration meditated on the power of poetry, drawing on the ancient Roman poets to do so. The speech is filled with citations of Virgil, Horace, Ovid, Lucan, Juvenal, and Statius. The Latin of the poetic quotations intermingles with Petrarch's own Latin, whose vocabulary is often drawn from them in the first place. Some have considered this speech, with its blending of old and new, "the first manifesto of the Renaissance."<sup>3</sup> The oration begins with a quotation of Virgil's *Georgics* (3.291–292):

Sed me Parnasi deserta per ardua dulcis raptat amor. Georgicorum III.  
Hodierno die magnifici ac venerabiles viri poetico mihi more procedendum est et idcirco propositionem meam non aliunde quam ex poeticis scripturis elicui.<sup>4</sup>

'But a sweet longing urges me upward over the lonely slopes of Parnassus.' *Georgics* Book Three.<sup>5</sup> Today, magnificent and venerable sirs, I must follow in my speech the ways of poetry, and I have therefore taken my text from none other than a poetic source.

Petrarch then dissects the lines of Virgil which he has quoted, demonstrating their applicability to his difficult task as a poet: "for he who undertakes to climb the *ardua deserta Parnasi* must indeed long intensely for that which he seeks to attain."<sup>6</sup> Although Virgil is the starting point, it is Cicero to whom Petrarch turns for an interpretive apparatus. The intense focus and dedication which a poet requires, at first illustrated with the word "*amor*" as it appears in Virgil's *Georgics*, is further explained with citations from Cicero. In *Tusculan Disputations* Book 4, Petrarch says, Cicero explained the Peripatetic position that "study without longing and without great mental pleasure and delight cannot attain the desired results,"<sup>7</sup> which amounts

*Francesco Petrarca* (Trieste: Tipografia del Lloyd Austro-Ungarico, 1874), 311; D. Looney, "The Beginnings of Humanistic Oratory: Petrarch's Coronation Oration," in V. Kirkham and A. Maggi, eds., *Petrarch: A Critical Guide to the Complete Works* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2009), 390.

<sup>3</sup>E. H. Wilkins, *Studies in the life and works of Petrarch* (Cambridge, MA: Mediaeval Academy of America, 1955), 300.

<sup>4</sup>English translation by E. H. Wilkins (1955), with adjustments.

<sup>5</sup>I have added the English phrase "Georgics Book Three," which Wilkins omitted.

<sup>6</sup>Petr. *Collatio*, Hortis p. 312: *quisquis enim per ardua deserta parnasi cupit ascendere necesse habet amare quod cupit.*

<sup>7</sup>Petr. *Collatio*, Hortis p. 312: *cum studium sine amore atque aliqua mentis magna delectatione et voluptate quadam optatos non producat effectus.*

to a paraphrase of *Tusculans* 4.44.<sup>8</sup> Petrarch connects what Cicero says in the *Tusculans* with a passage of the *De Inventione* (1.36),<sup>9</sup> which he quotes more closely: “the very definition of study as an assiduous and eager concentration of mind directed with great pleasure toward some object of striving.”<sup>10</sup>

That the hard work of striving is not enough, but that a poet must have talent or inspiration, Petrarch takes from Cicero’s *Pro Archia*, a speech which he himself had rediscovered at Liège in 1333.<sup>11</sup> Petrarch here paraphrases Cicero’s *Pro Archia* 18:<sup>12</sup>

Non mihi sed Ciceroni credite qui in oratione pro Aulo Licinio Archia de poetis loquens verbis talibus utitur. Ab eruditissimis viris atque doctissimis accepimus, ceterarum rerum studia et ingenio et doctrina et arte constare, poetam natura ipsa valere et mentis viribus excitari et quasi divino quodam spiritu afflari ut non inmerito noster ille Hennius suo quodam iure sanctos appellet poetas quod deorum munere nobis commendati esse videantur, hec Cicero.<sup>13</sup>

Take not my word for this, but Cicero’s who in his oration for Aulus Licinius Archias has this to say of poets: “We have it upon the authority of the most learned men that whereas attainment in other activities depends upon talent, learning, and skill, the poet attains through his very nature, is moved by the energy that is within his mind, and is as it were inspired by a divine inbreathing—so that Ennius fairly calls poets sacred in their own right, since they appear to be commended to us by the possession of a divine gift.”

Although the Latin poets’ testimonies are crucial to Petrarch, it is Cicero’s *Pro Archia* that exerts the greatest influence. In this speech, Cicero turned a legal defense into an opportunity to speak in a more

<sup>8</sup>Cic. TD 4.44: *philosophiae denique ipsius principes numquam in suis studiis tantos progressus sine flagranti cupiditate facere potuissent. . . num putamus haec fieri sine summo cupiditatis ardore potuisse?*

<sup>9</sup>Cic. Inv. 1.36: *studium est autem animi assidua et uehementer ad aliquam rem adplicata magna cum uoluptate occupatio, ut philosophiae, poeticae, geometricae, litterarum.*

<sup>10</sup>Petr. Collatio, Hortis p. 312: *ex diffinitione ipsius studii quod nihil est aliud quam assidua et uehemens ad aliquam rem applicata magna cum uoluptate occupatio.*

<sup>11</sup>Petrarch (Sen. 16.1) famously describes rediscovering the *Pro Archia* and copying it in his own hand with yellow ink “like saffron” (*id croco simillimum*).

<sup>12</sup>Petrarch foreshortens some of Cicero’s prose. I reproduce the pertinent part of *Pro Archia* 18 (Gotoff’s text) as a comparandum: *ac sic a summis hominibus eruditissimisque accepimus, ceterarum rerum studia ex doctrina et praeceptis et arte constare: poetam natura ipsa ualere et mentis uiribus excitari et quasi diuino quodam spiritu inflari. quare suo iure noster ille Ennius ‘sanctos’ appellat poetas, quod quasi deorum aliquo dono ac munere commendati nobis esse uideantur.*

<sup>13</sup>Hortis pp. 312–313.

elevated way on the power and importance of poets and poetry. In addition to Petrarch's explicit quotation of *Pro Archia* 18, the influence of this speech on Petrarch's *Coronation Oration* can be felt in several places. Cicero claims to speak "in a new and unaccustomed mode" (*nouo quodam et inusitato genere dicendi*, *Arch.* 3), one which is not usual for the courtroom; Petrarch imagines himself decorating the Roman Capitol with "new and unaccustomed laurels" (*nouis et insuetis frondibus*). Cicero said that the prize for hard work was praise and glory (*mercedem. . . laudis et gloriae*, *Arch.* 28). In his copy of the *Pro Archia*, Petrarch here wrote "be careful, though"<sup>14</sup> in the margin, but in the *Coronation Oration* he too claimed that the human desire for glory was innate: *glorie appetitum. . . insitum*.<sup>15</sup>

For Petrarch, then, Cicero's *Pro Archia* was fundamentally an oration about poetry. When a friend from Florence offered three more Cicero speeches, Petrarch thanked him with a copy of *Pro Archia*, which he described as a speech "stuffed with wonderful praise of poets" (*refertam miris poetarum laudibus*, *Var.* 45). Petrarch's interest in the speech meant that after his death the *Pro Archia* was one of the texts in his library that was most copied. Almost 270 manuscripts of the speech survive today; of these, all but four derive from the transcription made by Petrarch in 1333.<sup>16</sup> Michael Reeve has emphasized the fact that it was Petrarch's interest itself which sparked such an intense focus on the speech.<sup>17</sup> In the *Pro Archia*, the Renaissance humanists read *de studiis humanitatis ac litterarum* (*Arch.* 3):<sup>18</sup> the text was therefore perceived to be fundamentally a speech about "humanism" and "literature." A canonizing focus has elevated the speech and dislodged it from its historical context.<sup>19</sup>

---

<sup>14</sup>M. D. Reeve, "Classical Scholarship," in J. Kraye, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Renaissance Humanism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 21.

<sup>15</sup>Hortis p. 318.

<sup>16</sup>Reeve (1996), 23; J. de Keyser, "The Descendants of Petrarch's 'Pro Archia,'" *Classical Quarterly* 63 (2013), 292–328.

<sup>17</sup>Reeve (1996), 25: "What. . . of Petrarch's liking for the *Pro Archia*? Without it, his discovery might have led nowhere. Some works of classical literature owe their survival to responses like it."

<sup>18</sup>Reeve (1996), 22.

<sup>19</sup>I use the term "canonizing focus" to describe the phenomenon which occurs when an author excerpts a particular passage of text and thereby exerts such a focus upon it that later writers do not consider the passage in its original context, but rather think of the text in the terms presented by the famous excerpter. Another example of this phenomenon is the impact of Cicero's engagement with the poet, Ennius, upon Petrarch. Petrarch was only aware of Ennius because Cicero quoted him (see *Petr. Fam.* 3.18.4; *Fam.* 22.2.11), yet Ennius appeared as a character in Petrarch's own epic,

The *Pro Archia* in its afterlife became an icon of humanism and, in certain contexts, was read as a protreptic towards a liberal arts education. In 1903, W. E. B. Du Bois published *The Souls of Black Folk*, a meditation in fourteen essays on the contemporary struggles and experiences of African Americans which urged education as a vital remedy to a history of violence, alienation, dehumanization. In this work, Du Bois consistently presents education as the natural and necessary extension of the process which the legal emancipation of slaves had only begun. The first essay, entitled "Of Our Spiritual Strivings," urged "work, culture, liberty . . . not singly but together, not successively but together"; the "ideal of 'book-learning'" was "the curiosity, born of compulsory ignorance, to know and test the power of the cabalistic letters of the white man, the longing to know." While his contemporary, Booker T. Washington had taken a practical and materialist stance, Du Bois looked to education as a means of transcendence and empowerment.<sup>20</sup> The concepts of "longing" and "striving" which had appeared in Petrarch in relation to humanism come through with even greater urgency in Du Bois in the context of social crisis.

