

Parmularii et cetera...* On sources, silence of law and nature of the supporters of gladiatorial fights in Rome during the Republic and Early Empire

***Parmularii et cetera...* Par avotiem, likumu klusēšanu un gladiatoru cīņu atbalstītāju raksturu Romā Republikas un Agrās Impērijas laikā**

Dariusz Słapek, Assoc. Professor

University of Maria Curie-Skłodowska, Faculty of Humanities

Department of Ancient History of the Institute of History

Maria Curie-Skłodowska square 4a, 20-031 Lublin, Poland

E-mail: slopekdariusz@gmail.com

The enormous popularity of gladiatorial games, noted fights between fans of Pompeii and Nuceria, spontaneous demonstrations by viewers reinforced by the brutality of shows tend to suggest that a serious problem of threat to public order from the audience in the amphitheatre existed in Rome during the Principate. Meanwhile, Roman sources show relatively few examples of aggression. Also, Roman law did not create separate regulations, the task of which was to influence the behavior of spectators. The reasons for this situation were embedded not only in the *Lex Iulia theatralis*, but also in the nature of the Roman “devoted fans”. They were clearly divided into supporters of the various categories of gladiators, which resulted in their internal breakdown and impeded dangerous collective behavior.

Keywords: gladiatorial games, audience in amphitheatres, spectators’ manifestations and behaviour, Roman law, public and social order, “football hooliganism”.

Gladiatoru spēļu milzīgā popularitāte, pazīstamās cīņas starp Pompeju un Nucērijas līdzjutējiem, spontānās demonstrācijas, ko uzkurināja izrāžu brutalitāte, vedina domāt, ka principāta laikā amfiteātru auditorija radīja nopietnus draudus sabiedriskajai kārtībai Romā. Tai pašā laikā Romas vēstures avoti atspoguļo relatīvi nedaudz agresijas piemēru. Tāpat Romas likumos nebija īpaša regulējuma, kura uzdevums būtu ietekmēt skatītāju uzvedību. Šīs situācijas cēloņi bija ne tikai *Lex Iulia theatralis*, bet arī

* This paper is an extended version of an article published in 2010 with a title “*Spectaculi spectantes – on the nature of the sources and the silence of Roman law. Reconnaissance*”. In: A. AMIELAŃCZYK, A. DĘBIŃSKI, D. SŁAPEK (eds.). *Ochrona bezpieczeństwa i porządku publicznego w prawie rzymskim*. Lublin 2010, pp. 231–246.

romiešu fanu dedzīgā daba. Viņi ir iedalāmi dažādu gladiatoru kategoriju atbalstītājos, un tas noveda pie skatītāju grupu šķelšanās un izraisīja bīstamu kolektīvo uzvedību.

Atslēgvārdi: gladiatoru spēles, amfiteātru skatītāji, skatītāju manifestācijas un uzvedība, sabiedriskā un sociālā kārtība, “futbola huligānisms”.

The most spectacular manifestations of the attitude and behaviour in breach of the rules regulating public order, exhibited by the supporters of the Roman amphitheatres have already been described so often and numerous hypotheses have been created about the nature of the cases, which could be counted on the fingers of one hand, that even the most assertive scholar is probably not able to bring too many new finds into the current state of research. This helplessness, declared in merely one sentence, refers also to the possibility of exploring the reactions of legal regulations to the attitudes of the Roman supporters who were breaking the rules. An example illustrating this historiographic condition presents features of relatively numerous discussions, despite referring to just one episode known from the scanty sources or commonly associated with “the Roman supporters”, the incident of a fight between the fans from Pompeii and Nuceria, perfectly recognizable even outside of the circle of historians exploring ancient history.¹ Most of the space in these considerations was justifiably taken by the pursuit of reasons for these mutual animosities; a little less space, also understandably, was devoted to the reconstruction of the course of event, while the attempts of legal regulations, punishment and actions of a preventive nature were, at the same time, referred to rather casually.

A kind of consternation resulting from it can be determined by frequently automatic and not always rational comparisons between the reality of modern-day sport (in many ways capturing the attention

of legislations and entangled in a series of legal regulations indispensable for its functioning²) and similar phenomena of the ancient world.³ This kind of “demanding” perspective regarding the problem is also somewhat influenced by the nature of the ancient sources, which are usually critical towards the sports audience, particularly when it comes to comments made by the Christian authors on the over-enthusiastic crowds. They seem to be so close to us that with those passionate epithets and metaphors, i.e. by Tertullian and Novatian,⁴ we are inclined to describe the contemporary and dramatic individual events,⁵ which, when subjected to a simple conceptualisation, can turn into a phenomenon of “the stadium hooliganism”. It is also worth emphasising that the intensity of our surprise increases immeasurably if we correctly set a considerable demarcation line between the Greek and Hellenised agonistics, with their primary feature in the form of the direct participation of free men in the agones and the Roman games, which turned into the agones also because the Romans definitely more often – for many obvious reasons – saw their own place at the games only in a role of passive spectators. The Romans appear to be the viewers, *spectaculi spectantes* (see n. 37), with whom we unfortunately identify ourselves more often than with the Greeks active in sport. However, if such a particular role fell to them,⁶ they should pursue it equally well.⁷ It seems that due to these very features, or rather historical conditioning, an important question appears almost automatically, ignored

by the sources mentioned before and, to some extent, by the academic considerations: where is the law, where is the order and discipline based on it?

The core of the problem may also lie in a far-reaching autotelism of sport of the 21st century. It is nearly a value in itself, a phenomenon so homogenous and probably so unambiguously defined (when it comes to its substance, structure and functions) that the autonomous qualities, *signa* appropriate in many cases only for sport, which others linked to the remaining spheres of human activity (i.e. religion, war, politics), are increasingly often ascribed to it. Modern sport is progressively more understood through itself and not as characterised by external circumstances. For a long time subservient to other areas of life, almost in front of our eyes, sport starts to play a role of a sovereign. On the other hand, it can be stated that the Roman games had the instrumental values strongly embedded in them for the existence of the spectacle too often served as a tool to achieve the aims remaining outside of gladiatorial games.⁸ The scale and power of their genetic and functional involvement in other areas of life, their similarities of a structural nature were making them comprehensible only in relation to this broad historical context. For an extensive period they remained, i.e., in the service of war, they were in contact with it in various different ways, they almost constituted its propaedeutics. Roman games were genetically linked with the religious rituals, and their evolutionarily progressive secularisation never decisively pulled them out of the sphere of religious practice.⁹ In other words, if at times we conditionally accept the existence of “ancient/Roman sport”, then there is a million dollar award for whoever knows how to precisely define it, logically describe it and in a coherent formula to demonstrate its proper structure in particular.¹⁰

The problem of the identity of ancient sport (or rather the lack of its clear countenance) can have some relevance to the characteristics of its overall “relationships” with the legal regulations. Logical conclusion of these comments of the ordering nature seems to be that the legal regulations concerning the brutal Roman games pertained in the intention and conviction of their inspirers and initiators to other areas of life (most certainly other than those in which we would place them today), that is, those, in which the spectacles played instrumental and appurtenant functions, and of which they were the integral part. If, i.e. *munera gladiatoria* (gladiatorial games), were becoming a tool in political struggle then the matters concerning them were regulating the rules and principles associated with this wider, pivotal sphere of activity for the Romans. The case of *lex Tullia de ambitu* (law criminalizing electoral bribery passed in the consulship of Cicero in 63 BC) shows that its spear was directed against the politicians who were inclined to misuse the benefits coming from them, but not against the very institution of the games (see below). This issue is perhaps best illustrated by the reflection of a general nature on the so-called *leges gladiatoriae*. Quite significant seems to be the very term, a construct of a purely modern provenance (*terminus technicus*), created for the purpose of organising the legal regulations of different nature and regulating various spheres of functioning and organisation of Roman gladiatorial fights. However, it has no ancient provenance and assigning its origins to M. Tullius Cicero results from a somewhat erroneous reading of a short fragment from one of his speeches, otherwise referring, in fact, to *munera gladiatoria*.¹¹ These *leges gladiatoriae* never represented a separate category of legislations in the Roman law, such as, i.e. *leges sumptuariae* (sumptuary laws that attempt

to regulate permitted consumption) or *leges de ambitu* (laws criminalizing electoral bribery). Therefore, if regulations concerning the issuance of games, which were also public in their nature, emerged, then they belonged under the legislation, which was genetically associated with the areas of life other than the spectacles. During the Republic, they were usually under the regulations which were issued in order to inhibit the plague of electoral bribery. Such was undoubtedly the nature of the already mentioned *lex* from 63 BC, which in one of its parts (for it, importantly, was not concerned only with *munera gladiatoria*) banned the potential candidates for state offices from giving gladiatorial games for about two years before the elections.¹² Modern sport “happening” in a different context seems to be much more easily subjected to legal regulations...

