

PDF hosted at the Radboud Repository of the Radboud University Nijmegen

The following full text is a publisher's version.

For additional information about this publication click this link.

<https://hdl.handle.net/2066/220145>

Please be advised that this information was generated on 2021-04-18 and may be subject to change.

ANCHORING POLITICAL CHANGE: ADAPTIVE GOVERNMENT IN THE CLASSICAL WORLD

Olivier HEKSTER¹

This article takes an historical approach to analyse ways in which political changes are shaped and perceived. It compares ancient Athenian and Roman examples to highlight the difference between changes in governance that are explicitly referred to as innovations or adaptations to a new situation, and those that pretend to be continuations of existing practices. Athenian democracy, which mainly developed in the sixth century BC, is an example of an explicit adaptation. The Roman transition from Republic to Empire in the late first century BC illustrates a disguised form of adjustment. These two examples highlight the importance of 'anchoring' changes by making use of known concepts or structures. This is an important element to take into account when adapting governmental structures to changes in society, since it strongly influences how those changes are perceived.

Key words: anchoring innovation; political change; Athenian democracy; Roman empire.

1 INTRODUCTION²

Any stable form of government is adaptive. Societies change, and even if formal governance structures remain the same, the application of specific measures, or the explicit or implicit substantiation of those measures changes (OECD 2005; Brunner et al. 2005). Even the choice to remain static is a response to a changing society. In this sense, to mention an extreme example, an increasingly repressive dictatorship, trying to control a people on the verge of escaping the grip of this dictatorship through violent measures, is a form of adaptive government. But the fact that any stable administration is in a sense adaptive does not mean that all adaptive administrations are equal, or equally efficient. If we define the state as a cultural practice in which administrators respond to a changing context (Bevir

¹ Olivier HEKSTER is professor of ancient history at the Radboud Institute for Culture and History (RICH), Radboud University, Nijmegen, the Netherlands. He is leading participant of the NWO-funded Anchoring Innovation project and PI of the VICI project 'Constraints and tradition. Roman power in changing societies (50BC-AD565)'. Contact: o.hekster@let.ru.nl

² An alternate version of this argument appeared in Dutch as Hekster (2018).

and Rhodes 2010), it is clear that the way in which different groups of functionaries respond to all kinds of external factors determines how a form of governance is developing.

The notion that every administration is adaptive is obviously too simplistic and needs to be refined. One can analyse what administrators or politicians pay attention to when shaping changing governance, or the ways in which they respond (Shergold 2015, 63–82). It is also possible to discuss how changes are experienced by different groups in society. This article presents an historical perspective on what adaptive government means, focusing on classical antiquity, in particular Athenian and Roman forms of government.

Comparing the Athenian and Roman examples will highlight an important element within forms of adaptive government: some changes in governance are explicitly referred to as innovations or adaptations to a new situation, while others pretend to be continuations of existing practices. Athenian democracy, which mainly developed in the sixth century BC, is an example of an explicit adaptation.³ The Roman transition from Republic to Empire in the late first century BC illustrates a disguised form of adjustment. Through these two examples it becomes possible to analyse what is important to the powers-that-be in adaptive government; how people react to a changing society; and how those changes are perceived.

2 ADAPTIVE GOVERNMENT: ATHENS AND ROME

The first example is the Athenian democracy, which forms an obvious benchmark in political history. The exceptional political framework of ancient Athens is justly famous: a direct democracy, in which a majority of male citizens took the important decisions, and in which men could acquire further legal, political and military functions by lot or through direct election. Even determining who posed a threat to the state was democratically organized through so-called *ostracism*: men whom a majority found too powerful could be banned, with voting taking place on inscribed pottery shards. This form of democracy is often dated to 508 BC, and linked to the politician Cleisthenes (Cartledge 2016, 61–76).

However, in his reforms he built on previous important changes, in particular those of the famous statesman and poet Solon (ca. 638–ca. 558), who initiated the first popular assembly (Noussia-Fantuzzi 2010, 25–26). Cleisthenes also explicitly responded to attempts by other individuals to gain sole control of Athens. Nor did the development of Athenian democracy end with Cleisthenes. Final steps toward the so-called Athenian ‘radical democracy’, such as paying citizens to participate in public affairs, and the abolition of the powerful position of the aristocratic Areopagus, were only taken under Ephialtes in 462 BC (Cartledge 2016, 84–87; Osborne 2006).

