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ABSTRACT
THE ROMAN CULTURAL MEMORY OF THE CONQUEST OF LATIUM

Elizabeth G. Palazzolo
Cynthia Damon

In this dissertation, I examine the Roman cultural memory of the conquest of Latium and Rome’s earliest expansion through case studies of three Latin cities—Tusculum, Tibur, and Praeneste. Each of these cities underwent the transition from independent civic entity to community of Roman citizens on a different timeline than the majority of Latium: though most Latin cities came under Roman control after being defeated in the Roman-Latin Wars around 338 BCE, Tusculum had already been incorporated as the first municipium cum suffragio after 381 BCE, while Tibur and Praeneste seem to have remained independent allied cities until 90 BCE. I reconstruct the Roman cultural memory of these cities and how it changed over time, incorporating a variety of textual and material sources including literary references, inscriptions, iconography alluding to each city, and monuments or significant sites. I demonstrate that the memory of Tusculum, Tibur, and Praeneste as formerly independent, non-Roman communities persisted through the Late Republic and into the Empire, even as they became completely politically integrated with Rome. The cultural memory of these cities was shaped by continuing interactions between the Romans and the inhabitants of each conquered city, perhaps newly incorporated as Roman citizens themselves, and inconsistencies in depictions of the cities, I argue, provide evidence of the ongoing processes by which the conquered citizens of Latium and the conquerors of Latium were negotiating their history.
of conflict by reinterpreting and reframing their shared memory of the past. By identifying recurring themes and motifs across many types of evidence, as well as areas of dissonance and mutually incompatible characterizations, I argue that developments in the cultural memory of pre-Roman Latium should be connected to the multiple social groups within the Roman community that would have preserved different memories of Tusculum, Tibur, and Praeneste.
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INTRODUCTION

After centuries of intermittent war in the central Italian countryside, by the Late Republic Rome had pacified the surrounding territory and all of the neighboring cities were under Roman control. As of the beginning of the 1st century BCE, Rome’s closest wars were with the Italian allies who rebelled in the Social War, all of which lay beyond the region of Latium and were separated from Rome by both difficult terrain and travel time. The central Italian landscape in Rome’s immediate vicinity included a number of communities that had come into frequent conflict with Rome in the years of the early Republic, but that were not destroyed when they were ultimately defeated by Rome. Instead, these communities were integrated into the Roman citizen body—most commonly by incorporating the city as a municipium, though occasionally by sending a colonia to the site.\(^1\) As families from the conquered Latin cities immigrated to Rome, and wealthy Romans built large villas for agriculture and leisure in the Latin suburbium, geographic and social intermingling created a community of “Romans” in the Middle and Late Republic that was composed of both native-born Roman citizens and ones whose families became Roman citizens after their cities were conquered by Roman armies. As a result, the community of “Romans” in the Late Republic whose identity was defined by their citizenship or their residence in a Roman city included some subgroups that were united by their shared connections to a community that had been an enemy of Rome, and that may have been violently defeated by Roman forces prior to receiving Roman citizenship.

\(^1\) The degree of political independence held by each community varied—coloniae, municipia sine suffragio, and municipia cum suffragio co-existed at this time period (see Introduction Section III.C).
In this dissertation, I aim to reconstruct the Roman cultural memory of a selection of conquered cities in Latium in order to consider how Romans living in the centuries after the wars between Rome and the Latins remembered these conflicts and dealt with the legacy of Rome’s expansion into central Italy at the expense of her neighbors. The following sections will introduce the primary questions about these cities I seek to answer in this dissertation and the sources I am using to answer those questions, review the history of scholarship in collective and cultural memory that underlies my approach to reconstructing the image of these cities held by Romans in the centuries after their conquest, and address topics that are relevant to each city or provide necessary background.

The Latin city of Tibur, located about 30 km east of Rome in the foothills of the Apennines, had become a community of Roman citizens and a popular location for vacation homes for Roman elites in the Late Republic. It is described in poetry of the era as a thoroughly unthreatening pastoral landscape populated by aristocratic villas and peaceful retreats from the city, like several other cities in the suburbium. In the so-called encomium of Tibur that opens Ode 1.7, Horace describes Tibur’s pastoral landscape as a pleasant retreat from urban settings and declares his preference for Tibur over a list of famous cities in Greece:

\[ \text{me nec tam patiens Lacedaemon} \]
\[ \text{nec tam Larisae percussit campus opimae,} \]
\[ \text{quam domus Albuneae resonantis} \]
\[ \text{et praeceps Anio ac Tiburni lucus et uda} \]

Champlin 1982 examines the literary construction of the suburbium as a space of learned and leisurely aristocratic pursuits (e.g. poetry and philosophy), removed from urban concerns; on literary depictions of the suburbium, see also Hunt 1992, Spencer 2010, and Farrell 2014.
mobilibus pomaria rivis.

...Neither unyielding Lacedaemon
nor the plain of fertile Larisa so strikes me,
as the home of echoing Albunea
and the rushing Anio and the grove of Tiburnus,
and orchards soaked by swift streams.

Horace *Ode* 1.7.10-14

By framing Tibur in opposition to a list of distant sites associated with historic and legendary episodes, Horace highlights the separation between the peaceful life he enjoys in the suburban community and the “real world” of politics and war in far-away places.³ Despite the tranquil image of Tibur that appears in Horace’s poetry, however, the city had a history of confrontations with Rome during the centuries when it had been an independent community. These interactions were recorded in historical sources accessible to Horace and his contemporaries: the first collection of *Odes*, published in 23 BCE, was circulating around the same time as the relevant books of Livy, and Livy’s account of Tiburtine interactions with Rome in the early Republic shows a city that was firmly opposed to Roman hegemony and fought fiercely to resist Roman expansion in Latium, even to the point of allying with the Gauls in the mid-4th century BCE.⁴ Horace’s treatment of Tibur in *Ode* 1.7 is not unique to the poet, who had a villa in the Tiburtine

³ Horace *Odes* 1.7, esp. lines 1-14. See Santirocco 2015, 36. The *recusatio* begins with the declaration that “others will praise” (1.7.1 *Laudabunt alii*) the list of Greek cities that he compares to Tibur, suggesting the composition of the same type of encomiastic poetry Horace is writing about Tibur.
⁴ Livy discusses Tibur mostly in the first eight books—though the publication date of first decade is much contested, scholars generally agree that the first pentad was published no later than between 27 and 25 BCE, the second no later than the late 20s BCE. Luce 1965 is the seminal article that argued for interpreting some of the traditional markers used to date the first pentad as later insertions; for a review of more recent studies that seek to confirm or modify Luce’s dating see Burton 2000. Arguments for modifying Luce’s dating of the first pentad seek to push it (or some portion of it) earlier, and so would not result in Livy’s work being unavailable when Horace was writing.
countryside and frequently refers to his time writing poetry there: depictions of the idyllic landscape of Tibur and its elite villas appear in the Augustan era and recur in Imperial poetry through at least the Flavian period.\(^5\) The contrast between the images of Tibur found in Horace and Livy is representative of a broader ambivalence in the depiction of the cities surrounding Rome that were conquered in the earlier phase of Rome’s gradual conquest of the Italian peninsula. By the Late Republic, the citizens of the central Italian cities that had been conquered centuries ago had received the right to vote and become full citizens of Rome as these cities gradually gained the status of *municipia cum suffragio*, but sources from this period demonstrate that their existence as independent cities that had once fought against integration with Rome was not forgotten.

This dissertation originated in two questions stemming from this dissonance in the Roman memory of cities conquered in the Early Republic. First, how does a community that includes both people who have been conquered (sometimes violently) and their conquerors deal with the legacy of that conquest in their memory of the past? When Roman society of the Late Republic looked back on the Roman treatment of Tibur after the Latin city had allied with the Gauls in the mid-4\(^{th}\) century BCE, for example, that society included the descendants both of the Romans who had defeated the Tiburtines and of the Tiburtines who had taken up arms for independence from the Romans. Second, what accounts for the differences in the cultural memory of individual cities that were conquered and absorbed by Rome? Among the many cities of central Italy that were conquered by Rome and eventually joined the Roman citizenry, there is a wide range of

\(^{5}\) Propertius 2.32, 3.16.1-4; Horace *Odes* 1.7, 2.6, 3.4, 4.2.27-42, 4.3.10-12, and *Epistles* 1.7.44-5; Martial 5.71; Statius *Silvae* 1.3.
legacies in the historical tradition—some cities are barely mentioned by name, while others appear in several extended episodes; some are described in overwhelmingly positive terms, and others are depicted more ambiguously. The varying responses among Romans of the Late Republic to families descended from one city or another demonstrates that the cultural memory of individual communities diverged at some point, even when cities are recorded as having shared a similar pattern of interaction with Rome in the early Republic.

I. SOURCES AND QUESTIONS
For the purposes of this dissertation, I have chosen to restrict my study to the cultural memory of cities in Latium that existed as independent communities prior to their incorporation by Rome. I focus on the relationship between Rome and cities in a single region to eliminate the possibility that Rome’s response to a city reflects the city’s perceived ethnic identity, and Latium provides a suitable set of examples because of its history of recorded interactions with Rome and its cultural proximity to Rome. The relationship between Rome and most of the Prisci Latini, as it is recorded in textual sources (largely but not exclusively historiographical), follows a fairly consistent pattern. The Latin cities clashed with Rome intermittently through the regal period and early Republic, though these hostilities were interspersed with periods of cooperation when they were either bound by a treaty or united against a common enemy. Over the centuries, Roman colony foundations in Latium and the gradual incorporation or

---

destruction of some independent cities (e.g., Gabii is absorbed some time in the 6th century BCE, Fidenae and Crustumerium are seized between 505-495 BCE, Labici is destroyed in 418 BCE) led to an increasing portion of the Latin countryside belonging to the *ager Romanus*, and in the fourth century this caused a series of escalating conflicts between Rome and the Latin cities, allied and independently, that culminated in a serious defeat for the united Latin forces c. 338 BCE. The presence of a unified coalition at some points in the history of Latin interactions with Rome increases the likelihood of the cities being treated as a group, which in turn highlights the unusual features of certain cities. The cities of Latium also present a useful test case for the persistence of characteristics associated with the independent cities because of the timeline of their conquest and integration: a fairly comprehensive victory over the entire group is recorded in one year, and the historiographical record then presents Latium as largely conquered, and future episodes of conflict are presented as acts of rebellion against an established authority.

Within the cities of *Latium vetus*, I have chosen to look at cities that fall outside the common pattern of interactions with Rome, as described in the historiographic sources, in order to help isolate the aspects of the cultural memory of a city that are unique to that community from characteristics common to the Roman memory of all the conquered cities of Latium. In the three chapters of this dissertation, I aim to reconstruct the cultural memory of three Latin cities that are each remembered as having an unusual trajectory of interactions with Rome between their existence as independent communities and their eventual incorporation as communities of Roman citizens under Roman governance: Tusculum, Tibur, and Praeneste. Tusculum is the first city said to have been conquered by the Romans and granted citizenship, and the episode leading to this occurs
40 years prior to the defeat of most of the Latin cities. However, even after receiving Roman citizenship, the city is still said to have revolted against Rome alongside Latin cities that had not become citizens. Tibur and Praeneste, on the other hand, both seem to have resisted being incorporated by Rome much longer than most of the Latin cities—probably until 90 BCE, when they received Roman citizenship along with Italian allies from much further abroad. Praeneste is further distinguished by the forfeit of full Roman citizenship in the 80s BCE when it was refounded as a colony by Sulla for having sided with the younger Marius.

In my study of Tusculum, Tibur, and Praeneste, my concern is not to reconstruct the historical processes by which they were conquered by Rome and became Roman citizens, but to recover the cultural memory of these cities and of that process. I aim to develop a picture of what the Romans remembered about these cities as independent communities, how they remembered their interactions with Rome over the course of the Republic, and what values and characteristics were associated with them in the Roman memory. These questions cannot be answered by looking exclusively at historiographic texts, which are concerned with a specific and limited set of memories about the past (see following discussion of history vs. cultural memory in Introduction Section). In order to reconstruct the Roman cultural memory of the conquest of Latium, it is necessary to examine all of the sources that recorded attitudes and beliefs about these cities that were preserved in the centuries after their defeat.

In addition to historiography and texts in other genres that are concerned with historical events (e.g. biography, oratory, epic), literary sources in genres that do not typically address historical topics can also provide insights into the significance that a
reference to a conquered city’s past would have carried at the time of their composition.

In poems such as Propertius 4.10, for example, a historic episode—the conquest of Veii—provides an occasion to reflect on the beginning of Rome’s proto-imperialist expansion, where Rome stands in relation to the previous great civilizations that occupied the peninsula, and how they should relate to the communities around them. The city’s defeat was a significant Roman victory and allowed Rome to continue growing unimpeded by her rival to the north (as well as inadvertently allowing the Romans to survive the Gallic sack in the coming decade), but it is also lamented by Propertius as the end of a great civilization and tied to the end of the imaginary “golden age” when the countryside of central Italy had not yet been filled with the sound of war. The conquest of Rome’s neighbors is remembered as a turning point in Roman history by an author writing in a nominally non-historic genre, in a book of poetry that combines legendary-historical topics with love elegy, and this poem provides a piece of information about the Roman memory of their history of imperialism that is not explicitly stated in the same way in historiography. Such texts, whether or not they aim to record “history” in the sense of documenting the events of the past (without anything being added or lost), all participate in creating a shared memory of the past for their readers.

In addition to Latin sources, I also utilize authors who wrote in Greek, including Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Appian, Diodorus Siculus, Strabo, Cassius Dio, and Polybius. Although the goal of this dissertation is to reconstruct the way in which Roman

---

7 Prop. 4.10.23-30.
8 Prop. 4.10.25-6.
9 See Burke 1989, 98 on “history” as texts that generate memory (as well as being texts that record memory).
society remembered their neighbors in Latium and their own conquest of those cities, the context in which these Greek authors of Roman history lived and wrote suggests that they would have had access to Roman sources, been familiar with contemporary Roman attitudes, and (in some cases) written for Roman audiences. All but one of the Greek writers who referred to the history of Rome’s interactions with Latin cities lived in an era when the province of their birth was under Roman control and in which there was significant contact between Roman and Greek culture; furthermore, each of these authors either lived at Rome for a significant portion of time, or based his work heavily on sources who did.\(^{10}\) The earliest relevant text in Greek is that of Polybius, written around the middle of the 2\(^{nd}\) century BCE (contemporaneous with the Roman annexation of Greece as a province); though Polybius did not live in an era of established Roman rule in his province, his residence in Rome as an aristocratic hostage and subsequent travels with

---

\(^{10}\) **Dionysius of Halicarnassus:** lived from c. 60 BCE to after 7 BCE, spent over 20 years at Rome teaching rhetoric to aristocratic circles and researching the *Roman Antiquities*.  
**Appian:** lived c. 95-165 CE, born in Alexandria and moved to Rome c. 120 CE, where he worked as an advocate and was appointed to a procuratorial position, which he probably held in his home province of Egypt; wrote his *Roman History* between 147 CE and 162 CE.  
**Diodorus Siculus:** born in Sicily, wrote the *Bibliotheca Historica* between c. 60 and c. 30 BCE (known to have relied heavily on Polybius and Posidonius for the Roman material in his work).  
**Strabo:** born in Amaseia, Pontus around 64 BCE (the year in which his hometown was annexed as part of the Roman province of Bithynia and Pontus) to a wealthy and politically influential family of mixed Greek and Pontic ancestry who had surrendered to Lucullus and thus lost favor with both Mithridates, in whose court they had been active before revolting to Lucullus, and with Pompey, who was sent to replace Lucullus as commander of the Roman army annexing the province and had a personal enmity with Lucullus. Visited Rome several times during his life, including a stay from 44 BCE through at least 21 BCE during which he studied with the famous grammarian and geographer Tyrannion of Amisus, who had once been hired by Cicero to teach his nephew Quintus. The first edition of the *Geography* was started sometime after 20 BCE and published in 7 BCE, followed by a revised edition shortly before his death sometime after 23 CE.
Scipio Aemilianus, and his association with the Scipionic circle, suggest that he was familiar with contemporary Roman attitudes towards their own history.

I consider these textual sources together with material evidence pertaining to Tusculum, Tibur, and Praeneste, including iconography alluding to each city, monuments connected with the city or its relationship with Rome, and aspects of each city’s topography that may have been associated with memories of the city’s history. The trends that emerge in this material also representing important features of the Roman cultural memory of Tusculum, Tibur, and Praeneste—the themes, issues, and events that would have been evoked by a reference to each city. Many Republican moneyers, for example, specifically evoked their family origins in Latin cities through the iconography on the coins they minted; I consider these coins as evidence for the value that a connection with these cities held in the Late Republic, particularly for the people who traced their family lineage to conquered cities.¹¹ The epigraphic evidence that I will consider includes the records of triumphs over Latin cities displayed at Rome in the Fasti Triumphales, inscriptions from each city that recorded and displayed information about significant public works and dedications, and funerary monuments that publicly link the deceased to specific cities.

II. HISTORY OF SCHOLARSHIP

The questions I examine in this dissertation focus on the memory of the past that is shared by a group—the Roman memory of their own legacy of conquest and imperialist expansion, and the memory of formerly independent cities shared by the Roman

¹¹ See Farney 2007, especially the appendices of coin types advertising ethnic origins (247-293).
community that postdates their conquest and now includes the members of those conquered communities. The ability to ask these questions depends on the existence of memories that are shared by a social or cultural group and that are preserved by that group over time, allowing them to extend beyond the temporal range of individual memory. It is not sufficient that the members of the group share a memory because they all independently hold the same memory: the memory must be related to their membership in the group, and it must be possible for that memory to be affected in a way that affects the group’s memory collectively.

A. Collective Memory

The concept of communal memories was first explicitly addressed in the early 20th century in the work of the French sociologist Maurice Halbwachs, who proposed that groups can have a “collective memory” (mémoire collective) that depends on the social structures and frameworks (les cadres) to which a group belongs.12 Halbwachs was a student of Émile Durkheim, and his theory of collective memory builds on Durkheim’s

12 Halbwachs’ work on collective memory was originally completed in the 1920s and 1930s, but its publication history is complicated. Les cadres sociaux de la mémoire was originally published in 1925 in Les Travaux de L’Année Sociologique (a series established by Durkheim, with the journal L’Année Sociologique, for the purpose of circulating his work and the work of his students and intellectual circle). The only other major work on collective memory published during Halbwachs’ lifetime was the 1941 La Topographie légendaire des évangiles en terre sainte, a case study of collective memory in the Holy Land. La mémoire collective was published by the Presses Universitaires de France in 1950, after Halbwachs’ death in a concentration camp in 1945, and he does not seem to have finished working on the volume, which was intended in part as an answer to some of critiques he received from contemporaries immediately after the 1925 publication of Les cadres sociaux de la mémoire. Despite the incomplete nature of the book, it was the most readily available, as well as the most commonly referenced and translated, of Halbwachs’ works for decades after his death. In 1952, PUF republished Les cadres sociaux de la mémoire.
sociological work on collective consciousness (*conscience collective*) and social cohesion, though Durkheim himself never used the term “collective memory.”