It appears that the relations between legal provisions *versus* Roman games did not undergo a change along with the intensification of the games' production in the early imperial period or despite the final constitution of the full spectrum of the Roman amphitheatre spectacles as *munera legitima* (conglomerate spectacles, multi-dimensional entertainments). Laws regulating their organisation outside of Rome were most of all concerned with the religious aspects of the functioning of provincial communities within the state, the main binder of which was increasingly more “spectacular” form of the imperial cult.¹³ Those linked to the editions of *munera gladiatoria* in Rome itself had hidden political agendas, they served to monopolise the production of the games, keeping them in the hands of the emperor because they were viewed as an excellent tool to legitimise power. The rare regulations on producing the games in the provinces were expected, on the other hand, to limit the extortions and misappropriations

of the officials seeking the funds for their celebrations.¹⁴ Politics of *panem et circenses* (bread and circus), gaining the support of masses with gifts and entertainment, skilfully executed by Octavian Augustus together with the idea of returning to the tradition and to the maintenance of social order destabilised in the period of civil wars, resulted in a legislation, on the basis of which the allocation of the audience in the Roman amphitheatres became a reflection of the hierarchical structure of the Roman society.¹⁵ In order to impede the influx of free people to the arenas, the Roman Senate repeatedly proclaimed *senatus consulta* (decrees of the Senate). These regulations were present already in the Republic. Due to their low effectiveness, they were repeated with the greatest frequency at the end of the 1st century BC and the beginning of the 1st century AD. The overproduction of these bans lasted until 200 AD.¹⁶ After the disaster of the amphitheatre at Fidenae it was decided that, out of concern for the audience's safety, the similar architectural initiatives would have to be undertaken only by people of a specific social and financial status, conducting a careful and substantial preparations before commencing the investment.¹⁷ The spectacles' financial matters became effectively regulated by the Roman Senate during the reign of Marcus Aurelius, who was not too much in favour of the games. *Senatus consultum de pretiis gladiatorum minuendis* (decree of the Senate on expenditures for gladiatorial contests) from 177 AD precisely set the maximum costs of the organisation of the spectacles, primarily due to the situation of the potential editors of the games outside Rome, particularly the priests of the imperial cult. The profits of the *lanistae* (gladiatorial managers, professional entrepreneurs who bought, trained, sold, and rented gladiators to sponsors, editors of the games) that

were thereby reduced, were compensated to them through the suspension of taxes paid to the treasury so far.¹⁸

It seems that the legislations, presented only in order to illustrate the directions in which the Roman regulations concerning the organisation of the Roman gladiatorial spectacles were going, treated the problem somewhat selectively or, what is perhaps more convincing, in accordance with their complex and heterogeneous nature.¹⁹ It is possible to complain that they appeared to be *ad hoc*, a reaction to specific individual events, that they lacked the stability, their often local provenance limited the range of their activity; and finally, we know very little of their effectiveness. They were to a certain degree emerging on the occasion of the regulations associated with the areas of life genetically or “systemically” interconnected with the spectacles. In this regard, they are, of course, similar to the nature of modern regulations governing the functioning of sport; for it is difficult to presume that the problems of erecting the sports facilities were nowadays regulated by the legislations other than those related to the construction law. It also would be difficult to expect that the contemporary financial problems associated with sport went beyond the sphere of competence pertaining to the Minister of Finance... In the age of globalisation and the functioning of many transnational and supranational sports institutions, a new sub-discipline of law was constituted, referred to as *lex sportiva* or *lex ludica* (which indirectly proves the autotelic nature of modern sport).²⁰ The issues concerning hooliganism at the arenas were also included in the area of its activities. The long-lasting powerlessness in the sphere of legal form of fighting this phenomenon seems to be slowly fading away because the actions impeding the so-called “British disease” are indeed undertaken by the supranational

institutions, doing so in a consistent, coherent and coordinated manner, based on a serious of academic study beyond the British problem.²¹ Therefore, can the silence of the Roman law in this realm be regarded as a manifestation of its imperfections, or does this void rather convince us of the historical shallowness or even the lack of this phenomenon, which were simply not imposing any regulations and interferences?

It should be assumed that the “selectivity” of *leges gladiatoriae* mentioned above did not, in fact, mean that the problem was marginalised by the Roman law. Reconsideration of the outlined laws allows to state that they regulated the fundamental issues in the area dedicated to the spectacles’ organisation and they were simultaneously catering for the vital interests of the state (as well as, to some extent, those of the audience). Despite casuistry, they dispelled the doubts regarding who, in what circumstances and in what scale *munera gladiatoria* could be organised, who should actively participate therein, and, finally, who and in what order should be seated on the amphitheatres’ *cavea* (seating sections). This was fully adequate for the fundamental functions and tasks of the games, and sometimes supported or even crystallised their political, ideological and symbolic aims.²²

It seems that these considerations present quite an important conclusion: the similarity between the general nature of the Roman and modern legal regulations concerning sport and spectacles provides an inducement to the opinion that neither the autotelic nature of modern sport nor the instrumental, heterotelic, nature of ancient sport constituted, or constitute, an obstacle in creating the legal provisions concerning them. Hence, it would be pointless to talk about holistically understood purposes of the Roman legislations, which,

if only for the said casuistry, attempted to intervene in all the aspects of the functioning of the games.

The problem with the deliberate order in taking the seats in the audience by the “supporters” was regulated mainly by the legislations of Augustus. Aims other than those envisaged by the legislator (concerned mainly with putting to an end the chaos so far happening while taking seats at the spectacles²³ and, at the same time, creating a symbolic, socio-topographic map of the Roman society, the guarantor and “moderator”²⁴ of which was the emperor), i.e. an easy identification of the groups of supporters violating the rules of public order should be probably regarded as a secondary matter in comparison with the aims of these regulations initially envisaged by the legislator.²⁵ It seems that *Lex Iulia theatralis* (an Augustan law introduced between 20 and 17 B.C., which regulated the seating arrangements in the theatre, amphitheatre and, possibly, in the circus) admittedly, failed to create the general attitudes and behaviour of the audience in a straightforward manner.²⁶ Therefore, the basic questions and doubts once again emerge: was the problem of “troublesome supporters” non-existent, was the Roman law disregarding its existence or was it not so dangerous a phenomenon to be considered, in accordance with the outlined principles of these *leges*, threatening to the state and order imposed within it.

The problem appears to be quite complex. In modern scholarship on the sports fans in the Roman, and somewhat public, “sports facilities”, and in the study based on “modernising” ancient sport, many problems, which require some analysis are usually glossed over. These publications, most frequently using the selected examples from the sources of unconventional attitudes, of the supporters’ conduct in

the arenas,²⁷ circuses and amphitheatres, consider the question of game cheering as a thoroughly obvious matter in accordance with the syllogism: if sport/spectacle existed (*ludus, munus, spectaculum*), consequently, its inherent feature/part was to be watched. In general, there are no attempts to capture and define the problem, although the concepts like a fan/supporter and a spectator are nowadays used with some deliberation²⁸ (the threat usually comes from the former ones, while the latter are, on the whole, considered to be apathetic aesthetes²⁹).

It turns out that noticing these sometimes subtle differences from the perspective of philological studies appears to be very difficult. A kind of surprise can be, indeed, triggered by the fact that literary Latin (particularly in the face of accentuating the importance of the games, their extensive functions often transcending the role of an ordinary spectacle, the plethora of literary sources attesting to their great popularity, the specific sports metaphors present in the scholarship, etc.) used none of the universal terms which would unambiguously correspond to the notion of a “supporter, sports fan”. It seems that the term *spectator*³⁰ is not the key to understanding the core of the problem. The sources, of course, contain terms, which clearly “refer” to people who gathered in the circuses, amphitheatres and theatres.³¹ The essence of assigning seats in the buildings holding the spectacles was initially to give privilege to certain *ordines* (it took place in the theatres earlier than in the amphitheatres) and in the legislation of Augustus concerning the amphitheatre, on the other hand, the high point of changes was to present the divisions of the entire society (*universus populus*) in such a way that the assigned subdivisions would be adequate to the importance of individual classes, professional and age groups, and

even the divisions in accordance with sex, in the functioning of the state.³² It is, therefore, not surprising that the legal sources, as well as the literary ones, which describe order in the buildings and entertainment facilities, unanimously, universally and consequently use the terminology specific to the practice of social and political life: *senatores, equites, plebs, milites, matronae, praetextati, iuvenes, paedagogi*³³ (accordingly: senators, equites, lower class citizens, soldiers, married woman, boys still wearing the *toga praetexta*, youths, pedagogues of boys). In Augustus' opinion, the games were intended to reflect the world outside so precisely that the correct place in the amphitheatre, in correspondence with the role played outside of it, was given even to the Vestal Virgins.³⁴

The lack of the term “supporter-hooligan” in the classical literary and juridical Latin certainly does not determine, whether this phenomenon, associated with these modern concepts, existed in Rome at all towards the end of the Republic and during the early imperial period. Suffice it to say that perhaps the greatest outrage was triggered by the behaviour of the spectators which consisted of an arbitrary taking of seats unassigned to them by law. The energies and resources engaged for the purpose of having these provisions obeyed can suggest that the destruction of this order could have been the most dangerous manifestation of the “amphitheatric hooliganism” for the legislator.³⁵

The impression of the lack of the phenomenon of the “amphitheatric hooliganism” surely cannot be the result only of the consideration over scanty sources³⁶ and narrow philological studies, because the latter, conducted particularly through the inscriptions, argue that the existence of this category of the viewers is securely proven by some of the inscriptions, such as *spectaculi spectantes* (these were *signa*

of the organised groups of supporters who were affecting the life of the city also in a way that was different from spontaneous behaviour, activities at the games).³⁷ The inscriptions and literary texts, which deconstruct a certain, ordered and appeased, image of the spectators (see: conciliatory *populus* in Latin), who were divided in the amphitheatre according to the social groups they represented – at the same time pointing out that the emotions accompanying the games had certain supranational qualities – are slightly more numerous. However, the phenomenon is more difficult to detect because the supporters-fans were “hiding” under the names taken from the categories of gladiators or the characteristic elements of their armour, i.e. the so-called *parmularii*, fans who favoured *parmularius* gladiator, took their title from the name of a small and oval gladiatorial shield (Latin: *parma* or *parmula*).³⁸ Yet, the existence of names other than the “official” ones does not indicate that potential hooligans have been hiding behind them; besides, these terms are extremely rare and it is difficult to use them to determine the scale, scope and social depth of the phenomenon, important for the emergence of legislative provisions (arising of the need for regulations).³⁹

Nevertheless, the sources (in vast majority – literary ones) prove that amphitheatre was, at times, a place where public order was disturbed. The most widely known event of this type, the fight between the spectators from Pompeii and Nuceria in the amphitheatre of Pompeii, is, as far as the scanty existing information testifies, described and quite convincingly explained in the literature on the subject.⁴⁰ Quite an interesting interpretation can be offered regarding perfunctory remarks about Nero, who decided – only on a temporary and short-term basis – in favour of withdrawal of the Praetorian Guard troops

from the amphitheatre. These troops were the main tool of enforcing the imperial order and discipline.⁴¹ It is generally known that all the manifestations of disorderly conduct during the spectacles usually engendered a quick reaction of the authorities. The punishments included the exile of the ringleaders, sometimes also the very “competitors”, and the termination of informal associations of supporters. Most frequently, however, longstanding bans were passed against the organisation of the spectacles in the cities after violation of public order. Such punishments were given to Syracuse, Byzantium, Alexandria and Antioch.⁴²