And, like Petrarch, Du Bois had turned to Cicero to make his case. In the fourth essay of *Souls*, "Of the Meaning of Progress," Du Bois reflects on his experiences as a teenager teaching rural African American school children outside Alexandria, Tennessee. When some of the children did not appear at the schoolhouse for their lessons because they were needed at home for physical labour (the boys were needed to tend the crops; the girl to take care of the baby), Du Bois picked up his copy of Cicero's *Pro Archia*:

When the Lawrences stopped, I knew that the doubts of the old folks about book-learning had conquered again, and so, toiling up the hill, and getting as far into the cabin as possible, I put Cicero *pro Archia Poeta* into the simplest English with local applications, and usually convinced them—for a week or so.

Matthias Hanses has recently argued that Du Bois' citation of Cicero in the *Souls* reactivates the *Pro Archia* as a canonical text while simultaneously inscribing Du Bois as part of that canon.<sup>21</sup> Du Bois

---

the *Africa*. On Cicero, Ennius, and Petrarch, see N. Goldschmidt, "Absent Presence: *pater Ennius* in Renaissance Europe," *Classical Receptions Journal* 4.1 (2012), 1–19.

<sup>20</sup>P. Rankine, *Ulysses in Black: Ralph Ellison, classicism, and African American literature* (Madison, WI: Wisconsin studies in Classics, 2006), 26; E. A. Hairston, *The ebony column: classics, civilization, and the African American reclamation of the west* (Knoxville, TN: The University of Tennessee Press, 2013), 182.

<sup>21</sup>M. Hanses, "Cicero Crosses the Color Line: *Pro Archia Poeta* and W. E. B. Du Bois's *The Souls of Black Folk*," *International Journal of the Classical Tradition* 26 (2019), 10–26.

cited the *Pro Archia* several times as part of his endorsement of education. On 10 March 1891, Du Bois gave a lecture entitled "Does Education Pay?" to the National Colored League which included a close paraphrase of *Pro Archia* 20.<sup>22</sup> Later in life, Du Bois would write that he used the *Pro Archia* when he persuaded his daughter to go to college.<sup>23</sup>

The perception that the *Pro Archia* is a *bona fide* emblem of humanism has had consequences on how it is studied. Although the text has received several commentaries in Italian and German,<sup>24</sup> the only English commentary remains Harold Gotoff's *Cicero's Elegant Style*. Gotoff considers the speech closer to the "set-piece of declamation. . . devoid of public purpose, a form of decorative art" than to an actual legal defense.<sup>25</sup> As a result, he focuses on Cicero's artful construction of periods and prose rhythm. His commentary breaks down the sentence structure of the speech, but in no way comments on social, legal, or cultural issues raised by its contents. Gotoff's commentary by its execution argues that the only point of interest in the *Pro Archia* is its aesthetic. Subsequent scholarship revealed more about the *Pro Archia* by contextualizing the speech in different ways: Catherine Steel highlights how the *Pro Archia* constructs a vision of empire; John Dugan reads the *Pro Archia* as evidence of Cicero's impulse towards textual self-construction.<sup>26</sup>

In this article, I build on these contextualizations by focusing upon the individual of Archias himself, once described as "a cipher in whom most of us cannot muster much interest."<sup>27</sup> The *Pro Archia* was published following Cicero's defense of the Greek-speaking Syrian poet,

---

<sup>22</sup>Hanses (2019), 14.

<sup>23</sup>Hanses (2019), 15.

<sup>24</sup>R. Cornali, *Cicerone, Pro Archia* (Turin: Giovanni Chiantore, 1941); M. Zicari, *M. T. Cicerone, La difesa di Archia* (Turin: Loescher, 1974); K. Vretska and H. Vretska, *M. Tullius Cicero, Pro Archia poeta. Ein Zeugnis für den Kampf des Geistes um seine Anerkennung* (Darmstadt: WBG, 1979); A. Coşkun, *Cicero und das römische Bürgerrecht: die Verteidigung des Dichters Archias. Einleitung, Text, Übersetzung und historisch-philologische Kommentierungen*. *Vertumnus* Bd 5 (Göttingen: Ruprecht, 2010).

<sup>25</sup>H. Gotoff, *Cicero's Elegant Style* (Urbana, Chicago, London: University of Illinois Press, 1979), 81.

<sup>26</sup>C. E. W. Steel, *Cicero, Rhetoric, and Empire* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001); J. Dugan, *Making a New Man. Ciceronian Self-Fashioning in the Rhetorical Works* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005).

<sup>27</sup>W. M. Porter, "Cicero's *Pro Archia* and the Responsibilities of Reading," *Rhetorica* 8 (1990), 139; cf. J. H. Taylor, "Political Motives in Cicero's Defense of Archias," *American Journal of Philology* 73 (1952), 62: "Archias was not an important person, and no great issue was at stake."

Archias, in a citizenship trial.<sup>28</sup> I begin by emphasizing that, in the context of contemporary Roman citizenship law, Archias' case is an exceptional one, not the norm. While in reality, Archias owed his citizenship to the patronage of the Roman general, Lucullus, Cicero emphasizes the contingency of Archias' citizen status upon his relationship to the Greek city of Heraclea. As a result, he constructs his argument to emphasize two themes: Archias' poetry as service to empire; and Archias as a generic and palatable "Greek." In the former, he relies on a vision of poetry which rests on politicized characterization of the poet, Quintus Ennius; in the latter, he sanitizes the realities of Archias' poetry. In sum, the *Pro Archia's* apparent appeal to high-minded ideals about poetry is a smokescreen deliberately designed to create an image of the immigrant that suits the political preconceptions of Cicero's audience.

#### ARCHIAS THE CITIZEN

By 91 BCE, the issue of granting Roman citizenship to Italians could no longer be contained. After the tribune M. Livius Drusus' bill recommending the grant of citizenship to non-citizen Italians was rejected, revolts engulfed the whole of central and southern Italy. It was to address this particular historical moment that two laws which inform Archias' case, the *Lex Iulia de ciuitate Latinis danda* (90–89 BCE) and the *Lex Plautia Papiria* (probably 89 BCE), were each passed.<sup>29</sup> The *Lex Iulia* gave Roman citizenship to Latins and allies who had stayed loyal to Rome during the Social War, or who had formally agreed to lay down their arms.<sup>30</sup> The *Lex Plautia Papiria*, for which the prime evidence is *Pro Archia* 7,<sup>31</sup> seems to have allowed individuals who were registered (*ascripti*) in the cities affected by the *Lex Iulia* to become citizens.

In a letter from 46 BCE, Cicero refers to a man named L. Manlius Sosis from the town of Catina in Sicily who had received Roman citizenship from his "adscription" (*erat enim adscriptus, Fam.* 13.30.1) at Naples. Sherwin-White suggests, based on the cases of Archias and

---

<sup>28</sup>Whether the speech which Cicero delivered is the same as what we can read today, we do not know.

<sup>29</sup>Coşkun (2010), 43.

<sup>30</sup>Vell. Pat. 2.16, App. 1.49; C. Nicolet, *The World of the Citizen in Republican Rome*. Translated by P. S. Falla (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1980), 232.

<sup>31</sup>A. N. Sherwin-White, *The Roman Citizenship* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973), 151; Coşkun (2010), 43.



this Sicilian Manlius, that the *Lex Plautia Papiria* adjusted the *Lex Iulia* to include non-Italians who had been “adscripted” into Italian communities which received Roman citizenship.<sup>32</sup> Archias was therefore not made a citizen by the *Lex Iulia*, but by the *Lex Plautia Papiria*, which extended the citizenship right to those who were associated with the cities enfranchised by the *Lex Iulia*.<sup>33</sup> Archias’ claim was dependent on a provable link to one of these cities. Although Cicero has Tarentum, Locri, Rhegium, and Naples grant Archias citizenship (*Arch.* 5), it is particularly a connection to the city of Heraclea, granted *municipium* status c. 89 BCE,<sup>34</sup> which Cicero seeks to prove (*Arch.* 7–8).<sup>35</sup> That these were all culturally Greek cities is a point of importance, which we will return to shortly.

The law under which Archias was prosecuted (*Arch.* 10) was the *Lex Papia* of 65 BCE, which expelled non-citizens from Rome (*Off.* 3.47) and allowed for the prosecution of those who had illegally acted as Roman citizens (Dio 37.9.5).<sup>36</sup> Earlier expulsions from Rome had aimed at removing Italian influence:<sup>37</sup> in 95 BCE, the consuls L. Licinius Crassus and Q. Mucius Scaevola passed a law to remove Italians from Rome;<sup>38</sup> “Latin rhetoricians” (*Latinos rhetoras*) were

<sup>32</sup>Sherwin-White (1973), 152.

<sup>33</sup>Coşkun (2010), 44.

<sup>34</sup>The municipal regulations survive on the bronze tablets, the *Tabulae Heracleenses*, CIL I<sup>2</sup> 593. See M. H. Crawford, *Roman Statutes* (London: University of London, Institute of Classical Studies, 1996), 355–391.