Before that time, the Areopagus had been a council of Elders, in which those men who had held important positions in Athens served as some sort of supervisory board and supreme court of the city state. After 462 it remained only a criminal court (especially for cases of murder); the other functions were permanently transferred to the popular assembly (Rihll 1995; Wallace 2003; Cohen 2005). The development of Athens’ famous democracy, then, developed over more than a

³ Years are AD, unless BC is indicated.

century. Several times in that century, aristocrats tried to regain power and influence, after which new reforms further limited their power. The emergence of Athenian democracy in the form in which it has become justly famous was a process of adapting to specific challenges. Those adaptations were explicitly presented as improvements and innovations to the inhabitants of Athens.

The second example is that of ancient Rome at the end of the first century BC. Here, the situation was vastly different, though it would lead to the emergence of another form of government that functions as a benchmark in political history: Roman emperorship. The origin of this process was, like in the Athenian case, one in which governance structures were adapted step by step to changes in society, and to the expectations that these changes brought with them. From the sixth century BC onwards, Rome had been a Republic, led by two yearly elected consuls who were appointed and controlled by a senate of experienced administrators (Lintott 1999, esp. 65–120; Beck et al. 2011.). In contrast, in the new political situation there was a clear sole ruler, in power until his death, whose position allowed him to appoint and banish senators.

Where in Athens the changes in the political structure were explicitly presented as innovative, Roman rulers emphatically presented the new political structure as traditional. Roman emperorship arose after years of civil wars, in which men such as Sulla, Pompey and Caesar attempted to seize supremacy in a society that had for centuries emphasised its Republican form of government (Vervaeke 2014, 214–239; Rosillo-López 2019; Van der Blom 2011). The increasing problems faced by the vastly extended empire showed that the old governance structures, which had been stretched to its limits, no longer sufficed, but supremacy still seemed unacceptable. This did not stop Caesar's adoptive son, the later emperor Augustus, from gaining power. He reigned as sole ruler from 31 BC, when he won a decisive victory in the civil war following Caesar's assassination (44 BC), until his death in 14. The way he formulated his position was sufficiently successful to form the basis of a dynasty that lasted till 68 (Rich 2011; Galinsky 2005). And even the end of that dynasty, through the death of Nero, did not lead to an end of the administrative structure which Augustus created. This would last (in adapted forms) for more than two centuries. But *officially* no new form of government emerged under Augustus. Emperorship did not officially exist. Instead, there was a dominant administrator who had happened to acquire more influence within the *Res Publica* ('public affairs') than his predecessors had (Millar 1984). As in Athens, the government of the state adapts to specific challenges, but these Roman adaptations were hidden behind a façade of continuity.

The Athenian and Roman examples both show how forms of government change over time. In both cases, the result was a new form of government that turned out to be exceptionally successful. In one case innovation was emphasized, in the other continuity. Were there other differences and similarities? And how can an analysis of these political and administrative changes help research into contemporary adaptive government?

3 ANCHORING CHANGE IN ATHENS AND ROME

Striking in both historical examples is that the design of the - explicitly or implicitly - changing structure of government emphatically reverts to existing structures and recognizable, traditional forms of organization. In Athens, the ancient Aereopagus remained part of the new Athenian democracy, although in

a new position (Wallace 2003). And in his measures at the end of the sixth century, Cleisthenes not only built on Solon's much older and already normalized measures, but restructured Athens using a geographical distribution of its citizens, for which he used redefined existing terms and structures (*deme, phyle, trittys*) (Ober 2012, 129–131). Roughly speaking, Cleisthenes' reforms can be divided into two forms: redefining existing institutions, and changing how Athenian citizens perceived their position vis-à-vis each other and the state. Over time, these redefinitions became the new starting points, with all subsequent governmental adjustments relating to them. When shaping his new structure, Cleisthenes not only looked at the situation that had to be changed (removing threats to the developing democracy, in particular the reduction of the power of the aristocrats) but also emphatically at ways in which to formulate that new structure in terms that people already knew. Even an explicit innovation had to be incorporated into recognizable concepts. Only when that new structure had, in itself, become traditional, there was space to abolish older traditions, such as the role of the Areopagus.