Halbwachs presents memory as a phenomenon that occurs within society (i.e. when individuals come together as a group) and that is structured by the social arrangements that govern the relationships among individuals in those groups. He argued that all memory, even individual memory, operates through social structures such as families, institutions, and nations—an individual’s private memory is only understood through a group context, because all individuals understand the world around them through a social context and therefore order their memories through the same social context. Groups are able to maintain collective memory beyond the extent of individual group member’s memories of a personal experience, which fade over time and distance from the experience, by selectively reinforcing memories that are believed to be of mutual importance to the group. This concept of deliberate and selective maintenance of collective memory separates Halbwachs’ work from other theories of group memory proposed in the early modern period, which depicted the preservation and decay of memory to be a natural process, if they addressed it at all. Social constructions of

---

13 Introduced in Durkheim’s doctoral dissertation, *De la division du travail social*, the idea pervades his work on the maintenance and disruption of social order. Also important to Halbwachs’ work is Durkheim’s concept of *représentations collectives*, which represent the beliefs and values held by a group, are produced only by interactions among a group, and cannot be reduced to individual constituents of the group.

14 Halbwachs 1952. The only individual memories that Halbwachs believed are not constructed through social groups are the images we remember from dreams (see 17-18).

15 Russell 2006 provides an overview of approaches to collective memory before Halbwachs: he notes pre-Halbwachs usages of *mémoire* in French scholarship in contexts that clearly refer to memory held by more than one individual, as well as the use of *la mémoire des hommes* and *la mémoire de la postérité*, which also imply memory held by a group, and *une mémoire éternelle* and *une mémoire perpétuelle*, which suggest memory
collective memory are selected based on the needs of the group in the present, according to Halbwachs, rather than being determined by the concerns of the time when the remembered event occurred.\textsuperscript{16}

Though Halbwachs began work on the concept of \textit{la mémoire collective} in the first half of the 20\textsuperscript{th} century, few scholars engaged directly with his work until interest in memory studies surged in the 1980s in conjunction with increasing interest in subjectivity in history in the decades following World War II.\textsuperscript{17} In the final decades of the 20\textsuperscript{th} century and the early 21\textsuperscript{st} century, this proliferation of work on memory has spread across several disciplines in the humanities, social sciences, and life sciences, often in the form of interdisciplinary studies. As a result, a diverse array of topics has been studied under the umbrella of “memory studies.”

\textsuperscript{16} Among Halbwachs’ published works, the case study of collective memory \textit{La Topographie légendaire des évangiles en terre sainte} provides the fullest articulation of this argument; in it, Halbwachs provides explicit examples of alterations to collective memory caused by changes in the needs of the community (first published in 1941, but the 2008 edition edited by Marie Jaisson incorporates some of Halbwachs’ letters and notes on the text, in addition to essays from several modern scholars, in an attempt to situate the case study in relation to Halbwachs’ more systematic treatments of his theory of collective memory).

\textsuperscript{17} Though the middle of the century is sometimes depicted as a decades-long gap in the progress of memory studies between Halbwachs and the 1980s (and engagement with Halbwachs’ work, particularly outside of France, was made difficult by the complicated posthumous publication history of his work), a few scholars did address Halbwachs’ thesis, both in immediate direct responses by his contemporaries (e.g. Bloch 1925, Blondel 1926) and in related studies published in the intervening decades that proposed competing theories of social memory (e.g. the 1940s-1960s work of anthropologist E. Evans-Pritchard, who found that premodern societies relying on non-written means of preserving collective memory can maintain specific genealogical memories for six generations before ancestors become part of a generalized mythological tradition). For a contrasting perspective on the evolution of scholarship about memory, see Whitehead 2009, 3-14, who aims to demonstrate the continuity of this intellectual tradition from the Greeks onwards.
B. Memory and History

One of the major concerns of scholars approaching memory studies through the study of historiography has been to articulate the relationship between memory and history. This issue has been addressed from the beginning of the study of collective memory but remains unresolved, in part because scholars working on different periods and cultures have come up with radically different proposals. Halbwachs defined the relationship between history and memory as one of mutual exclusivity: “C'est qu'en général l'histoire ne commence qu'au point où finit la tradition, moment où s'éteint ou se décompose la mémoire sociale. Tant qu'un souvenir subsiste, il est inutile de le fixer par écrit, ni même de le fixer purement et simplement.”¹⁸ Historiography steps in when (and only when) social memory fails, which for Halbwachs occurs when the passage of time reduces the number of people who experienced the event or learned about it from someone who experienced it, at which point these memories can only be preserved if they are written down in a narrative form. Within this framework, he identifies (at least) two differences between history and collective memory—collective memory functions as a continuous current of thought, and history imposes retrospective and artificial boundaries on time; history is conceptually unitary, but several different collective memories coexist, just as several different groups do.¹⁹ Halbwachs’ insistence on the complete separation of history

---

¹⁸ Halbwachs 1950, 45.
¹⁹ Halbwachs 1950, 46, “C'est un courant de pensée continu, d'une continuité qui n'a rien d'artificiel, puisqu'elle ne retient du passé que ce qui en est encore vivant ou capable de vivre dans la conscience du groupe qui l'entretient...L'histoire divise la suite des siècles en périodes, comme on distribue la matière d'une tragédie en plusieurs actes...dans l'histoire on a l'impression que, d'une période à l'autre, tout est renouvelé, intérêts en jeu, direction des esprits, modes d'appréciation des hommes et des événements, traditions aussi et perspectives d'avenir, et que si, en apparence, les mêmes groupes reparaissent,
and memory was interpreted in the decades after his death as the product of Halbwachs’ positivist view of history—he describes history, in contrast to memory, as a series of events being “recorded and transcribed (relevé et transcrit).”20 This sharp distinction allowed Halbwachs to sidestep arguments about subjectivity in historiography by categorically defining all subjective interpretations of the past as belonging to memory rather than history.

Pierre Nora’s work on collective memory, which is best known for his study of sites of memorialization (lieux de mémoire), originated in his examination of the relationship between memory and the “transformation” of historiography.21 Like Halbwachs, Nora believes that groups utilize collective memory to interpret the past, even as those memories are detached from the past by the passage of time and other forces that cause individuals’ autobiographical memory of an event to fade and disappear. Nora theorizes that collective memory provides the source material for history, but that memory is actively manipulated in the process of creating history. Nora focuses on the interaction between power, collective memory, and history, arguing that those who hold power select certain aspects of collective memory to “commemorate” and thus reinforce.

\[c'est \ que \ les \ divisions \ extérieures, \ qui \ résultent \ des \ lieux, \ des \ noms, \ et \ aussi \ de \ la \ nature \ générale \ des \ sociétés, \ subsistent...\] and 1950, 48, “Il y a, en effet, plusieurs mémoires collectives...L'histoire est une et l'on peut dire qu'il n'y a qu'une histoire.”

20 Halbwachs 1950, 48. For this reason, Halbwachs objected to the use of the term “historical memory:” he opens the section of La mémoire collective titled “Opposition finale entre la mémoire collective et l'histoire” with the statement (1950, 45) “De tout ce qui précède il résulte bien que la mémoire collective ne se confond pas avec l'histoire, et que l'expression : mémoire historique, n'est pas très heureusement choisie, puisqu'elle associe deux termes qui s'opposent sur plus d'un point.” See Falasca-Zamponi 2003, 48-51 on the intellectual history of sociology in the late 19th and early 20th centuries as a context for Halbwachs’ views on “professional history” and “historical science.”

21 Nora’s monumental seven-volume work on these sites of commemoration in French society, Les Lieux de Mémoire, was published over the years 1984–1992.
and refuse to commemorate others, leading to the removal of these events from the collective memory. In the context of the rise of the French nation-state, Nora associates the professionalization of history with the increasing power of the bourgeoisie, and thus the growing ability of this group to control the identity of the nation-state; “history” or “historical memory” is therefore the collective memory of one specific group, professional historians (and by extension the bourgeoisie). He maintains that the exact definition of “memory” and “collective memory” is less important than the relationship between memory and history, and speaks about collective memory primarily as the unselfconscious conception of the past held by “traditional” societies, in contrast to the modern era’s more deliberate and selective writing of “history.” Modern societies, Nora argues, require history to structure the memory of their past because it will otherwise be forgotten in a culture driven by change and progress. Similar arguments about collective memory shaping a group’s sense of their shared past appear in many scholars working in memory studies in the 1990s. One approach, described as the “dynamics of memory” perspective, refines the presentist approach of Halbwachs and Nora and treats collective memory as a continual process of negotiation, which is shaped but not solely determined by the concerns of the present. The American cultural historian Michael Kammen, for example, argued that “societies...reconstruct their pasts rather than faithfully record them, and that they do so with the needs of contemporary culture clearly in mind,” while

---

23 Nora proposes the rise of the European nation-state as the moment that separates these traditional societies from the modern era. Others have suggested a more specific “breaking point,” e.g. Terdiman 1993 points to the French Revolution.
sociologist Jeffrey Olick describes collective memory as “an active process of sense-making through time.”

C. Cultural Memory

In the late 1980s and 1990s, the Egyptologist Jan Assmann and his wife Aleida Assmann, who works in literary and cultural studies, developed a theory of “cultural memory” (kulturelle Gedächtnis) which builds upon Halbwachs’ concept of collective memory and incorporates a wider array of shared cultural phenomena that contribute to preserving and replicating memories. They see Halbwachs’ mémoire collective as a form of “communicative memory” (kommunikatives Gedächtnis) that operates on the social level and propose that there is also a form of shared memory that operates on a cultural level—a “cultural memory” that exists in addition to communicative memory. Communicative memory deals with the historic experiences of individuals’ lifetimes, is informal and spontaneously created in the course of social interactions, takes the form of lively memories of things experienced and heard, has a time horizon of 80-100 years (or 3-4 generations), and is passed down initially by the members of the community who had the experience; in contrast, cultural memory deals with mythical proto-history and events that

25 The term first appears in print in 1988 in Jan Assmann’s essay “Kollektives Gedächtnis und kulturelle Identität,” and is more fully developed in his 1992 book Das Kulturelle Gedächtnis: Schrift, Erinnerung und Politische Identität in Frühen Hochkulturen. Jan Assmann describes the theory of cultural memory as a joint enterprise with Aleida Assmann from the earliest publication on the topic and both Jan and Aleida Assmann have published extensively on cultural memory since 1992 (see e.g. J. Assmann 1995 and 2000; A. Assmann 1999, 2002, and 2011); accordingly I follow Jan Assmann’s practice of using the plural to refer to Aleida Assmann’s co-authorship of the concepts presented in his work on cultural memory (see J. Assmann 1988a, 16, note 3, “Der Plural verweist auf die Mitverfasserschaft von Aleida Assmanns an den hier vorgetragenen Gedanken.”).
definitely belong to the past, is a formal and ceremonial type of communications, takes
the form of fixed and traditional symbolic representations, extends back to mythical and
prehistoric times, and is passed down by specialized transmitters of tradition. Cultural
memory engages with a group’s fundamental beliefs about their own identity, and
therefore must reach deeper into the past, is more closely guarded, and is treated with
more formality and ritual, than communicative memory.

D. Rome and Cultural Memory

As a legacy of Jan Assmann’s work on ancient Egypt, interest in cultural memory in
ancient societies has been part of the field from its origins and developed alongside
studies pertaining to modern societies. The earliest studies of Roman cultural memory
were split into work on literature (including historiography), sometimes connected to
studies of intertextuality, and work on material sources, including iconography and
topography. More interdisciplinary work emerged in the mid-1990s in a wave of interest
which produced a number of studies on memory in Roman culture focusing on the
phenomenology of memory and incorporating material from the emerging field of
cognitive science, including a 1993 APA panel on “New Approaches to Memory.”

These discussions are primarily concerned with issues associated with memory as a
function of the human mind, such as the preservation of experiences as memory and the
retrieval of memories, and focus on the way Roman sources think about these processes.

---

28 The organizers of this panel, Jocelyn Penny Small and James Tatum, published revised
versions of papers delivered at the meeting in Helios 22 (1995); Farrell 1997 expands on
a paper originally delivered at the same panel. See also Small’s 1997 monograph Wax
Tablets of the Mind, which she characterizes as working between the disciplines of
classics and cognitive psychology (xvi).
The most relevant aspect of these works on the phenomenology of memory for studies of cultural memory is their emphasis on memory as a process rather than a static object.²⁹

The growing interest in Roman cultural memory as an interdisciplinary topic within Classics in the 2000s is demonstrated by the activity of a large Max-Planck Prize-funded research project led by Karl Galinsky that included several conferences and publications bringing together scholars working on memory across different facets and eras of Roman history. The publications produced as part of this project, “Memoria Romana: Memory in Roman Civilization,” contributed to the development of Gedächtnisgeschichte in Roman history by bringing together scholars working across disciplines: individual contributions focus on historiography, topography and urban fabric, infrequently-studied genres of writing, oral traditions, visual artifacts and iconography, intertextuality, cult sites and religious practices, and even digital reconstructions of the ancient world.³⁰ The most recent affiliated publication—following a trend of incorporating hard-science approaches that is emerging in memory studies in other fields in the humanities—including a chapter written by three neuroscientists on the

²⁹ Farrell 1997 summarizes the implications of this stance when he says that this process of memory is one “in which an individual mnemonic act represents a specific memory of the past, embodies this memory in a new form appropriate to the present, and produces new memories destined to serve the future...memories are not things handed down unchanged from the past to the future, but rather are patterns of cognition and behavior by which the past creates the future.” (375).

³⁰ Edited volumes (including conference publications): Galinsky 2014, Memoria Romana: Memory in Rome and Rome in Memory, Galinsky and Lapatin 2015, Cultural Memories in the Roman Empire; Galinsky 2016, Memory in Ancient Rome and Early Christianity. Among the many individual publications that are affiliated with this project, those particularly relevant to this dissertation include Nelis and Farrell 2013, Rebeggiani 2013, and Seider 2013 and 2012.
neuroscience of memory. This integration of types of source material as evidence for cultural memory is increasingly common and has influenced my approach to sources for this dissertation, which incorporates evidence from historiography and non-historical literary genres, epigraphic texts, numismatic iconography, and topography.

Scholarship in memory studies generally differentiates between historiography and historical, cultural, social, or collective memory. This distinction relies on a modern understanding of historiography as a genre that privileges the avoidance of authorial bias in the search for objective facts about the past, a description that many scholars have argued is inapplicable to the classical Greco-Roman conception of history and historiography. Greek and Roman authors do not fetishize this concern for evaluating history in terms of its relationship to some objective truth about the past, despite discussions of avoiding “bias” in writing history, and recognize the problems inherent in relying on human recollection of events in the past, especially events so far in the distant past that they have been passed from the memory of one person to another. The Greeks and Romans did recognize the fallibility of memory: Plato famously refers to it in the *Theaetetus* as a “lump of wax” that our senses imprint with images, but that can fail to...

---

32 See e.g. Nora 1984, Hobsbawm 1997 (see also Introduction Section II).
33 I will be focusing primarily on scholarship that discusses Roman historiography, but this occasionally depends on studies that only address Greek material. Work on sources of knowledge in Greek historiographers and the hierarchy assigned to these sources of knowledge about the past, for example, has been particularly influential for Roman historiography as well: see e.g. Walbank 1972, 66-96; Gabba 1991, 60-91.
34 See Woodman 1988, especially the epilogue (197-212 and notes 212-216) for critiques of the interpretive inadequacies of scholarly approaches that fail to account for the differences between their own cultural context and that of their subjects. On ancient sources and bias in historiography, see overviews in Gowing 2005, 1-16 and Miles 1995, 8-74.
capture some images and may lose the others over time, and it is compared to the wax of
writing tablets by Aeschylus, Cicero, and the author of the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*. Nevertheless, Roman authors closely connected *historia* with *memoria*: Cicero’s often-quoted description of *historia* identifies it as (among other things) the *vita memoriae*, and similar sentiments appear in Livy, Sallust, Tacitus, and Quintilian.

Cicero defines history, one of the types of narration, in the *de Invenzione* as “deeds remote from the memory of our age” (*1.27 Historia est gesta res, ab aetatis nostrae memoria remota*). Though the statement implies a temporal distance from the present by referring to eras of time (*aetatis*), the quality that distinguishes history is its separation from the memory of the present. Despite this distance from contemporary memory we still take history into consideration, Cicero claims later in the *de Invenzione*, because “even the deeds which were performed a long time ago and are remote from our memory still create a belief that they have been handed down truly, since established memorials of these deeds appear in writing” (*1.39 et quae iam diu gesta et a memoria nostra remota tamen faciant fidem vere tradita esse, quia eorum monumenta certa in...*).
Historia is based on the memoria of the historian and his sources, but the narration of deeds only enters the realm of historia once those deeds have become removed from the memoria of the present time. Cicero’s claims that a continuous thread of written records creates trust in the veracity of memoria suggests that the genre of historiography has the ability to shape the memory of the past that is passed on to the Roman people at large.

An interest in the means of preserving and shaping cultural memory through time has been a cohesive thread in scholarship on cultural memory in the Roman world. At the time that Roman historiography emerged as a literary genre, it drew not just from the archival annales, but also from several other sources that claimed to preserve the memory of the past. One group of such sources, inscribed and publicly displayed texts such as the Fasti Capitolini, is notable for the permanence implied by the sources’ materiality. Unlike the scrolls recording republican history, which were subject to damage or destruction through a variety of mechanisms (from the mundane mistakes made in copying to the catastrophic fires that swept through the city on occasion) and were only accessible to a limited group of people, the Fasti Capitolini provide visible and tangible “proof” that Rome’s history is known from the viewer’s day back to Romulus.

Fasti-type records provide only a framework for the Roman memory of the past, however—the names of magistrates for the year and major military engagements—and lack the narrative and detailed stories that are included in Roman historiographical narratives. Recent studies have located the elaboration of such stories in the memories preserved by the aristocratic families of Rome, originally for the purpose of preserving their own family history and legitimizing their social position. Harriet Flower’s 1996
Ancestor Masks and Aristocratic Power in Roman Culture explores the role of imagines in the display of power and prestige at aristocratic funerals, and other aspects of these funerals (e.g. laudatory eulogies and public parades) have been explored as means of both preserving family history, displaying it to the public, and manipulating the memory of that history.\footnote{Flower 1996, Farney 2007.} For the Romans, the various mechanisms used to pass down family history—imagines on display in the atrium, funerary orations citing the accomplishments of the deceased and his ancestors, and the production of genealogical narratives of family history, for example—also located the memory of an individual (and an individual’s memory) in the broader social context and could contribute to the codification of that memory outside what Gallia describes as “the discrete and idiosyncratic mental processes of the individual.”\footnote{Gallia 2012, 3-6.}

The example of funerary celebrations demonstrates how textual and material sources worked together in the Roman world to preserve and shape memories of the past. The orations composed about ancestors provided a narrative to flesh out the basic data points, such as names, relationships, and political offices, associated with family genealogy; after being composed and delivered at a funeral, written copies of the eulogies provided source material that could be referred to in later years and reused for future funerals. The material presence of the imagines repeatedly evoked the memories of the ancestors they depicted, and the physical space where they were displayed in the atrium became a location that was associated with the memory of a family’s ancestry. In the Roman world, physical space was described as having especially powerful abilities to
evoke memory on both an individual and social level. Many of the mnemonic
techniques practiced by Roman orators conceptualize the objects of memory as located
within a physical space, or in spatial relationships with one another, including the method
that is characterized in Cicero as the “first” memory technique discovered by a
professional speaker. Physical monumenta are strongly associated with memories of the
past in a way that closely evokes Pierre Nora’s lieux de mémoire: Propertius’ famous
lament for Veii, for example, depicts the “abandoned” site provoking memories of the
city’s former glory. Livy particularly privileges physical monuments as sources for the
distant past that are not subject to the same corruption (intentional or accidental) that
occurs in stories that are remembered and related from one person to another. In his
preface, while refusing to pass judgment on stories that are in the realm of the
mythological rather than the historical, he describes these affairs as “more suitable for
poetic tales than the uncorrupted memorials of deeds” (pref. 6 poeticis magis decora
fabulis quam incorruptis rerum gestarum monumentis). The relationship between
physical space and attempts to shape the memory of Roman history has been a popular
topic since the mid-1990s: Ann Vasaly’s study of the ways in which Cicero incorporates
culturally significant elements of the topography around him in his oratory was published
1997 Livy's Written Rome explores how Livy’s written account of Roman history

39 Cic. De Or. 2.351-3; see discussion in Farrell 1997, 376-8.
40 Prop. 4.10. See discussion of Nora’s work above in Section II.B of the Introduction;
the fullest formulation of his thesis comes in the seven volumes of Les Lieux de mémoire,
41 See discussion in Miles 1995, 16-20. On physical monuments and the Roman
historians, see also Wiseman 1986b.
employs textual representation of monuments at Rome that are related to memories of Roman history; Tara Welch examines similar questions in Propertius’ poetic version of Roman topography in The Elegiac Cityscape: Propertius and the Meaning of Roman Monuments (2005). The types of sites that are available for study differs for each city studied in this dissertation, and are discussed in more detail in Section IV of each chapter, “Topography and Monuments.”