Factual evidence (even general and laconic descriptions of events, incidents, accidents, fights, etc.) seems to be relatively little even beyond the centuries-old Roman tradition of organising the games. There is a plentiful evidence indicating that gladiatorial fights, at least theoretically and potentially, could have been a source of many conflicts. The most notable amongst them seems to be the conviction that the level of emotions triggered by the spectacle spectre (by what was taking place directly at the arena) was almost mechanically transferred to the audience.⁴³ *Ergo*, the violence in the gladiatorial fights, sanctioned at the arena and iconic for this kind of games, could have generally been a bad example of disrespect for the law,⁴⁴ because it almost inspired the viewers to equally brutal attitudes and conduct. However, psychologists failed to provide a convincing proof of the existence of this mechanism and, besides, the aggression engendered in the audience could disclose itself in ways other than stirring up brawls and fights in and outside of the amphitheatre.⁴⁵

Discussion on the mysterious (or natural towards historical reality) silence of the sources and the composure of the creators of Roman law in relation to the “order

in the amphitheatres” should be started from a certain rationalisation of the nature of the sources dealing with spectators’ behaviour. Apart from shallow complaints, the quality of the sources should also be considered (just like understanding game cheering in sport cannot be a simple casuistry because the latter prefers illustrations over reliable research, shocks with the examples without any detailed discussion in geographically and chronologically dispersed sources).⁴⁶ A common feature shared by a large part of sources undertaking to analyse the motive of spectators from the Roman amphitheatres is the fact that they derive simultaneously from the commentators and the mentors of the games. In this “presentation of the authors” the question is not only about the emphasis on otherwise significant fact that not much of this information was created directly by the very “devoted fans”. It was, of course, created by those who could observe certain behaviours. However, a possibility to be kept in mind – that they only heard of them more frequently because the fights caused a stir and, therefore, they were reproduced as extraordinary events (just as nowadays done by the tabloids). On the other hand, the comments had didactic and mentoring overtones, assuming criticism of conducts, which were, after all, transcending the rule of moderation and balance also in the emotional sphere universally accepted in antiquity (characteristically, it is always THEM who get excited).⁴⁷ It is also worth to emphasise the specific provenance of these opinions, as they derive from the choirs of Roman or Romanised elites who are consistent in their criticism of sport and spectacles. Moderation about the games, as an ephemeral and trivial entertainment, is an imperative of a certain correctness, characteristic to ancient literature probably already from the times of Plato, it can

be seen in Cicero, even Seneca, Galen, and, most of all, in the early Christian authors.⁴⁸ The climate and overtone of comments made about the behaviour of the audience was, therefore, consistent with the dominant attitude of the elites of that time towards sport (particularly the professional type, violent and somewhat secularised).⁴⁹ It is also worth adding that in the admittedly shallow but tangible criticism of the Roman spectacles, the image of the games as an important seedbed for civil unrests is not predominant.⁵⁰

Therefore, these sources cannot play a primary role in the discussion on the condition of Roman game cheering (that is, on a relative peace and order in the amphitheatre, and, finally, on the silence of law indicated in the title...). The main focus in the historians' deliberations upon the problem of the "Roman supporters" is, consequently, at times moved to the circumstances, surroundings and unique entourage of game cheering, – the factors which could determine the nature of their conduct. An important place amongst them is taken, for instance, by a matter of comfort and security of those watching the spectacles, particularly in the amphitheatre. A number of architectural solutions were subjected to a thorough analysis, in particular, those which were to provide sense of security for the audience. Consequently, the attention was focused on the effectiveness of the routes facilitating the filling and leaving of amphitheatre, protection against wild animals, gladiators' seditions, but quite a lot of space was devoted to the comfort of watching the games, conditioned by the presence of attractions like *velaria*, *sparsiones*, *missilia*, etc.⁵¹ (i.e. awnings over amphitheatres protecting spectators from the sun, perfumed water spraying during spectacles, distribution – by random throwing – of favors such as various foodstuff, coins, clothing, slaves, etc.). This

approach seems to be correct even though the luxury of watching cannot become the main proof to rationalise the relative tranquillity of the audience in the amphitheatres. The comfort of the viewers was probably not an important tool in pacifying their attitudes, as even harsh social conditions for cheering in the Hellenistic sanctuaries, the places of great Panhellenic games, are not listed as a significant factor determining the extremely turbulent behaviour of the Greek supporters.⁵² Observations by A. Scobie, P. Rose and S. Bingham gravitate towards the achievements of social proxemics, which examine the impact of spatial relationships between people, as well as between people and spatial surroundings upon psychological reactions, and the means of communicating relevant thereof (and the level of aggression in these relationships).⁵³

It seems, however, that broad knowledge about the games provides more extensive opportunities to explain reasons for "pacifist" attitudes of the viewers and to understand, at the same time, the silence of the sources indicated in the title. This can particularly refer to strongly accentuated functions of *munera gladiatoria* as a central axis of the Roman culture, a core of *romanitas* (Roman-ness – the collection of political and cultural concepts and practices defining what it means to be a Roman). Any disruptions of public order in the amphitheatre would have destroyed the meticulously constructed symbolism of the amphitheatre and the games taking place in it (if only their elaborate ideological, symbolic, political and, finally, religious functions are not merely a product of our imagination, or misinterpretation, awakened through the achievements of sociology and cultural anthropology).⁵⁴ In other words, if the amphitheatric spectacles were indeed the projection Roman order in general, then the anarchy

in the audience should be treated almost as an attack upon the unwritten "Roman constitution". The prestige, esteem, respect and, finally, sanctity of the games could constitute important factors stimulating the reactions of the audience in the amphitheatre.⁵⁵ Other factors determining the behaviour of the audience could indirectly derive from the functions and rules of organising the games.⁵⁶ From these factors emerged quite a distinctive participation of the "supporters" in the spectacle taking place right in front of their eyes, which was controlled and channeled the audience's emotions. Unlike in any other type of violent sport, the audience, after all, with a simple gesture could decide the fate of the defeated gladiators, result of the duel, less frequently – the amount of the award.⁵⁷ Not all the parts of structurally arranged spectacle (the so-called *munera legitima*) were equally appreciated by the audience – the most prestigious ones took place towards the end of the day when the excitement after daylong watching of *venationes* (type of entertainment in Roman amphitheatres involving, among others, the hunting and killing of wild animals) and the slaughter of *noxii* (condemned criminals), could have dropped significantly. Apparently, a certain importance in tempering the audience's emotions was allotted also to the already mentioned order not only associated with the sequence of "performances", but also with the extended formalities of the arena (they indicated that the game had to take place in accordance with strictly defined rules and that everything preceding it during the fight and after its conclusion was consistent with specific procedures).⁵⁸ The order within the arena was evidently moved to the *cavea*. If the amphitheatre was indeed playing a role of the parliament of the people, then the requests, rather than demands, formed by the audience and

addressed to the ruler had a thoroughly trivial dimension from the perspective of the most important, political, point of view. At times, the requests were of a nature of true sports fans and they asked the ruler to present a specific competitor at the arena, to pardon a brave gladiator or to organise additional games. Importantly, during Claudius' reign, the ruler was contacted not through the herald (shouts, gestures), but instead by passing the demands written on the boards covered with wax to the emperor. Even this element of interactions was "institutionalised" and given a certain rigor and order.⁵⁹

Perhaps the most important factor, which had a calming effect on the emotions of the audience in the amphitheatre, was the one deriving directly from the nature of the abovementioned terminology – the nature of "gladiatorial" cheering. The immanent feature of ancient sport was, undoubtedly, the lack of rivalry in team sports.⁶⁰ Perhaps the "personalisation" of the names of the supporters-fans, indicated above, was a result of the dominance of individual competitions (duels between particular pairs of gladiators representing a specific type of armament and fighting techniques) over team competitions, which usually triggered the greatest excitement because it was linked, along with easily determined provenance of the team, to some form of a local patriotism or primitive xenophobia.⁶¹ Gladiators fighting, for instance, in Pompeii, were coming from different, sometimes distant, parts of the vast empire, and in the audience's opinion their ethnic provenance probably played no important role.⁶² Thus, nearly the entire potential energy for cheering was focused on identifying with the stars of the arena, the winners. Thomas Wiedemann even suggested that amongst the supporters of gladiatorial games there were practically no men who lost, since,

regardless of the outcome of a specific fight, the attention of the audience was focused on the winner and the very idea of victory, immanently associated with him (in a symbolic context, gladiatorial contest was always presenting the idea of life's triumph over death).⁶³ In metaphorical sense, Wiedemann's opinion could be supported, but in practice not all the gladiators ended their duels as victors. Correct identification makes sense only when the bond between the fan and the object of his regard is not ephemeral or opportunistic. *Parmularii* were, after all, the supporters of a specific type of gladiators (the Roman substitute for the contemporary notion of the team) but it would be difficult to assume that gladiators who used this kind of shield were always winning. Having accepted Wiedemann's opinion, it can be assumed that his view generally refers to the spectators gathered in the amphitheatre, the audience *in gremio*, collectively, together. They were the people who accepted *munera gladiatoria* as a part of the Roman lifestyle and participation in the spectacles as a form of expressing the affiliation with the great "multi-adjectival" community. If the place of this "subgroup" was to be measured by the intensity of emotions, passion and enthusiasm, those whose relationships with the arena/gladiatura took exceptional and distinctive forms partially associated with modern-day team cheering, were placed above it. In other words, if there were no supporters of a gladiatorial *familia* from i.e. Capua or Pompeii in Rome, this gap was filled by the admirers of their individual and quite numerous categories and, most of all, the stars of the arena. This could generate a lot of complicated subdivisions amongst the spectators, essentially hindering their joint actions that could potentially be dangerous to the state.

It is also worth adding that gladiatorial fights from the imperial period still

maintained their eclectic, almost cosmopolitan, dimension because the Etruscan, Greek, and even Near Eastern influences had left the genetic mark on them. This undoubtedly facilitated their universal (in the topography of the Roman world) acceptance but also pacified the potential threat of some form of xenophobia.⁶⁴ It should not be forgotten that within the policy of *panem et circenses* gladiatorial fights were expected to alleviate conflicts, pacify particularisms, promote unification and bounding. It appears to be devised so successfully that mainly amphitheatric spectators were created. Legal regulations concerning spectacles, adding great seriousness to the games through extensive symbolism and formalities, linking them to the imperial cult, nuances in the organisation of the games themselves and, finally, some features of *munera gladiatoria* as a sports event, resulted in a situation where probably less numerous supporters generally did not present a threat to the Roman legislative order.