In Rome we see broadly the same way of dealing with existing administrative structures. The *Res Publica* remained the underlying terminology for describing the new form of rule, and the new ruler did not become *rex* (king) but instead used the term *princeps* (the first man); a form of address previously used for important men in the Republic, such as Scipio, Cato and Pompey (Moatti 2018; Hekster 2017a, 50–51). The power of the new ruler was shaped by "stacking" different existing honours and powers. Existing governmental institutions, such as the Senate and the popular assemblies, remained formally unaffected, but changed their functions and lost influence, though not all at once. Even the new name/ title that was given to the ruler, 'Augustus' (the exalted one), had previously been in use as a concept within Roman religion – be it a rarely used one. The use of Augustus as a name/title was new, and made it clear that matters had changed considerably, but the term was known to Roman subjects, and had clear associations with traditional Roman values. In the Roman case, furthermore, there is a noticeable discussion about agency regarding the process of reforms (Morell 2019; Wallace-Hadrill 2008).

Stories circulate about the ways in which people surrounding the ruler took an important role in shaping the new form of government through stapling existing magistracies, and in formulating the new ruler's title. In both cases, people surrounding the ruler awarded him honours and powers, and suggested new names. In his turn, the new ruler accepted some of these and refused others (Hekster 2017a, 52). Quite possibly, the emergence of Roman emperorship could more easily be presented as continuity with the previous form of administration, because several groups were involved in the way it was designed. That did not alter the fact that Augustus had come to power through a military victory, and became *de facto* sole ruler in a state that had been a Republic for centuries. But the use of recognizable terms and structures made the new situation acceptable as a form of adapted tradition, rather than forced innovation.

4 ANCHORING AND INNOVATION

What both examples show is the importance of 'anchor points' when trying to make new policies and government structures understandable – and therefore acceptable – to different groups within a state. People relate to matters and concepts that they know, and seem to be able to position innovations

(cognitively) better if that innovation is explicitly embedded into what they already know. That is the starting point of the research agenda "anchoring innovation" which is currently being carried out by classicists, historians and archaeologists in the Netherlands (Sluiter 2017; Hekster 2017b). Familiar terms, structures or visual language give people a direction of thinking, which helps them to fit new structures and situations into their world view. (Administrative) changes that are insufficiently anchored, or use an anchor point with unfortunate connotations, are much more likely to fail.

In the context of Athens, the regime of the so-called 'Thirty Tyrants' forms a good example of a failed adaptation of government. This new governmental structure followed on the Athenian loss against Sparta in the Peloponnesian War (431–404 BC). One result was that Sparta forced Athens to give up its democratic government. A new regime was imposed on the loser Athens, and it was consequently clearly linked to that loss. Already a year later that government fell, and democracy was restored (Osborne 2010, 273–287). A possibly useful contrast is formed by the rule over Egypt by Alexander the Great (336–323) and his successors, the Ptolemies. Here, too, rule changed after a military victory. Yet rather than emphasising the victory through an innovative political framework, Alexander allowed himself to be worshiped as a pharaoh. His successors likewise emphatically placed themselves into that well-known structure of rule (Bosch-Puche 2013; Bosch-Puche 2014). That made it much easier for the inhabitants of the area to accept the new regime. This appropriation of earlier traditions proved so successful that when the Romans incorporated Egypt into their empire, they kept this pharaonic formulation of power (Hekster 2015, 268–273).

For Rome, the famous attempt by Caesar (Augustus' predecessor and adoptive father) to gain supremacy was at least partly problematic because it was overtly linked to the concept of kingship, which was highly unpopular in Rome. There are a number of classical anecdotes in which Caesar denies that he wants to function as king. He famously publicly refused the crown offered to him by Antony, and is purported to have stated: 'I am not called *Rex* (king) but Caesar' (*Rex* being both a Roman surname and the word for king) (Baraz 2018).⁴ But even the denial of the link did not remove kingship as an anchor point from people's mind. Once such a link is made, it becomes difficult to remove that association. The removal of the kings of old to establish the Republic (519 BC) had been celebrated as a positive act for centuries. This made it difficult to formulate Caesar's sole regime in positive terms, with his assassination in 44 BC as ultimate consequence.

The above examples all discuss fairly major political shifts, in which not only parts of government structure but whole forms of government changed. However, the basic principles that follow from these examples may also apply to more limited changes. In all cases, there was a change in society which made political changes necessary, and these changes had to relate explicitly to what people already knew in order to be successful. Positive anchor points made it easier for people to accept new measures. An example from the Roman Empire, from the year 48, makes clear how important these anchor points can be to get a political response to a changing context accepted by different groups.