<sup>35</sup>Cicero claims that the physical evidence of Archias’ “adscription” at Heraclea had been destroyed during the Social War (*Arch.* 8). Instead he relies on the witness testimony of Lucullus himself and a deputation from Heraclea (*Arch.* 8). That Cicero privileges Lucullus’ authority over physical evidence is a suggestion that the latter may never have existed; see S. P. Haley, “Archias, Theophanes, and Cicero: The Politics of the *Pro Archia*,” *Classical Bulletin* 59 (1983), 3. Cicero is indignant that Grattius, the prosecutor, privileges the *memoriam litterarum* to the *memoriam hominum* (*Arch.* 8). But the deemphasis of text as proof in the *Pro Archia* is a departure from Cicero’s regular practice. Cicero’s prosecution of Verres in 70 BCE involved an overabundance of textual evidence—*multitudo litterarum et testium*, “a mass of letters and testimonies” (*Verr.* II 1.16); see S. Butler, *The Hand of Cicero* (London: Routledge, 2002), 35–60.

<sup>36</sup>E. S. Gruen, *The last generation of the Roman Republic* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1974), 410; Nicolet (1980), 232.

<sup>37</sup>On the expulsions from Rome within the context of the extension of citizenship, see Steel (2001), 76.

<sup>38</sup>A fragment of Cicero’s *Pro Cornelio* from 65 BCE preserved by Asconius (67) describes the *Lex Licinia et Mucia* from 95 BCE as *de ciuibus redigendis*. In the *De Officiis* (3.47), Cicero praised the spirit of this law, i.e. that a non-citizen should not act as a citizen. But he thought that barring the city’s access to foreigners, as he says the *Lex Papia* did or was intended to do, was “cruel” (*inhumanum est*, *Off.* 3.47).

expelled from Rome in 92 BCE (Suet. *Rhet.* 25).<sup>39</sup> Cicero's *De Oratore*, which has the dramatic date of 91 BCE, incidentally captures some of the anti-Italian sentiment of that era. During Caesar Strabo's excursus on wit, he refers to a recent situation where M. Aemilius Scaurus (cos. 115 BCE), angry at the illegal adoption of Roman citizenship by Italians, quoted two verses of the comic playwright Caecilius Statius (somewhat ironically—Statius apparently came from Mediolanum).<sup>40</sup> These verses tell Scaurus' opponents to "shut up" and accuse them of being bastards (*De Or.* 2.257):

. . .ut Stati a Scauro stomachante: ex quo sunt nonnulli, qui tuam legem de ciuitate natam, Crasse, dicant:

*st, tacete, quid hoc clamoris? quibus nec mater, nec pater,  
tanta confidentia? auferte istam enim superbiam.*<sup>41</sup>

. . .like the verse of Caecilius Statius quoted by a fuming Scaurus. There are some who would say that your own law on citizenship, Crassus, came out of this:

*Sh, shut up! What's this shouting? From men without mother, without  
father  
such boldness? Away with your arrogance.*

Cicero here has Strabo refer to Crassus' and Scaevola's law of 95 BCE.<sup>42</sup> The apparent "wit" of the quotation does not come (at least solely) from the fact that the verses were cited from a Roman comedy, but from the aptness of the verses to describe the tension between the hostile Scaurus and the imagined Italian "bastards," usurping Roman civil rights.

But the *Lex Papia* of 65 BCE was not aimed at criminalizing or expelling the Italians who had been involved in the Social War, since, following the *Lex Iulia*, those communities had become enfranchised.<sup>43</sup> Roman citizenship was always defined by Rome's relationship with peoples

---

<sup>39</sup>R. Kaster, *Suetonius: De grammaticis et rhetoribus* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995), 30–31; D. Noy, *Foreigners at Rome: Citizens and Strangers* (London: Duckworth, 2000), 37–39.

<sup>40</sup>Jer. Chron. a. Abr. 1838 = 179 BCE.

<sup>41</sup>Caecilius Statius *inc.* 251–253 Warmington.

<sup>42</sup>See n34.

<sup>43</sup>H. Mouritsen, *Italian Unification: A Study in Ancient and Modern Historiography* (London: University of London, Institute of Classical Studies, 1998), 7.

considered to be outside of itself.<sup>44</sup> By the 60s, Rome's expanded and expanding interests meant that the individuals perceived to be making illegal use of the citizenship were coming from farther afield. The *Lex Papia* arose out of an evolving idea of what it really meant to be "Italian," since it was related to the question of whether to enfranchise the communities north of the River Po, i.e. the "Transpadane" Gauls. In 65 BCE, the year of the *Lex Papia*, the censors, Q. Lutatius Catulus (cos. 78 BCE) and the future triumvir, M. Licinius Crassus (cos. 70, 55 BCE), fought over whether to extend the Roman citizenship to the Transpadanes. They failed to conduct the census and were compelled to resign (Dio 39.9). Roman citizenship would not be extended all the way to the Alps until the *Lex Vatinia* of 49 BCE (Suet *Iul.* 28.3).<sup>45</sup>

Given that the expansions and limitations of the Roman citizenship in the 1st century BCE seem to be so connected to Rome's history with Italians, it is significant that the extant citizenship cases—those recorded by Cicero's *Pro Archia* and *Pro Balbo*—do *not* involve individuals from the Italian peninsula. The men who were defended by Cicero against prosecutions made under the *Lex Papia*, Archias (62 BCE) and L. Cornelius Balbus (56 BCE), came from Antioch in Syria (*Arch.* 4) and Gades (modern Cádiz) in "Further Spain" (*Balb.* 5).<sup>46</sup>

Each in their own way, Archias and Balbus reflected the limits of the contemporary Roman world, coming as they did from opposite points on the wide expanse of the Mediterranean. In the *Pro Archia*, Cicero describes the poet's travels from east to west in a manner which emphasizes the physicality of geographical distance: Archias begins in Antioch (*Arch.* 4), where he was born; he travels to other parts of Asia and all of Greece (*Arch.* 4); then he makes it to Italy, where he is welcomed at Tarentum, Locri, Rhegium, and Naples (*Arch.* 5), an imagined sailing route which takes him from Italy's "heel," round the "toe," and north to Campania. Balbus' hometown of Gades lay beyond the Pillars of Hercules,<sup>47</sup> considered an edge of the known world in

---

<sup>44</sup>In reference to the theory and practice of modern American immigration, B. Honig, *Democracy and the Foreigner* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001), 75, notes that the legitimacy of a political status quo uses a "mechanism of legitimation. . . that operates through the agency of foreignness."

<sup>45</sup>Gruen (1974), 410.

<sup>46</sup>Steel (2001), 77.

<sup>47</sup>Strabo 3.3.1: ἔξω δὲ Στηλῶν τὰ ἀδεια, "Gades, however, is outside the Pillars." On Gades as a pilgrimage site beyond the known world, see A. Fear, "A Journey to the End of the World," in J. Elsner, I. Rutherford, eds., *Pilgrimage in Graeco-Roman and Early Christian Antiquity: Seeing the Gods* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), 328.

antiquity.<sup>48</sup> Despite its “extreme” western position, Gades, as an ancient Phoenician settlement,<sup>49</sup> had deep connections to the east and extant evidence suggests complex cultural hybridity.<sup>50</sup> From the Roman perspective, Archias and Balbus were men from the boundaries of the world.

The context of the *Lex Papia*'s passing strongly suggests that it was intended to address an anxiety regarding illegal use of the Roman citizenship *within* Italy. In the *Pro Archia*, Grattius, the prosecutor, claims that citizenship records were regularly tampered with during this period (*Arch.* 8). Cicero himself admits that non-Romans “crept somehow” (*aliquo modo. . . inreperunt*, *Arch.* 10) onto the records of citizens in the *municipia* even following the *Lex Papia*. There must have been far more mundane cases prosecuted under the *Lex Papia* involving individuals from Italy which Cicero was not involved in. Archias and Balbus were each enfranchised by Roman generals, Lucullus (*Arch.* 6–8) and Pompey (*Balb.* 6) respectively.<sup>51</sup> Cicero does refer to the regular processes of documentation and validation of Archias' citizenship (*Arch.* 7–8), but we should take seriously his emphasis of Lucullus' eminent authority: “Lucullus says that he performed the action” (*sed egisse dicit*, *Arch.* 8). Archias and Balbus, then, although social inferiors to their patrons, were privileged and exceptional citizenship cases, not the norm. Each foreigner became initially involved with their patron because of military operations: Archias accompanied Lucullus on campaign (*Arch.* 6); Balbus fought under Pompey in Spain

---

<sup>48</sup>Generally speaking, the Pillars of Hercules refer to the narrow strait between the Iberian peninsula and Africa, connecting the Atlantic Ocean with the Mediterranean. When Pompey was given *imperium* in 67 BCE via the *Lex Gabinia* to handle the pirate crisis, the wide scope of his power was limited to “the sea on this side of the Pillars of Hercules” (Plut. *Pomp* 25), which emphasized his power over the known and navigable seas rather than expressing a true limitation. In the *Inferno* (26.106–108), Dante writes of passage through the Pillars of Hercules: ‘accìo che l'uom più oltre non si metta,’ “for men never to pass beyond.”

<sup>49</sup>The city known to the Romans as “Gades” was founded by Phoenicians from Tyre as “Gaddir,” i.e. “fortified place”; see Fear (2015), 319.

