Politics and Performance in Western Greece

edited by
Heather L. Reid,
Davide Tanasi
and Susi Kimbell

Matthew A. Keil[1]

From Ὁμόνοια to Concordia: The Journey of a Greek Political Ideal to Rome through Southern Italy

As the chief political problem of the ancient Greek world, civil discord, or στάσις, had long reigned with uncontested and ignominious primacy from the seventh century BCE onwards, when tensions in each polis between the traditional, aristocratic elements and their increasingly discontented lower orders had first begun to flare up into violent power struggles, armed insurrections, and the establishment of tyrannies. Far from diminishing over time, however, this problem only greatly increased, and ultimately engulfed more or less the whole Greek world in the course of the Peloponnesian War (431 - 404 BCE). It was at this time in the last quarter of the fifth century BCE, and in this context of protracted war and civil strife, that we see the term ὁμόνοια first articulated.[2]

The Origins of Ὁμόνοια

The first occurrences of the word are encountered in the writings of the prose authors who flourished in that great period of intellectual fervor at Athens after the time of Pericles (c. 495 - 429 BCE). It is a term first found among the Sophists, and subsequently in the writings of those who either studied under them or who stood in opposition to them, particularly Thucydides and Plato. The emergence of the word ὁμόνοια in this context is not at all surprising given the fact that these thinkers at Athens were as vigorous in their exploration of questions regarding politics, ethics, and society as they were ground-breaking in their enhancement of the Greek tongue at a time when systematic instruction in language, and experimentation in its uses, were essentially new subjects.[3]

Moreover, the concept of ὁμόνοια clearly emerges at this time in reaction to the Peloponnesian War and to the current state of endless civil strife between factions within poleis to which that war gave rise.[4] Consequently, as the antidote to στάσις, (or later, the Latin discordia) ὁμόνοια in this initial stage of its development signified the absence of faction-fighting[5] through a sense of "fellow-feeling,"[6] or a collective spirit among citizens, intimated by the word's very etymology (a

combination of the words ὁμός, "the same," and νοῦς, "mind").[7] Though "concord" is the traditional English translation for this word, and the one which I use in my translations of the passages that follow, there is no real one-word equivalent for ὁμόνοια in any modern European language, and Smith perhaps gets it best by defining it, though awkwardly, as "a bond that could bring together otherwise unrelated or unallied groups."[8] Latin *concordia* will have the same nuance. Such community spirit contained various aspects, both economic and political, but from its beginnings, ὁμόνοια was seen to have the two complementary aims of avoiding civil strife and preserving solidarity in the face of external threat.[9] It did not mean, however, that a society ought to be absolutely uniform, without different political persuasions or even unequal social classes, since the very conception of Greek political life required the cooperation of different entities.[10] Ὁμόνοια rather stood as the ideal of the ordering, agreement, and harmonization of these differences within the body of the state, and in this way it signified the unity that was comprised of such differences.[11] Thus conceived, ὁμόνοια was seen by writers to be based, generally speaking in regard to the Classical period, on the collective subordination of individuals to either an impersonal force of law, on the reciprocal checks and balances of a mixed constitution, or on the mutual helping of individuals of different social status, particularly the rich and poor.[12]

To give a brief example, we can look at the earliest, uncontestable use of the word which appears in a fragment of the sophist Thrasymachus (c. 459 - c. 400 BCE). This one substantial, surviving fragment of Thrasymachus's work is a lengthy quotation from a political speech, composed for delivery apparently by a young upper-class Athenian who is critical of the Peloponnesian War currently raging.[13]

ἀλλὰ γὰρ ἡμῖν ὁ παρελθὼν χρόνος καὶ ἀντὶ εἰρήνης ἐν πολέμῳ γενέσθαι καὶ διὰ κινδύνων ἐλθεῖν εἰς τόνδε τὸν χρόνον, τὴν μὲν παρελθοῦσαν ἡμέραν ἀγαπῶσι, τὴν δ᾽ ἐπιοῦσαν δεδιόσι, ἀντὶ δ᾽ ὁμονοίας εἰς ἔχθραν καὶ ταραχὰς πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἀφικέσθαι. καὶ τοὺς μὲν ἄλλους τὸ πλῆθος τῶν ἀγαθῶν ὑβρίζειν τε ποιεῖ καὶ στασιάζειν, ἡμεῖς δὲ μετὰ