The conduct of spectators in the Roman circus, particularly in the time of Late Empire, was completely different.⁶⁵ The emergence of a different quality in the Roman cheering, crossing fingers for the team, racing stables, can be attributed to the functioning of a few circus factions. The proper order in the audience, typical for the amphitheatre, was imposed on the circus relatively late. Its nature was more egalitarian and on this broad foundation emerged a much more dangerous threat for the civic order than the one deriving from fragmented and disintegrated crowd of the Roman amphitheatres.⁶⁶ It seems that on this basis a thoroughly unique importance of factions determining many areas of life was born, particularly of Constantinople. Although big games were organised in Rome, the notable problems with them started only at the Bosporus.⁶⁷

REFERENCES AND NOTES

- ¹ AMADEO MAIURI. Pompei e Nocera. In: Rendiconti dell'Accademia di Archeologia, Lettere e Belle Arti di Napoli 33, 1958, pp. 35–40; WALTER MOELLER. The Riot of A.D. 59 at Pompei. In: *Historia* 19, 1970, pp. 84–95. The unique role of Tacitus as the only commentator of this event is emphasized by PAAVO CASTRÉN. *Ordo Populusque Pompeianus*. Polity and Society in Roman Pompei. Roma 1975, p. 26. Detailed studies are surpassed by the number of references to the incident in synthetic works, i.e. THOMAS WIEDEMANN. *Emperors and Gladiators*. London, New York 2001, p. 132; LUCIANA JACOBELLI. *Gladiators at Pompeii*. Los Angeles 2003, pp. 106–108. See the extensive bibliography on this problem in *Spectatores. Quellen zum Zuschauer im Altertum* (<http://www.gewi.uni-graz.at/spectatores>).
- ² For the areas of activity of modern legislators see, i.e.: STEVE GREENFIELD, GUY OSBORN. *Law and Sport in Contemporary Society*. London 2000, pp. 1–20; ADAM EPSTEIN. *Sports Law*. New York 2003, pp. 87–102. Dynamics of the phenomenon is proven by numerous professional journals, i.e. *Sport and Law Journal*, *Revue juridique et économique du sport*, *Journal of Legal Aspects of Sport*, *Sweet & Maxwell's International Sports Law Review*, *Entertainment and Sports Law Journal*, *International Sports Law Review*.
- ³ The exposure of their diversity by no means leads to the loss of perspective in the continuity of the development of this form of human activity, levelling the undoubted genetic dependencies, trivialising the lifespan of values inherent in it, particularly if we look at it from the perspective of a cultural anthropologist. For more, see DARIUSZ SŁAPEK. *Sport i widowiska świata antycznego*. Kraków, Warszawa 2010.
- ⁴ See, i.e.: JOACHIM EBERT. Die lateinischen Kirchenväter und die antiken Wettkämpfe. In: *Stadion* 1, 1975, S. 185–197; VICENTE PICÓN GARCÍA. El *De Spectaculis* de Tertuliano: su originalidad. In: *Helmantica* 40, 1989, pp. 397–412; MICHEL MATTER. Jeux d'amphithéâtre et réactions chrétiennes de Tertullien à la fin du V^e siècle. In: CLAUDE DOMERQUE et al. (eds.). *Spectacula I. Gladiateurs et amphithéâtres*. Lattes 1990, pp. 259–264.
- ⁵ Consequently exaggerated by tabloid-like media See: GARRY WHANNELL. Football Crowd Behaviour and the Press. In: *Media, Culture and Society* 1–2, 1979, pp. 327–342; PATRICK MURPHY, ERIC DUNNING, JOHN WILLIAMS. Soccer Crowd Disorder and the Press: Processes of Amplification and De-amplification in Historical Perspective. In: *Theory, Culture and Society* 5, 1988, pp. 645–693.
- ⁶ I.e. DONALD KYLE. *Sport and Spectacle in the Ancient World*. Malden 2007, p. 256. For the author of this article the centre of attention is placed mainly on the Roman reality not only because the “commentaries” on the behaviour of spectators, for example, in the amphitheatres, which are relatively more numerous and Roman in their provenance, provide some chances for rationalising the problem of ancient “game cheering”. Greek sport had the quality which somehow makes it difficult to study this problem because the audience in the stadiums and hippodromes were, at the same time, active participants in the agones. In Rome, on the other hand, “throwing” to the arenas slaves, criminals, etc. brought about a fundamental division between those who were only “viewing audience” and the actual participants, gladiators, aurigae... In the Roman context, a wall was erected between the arena and cavea (rather symbolic for in practise it was overstepped), which accentuated the difference between “doing and watching”. See also: i.e. ALLEN GUTTMANN. Sports Spectators from Antiquity to the Renaissance. In: *Journal of Sport History* 8, 1981, No. 2, pp. 5–10.
- ⁷ It is impossible to completely ignore other “catalysts of the phenomenon”. PAUL VEYNE. Païens et chrétiens devant la gladiature. In: *Mélanges de l'École française de Rome. Antiquité* 111, 1999, No. 2, pp. 899–917, proves that a little surprising observation results from the analysis of the comments of Christian authors on gladiatorial games. Here an important reason for hostility towards them were not only the acts of martyrdom of the Christians or the idolatry of the games. Serious doubts were raised about the games functioning as a unique space for pagan gatherings, publicly manifesting their unity. This kind of tool was not at the disposal of the emerging Christianity. Both Stoicism, as well as Epicureanism, the most popular “attitudes to life” in

the Roman society, generally saw many practical qualities in the gladiatorial fights, particularly in the creation of man's attitude towards death. See also: HEATHER L. REID. The Epicurean Spectator. In: Sport, Ethics and Philosophy 4, 2010, No. 2, pp. 195–203; PIERRE CAGNIART. Seneca's Attitude Towards Sport and Athletics. In: The Ancient History Bulletin 14, 2000, No. 4, pp. 162–170.

⁸ Through opposition to autotelism, it is possible to say that ancient sport was heterotelic, it appealed to external circumstances, existed within a complex context. It was rather in this context's outcome and derivative, and reaching to the Greek etymology of the word that it simply did not directed itself and was not an aim in itself. On the term autoteles in the Stoics see: MICHAEL FREDE. Essays on Ancient Philosophy. Minneapolis 1987, p. 140n.

⁹ TIM CORNELL. On War and Games in the Ancient World. In: TIM CORNELL, THOMAS B. ALLEN (eds.). War and Games. Studies on the Nature of War. Woodbridge 2000, pp. 37–58, questions the nature of sport as a preparation to war. No one, however, doubts about the relations between ancient sport and religion. See also: i.e. ELIZABETH PEMBERTON. Agones hieroi. Greek Athletic Contests in Their Religious Context. Nikephoros 13, 2000, pp. 111–123; ROSMARIE GÜNTHER. Olympia: Kult und Spiele in der Antike. Darmstadt 2004. On similar relations of Roman games see i.e. JONH MOURATIDIS. On the Origins of the Gladiatorial Games. In: Nikephoros 9, 1996, S. 111–134; DARIUSZ SŁAPEK. *Bustuarius Gladiator* – ein Mythos des ersten Gladiators. In: Pomoerium 3, 1998, pp. 37–50; EMILY B. LYLE. The Circus as Cosmos. In: Latomus 33, 1984, pp. 827–841; ANDRÉ PIGANIOL. Recherches sur les jeux romains. Notes d'archéologie et d'histoire religieuse. Paris 1923, pp. 75–101, 137–150; DANIEL P. HARMON. The Public Festivals of Rome. In: Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt II. Principat 16.2. Berlin, New York 1978, S. 1440–1468. The opinion of the theoretician of sport, GUTTMANN, Sports Spectators from Antiquity, p. 5; “[...] the Greeks were the first peoples to approach sports not merely as an aspects of cult or a preparation for warfare but as ends in themselves”, has no enthusiasts amongst the historians of antiquity.

¹⁰ Broader discussion on this topic: SŁAPEK, Sport i widowiska świata antycznego, pp. 41–57.

¹¹ CIC., HAR. 26.56. “*Repulsi sunt ii quos ad omnia progredientis, quos munera contra leges gladiatoria parantis, quos apertissime largientis non solum alieni sed etiam sui, vicini, tribules, urbani, rustici reppulerunt: hi ne honore augeantur monent.*”

(Those are the rejected candidates meant, whom, when they were proceeding to the most violent measures, when they were preparing exhibitions of gladiators contrary to the laws, when they were bribing in the most open manner, not only strangers, but even their own relations, their neighbours, the men of their own tribe, towns-people and countrymen, all rejected (transl. C. D. YONGE. In: M. TULLIUS CICERO. On the Responses of the Haruspices. London 1891, p. 97).)