<sup>50</sup>Pliny (*NH* 3.1.8) cites Agrippa, who in creating his map of the world, considered the region of Gades to be Phoenician; see Fear (2015), 319. Coins from the Gades area minted between the middle of the 2nd c. BCE and the first half of the 1st c. BCE have bilingual inscriptions in Latin and a variant of neo-Punic; see A. Jiménez, “Punic after Punic Times? The Example of the So-called ‘Libyphoenician’ Coins of Southern Iberia,” in J. C. Quinn, N. C. Vella, eds., *The Punic Mediterranean: Identities and Identification from Phoenician Settlement to Roman Rule* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014), 219–242.

<sup>51</sup>Pompey also enfranchised the historian, Theophanes of Mitylene, at a military *contio* (*Arch.* 24); see Haley (1983), 2; B. K. Gold, “Pompey and Theophanes of Mitylene,” *American Journal of Philology* 106 (1985), 313.

(*Balb.* 5). The military context of the patronage relationship goes some way towards explaining the overarching message of the *Pro Archia*: that poets service empire.

The scholars who suggest that the prosecution of Archias was an attempt to embarrass Lucullus, Archias' patron, and that the speech is therefore more about political conflict among elites than "immigration,"<sup>52</sup> are right to the extent that the "immigrant" becomes a cipher for pushing a political agenda and debating the boundaries of national identity. Scholarship on modern immigration has pinpointed a cultural and political process whereby outsiders are welcomed into a society only if they meet certain conditions, i.e. they fulfil the role of a "model minority,"<sup>53</sup> or are perceived to have extraordinary abilities, such as national or international acclaim.<sup>54</sup> In the context of 1st century BCE concerns regarding the regulation of the Roman citizenship, Archias' case is extraordinary. His prosecution could be interpreted as an attempt to chastise the most powerful men at Rome for how they choose to wield their influence. Both Lucullus and Pompey gave preferential treatment to foreigners, their own personal dependents and intimates, in a manner which could be perceived to override the system of law as it applied to the common people. Read in this way, the *Pro Archia* is less an exhortation towards humanism and more a defense of political power granted by military command.

Since Cicero's characterization of poetry was influenced by the political context of the case, we should suspect that his depiction of Archias was manipulated to fit his rhetorical strategy. Cicero's projected ideals in the *Pro Archia* were deeply dependent on a construction of political poetics based on a perception of the relationship between the Latin poet, Quintus Ennius, and his Roman patrons (*Arch.* 20). Cicero's depiction of Ennius as the "good poet" and "good citizen" who used his poetry principally to further the Roman agenda of empire must also be an overstatement of the truth of Ennian poetry.<sup>55</sup> In other

---

<sup>52</sup>Taylor (1952), 63; Haley (1983); Porter (1990), 140; Steel (2001), 81.

<sup>53</sup>On the history of immigration exemptions for Chinese elites which shaped the concept of the "model minority" in the United States, see M. Y. Hsu, *The Good Immigrants. How the Yellow Peril Became the Model Minority* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2015). Honig (2001), 74, notes that the American myth of immigration is founded on an insistence of individual exceptionalism: the immigrant's virtues elevate the moral character of their new community, thereby returning the nation to what it considers to be its first principles.

<sup>54</sup>A current prerequisite for the immigrant visa classification EB-1A in the United States.

<sup>55</sup>It is noteworthy that the oft-repeated anecdote about Ennius' three hearts (Oscan, Latin, and Greek) does not come from Cicero, but Gellius (17.17.1). On

words, Cicero's depiction of Ennius in the *Pro Archia* was also politically motivated and to some extent papered over heterogeneous aspects of Ennian works which do not conform to the idea of poetry in service of empire.<sup>56</sup> In turn, Cicero based his projection of Archias on an idealized relationship between the classic Latin poet of the previous century, not on current poetic (or political) trends. The assimilation between Archias and Ennius has the effect of arguing that Archias too was a "good poet" and "good immigrant," and likewise masks the truth of Archias' poetics. An examination of the *Pro Archia* in dialogue with extant contemporary Hellenistic epigram, including poems which may have been written by Archias himself, reveals the distance between Cicero's image of Archias and Archias' own self-fashioning.

#### ARCHIAS THE "GREEK"

We regularly read that Archias was a "Greek poet."<sup>57</sup> But, of course, assertions of "Greekness" during the Ciceronian era (or any era) are not straightforward. Archias, Cicero says (*Arch.* 4), came from the city of Antioch, once the capital of Syria under the Seleucids.<sup>58</sup> By the time of his citizenship trial, Antioch had recently been taken into Roman control, following Pompey's activities in the area.<sup>59</sup> Antioch as a Hellenistic city was a deliberate, forceful expression of Greek elite culture,<sup>60</sup> simultaneously modulated by its entanglement with other

---

Ennius' own strategies of self-positioning, see I. Gildenhard, "'The 'Annalist' Before the Annalists: Ennius and his *Annales*,'" in U. Eigler et al, eds., *Formen römischer Geschichtsschreibung von den Anfängen bis Livius. Gattungen, Autoren, Kontexte* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2003), 93–114. On Cicero's distortion of Ennius, see J. Zetzel, "The Influence of Cicero on Ennius," in W. Fitzgerald and E. Gowers, eds., *Ennius Perennis: the Annals and beyond* (Cambridge: Cambridge Philological Society, 2007), 1–16.

<sup>56</sup>J. Elliott, *Ennius and the Architecture of the Annales* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 172.

<sup>57</sup>Dugan's "Syrian-born Greek-speaking poet" (2005), 31, comes closer, but I think we can explore the issue further.

<sup>58</sup>G. Downey, *A History of Antioch in Syria* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1961), 54; S. Sherwin-White and A. Kuhrt, *From Samarkand to Sardis. A New Approach to the Seleucid Empire* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993), 38, 135.

<sup>59</sup>R. Seager, *Pompey: A Political Biography* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1979), 53–63.

<sup>60</sup>In a laudatory oration for the city, Libanius (4th c. CE), who came from Antioch, claimed (*Or.* 11.76) that its foundation was the fulfilment of none other than Alexander the Great's design. Little of Hellenistic Antioch has physically survived, since the area was extensively rebuilt during the Roman period, see Sherwin-White and Kuhrt (1993), 135.

cultures. In particular, Jewish culture was a presence in the city since at least the 2nd century BCE, when Judaea became a Seleucid possession under Antiochus III.<sup>61</sup> The Maccabean revolt (167-160 BCE), a Jewish uprising against Seleucid power, and Hellenistic intellectual influence, attests to the tensions created by the simultaneous potentialities of cultural binarism or hybridity in this area.<sup>62</sup>

Archias' slightly older contemporary, the Syrian poet Meleager (c. 130 - c. 70 BCE), who collected Greek epigrams into his *Garland*,<sup>63</sup> came from the city of Gadara. Meleager called Gadara the "Attic city of Syria" (Ἀτθίς ἐν Ἀσσυρίοις, *Ath. Pal.* 7.417.2). The city lay east of Lake Gennesareth, had formed part of the Seleucid kingdom since 198 BCE, and was incorporated by the Romans in 63 BCE. In a famous poem, Meleager presents himself as a cultural hybrid (*Anth. Pal.* 7.419):

Ἀτρέμας, ὦ ξένε', βραῖνε παρ' εὐσεβέσιν γὰρ ὁ πρέσβυς  
 εὐδῆι, κοιμηθεὶς ὕπνον ὀφειλόμενον,  
 Εὐκράτεω Μελέαγρος, ὁ τὸν γλυκυδάκρυον ρωτα  
 καὶ Μούσας λαραῖς συστολίσας ἀρίσιν  
 ὄν θεόπαις νδρωσε ὕρος ἀδάρων θ' ἐρὰ χθών·  
 Κῶς δ' ἐρατῆ Μερόπων πρέσβυν ἐγηροτρόφει.  
 ἀλλ' εἰ μὲν Σύρος ἐσσί, Σάλαμ εἰ δ' οὖν σύ γε οἶνιξ,  
 αἰδῖος<sup>64</sup> εἰ δ' ἄλλην, αἶρε τὸ δ' αὐτὸ φράσον.

*Go noiselessly by, stranger; the old man sleeps among  
 the pious dead,  
 wrapped in the slumber that is the lot of all.  
 This is Meleager, the son of Eucrates, who linked  
 sweet tearful Love  
 and the Muses with the merry Graces.*

<sup>61</sup>Downey (1961), 108. Jewish intellectual tradition imagined a Jewish presence at Antioch which even predated the Seleucids. The Talmud identified Antioch with places from the ancient tradition, Hamath and Riblah; the meeting between Nebuchadnezzar and the Great Sanhedrin was placed at Daphne, the suburb of Antioch. See C. H. Kraeling, "The Jewish Community at Antioch," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 51 (1932), 131-132.

<sup>62</sup>F. Millar, *Rome, the Greek World, and the East. Volume 3: The Greek World, the Jews, and the East. Edited by Hannah M. Cotton and Guy M. Rogers* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2006), 3-31.

<sup>63</sup>A. S. F. Gow, D. L. Page, *The Greek Anthology. Hellenistic Epigrams. Vol. I* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965), xiv-xvii; K. J. Gutzwiller, *Poetic Garlands. Hellenistic Epigrams in Context* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998), 276-77.

<sup>64</sup>Gow-Page *ad loc.*: "αὐδονίς (Scaliger) or αὐδονί (Herwerden) is said to be a likelier Greek equivalent for the Phoenician; Plautus *Poen.* 1141 is commonly quoted here, but it is hard to see what use can be made of it."