μέντων ἀγαθῶν ἐσωφρονοῦμεν, ἐν δὲ τοῖς κακοῖς ἐμάνημεν, ἃ τοὺς ἄλλους σωφρονίζειν εἴωθεν.[14]

We have had enough of the recent times, and the dangers of war that have emerged in place of peace. It has come to the point where men pine away for a bygone day, and fear the one that is to come, where instead of concord we have arrived at enmity and dissension with one another. An excess of good things makes some commit acts of hubris and foment civil discord, whereas we, although having kept our wits in a time of good things, have gone mad amid misfortunes, things which usually accustom others to act with moderation.

The word ὁμόνοια is used here unambiguously as an expression of civic harmony, and is placed in opposition to the phenomenon of στάσις. It has been suggested that this might have been a speech given around the year 411, when the factions at Athens were embroiled in violent struggle with one another.[15] Though this is only speculative, such a conjecture is bolstered by the lines which follow describing the infighting of the different political groups who both desire essentially the same things, yet are unable to harmonize their efforts.

πρῶτον μὲν οὖν τοὺς διαφερομένους πρὸς ἀλλήλους καὶ ῥήτορων καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἀποδείξω γε παρὰ λόγον πεπονθότας πρὸς ἀλλήλους, ὅπερ ἀνάγκη τοὺς ἄνευ γνώμης φιλονικοῦντας πάσχειν· οἰόμενοι γὰρ ἐναντία λέγειν ἀλλήλοις οὐκ αἰσθάνονται τὰ αὐτὰ πράττοντες οὐδὲ τὸν τῶν ἑτέρων λόγον ἐν τῷ σφετέρῳ λόγῳ ἐνόντα. σκέψασθε γὰρ ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἃ ζητοῦσιν ἑκάτεροι. πρῶτον μὲν ἡ πάτριος πολιτεία ταραχὴν αὐτοῖς παρέχει ῥάστη γνωσθῆναι καὶ κοινοτάτη τοῖς πολίταις οὖσα πᾶσιν.[16]

The first thing I, for my part, will show is that both the speakers and the others disputing with one another have fallen into an absurd quandary, a thing which necessity compels all to suffer who lust after victory without any regard for common sense. For although thinking that they are expressing opposite opinions, they neither perceive that they

are in fact both enacting the same policies, nor that they have in their own speech the same line of reasoning as the others. Consider what things from the beginning each side is pursuing. The first bone of contention is the ancestral constitution, even though it is very easy to understand and the most common property of all our citizens.

The passage is thus presented as part of an attempt to reconcile opposing political factions by pointing out common ground, and by channeling the contrary energies, or infighting, of the people towards a collective good. In this regard, Sinclair has noted that the emergence of the term ὁμόνοια at this time in Athens is reflective of "an awakening of a social conscience, or at any rate, part of the growing awareness of the need of good relationships" in city-state life.[17] Such would be the standard association for this word in Thucydides, and in all the oratorical writers whose works survive from the Classical period, especially Demosthenes. The word is particularly widely attested at this time in reference to the resolution of the political conflicts towards the end of the Peloponnesian War in 404 between the oligarchic and democratic factions[18] (opposing groups which would, when transposed into the Roman sphere, become replaced by the plebs and the patricians).

On the other hand, a more cynical view of this Thrasymachean passage (and one perhaps more consonant with the man's personality as presented to us by Plato in the first book of the *Republic*) would be that the term ὁμόνοια is already being employed here at this early time as a catchphrase, a political slogan, upholding in this particular instance an idea invoked by democrats and oligarchs alike, ἡ πάτριος πολιτεία. Yet even if that is the case, the very fact that ὁμόνοια could be bandied about as a catchphrase bears witness to its presence as a community ideal, wherein, far from unanimity in values, beliefs, or interests, ὁμόνοια is envisioned rather as the harmonization of disagreement by tolerating the differences of others, and by making those differences tolerable to others.[19]

The Philosophical Connection

Significantly, however, although it was within the sophistic and rhetorical tradition that the ideology of ὁμόνοια was first delineated,

it was nevertheless among the philosophers of the fourth century BCE that this concept reached its highest level of development and expansion. Even before Plato, and no doubt a strong influence on him,[20] the southern Italian, Pythagorean philosopher Archytas (c. 435 – c. 350)[21] used the word in his political philosophizing to express the need for the geometric ordering of society's various elements. He states, for example:

ὅτασιν μὲν ἔπαυσεν, ὁμόνοιαν δὲ αὔξησεν λογισμὸς εὑρεθείς, πλεονεξία τε γὰρ οὐκ ἔστι τούτου γενομένου καὶ ἰσότας ἔστιν. τούτῳ γὰρ περὶ τῶν συναλλαγμάτων διαλλασσόμεθα. διὰ τοῦτον οὖν οἱ πένητες λαμβάνοντι παρὰ τῶν δυναμένων, οἵ τε πλούσιοι διδόντι τοῖς δεομένοις, πιστεύοντες ἀμφότεροι διὰ τούτῳ τὸ ἴσον ἕξειν. κανὼν δὲ καὶ κωλυτὴρ τῶν ἀδικούντων ἐὰν τοὺς μὲν ἐπισταμένους λογίζεσθαι πρὶν ἀδικεῖν ἔπαυσε, πείσας ὅτι οὐ δυνασοῦνται λαθεῖν, ὅταν ἐπ᾽ αὐτὸν ἔλθωντι· τοὺς δὲ μὴ ἐπισταμένους, ἐν αὐτῷ δηλώσας ἀδικοῦντας ἐκώλυσεν ἀδικῆσαι.[22]

Once rational calculation has been secured, it puts an end to discord and increases concord.[23] For once this calculation has come into being, there is no longer any grasping after more than is one's fair share, but rather equality. By calculation, we are reconciled to one another concerning our mutual interactions. On account of this, likewise, the poor take from the powerful, and the rich give to the needy, both being confident that through this they will have what is equitable. It is a standard of measure and an impediment to the unjust, stopping those who know how to calculate before they commit injustice, while also convincing them that they will not be able to escape notice whenever coming before it as a standard of measure. It prevents those who do not know how to calculate, having in itself exposed them as workers of injustice.

With this fragment, coming at least a generation after the origin of the word ὁμόνοια at Athens, we can already see many elements which

were before implicit now crystallizing into a nexus of ideas that would become standard for the concept. The first of these elements is the opposition made between ὁμόνοια and στάσις, now clearly a commonplace. The second and even more important element is the cause attributed here by Archytas to στάσις. Πλεονεξία, or the arrogation of more than one's share of resources or political power, is here seen as the fundamental force that both produces στάσις and prevents ὁμόνοια. This connection is illustrative of a sense of limit and boundary that was especially important in the Greek view of the cosmos and of society, and which was linked, especially in the larger Pythagorean tradition, to notions of geometric proportionality and even musical harmony. That is, the same forces of rationality and due proportion that are operative in the physical world likewise constitute the natural principles of equilibrium and ὁμόνοια in the state. A πόλις ὁμόνοος accordingly is a state wherein all different levels of both economic and political diversity find their fitting place and cooperate, whereas πλεονεξία, by contrast, breaks that proportionality through the grasping of individuals after more than their allotted share of either money or power. Such replacing of the common good with individual rapacity in turn produces στάσις and all its accompanying discord.

As a contemporary of Archytas, and one deeply influenced by the Pythagorean tradition of southern Italy, Plato combined many Pythagorean ideas about ὁμόνοια *qua* geometrical proportionality within society, together with the traditional elements of the *sophistiche Gesellschaftkonzept* of the orators.[24] Moreover, it was from Plato that Aristotle and subsequent writers took over many of their ideas about ὁμόνοια. But the crucial point for our purposes here is that already by the early fourth century BCE we can locate ὁμόνοια on the Italian peninsula, and see that the term has here an even more expanded signification and centrality in political discourse than it had held in the previous generation at Athens.[25]

Similarly, given the strong connection that existed in the classical world between civic government and religious cult, it was in a sense natural that by the mid-fourth century the far-famed political abstraction of ὁμόνοια would become deified throughout the Greek world,[26] and inscriptions bearing the word first begin to appear at this time as well.[27] In particular with regard to Southern Italy, this is a fact clearly

born out in the archaeological record as coins from Metapontum[28] and Sicily,[29] as well as a vase from Apulia,[30] all inscribed with the word ὁμόνοια, have been decisively dated to the fourth century.