¹² The legislation was born in pain because it interfered in a private and religious sphere at the same time; it concerned, after all, the organisation of gory duels at the funerals of the deceased ancestors, a tradition dating back to at least the 3rd century BC. Therefore, there were attempts to diminish the electoral effectiveness of gladiatorial games and not heavy-handedly ban their organisation. Perhaps the sphere of private gladiatorial games was also interfered with by the earlier republican *leges de ambitu*. See also: DARIUSZ SŁAPEK. *Gladiatorzy i polityka. Igrzyska w okresie późnej republiki rzymskiej*. Wrocław 1995, p. 139; ERNST BALTRUSCH. *Regimen morum*. Die Reglamentierung des Privatlebens der Senatoren und Ritter in der römischen Republik und frühen Kaiserzeit. München 1989, S. 106–122. On the decisions of the Senate to limit the officials' expenses for organising *ludi publici* already at the turn of the 3rd and the 2nd century BC see, i.e.: NATHAN S. ROSENSTEIN. The Forms of Control and Limitation of Aristocratic Competition in the Middle of Roman Republic. Berkeley 1982; ISRAEL SHATZMANN. Senatorial Wealth and Roman Politics. Bruxelles 1975, pp. 85–87, 156–158. The decision of the Senate from 65 BC on limiting the number of gladiators in Caesar's games was taken due to security reasons (or political fears of his enemies) and did not result from a particular interest of the legislator in the games themselves (it probably referred only to funerary *munera* of the contemporary *aedile*). See also: DARIUSZ SŁAPEK. *Senatus consultum z 65 roku p.n.e. wobec pogrzebowych igrzysk Cezara*. In:

- MAREK KURYŁOWICZ, ANTONI DĘBIŃSKI (eds.). *Religia i prawo karne w starożytnym Rzymie*. Lublin 1998, pp. 151–173.
- ¹³ BARBARA LEVICK. The *senatus consultum* from Larinum. In: *Journal of Roman Studies* 73, 1983, pp. 97–115; WOLFGANG D. LEBEK. Augustalspiele und Landestrauer (Tab. Siar. fr. II col. A 11–14). In: *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 75, 1988, S. 59–71.
- ¹⁴ ADELE M. CAVALLARO. *Spese e spettacoli. Aspetti economici-strutturali degli spettacoli nella Roma giulio-claudia*. Bonn 1984, pp. 33–90, 121–129; RIGOBERT W. FORTUIN. *Der Sport im augusteischen Rom. Philologische und sporthistorische Untersuchungen*. Stuttgart 1996.
- ¹⁵ JONATHAN C. EDMONDSON. Dynamic Arenas: Gladiatorial Presentations in the City of Rome and the Construction of Roman Society in the Early Empire. In: WILLIAM SLATER (ed.). *Roman Theater and Society*. Ann Arbor 1996, pp. 69–112; CHRISTINE SCHNURR. The *lex Iulia Theatralis* of Augustus. Some Remarks on Seating Problems in Theatre, Amphitheatre and Circus. In: *Liverpool Classical Monthly* 17, 1992, pp. 147–160; EDMOND FRÉZOULS. Les monuments des spectacles dans la ville: théâtre et amphithéâtre. In: *Spectacula I. Gladiateurs et amphithéâtres*, pp. 77–92.
- ¹⁶ See also: LEVICK, The *senatus consultum* from Larinum; WOLFGANG D. LEBEK. Standeswürde und Berufsverbot unter Tiberius: das SC der Tabula Larinas. In: *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 81, 1990, S. 37–58; PHILIPPE MOREAU. A propos du *senatus consulte* epigraphique de Larinum: gladiateurs, arbitre et valets d'arène de condition sénatoriale ou équestre. In: *Revue des études latines* 61, 1983, pp. 36–48; CARLA RICCI. *Gladiatori e attori nella Roma Giulio-Claudia. Studi sul senatoconsulto di Larino* (e-book 2006). See also: OLIVIERO DILIBERTO. *Ricerche sull' auctoramentum* e sulla condizione degli "auctorati". Milano 1981; ANTONIO GUARINO. I "gladiatores" e l'"auctoramentum". In: *Labeo* 29, 1983, pp. 7–24.
- ¹⁷ TAC., ANN. 4, 62–63. See also: ANTHONY J. WOODMAN. Remarks on the Structure and Content of Tacitus, *Annals* 4. 57–67. In: *The Classical Quarterly* 22, 1972, pp. 150–158; FRANCESCA SANTORO L'HOIR. *Tragedy, Rhetoric and the Historiography of Tacitus' Annales*. Ann Arbor 2006, pp. 237–238; CARL W. WEBER. *Panem et circenses*. La politica dei divertimenti di massa nell' antica. Roma, Milano 1986, pp. 11–14.
- ¹⁸ See also: ALVARO D'ORS. Observaciones al texto de la *oratio de pretiis gladiatorum minuendis*. In: *Emerita* 18, 1950, pp. 311–339; JAMES OLIVER, ROBERT PALMER. Minutes of an Act of the Roman Senate. In: *Hesperia* 24, 1955, pp. 320–355; ALBERTO BALIL. *La ley gladiatoria de Itálica*. Madrid 1958; JULIEN GUEY. Le sénatus-consulte *de sumptibus ludorum gladiatorum minuendis* (177 a. J.C.). In: *Bulletin de la Société Nationale des Antiquaires de France* 1964, pp. 42–46; MICHAEL CARTER. Gladiatorial Ranking and the *senatus consultum de pretiis gladiatorum* (CIL II 6278 = ILS 5163). In: *Phoenix* 57, 2003, pp. 83–114.
- ¹⁹ They are comprehensively discussed by GEORGES VILLE. *La gladiature en Occident des orgines a la mort de Domitien*. Paris 1981, pp. 200–209.
- ²⁰ Cf. i.e. DEBORAH HEALEY. *Sport and the Law*. Sydney 2009, p. 20. "Purists have considered whether there is a separate branch of law which can be called "sports law", or whether there is just a collection of laws that happen to apply to sports industry in particular circumstances in the same ways as laws apply to entertainment or tourism today." Voices without doubts as to the existence of *lex sportiva*, see, i.e.: KEN FOSTER. *Lex Sportiva* and *Lex Ludica*: the Court of Arbitration for Sport's Jurisprudence. In: *Entertainment and Sports Law Journal* 3, 2005, No. 2, pp. 1–14; MICHAEL J. BELOFF. Is There a *Lex Sportiva*? In: *Sweet & Maxwell's International Sports Law Review* 5, 2005, No. 3, pp. 49–67. See also the titles of journals from reference No. 5.
- ²¹ See i.e. reports: ROBERT SIEKMANN (ed.). *Football hooliganism with an EU dimension: towards an international legal framework*. Hague 2004, pp. 18–29; GIOVANNI CARNIBELLA, ANNE FOX et al. (eds.). *Football violence in Europe. A report to the Amsterdam Group*. Oxford 1996 (with an extensive bibliography, pp. 128–160), as well as the official document, *FIFA Disciplinary Code*, edition 2011, issued by Disciplinary Committee of this international football association (see particularly chapter I. 3. Common Rules, pp. 21–23).

- ²² An extensive bibliography on the problem see: ŚLAPEK, Sport i widowiska świata antycznego, pp. 211, 293, 403, 448, 536.
- ²³ During the Republic the shaping of the audience during funerary and private *munera gladiatoria* remained in the hands of their editores. See also: ŚLAPEK, Gladiatorzy, pp. 76–83; VILLE, La gladiature en Occident, pp. 433–439. The matter looked different in the Greek agones. Their sacred nature excluded slaves and criminals from participation. See also: NIGEL B. CROWTHER. Slaves and Greek Athletics. In: Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica 40, 1992, pp. 35–42.
- ²⁴ EDMONDSON, Dynamic Arenas, pp. 81–84, 110–113; ERIK GUNDERSON. The Ideology of the Arena. In: Classical Antiquity 15, 1996, pp. 123–126; ERIK GUNDERSON. The Flavian Amphitheatre: All the World as Stage. In: ANTHONY J. BOYLE, WILLIAM J. DOMINIK (eds.). Flavian Rome. Culture, Image, Text. Leiden, London 2003, pp. 639–658.
- ²⁵ Such an objective is rather a kind of interpretation based on modern-day methods of fighting against arena hooliganism, in which depraving the dangerous crowd of anonymity and “attaching” the fans to the seats assigned by the entry tickets is considered an effective measure of prevention. See also: ALEX SCOBIE. Spectator Security and Comfort at Gladiatorial Games. In: Nikephoros 1, 1988, pp. 191–241. See also reference No. 13.
- ²⁶ GUNDERSON, The Ideology of the Arena, pp. 112–151; GUNDERSON, The Flavian Amphitheatre, pp. 637–658; JULIÁN GONZÁLEZ. Leyes, espectáculos y espectadores en la Roma. In: TRINIDAD NOGALES BASSARATE (ed.) et al. *Ludi romani*. Espectáculos en Hispania Romana. Merida 2002, pp. 79–90. Modern-day regulations prohibit i.e. setting alight the flares, throwing objects onto the pitch, covering one’s face, xenophobic shouting.
- ²⁷ I.e. HENRI W. PLEKET, MOSES FINLEY. Olympic Games: The First Thousand Years. New York 1976, i.e. pp. 57, 128–129, form general evaluative judgements based on isolated cases of the fans’ behaviour and events from different historical periods: “crowds in ancient Greece were as partisan, as volatile and as excitable as in any other period of time”. In relation to Rome, i.e.: JONH P. V. D. BALSODN. Life and Leisure in Ancient Rome. London 1969, p. 314, also uses rather rhetorical examples.
- ²⁸ Mała encyklopedia sportu. T. I. Warszawa 1984, pp. 268, uses the term “sports fan” with the proviso that this kind of “fan observing sports entertainments”, who is “*a carrier of a specific type of behaviours [...] which are different from behaviours accepted in the situations outside of sport*”. ERIC DUNNING. Spectators. In: DAVID LEVINSON, KAREN CHRISTENSEN (eds.). Encyclopedia of World Sport from Ancient Times to the Present. New York, Oxford 1999, pp. 373–375, distinguishes the terms spectator and fan. The main reason for watching sport (by the “spectators”) is the search for excitement, but also appreciation for its aesthetic values. On the other hand, fanatics (phenomenon typical for team sports), believe that “*sport functions as a kind of surrogate religion*”. It is worth adding that “*there is still no single, universally adopted definition of football hooligans*”. See: CARNIBELLA, FOX et al., Football violence in Europe, p. 13. See also: MANUEL COMERON. The prevention of violence in sport. Strasbourg 2002, p. 11; ERIC DUNNING. Towards a sociological understanding of football hooliganism as a world phenomenon. In: European Journal on Criminal Policy and Research 2, 2000, p. 142. It is easier to create their personal profile, i.e. CARNIBELLA, FOX et al., Football violence in Europe, pp. 71–98.
- ²⁹ GUTTMANN, Sports Spectators from Antiquity, p. 6. See also: ALLEN GUTTMANN. From Ritual to Record: The Nature of Modern Sports. New York 1978, pp. 1–14, thinks that the given division is not correct. For it was proven that the audience of sports arenas is generally more engaged in cultural and political life than “non-spectators”.
- ³⁰ One can have doubts about the faithful reflection of the modern-day term “sports fan”, additionally tainted by the emotions. For a Roman man, spectator was not only a “viewer” (also in the theatre), but a scholar, connoisseur and arbiter as well. In the context of the Roman games, the word usually appeared in this former meaning and it indicated rather those who “filled” the public buildings and whose activity was limited to watching. Spectator is a term making a clear distinction between the viewer and the spectrum, the core of spectacle, which are therefore treated with a distance, without affectation. See also: ŚLAPEK, Sport i widowiska

świata antycznego, pp. 725–726. Due to this reason CHARLOTTE ROUCHÉ. Performers and Partisans at Aphrodisias in the Roman and late Roman periods. A Study Based on Inscriptions from the Current Excavations at Aphrodisias in Caria. London 1993, resigned from the term spectator and instead used in the title of her work the word partisan, at the same time avoiding the modern-day associations.