*Heavenborn Tyre and Gadara's holy soil reared him to  
manhood,  
and beloved Cos of the Meropes tended his old age.  
If you are a Syrian, Salam! if you are a Phoenician,  
Naidios! if you are a Greek, Chaire! And say the  
same yourself.*<sup>65</sup>

In this and the two other autobiographical poems, Meleager makes claims on the Phoenician city of Tyre as well as Gadara. Here, both cities raised him to manhood (7.419.5). In another, Gadara was simply the “first” (πρώτα, 7.418.1) in a list of cities which Meleager considers home: first Gadara, then Tyre (7.418.2), then the island of Cos (7.418.3), which made him a citizen (ἄστών, 7.418.4). Poem 7.419 sets itself up like an inscribed stone on an imagined crossroad,<sup>66</sup> a place where a “Syrian” (Σύρος) might say “Salam,” a Phoenician, “Naidios,” a Greek, “Chaire.” In another poem, Meleager identifies himself as Syrian: “If I am Syrian, so what?” (εἰ δὲ Σύρος, τί τὸ θαῦμα; 7.417.5) and many scholars have seen in this the rhetorical stance of a self-conscious admission of inferiority.<sup>67</sup> Yes, Meleager says, I am Syrian. But: “we, stranger, live in one country, one world” (μῖταν, ζένε, πατρίδα κόσμον | ναίομεν, 7.417.5–6).

Meleager's autobiographical poems give us a small window into the cultural complexity which lay beneath expressions of “Greekness” in Syria during Archias' lifetime.<sup>68</sup> There are points of contact between what Meleager says of himself and what Cicero says of Archias. Both Archias and Meleager are itinerant: Archias in Asia, Greece, then Italy; Meleager in Gadara, Tyre, then Cos. Both poets are claimed by cities as new citizens: Archias by Heraclea, Meleager by Cos. But as for Meleager's insistence on a Syrian identity expressed in Greek words—nothing like this appears in Cicero's *Pro Archia*. When Cicero speaks of another individual from Gadara, Philodemus the poet and Epicurean

<sup>65</sup>As translated by Paton in the 1917 Loeb edition.

<sup>66</sup>M. Luz, “Salam, Meleager!” *Studi italiani di filologia classica* 6 (1988), 222–231.

<sup>67</sup>B. Isaac, *Empire and Ideology in the Graeco-Roman World: Selected Papers* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017), 157; N. J. Andrade, *Syrian identity in the Greco-Roman World* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 49; R. Höschel, “‘If I Am from Syria — So What?': Meleager's Cosmopoetics,” in S. L. Ager, R. A. Faber, eds., *Belonging and Isolation in the Hellenistic World* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2013), 20.

<sup>68</sup>See K. Gutzwiller, “Genre and Ethnicity in the Epigrams of Meleager,” in S. L. Ager, R. A. Faber, eds., *Belonging and Isolation in the Hellenistic World* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2013), 47–70, on the interaction of genre and ethnicity in Meleager.



philosopher,<sup>69</sup> he simply calls him *Graecus* (*Pis.* 68, 69, 70).<sup>70</sup> This should be our first clue that when Cicero speaks of “Greekness” he refers to a socio-cultural construction rather than a specific point of origin or “ethnicity.”<sup>71</sup>

Given that the *Pro Archia* presents itself as a meditation on the power of poetry, it is striking that Cicero seems not to quote any poetry in the speech, whether by Archias or by any other poet.<sup>72</sup> Despite the fact that Cicero professes to speak in a “new mode” (*Arch.* 3), he does not extend this temporary iconoclasm to actually quoting poetry, which, as he says in the *In Pisonem* (71),<sup>73</sup> would violate the norms of forensic oratory.<sup>74</sup> The power of poetry is not allowed to manifest itself by being brought into the court as evidence.<sup>75</sup> Instead, Cicero’s prose itself takes on the generic features of verse.<sup>76</sup> This technique is in fact a natural extension of Cicero’s strategy regarding the projection of *ethos* in the courtroom: as advocate, he was stand-in for his client, and so could temporarily take on his characteristics, or stand as a surrogate for him.<sup>77</sup> In his oratorical surrogacy for Archias, Cicero demonstrated poetry’s potency by claiming that his own oratory had benefited from it: poetry helped in his oratorical training (*Arch.* 1);

---

<sup>69</sup>Philodemus’ poetry also appears in the *Greek Anthology*; see D. Sider, *The epigrams of Philodemus* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997). Philodemus’ Epicurean philosophy was rediscovered in the Villa dei Papiri at Herculaneum.

<sup>70</sup>And even *Graeculus* (*Pis.* 70).

<sup>71</sup>On the concept of “Greek” and “Roman” as cultural constructions rather than “ethnic” designations, see J. Farrell, *Latin Language and Latin Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 18–26; J. Uden, *The Invisible Satirist. Juvenal and second-century Rome* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), 86–116.

<sup>72</sup>When Cicero says that Ennius called poets *sancti* (*Arch.* 18), he may be alluding to something Ennius actually wrote. The two word “*sancti poetae*” appear among Skutsch’s *opera incerti fragmenta* (xvi), see Elliott (2013), 171. S. Timpanaro, “Note a Livio Andronico, Ennio, Varrone, Virgilio,” *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa* 18 (1949), 186–204, suggests that *Arch.* 27 contains a quotation of Ennius’ *Ambracia*.

<sup>73</sup>Dugan (2005), 64 n115.

<sup>74</sup>Although Cicero quoted poetry freely in works which were intended to be consumed primarily by reading (rather than hearing), it was not his usual practice to quote poetry in his oratory, see H. Jocelyn, “Greek poetry in Cicero’s prose writing,” *Yale Classical Studies* 23 (1974), 61; M. von Albrecht, *Cicero’s Style* (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 40.

<sup>75</sup>Contrast this with Petrarch’s *Coronation Oration*, stuffed with citations of ancient poets.

<sup>76</sup>Gotoff (1979), Dugan (2005), 35.

<sup>77</sup>J. May, *Trials of character. The eloquence of Ciceronian ethos* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1988), 10.

poetry relaxed him during his time off, allowing him to return in full vigour (*Arch.* 12).

Although Cicero does not show us Archias' poetry, we may actually still be able to read some of it. The *Greek Anthology* contains many poems which are attributed to an Archias. The trouble, and the reason why these poems are not usually discussed in relation to the *Pro Archia*, is that the poems are ostensibly attributed to several different poets by the name of Archias.<sup>78</sup> Twenty-one poems in the *Greek Anthology* are attributed to "Archias,"<sup>79</sup> four to "Archias of Mitylene,"<sup>80</sup> one to "Archias of Macedon,"<sup>81</sup> one to "Archias of Byzantium,"<sup>82</sup> two to "Archias the younger,"<sup>83</sup> and one (or two) to "Archias the grammarian."<sup>84</sup> D. H. Berry noted that "there could be as many as six Archiases" and that we have no way of knowing which of these poems, if any, were composed by Cicero's Archias.<sup>85</sup> I wonder whether we could explain the proliferation of city names as a byproduct of Archias' itinerant nature; Cicero does say that many cities claimed him as their own.

Faced with such difficulty, it is understandable that scholars have recently been hesitant to use the Archias poems in the *Greek Anthology* as evidence of our Archias.<sup>86</sup> If any of the poems attributed to Archias in the *Greek Anthology* were authored by him, they would represent an important counterbalance to Cicero's depiction of Archias in the *Pro Archia*. One of the arguments against dating these poems to a specific period or indeed taking these poems to be authentic is that they partake in the general characteristics of Hellenistic epigram, a style which

---

<sup>78</sup>H. H. Law, "The Poems of Archias in the Greek Anthology," *Classical Philology* 31 (1936), 225.

<sup>79</sup>*Anth. Pal.* 5.58, 5.59; 6.16, 6.39, 6.179–81, 6.192, 6.207; 7.68, 7.147, 7.191, 7.213, 7.214; 9.343, 9.750; 10.7, 10.8; 15.51; 16.94, 16.179.

<sup>80</sup>*Anth. Pal.* 7.696; 9.19, 9.111, 9.339.

<sup>81</sup>*Anth. Pal.* 7.140.

<sup>82</sup>*Anth. Pal.* 7.278.

<sup>83</sup>*Anth. Pal.* 9.91; 10.10.

<sup>84</sup>*Anth. Pal.* 6.194–195; see Law (1936), 225n4.

<sup>85</sup>D. H. Berry, "Literature and Persuasion in Cicero's *Pro Archia*," in J. G. F. Powell, J. Paterson, eds., *Cicero the Advocate* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 292.

<sup>86</sup>This was not the case in the 19th century, when the editors of the *Anthology* felt reasonably certain that at least the poems marked "Archias" (without a place of origin) were composed by our poet. Stadtmüller marked the Archias poems in Book 6 with "*Antiochensis?*", i.e. Archias of Antioch. Haupt wrote that although he would not say that *all* of the poems attributed to Archias were by the same poet, he did not see anything in the poems which make it impossible for a contemporary of Cicero to have composed them. On the 19th c. editors see Law (1936), 226–229.

persisted for so long that it does not belong to a very specific time period.<sup>87</sup> While this might dissuade us from using the Archias poems as evidence, it could also be turned into a positive argument: the Archias poems in the *Anthology* are written in a general style that we know—from e.g. the epigrams of Meleager or Philodemus—was in vogue during the Ciceronian era.