III. ROME AND LATIUM

I have selected the cities I consider in this dissertation because they are in some way exceptional among the communities of Latium Vetus, and in the following chapters I primarily discuss those characteristics and episodes that Tusculum, Tibur, and Praeneste do not share with most of the Latin cities. In this section of the Introduction, I establish the general background of Rome’s relationship with Latium from the Iron Age through the era of the Roman Republic.

A. Archaic Italy and Iron Age Settlements in Latium

The groups that developed into Rome and the cities of the Latin League emerged in central Italy around the end of the 8th century, in the midst of a widespread pattern of increasing urbanization. This era roughly coincides with the development of the precursor to classical Latin, referred to as “Old Latin.” Within the broader region of central Italy, the plain of Latium is a geographically advantageous location for

---

42 The dating of this process has been an active topic of debate: for recent arguments see, among others, Alessandri 2013, Attema et al. 2011, and Robinson 2014 (an edited volume of conference proceedings; particularly relevant to Latium are the contributions of Mogetta and van’t Lindenhout). For endogenous vs. exogenous models of urbanization and state formation in central Italy: Fulminante 2014: 7-21
settlements: it is protected on all sides by mountain ranges or bodies of water, and the valleys between those mountains provide fertile plains (with rivers running through many of them), and the navigable stretch of the Tiber that extends from the sea to Rome compensates for the lack of natural harbors along this section of the Tyrrhenian coast. The small settlements that emerged in Latium during this time period, roughly equivalent to the “regal period” in the Roman annalistic tradition, were in close contact: their language, burial customs, and traded goods attest to close connections among the cities, including Rome, even as the latter began to grow much larger than the next-largest cities in the area in the 7th-6th centuries.

B. The Latin League

The term “Latin League” is used to refer to a variety of iterations and types of alliances among the cities of Latium from the 8th-4th centuries BCE, and there is no scholarly consensus on the nature or duration of the entity signified by this term. Most scholars accept the basic historicity of a coalition of cities in Latium that existed for some period of time during the Roman regal and republican eras, but there is also widespread disagreement about the fundamental nature of the League—its origins, purpose, and constitution—and the ancient sources are silent on this topic. Latin peoples united in a type of “league” or alliance are mentioned in both military and religious contexts, in addition to the sources that record a list of these cities with no context for their

---

44 Fulminante 2014, 36.
45 For overviews of the evidence for Latial culture in a variety of archaic settlements in the immediate area of Rome see Holloway 2014, chapters 2 and 3; Fulminante 2014, chapters 5 and 6.
grouping. Some scholars distinguish between an “Alban League” and a “Latin League,” with the former referring to an early coalition of Latin cities centered on the Alban Hills; a fragment of Cato listing communities that came together to dedicate a grove to Diana is usually associated with this Alban League when it is proposed. Mommsen identified the archaic “Alban League” as consisting of the old Latin members who saw themselves as potential challengers to Rome, while the group he refers to as the “Latin League” existed in the years after the majority of the Prisci Latini were no longer independent cities, and and was made of communities on the outskirts of Roman control in Italy (both colonies and formerly independent cities) that received legal benefits from their Roman citizenship and depended on Rome’s military power to deter aggression from the non-allied communities surrounding them. The sources for this early version of the league are notoriously problematic; for example, the best account of the so-called foedus Cassianum comes in Dionysius of Halicarnassus, who gives a long list of Latin cities he

---

47 Military: Livy, Dionysius of Halicarnassus; Religious: Cato, Pliny; List: Diodorus Siculus.
48 See Palmer 1970: 5-25 and 132-140; Cato Orig. Cornell F36 (=Jordan II F21, Peter F58, Chassignet II F28, Cugusi F62)=Prisc. GL 2.129. The inclusion of Cora and Pometia on Cato's list of Latin League cities confirms that the fragment pertains to a period before the start of the 5th century BCE, as both communities are said to have been destroyed sometime shortly after taking up arms against Rome with the Volsci in 495 BCE.
49 Mommsen Vol. I (1854) Book I, Chapter III; and Book II, Chapters V-VII, Character of the archaic Alban League (281). Mommsen describes the archaic Alban League as united by a sense of their common origins, language, and political and religious institutions; he does not believe it is possible to reconstruct the list of original members based on the information in our sources, which all date from a later period and (he believes) represent an era closer in time to their composition (26).
claims were signatories, but otherwise almost never distinguishes among the actions of
various Latin cities and describes them acting instead as an undifferentiated unit.\(^{50}\)

**C. Roman Citizenship**

Roman citizenship is a central motif in the historical narratives of the relationship
between Rome and the Latin cities by the time of the defeat of the Latin League in 338
BCE, though it is discussed occasionally at earlier dates. Livy’s description of the end of
the war includes the penalties Rome imposed on various cities of the Latin League, and
Livy uses citizenship status to distinguish between the Latin cities that are welcomed
fully into Rome (Lanuvium, Aricium, Nomentum, Pedum, and Tusculum), and those that
are only partially assimilated to Rome as allied cities. In Livy’s narrative, receiving
citizenship is a reward for the former cities, and is specifically contrasted to the way that
Rome deprived the latter cities of the rights of intermarriage, trade, and inter-Latin
political assembly by denying them admission to Roman citizenship.\(^{51}\) The only cities
that are said to receive full citizenship are Lanuvium, Aricium, Nomentum, and Pedum;

\(^{50}\) Dion. Hal. 5.61.3 οἱ δὲ ἐγγραφήσαντες ταῖς συμβάσεσις ταῦτα πρόβουλοι καὶ τοὺς ὀρκους ὀμόσαντες ἀπὸ τούτων τῶν πόλεων ἦσαν ἄνδρες, Ἀρδεατῶν, Ἀρικηνῶν, Βοιλλανῶν, Βοβεντανῶν, Κόρων, Καρυεντανῶν, Κοραιτῶν, Κοριολανῶν, Κορνων, Καρβιτῶν, Καβανῶν, Φορτινείων, Γαβίων, Λαυρεντίων, Λανουίων, Λαβινιατῶν, Λαβικανῶν, Νωμεντανῶν, Νωρβανῶν, Πραινεστίνων, Πεδανῶν, Κορκοτουλανῶν, Σατρικανῶν, Σκαπτηνίων, Σητίνων, Τιβουρτινῶν, Τυσκλανῶν, Τοληρίων, Τελληνίων, Οὐκελιτρανῶν: οἱ δὲ τοῦτο ἀπασάζων τῶν πόλεων τοὺς ἐν ἀκμῇ συστατεύειν ὅσων ἤν δὲ τοῖς ἴχνεσιν Οκταουίῳ Μαμίλῳ καὶ Σέξῳ Ταρκυνίῳ: τούτοις γὰρ ἀπέδειξαν στρατηγοὺς αὐτοκράτορας. (The delegates who were signatories to the treaty and swore the oaths were men from these cities: Ardea, Aricia, Bovillae, Bubentum, Cora, Carventum, Cicerei, Coriolis, Corbio, Cabum, Fortina, Gabii, Laurentum, Lanuvium, Lavinium, Labici, Nomentum, Norba, Praeneste, Pedum, Querquetula, Satricum, Scapta, Setia, Tibur, Tusculum, Tolerium, Tellenae, and Velitrae: they declared that as many men from all these cities in the prime of youth as was necessary for the generals Octavius Mamilius and Sextus Tarquinius ought to fight, for they had appointed these men as generals with absolute authority).

\(^{51}\) Livy 8.14.10.
additionally, Tusculum retained the Roman citizenship it had been awarded in 381 BCE. Capua, Fundi, Formiae, Cumae, and Suessula are said to have received the citizenship “sine suffragio.” Some scholars have stated that the status of civitas sine suffragio was also bestowed on the Latin cities not specifically said to have been granted a different status, and that this status continued to be awarded to newly conquered cities and regions as a sort of first step in a process of Romanization that ended in full citizenship. Mouritsen notes that early references to the grant in Livy “are so obscure that it has been construed both as a reward and as a punishment,” and the evidence suggests a much more uneven distribution of rights to different communities--attributing the different relationships between Rome and Italian cities to a cohesive plan is better thought of, he argues, as “a later rationalization of earlier more complex patterns of relationships between Rome and the Italians.” Though the literary evidence does not allow us to reconstruct a precise timeline of when each Latin city received Roman citizenship (whether with or without the right to vote), it is possible to say that after the late 4th century BCE, Rome began incorporating the cities of Latium into Roman citizenship, generally through non-military actions. By tracing the presence of novi homines from different Latin cities in the Roman Senate, we can identify a terminus ante quem for the date when most cities received citizenship.

52 See Chapter One, Section II for a discussion of the events that led to Tusculum receiving Roman citizenship in 381 BCE. Velitrae and Antium received colonies from Rome in 338 BCE and the colonists would have held Roman citizenship, though the previous inhabitants of the city lost their independence and self-governance.
53 This position is most fully articulated in Humbert 1978.
54 Mouritsen 2007, 150 and 157.
In his discussion of Rome “rewarding” Latin cities with Roman citizenship, Livy speaks from the perspective of a Roman of the Late Republic, to whom Roman citizenship was understood to be a desirable goal and the withholding of citizenship understood to be a punishment. It does not necessarily follow, of course, that the people of these conquered Latin cities felt the same way—that they would have viewed Roman citizenship as a benefit to be desired rather than as the imposition of a status they did not wish to hold. In fact, one episode from Livy’s account of the Hannibalic Wars shows a group of Praenestine citizens rejected the opportunity to receive Roman citizenship in 216-15 BCE when it was offered to them as a reward for their defense of the garrison at Casilinum against Hannibal’s siege. Though there is no trace of any further reluctance by Praenestines to accept Roman citizenship between this incident in 216-15 BCE and 90 BCE, all of the surviving evidence for the aftermath of the Social War comes from Roman sources, to whom the concept of Roman citizenship being an oppressive imposition rather than a desirable honor may have been somewhat foreign. Nevertheless, in the unilateral imposition of a new status of “Roman citizens” on the Italian allies—even some of whom seem to have resisted it in the past—it is difficult not to see some element of the dominant power enforcing membership in their pre-existing social

---

56 Livy 23.19-20. Casilinum, a town just outside of Capua, was besieged by Hannibal in 216-15 BCE and defended by a force mostly consisting of Praenestines. After Hannibal agreed to negotiate the city’s release in exchange for ransom, the Romans tried to offer awards to the Praenestine troops—doubled pay, exemption from military service for five years, and Roman citizenship. Though the Praenestine troops accepted the first two rewards, Livy explains that “when they were offered the citizenship on account of their virtue, they did not change” (23.20 ciuitate cum donarentur ob uirtutem, non mutauerunt). See further discussion in Chapter Three, Section II.
structure, even if that may have been comingled with a genuine concession to the allies’
desire for greater rights within the political system they found themselves living under.

While we cannot necessarily reconstruct the attitude of Latin communities to
Roman citizenship in the absence of sources recording their reactions, there are smaller
groups—like the Praenestine garrison at Casilinum—for which we have more specific
evidence about their response to being offered Roman citizenship. One such group is
made up of families from Latin cities who were granted Roman citizenship on an
individual basis (before their city of origin received the citizenship). Latins are said to
have received Roman citizenship, which passed to their descendants, as a reward for
several types of service to the Republic. Civil service, including successfully prosecuting
a criminal in a Roman court, was grounds for receiving citizenship in the Late Republic;
though most cities in Latium held Roman citizenship by that point, and the majority of
the beneficiaries of this policy were among the Italian allies, Cicero reports that the
Tiburtines T. Coponius and L. Cossinius both gained Roman citizenship after their
successful prosecutions of T. Caelius and C. Masso, respectively, which indicates that the
family became Roman citizens prior to the general grant of citizenship to Tibur as a
whole in 90 BCE (see Chapter Two, Section III).57 Exceptional service to aid the state
was also grounds for receiving citizenship: the gens Mamilia of Tusculum are said to
have received the Roman citizenship in the 5th century BCE after L. Mamilius exhorted

57 Cic. Balb. 53. Roman citizenship was not granted automatically to magistrates of Latin
cities in the Republic, though it became common in the Empire: it could not have been in
practice before 215 BCE because Livy describes a proposal in the senate by Spurius
Carvilius to establish the practice at that date, and the Pro Balbo suggests that it was not
established by 56 BCE because Cicero mentions one cannot hold citizenship of two cities
simultaneously.
his countrymen to Rome’s aid when a group under Appius Herdonius’ leadership seized
the Capitoline.58

From the beginning of the time when the Latin cities were formally incorporated
into the expanding Roman Republic, citizenship was a useful proxy for defining a city’s
status in relation to Rome. The “punishment” of refusing citizenship consists of formally
designating a city as having secondary status in relation to Rome: the deprivation of
citizenship is not a hollow signifier but comes along with very real consequences for an
allied city’s freedoms (association, trade, self-government, etc.). Conversely, the award
of citizenship marks a city as holding privileged status in relation to Rome and provides
tangible benefits for the city in the future. Roman accounts may reflect this concern in a
way that is not entirely parallel to the Latin perception of the issue, but this does not
mean they are any less interesting or useful. While it is not the goal of this dissertation to
reconstruct a Latin perspective on the city’s conquest and assimilation (or lack thereof)
by Rome, it is nevertheless an important part of reconstructing the Roman cultural
memory of the city to acknowledge places where the Roman cultural memory of Latin
cities seems to struggle with explaining the other cities’ behavior and attitudes—topics,
like the matter of citizenship, that suggest possible discontinuities between the surviving
Roman account and a theoretical non-Roman version tell us as much about the Romans
as they do about the other group.

58 See Chapter One, Section II for a full discussion of this episode and Chapter One,
Section III for the Mamilii.
IV. DISSERTATION OVERVIEW

The following three chapters each present a case study of the Roman cultural memory of one city in Latium: Tusculum (Chapter One), Tibur (Chapter Two), and Praeneste (Chapter Three). In each chapter, I consider the source material for the Roman cultural memory of the city within three overarching categories: (1) sources that talk about the city as a *civic entity*, a unified collective body sharing civic institutions, (2) sources that refer to *individuals* who are associated with the city in some way, including inhabitants of the city, people born in the city who have moved away, and people who had ancestors from the city but were themselves born and live elsewhere, among others; and (3) sources related to the physical space of the city, its *topography and monuments*, including the natural features of the site where the city is located, and the buildings and monuments that form the cityscape.
CHAPTER ONE: TUSCULUM

I. INTRODUCTION

Atticus: But still, what sort of statement was it, that thing you said a little while ago, that this place—which I take it you refer to Arpinum—is your true fatherland? Do you have two fatherlands? Or is there one, that fatherland which is communal? Or perhaps Rome was not wise Cato's fatherland, but Tusculum.

Cicero: Assuredly I believe that both he and all the residents of the municipia have two fatherlands—one by nature, the other by citizenship—just as Cato, although he was born in Tusculum, was admitted into the polity of the Roman people; thus, while he was a Tuscan by birth, he was a Roman by citizenship, he had one fatherland by place [of his birth], the other by law [...] But it is necessary for the fatherland in which the name of “republic” signifies our common citizenship to be foremost in our esteem; for which fatherland we must die, and to which we must give ourselves totally, and in which we must place, and as it were consecrate, our whole being. [...] Thus I will certainly never deny that this place (Arpinum) is my fatherland, although that fatherland (Rome) is greater, and contains this one in it...

In the last half of the 1st century BCE, the community of Tusculum had become the archetypal example of a Roman municipium in Latium vetus. Cicero uses Tusculum and its most famous son, M. Porcius Cato, as an example of the idealized relationship that a

59 Cic. Leg. 2.5.
municeps ought to have with Rome, the republic to which he owes his loyal service in
gratitude for its citizenship, and his hometown, which simultaneously holds his loyalty as
the place of his birth. In Cicero’s political philosophy, a citizen of municipal origin, like
Cato, should recognize both of these fatherlands, but feel no conflict in acknowledging
the superiority of his fatherland at Rome.

Tusculum would have furnished many other examples for Cicero’s
contemporaries of municipal novi homines who found success at Rome and established
aristocratic dynasties that could compete with the most venerable Roman gentes. Having
held Roman citizenship for more than three centuries, many of Tusculum's leading
families had a longstanding tradition of political success at Rome, and Tuscan ancestry
seems to have developed a certain cachet within the environment of Late Republican
political self-promotion. The pattern of young politicians from Tuscan households
rising quickly through the ranks of the cursus honorum at Rome was sufficiently
common for Cicero to allude to it in a defense speech: in the Pro Plancio, Cicero’s client
is said to have been prosecuted for electoral fraud because it was so difficult to believe
that the plaintiff, the Tuscan M. Iuventius Laterensis, could have been defeated by a
novus homo from a much less politically advantageous place of origin. Tusculum is “a

---

60 On political propaganda that relies on ancestry as a source of prestige, see especially Flower 1996 and Wiseman 1974; see Farney 2007 for a discussion of ethnic identity among Latins and Etrusans in relation to this phenomenon.
61 Cic. Planc. 8.19 Tu es e municipio antiquissimo Tusculano, ex quo sunt plurimae familiae consulares, in quibus est etiam Iuventia —tot ex reliquis municipiis omnibus non sunt—hic est e praefectura Atinat non tam prisca, non tam honorata, non tam suburbana. (You are from the most ancient municipium of Tusculum, from which there are very many consular families, among whom is also the gens Iuventia—there are not so many among all the other municipia—this man [Plancius] is from the prefecture of Atina, (which is) not so ancient, nor so honorable, nor so close to the city of Rome.)
most ancient municipium, from which there are many consular families” (municipio antiquissimo Tusculano, ex quo sunt plurimae familiae consulares), and the defendant’s hometown is neither as old, nor as honorable, nor as close to the city of Rome (non tam prisca, non tam honorata, non tam suburbana). In the Pro Fonteio, Cicero cites the defendant’s venerable family from Tusculum, a “most illustrious municipium” (ex clarissimo municipio), as one of the extenuating circumstances that ought to inspire the audience’s sympathy towards his client. Not only could Cicero expect the Romans of the Late Republic to recognize Tusculum as a source of exemplary municipal citizens who recognized the appropriate relationship between their hometown and their political homeland, he could also refer to that image as influencing the general public’s expectations of Roman citizens with Tuscan origins. Several late Republican politicians from families of Tuscan origin also seem to have anticipated that a Roman audience would respond positively to connections with Tusculum: the first family to mint coin types that seem to reference ethnic roots in a Latin city had a Tuscan origo, and

---

62 Cic. Font. 41 Videte igitur utrum sit aequius hominem honestissimum, virum fortissimum, civem optimum dedi inimicissimis atque immanissimis nationibus an reddi amicis, praesertim cum tot res sint quae vestris animis pro huius innocentis salute suppliant, primum generis antiquitas, quam Tusculo, ex clarissimo municipio, projectam in monumentis rerum gestarum incisam ac notatam videmus... (Therefore consider whether it is more fair that a most honorable person, a most brave man, a most excellent citizen, be given over to the most hostile and most savage nations, or that he be restored to his loved ones, especially when there are so many things that implore your minds on behalf of this innocent man’s safety: first, the antiquity of his family, which we know to have originated from Tusculum, a most illustrious municipium, and to be inscribed and recorded on monuments of their deeds...)