Ὁμόνοια Enters Rome

It was through this nexus of religious cult and political ideal that ὁμόνοια first entered the Roman world at this time under the name of Concordia, and, perhaps surprisingly, the Romans would in fact make the idea more central to their political discourse than even the Greeks had. As the central paradox of Roman society, strict class divisions, coexistent with an almost religious sense of community, had long evolved throughout the course of Republican history,[31] and the roots of this particularly Roman outlook on civic identity were held by tradition to have antedated even the Republic itself. It was therefore precisely these two conflicting dynamics of unity and hierarchy that came to underlie and comprise the very essence of the concept of Roman political and social *concordia* as the force of harmony modulating such discordant elements.[32]

According to a tradition told by writers from the early and high Empire,[33] the initial emergence of *concordia* at Rome was in the first half of the fourth century BCE, during the "struggle of the orders," when Roman society was wracked with internal discord between plebs and patricians, and debt crises, protests, and secessions were the frequent manifestations of the disaffection rife among the lower classes.[34] But after the reforms of 367 BCE, known as the *Leges Liciniae Sextiae*, in which the consulship was made to require a plebeian seat, public land holdings were limited, and debts regulated,[35] M. Furius Camillus vowed a temple to the goddess Concordia that was subsequently dedicated on the east slope of the Capitoline, thus celebrating the putative reconciliation of the plebs and the patricians.

It must be said at once, however, that the literary record cannot be used to prove conclusively the veracity of this tradition regarding whether or not Camillus did in fact dedicate such a temple to Concordia, the chief problems for which are the lack of any record of the temple's dedication, or dedication day, Livy's complete silence regarding Camillus's vowing of a temple, the very late date of Plutarch's account, and the ambiguous phraseology of the only other

source, Ovid, who states that Camillus vowed to build the temple and then *solverat ille fidem* (with the construction *fidem solvere* in other authors, and even elsewhere in Ovid, potentially meaning to break a vow).[36] Likewise, the archaeological evidence has been challenged for over a century as to whether or not it offers a more concrete answer.[37]

Nevertheless, starting with Mommsen[38] in the 19th century, and continuing with Wissowa,[39] and many others right up to our day,[40] there are a good many serious scholars who have continued to accept, or, at least defend as plausible this tradition associating Camillus with the foundation of the cult of Concordia at Rome in 367 BCE.

As Momigliano and Fears outline,[41] the essential question involving the archaeological record centers on the *caementa*. For Frank,[42] as well as Rebert and Marceau who follow him,[43] the presence of Grotta Oscura and Fidenae tufa in the foundation of a temple to Concordia built in the Forum by the consul L. Opimius in 121 BCE, indicated a mid-fourth century temple whose materials were then reincorporated into the new temple when it was rebuilt by Opimius. Leaving aside the blanket assertion of Momigliano[44] that it is an entirely modern notion that the 121 BCE temple was a reconstruction of the fourth century one, Fears[45] raised the significant point that Grotta Oscura and Fidenae tufa are not really reliable tools for dating-criteria since they seem also to be used until rather late. Additionally, Fears continues, the presence of these tufas in the *caementa* is quite small, and may have just come from the breaking up and using of a nearby wall or some other structure.

The problem, however, was made even more complicated when, starting from 1983, the modern road which had thitherto blocked access to much of the ruins was removed, and systematic excavation was initiated by Maetzke.[46] The results were that, in addition to finding an archaic votive offering, three building phases prior to the 121 BCE temple of Opimius were identified.[47] Thus there emerged solid archaeological evidence that Opimius's temple was indeed a reconstruction of some earlier one. The date of 367 BCE, however, though not impossible, would seem a bit too early given that our earliest material sources from Western Greece concerning ὁμόνοια only begin to appear at around the same time. Some "lag time" would be necessary for the concept to have migrated north, and to have

become well-enough established to have warranted a temple dedicated to it. Thus, though a most recent discussion of this issue has called the whole problem of the historicity of Camillus's temple "unresolved and irresolvable,"[48] we can be more assertive in rejecting it both on its insufficient evidence, and also because of the difficulty of the time-frame.