One way or another, the difference between Cicero's depiction of "Greek" poetry in the *Pro Archia* and what actually appears in the *Greek Anthology* represents a sizeable gulf. The poems attributed to Archias in the *Anthology* do not have anything to do with recording the deeds of great men. Some poems are about love (*Pal. Anth.* 5.58, 5.59); several of them record dedications of specific objects to specific gods: e.g. spoils of the hunt to Pan (6.16; 6.179–181), weaving implements (6.39) and a trumpet (6.195) to Athena, fishing gear to Priapus (6.192), luxury goods to Aphrodite (6.207), a simple offering to Hermes (9.91). Poor women (6.39) and rich women (6.207) are described. Many different places are mentioned (which aligns with Cicero's depiction of Archias as itinerant): Samos (6.39), Naucratis (6.207), the Bosporus (10.7), Thrace (9.111), Troy (6.195), Corycus (9.91). The "Archias" poems present vignettes of personal themes, rather than narratives of Roman nationalism. These poems focus on the individual: their relationship to the gods, objects, and places in their daily lives.

The difference between the epigrams in the *Greek Anthology*, and Cicero's characterization of Archias suggests that Cicero is presenting a deliberately sanitized version of the poet. When Catherine Steel noted that assimilation rhetoric was lacking in the *Pro Archia*—suggesting that such a lack reflected the Roman jury's anxiety at the prospect of foreigners actually becoming Roman citizens—she was right to the extent that Cicero does not try to make Archias into an "ideal Roman citizen."<sup>88</sup> I would suggest, however, that assimilation rhetoric is in fact present, but manifests in a different manner. Bonnie Honig has noted that immigration is often conceptualized as a way in which a nation can "refill" itself with the values it has come to lack or which have become degraded—foreignness "helps to found the regime or return it to itself."<sup>89</sup> The value-system of immigration centres the extraordinary productivity of the foreigner, emphasizing their ability to contribute to their new community. In the context of the

---

<sup>87</sup>Law (1936), 227; "there is nothing in the poems which makes it impossible for them to have been written a generation before Cicero or a century after him."

<sup>88</sup>Steel (2001), 75.

<sup>89</sup>Honig (2001), 73.

contemporary Roman discourse regarding citizenship, which, as we have seen, focused specifically on the identity of *municipia* within Italy, it was important for Cicero to frame Archias' claim to Roman citizenship as a positive response to Roman needs.

Given that his citizenship status is dependent on the culturally "Greek" city of Heraclea, Archias' assimilation is with an acceptable stereotype, or idealized amalgam, of "Greekness," informed by and contingent upon a deliberately constructed vision of the role of Greek culture in Italy. When Cicero says that Greek culture was thriving in Italy at the time of Archias' arrival (*Arch.* 5), he creates a continuity between Archias and the Greekness of southern Italy, and elides potential markers of cultural difference. With such a strategy, Archias is figured as just another Greek intellectual brought to Rome as a desired intellectual commodity: an educator of "great" men (i.e. Cicero himself, *Arch.* 1;<sup>90</sup> Catulus, *Arch.* 5), who commemorated Rome's "greatness" in his poetry.<sup>91</sup> Cicero's insistence upon Archias' essential marketability—a long list of noble Romans court him (*Arch.* 5–7)—suggests Honig's theory that immigrant foreigners can—indeed, they *must*—contribute to the construction of a national ideology by presenting themselves as a productive organ in the mechanism of the nation's selfhood. Cicero's argument that Archias is useful to Rome is dependent on his claim that Archias is indeed a valuable commodity for Rome's image-making. Cicero commodifies Archias via the association with the Greek liberal arts and thereby insists on his market value.

Several of Cicero's contemporary orations, strongly characterized by a deep hostility towards foreigners, cast the decision to sanitize Archias as an acceptable stereotype in high relief. As Francisco Pina Polo (2019) has recently demonstrated, the remains of three Ciceronian speeches—*Pro Fonteio* (c. 69 BCE), *Pro Flacco* (59 BCE), and *Pro Scauro* (54 BCE)—testify to the fact that Cicero found xenophobic rhetoric valuable in mobilizing hostility against his oratorical opponents. Cicero emphasizes cultural difference to incite hatred, emphasizing the superiority of the Roman citizen and the monstrosity of the alien: the testimony of a Roman citizen is always more valuable than that of a foreigner (*Font.* 16; 23; *Flacc.* 5–6); the Gauls do not keep

---

<sup>90</sup>Cicero's claim of Archias' influence upon him cannot be independently verified, and may well be fabricated. Porter (1990), 140, writes that Archias' role in Cicero's early life is a "fable." Taylor (1952), 62, that we have "no reason for doubting that this was a genuine motive."

<sup>91</sup>According to Suetonius (*de gramm.* 1), the "half-Greek" (*semigraeci*) poets, Livius Andronicus and Ennius, were both also teachers at Rome.

oaths because they do not fear gods (*Font.* 30); Greeks cannot be believed because they are Greeks (*Flacc.* 9; 23); Gaul is an inherently cruel nation (*natio crudelissima*, *Font.* 33) which engages in human sacrifice (*Font.* 31); the villagers in the mountains of Asia are uncultured and uneducated (*Flacc.* 8), but so are most of the peoples of the western Mediterranean, the Sardinians, Gauls, Africans, and Hispanians (*Scaur.* 40). In short, when Cicero is on the attack, he finds no shortage of hostile rhetoric with which to other and discredit foreigners.

Cicero's xenophobic rhetoric demonstrates the fact that he understood very well that a Roman audience was capable of deep hostility towards foreigners, and that orators could take advantage (not to mention encourage) such ill-feeling. It is likely that in the speeches for the prosecution, which do not survive, Archias as an Asiatic Greek, was attacked in such a way. Indeed, we might read Cicero's emphasis in the *Pro Archia* upon Archias' "Greek" artistic prowess as part of the orator's technique to combat the hostile stereotyping of the prosecution. That is, the very rhetoric of the liberal arts education which is invoked by modern readers of the *Pro Archia* may have been designed as a carefully strategized antidote to the technique of casting a foreign defendant as a monstrous alien. Cicero betrays some of his own xenophobic thinking in the *Pro Archia* when he reveals how Romans judged poets by their accent: Latin poets from Spain "spoke somewhat fatly and foreignly" (*pingue quiddam sonantibus atque peregrinum*, *Arch.* 26). By criticizing foreign accents of Latin poets, Cicero implicitly raises the question of how Archias, who spoke Greek, would have sounded to a Roman audience.<sup>92</sup>

It is worth noting that the Romans of the Ciceronian period were capable of making differentiations between different types of "Greekness." In the 1st century BCE, there arose among some Roman intellectuals an interest in "Atticism"—that is, an invocation of "classical" Greek models in contemporary Latin rhetoric and prose.<sup>93</sup> The Roman Atticists favoured what they considered to be a simple and elegant aesthetic. The opposite of Atticism was "Asianism" (*genus Asiaticum*, *Brut.* 325), a style considered to be puffed-out, soft, swollen. The Atticists accused Cicero of Asianist bombast

---

<sup>92</sup>Indeed, linguistic performativity was an important feature of the Roman citizenship. In the face of a "Gallic invasion" of orators, Cicero longed nostalgically for the linguistic purity of the satirist, Lucilius (*Fam.* 9.15).

<sup>93</sup>J. Wisse, "Greeks, Romans, and the Rise of Atticism," in J. G. J. Abbenes, S. R. Slings, I. Sluiter, eds., *Greek Literary Theory after Aristotle: A Collection of Papers in Honour of D. M. Schenkeveld* (Amsterdam: VU University Press, 1995), 65–82.

(Tac. *Dial.* 18.4–5, Quint. 12.10.12),<sup>94</sup> particularly for his use of prose rhythm (Sen. *Ep.* 100.7).<sup>95</sup>

An obvious dichotomy emerges here between the austere prestige of the old “Attic” classics, in contrast to an ornamentalism perceived to be “eastern” in origin. Strabo (14.1.41), naming the orator Hegesias of Magnesia ad Sipylum (in Lydia) as the originator of “Asianism,” explicitly described it as a “corruption” (παρὰφθείρας) of established Atticism.<sup>96</sup> Many made the claim to Atticism—Cicero himself, who appealed to Demosthenes as a model (*Brut.* 35), and Meleager, who had called Gadara the “Attic city in Syria” (*Ath. Pal.* 7.417.2). But the Greeks whom the Roman Atticists admired were the long dead ones—the ones whose voices they could only recover to imitate by reading.<sup>97</sup> It is probably not an accident that, as Rome was more and more exposed to poets like Archias, some Romans recoiled from the “new” Greekness of the Hellenistic world, and nostalgically longed for old Athens.

Behind the term “Asianism” lay a potent combination of negative stereotypes: eastern associations, inferior Hellenism, and all the moral perturbations which were supposed to come with this aesthetic. Cicero’s own frustration with the Atticism vs. Asianism debate points to its essentially artificial dualism. But at the bare minimum, the tension in the imagined binary reflects a hierarchizing of different ways to be “Greek.” In fact, Cicero himself encouraged this kind of identity hierarchy; in the *Pro Flacco* (65–66), Cicero distinguished the Greeks from Athens, Lacedaemonia, Achaëa, Boeotia, and Thessaly (i.e. “European” Greeks) and the “Asiatic race” (*Asiaticus genus*) of Greeks from Phrygia, Mysia, Caria, and Lydia.<sup>98</sup> No Greek is to be trusted according to Cicero’s *Pro Flacco*, but “Asian” Greeks are to be trusted even less than “European” ones. Cicero’s defense of Archias the Syrian Greek was designed with these hostile cultural judgments

---

<sup>94</sup>Dugan (2005), 108–109.