Tusculum produces an exceptionally large number of families that reference the municipium in numismatic iconography.\textsuperscript{63} Tusculum was also a popular and prestigious—even exclusive—location for aristocratic suburban villas in the Late Republic. Cicero, self-conscious of his status as a new man, complained in a letter to Atticus about the “leading men” who were irritated that Cicero had acquired a Tuscan property that once belonged to Quintus Lutatius Catulus.\textsuperscript{64} The pseudo-Sallustian \textit{Invective against Cicero} reflects a similar sentiment: the anonymous author scornfully characterizes Cicero as a “new man from Arpinum” (\textit{homo novus Arpinas}) while questioning how he could have acquired the funds to build his Tuscan and Pompeian villas “at infinite expense”(\textit{Tuscanum et Pompeianum infinito sumptu aedificaveris}).\textsuperscript{65} The Tuscan landscape into which these villas were set is characterized in literary sources as a peaceful landscape of elite leisure and natural abundance. While the Augustan and Imperial periods saw a widespread interest in the \textit{villa suburbana} in towns across Latium, and a corresponding development of a series of literary tropes related to the \textit{suburbium}, Tusculum seems to have become a popular

\textsuperscript{63} For figures, see Farney 2007, 291. Tusculum is second only to Lanuvium in quantity of coin types making identifiable references to the city; see further discussion in Section III of this chapter.

\textsuperscript{64} The \textit{gens Lutatia}, though they were not among the \textit{gentes maiores}, had been consular since the mid-3\textsuperscript{rd} century BCE. Cic. \textit{Att.} 4.5.2 \textit{et ii subringentur qui villam me moleste ferunt habere quae Catuli fuerat, a Vettio emisse non cogitant} (...and those men smirk, the ones who are angry that I possess the villa which was once Catulus’, and they do not think about the fact that I bought it from Vettius...)

\textsuperscript{65} Ps. Sallust, \textit{Invective Against Cicero} 3-4. The author asks for an accounting of how Cicero could have build these properties and purchased his house, if not from fines levied in illegal trials—if legitimately, how much did he inherit from his father (compared to how much money he made from fining citizens tried under the \textit{Lex Plautia})? The implication seems to be that a man from an undistinguished background, without a substantial inheritance, could not have come by such funds legally and must therefore have gained his fortune through illegal means.
location for aristocratic suburban villas at an earlier date: Cicero’s Tuscan villa, for example, had a pedigree that stretched back to Q. Lutatius Catulus (cos. 102 BCE, lived 149-87). The Tuscan landscape of the Late Republic was a thoroughly peaceable landscape, a landscape that—like the political ambitions of the civic entity inhabiting it—displayed no pretensions towards competing with Rome. The physical space of the city appears in literary sources as an idyllic suburban setting—home to poetic, philosophical, and religious concerns—and the landscape that was the scene of many battles in the Early and Middle Republic with the Volsci and Aequi, as well as the Romans themselves, is no longer mentioned as a site of any military actions.

A image of Tusculum that appears similarly friendly to Rome can be found in some references to its life as an independent city, before it was incorporated by Rome: Livy, for example, narrates multiple episodes in the 5th century in which the Tusculans and the Romans declare their mutual loyalty and come to the other’s rescue in the face of attacks by hostile peoples. But Tusculum did fight for centuries against Rome’s growing power in Latium, and the historical record preserves several episodes after Tusculum’s nominal integration into Rome in which Tusculum rebelled against Roman control. In this chapter I reconstruct the Roman cultural memory of Tusculum as an independent civic entity, focusing on its relationship to Rome both before and after its incorporation as a municipium, to the extent that the surviving literary and material evidence permits. The relationship between Rome and Tusculum is exceptional among the Latin allies because of the early date at which Tusculum received Roman citizenship, and this early incorporation is reflected by the large number of Tuscan families who become politically prominent at Rome and by the early date at which Tusculum’s landscape is
described as a landscape of elite leisure. However, the history of interactions between Rome and Tusculum was sometimes contentious, and the Roman cultural memory of Tusculum’s past includes a number of multivalent episodes that reflect the difficulty of incorporating a former enemy into the historical and cultural memory of the society that takes in that enemy as part of its own citizen body.

The earliest datable interaction between Rome and Tusculum in the historical record occurs during the reign of Tarquinius Superbus (c. 535-509 BCE); it is also the earliest of several recorded alliances between the two cities. As part of Tarquinius’ campaign to strengthen his power by securing alliances with Latin cities, the final king of Rome is said to have married his daughter to the Tusulan Octavius Mamilius, thereby securing the loyalty of Tusculum. Both Livy and Dionysius of Halicarnassus report that Mamilius was also well-regarded and influential among the Latin community at large, and record that he was said to have been descended from Telegonus, the son of Odysseus and Circe (and the mythical founder of Tusculum). After Tarquinius was overthrown, his alliance with Tusculum continued in the form of a personal connection to Mamilius Octavius. Dionysius of Halicarnassus describes Octavius Mamilius leading troops from Tusculum, alongside the Etruscan leader Lars Porsenna to whom Tarquinius had fled, in attacking Rome to reinstitute Tarquinius’ regime, and Livy reports that when the Roman people rejected Porsenna’s final attempt at negotiating Tarquinius’ return, the former king went to live out his exile in Tusculum at the home of his son-in-law (exsulatum ad

---

66 Livy 1.49.9, Dion. Hal. 4.45.1. Ogilvie ad loc. notes the similarity to Thucydides 6.53—Hippias, concerned with revolution at home in the face of rising resentment of his tyranny, looked abroad for aid and married his daughter to the son of the tyrant of Lampsacus because he was influential in Darius’ court.

67 Livy 1.49.8-9, Dion. Hal. 4.45.1-2.
Though Octavius Mamilius seems to have spoken for the people of Tusculum (probably leading them as dictator), it is clear that his alliance with Tarquinius Superbus was thought of as tied to the individual figure rather than to the city of Rome as a civic entity: once Tarquinius was in opposition to the current regime at Rome, Mamilius led his forces against Rome in support of his father-in-law. In fact, Mamilius is said to have served as a key figure convincing the Latin cities to join together and go to war against Rome in the conflict that ended with the Battle of Lake Regillus (itself in Tusculan territory) in 493 BCE, and the Tusculan general led the troops of the Latin League in that battle.

When Rome defeated the Latin League at Lake Regillus, Tusculum—like the other allied Latin cities—entered into a treaty promising peace and mutual military

---

68 Livy 2.15.7 Tarquinius spe omni reditus incisa exsulatum ad generum Mamilium Octavium Tusculum abiit. (Tarquinius, cut off from all hope of a return, departed to Tusculum to live as an exile at the home of his son-in-law Octavius Mamilius); see also Dion. Hal. 5.21.3.

69 Livy 2.18.3 supra beli Latini metum id quoque accesserat, quod triginta iam coniurasse populos concitante Octavio Mamilio satis constabat. (Additionally, this was also added to fear of war with the Latins—that it was well known that thirty cities had already joined in an alliance at the instigation of Octavius Mamilius). I print the text of Ogilvie’s 1974 OCT, but see the commentary in Ogilvie 1965, 279-80, on the textual issues with the first half of this sentence. See also Livy 2.19-20 (Battle of Lake Regillus; Octavius Mamilius is described as leading the Latin troops several times); Dionysius similarly describes him leading troops (Dion. Hal. 5.22.4 and 5.76.3) and further credits him with stirring up the Latins to aid Tarquinius: Dion. Hal. 5.61.1-2 συναχθείσης δ’ ἀγοράς ἐν Φερεντίῳ πολλήν ἐποιοῦντο τῶν ἀποσπευδόντων τὸν πόλεμον κατηγορίαι οἱ τὰ ὀπλα πείθοντες αὐτούς ἀναλαβεῖν, μᾶλιστα δὲ Ταρκύνιος τε καὶ ὁ κηδεστὴς αὐτοῦ Μαμίλιος καὶ οἱ προεστηκότες τῆς Ἀρικηνῶν πόλεως, ὡς ἐκδημαγωγηθέντες, ὅσοι τοῦ Λατίνων μετείχον γένους, κοινῇ τὸν κατὰ Ῥωμαίων ἀναρωτόντα πόλεμον (When an assembly was gathered at Ferentinum, those who were prevailing upon them to take up arms, especially Tarquinius and his son-in-law Mamilius and the leaders of the city of Aricia, made a great invective against those opposing the war. On account of their haranguing, all those who belonged to the Latin race undertook a common war against the Romans).
defensive aid, known as the foedus Cassianum. The interactions between Rome and Tusculum through the remainder of the 5th century BCE that are recorded in the historical tradition are a series of episodes in which one city comes to the assistance of the other against external forces, much like the mutual aid said to have been promised by the foedus Cassianum. In 463 BCE, the Volsci and Aequi attacked Tusculum (which controlled a strategic passage through the Alban hills between Rome and the territory of the Volsci and Aequi); Livy claims that the hostile tribes headed to pillage Tuscan territory when they realized they could not successfully reach and attack Rome, and the allied forces who had planned to defend Rome attempted to pursue the Volsci and Aequi to the Tusculan hills. In 460 BCE, when a force led by the Sabine Appius Herdonius seized the Capitolium and the Arx, Tuscan troops came to Rome’s aid unasked at the encouragement of a descendant of Octavius Mamilius, L. Mamilius. In the next year, Tusculum faced another attack from the Aequi, who seized the Tuscan acropolis, and Rome returned their earlier assistance in kind. Tusculum is also said to have welcomed and sheltered Roman troops after a disastrous defeat at the hands of the Aequi in 449 BCE.

There is no record of interactions between Rome and Tusculum in the second half of the 5th century BCE (between 449-400), though several Roman conflicts with the

---

70 Livy 2.33, Dion. Hal. 6.95. See general discussion of the archaic Latin League in the Introduction, Section III.B.
71 Livy 3.7
72 Livy 3.15-18; Dion. Hal. 10.14-16. Livy and Dionysius of Halicarnassus concur in identifying Appius Herdonius as the ringleader of this event but differ in their characterization of the incident as either an insurrection of exiles and servants (Livy) or an attack of foreign troops (Dionysius); see discussion in this chapter, Section II.
73 Livy 3.23; Dion. Hal. 10.20-21.
74 Livy 3.42.
Aequi and the Volsci in the territory of Tusculum are mentioned.\textsuperscript{75} At some point in the early 4\textsuperscript{th} century, Tusculum evidently decided to attempt opposition to Rome: in 381 BCE, after defeating an army of Volsci, the Romans found that the forces they had captured included a number of Tusculans.\textsuperscript{76} Angered by this development, which Livy describes as “the Tusculans [having] revolted from their alliance,” the Senate sent an army to Tusculum, but when they arrived they found the city with its gates open, peaceable and making no attempt at resistance.\textsuperscript{77} The Romans decided not to attack Tusculum, and in the aftermath of this conflict Tusculum was admitted to Roman citizenship. In reporting the resolution of the conflict, Livy says that "for the present, [the Tusculans] obtained peace, and not long afterwards they also obtained citizenship (\textit{civitatem})," and when recounting events that took place in 377 BCE he describes the Tusculans as having "entered into not only a Roman alliance, but Roman citizenship."\textsuperscript{78}

Within half a century, however, Tusculum revolted against Roman power again: the Tusculans joined the other Latin cities in rebelling against Rome in the Roman-Latin Wars of c. 340-338 BCE.\textsuperscript{79} When the Latin allies were defeated by Rome, Rome meted out a variety of punishments to the individual cities; ultimately, the city of Tusculum paid

\textsuperscript{75} E.g. Livy 4.27-29, in 431 BCE the dictator T. Quinctius Cincinnatus won a decisive victory against the Aequi and Volsci in the territory of Tusculum.
\textsuperscript{76} See Livy 6.25-26 for the whole episode.
\textsuperscript{77} Livy 6.25.2 \textit{ne patres ignari sint Tusculanos ab societate descisse} (lest the senators be unaware that the Tusculans had revolted from the alliance).
\textsuperscript{78} Livy 6.26.8 and Livy 6.33 The exact date when Tusculum obtained citizenship is uncertain, but (based on the dates of the above references) Livy’s chronology places it between 381 and 377 BCE.
\textsuperscript{79} In addition to Livy’s inclusion of Tusculum at the conclusion of the war when he discusses the treatment of the various defeated Latin cities (8.14), Tusculum’s participation is also attested by an episode in 340 BCE in which the Roman consul’s son, T. Manlius, fought a Tusculan named Geminus Metius (Livy 8.7, note especially the “Tusculan cavalry” (\textit{Tusculani...equites}) at 8.7.2).
little to no penalty for its involvement in the revolt and its betrayal of Rome. They retained their citizenship (joined now by several other Latin cities that Rome incorporated as municipia in the aftermath of their defeat), a feat that Livy attributes to the fact that the Romans blamed a few wrongdoers for the rebellion and did not hold the general Tuscan public responsible.\textsuperscript{80} Tusculum was pardoned for actions hostile to Rome again in 323 BCE, when a tribune brought accusations against the Tusculans for inciting and aiding a revolt of two other Latin cities: when the people of Tusculum came to Rome as supplicants and prostrated themselves in front of the voting tribes, all but one voted against the proposed punishment.\textsuperscript{81}

After the 4\textsuperscript{th} century BCE, Tusculum does not seem to have had any major interactions with the city of Rome, though individuals of Tuscan origin continued to pursue political office at Rome and Romans from many other hometowns purchased suburban property at Tusculum. There is one mention of Tusculum in the Punic Wars, when Hannibal is said to have marched by Tusculum on his way to Rome in 211 BCE and been refused entry to the city (...Tusculum petiit, nec receptus moenibus...).\textsuperscript{82} No further references to political or military interactions between Rome and Tusculum

\textsuperscript{80} Livy 8.14.4 Tuscanis servata civitas quam habebant, crimenque rebellionis a publica fraude in paucos auctores versum. (The citizenship which the Tusculans held was preserved, and the crime of rebellion was directed away from the civic body to the fault of a few instigators.)

\textsuperscript{81} Livy 8.37.8-12; 8.37.8 M. Flavius tribunus plebis tuit ad populum ut in Tusculanos animaduerteretur, quod eorum ope ac consilio Veliterni Priuernatesque populo Romano bellum fecissent. (M. Flavius, the tribune of the plebs, brought a motion to the people that they punish the Tusculans, because the people of Velitrae and Privernum had gone to war against the Roman people with their help and advice.)

\textsuperscript{82} Livy 26.9.12 inde Algido Tusculum petiit, nec receptus moenibus infra Tusculum dextrorsus Gabios descendit. (Then from Algidus he sought Tusculum, and when he was not received within the (Tuscan) walls he descended below Tusculum on the right side, towards Gabii.)
provide evidence for the relationship between the two civic entities in the Late Republic, though the interchange of individuals continued. However, many sources from the centuries after Tusculum became a Roman community record different aspects of the contemporary Roman memory of Tusculum’s past. In the following three sections, this chapter examines these sources in three major categories: the memory of Tusculum as a civic entity, connections between individuals and the city of Tusculum, and changing perceptions of the physical space of Tusculum.

II. CIVIC ENTITY

Like all the cities of the Latin League, Tusculum came into conflict with Rome in the years of the early Republic. The civic entity of Tusculum has a unique relationship to Rome, however, as the earliest Latin settlement of significant size said to have been incorporated as a community whose members held Roman citizenship: the acquisition of Gabii and Crustumerium, traditionally dated to the regal period, occurred by a “process of direct absorption,” and the fifth-century BCE is characterized by the establishment of Roman colonies (along with Latin colonies and joint Roman-Latin colonies), which were utilized as part of a process of dominating hostile territories by force. Tusculum, on the other hand, is said to have received citizenship shortly after the time of its conquest by Rome.

83 “Direct absorption” is Sherwin-White’s (1971, 19-20) characterization of this early phase of Roman expansion (as narrated in Livy and Dionysius, and supported by the evidence of apparently archaic religious distinctions associated with these territories).
A. The Municipalization of Tusculum

The historiographic record places the date when Tusculum received Roman citizenship shortly after 381 BCE: in reporting the resolution of a conflict between Rome and Tusculum in that year, Livy says that "for the present, [the Tusculans] obtained peace, and not long afterwards they also obtained citizenship (civitatem)," and when recounting events that took place in 377 BCE he describes the Tusculans as having "entered into not only a Roman alliance, but Roman citizenship."\(^8^4\) The change in status Tusculum experienced is not discussed extensively by Livy or Dionysius in their accounts of the event; however, since the city was incorporated as a community holding Roman citizenship (civitas) rather than as a community without full citizenship rights (municipium sine suffragio), it is possible to make a few statements based on the rights and responsibilities of Roman citizens: Tusculum would have retained a degree of independence in matters of domestic self-government, but was bound to follow Rome's will in matters of military and other external policy.\(^8^5\) The early date at which Tusculum received Roman citizenship was recognized as significant by later Romans: it is mentioned by Cicero, for example, in the Pro Plancio, in which he refers to Tusculum as a "most ancient municipium."\(^8^6\) The antiquity of Tusculum's incorporation was particularly identified with its reputation for producing politicians who found success in the cursus honorum at Rome, and the early date at which the residents of Tusculum

---

\(^8^4\) Livy 6.33 non in societatem modo Romanam sed etiam in civitatem se dedissent. The terminology used for Italian cities that became Roman citizens in the 4th century is unknown, but references to Tusculum as a municipium in Cicero's speeches that confirm this term was used by the Late Republic (see e.g. Cic. Font. 41 quam Tusculo, ex clarissimo municipio; Cic. Planc. 19 e municipio antiquissimo Tusculano).

\(^8^5\) See Introduction, Section III.C.

\(^8^6\) Cic. Planc. 19.
received Roman citizenship and the ability to run for office at Rome meant that Tusculum's politics and Rome's politics overlapped for a longer period of time than was true for other Latin cities.