This is especially the case in light of another literary tradition, much more likely and much less problematic, which is recorded by Livy and others, about the first emergence of Roman *concordia* at the *end* of the fourth century BCE, when, in 304, the aedile Cn. Flavius, a plebeian, set up a bronze *aedicula* to Concordia[49] overlooking the Forum.[50] It was at the time of his election to the curule aedileship, which he won with favor on the part of the plebs equal only to the ire against him on the part of the *nobiles*,[51] that Flavius "dedicated a shrine to Concordia on the Vulcanal,"[52] on the *Graecostasis*, overlooking the Forum,[53] thus obstinately defying the "intense loathing of the *nobiles*."[54] This later date makes much more sense, and allows for both the evidence of the fourth century building phase found in Opimius's 121 BCE temple to Concord, as well as for a sufficient amount of time for the concept to have migrated from Southern Italy to Rome. Additionally, the fact that Flavius's shrine was located on the *Graecostasis*, or area set aside for Greek embassies, provides the perfect venue for an essentially Greek idea that had been but recently co-opted.

From all these considerations, therefore, the most important fact, and one not open to doubt is that the thitherto Greek, political concept and religious cult of ὁμόνοια first made its appearance in the Roman world in the fourth century BCE as *concordia* within the context of the class struggles that so dominated the early- and mid-Republic. Its appearance at this time is, in a sense, entirely to be expected, since as Musti, Curti, and others[55] have shown, Rome of the fourth century had begun to be profoundly influenced and affected by the spread of Greek political, cultural and social values that had emerged in Athens and elsewhere on the mainland during the fifth and fourth centuries, and which had spread westward to the Greek colonies of Sicily and the southern Italian peninsula.

[1] Matthew Keil is an adjunct professor in the department of Classics at the City University of New York, Queens College. Recently receiving his PhD in Classics from Fordham University, his main area of research lies in the patristic reception of the classical tradition, particularly historiographical and philosophical. Email: Matthew.Keil@qc.cuny.edu

[2] H. Kramer, *Quid Valeat* ὁμόνοια *in Litteris Graecis*, Göttingen, Göttingen University Press, 1915, p. 13; E. Skard, *Zwei religiös-politische Begriffe: Euergetes-Concordia*, Oslo, Avhandlinger Utgit av Det Norske Videnskaps-Akademi, 1932, p. 67; G. Brunner, *Die Theologische Mitte des ersten Klemensbriefs: Ein Beitrag zur Hermeneutik frühchristlicher Texte*, Frankfurt-Main, Frankfurter Theologische Studien, 1972, p. 135; J. de Romilly, "Vocabulaire et Propagande ou les Premiers Emplois du Mot ὁμόνοια," in *Melanges de Linguistique et de Philologie Grecques Offerts à Pierre Chantraine*, Paris, Klincksieck, 1972, p. 199; J. de Romilly, "Les différents aspects de la concorde dans l'oeuvre de Platon," *Revue de Philologie*, 46.1972, p. 7; A. Moulakis, *Homonoia: Eintracht und die Entwicklung eines Politischen Bewußtseins*, Munich, Paul List, 1973, p. 21 K. Thraede, "Homonoia (Eintracht)," *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum*, 16, 1994, p. 177.

[3] H. Kramer, *Quid Valeat* ὁμόνοια *in Litteris Graecis*, Göttingen, Göttingen University Press, 1915, p. 13; K. Thraede, "Homonoia (Eintracht)," *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum*, 16, 1994, p. 179.

[4] H. Kramer, *Quid Valeat* ὁμόνοια *in Litteris Graecis*, Göttingen, Göttingen University Press, 1915, pp. 13, 27; E. Skard, *Zwei religiös-politische Begriffe: Euergetes-Concordia*, Oslo, Avhandlinger Utgit av Det Norske Videnskaps-Akademi, 1932, p. 67; J. de Romilly, "Vocabulaire et Propagande ou les Premiers Emplois du Mot ὁμόνοια," in *Melanges de Linguistique et de Philologie Grecques Offerts à Pierre Chantraine*, Paris, Klincksieck, 1972, pp. 199-201; A. Moulakis, *Homonoia: Eintracht und die Entwicklung eines Politischen Bewußtseins*, Munich, Paul List, 1973, pp. 19-23; M. Piérat, R. Étienne, "Un Décret du Koinon des Hellènes à Platées en l'Honneur de Glaucon, fils d'Étéocles, d'Athènes," *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique*, 99, 1975, p. 71; K. Thraede, "Homonoia (Eintracht)," *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum*, 16, 1994, p. 176-180; G. Thériault, "L'Apparition du Culte d'Homonoia," *Les Études Classiques*, 64, 1996, p. 5; G. Thériault, *Le Culte d'Homonoia dans les Cités Grecques*, Lyon and Quebec, Lyon Maison de l'Orient Méditerranéen, 1996, p. 129; O.M. Bakke, *Concord and Peace: A Rhetorical Analysis of the First Letter of Clement with an Emphasis on the Language of Unity and Sedition*, Tübingen, Wissunt zum Neuen Testament, 143, 2001, p. 73.