<sup>95</sup>Gotoff (1979), 62; Dugan (2005), 111.

<sup>96</sup>Cicero says that Hegesias actually modelled himself after the “Attic” orator, Charisius, and that Hegesias thought himself more Attic than even writers from Athens (*Brut.* 286).

<sup>97</sup>Cicero draws attention to the artificiality of this in his criticism of Thucydides as a model for oratory (*Brut.* 287). Gotoff (1979), 62, remarks that those who styled themselves *Attici* “appealed to cultural chauvinism” in invoking the supposed purity of early Latin oratory as well as “Attic” exemplars.

<sup>98</sup>F. Pina Polo, “The Rhetoric of Xenophobia in Cicero’s Judicial Speeches: *Pro Flacco*, *Pro Fonteio*, and *Pro Scauro*,” in F. Marco Simón, F. Pina Polo, J. Remesal Rodríguez, eds., *Xenofobia y Racismo en el Mundo Antiguo* (Barcelona: edicions de la Universitat de Barcelona, 2019), 120.

in mind: instead of an honest account of Archias' ethnicity and cultural background, Cicero aligns the poet with the most elevated ideals of "Greekness" from the contemporary Roman perspective.

#### ARCHIAS AND THE EPIGRAM

Cicero in the *Pro Archia* makes certain claims about precisely what kind of poetry Archias composed. According to Cicero, Archias began<sup>99</sup> a poem on the Cimbric War as a young man, which pleased Marius (*Arch.* 19);<sup>100</sup> he wrote more than one book (*libri*) on the Mithridatic War, which praised Lucullus (*Arch.* 21); and at the time of the trial, Archias had begun a poem on Cicero's consulship (*Arch.* 28), which, infamously, never materialized (*Att.* 1.16.15).<sup>101</sup> Based on these claims, Archias comes across as an epic poet, since it was the epic hexameter which commemorated and praised war.<sup>102</sup>

But while Cicero projected the idea of Archias as a poet whose works monumentalized Rome, he revealed tensions in his own projection when he actually described Archias' poetic abilities. Archias' prowess as an extemporizer (*Arch.* 18) identifies him as a composer not of epic, but rather epigram. In the *Pro Archia*, Cicero seems to deride poets who write in "lesser" metres. Sulla, who, Cicero says, granted citizenship to men from even Spain and Gaul, was approached by a "bad poet" (*malus poeta*) who presented him with a book of poetry (*libellum*) containing an epigram on the Roman general (*epigramma in eum*)—"it was even in alternating couplets of longs and shorts" (*tantummodo alternis uersibus longiusculis*, *Arch.* 25). Sulla, Cicero says, rewarded the poet (although not with citizenship),<sup>103</sup> provided that the poet never wrote anything again. The joke that bad poetry was

---

<sup>99</sup>Steel (2001), 84, suggested that Cicero's use of the verb *attingo*, which usually means "to begin," to describe Archias' undertaking of these projects (*attigit*, *Arch.* 19; *attigit...atque inchoauit*, *Arch.* 28), implies that they were never completed. When Cornelius Nepos describes Atticus' composition of epigram, he says: *attigit quoque poeticen* (*Att.* 18.5). Since Nepos goes on to describe complete poems which accompany statues, perhaps *attingo* was used by the Romans of this era in a tongue-in-cheek way to describe a genre of poem so naturally short that it was as if it had only just been "begun."

<sup>100</sup>Some have doubted that Archias finished his poem on the Cimbric War; see Vretska and Vretska (1979), 105; Steel (2001), 83.

<sup>101</sup>Steel (2001), 83; Dugan (2005), 47.

<sup>102</sup>Steel (2001), 91.

<sup>103</sup>*Arch.* 25: *statim ex eis rebus quas tunc uendebat iubere ei praemium tribui*, "he immediately ordered that a reward be given to the poet from the things which he was then auctioning."

written in elegiac couplets is intended to distance Archias from this genre, but it may have the opposite effect. While Archias' poetry was, Cicero implies, elevated enough to avoid such a characterization, the transactional nature of the exchange between Sulla and the *malus poeta* reveals how a contemporary Roman may have viewed Archias.

Cicero's projection of Archias as an epicist comes from an assimilation with Homer (*Arch.* 19), as well as with Ennius, author of the Latin epic, the *Annales*.<sup>104</sup> Ennius appears in the speech as the *exemplum* of a foreigner who elevated Rome with his poetry, and was elevated in turn with Roman citizenship. Archias accompanied Lucullus, just as Ennius had followed Fulvius to Aetolia (*Arch.* 27). Ennius, Cicero says, praised Scipio Africanus, Cato the Elder, the Fabii Maximi, the Claudii Marcelli, the Fulvii, and "that was why our ancestors made a man from Rudiae a citizen" (*ergo illum, qui haec fecerat, Rudinum hominem, maiores nostri in civitatem receperunt, Arch.* 20).

Although the emphasis upon the ability of poetry to glorify war (*Arch.* 21), and the invocation of Homer as a poetic prototype may make us think of epic, we should not forget that Ennius, too, wrote epigrams. Indeed, Ennius is credited with bringing not just the hexameter to Rome, but the elegiac couplet.<sup>105</sup> Among the fragments of Ennius we find poems which reflect the inscriptional style of Hellenistic epigram: epitaphs for Scipio Africanus,<sup>106</sup> epitaphs for himself as a poet,<sup>107</sup> even a fragment, attributed to Ennius' *Scipio*, which imagines a statue and a column dedicated to Scipio Africanus by the Roman people.<sup>108</sup> Another fragment of Ennian epigram appears in the *Tusculan Disputations* (5.49) next to Cicero's quotation of an inscription on a statue of the Spartan Epaminondas, testifying to Cicero's view of Ennian epigram as physical, material.<sup>109</sup> Ennius' *Annales*, in its own way, no doubt glorified Roman generals as they extended Rome's reach,<sup>110</sup> but Cicero's emphasis on Ennius' praise for specific individuals may rather refer to Ennius' epigrams.

<sup>104</sup>Steel (2001), 86, 91.

<sup>105</sup>Goldberg-Manuwald T 109 = Isidore *Orig.* 1.39.15.

<sup>106</sup>Goldberg-Manuwald F1a = Cicero *Leg.* 2.56–57, F1b = Seneca *Ep.* 108.33; F3a = TD 5.49, F3b = Lactantius *Div. inst.* 1.18.10–13.

<sup>107</sup>Goldberg-Manuwald F2a = Cicero TD 1.34, F2b = TD 1.117.

<sup>108</sup>Goldberg-Manuwald F7 = *SHA*, Claud. (25) 7.7.

<sup>109</sup>Goldberg-Manuwald F3a = TD 5.49. At TD 5.49 Cicero translates into Latin one line of an inscribed epigram which accompanied a statue of Epaminondas. Pausanias (9.15.6) preserves the Greek.

<sup>110</sup>On *Arch.* 22 and its difficulty as evidence of Ennius' praise of the individuals there named, see O. Skutsch, *The Annals of Q. Ennius* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985), 642.



The inscriptional character of the epigram meant that this form of poetry was a public commodity: words inscribed into stone in public spaces gave the content of the poems over to a community of passers-by. That Cicero imagines some poetry to have a physical dimension (i.e. that it is inscribed into stone, or appears alongside a statue) is implied throughout the *Pro Archia*: Ennius' statue is supposed to be part of the tomb of the Scipios (*Arch.* 22); Accius' verses were inscribed on the temple of Decimus Brutus Callaicus (*Arch.* 27); monuments such as Fulvius' Temple to Hercules Musarum were built from the spoils of war in order to commemorate war (*Arch.* 27).<sup>111</sup> Throughout the *Pro Archia*, Cicero praises poetry's ability to immortalize the great deeds by allowing them to live on in the memory of men (*Arch.* 29–30), but perhaps he means more than just living memory.<sup>112</sup> Poetry inscribed into monuments allowed a spectator to "read" the meaning of that monument. For Rome's generals, the inscribed materials were monuments of empire; for poets, inscriptions reminded their reader that words lived beyond matter.

Cicero knew Ennius' epitaphs, and used them as evidence of the human desire for glory as a kind of life after death in the *Tusculan Disputations* (1.34):

loquor de principibus, quid poetae? nonne post mortem nobilitari uolunt? unde ergo illud?

*aspicite, o ciues, senis Enni imaginis formam:  
hic uestrum panxit maxuma facta patrum*

mercedem gloriae flagitat ab iis quorum patres adfecerat gloria. idemque:

*nemo me lacrimis decoret nec funera fletu  
faxit. cur? uolito uiuos per ora uirum*

sed quid poetas? opifices post mortem nobilitari uolunt. quid enim Phidias sui similem speciem inclusit in clipeo Mineruae, cum inscribere non liceret? quid nostri philosophi? nonne in iis libris ipsis, quos scribunt de contemnenda gloria, sua nomina inscribunt?

I speak about leading men, but what about poets? Do they not want to be known after death? What about this?

---

<sup>111</sup>According to Cicero, the Temple of Hercules Musarum was built from the spoils of the war in Ambracia (*Arch.* 27), which he captured in 189 BCE. Cicero says that Ennius accompanied Fulvius to Aetolia (*Arch.* 27). Ennius later staged this event with his *fabula praetexta*, the *Ambracia*.

<sup>112</sup>On Cicero's intention that Archias immortalize his consulship in verse as an attempt at textual fixity, see Dugan (2005), 43–47.