The original character of Rome's incorporation of Tusculum, which simultaneously deprived Tusculum of political independence and granted its inhabitants the full rights of the Roman citizenship, is difficult to determine in the absence of any contemporary sources describing the conflict. The historiographic tradition preserved in Livy and in Dionysius of Halicarnassus describes this act as a purely positive event for Tusculum, but both of these authors postdate any serious debate about citizenship for Latin cities by centuries and it is certainly possible to see evidence for a more pessimistic view of this event underlying their narratives: Oakley describes the incorporation of Tusculum, for example, as “an aggressive act in retaliation to an aggressive act” that occurred well before the “the days when an outsider (such as [Livy] himself) might value the citizenship.”

Indeed, Livy’s narrative shows no trace of Tusculan antagonism towards the Romans’ actions. Livy even describes the other Latin cities viewing Tusculum’s incorporation as a Roman municipium as a betrayal of their own cause, deserting a united body of Latins (deserto communi concilio Latinorum), implying that Livy believed the other Latin cities were interpreting the episode as more voluntary than necessary concession to a superior force. Nevertheless, this was not an unambiguously positive development for Tusculum, and modern scholars have recognized potential

87 Oakley 1997 (Vol. I), 357.
88 Livy 6.33.6; Sherwin-White 1973, 30 attributes the attitude behind the phrase deserto communi concilio Latinorum, described as “stigmatizing the Tusculani,” to “the annalistic tradition.”
ambiguities in the narrative of Tusculum’s incorporation as it is preserved in the
historiographic tradition.

Firstly, the logic of the story (as preserved in the Roman historiographic tradition)
does not support the conclusion that Rome would have intended to reward Tusculum for
its behavior, while a hostile takeover seems to be a plausible explanation in the context of
Tusculum and Rome's actions immediately prior to this point. On its face, Livy’s account
of the conflict in 381 BCE does not lead to the logical conclusion that Rome granted
Tusculum Roman citizenship as a reward. The events leading up to Tusculum receiving
Roman citizenship begin with the discovery that the army of Volsci captured by the
Romans included a number of Tusculans, and Roman anger at this development leads the
Senate to send an army to Tusculum--it is essentially treachery on the part of the
Tusculans (above and beyond the antagonism that seems to have existed between Rome
and most other Latin cities) that precedes its incorporation.

We also have to account for the date of our surviving sources: post-Social War
Romans may have been predisposed to assume that Roman citizenship was a desirable
outcome for Italian allies, but in the early 4th century the other interactions between
Rome and Latin cities are hostile or restrained by formal treaties; it would be odd in this
environment for Rome to expect Tusculum to be grateful for Roman citizenship. This
chapter does not aim to reconstruct 4th century attitudes towards Roman citizenship,
Roman expansion, or the municipalization of Tusculum, beyond the observation that (as
scholars have noted) they probably did not align with the attitudes of writers from the 1st
century BCE and later, and that a close reading of accounts of Tusculum’s
“romanization” supports the claim that contemporary attitudes towards becoming a
Roman *civitas* were not universally positive. Instead, in this section I aim to demonstrate that the textual sources on Tusculum (all of which postdate the city’s municipalization by centuries) show that the memory of Tusculum’s existence as a civic entity is alternatively presented as characterized both by a history of positive interactions with Rome and by a history of negative interactions with Rome. In these contradictory treatments of Tusculum, an association with the city's cultural memory can become either a positive or a negative characteristic.

**B. Characterizations of Tusculum**

Two distinct trends can be discerned in the corpus of references to Tusculum as a civic entity: on the one hand, a number of these references can be read as depicting pre-Roman Tusculum in a positive light, as a city that was rewarded with Roman citizenship at an early date due to its loyalty and good service and that had a long history of close connection with Rome. On the other hand, a number of references characterize Tusculum's relationship with Rome as primarily negative, associated with betrayal, hostility, and rebellion, and emphasize the characteristics of Tusculum that made it a potentially dangerous enemy to Rome.

Tusculum first appears in the historical record as one of the leading cities of various confederations of Latin cities (known collectively in modern scholarship as the "Latin League") in the Archaic period, and Roman historiographic sources reflect a memory of Tusculum as an active participant in power struggles between Rome and the Latin states in the late regal and early republican periods. Tusculum’s participation in the

---

89 On the extension of Roman citizenship to Italian cities, see generally Sherwin-White 1971.
League is attested by one of the earliest sources on Tusculum, a fragment from Cato’s *Origines*, which names Tusculum among the Latin communities who jointly dedicated the grove of Diana at Aricia.\(^90\) The inclusion of Cora and Pometia on Cato’s list of Latin League cities confirms that the fragment pertains to a period before 495 BCE, as both communities were destroyed sometime shortly after taking up arms against Rome with the Volsci in that year.\(^91\) The same fragment of the *Origines* names Egerius Baebius, whom Cato identifies as a Tusculan (*Tusculanus*), as the "Latin dictator" who performed the dedication of the grove (*lucum Dianium in nemore Aricino Egerius Baebius Tusculanus dedicavit dictator Latinus*). Livy names another Tusculan, Octavius Mamilius, as a commander of Latin forces at the Battle of Lake Regillus in 499 BCE, and identifies Mamilius as the figure responsible for inciting the allied Latin cities to hostility against Rome.\(^92\) Octavius Mamilius also appears in Livy’s account of the reign of

\(^90\) Cato *Orig.* Cornell F36 (=Jordan II F21, Peter F58, Chassignet II F28, Cugusi F62)=Prisc. *GL* 2.129. Cato Censorius...ibidem: *lucum Dianium in nemore Aricino Egerius Baebius Tusculanus dedicavit dictator Latinus. Hi populi committer: Tusculanus, Aricinus, Lanuvinus, Laurens, Coranus, Tiburtis, Pometinus, Ardeatis Rutulus. (Cato the Censor, in the same place: The Tuscan Egerius Baebius, as dictator of the Latin League, dedicated the sacred grove of Diana in the Arician woods. These communities joined in: Tusculum, Aricia, Lanuvium, Lavinium, Cora, Tibur, Pometia, Rutulian Ardea.)

\(^91\) Livy 2.25, Dion. Hal. 6.29. Though archaeological excavation has not identified any evidence for worship of Diana at the site prior to the fourth century BCE, when the earliest sanctuary construction and votive remains are dated (see Coarelli 1987, 165-85), the "grove" (*lucus Dianius*) to which Cato refers may have been dedicated centuries earlier.

\(^92\) Octavius Mamilius is identified first as the "Tuscan general" (Livy 2.19.7 *Tuscalanum ducem*) and then, a few sentences later, as the "Latin general" (2.19.10 *Latinus dux*); see also 2.20.7, where he is identified as the "Latin commander" (*imperator Latinus*) in juxtaposition with "the Roman dictator" (*dictatore Romano*). Livy 2.18.3 attributes the instigation of Latin hostilities against Rome to Mamilius: *supra bell i Latini metum id quoque accesserat, quod triginta iam coniurasse populos concitante Octavio Mamilio satis constabat*. (Additionally, this was also added to fear of war with the Latins
Tarquinius Superbus, as the Roman king is said to have sought an alliance among the Latins by marrying his daughter to the Tusculan leader. Although Octavius Mamilius is identified as a Tusculan by Livy, he is characterized by his importance among the "Latin name," i.e. the Latin community as a whole (1.49.9 *longe princeps Latini nominis*), and the marriage is described in the context of Tarquinius' quest to strengthen his position by securing alliances with the Latin nation (1.49.8 *Latinorum...gentem*). Given his later appearance as a political leader responsible for stirring up all the Latin cities and as a military leader commanding Latin troops in battle, the importance which Livy's Tarquinius attributes to Mamilius should be interpreted not only as a statement about his personal status among the Latins, but also as a statement about the role of Tusculum in the governance of the League at the time. During the time when Mamilius was simultaneously the Tusculan commander and commander of the Latin League, the leadership of Tusculum and the League was one and the same. Though this period was certainly limited—the leadership of the League seems to have rotated on a semi-regular basis (later, when it was a dictatorship, probably annually)—it was sufficient for Tarquinius to identify Mamilius' family as a powerful ally. When Mamilius’ role in Livy and Dionysius’ narratives is considered alongside Cato’s attestation of another Tusculan (Egerius Baebius) in command of the League within a roughly 20-30 year period, it appears that the Roman historiographical tradition disproportionately associates Tusculum with the leadership of the Latin League compared to its other members (traditionally, the League is said to have been as large as thirty cities, but at a minimum,

---that it was well known that thirty cities had already joined in an alliance at the instigation of Octavius Mamilius). See note 69 on the text of this passage.

93 Livy 1.49.9; Dion. Hal. 4.45.1
the fragment in Cato's *Origines* identifies eight members who were jointly responsible for the dedication of Diana's grove at Aricia).  

**C. Remembering Tusculum as a Roman Ally**

A number of the incidents involving Tusculum in Livy’s narrative are compatible with a depiction of Tusculum as a willing and loyal ally to Rome. One recurring motif in these positive depictions is that Tusculum comes to Rome’s defense against enemies from the tribes outside Latium, particularly the Aequi and the Volsci (whose territory lay beyond Tusculum in the upper Anio and upper Liris valleys, respectively). In 358 BCE, the Tusculans are said to have warned the Romans about an impending attack of the Aequi, who had broken their truce with the Romans and were encamped in the territory of Tusculum en route to Rome, and about the betrayal of the neighboring Latin city of Labici, which had allied themselves with the invading army.  

Livy also mentions reports coming from Tusculum in 455 and 449 BCE, though the narrative is less explicit in characterizing these episodes as assistance from Tusculum to Rome (i.e. versus a request for aid, though the strategic location of Tusculum overlooking the Algidus pass may make the two virtually indistinguishable).

Several episodes are also recorded in which, prior to its incorporation as a *municipium*, the independent city of Tusculum provided military aid to Rome (in addition to campaigns undertaken as part of the Latin League, apparently under the terms of the *foedus Cassianum*). Additionally, Tusculum is said to have welcomed and sheltered

---


95 See Livy 4.45-7.
Roman troops after a disastrous defeat at the hands of the Aequi in 449 BCE (Livy 3.42). One aspect of this depiction is an emphasis on the reciprocity between the two states: for example, Tusculum and Rome are shown performing near-identical acts for one another in quick succession during conflicts in 460-59 BCE. The precise similarity of these episodes suggests that they were fictionalized to some extent, but their presence in the historiographic tradition demonstrates an impulse to depict Rome and Tusculum engaging in such mutual aid. Livy describes the first incident in this sequence as an insurrection led by Appius Herdonius in 460 BCE that escalated to the seizure of the Capitolium and the Arx and was ended by the timely intervention of forces from Tusculum. Tusculum’s status as a foreign city is emphasized by Livy’s narration of the passage, which contrasts the intercession of Tusculum, the foreign ally, with several elements of internal strife that surround the occupation of the Capitoline. First and foremost, an alternate tradition existed that characterized the hostile force as an invading troop of Sabines rather than primarily composed of Romans. Livy describes the attackers as disaffected Romans, “exiles and servants...led by Appius Herdonius the Sabine” (3.15.5 exsules servique [...] duce Ap. Herdonio Sabino); Dionysius of Halicarnassus, in contrast, describes the same episode as an invasion of Sabines led by Appius Herdonius that sailed down the Tiber from Sabine territory into Rome “attempt[ing] to destroy the...

96 See Ogilvie 1970, 423: Ogilvie believes the entire episode in Book 3 is fictional and derived from the family history of the Mamilii on the grounds that no other explanation accounts for the presence of a similar episode in Book 1 involving the Tusculan Octavius Mamilius and the Sabine Turnus Herdonius (see Livy 1.49.9), though Ogilvie doubts the historicity of Turnus Herdonius in the earlier episode (see Ogilvie 1970, 191-202) and believes his presence in the story to be a doublet of his more securely attested descendant Appius Herdonius. The episode would have been inserted into the Roman historical tradition from the family history of the Mamilii during the acme of the family’s fortunes in the 3rd century BCE.
hegemony of the Romans” (10.14.1 καταλύσαι τὴν Ῥωμαίων ἡγεμονίαν ἐπεβάλετο). The opening of the episode in Livy focuses on the confusion and terror within the city, amplified by uncertainty about their enemy: panicking amid shouts that hostile forces are inside the city, the Romans are “unsure what sudden trouble—whether foreign or domestic, whether from the hatred of the plebs or servile deceit—had invaded the city” (3.15.7 timebant incerti quod malum repentinum, externum an intestinum, ab odio plebis an ab servili fraude, urbes invasisset). These episodes also emphasize the importance of Tusculum as an ally to her larger neighbor, both before and after the establishment of Tusculum as a municipium. The location of Tusculum in the Alban hills overlooking the Algidus pass made the city a site of tactical importance for Rome’s defense. The fate of Tusculum’s neighbor Labici, which held another strategic location on the northern slopes of the Alban hills, provides an extreme example of Roman reactions to similar cities: after Labici sided with the Aequi against Rome and her allies (including Tusculum), Rome sacked the city and established a colony on its location.

These references, taken together, present a picture of Tusculum as a loyal ally to Rome who held a long tradition of providing military aid to Rome and receiving it in return, willingly left behind her Latin fellows and Romanized, and was located in a position of great strategic importance and benefit to Rome. It is clear that an association

---

98 Oakley 1997, 337; see Livy 4.45-7 for Labici’s destruction and colonization (4.47.5 postero die ad Labicos ductus exercitus oppidumque corona circumdata scalis captum ac direptum est; 4.47.6 censuit frequens coloniam Labicos deducendam). Note also that in Livy 3.25 Tusculum and Labici are discussed in tandem as targets of the Aequi in the territory of Mt. Algidus.
with the image of Tusculum generated by these sources would be a positive attribute for a Roman audience.

**D. Remembering Tusculum as an Enemy of Rome**

In addition to these episodes that characterize Tusculum’s relationship to Rome positively, however, the annalistic tradition also preserves several episodes in which Tusculum is depicted with characteristics that would be received negatively by a Roman audience. Though Tusculum does often come to Rome’s aid as an ally, they are also recorded as having betrayed treaties with Rome on several occasions. The conflict in 381 BCE that ultimately led to Tusculum becoming a Roman *municipium* began when Tusculum, though bound by a treaty with Rome, nevertheless secretly provided forces to aid the Volsci in an attack on Rome. In Livy’s account of this episode, Camillus characterizes the situation as “the Tusculans [having] revolted from their alliance,” when he insists that the Senate must know about the event.\(^9^9\) Even though the Tusculans apparently did not suffer any military penalty for this violation of their treaty with Rome (although the political consequence of being incorporated by Rome could be interpreted as a penalty from the perspective of the Tusculans), they revolted against Roman control again only 40 years later when the Latin cities allied to fight against Rome in 340-338 BCE.

Additionally, many of the same characteristics that make Tusculum a potentially useful ally for Rome could also allow Tusculum to be a formidable opponent. Tusculum’s strategic importance allows it to warn the Romans of incoming invasions.

\(^{99}\) Livy 6.25.2 *ne patres ignari sint Tusculanos ab societate descisse* (lest the senators be unaware that the Tusculans had revolted from the alliance).
from the Volsci and Aequi beyond the Alban hills and oppose those enemies’ progress to Rome.\textsuperscript{100} In the hands of a hostile polity, however, such a location could lead to enemies of Rome being given free reign to approach the city, and the Romans recognized the potential danger posed by Tusculum if the city chose to oppose Rome: when Camillus is alarmed by the appearance of Tuscanian troops among his Volsci prisoners, for example, he is said to be “disturbed by fear of a war so close by” (\textit{cuius tam vicini belli metu Camillus motus}).\textsuperscript{101} The perceived danger posed by the potential alliance of Tusculum to the hostile tribes on the other side of the hills is highlighted by the observation in Livy that the Romans were once frightened by the sight of Tuscanian troops (approaching peaceably as allies) because it looked like the Aequi or the Volsci were approaching.\textsuperscript{102}

Furthermore, the early date of Tusculum’s incorporation takes on different inflections depending on whether the incorporation is interpreted as a reward or as a hostile takeover. A pessimistic reading of Tusculum’s incorporation would lead to considering the early date of incorporation to be related to Tusculum’s ancient and persistent hostility against Rome (which was then countered, as soon as Rome was sufficiently powerful, by the conquest and acquisition of the city). In the case of a more optimistic reading of Tusculum’s incorporation—for example, one that accepts Livy’s statement that the Romans chose to offer the Tusculans peace and then citizenship because the Tusculans did not try to oppose their approaching troops in 381 BCE—the

\textsuperscript{101} Livy 6.25.2. On the topography of Tusculum as a threatening feature, see Section IV in this chapter.
\textsuperscript{102} Livy 3.18.4 \textit{Romam prima luce venientes procul speciem hostium praebuere; Aequi aut Volsci venire visi sunt} (When they were coming to Rome at first light, from far off they offered the appearance of enemies; the Aequi or Volsci seemed to be coming.)
early date of Tusculum’s incorporation becomes another piece of evidence for the antiquity of the friendly relationship between the two cities.\textsuperscript{103} Although it is never explicitly presented as such by a Roman source, Tusculum’s prominence in the archaic Latin League can also be read as potentially threatening. Given the frequency with which the League united for the purpose of opposing Rome in the 6-5\textsuperscript{th} centuries BCE, a strong affiliation with the Latin League could be interpreted as indicating that Tusculum was generally hostile to Rome’s expanding power in Latium, while the amount of influence apparently wielded by Tusculans in the leadership of the League could be seen as evidence that archaic Tusculum was once one of the civic entities capable of challenging Rome for supremacy in central Italy.

Though Livy’s narration describes the integration of Tusculum as a positive event offered by the Romans when faced with a lack of resistance from Tusculum, and Livy’s history frequently characterizes Tusculum’s relationship with Rome in terms that support an overall image of Tusculum as a loyal and useful ally to Rome prior to its integration, the historical tradition as recorded in Livy still includes events that can be read as consistent with a more negative characterization of Tusculum. The possibility of such a negative characterization—one that focuses on Tusculum’s history as an enemy of Rome and reads the city’s early incorporation by Rome as a response to that hostility—is supported by the existence of other narratives of the events of 381 BCE that paint Tusculum’s behavior in a more ambiguous light. Plutarch’s \textit{Life of Camillus}, while it reports substantively similar events—after Rome hears about revolt at Tusculum

\textsuperscript{103} Livy 6.26.8 \textit{Pacem in praesentia nec ita multo post civitatem etiam impetraverunt.} (They [the Tusculans] obtained peace in the present and the citizenship not long afterwards).
Camillus marches on the city but finds it offering no resistance, so the Romans do not go to battle against them—describes the actions of Tusculum in much more negative terms. Plutarch describes the Tusculans as trying to conceal their wrongdoing (τὴν ἁμαρτίαν, i.e. the attempted rebellion) “craftily” (πανούργως) and says that Camillus recognized their treachery (τὴν προδοσίαν), but took pity on them because of their “change of mind” (τὴν μετάνοιαν). At best, this depiction of Tusculum shows the city as cognizant of its own inability to withstand the Romans; at worst, Tusculum is shown to be untrustworthy and deceitful.