In this period, a number of prominent members of the elite of Roman Gaul (modern France) increasingly wished to be involved in the central administration of the Roman Empire. That central administration was in practice carried out by senators; important Roman (ex) magistrates. Gaul had been part

⁴ Caesar's quote is from Suetonius, *Life of Caesar*, 79.2, written in the early second century.

of the Roman Empire for a century, since its conquest by Caesar (58–54 BC), and had become a very prosperous territory, becoming an integral part of the empire (Woolf 1998). Thus, over a prolonged period of time, there had been a change in context, in which Gallic leaders had changed from being conquered enemies to wealthy citizens. The reaction of incumbent senators to the Gallic wish to join the senate was – perhaps unsurprisingly – negative. They apparently did not wish to open up their sphere of influence to (relative) outsiders. But the reigning emperor, Claudius (41–54), was willing to meet the Gallic requests, partly to strengthen unity in the empire and partly to strengthen his own position. The new ‘Gallic’ senators would, after all, be loyal to the person who had admitted them into the senate (Osgood 2011, 165–167). The way in which Claudius made this measure acceptable to the Roman people and the local senators is known because his speech from 48 on this topic has been preserved in both a passage from the historian Tacitus (*Annales*, 11.23–24) and a famous bronze plaque (*CIL* 13.1668), the so-called Tablet of Lyon (Brock 1995, 210–212). In the speech, Claudius emphasised how Rome had traditionally allowed foreigners to become citizens, and how citizens from outside Rome had already been allowed to join the senate at prior occasions. In addition, he stressed how prosperous and ‘Roman’ the members of the Gallic elite were, emphasising their similarity to current senators (Smith 2006, 424). After anchoring his speech through these two notions, he proposed that a number of Gallic men be admitted to the Senate. The measure was explicitly presented not as an adjustment, but as a logical consequence of existing practices. The administrative adjustment becomes acceptable because it is presented as hardly an adjustment.

A final example comes from late Antiquity and differs somewhat from the previous cases. It deals with a prolonged process of adjustments, making it difficult to identify precise agents or moments of change. Moreover, it shows a change in the surroundings in which politics was enacted, rather than in the political structures as such. Yet this change, too, shows the importance of anchoring administrative shifts through the use of existing notions and concepts. Through the fourth and fifth century, the Roman Empire had changed from a pagan into a Christian world. This also had consequences for administrative structures. Bishops took over some of the roles of senators (Heather 1997; Hunt 1997). Senators nevertheless continued to perform certain important civic duties. But the location in which those tasks were performed shifted from the market square (*forum*), which had been the centre of public space for centuries, to the church (*basilica*). Important ceremonies, meetings of the senate, the publication of laws and the issuing of legal decisions, imperial rulings and edicts increasingly took place in the churches of Rome, such as Saint Peter, and less and less at the traditional locations of the Roman Forum and Forum of Trajan (Liverani 2014, 33; Machado 2006, 157; Videbech 2017). In other words, the *basilica* took over the role of the public heart of Rome from the forum at all levels. It is interesting to see that exactly in this period the churches became decorated with all kinds of *spolia* – recycled materials from other locations. As a result, churches were filled with columns, statues, mosaics, floor pieces and other ornaments that often came from forums, or from buildings adjacent to the forums. The church thus not only took over the function of the market square, but even to a certain extent its form (Videbech 2017; Bosman 2014). That may well have been the point. The use of material that had always shaped the environment of the activities now taking place in the basilica, anchored this new environment in ancient traditions. The architectural change of the churches made it easy to anchor the new administrative situation in an understandable

past. People understood new and innovative messages better if they used a well-known visual language.