³¹ They are devoid of the coat of an emotional nature, which is automatically associated with the sports fans; but, after all, the modern-day language of legislation also does not use terms such as “sports fan” or directly “hooligan”.

³² See i.e.: JERZY KOLENDO. La repartition des places aux spectacles et la stratification sociale dans l'Empire Romain. In: *Ktéma* 6, 1981, pp. 301–315; SAARA LILJA. Seating Problems in Roman Theater and Circus. In: *Arctos* 19, 1985, pp. 67–73; JÜRGEN VON UNGERN-STERNBERG. Die Einführung spezieller Sitze für die Senatoren bei den Spielen. In: *Chiron* 5, 1975, S. 157–163; GUNDERSON, The Flavian Amphitheatre, pp. 637–658; ELIZABETH RAWSON. *Discrimina ordinum: the lex Iulia theatralis*. In: *Papers of the British School at Rome* 55, 1987, pp. 83–114; JEAN-CLAUDE GOLVIN. L'amphithéâtre romain. Essai sur la théorisation de sa forme et de ses fonctions. Vol. 1. Paris 1988, pp. 346–367; EDMONDSON, Dynamic Arenas. Divisions of the audience in the provincial games looked similar because the most fundamental criterion for the subdivision was the social rank of a spectator, see: ROUCHE, Performers and Partisans, pp. 129–140. On a slightly disparaging term towards part of the audience, “plebecula”, and a significant “spectante populo” see RICHARD LIM. In the “Temple of laughter”. Visual and literary representations of Spectators at Roman Games. In: BETTINA BERGMANN, CHRISTINE KONDOLEON (eds.). *The art of ancient spectacle*. Washington 1999, pp. 343–344. In the times of Augustus there appeared an ersatz of the arena bans. Unmarried people were banned from attending to the arenas, which does not mean that they were the ones initiating the fights (a proper attitude towards procreation was promoted this way). See also: KARL GALINSKY. Augustus Legislation on Morals and Marriage. In: *Philologus* 125, 1981, p. 126.

³³ See i.e. LIV. 34.44; PLAUT., POEN. 10–12; CIC., TUSC. 1, 37; VITR., ARCH. 5, 62; SUET., AUG. 35, 2; 44, 2; VELL., 2, 32, 3; TAC., ANN. 2.83; SEN., BENEF. 7, 12, 3; TAC., ANN. 4, 63; CASS. DIO 60, 7; MART. 5, 41, 7; PROP. 4, 8, 77; OV., AM. 2, 7, 3; STAT., SILV. 1, 6, 43–4; CIL VI 32098.

³⁴ See: ARIADNE STAPLES. Good Goddess to Vestal Virgins. Sex and Category in Roman Religion. London 1998, pp. 131–156; ROBIN LORSCH WILDFANG. The Vestals and Annual Public Rites. In: *Classica et mediaevalia: revue danoise de philologie et d'histoire* 52, 2001, pp. 223–255.

³⁵ On this kind of lawlessness in amphitheatre: EDMONDSON, Dynamic Arenas, pp. 69–112. In the Colosseum the division of seats depended on procurator amphitheatrici, see HENRIETTE PAVIS D'ESCURAC. La Préfecture de l'Annone, service administratif impérial d'Auguste à Constantin. Rome 1976, pp. 57, 76, 325, 362. On the examples from theatre, GONZALES, Leyes, espectadores y espectadores en la Roma, p. 83. Martial (5, 8, 14) mentioned the guards, the so-called designatores, who controlled the compliance with the regulations about the division of seats. Such broad efforts and attempts should be explained by the hostility of people towards this segregation. See, i.e. NORBERT ROULAND. Rome, démocratie impossible? Les acteurs du pouvoir dans la cité romaine. Paris 1981, pp. 212–215.

³⁶ GUTTMANN, Sports Spectators from Antiquity, pp. 5–7, believes that the universal feature of the study on the history of sport is a dramatically small amount of information about the spectators. He is also correctly stating that there are, however, more of them in relation to Rome or Greece because watching sport was a Roman characteristic. See also: ANTHONY J. PAPALAS. Sport Spectators in Ancient Greece. In: *North American Society for Sport History Proceedings* 1986, pp. 6–7. His opinions on the submissiveness of the audience of the Greek agones is unconvincingly revised by FERNANDO GARCIA ROMERO. Violencia de los espectadores en el deporte griego antiguo. In: *Cuadernos de Filología Clásica Estudios Latinos* 16, 2006, pp. 139–156. Shallowness of the sources about the audience in the amphitheatre is not changed by the Roman iconography, which presents only the editores of the games or the crowds of

- fans represented “by using a large number of “heads””, see LIM, In the “Temple of laughter”, pp. 343–348.
- ³⁷ CIL IV, 7585. “*Holconium Priscum duovirum iure dicundo spectaculi spectantes rogant.*” More broadly: ERIC CSAPO. *Actors and the Icons of the Ancient Theater*. Malden 2010, p. 189. “Spectaculi spectantes” supported specific candidates for offices with inscriptions of electoral nature. They most likely expected from them to return the favour in the form of spectacular games. It is, however, important that the bonds between those who were “watching the games” were tied up in the amphitheatre or theatre.
- ³⁸ MARIA G. MOSCI SASSI. *Il linguaggio gladiatorio*. Bologna 1992, pp. 149–150. The inscriptions are obviously an important material, see also: ROUCHE, *Performers and Partisans*, pp. 129–140, and the graffiti which constituted the expression of the emotions of fans, even women (cf. ILS 5142, a-d). At times they created their names from the names of their sports idols (per analogiam, the admirers of the mime Paris, acted as paridiani (CIL IV 7919)). The amateurs of circenses took on the names of the factions. See also: CSAPO, *Actors and the Icons*, p. 189; RAMSAY MACMULLEN. *Enemies of the Roman Order: Treason, Unrest, and Alienation in the Empire*. Cambridge 1971, p. 168. The texts of “sports fans” from Pompeii are cited by JACOBELLI, *Gladiators at Pompeii*, pp. 39–41, from Spain, ALBERTO BALIL. *Su gli spettacoli di anfiteatro*. In: *Mélanges d’ Archéologie et d’Histoire offerts à A. Piganiol*. Vol. I. Paris 1966, pp. 363–368.
- ³⁹ MACMULLEN, *Enemies of the Roman Order*, (chapter Urban Unrest), is highly suspicious about these groups but he does not find arguments in favour of the real threat from them. The involvement of the informal groups into the politics does not mean, after all, that they automatically used violence as a tool for conducting it.
- ⁴⁰ See reference No. 1. “Amphitheatric” conflicts concerned also the inhabitants of Capua and Puteoli, Corinth and Athens, and not very Near Eastern Apamea and Prusa. More broadly: DONALD KYLE. *Spectacles of Death in Ancient Rome*. London, New York 1998, pp. 246–254; MACMULLEN, *Enemies of the Roman Order*, pp. 169–171, 339, reference No. 8; RICHARD J. A. TALBERT. *The Senate of the Imperial Rome*. Princeton 1984, pp. 414–419.
- ⁴¹ Military units entered amphitheatres as a form of prevention in 15 BC. See also: MACMULLEN, *Enemies of the Roman Order*, pp. 170–172; KYLE, *Spectacles of Death*, pp. 94, 166–168; SCOBIE, *Spectator Security*, pp. 207–209; WILFRIED NIPPEL. *Public order in Ancient Rome*. Cambridge 1995, pp. 93–95.
- ⁴² TAC., ANN. XIII, 49, treats the decision of the Senate on the ban for Syracuse as a trivial matter. Such interventions are for TALBERT, *The Senate of the Imperial Rome*, p. 419, a manifestation of the crisis of the Senate’s prestige. See also: MACMULLEN, *Enemies of the Roman Order*, pp. 168–172. While avoiding the accusation of ahistoricism, it is impossible to juxtapose the nature of the actions of the Roman and modern hooligans, it is possible to try to compare the methods of fighting against them. Such enterprises would include: preventive and repressive police actions, control over ringleader, identifying the audience through its segregation, “arena bans” and bans concerning the organisation of events. See also: FIFA Disciplinary Code, pp. 19–20; CARNIBELLA, FOX et al., *Football violence in Europe*, pp. 120–123, 126–127; SIEKMANN, *Football hooliganism with an EU dimension*, pp. 18–25, 28–29, 53–57, 61–64, 71–74, 85–87, 97–99.
- ⁴³ Others have qualities of a more psychological than historical nature (they refer even to the possibility of anonymous acting in the crowd, the law on crowd, etc.). These are discussed by ZVI YAVETZ. *Plebs and Princeps*. Oxford 1988, pp. 19–21. The historical ones accentuate the identification with gladiators, fascination with their ethos. See also: i.e. CARLIN BARTON. *The Sorrows of the Ancient Romans. The Gladiators and the Monster*. Princeton 1996, pp. 11–47, 85–107.
- ⁴⁴ More broadly, see, i.e. CINZIA VISMARA. *Il supplizio come spettacolo*. In: NICOLA SAVARESE (ed.). *Teatri romani. Gli spettacoli nell’ antica*. Roma, Bologna 1996, pp. 115–120; DAVID S. POTTER. *Martyrdom as Spectacle*. In: RUTH SCODEL (ed.). *Theater and Society in the Classical World*. Ann Arbor 1993, pp. 53–88; KYLE, *Spectacles of Death*, pp. 35–76.