III. INDIVIDUALS

In addition to references to Tusculum as a collective, references to individuals associated with Tusculum also appear during the centuries following Rome’s conquest of the city. Such “associations” take many forms—people who held Tuscan citizenship prior to its incorporation by Rome, residents of Tusculum and the owners of Tuscan property, people living elsewhere who had formerly lived at Tusculum, people from families that traced their ancestry to Tusculum, and people associated by others with Tusculum. Nevertheless, they all represent a perceived connection between city and individual. Disentangling the actual historical tie between any given individual and Tusculum is often difficult, even impossible, but is not ultimately necessary; for the purpose of articulating the Roman cultural memory of Tusculum, the perception of an association

104 Plutarch Life of Camillus 38.2 οἱ δὲ Τουσκλανοὶ τὴν ἁμαρτίαν ἐπανορθούμενοι πανούργως, ἡδη βαδίζωντος ἐπὶ αὐτῶν τοῦ Καμίλλου (But the Tusculans, correcting their wrongdoing craftily when Camillus was marching against them...). Cassius Dio describes the same actions of Tusculum as a “remarkable dissimulation” (Cass. Dio 7.28 θαυμάστῃ δὲ τινὶ προσποιήσει).
with Tusculum is the relevant factor. Individuals and families who immigrated to Rome from Tusculum provide the clearest examples: whether these individuals emigrated and sought Roman citizenship prior to 381 BCE or moved after the time when Tusculans held Roman citizenship by birth, the Roman interest in elite family origins and genealogy ensured that their place of origin was known.\textsuperscript{105}

\textit{A. The Gens Mamilia}

The most prominent family of Tusculum in the historical record are the Mamilii, who attained some political success at Rome during the Republic—they produced three consuls in less than 50 years during the 3\textsuperscript{rd} century BCE—and are mentioned by name in several historiographic episodes as political and military leaders of Tusculum. Members of the \textit{gens Mamilia} appear as dictators of Tusculum in the regal period (Octavius Mamilius, in Livy 1.49.9 and Dion. Hal. 4.45.1) and the early Republic (Lucius Mamilius, in Livy 3.15-18 and Dion. Hal. 10.14-16). The Mamilii were also among the first Tusculans to become Roman citizens: the family is said to have received Roman citizenship in 458 BCE as a reward for L. Mamilius’ proactive aid in recovering the Sabine-occupied \textit{arx} in 460 BCE, prior to the entry of Tusculum into the Roman citizen body in 381 BCE.\textsuperscript{106} The \textit{gens Mamilia} traced their own origins in Tusculum to even earlier than the Roman regal period, in the pre-Roman era of Greek heroes occupying the Latin countryside: both Livy and Dionysius of Halicarnassus mention that the Mamilii claimed descent from the city’s founder, Odysseus’ son Telegonus, while Festus adds the

\textsuperscript{105} On elite Roman families and genealogy, see especially Wiseman 1974 and 1983, Flower 1996, and Farney 2007.
detail of a daughter of Telegonus named Mamilia, and this origin story is attested by a variety of poets. The family is therefore in the odd position of being closely associated with the city of Tusculum as an independent civic entity—they claim descent from an ancestor related to the founder, historians tie at least two early rulers of Tusculum to their family, and the epigraphic record attests to their political prominence at Tusculum—and also being recorded as the earliest Tusculans to leave Tusculum for Rome. Through the stories associated with their famous ancestors, the Mamilii are tied to several of the themes that characterize the Roman cultural memory of the city of Tusculum as a civic entity: close ties and reciprocal obligations with Rome (Octavius Mamilius’ alliance with Tarquin, Lucius Mamilius encouraging his fellow citizens to Rome’s aid in 460 BCE), occasional realignment of loyalties with the other Latin cities (Octavius Mamilius’ war against the nascent Roman Republic after Tarquin’s exile), and relatively early adoption of Roman citizenship (the individual grant of citizenship to Lucius Mamilius in gratitude in 458 BCE).

The Mamilii were one of the earliest families in Rome to issue a coin type referencing their origins in Latium, which they accomplished by tying their genealogical origins to the city’s mythological foundation. A member of the family named Lucius Mamilius, like his famous ancestor, issued a series of bronze coins while serving as IIIvir monetalis between 189-180 BCE that illustrate the family’s legendary ancestry. The coins (RRC149) have a reverse showing a man holding a staff and standing on a ship’s prow; the figure is conventionally identified as Odysseus and thought to reference the

107 Livy 1.49.9, Dion. Hal. 4.45.1, Verrius Flaccus apud Festus 116-117L; e.g. Hor. Ep. 1.29 ff., Hor. Carm. 3.29.8 and Porph. loc. cit., Prop. 2.32.4, Ovid Fasti 3.91 and 4.71.
foundation of Tusculum by Odysseus’ son Telegonus. The career of this L. Mamilius is otherwise unknown, but he is probably descended from one of the Mamilii who held the consulship in the 3rd century BCE: L. Mamilius Vitulus (cos. 265), Q. Mamilius Vitulus (cos. 262), or C. Mamilius Turrinus (cos. 239). L. Mamilius’ coins are the earliest recognized examples both of ancestral imagery (a so-called “private type”) and of what Farney identifies as “ethnic” imagery—coin types referring to the moneyer’s origo outside of Rome. While genealogical and ethnic self-advertisement on coins was eventually imitated by a number of other gentes in the Late Republic, there was a gap of several decades after L. Mamilius’ issue before the apparent innovation began to be duplicated in the 130s. That this coin is the first known example of both ancestral and ethnic coin types echoes the close connection between the Mamilii and the town of Tusculum itself found in other media. Like the Caesii and the Cestii of Praeneste (see Chapter Three, Section III.B), the Mamilii of Tusculum tell a family history that places them outside Rome, but as peers and rivals of the legendary heroes of early Rome claimed by families like the Julii, Fabii, and Aemilii. A later member of the gens Mamilia, C. Mamilius C.f. Limetanus, issued coins in 82 BCE showing Odysseus that seem to allude to the same legendary ancestry (from Odysseus to Telegonus to Mamilia) and connections with Tusculum’s foundation. The continuity of ancestral themes in

109 Farney 2007, 252.
111 Farney 2007, 265. This later coin type may suggest that the family was emphasizing the continuity of their lineage back to a divine ancestor (cf. the Julii and Venus through Aeneas): C. Mamilius Limetanus’ coins (RRC 362) show Mercury on the obverse and Odysseus on the reverse, and by the 5th century BCE genealogists and poets had begun to
these coins, separated by a century, is notable in light of the family’s declining fortunes during that time period. The height of the gens Mamilia seems to have occurred in the middle of the 3rd century BCE, when the family produced three consuls; in the late 3rd century BCE, two Mamilii held the praetorship, but the moneyer L. Mamilius is otherwise the only family member of any recorded political success before the end of the 2nd century BCE.\footnote{112} The continuity with earlier generations of his gens emphasized by C. Mamilius Limetanus demonstrates the perceived value in Rome of an ongoing association with this once-powerful family who had formerly led a once-powerful Latin city.

The frequency and diversity of references to ancestors of the Mamilii in the Roman historical record suggests the presence of a body of information about the family’s history, whether as informal family tradition or as a written work commissioned by the family. A fragment of Cato’s Origines alluding to the introduction of the Mamilii to Roman citizenship demonstrates that the story of Lucius Mamilius’ reward for his good deed to the Roman people was circulating by the first half of the 2nd century BCE.\footnote{113} Smith characterizes the Mamilii as particularly good self-promoters and ascribes

\footnote{112} Farney 2008a, 250 and 252. Farney argues that by the early 1st century BCE, the era of the moneyer C. Mamilius Limetanus, the Mamilii may have been actively working to carve out a political niche for their family in issues involving legal land boundaries (limites) and promoting their association with their legendary ancestor Mercury because of the god’s association with various types of limites (252-4).

\footnote{113} Cato Orig. Cornell F25 (=Jordan I F24, Peter F25, Chassignet I F26, Cugusi F29; Prisc. GL 2.227) Nam de omni Tusculana ciuitate soli Lucii Mamilii beneficium gratum
their prominence in the historical record to a more successful campaign than most of the
bids for historical recognition being launched by elite families from the areas around
Rome; he associates the origins of their attempts to publicize their genealogy with a
hypothesized entrance into Roman politics in the 4th century BCE, shortly after the
incorporation of Tusculum. Traditions that seem to date to very early periods of
Roman history include references to the Mamilii: the family name of the gens Mamila
appears in Festus’ description of a tradition centering on the sacrifice of a horse, referred
to by Festus as the “October horse” (October equus), in a place-name associated with the
ritual (the Turris Mamilia). After the horse is selected by competition in a race,
sacrificed, and decapitated, two teams composed of residents of the Via Sacra and Subura
fight to bring its head to the Regia and a building known as the Turris Mamilia,
respectively. Modern interpretations have generally characterized the origins of the
October horse sacrifice as agrarian, military, or regal (e.g. Dumézil, who sees the practice
as derived from a proto-Indo-European horse sacrifice ritual for the benefit of the
king). The rite struck even ancient commentators as archaic and out of character with

\textit{fuit.} (For out of the whole Tuscan community, the service of Lucius Mamilius alone
was welcome.) Cato himself was closely connected with Tusculum, but given the
extremely fragmentary nature of the surviving text, it is unclear how that affiliation may
have shown up in the treatment of Tusculum in the \textit{Origines}.

\textsuperscript{114} Smith 1996, 176.
\textsuperscript{115} Festus recorded that the building got its name from a member of the family (Paulus ex
\textit{Fest.} 117L: \textit{Mamilia turris intra Suburae regionem a Mamilio nomen accepit}, “The
Turris Mamilia in the Subura gets its name from a Mamilius”); see also \textit{LTUR} s.v. \textit{Turris
Mamilia}.
\textsuperscript{116} Dumézil 1975: Dumézil offers parallels to the Vedic \textit{as'vamedha} ceremony. Festus is
cited in support of both of the first two explanations, as he characterizes the sacrifice as a
harvest festival but also claims that a horse is an appropriate sacrifice because of its
military connotation, while Polybius records Timaeus’ association of the horse sacrifice
with the Trojan horse (Festus 190L, Timaeus, \textit{apud} Polybius 12.4b).
the majority of Roman religion: Timaeus’ suggestion, for example, that the slaughter of
the horse was an act of vicarious revenge for the Trojan horse is dismissed by the ancient
authors whose citations preserve his opinion. However, the form in which Timaeus’
suggestion is preserved (cited in other historians as evidence for one interpretation of the
festival’s origins) suggests that the Romans were unsure of the original context of the
October horse by the late Republic, though they believed it to be a very old ritual.

One of the more confusing aspects of the ceremony is the presence of the two
opposing factions seeking to bring the severed horse head to either the Regia (the
inhabitants of the Via Sacra) or a building called the Turris Mamilia (the inhabitants of
the Subura). The two sites do not seem to be parallel in importance or significance; if the
ceremony is derived from a regal ritual for the well-being of the king, for example, it is
odd to see an obscure landmark competing with the marked location of the archaic
Roman king’s house at the Regia. The fighting teams must also postdate the original
ceremony by centuries, both as there are no parallels in other Indo-European cultures and
as it incorporates elements of Roman topography and history from the regal period and
early Republic. The context in which a tower named after the gens Mamilia became an
antagonistic pair for the Regia should therefore be somewhere in the period when the
Mamilii could be thought of as “equals” of the inhabitants of the Regia, the kings of
Rome. Given the way in which the Mamilii and Tusculum are depicted during the regal
period and early Republic in Roman sources, it seems that Tusculum and the Mamilii
may have once had sufficient stature to challenge Rome and her kings. The Mamilii of

117 Pascal 1981, 262.
Tusculum are depicted in Roman historiography as having been legitimate peers to their Roman contemporaries. The Roman memory of Tusculum as an independent city suggests that the Romans characterized it as a peer if not a near-equal, and it is also clear that Tusculum, at times, turned against Rome and allied with her enemies. The memory of Tusculum led by a Mamilius sweeping in and rescuing the Romans from a siege must coexist with a memory of Tusculum led by an earlier Mamilius sheltering Rome’s exiled king and allying with him against the new Republic. In the competition between the two teams, then, the Turris Mamilia seems to represent the “stronghold” of a faction once based outside of Rome and capable of opposing the Roman kings headquartered at the Regia—the gens Mamilia and the Tusculans. The antagonistic relationship between the “Mamilian faction” and the team fighting on behalf of the Regia represents a sort of reenactment of a former state of affairs in which the Mamilians, and presumably the Tusculans with them, had the ability to stand on an equal footing and compete with the Roman kings for a symbolic offering, not an “sham battle.”

Dumézil proposes that the fight over the horse head is meant to re-enact the Roman defeat of an enemy (probably the Mamilii and the Tusculans). Regardless of the original purpose of the ritual, the continued recreation of the “battle” between two factions and the persistence of the name of the Mamilian tower provides both an ongoing physical reminder and yearly reenactment of the former status of the Mamilii as outsiders.

---

119 Pascal 1981, 280. Even if it is not clear exactly what the horse head represents in the imagined/re-enacted conflict, the significance of the slaughtered horse as a symbol (of vitality, fertility, kinghood, military might, etc.) is agreed upon by all authors who discuss the October horse.

120 Dumézil 1975, 153.
In addition to being associated with the first family to mint “private issues” that seem designed to depict the moneyer’s ethnic origin in a Latin city, Tusculum also produced an exceptionally large number of families that refer to their Tusculan *origo* in numismatic iconography. A total of seven moneyers from four families, including the Mamilii, issued coins with iconography associated with Tusculum between the 180s and 40s BCE.121 In addition to the coinage of the Mamilii depicting Odysseus, members of three families connected to Tusculum (the Cordii, Fonteii, and Servii) minted coins with iconography associated with the Dioscuri, who had a major cult center at Tusculum. Farney suggests that the Dioscuri were the most easily recognizable iconographic allusion to Tusculum for families that could not make a specific claim to participation in Tusculum’s history, as the Mamilii could, and were thereby adopted by such families when they wanted to depict a connection to the city.122 The Cordii have no known genealogical claims to prominence in early Tusculan history and are known almost entirely from coinage. The only member of the *gens Cordia* from the Republic that can be positively identified is Mn. Cordius Rufus, who issued denarii depicting the Dioscuri wearing laureate pilei on the obverse as *Illir monetalis* in 46 BCE. The connections between the *gens Cordia* and Tusculum are supported by a 1st-century BCE inscription found at Tusculum that records a M’. Cordius Rufus (either this man or a family member who was his contemporary) who held the praetorship and a proconsular position.123

121 RRC149, RRC290/1-5, RRC307/1a-d, RRC353, RRC362, RRC463/1, RRC515/1-2.
122 Farney 2007, 70.
123 See RRC 463/1; *ILLRP* 414: *M. ’ Cordius M.’f. Rufus pr. procos. aed. lustr. mon. sacr.*
In contrast, the gens Fonteia, whose members issued several coins very similar to the Dioscuri type issued by Mn. Cordius Rufus, were politically active in the Late Republic: members of the gens include P. Fonteius, who facilitated P. Clodius Pulcher’s election to the tribunate by adopting the patrician into a plebeian family, and M. Fonteius, who was defended by Cicero of charges related to his propraetorship in Gallia Narbonensis. Coins with heads of the Dioscuri were issued by a C. Fonteius in 114/113 BCE (RRC290/1-5: denarii with janiform head of the Dioscuri on the obverse) and his cousin Mn. Fonteius in 108/107 BCE (RRC 307/1a-d: denarii with jugate laureate heads of the Dioscuri on the obverse). Gaius’ denarii and the first subtype of Manius’ denarii have a ship on the reverse, which Crawford identifies as an allusion to the transmarine origin of the city founder Telegonus, but the rarer second subtype of denarii issued by Manius depict a ship carrying a doliolum in the stern, which probably represent the doliolum thought to have carried the sacra of Troy to Italy with Aeneas. The M. Fonteius known from Cicero’s Pro Fonteio was tried under the Lex Cornelia de Repetundis on charges of corruption during his term as provincial governor in Gaul. Cicero refers to M. Fonteius’ Tusculan origin in his defense in a list of reasons for the jury to treat Fonteius with leniency; the list both explicitly claims that the virtues of M. Fonteius’ ancestors, as well as his own good deeds, ought to sway them in the defendant’s favor and implies that association with a family with a virtuous past is

124 RRC 307/1-d; see Crawford 2001, 316-7.
126 MRR 2.60, 78, 97, 104. Cicero mentions this M. Fonteius served as triumvir monetalis between 88-84 BCE, but none of the coin types he issued are known—see Crawford 2001, 78 and 619 for discussion. Also see Brennan 2000, 509-11 on the dates of Fonteius’ three-year term as praetor in Gaul: suggestions range from (at the earliest) late in the year 77 BCE through the end of 75 BCE to 74 through 72 BCE.
beneficial to the public image of a contemporary figure. The first reason that appears on Cicero’s list is “the antiquity of his family, which we see engraved and recorded in monuments of their deeds, having begun from Tusculum, a most honorable municipium” (primum generis antiquitas, quam Tusculo, ex clarissimo municipio, profectam in monumentis rerum gestarum incisam ac notatam videmus). Membership in a venerable and accomplished Tuscan gens is presented as a mitigating factor in Fonteius’ defense, and Tusculum itself is referred to as a city with a special place of honor to the Romans.

The iconography of the coinage of L. Servius Rufus, who minted aurei and denarii in 41 BCE (RRC515/1-2), is more difficult to interpret. Both coins types have depictions of the Dioscuri—the obverse of the aureus shows the Dioscuri with laureate pilei, and the reverse of the denarius shows the Dioscuri standing with spears and swords—but the aureus (RRC515/1) combines the obverse Dioscuri type with a reverse depicting a turreted city gate labeled with the letters TUSCUL on the gate, while the denarius (RRC515/2) joins the reverse image of the Dioscuri to an obverse with a bearded male head facing right. The aureus clearly refers to Tusculum, and makes that reference explicit through the legend on the gate. The simplest reading of the coin interprets it as the same type of reference made by the Fontei and Cordii in their coins depicting the Dioscuri to the city of Tusculum and their family’s origins in the city, but the interpretation of L. Servius Rufus’ coins is complicated by disagreement over his

127 Cic. Font. 41.1
128 RRC515/1 (aureus); obverse: legend L·SERVIVS RVFVS, jugate heads of the Dioscuri right, wearing laureate pilei, border of dots; Reverse: TVSCVL, view of Tusculum, with inscribed gate, border of dots. RRC515/2 (denarius); obverse: legend L·SERVIVS RVFVS, male head right, bearded, border of dots; reverse: Dioscuri standing facing, each holding spear and with sword hanging from waist, border of dots.
connection to the Sulpicii, who frequently used Servius as a praenomen. The Sulpicii were associated with the history of Tusculum not by origins in the city but through the actions of their ancestor Servius Sulpicius Rufus, who led the Roman army to the city’s rescue as consular tribune when the city was seized by rebelling Latins in 377 BCE. Whether the L. Servius Rufus who issued these coins meant for them to be read as suggesting a connection to Tusculum through ancestors who lived in the town or ancestors who ran to its support, however, the coin assumes the same background of close connection between the Romans and Tusculans that underlies the telling of Servius Sulpicius Rufus’ rescue of Tusculum as part of a series of reciprocal military obligations performed by the Romans and Tusculans.