[5] W.W. Tarn, "Alexander the Great and the Unity of Mankind," *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 19, 1933, p. 125. Elsewhere, Tarn emphasizes the difficulty of translating the word, and suggests that the negative meaning of "to live without quarrelling" gets close to the sense since this is "a thing that can be done by people of very different mentalities and outlooks. 'Unity' might pass, but it is too vague." (W.W. Tarn, *Alexander the Great*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1948, p. 400). The emphasis must be on differences as well as on similarities.

[6] T. Sinclair, *A History of Greek Political Thought*, Cleveland, World Publishing Company, 1953, p. 343.

[7] P. Chantraine *Dictionnaire Étymologique de la Langue Grecque*, Paris, Klincksieck, 1977, pp. 799-800.

[8] A. Smith, *Polis and Personification in Classical Athenian Art*, Leiden, Brill, 2011, pp. 123-124. Cfr. Ferguson's preferred rendition of the word as "unity of purpose." (J. Ferguson, *Moral Values in the Ancient World*, London, Methuen, 1958, p. 118).

[9] A. Sheppard, "Homonoia in the Greek Cities of the Roman Empire," *Ancient Society*, 12, 1984-1986, p. 229.

[10] This quintessentially Greek notion of the necessity of "unity within plurality" as the foundation of the state is given its perhaps finest articulation in Aristotle *Pol.* 1263b31-38. Likewise, Plato makes this point explicit in *Rep.* 369b5-c4.

[11] I. Melanchenko, "Ὁμόνοια in Fifth and Fourth Century BCE Greek Political Theory," *Russian Society of Classical Studies*, 2, 2000, p. 6.

[12] A. Momigliano, "Camillus and Concord," *Classical Quarterly*, 46, 1942, pp. 101-102; F. Cairns, *Virgil's Augustan Epic*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1980, pp. 90-92.

[13] J. Dillon, T. Gergel, *The Greek Sophists*, London, Penguin Classics, 2003, p. 210.

[14] Thrasymachus B1 (= Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *On the Style of Demosthenes*, 3).

[15] H. Kramer, *Quid Valeat* ὁμόνοια *in Litteris Graecis*, Göttingen, Göttingen University Press, 1915, p. 20.

[16] Thrasymachus B1 (= Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *On the Style of Demosthenes*, 3).

[17] T. Sinclair, *A History of Greek Political Thought*, Cleveland, World Publishing Company, 1953, p. 62.

[18] H. Yunis, "Thrasymachus B1: Discord, Not Diplomacy," *Classical Philology*, 92, 1997, p. 63.

[19] R. Kamtekar, "What's the Good of Agreeing? *Homonoia* in Platonic Politics," in D. Sedley (ed.), *Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy*, Vol. 24, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 2003, p. 136, n. 6.

[20] C. Huffman, *Archytas of Tarentum*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2005, pp. 32-42.

[21] C. Huffman, *Archytas of Tarentum*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2005, p. 5.

[22] Stobaeus, *Anthology*, 4.1.139.

[23] I take ἔπαυσεν and αὔξησεν as gnomic aorists (*contra* C. Huffman, *Archytas of Tarentum*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2005, p. 183, who translates them in the past tense).

[24] As an example of this confluence of traditions, Plato's attack on the glorification of πλεονεξία throughout the *Gorgias* comes to mind most immediately.