*Look, o citizens, on the form of the image of old Ennius:  
he opened up the greatest deeds of your fathers.*

He demands the reward of glory from those whose fathers he gave glory. The same poet writes:

*Let no one embellish me with tears or on my weep on  
my ashes.  
Why? I fly alive on the lips of men.*

But why just poets? Artists want to be known after death. For why did Pheidias insert his likeness on the shield of Minerva, though not allowed to inscribe his name on it? What about philosophers? Do they not write their names on the very books they write about the need to disdain glory?

Ennius' epitaph, like so many epigrams in the *Greek Anthology*, activates a passerby (*aspicite*, "look!"); not just any passerby, but fellow Roman citizens (*o ciues*). Even if the poem never appeared next to a statue, the verses make their reader imagine "the form of the image of old Ennius" (*senis Enni imaginis formam*). With his self-composed epitaph as enough inscriptional adornment, Ennius asked not to be "decorated" further with tears (*lacrimis decoret*).

Cicero's prose frame to the Ennian epitaph in the *Tusculans* demonstrates that he interpreted the verses as a combination of art and inscription: he follows the Ennius quotation with a description of the Athenian sculptor, Pheidias, inserting an image of himself into his own art, before turning to criticize the hypocritical philosophers who write their names on treatises which urge readers to reject the pursuit of glory. Cicero had included an identical criticism of philosophers in the *Pro Archia* (26),<sup>113</sup> which exposes an explicit connection in Cicero's mind between poetic immortality and this specific Ennian epigram. It is an Ennian sentiment, then, that lurks behind Cicero's projection of Archias as an inscriber of Roman glory.

But, of course, Archias was also a writer of epigram. We do not need to rely on the *Greek Anthology* to prove this, or even the incidental remarks in the *Pro Archia*, but can demonstrate this from comments made in Cicero's letters. In 61 BCE, we learn that Archias had apparently completed the poem for the Luculli, but the promised poem on Cicero's consulship had not been delivered (*nihil de me scripserit*,

---

<sup>113</sup>*Pro Archia* (26): *ipsi illi philosophi, etiam in eis libellis quos de contemnenda gloria scribunt, nomen suum inscribunt*, "Those very philosophers write their own names on the books which they write on rejecting glory." Petrarch knew that *Arch.* 26 was connected to TD 1.34; he annotated the margin of *Arch.* 26 with a quotation of TD 1.34.

*Att.* 1.16.15).<sup>114</sup> Cicero here writes that Atticus has composed “epigrams” (*epigrammatis tuis*, *Att.* 1.16.15) for the *Amaltheum* at his villa in Epirus. From Cornelius Nepos’ biography of Atticus, we learn that these short poems were inscribed under sculptures of Roman generals and magistrates (*Att.* 18.5). Atticus’ epigrams, as described by Nepos, have the same qualities of the Hellenistic epigrams in the *Greek Anthology*. These are poems which praised or commemorated, appeared as inscriptions alongside statues or dedications (or pretended to be inscriptions), and, above all, were concise.<sup>115</sup> In the letter from 61 BCE, Cicero praises Atticus’ epigrams, *especially since* (*praesertim cum*, *Att.* 1.16.15) Archias has written nothing, and another poet, Thyillus has deserted Cicero (*Thyillus reliquerit*, *Att.* 1.16.15).<sup>116</sup> The implication here is that Atticus’ poems are a substitute for the epigrams Cicero had hoped for from Archias.

Cicero discusses Archias’ epigrams again in the *De Divinatione* (1.79), where he describes an omen which occurred at the birth of the actor, Roscius.<sup>117</sup> When Roscius was an infant, his nurse awoke at night to find a snake coiled around him. This story was, Cicero says, engraved into silver by the artist Pasiteles; and it was “described in poetic verses by Archias” (*noster expressit Archias uersibus*, *Div.* 1.79). It is tempting to interpret this passage to mean that Archias wrote a poem on Pasiteles’ artistic rendering of the scene. Two of the epigrams in the *Greek Anthology* attributed to Archias are in fact poetic descriptions of artworks: one, a description of a life-like engraving of cows on a jasper ring (9.750); the other, a description of the famous painting of Aphrodite Anadyomene by Apelles (16.179). At any rate, Cicero’s remark here about Archias characterizes his poetry as a luxury commodity, a highly-wrought *objet d’art*.

Cicero’s comments about Archias outside of the *Pro Archia* therefore give an impression not unlike that which is given by the Archias

<sup>114</sup>Cicero writes that he feared Archias was now thinking about writing a *Caecilian fabula* (*Att.* 1.16.15); i.e. that the poet was thinking of writing for the Caecili Metelli, instead of Cicero. The pun is of course on the name of Caecilius Statius whose *fabula* was the comedy (*fabula palliata*) performed on the Roman stage. On this letter, see Dugan (2005), 43.

<sup>115</sup>Gutzwiller (1998), 3.

<sup>116</sup>Thyillus is a poet whom Cicero had known since at least 67 BCE (*Att.* 1.9.2), and three poems attributed to a Thyillus appear in the *Greek Anthology*. One describes a spring sacred to Pan (6.170), another is an epitaph to a woman named Aristion who had danced in the nocturnal rites of Cybele (7.223), the third gives advice to sailors during spring in the persona of Priapus (10.5).

<sup>117</sup>Cicero refers to Roscius’ recent death in the *Pro Archia* (17). Was a connection between Roscius and Archias common knowledge?

poems in the *Greek Anthology*. In the *Pro Archia*, Cicero's alignment of Archias' poetry with Ennian epigram—deliberately characterized by Cicero as a reflection of national pride—augments and aggrandizes the works of Archias. Yet, Cicero's private writings depict Archias as a producer of smaller scale objects, the products of an itinerant artisan deeply dependent on contracts with Roman aristocrats on a case-by-case basis, rather than a poetic architect of Rome's national agenda. As a result, we ought to view Archias' poetry in the context of contemporary conceptualizations of social hierarchy and financial dependence, rather than as good faith expressions either of the transcendence of the poetic sublime or as evidentiary reflections of Roman power on a global scale. It is Cicero's sneering depiction (*Arch.* 25) of the epigrammatist—the “bad poet” (*malus poeta*)—who approached Sulla to present his work as a transaction that we should keep in mind here. Lurking in this anecdote is a vision of Archias, which Cicero has banished with high minded evocations of the sacred poet whose words can turn animals from their path and charm nature itself into submission.

## CONCLUSION

The fact that the *Pro Archia* continues to be read as a *bona fide* encomium of humanism and a protreptic towards the liberal arts is certainly a testament to Cicero's rhetorical prowess. But Ciceronian oratory always constitutes a projection of one kind or another, rather than an expression of universal truth without qualification. For Petrarch, the *Pro Archia* was an artefact of Cicero's esteem for poetry which lent greater weight to Petrarch's own poetic self-conceptualization, and for that it had value regardless of its original context. For Du Bois, his own knowledge of Cicero was a symbol of how education could bring transcendence in face of deliberate dehumanization. The *Pro Archia*'s meditation on the power of poetry to elevate and educate was therefore an ideal model.

Yet contextualizing the *Pro Archia* within contemporary discourses regarding the Roman citizenship and the xenophobic characterization of foreigners at Rome reveals some of the social and political complexities deliberately masked by Cicero's rhetoric. In the *Pro Archia*, Cicero asks his audience to accept the divine nature of the poet, claiming that not even a “foreign nation” (*barbaria*, *Arch.* 19) would violate this sacred belief. Just as Cicero asks his audience to elevate their thinking, he conjures the very image which he seeks to dispel: Archias is, to Roman eyes, a “barbarian.” Cicero himself publicly derided “Asiatic”

Greeks (*Flacc.* 65–66), characterizing them as a subspecies of Greek culture, and he claimed an inherent superiority to the Roman citizen over the foreigner (*Font.* 16; 23; *Flacc.* 5–6). In the face of xenophobic rhetoric, which Cicero himself used, it was Cicero's task in the defense of Archias to project a palatable persona for his client, and so he reconstructed the Syrian epigrammatist as a "Greek" epicist whose official acceptance into Roman society could be justified by his apparent services to empire. In this way, Archias was simply an iteration of Quintus Ennius, an illustrious foreigner whose monumentalizing of imperialist heroes in epic opened the door, so Cicero claims, to Roman citizenship. Cicero projects Archias as an iteration not only of Ennian epic but of Ennian epigram, characterizing Ennius' praise of Roman heroes in elegiac couplets as part of a nationalistic agenda which likewise motivated Archias' poesis. Yet Cicero's private depiction of Archias reveals the cracks in the *Pro Archia's* polished veneer. Indeed, Cicero's depiction in his personal correspondence of Archias' poetry aligns more closely with the poems attributed to "Archias" in the *Greek Anthology* than the image which Cicero projects in the *Pro Archia*. In this light, Archias appears not as a sacred poet worthy of the sublime, but rather as an itinerant individual whose work is deeply inflected by the structures of social hierarchy and financial dependence.

In sum, by contextualizing the *Pro Archia's* rhetoric of high-minded ideals within the social, political, and poetic tensions of the late Republic, the speech reveals itself to be a carefully designed script for the "good immigrant." The rhetoric of the model foreigner is designed to replace individual characteristics with generalized and idealized qualities, carefully calibrated to serve the ideological needs of the community into which the foreigner seeks to be integrated. By adjusting our approach to the *Pro Archia*, whose premise as a "defense of poetry" has often been uncritically accepted, we can see it not as an uncomplicated expression of humanistic values, but as an artefact of social and political tensions in the Ciceronian period.