C. Tusculans in Roman Politics

The strength and persistence of such associations between some elite Roman families and the municipium of Tusculum demonstrates that connections with the city had some potential benefit; literary references such as the one found in the Pro Fonteio and other speeches of Cicero clarify what sort of assumptions the Roman public was expected to make about families associated with Tusculum. In the Pro Plancio, Cicero claims that Tusculan ancestry could be expected to serve as a source of political advantage for the plaintiff, M. Iuventius Laterensis, over his client Cn. Plancius, a citizen of the city of Atina in Latium adiectum. In fact, Iuventius’ status as a member of the Tusculan elite gave him such confidence in the election that he assumed fraud when Plancius won. Cicero ultimately goes on to argue that his client’s lowly origins actually helped him win.

129 Livy 6.33 records the story. On the association of the praenomen Servius and the gens Sulpicia, see also Tacitus Hist 2.48, Plutarch Galba 3.1.
the election, as Plancius’ birth in such an insignificant town ensured that his countrymen
would turn out to the election *en masse* to support him, while the people of Tusculum,
having produced several consular families, are less impressed by a local candidate for the
aedileship.\textsuperscript{130} In setting up this argument, however, Cicero assumes that the Roman
audience—like Iuventius himself—would have expected Tusculan origins to convey a
political prestige. Though several features distinguish Tusculum from Atina, Cicero
identifies three factors that are responsible for the former’s elevated status: Atina is not
as ancient (*prisca*), “honored” (*honorata*), or close in proximity to the city of Rome
(*suburbana*) as Tusculum.\textsuperscript{131} *Honorata* in this usage may mean distinguished and
respected in a general sense, or may have the more specific meaning of “honored by
political offices,” i.e. Tusculum has been honored by having a great number of its citizens
attain political office (which would certainly be a true statement—only one family from
Atina, the Sentii Saturnini, is known to have reached praetorian rank by the time of
Plancius’ election, while Tusculum was home to at least five consular families). If Cicero
refers here specifically to the offices held by citizens from Tusculum, then he is referring
to an assumption held by Iuventius and the Roman audience (admittedly, one that he
immediately refutes) that Roman citizens from Tusculum were particularly likely to
attain public office. In naming these three characteristics, Cicero situates Tusculum
among the suburban cities of *Latium Vetus* that have an extended relationship with Rome
and have had centuries to establish family connections and pursue political success, in
contrast to the newcomers from cities that are both geographically and culturally more

\textsuperscript{130} Cic. *Planc.* 8.19
\textsuperscript{131} See *TLL* s.v. *honoratus* I.A.2.a.
distant. The prestige associated with Tusculum’s status as the first *municipium cum suffragio* seems to outweigh the competing theme in the historical tradition of Tusculum’s frequent alliances with Rome’s enemies.

**D. Cicero and Tusculum**

Cicero himself was affected by this hierarchy of suburban sites as a *novus homo* from the rural site of Arpinum, and seems to have “adopted” Tusculum as a second homeland outside of Rome—a more prestigious waystation between the center of Rome and the more peripheral *Latium adiectum*. In the late Republic, Tusculum experienced a surge in the construction of large-scale luxury villas occupied by Roman elites from across central Italy (see Section IV for further discussion). Among the known owners of these villas, Cicero is famous for his connection to the town, in part due to the extensive references to Tusculum in his own writings. In addition to the role which Tusculum plays in his legal arguments in the *Pro Plancio* and the *Pro Fonteio*, Tusculum appears frequently in other genres of Cicero’s writing: one of his philosophical works (the *Tusculan Disputations*) is framed as an extensive discussion held at his Tusculan villa, his letters to friends and family refer to travel and business affairs associated with Tusculum, and he often describes Tusculum and his villa as a source of peace and leisure in the midst of a politically chaotic life. While Arpinum is described in contrast to Rome as rustic and rugged, Tusculum—though it serves as a retreat from the chaos of urban life at Rome—is a place for the more luxurious peace suggested by *otium*, a place where Cicero practices philosophy, reads literature, and admires art collected for him from Greece.\(^{132}\) Cicero’s

---

\(^{132}\) On Arpinum, see e.g. Cic. *ad Att.* 2.11, 15-16.
home at Tusculum is a consciously chosen home away from Rome: sufficiently separated from the city center to allow for the sort of the leisure appropriate to the elite political class but not compatible with the negotium that consumes life at Rome, and a more prestigious location than his actual birthplace. By choosing to locate his villa at Tusculum and make frequent reference to his life there, Cicero associates himself with the same group of Latin elites who were remembered as sharing a long history of mutual cooperation with Rome and had attained considerable political success at Rome after their city’s incorporation as a municipium cum suffragio.

**E. Cato and Tusculum**

Tusculum also features prominently in the biographical tradition of Cato the Elder. Nepos’ life of Cato begins by characterizing the historian as “born in the municipium of Tusculum” (ortus municipio Tusculo) before he lived in Sabine territory on inherited land and then moved to Rome to pursue a political career.133 In Velleius Paterculus, Cato’s origins at Tusculum are cited as an example of the Roman meritocracy: after declaring that Romans have long judged that which is the best (quod optimum sit) to be the most noble (nobilissimum), he provides a list of Republican figures who were celebrated as excellent Romans because of their good qualities and achievements, although they were born to less noble families or in less prestigious locations.134 Cato appears in this list, described as “a new man and also foreign-born, from Tusculum” (mox M. Catonem, novum etiam Tusculo urbis inquilinum), alongside examples including the new man Ti.

---

134 Vell. Pat. 2.128.1 neque novus hic mos senatus populique Romani est putandi, quod optimum sit, esse nobilissimum (nor is this a novel habit of the Senate and people of Rome—thinking that which is the best to be the most noble).
Coruncanius (*hominem novum*), the equestrian-born Spurius Carvilius (*equestri loco natum*), and C. Marius, who came from an obscure family (*ignotae originis*). Valerius Maximus says of Cato’s rise to political success that he “made his name, which was ignoble in Tusculum, the noblest in Rome” (*qui nomen suum Tusculi ignobile Romae nobilissimum reddidit*). Cato’s origins in Tusculum—in particular, his birth in Tusculum—are presented in Valerius Maximus and Velleius Paterculus as part of a narrative of progress from the Latin countryside upwards towards success at Rome: in Cato’s day, families from Latin cities, like families of *novi homines*, start from humbler beginnings and climb their way up to the top of the Roman political elite through hard work and virtue. Cato’s reputation for austerity and stern virtue represents the best aspects of the heritage of *Latium vetus* harnessed for the advantage of Rome, the occasionally harsh strength of the early republican Tusculans diverted towards the greater good of the Roman state. Cicero’s image of Tusculum and Tusculan ancestry echoes the exemplarity of Tusculan natives who sought political success at Rome found in Velleius Paterculus’ narrative, but by Cicero’s day—more than a century later—this ascension of Tusculans to the height of Roman power had become commonplace. Tusculum was physically close to Rome, had been politically united with Rome from an early date, and was being described in contemporary histories as an ally of Rome even before the date of its incorporation.

**IV. TOPOGRAPHY AND MONUMENTS**

When Strabo’s *Geography* discusses the cities surround Rome, he identifies Tusculum as one of three cities in Latium—Tibur, Praeneste, and Tusculum—that are visible to people

---

135 Vell. Pat. 2.128.2  
136 Val. Max. 3.4.6
in Rome: ἐν ὤψει δ’ εἰσὶ τοῖς ἐν Ρώμῃ Τίβουρά τε καὶ Πραινεστὸς καὶ Τοῦσκλον. The reference to eyesight highlights the potential threat posed by cities close enough to launch an attack on Rome. In Florus’ epitome of Livy, Pyrrhus is said to have looked out (prospexit) upon Rome from the citadel of Praeneste (one of Strabo’s listed cities), and Rome is described as being already nearly conquered once Pyrrhus was within eyesight of Rome: the cities are so close that the cloud of smoke and dust raised by Pyrrhus’ army at Praeneste can be seen at Rome as a looming threat. Cities that are “within sight” of Rome are also cities whose physical proximity makes them a potential risk—if they choose to attack Rome, their armies can be right at Rome’s gates within the day—and their very visibility serves as a permanent reminder of their looming presence and the latent threat it represents. Strabo describes Tusculum as even closer to Rome than Tibur and Praeneste; situated on a “ridge” (ῥάχις) separated from the hilly territory of the other two cities by a valley, and “not badly equipped” (οὐ φαύλως κατεσκευασμένη).

A. Defensibility and Strategic Location

Tusculum’s topography provided both offensive and defensive natural advantages. The city was built on a long plateau on the northwestern ridge of the Alban Hills: at the eastern end of the ridge, a higher peak formed the acropolis, while the remainder of the...
ridge was occupied by the town’s civic center. The acropolis was accessible only from the west and had natural defenses to the north, east, and south in the form of sharp cliffs. Tusculum’s physical location, naturally fortified and elevated above the valleys below, allowed it to overlook the lowlands of the Roman Campagna to the north and control the routes south through the Alban hills to Campania, including the Algidus Pass. Tusculum therefore effectively controlled a stretch of the Via Latina, which connected Rome to the Mons Albanus and the sanctuary of Jupiter Latiaris. The geographic importance of Tusculum’s site is demonstrated by the battles that took place in the Algidus pass adjacent to the city: Livy records episodes in 458 BCE (3.25-9) and 431 BCE (4.27-9), for example, in which the area is the turning point at which the Romans turn back the hostile tribes beyond the Alban hills (in 458 BCE, the Aequi; in 431 BCE, the Aequi and the Volsci.)

In addition to the natural defenses of the surrounding hills, particularly the cliffs on three sides of the acropolis, Tusculum was also encircled by walls whose earliest phases date to the 5th or 4th century BCE. The construction of defensive walls in *opus quadratum* in this period is consistent with a number of other sites in Latium and southern Etruria as well as with the historiographic record of increased conflict between Rome and the cities of the Latin League; however, the continued repair of the walls through at least the 2nd century BCE (attested by the use of concrete) demonstrates that they were not allowed to fall into disrepair after Tusculum’s integration as a Roman

---

140 Valenti 2003, 98; Ribaldi 2008, 9.
141 Quilici and Quilici Gigli 1993 (for the walls generally); for the date of the walls and subsequent repairs in concrete, see Quilici and Quilici Gigli 1993, 256-258 and Ribaldi 2008, 22-23
municipium eliminated the theoretical primary threat of their 5th-4th century construction date. Quilici and Quilici Gigli’s topographic study characterizes the portion of the acropolis wall that separates the acropolis from the remainder of the city center as deliberately monumental, designed to make the acropolis look like a well-fortified fortress above the rest of the city (though the remainder of the city is itself surrounded by a circuit of walls).\textsuperscript{142} Literary references to the defensibility of Tusculum suggest that the advantages presented by city’s walls and cliffs were recognized and remembered by Roman authors. The strength of Tusculum’s defenses is said to have prevented Hannibal from taking the city on his march towards Rome: Livy says only that when Hannibal attacked Tusculum, he was not admitted within the walls (\textit{nec receptus moenibus}), but Silius Italicus describes an actual attack on Tusculum being thwarted by an inability to breach the walls before Hannibal’s army had to rush onwards to Rome (\textit{linquens Telegoni pulsatos ariete muros}, abandoning the walls of Telegonus that had been struck by the ram).\textsuperscript{143}

The topography of Tusculum is clearly linked, in Strabo’s account, to the topography of two other cities that seem to have taken advantage of the strategic advantages afforded by that topography to gather power over smaller neighboring towns and to resist oncoming Roman armies at several points in the republic. The same proximity to Rome and naturally fortified location is a frequent trope in other genres of literary references to Praeneste and Tibur, but this potentially threatening physical situation is not a similarly recurring topic in discussions of Tusculum, perhaps due to

\textsuperscript{142} Quilici and Quilici Gigli 1993, 245-247, 269
\textsuperscript{143} Livy 26.9.12; Sil. Pun. 12.534-537.
Tusculum’s shorter history of resistance to Rome. Over several centuries of Roman conflict with Tibur and Praeneste, the cities’ repeated alliances with Rome’s enemies and continuous refusal to join the Roman citizen body is directly and indirectly tied to the military advantages posed by the physical characteristics of each city’s site; Strabo himself describes the topography of both Praeneste and Tibur making the cities “well-fortified.”\textsuperscript{144} Tibur’s topography—high walls set above precipitous cliffs and rocky waterfalls—appears in Vergil (roughly contemporaneous with Strabo’s Geography) alongside descriptions of fierce Tiburtine warriors fighting the early intrusions of Aeneas’ proto-Romans into Latium.\textsuperscript{145} Praeneste’s mountainous terrain and system of subterranean tunnels is linked to the briefly successful fortification of the city against Sulla by the younger Marius’ troops.\textsuperscript{146} Tusculum, on the other hand, is said to have entered a formal political and military union with Rome in 381 BCE, and—despite a history of frequent hostility to Rome before that point, and despite a few rebellions against Rome after that point—there is also a recurring element of reciprocity and loyalty in the cultural memory of Tusculum as a civic entity, and this set of characteristics seems to be the one that is more often associated with the topography of Tusculum in Roman sources. In addition to the military advantages provided by its location, Tusculum’s site also provided fields of soil made fertile by local volcanic activity. Strabo describes Tusculum’s terrain as fertile (εὔγεως) and well-watered (εὐδρος).\textsuperscript{147} Numerous literary references discuss the various agricultural products of the region, including trees, flowers,

\textsuperscript{144} Strabo 5.3.11
\textsuperscript{145} See Chapter Two, Section IV.
\textsuperscript{146} See Chapter Three, Section IV.
\textsuperscript{147} Strabo 5.3.12 τὸ γάρ Τούσκλον ἐνταύθα ἐστὶ λόφος εὐγεως καὶ εὐδρος,
fruits, and vegetables. Waterways flowing through Tusculan territory, supplemented by the presence of several aqueducts, ensured a steady supply of water for these fields.

B. Religious Sites at Tusculum

Few features of the physical space of archaic Tusculum are recorded in Roman sources, though excavations have provided archaeological evidence for a significant Iron Age settlement on the site. Early Tusculum plays a central political role in various iterations of a “Latin League,” on the other hand, in several sources (see Section II.A in this chapter) and Pliny identifies a sacred grove at Tusculum that he claims was consecrated “by Latium” (sacratus a Latio). While the goddess’ worship at Tusculum is not as well-known as at Nemi and Aricia, it is attested by inscriptions, including at least one of republican date. The Dioscuri were also associated with Tusculum from an early date, and their cult at Tusculum is attested in literary references through the Late Republic (Cicero mentions a temple of Castor and Pollux at Tusculum in the De Divinatione as the

---

149 Literary sources refer to a water source called the Crabra, probably a natural feature rather than an aqueduct (Frontin. Aq. 9, Cic. Leg. Agr. 3.2.9, Cic. Balb. 45). On the history of scholarship on the Crabra, see Notarian 2011, 78 and Evans 2002, 72, 246-248. 150 There is pottery evidence for habitation on the acropolis as early as the 8th century BCE (Quilici and Quilici Gigli 1990, 208-209) and for activity in the area of the forum by the 7th-6th centuries BCE, probably the construction of an archaic temple in opus quadratum.
151 Pliny NH 16.91.242 Est in suburbano Tusculani agri colle, qui Corne appellatur, lucus antiqua religione Dianae sacratus a Latio (There is a grove in the suburban Tusculan territory on a hill (which is called Corne) that was consecrated by Latium to the ancient worship of Diana).
152 ILLRP 361-2 no. 101; CIL XIV 2633=ILS 7317a.
site of a prodigy, for example).\textsuperscript{153} Excavations have uncovered the foundations of a very early temple built in \textit{opus quadratum} on the acropolis; the excavated material does not identify the dedicatee of the temple, but most scholars agree that such an early and centrally located temple must be dedicated to Jupiter or to the Dioscuri, based on the literary and epigraphic evidence for cult activity at Tusculum.\textsuperscript{154} The tie between the Dioscuri and Tusculum was apparently so recognizable that several families who traced their origins to Tusculum issued coins that depict the Dioscuri and have been identified as examples of “private types” alluding to ethnic origins (see Section III. in this chapter). Tusculum’s importance as a religious center did not end with Tusculum’s independence; in fact, Tusculum seems to have asserted continued relevance as a cult site for the Dioscuri well into the Late Republic. An inscription attests the presence of statues of the Dioscuri in the theatre at the city center, and Cicero mentions the worship of the Dioscuri at Tusculum in the \textit{De Divinatione}.\textsuperscript{155} Despite the continually fading political relevance of Tusculum, the city’s topography continued to assert a religious role for the \textit{municipium} in the broader Roman world.

\textbf{C. Aristocratic Villas at Tusculum in the Late Republic}

In the late Republic, Tusculum emerged as a popular site for elite Roman families to hold suburban properties, particularly large villas that served as retreats from city life. Cicero’s Tusculan villa is the most famous example, due to Cicero’s frequent references to his life at Tusculum: he discusses matters related to the business and administration of the villa

\textsuperscript{153} Cic. \textit{Div.} 1.43.98  
\textsuperscript{154} Quilici and Quilici Gigli 1990, 209-210; Ribaldi 2008, 24.  
\textsuperscript{155} \textit{CIL} 14.2620, 2629, 2637, 2639, 2918; 1. Cic. \textit{Div.} 1.98
in letters, mentions the seizure of his Tusculan villa alongside his Palatine house in his speeches after returning from exile, mentions his presence at Tusculum and explains his travel plans to and from the suburban villa, describes his Tusculan villa as a site of relaxation and happiness for him, and places philosophical works in the peaceful setting of his countryside retreat at Tusculum (most obviously the Tusculan Disputations).\textsuperscript{156} Cicero’s relationship to Tusculum in his writing is perhaps best expressed as he says of the (physical) city in a letter to Atticus: “thus, again and again I return to my Tusculan villa” (\textit{itaque revolvor identidem in Tusculanum}).\textsuperscript{157}

Both archaeological and literary sources testify to the appearance of a substantial collection of elite villas at Tusculum in the late Republic even earlier than the emergence of the more widespread \textit{villa suburbana} culture of the very late Republic/Augustan era.\textsuperscript{158} The incorporation of Tusculum as a \textit{municipium} at an earlier date than any other communities in Latium meant that Tusculum had been legally and politically intertwined with Rome for several generations longer than the next earliest \textit{municipia} (including only formerly independent polities, not communities established as Roman colonies) in Latium, which are said to have been established in the aftermath of the Roman-Latin wars that ended in 338 BCE. In Imperial literature, Tusculum appears in several authors on lists of towns that have become firmly established as popular suburban retreats for the

\textsuperscript{156} Administration of villa at Tusculum: e.g. \textit{Att.} 1.1.5, 9.9.4, 4.2.5-7, 12.37.2. Seizure of villa and house: e.g. Cic. \textit{Red. Sen.} 18, Cic. \textit{Dom.} 62, 124. Travel to/from Tusculum: e.g. \textit{Att.} 2.8.2, 2.9.4, 4.13.1, 5.1.3, \textit{et al.} Leisure and pleasure at Tusculum: e.g. \textit{Att.} 1.2.1, \textit{Att.} 12.3.1, \textit{Repub.} 1.1. Philosophy and other intellectual work at Tusculum: e.g. Cic. \textit{Top.} 1.1, \textit{Brut.} 293-4

\textsuperscript{157} Cic. \textit{Att.} 13.26.1

\textsuperscript{158} See especially Champlin 1992 and Spencer 2010; for the connection between this and the previous topic, see also Farrell 2014 on the literary connections between the \textit{suburbium} and the past.
Roman elite. In Statius’ fourth book of *Silvae*, he describes people departing the city for summer retreats in Tusculum, Praeneste, Tibur, Nemi, and Mt. Algidus. These sites are described as verdant and breezy environments in which Romans flee the city’s clamor and the summer sun: though several of these cities are substantial urban presences in their own right, and the sharp increase in construction of large villas made the environment significantly more suburban than rural, the cities outside Rome are construed as sufficiently peripheral to allow for relaxation and leisure in contrast to the “center of world” at Rome. In Martial 10.30, Formiae is compared favorably to other calm retreats from one’s cares including Tusculum, Praeneste, Tibur, and Algidum, implying that these cities were already famed as such retreats. A letter from Pliny compares a new villa in Etruria favorably to those he owns in Tusculum, Tibur, and Praeneste, suggesting that Tusculum was among some countryside retreats that were so thoroughly dedicated to the leisure of the upper class that they had become practically crowded with vacationers. This accumulation of authors mentioning Tusculum as a site of wealthy villa retreats suggests that the prevailing image of the city in this time period was that of a peaceful country town, not a powerful former enemy. The town is not only depicted as fully subjugated to Rome, but as lacking any potential to be a threat in the future. As Matthew Notarian has observed, this change in Tusculum’s role incorporates an inversion of the significance of the city’s topography: the same commanding location that once

159 Stat. *Silv.* 4.4.15-7
161 Mart. 10.30.1-7.
162 Pliny *Ep.* 5.6.45 *Habes causas cur ego Tuscos meos Tuscanalis Tiburtinis Praenestinisque praeponam.* (I have reasons why I prefer my Tuscan villa to those in Tusculum, Tibur, and Praeneste).
gave the archaic Latin settlement control over significant lowland highways and protected it from assault was now responsible for providing “panoramas [that] attracted members of the elite who valued them for more aesthetic reasons.” In both cases, however, the physical space of the city is directly tied to its role in relation to Rome.