[25] The earlier Pythagorean philosopher Philolaus (c. 470 - c. 385 BCE) also has fragments attributed to him that define ὁμόνοια as an expression of principles of geometric proportionality, to which the boundary-disrespecting forces of στάσις brought on by πλεονεξία are opposed. However, the authorship of many of these fragments has been called into question by modern scholars, and so I have thought it best to leave them out of the discussion here. Nevertheless, the point still stands that such ideas were clearly an important part of Pythagorean philosophy by the late fifth and early fourth century in southern Italy. See M. Humm, "Les Origines du Pythagorisme Romain: Problèmes Historique et Philosophiques," *Les Études Classiques*, 64, 1996, pp. 339-353.

[26] S. Celato, "Homonoia e Polis Greca," *Religione e Città Mondo Antico*, 11, 1984, p. 269.

[27] The earliest inscription with the word, from Olympia in mainland Greece, has been dated to 364 BCE. (E. Schwyzer, *Dialectorum Graecarum Exempla Epigraphica Potiora*, Leipzig, Salomon Hirzel, 1923, p. 423.

[28] First published in the 19th century (R. Poole, *Catalogue of the Greek Coins in the British Museum*, Vol. 1: Italy, London, Woodfall and Kinder, 1873, p. 244), a *stater* shows the representation of a female figure together with the word ὁμόνοια on the obverse, and the letters META, for Metapontum, on the reverse. There has been considerable controversy about whether this is a representation of the goddess Ὁμόνοια, or of Demeter with the epithet ὁμόνοια (an epithet certainly plausible judging from both Callimachus's hymn to Demeter [135: Χαῖρε τὰνδε σάω πόλιν ἐν θ' ὁμονοίᾳ ἔν τ' εὐηπελίᾳ], and also a fourth century inscription from the Piraeus containing the phrase Δήμητρα ὁμόνοιαν

τοῦ κοινοῦ [IG II², 1261]). The main point for us, however, is the coin's date which is commonly given to be from the first half of the fourth century BCE (B.V. Head, G. MacDonald, W.W. Warwick, G.F. Hill, *Historia Numorum: A Manual of Greek Numismatics*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1911, p. 76, n. 10; S.P. Noe, *The Coinage of Metapontum. Part Two*, New York, American Numismatic Society, 1931, p. 92, n. 31; C.M. Kraay, *Archaic and Classical Greek Coins*, London, Methuen, 1976, pp. 189-194, especially n. 17; G. Thériault, *Le Culte d'Homonoia dans les Cités Grecques*, Lyon and Quebec, Lyon Maison de l'Orient Méditerérranéen, 1996, pp. 133-34).

[29] Four drachmas from Kimissa in Sicily, like the *stater* from Metapontum, show a female figure together with the word ὁμόνοια on the obverse, and an altar on the reverse; they are generally dated to the second half of the fourth century BCE (A. Evans, "Contributions to Sicilian Numismatics, Part II," *Numismatic Chronicle*, 3, 1896, pp. 140-143; E. Gabrici, "Notes on Sicilian Numismatics," *Numismatic Chronicle*, 4, 1931, pp. 87-88; G.E. Rizzo, *Monete Greche della Sicilia*, Bologna, Forni, 1946, p. 267; G. Thériault, *Le Culte d'Homonoia dans les Cités Grecques*, Lyon and Quebec, Lyon Maison de l'Orient Méditerérranéen, 1996, pp. 143-144).

[30] The piece is a red figure *pelike* showing one of the most ancient representations of the goddess Ὁμόνοια still in existence. It is attributed to the Darius Painter and consequently dated to between the years 340-320 BCE (G. Thériault, *Le Culte d'Homonoia dans les Cités Grecques*, Lyon and Quebec, Lyon Maison de l'Orient Méditerérranéen, 1996, pp. 144-145).

[31] T. Holland, *Rubicon: The Triumph and Tragedy of the Roman Republic*, London, Little, Brown and Company, 2003, p. 22.

[32] H. Strasburger, *Concordia Ordinum: Eine Untersuchung zur Politik Ciceros*, Borna-Leipzig, R. Noske, 1931; reprint Amsterdam, Hakkert, 1956, p. 12.

[33] Ovid, *Fasti*, 1.637-51; Plutarch, *Life of Camillus*, 42.

[34] K. Hölkeskamp, *Die Entstehung der Nobilität*, Stuttgart, Steiner, 2011, p. 12.

[35] Livy, *Books from the Foundation of the City*, 6.42.