- ⁴⁵ See also: ALISON FUTRELL. *Blood in the Arena. The Spectacle of Roman Power*. Austin 1997, pp. 47–49. BARTON, *The Sorrows of the Ancient Romans*, thinks that the affectation was materialised in the identification with gladiators (including the combats of free people at the arena) rather than in the aggressive behaviour of spectators. In militarised Roman society violence was a norm (extensive, strict power of the father in the family and the master over his slave, universal military training, continuous policy of conquest, etc.). What is more, the games were expected in a way to familiarise the Romans with the sight of blood and killing. It was one of the most desired effects of the popularisation of *munera*. See also: GUNDERSON, *Ideology of the Arena*, pp. 22–25.
- ⁴⁶ This is correctly emphasised by GUTTMANN, *Sports Spectators from Antiquity*, pp. 7–9.
- ⁴⁷ Comments about them (the sources are dominated by the 3rd person!) do not indicate that this behaviour was dangerous for civic order because they came down to shouts, whistles, applause, gestures such as jumping, waving hands and robes. See also: i.e. DAVID S. POTTER. *Performance, Power, and Justice in the High Empire*. In: SLATER (ed.), *Roman Theater*, pp. 132–147. This repertoire seems to be even poorer than the standards accepted nowadays. The visual representations of spectators also argue in favour of this opinion. See: LIM, in the “Temple of laughter”, pp. 343–365. See also: INGOMAR WEILER. *Zum Verhalten der Zuschauer bei Wettkämpfen in der Alten Welt*. In: E. KORNEXL (ed.). *Spektrum der Sportwissenschaften*. Wien 1987, S. 43–59; SŁAPEK, *Gladiatorzy*, pp. 73–98.
- ⁴⁸ DANIEL A. DOMBROWSKI. *Plato and Athletics*. In: *Journal of the Philosophy of Sport* 6, 1979, pp. 29–38; BERNARD JEU. *Platon, Xénophon et l'idéologie du sport d'Etat*. In: JEAN-PAUL DUMONT, LUCIEN BRESCON (eds.). *Politique dans l'Antiquité. Images, mythes et fantasmes*. Lille 1986, pp. 9–33; THOMAS M. ROBINSON. *The Defining Features of Mind-Body Dualism in the Writings of Plato*. In: JOHN P. P. WRIGHT, PAUL POTTER (eds.). *Psyche and Soma. Physicians and Metaphysicians on the Mind-Body Problem from Antiquity to Enlightenment*. Oxford 2000, pp. 37–56; LAWRENCE FIELDING. *Marcus Tullius Cicero: A Social Critic of Sport*. In: *Canadian Journal of the History of Sport and Education* 8, 1977, pp. 16–27; CAGNIART, *Seneca's Attitude Towards Sport and Athletics*, pp. 162–170; PIERRE CAGNIART. *The Philosopher and the Gladiator*. In: *Classical World* 93, 2000, No. 6, pp. 607–618; ANTHONY A. LONG. *Soul and Body in Stoicism*. In: *Phronesis* 27, 1982, pp. 34–57; VEYNE, *Païens et chrétiens devant la gladiature*, pp. 883–898.
- ⁴⁹ GUTTMANN, *Sports Spectators from Antiquity*, pp. 5. See also: DOLF ZILLMANN, JENNINGS BRYANT, BARRY SAPOLSKY. *The Enjoyment of Watching Sport Contests*. In: JEFFREY GOLDSTEIN (ed.). *Sport, Games, and Play*. Hillsdale 1979, p. 302.
- ⁵⁰ Triviality of the games and engendering low emotions are usually under heavy attacks. See WIEDEMANN, *Emperors and Gladiators*, pp. 128–130; VILLE, *La gladiature en Occident*, pp. 456–460; LOUIS ROBERT. *Les gladiateurs dans l'Orient grec*. Paris 1940, pp. 249–251.
- ⁵¹ SCOBIE, *Spectator Security*, pp. 191–243; SANDRA BINGHAM. *Security at the Games in the Early Imperial Period*. In: *Echos du monde classique/Classical Views* 43, 1999, pp. 369–379; PETER ROSE. *Spectators and Spectator Comfort in Roman Entertainment Buildings: A Study in Functional Design*. In: *Papers of the British School at Rome* 73, 2005, pp. 99–130; MARK W. JONES. *Designing Amphitheatres*. In: *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts: Römische Abteilung* 100, 1993, S. 391–442. These works are the apotheosis of the structure as a guarantor of security; they partly prove the genius of the Romans in organising mass events. Accurate opinion by WIEDEMANN, *Emperors and Gladiators*, p. 19, “Permanent buildings would indicate permanent political control”, deprives them in fact of their *raison d'être*.
- ⁵² More broadly: NIGEL B. CROWTHER. *Visiting the Olympic Games in Ancient Greece. Travel and Conditions for Athletes and Spectators*. In: *International Journal of the History of Sport* 18, 2001, pp. 37–52; FRANZ GOLD. *Das Publikum bei sportlichen Wettkämpfen in der alten Welt unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Zuschauer der Olympischen Spiele*. In: MANFRED MESSING et al. (eds.). *Olympischer Dreiklang. Werte, Geschichte, Zeitgeist*. Kassel 2004, S. 207–226; INGOMAR WEILER. *Das Antike Olympia als Festwiese – was gab es neben dem Sport. Überlegungen zu einer Soziologie der Olympiabesucher und Zuschauer*. In: MESSING et al. (eds.), *Olympischer*

- Dreiklang, S. 173–197. Mitigating emotions in the Greek agones was immediate. On the helpers to hellanodikai, the so-called mastigophoroi (carrying whips) and rabdouchoi (holding sticks), see: THUC. 5.50; IG IX.2 1109; IG II 3968, 5, 1. More broadly, i.e.: HORTON A. HARRIS. *Greek Athletes and Athletics*. London 1964, pp. 158.
- ⁵³ See also: i.e. ALEKSANDER SZTEJNBERG, TADEUSZ JASIŃSKI. *Proksemika w komunikacji społecznej*. Płock 2007.
- ⁵⁴ Shortly see, ŚLAPEK, *Sport i widowiska świata antycznego*, pp. 530–536 (theatre of power, tool for social communication, safety valve, barometer of public sentiments, tool of justice, imperial politics, integration functions, catharsis, socio-political map). DONALD KYLE. Rethinking the Roman Arena: Gladiators, Sorrows, and Games. In: *The Ancient History Bulletin* 11, 1997, pp. 94–97, considers some of these functions as “too sophisticated”.
- ⁵⁵ A brief overview of the vast literature on this problem: DARIUSZ ŚLAPEK. *Amfiteatr w mieście rzymskim*. In: *Pępek świata” czy peryferium?* In: LESZEK MROZEWICZ, KATARZYNA BALBUZA (eds.). *Miasto w starożytności*. Poznań 2004, pp. 397–420.
- ⁵⁶ The emperor present in the *pulvinar* acted as a master of life and death and, potentially, this vision could result in a change of roles, dangerous in its consequences, which involved driving out random spectators into the arena by the emperor. More broadly: EDMONDSON, *Dynamic Arenas*, pp. 106–108; EMANUELE E CIACERI. *Le vittime del dispotismo in Roma nel I° secolo dell'impero (da Augusto a Domiziano)*. Catania 1898, pp. 75, 78–87; ABEL H. J. GREENIDGE. *Infamia. Its Place in Roman Public and Private Law*. Oxford 1894, pp. 68–70; PETER GARNSEY. *Social and Legal Privilege in the Roman Empire*. Oxford 1979, p. 130; WILHELM BACKHAUS. *Öffentliche Spiele, Sport und Gesellschaft in der römischen Antike*. In: HORST ÜBERHORST (ed.). *Geschichte der Leibübungen*. Vol. II. Berlin 1972, S. 208–209.
- ⁵⁷ VILLE, *La gladiature en Occident*, pp. 403–405; ANTHONY CORBEILL. *Thumbs in Ancient Rome. Pollex as Index* In: *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome* 42, 1997, pp. 1–23; ANTHONY CORBEILL. *Nature Embodied. Gesture in Ancient Rome*. Princeton 2004, pp. 41–66; KATHLEEN M. COLEMAN. *Missio at Halicarnassus*. In: *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 100, 2000, pp. 487–500.
- ⁵⁸ VILLE, *La gladiature en Occident*, pp. 360–368, 399–401, 407–409; WIEDEMANN, *Emperors and Gladiators*, pp. 90–95; CINZIA VISMARA. *The World of the Gladiators*. In: ADA GABUCCI (ed.). *The Colosseum*. Los Angeles 2001, pp. 49–52.
- ⁵⁹ See also: PAUL VEYNE. *Le pain et le cirque. Sociologie politique d'un pluralisme politique*. Paris 1976, pp. 701–730; WIEDEMANN, *Emperors and Gladiators*, pp. 165–176; YAVETZ, *Plebs and Princeps*, pp. 18–24; FERGUS MILLAR. *The Emperor in the Roman World*. London 1977, pp. 368–375; KYLE, *Spectacles of Death*, pp. 95–99; GUNDERSON, *Ideology of the Arena*, pp. 126–133.
- ⁶⁰ Individual rivalry was a substance of the Greek agones, see: HELMUT BERVE. *Vom agonalen Geist der Griechen. Gestaltende Kräfte der Antike*. In: HELMUT BERVE (ed.). *Gestaltende Kräfte der Antike. Aufsätze und Vorträge zur griechischen und römischen Geschichte*. München 1966, S. 1–20. Group competitions occurred extremely rarely, most frequently in the form of playing the ball, which was not included in the programme of the largest agones. See also: M. N. TOD. *Teams of Ball Players at Sparta*. In: *Annual of the British School at Athens* 10, 1903–1904, pp. 63–77; GARCIA ROMERO. *El “rugby” en la antigua Grecia. Sobre un fragmento del poeta comico Antifanes (s. IVa.C.)*. In: TERESA GONZALEZ AJA et al. (eds.). *Actas V congreso de historia del deporte en Europa*. Madrid 2002, pp. 13–18. The gregatim fights in the amphitheatres diversified the duels between the contestants. See: WIEDEMANN, *Emperors and Gladiators*, p. 89.
- ⁶¹ On the attitudes and emotions engendered by team sports see i.e. DANIEL WANN, NYLA BRANSCOMBE. *Sports fans: Measuring degree of identification with their team*. In: *International Journal of Sport Psychology* 24, 1993, pp. 1–17; NICHOLAS THEODORAKIS, SYMEON VLACHOPOULOS et al. *Measuring team identification: Translation and cross-cultural validity of*