5 ANCIENT ANCHORS AND MODERN ADAPTIVE GOVERNMENT

It is difficult to compare a classical Greek *polis* and the developing Roman empire to the various cities and nation states in our 21st-century globalized world. The above examples cannot be simply translated into lessons for the modern world. What they can do is help us to consider the preconditions that are important to make changes in government structures understandable and acceptable for the groups that are affected by those changes. As this article has aimed to show, how changes in governmental structures are perceived depends greatly on the extent to which these changes are embedded in known concepts or structures. We have seen how when changes were sufficiently anchored in recognisable terms and practices, it became easier for people to accept these new measures. Even a renewal that explicitly emphasized its revolutionary character (and distanced itself from the existing elite and its practices), such as the development of the Athenian 'radical democracy', could not avoid anchoring its new form in a language or image that people recognized. One noticeable point that the various examples showed was furthermore the importance of the reason why changes in governmental structures were instigated. It made substantial difference whether changes were the result of changing local expectations, or of changes at a supra-regional level, to which local government had to react – possibly even against local wishes. In the latter case, it became even more important to anchor these changes in local practices and structures. The rule of the 'Thirty Tyrants' failed at least partly because it was presented as an innovation, highlighting the outside intervention that underlay it. Ptolemaic rule, in contrast, was deemed much less problematic because it anchored itself in local traditions, taking into account how ancient Egyptians thought about their local government. The success of Augustus's sole rule was to a large extent due to the way in which the new regime was formulated through known concepts and magistracies, making the changes less obtrusive. Adaptive government, ultimately, implies that organizational structures and political decision-making adapt to changing expectations in society. But society includes multiple groups, and multiple patterns of expectations, often mutually contradictory. It is therefore essential that ways in which different groups of people position themselves in time and place are taken into account when making political changes. As history shows, working from recognizable anchor points makes it easier to accommodate such changes.

REFERENCES

- Baraz, Yelena 2018. Discourse of Kingship in Late Republican Invective. In *Evil Lords. Theories and Representations of Tyranny from Antiquity to the Renaissance*, eds. Panou, Nikos and Hester Schadee, 43–60. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Beck, Hans, Antonio Duplá, Martin Jehne and Francisco Pina Polo (eds.). 2011. *Consuls and Res Publica: Holding High Office in the Roman Republic*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bevir, Mark and Rod A.W. Rhodes. 2010. *The State as Cultural Practice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bosch-Puche, Francisco. 2013. "The Egyptian Royal Titulary of Alexander the Great, I: Horus, Two Ladies, Golden Horus, and Throne Names." *The Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 99 (1): 131–154.