[36] For example, Ovid, *Heroides*, 10.78; *Lewis and Short Latin Dictionary* II B 3d, and *Oxford Latin Dictionary* 20b both s.v. 'solvo.'

[37] Representative voices of the school of thought rejecting the notion of Camillus's temple to Concord include O. Hirschfeld, *Kleine Schriften*, Berlin, Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1913, p. 285; A. Momigliano, "Camillus and Concord," *Classical Quarterly*, 46, 1942, pp. 111-120; C.

Nicolet, *L'Ordre équestre à l'époque Républicaine*, Paris, E. de Boccard, 1966, p. 634; L. Richardson, "Concordia and Concordia Augusta: Rome and Pompeii," *La Parola del Passato*, 33, 1978, p. 261; and, most recently, J. Lobur, *Consensus, Concordia, and the Formation of Roman Imperial Ideology*, New York and London, Routledge, 2008, p. 231, n. 11.

38 T. Mommsen, "Der Senatsbeschluss bei Josephus, Ant. 14, 8, 5," *Hermes*, 9, 1875, pp. 287-291.

39 G. Wissowa, *Religion und Kultus der Römer*, Munich, C. H. Beck, 1912, p. 328.

40 For instance, R. Fears, "The Theology of Victory at Rome: Approaches and Problems," *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, II.17.2, 1981, p. 741, n. 6.

41 A. Momigliano, "Camillus and Concord," *Classical Quarterly*, 46, 1942, pp. 115-17; R. Fears, "The Cult of Virtues and Roman Imperial Ideology," *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, II.17.2, 1981, p. 849, n. 77.

42 T. Frank, "Roman Buildings of the Republic: An Attempt to Date them from their Materials," *Papers and Monographs of the American Academy in Rome*, 3, 1924, pp. 1-149.

43 H.F. Rebert, H. Marceau, "The Temple of Concord in the Roman Forum," *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome*, 5, 1925, pp. 53-77.

44 A. Momigliano, "Camillus and Concord," *Classical Quarterly*, 46, 1942, p. 115.

45 R. Fears, "The Cult of Virtues and Roman Imperial Ideology," *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, II.17.2, 1981, p. 849, n.77, citing M. Blake, *Ancient Roman Construction in Italy from the Prehistoric Period to Augustus*, Washington, Carnegie Institute, 1947, pp. 26-27, and R. Meiggs, *Roman Ostia*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1960, p. 223.

46 G. Maetzke, "Roma: Area Nord-occidentale del Foro Romano," *Bullettino della commissione archeologica comunale di Roma*, 91, 1986, pp. 360-391; G. Maetzke, "Struttura Stratigrafica dell'area Nordoccidentale del Foro Romano Come Appare dai Recenti Interventi di Scavo," *Archaeologia medievale*, 18, 1991, pp. 43-200.

47 I. Sciortino, E. Segala, "Rinvenimento di un Deposito Votivo Presso il Clivo Capitolino," *Archeologia Laziale*, 10, 1990, pp. 17-22. I. Sciortino, E. Segala, "Foro Romano," *Bullettino della Commissione Archeologica Comunale di Roma*, 1-2, 1990, pp. 165-170; A.M. Ferroni, "Concordia, Aedes," in E. Steinby (ed.), *Lexicon Topographicum Urbis Romae*, Vol. 1, Rome, Quasar, 1993-2000, p. 319.

48 A. Clark, *Divine Qualities: Cult and Community in Republican Rome*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 2007, p. 31.

49 Livy, From the Foundation of the City, 9.46.6.

50 Pliny, *Natural History*, 33.6.19.

51 Aulus Gellius, *Attic Nights*, 7.9.2-5.

52 Livy, From the Foundation of the City, 9.46.6: aedem Concordiae in area Volcani summa invidia nobilium dedicavit.

53 Varro, The Latin Language, 5.32: senaculum supra Graecostasim, ubi Aedis Concordiae et Basilica Opimia.

54 Livy, From the Foundation of the City, 9.46.6; summa invidia nobilium. Cfr. Pliny, Natural History, 33.19.6.

55 D. Musti, *Strabone e la Magna Grecia*, Padua, Esedra, 1994, *passim*; E. Curti, E. Dench, J. Patterson, "The Archaeology of Central and Southern Roman Italy: Recent Trends and Approaches," *Journal of Roman Studies*, 86, 1996, pp. 180-189.