- the Sport Spectator Identification Scale. In: *International Journal of Sport Management* 7, 2006, No. 4, pp. 506–522.
- ⁶² The emperors favoured specific categories of gladiators. See also: DONATO MARTUCCI. Roman Emperors and Their Sportsmen. In: *Olympic Review* 1991, pp. 462–464. Crossing, mixing gladiators was an effective method because it turns out that dangerous situations were taking place when the local gladiators were fighting at the arena. On the diverse ethnical origins of gladiators see: BALIL, *Su gli spettacoli*, pp. 363–368. During the Severan dynasty, the fans of gladiators of the local *lanista* were the initiators of unrest in Ephesus. ROBERT, *Les gladiateurs dans l'Orient grec*, pp. 27, 196.
- ⁶³ WIEDEMANN, *Emperors and Gladiators*.
- ⁶⁴ See also: i.e. KYLE, *Sport and Spectacle*, p. 253.
- ⁶⁵ On the circus factions see i.e. WŁODZIMIERZ GORDZIEJEW. Zur Entstehung und Organisation der Zirkusparteien in Rom. In: *Charisteria G. Przychocki a discipulis oblate. Varsoviae* 1934, S. 156–174. Violent reactions were taking place in the theatre. Through suggestibility of allusions, which were easily expressed in the language of the theatre, its political role triggered other kind of emotions (cf., i.e. EMIN TENGSTRÖM. Theater und Politik im kaiserlichen Rom. In: *Eranos* 75, 1977, S. 43–56; JERZY AXER. Spettatori e spettacoli nella Roma antica. In: *Dionisio* 61, 1991, pp. 221–229), even though gladiatorial fights enjoyed greater attention already in the 2nd century BC. See: DVORA GILULA. Where Did the Audience Go? In: *Scripta Classica Israelica* 4, 1978, pp. 45–49.
- ⁶⁶ Circus gathered a more numerous audience and *ludi publici* were organised more frequently than *munera*. See also valuable remarks of HUGH M. LEE. The Sport Fan and “Team” Loyalty in Ancient Rome. In: *Arete* 1, 1983, pp. 139–145.
- ⁶⁷ RUDOLPHE GUILLAND. The Hippodrome at Constantinople. In: *Speculum* 13, 1948, pp. 678–680; ALAN CAMERON. *Circus Factions: Blues and Greens at Rome and Byzantium*. Oxford 1976; ALAN CAMERON. “Sports Fans” of Rome and Byzantium. In: *Liverpool Classical Monthly* 9, 1984, pp. 50–51; ATHANASIOS S. FOTIOU. Byzantine Circus Factions and their Riots. In: *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik* 27, 1978, pp. 1–17; NIGEL B. CROWTHER. Sports Violence in the Roman and Byzantine Empires. A Modern Legacy? In: *International Journal of the History of Sport* 13, 1996, pp. 445–484; GEOFFREY GREATREX. The Nika Riot: A Reappraisal. In: *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 117, 1997, pp. 60–86; ALDO DELL'ORO. Giustiniano. Manifestazioni sportive e tifosi; In: *Atti dell'Accademia romanistica constantiniana. VIII Convegno internazionale*. Napoli 1990, pp. 623–628; SOTIRIS GIATSI. The Massacre in the Riot of Nika in the Great Hippodrome of Constantinople in 532 A.D. In: *International Journal of the History of Sport* 12, 1995, pp. 141–152; PAWEŁ FILIPCZAK. Władze państwowe wobec zamieszek faksji cyrkowych w Antiochii w świetle Kroniki Jana Malalasa. In: *Piotrkowskie Zeszyty Historyczne* 6, 2004, pp. 35–49; PAWEŁ FILIPCZAK. *Bunty i niepokoje w miastach wczesnego Bizancjum (IV wiek n.e.)*. Łódź 2009, pp. 51–105.

ABBREVIATIONS

- CASS. DIO – Cassius Dio Cocceianus, *Historiae Romanae*
 CIC., HAR. – Marcus Tullius Cicero, *Oratio de Haruspicum Responso*
 CIC., TUSC. – Marcus Tullius Cicero, *Tusculanarum Disputationum*
 CIL VI – CORPUS INSCRIPTIONUM LATINARUM (Vol. VI, *Inscriptiones urbis Romae Latinae*)
 IG – *Inscriptiones Graecae* (IG II ATTICA; IX 2 THESSALIA)
 LIV. – Titus Livius, *Ab Urbe condita*
 MART. – Marcus Valerius Martialis, *Epigrammata*
 OV., AM. – Publius Ovidius Naso, *Amores*

PLAUT., POEN. – Titus Maccius Plautus, Poenulus
PROP. – Sextus Propertius, Elegiae
SEN., BENEF. – Lucius Annaeus Seneca (Minor), De Beneficiis
STAT., SILV. – Publius Papinius Statius, Silvae
SUET., AUG. – Caius Suetonius Tranquillus, Vitae Caesaris (Divus Augustus)
TAC., ANN. – Cornelius Tacitus, Annales
THUC. – Thucydides, Historiae
VELL. – Velleius Paterculus, Historiae
VITR., ARCH. – Marcus Vitruvius Pollio, De architectura

KOPSAVILKUMS

Salīdzinot moderno sportu un ļoti populārās Romas gladiatoru spēles, tas, ka Romas likumi klusēja par drošības noteikumiem amfiteātros, var likties pārsteidzoši. Tomēr mūsdienās sporta spēles notiek vairāk pašu spēļu dēļ salīdzinājumā ar daudznozīmīgajām romiešu spēlēm pagātnē un tādēļ vieglāk pakļaujas juridiskai regulēšanai. “Sports Romā” bija cieši saistīts ar citām dzīves jomām (relīģiju, apbedīšanas ieražām, karu utt.) – tas nozīmēja, ka likumi bija saistīti ar kontekstu un spēļu rīkošanas iemesliem (piemēram, *lex Tullia de ambitu*).

Kopumā, neņemot vērā spēļu kazuistiku un selektivitāti, romiešu tiesību normas regulēja pamatjautājumus: kurš, kādos apstākļos un cik plašā mērogā var organizēt *munera gladiatoria*, kas tajās var aktīvi piedalīties un, visbeidzot, kas un kādā kārtībā sēdēs Romas amfiteātru *cavea*. Šai ziņā šie risinājumi atgādina mūsdienu normatīvus, kas daudz vairāk uzmanības pievērš drošības jautājumiem un auditorijas uzvedībai. Jautājums saistībā ar “līdzjutējiem” – par tiesībām ieņemt vietas amfiteātrī – tika regulēts galvenokārt imperatora Augusta likumdošanā (*lex Iulia theatralis*). Likumdevējs radīja Romas sabiedrības simbolisku, sociāli topogrāfisku kartējumu, kura garants un arbitrs bija imperators.

Iespēja identificēt skatītājus pēc to piederības *ordines* varbūt ietekmēja to uzvedību (pilnīgas anonimitātes zudums), bet – spriežot pēc sociālās nomenklatūras (*senatores, equites, plebs, milites, matronae* etc.), kas izmantota likumos, likumdevējs neuzskatīja kādu noteiktu līdzjutēju grupu par bīstamu. Ir arī grūti piekrist viedoklim, ka modernais koncepts par “līdzjutēju, sporta fanu” (vai hulīgānu!) ir sinonīms emocionāli neitrālajam latīņu lietvārdam *spectator*. Tomēr filoloģiski argumenti nevar noliegt noteiktu “uzticamu fanu” grupu pastāvēšanu. Bez Pompejas gadījumiem ir zināmi arī citi piemēri par nekārtībām izrāžu laikā.

Informācija par tām ir trūcīga (gandrīz tikai no uzrakstiem un grafiem), jo romiešu elite gladiatoru spēles bieži uzskatīja par kaut ko triviālu, banālu un uzmanības necienīgu. Liekas, bija kādi cēloņi gan avotu klusēšanai (ieskaitot romiešu tiesības), gan relatīvi “padevīgai”, “pacifistiskai” skatītāju uzvedībai. Jebkuri sabiedriskās kārtības pārkāpumi amfiteātrī būtu sagrāvuši amfiteātra un tajā notiekošo spēļu skrupulozi konstruēto simbolismu – simbolismu, kas asociējās ar valdnieka kā visas anarhijas ienaidnieka statusu. Spēļu prestižs, novērtējums, respekts un, visbeidzot, svētums varēja būt nozīmīgi faktori, kas noteica skatītāju reakciju amfiteātrī.

Spēļu skatīšanās un loģistika, kas bija saistīta ar spēļu sagatavošanu, arī neizraisīja vardarbību. Problēmas būtība bija romiešu atbalsta/līdzjušanas raksturs. Viena no tā iezīmēm bija līdzjutēju dalība izrādes veidošanā, kas noritēja viņu acu priekšā. Ir vērts pieminēt, ka antīkā sporta neatņemama iezīme neapšaubāmi bija komandu sporta sacensības gara trūkums, tas parasti izraisa vairāk emociju. Varbūt atbalstītāju grupu vārdu “personalizācija”, kuras izcelsme saistīta ar gladiatoru apbruņojumu un cīņas tehniku (sk. *parmularii*) vai viņu vārdiem vai iesaukām, bija rezultāts tam, ka dominēja individuālas sacensības (dueļi starp noteikta veida gladiatoriem).

Tas varēja radīt daudzas komplikētas iedalījuma grupas starp skatītājiem, būtībā izraisot kopīgas (un valstij potenciāli bīstamas) akcijas. Skatītāju uzvedība Romas cirkā, konkrēti, Vēlās Impērijas laikā, bija pilnīgi atšķirīga. Atšķirīga rakstura līdzjušana un ikšķu turēšana var tikt attiecināta uz t. s. ratu braucēju sacensībām. Pienācīga kārtība skatītāju rindās, kas bija tipiska amfiteātriem, cirkos tika ieviesta relatīvi vēlu. Tai bija egalitārāks raksturs, un uz šī pamata radās daudz bīstamāki draudi pilsoniskajai kārtībai nekā no fragmentētās un dezintegrētās skatītāju masas Romas amfiteātros.