- Bosch-Puche, Francisco. 2014. "The Egyptian Royal Titulary of Alexander the Great, II: Personal Name, Empty Cartouches, Final Remarks, and Appendix." *The Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 100 (1): 89–109.
- Bosman, Lex. 2014. Spolia in the Fourth-Century Basilica. In *Old Saint Peter's, Rome*, eds. McKitterick, Rosamond, Robin Osborne, Carol M. Richardson and Joanna Story, 65–80. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Brock, Roger. 1995. "Versions, 'Inversions' and Evasions: Classical Historiography and the 'Published' Speech." *Papers of the Leeds Latin Seminar* 8: 209–224.
- Brunner, Ronald D., Todd A. Steelman, Lindy Coe-Juell, Christina M. Cromley, Christine M. Edwards and Donna W. Tucker (eds.). 2005. *Adaptive Governance: Integrating Science, Policy, and Decision Making*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Cartledge, Paul. 2016. *Democracy. A Life*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Cohen, David. 2005. Crime, Punishment, and the Rule of Law in Classical Athens. In *The Cambridge Companion to Ancient Greek Law*, eds. Gagarin, Michael and David Cohen, 211–235. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Galinsky, Karl (ed.). 2005. *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Augustus*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Heather, Peter. 1997. Senators and Senates. In *The Cambridge Ancient History. Volume 13: The Late Empire, AD 337–425*, eds. Cameron, Averil and Peter Garnsey, 184–210. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hekster, Olivier. 2015. *Emperors and Ancestors. Roman Rulers and the Constraints of Tradition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hekster, Olivier. 2017a. "Identifying Tradition: Augustus and the Constraint of Formulating Sole Rule." *Politica Antica* 7: 47–60.
- Hekster, Olivier. 2017b. "Religion and Tradition in the Roman Empire: Faces of Power and Anchoring Change." *Journal of Ancient Civilizations* 32: 13–34.
- Hekster, Olivier. 2018. Het verankeren van verandering. Adaptief bestuur in de antieke wereld. In *Adaptief bestuur. Essays over adaptiviteit en openbaar bestuur*, eds. Mettau, Petra and Zoe Hulsboom, 14–20. Den Haag: Ministerie van Binnenlandse Zaken en Koninkrijksrelaties.
- Hunt, David. 1997. The Church as Public Institution. In *The Cambridge Ancient History. Volume 13: The Late Empire, AD 337–425*, eds. Cameron, Averil and Peter Garnsey, 238–276. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lintott, Andrew. 1999. *The Constitution of the Roman Republic*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Liverani, Paolo. 2014. Saint Peter's and the City of Rome between Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages. In *Old Saint Peter's, Rome*, eds. McKitterick, Rosamond, Robin Osborne, Carol M. Richardson and Joanna Story, 21–34. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Machado, Carlos. 2006. Building the Past: Monuments and Memory in the Forum Romanum. In *Social and Political Life in Late Antiquity*, eds. Bowden, William, Adam Gutteridge and Carlos Machado, 157–192. Leiden and Boston: Brill.
- Millar, Fergus. 1984. State and Subject: the Impact of Monarchy. In *Caesar Augustus. Seven Aspects* eds. Millar, Fergus and Eric Segal, 37–60. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Moatti, Claudia. 2018. *Res publica: Histoire romaine de la chose publique*. Paris: Librairie Arthème Fayard.
- Morell, Kit. 2019. Augustus as Magpie. In *The Alternative Augustan Age*, eds. Osgood, Josiah, Kit Morrell and Kathryn Welch, 2–26. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Noussia-Fantuzzi, Maria. 2010. *Solon the Athenian, the Poetic Fragments*. Leiden and Boston: Brill.
- Ober, Josiah. 2012. Epistemic Democracy in Classical Athens: Sophistication, Diversity, and Innovation. In *Collective Wisdom: Principles and Mechanisms*, eds. Landemore, Helene and Jon Elster, 118–147. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development. 2005. *Modernizing Government: The Way Forward*. Paris: OECD.
- Osborne, Robin. 2006. When was the Athenian Democratic Revolution? In *Rethinking Revolutions through Ancient Greece*, eds. Goldhill, Simon and Robin Osborne, 10–28. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Osborne, Robin. 2010. *Athens and Athenian Democracy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Osgood, Josiah. 2011. *Claudius Caesar: Image and Power in the Early Roman Empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rich, W. John. 2012. Making the Emergency Permanent: 'Auctoritas', 'Potestas' and the Evolution of the Principate of Augustus. In *Des réformes augustéennes*, ed. Yann Rivière, 29–113. Rome: École Française de Rome.
- Rihll, Tracey. 1995. "Democracy Denied: Why Ephialtes Attacked the Areiopagus." *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* 115: 87–98.
- Rosillo-López, Cristina. 2019. Can a Dictator Reform an Electoral System? A Reassessment of Sulla's Power over Institutions. In *Sulla: Politics and Reception*, eds. Eckert, Alexandra and Alexander Thein, 55–70. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Shergold, Peter. 2015. *Learning from Failure: Why Large Government Policy Initiatives Have Gone So Badly Wrong in the Past and How the Chances of Success in the Future Can be Improved*. Available at <http://www.apsc.gov.au/publications-and-media/current-publications/learning-from-failure>.
- Sluiter, Ineke. 2017. "Anchoring Innovation: a Classical Research Agenda." *European Review* 25 (1): 1–19.
- Smith, Rowland. 2006. The Construction of the Past in the Roman Empire. In *A Companion to the Roman Empire*, ed. Potter, David, 411–439. Malden and Oxford: Blackwell.
- van der Blom, Henriette. 2011. "Pompey in the *Contio*." *Classical Quarterly* 61 (2): 553–573.
- Vervaet, Frederik. 2014. *The High Command in the Roman Republic: The Principle of the Summum Imperium Auspiciumque. From 509 to 19 BCE*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.
- Videbech, Christina. 2017. *Anchoring Innovations in Rome from the 4th-6th Century: The Case of the Basilica of St. Peter*. Available at <https://www.ru.nl/oikos/anchoring-innovation/anchoring-scholarship/anchoring-sanctity-masterclass/proceedings-workshop-anchoring-sanctity/>.
- Wallace, W. Robert. 2003. "Ephialtes and the Areopagus." *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 15: 259–269.
- Wallace-Hadrill, Andrew. 2008. *Rome's Cultural Revolution*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Woolf, Greg. 1998. *Becoming Roman: the origins of provincial civilization in Gaul*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.