The list of elite political families who held villas at Tusculum is extensive, and their ownership was clearly a point of pride: so many individuals refer to their villas at Tusculum in their own writing, and so many authors mention villas at Tusculum owned by others, that it is possible to construct a fairly long list of Romans who owned Tuscan villas based exclusively on literary evidence without any recourse to the archaeological data from excavations of those villas. Cicero’s ownership of a villa in Tusculum at which he spent extended periods of time is well attested in his own writings, and he mentions the owners of other villas at Tusculum as well. Pliny claims that Sulla had a villa at Tusculum; Plutarch, Pliny, and Columella mention Lucullus owned a Tuscan villa; and both Cicero and Frontinus refer to Varro’s Tuscan villa, as does Varro himself. Tusculum’s popularity extended into the empire: members of the imperial family who are said to have owned property or spent leisure time at Tusculum include Tiberius (Cass. Dio 58.24), Nero (Tac. Ann. 14.3), and Galba (Suet. Galb. 4.3), while Domitian’s ownership of a villa is attested epigraphically (CIL XV 7818).

---

163 Notarian 2011, 69.
One common feature in references to the landscape of villas at Tusculum is the characterization of these buildings as particularly luxurious or sumptuous. In contrast to his positive treatment of his own villa, Cicero also mentions some of the excesses associated with villas at Tusculum, clearly alluding to a reputation for sumptuous and luxury, when he includes references to enormous properties at Tusculum in invectives against both Piso and Antony.\textsuperscript{167} Seneca implies that the cost of a Tusculan villa is assumed to be high, but the price is not the buyer’s primary concern (\textit{Nemo Tusculanum aut Tiburtinum paraturus salubritatis causa et aestivi secessus, quo anno empturus sit, disputat}).\textsuperscript{168} The construction of these villas represents more than a physical change in the topography of Tusculum, as their presence is closely associated with a specific cultural trope of elite leisure outside the hustle and bustle of the urban center at Rome.\textsuperscript{169} When Roman authors of the late Republic refer to the physical landscape of suburban Tusculum and the villas that populated this landscape, they characterize this landscape as one in which otherwise busy and powerful Romans come to relax from the work of politics, oratory, war, etc. Two specific aspects of the \textit{otium} associated with the experience of \textit{villae suburbanae} at Tusculum emerge from these references: \textit{otium} as deliberately apolitical, held in opposition to the \textit{labor} of exercising political power at Rome and abroad, and \textit{otium} as leisure time for the life of the mind, including creative activities like the production of philosophy and poetry. Champlin refers to the \textit{suburbium} and the \textit{villa suburbana} as the “ideal setting” for this \textit{otium litterarum} because the

\textsuperscript{167} Cic. \textit{Pis.} 21.48; see also Cic. \textit{Phil.} 8.9 and 13.11.
\textsuperscript{168} Sen. \textit{Ben.} 4.12.3
\textsuperscript{169} See i.e. Propertius 2.32, 3.16.1-4; Horace \textit{Odes} 1.7, 2.6, 3.4, 4.2.27-42, 4.3.10-12, and \textit{Epistles} 1.7.44-5; Martial 5.71; Statius \textit{Silvae} 1.3
location avoided both the negotium of Rome and the undesirably extreme “rustication” of returning to one’s “distant homeland.”¹⁷⁰ For the Roman citizens who purchased or built villas at Tusculum in the late Republic, Tusculum existed in a location between center and periphery—sufficiently close to Rome so as to allow continued participation in the elite social environment in which, for example, one’s philosophical and poetic compositions might be shared and appreciated, but sufficiently far from Rome to allow time and space for those creative activities outside the social and political demands of urban life in the same social circles. The use of Tusculum as a setting for this nominally apolitical otium by members of an otherwise politically active elite contrasts with the political advantage attributed to association with Tusculum.

V. CONCLUSION

Cicero’s relationship to Tusculum offers a window into how the city seems to have been perceived at Rome in the Late Republic. To the novus homo from an undistinguished town in the Campanian hills, Tusculum was both a shining example of the potential for self-advancement promised by the Roman political system and a constant reminder of the second-class status he would never fully escape. Cato’s ascent from humble origins in a farming family from Tusculum provided a model for the career of a municipal new man that Cicero employed in his own philosophical work; when Cicero presents Cato as an example of the relationship a municeps ought to have with his duae patriae, it is alongside Cicero himself and his own hometown of Arpinum.¹⁷¹ He purchased a villa at Tusculum and attempted to assimilate himself to his aristocratic peers, but found that he

¹⁷⁰ Champlin 1992, 107
¹⁷¹ Cicero De leg. 2.5.
continued to encounter bias—the prestige of a Tuscan pedigree was not something he could acquire within a generation. The impression of Tusculum’s relationship to Rome that comes from Cicero’s writing and biography is consistent with the positive characterization of Tusculum’s historical relationship with Rome that can be constructed from several sources across a wide chronological range and which suggests that an association with Tusculum would be highly valued. Given that this relatively positive version of Tusculum’s incorporation does not appear to be consistent with the most historically plausible account of the event, and is in conflict with several sources that suggest a much more pessimistic reading of Tusculum’s relationship with Rome prior to its conquest, how can we account for its persistent presence in the cultural memory of Tusculum?

While Tusculum’s early admission into Roman citizenship is certainly a central factor in the cultural memory of Tusculum’s past, it does not fully explain the characterization of the city that persisted centuries after this event. Though Tusculum is the first Latin city said to have gained the Roman civitas in any historiographical or documentary source, and the antiquity of Tusculum’s admission to Roman citizenship is a repeated motif in literary sources, there are no examples of Tusculum being described as the “first” municipium or the first Latin city to become a Roman civitas.¹⁷² Nor is a relatively early date of Roman citizenship the sole factor that differentiates other Latin cities’ histories of rebellion or cooperation with Rome, or the relative success of their families in politics. However, Tusculum’s Roman citizenship did offer its citizens the

¹⁷² Either the antiquity of Tusculum’s citizenship or the early date at which Tusculans held Roman political offices is mentioned at, among others: Cic. Font. 41, Tac. Ann. 11.24, Vell. Pat. 2.128
opportunity to pursue political office at Rome from an early date, and the exceptional case of the gens Mamilia obtaining citizenship as a reward for service at an even earlier date gave Tusculan families a chronological advantage in the accumulation of politically influential families. Ultimately, the success of these Tusculan families at Rome seems to have contributed to the continued positive reception of Tusculans at Rome by influencing the way in which Tusculum’s history of interactions with Rome was remembered. The Romans were aware of the possibility that family histories and genealogical claims could be influenced (or even dictated) by the political aims of the family’s descendants: in the Brutus, Cicero criticizes family histories preserved in the form of laudatory funeral orations for the various embellishments that have been added by families seeking to increase their own prestige—invented triumphs, consulships, and connections to famous historical figures. They also recognized that these claims had the potential to affect cultural memory beyond a particular family’s genealogy, as these false statements could

173 Cic. Brut. 62. Et hercules eae quidem exstant: ipsae enim familiae sua quasi ornamenta ac monumenta servabant et ad usum, si quis eiusdem generis occidisset, et ad memoriam laudum domesticarum et ad illustrandam nobilitatem suam. quamquam his laudationibus historia rerum nostrarum est facta mendosior. multa enim scripta sunt in eis quae facta non sunt: falsi triumphi, plures consulatus, genera etiam falsa et ad plebem transitiones, cum homines humiliores in alienum eiusdem nominis infunderentur genus; ut si ego me a M'. Tullio esse dicerem, qui patricius cum Ser. Sulpicio consul anno x post exactos reges fuit. (And assuredly some of these (funeral orations dating to before Cato) are certainly extant: for their families were in the practice of preserving them as trophies of honor and memorials, and for use when someone of the same family died, and for remembering the renown of their household, and for illustrating their own nobility. Yet our history has been made more erroneous by these panegyrics. For many things were written in them which did not happen: false triumphs, an abundance of consulships, false genealogies and false transitions to plebeian status, when men of humbler birth mingled their own family with another one of the same name; as if I should say that I was descended from Manius Tullius, who was a patrician and served as consul with Servius Sulpicius ten years after the kings were expelled.)
enter the historical record and change the memory of the past. The role of family histories in emphasizing (or embellishing) certain events in the broader historical record, while it cannot fully rewrite the memories of a contentious relationship, provides a context for reading more problematic episodes that allows them to be interpreted as part of a coherent, positive narrative—though the traces of a possibly less amicable relationship remain. In the case of Tusculum, a number of episodes that paint the gens Mamilia in a flattering light also have the effect of depicting Tusculum, and Tusculum’s relationship to Rome, positively; while stories that may have been influenced by the descendants of the Mamilii are particularly easy to identify, other families with Tuscan origins probably promoted stories about their ancestors as well. The early date at which Tuscan families came to Rome and began participating in politics and aristocratic competition contributed to the abundance of Tuscan families known to have attained political success at Rome. The number of Tuscan families who had a vested interest in promoting a positive memory of their own ancestors’ relationship with Rome could, in turn, have offered a large number of ways for the historical record to be influenced, as Cicero laments, by embellished claims and reinterpreted stories. Ultimately, the more flattering characteristics associated with Tusculum might have become a self-fulfilling prophecy: as more Tuscan families were elected to office, and as the date of the earliest Tusculans to hold political office at Rome became more and more remote, the cultural value of being connected to the increasingly “ancient” and “honored” municipium grew as well.

\(^{174}\) Cic. Brut. 62 (see previous note).
In the following two chapters, by contrast, I examine the effect of receiving Roman citizenship significantly later than the majority of cities in Latium. Like Tusculum, Tibur and Praeneste had a unique path to Roman citizenship. Left independent of Rome at the conclusion of the Roman-Latin wars in 338 BCE, but deprived of territory they had previously controlled, Praeneste and Tibur had contentious relationships with Rome up to—and after—they received Roman citizenship centuries later as a result of the *Lex Iulia de Civitate Latinis Danda* of 90 BCE.
CHAPTER TWO: TIBUR

I. INTRODUCTION

As one of the few communities in Latium that approached Rome’s size and influence during the regal period and early Republic, Tibur represented a potential rival to Rome and her successful expansion into central Italy; the history of Tibur’s relationship to Rome during the Republic is one of continued hostility to Roman power, and the city’s relative strength seems to have allowed it to remain free of Roman rule after most of Latium had become Roman territory by the end of the 4th century BCE. Roman sources record frequent wars with Tibur, either alone or allied with other Latin cities, during the periods when the Romans and Latins were not bound by peace treaties, and a Tiburtine attack on Rome in 359 BCE is one of the very few episodes in Early and Middle Republican history in which an enemy is said to have directly assaulted the city of Rome.176

Itaque insequenti anno M. Popilio Laenate Cn. Manlio consulibus primo silentio noctis ab Tibure agmine infesto profecti ad urbem Romam venerunt. Terrorem repente ex somno excitatis subita res et nocturnus pavor praebuit, ad hoc multorum inscitia, qui aut unde hostes advenissent...

Therefore, in the following year when M. Popilius Laen as and Cn. Manlius were consuls, they came to the city of Rome in the first quiet of the night, having set out from Tibur in a hostile battle-array. The sudden occurrence and the nocturnal alarm caused terror in those roused from sleep hastily, as did the ignorance of many [about] who the enemies were or whence they had come...

175 Estimates of 6th century territorial holdings as first hypothesized by Beloch 1926, 178: Rome, 822 km²; Tibur, 351km²; Praeneste 262.5 km². None of the other cities reach 200 km², and all but Ardea and Lavinium are less than 100km². Further discussion in CAH VI. 243-7 includes comparative charts and map. See also more recent discussion, population figures, and estimates of productive capacity in Cornell 2000, 204-8.

176 In addition to the historiographic sources, the Fasti Capitolini also record several conflicts with Tibur.

177 Livy 7.12.1-2
Despite the brevity of this episode in Livy’s narrative, it describes a vivid moment of panic in the city as the Romans realize an enemy has reached their city without any notice or alarm until they had already arrived. The incident occurs within 50 years of the sack of Rome by the Gauls, and the terror in Livy’s narrative suggests fear of a similar incident in the Romans as an unseen army woke them from their sleep. Although the Romans routed the attacking army easily, the initial alarm caused by the Tiburtines’ ability to reach the city in a single night under cover of darkness exemplifies the threat posed by a hostile force living close to Rome: the Tiburtines are able to assault the city with no warning. Furthermore, Tibur’s location in the foothills of the Apennines, controlling the valley that eventually held the Via Tiburtina, placed the city between Rome and enemies including the Volsci and the Samnites. The Tiburtines demonstrated the danger that their city represented for Rome by controlling such a strategically significant location in the year before their attack on Rome, 360 BCE, when they had provided aid to the Gauls and ensured their safe passage to and from Campania.\textsuperscript{178} Tibur’s strength and natural advantages, together with the city’s history of hostility towards Rome, combine in Livy’s narrative to characterize republican-era Tibur as a potential threat to Rome.

In contrast, Horace Odes 1.7, published around the same time as the relevant books of Livy, describes the city in his own day as a peaceful retreat:\textsuperscript{179}

\begin{verbatim}
me nec tam patiens Lacedaemon
nec tam Larisae percussit campus opimae,
quam domus Albuneae resonantis
et praeceps Anio ac Tiburni lucus et uda
mobilibus pomaria rivis.
\end{verbatim}

\textsuperscript{178} Livy 7.9-11
\textsuperscript{179} See discussion of publication dates in the Introduction, Section I.
Neither unyielding Lacedaemon 
nor the plain of fertile Larisa so strikes me, 
as the home of echoing Albunea 
and the rushing Anio and the grove of Tiburnus, 
and orchards soaked by swift streams.

To the poet, the city of Tibur has become a thoroughly unthreatening landscape, so completely assimilated into a retreat for Rome’s elite that he can praise it specifically in contrast to sites of adventure abroad.\(^{181}\) The city is distinguished by the physical features—rivers and orchards—that create the lush landscape into which villas of wealthy Romans nestle, serving as a luxurious retreat from the chaos of business in the city or military concerns abroad. Horace’s poetry anticipates the continued development of Tibur’s relationship to Imperial Rome that culminates in the construction of Hadrian’s elaborate villa, which sprawls across the Tiburtine countryside and inspired imitators for centuries. The Tibur that threatened Republican Rome appears to have almost disappeared by the beginning of the Empire.

In this chapter I reconstruct the Roman cultural memory of Tibur and its eventual incorporation by Rome, to the extent that the surviving literary and material evidence permits. Admittedly, there are no surviving sources contemporary to the period of greatest conflict between Rome and Tibur, the 5\(^{th}\)-early 3\(^{rd}\) centuries BCE, and there are

---

\(^{180}\) Hor. *Carm*. 1.7.10-14

\(^{181}\) The poem opens with a priamel that proclaims the poet’s affection for Tibur over a series of twelve Greek cities, ending with the emphatic statement that neither Lacedaemon (Sparta) nor the Thessalian city of Larissa affects Horace as much as Tibur (using the oddly violent *percussit*, line 11). In addition to Lacedaemon and Larissa, Horace rejects Rhodes, Mytilene, Ephesus, Corinth, Thebes, Delphi, Tempe, Athens, Argos, and Mycenae (Hor. *Carm*. 1.7.1-9). In addition to declaring Horace’s preference for Tibur over these famous cities of Greece, the priamel functions as a *re cusatio* on the topic of poetic composition, one of the leisurely pursuits that Horace associates with the town.
very few sources dating from the middle of the 3rd century BCE to the early 1st century BCE. The sources we do have from the later Republic and Empire cannot and do not represent Roman perspectives on Tibur contemporary to its conquest. Instead, they represent the image of Tibur passed down to later generations, and that is the topic of this chapter. My primary goal is not to reconstruct the historical events associated with the city’s conquest and gradual assimilation into the expanding Roman empire, but rather to identify loci of anxiety about the nature of Tibur’s relationship to Rome. The challenge posed by Tibur’s physical and topographical features is made manifest by the city’s extended history of hostility to Rome and its continued resistance to integration until 90 BCE, when the city accepts Roman citizenship. During the last century of the Republic, the Roman image of Tibur begins to be transformed into that of the suburban villa site populated by Roman elites recorded by Horace and several of his contemporaries, and well represented in the physical remains of the ancient site, and Tiburtine elites begin to appear in positions of power at Rome. This development, however, is chronologically contemporaneous with sources continuing to describe Republican Tibur as a threat to the city of Rome. This chapter aims to examine our contradictory evidence in juxtaposition in order to create a comprehensive picture of the Roman cultural memory of the city of Tibur.

II. CIVIC ENTITY

In this chapter, I first examine sources that discuss Tibur as a civic entity or cohesive group—a civitas, defined by its government and institutions. These sources talk about decisions made and actions taken by the city at large, such as declaring war or signing
treaties; Roman treatment of the city as a unit (as when deciding whether to not to offer its citizens Roman citizenship or rights en bloc); and institutions or characteristics associated with the community. Some themes, such as Tibur’s relative antiquity, appear across a variety of time periods and genres, demonstrating their persistence in the Roman cultural memory of Tibur. Others, including resistance to Roman integration, hostility against Rome, and welcoming Roman exiles and enemies, seem to drop off over time and the last attested examples date to the late Republican or Augustan period. The eventual cessation of references to these tropes occurs contemporaneously with the development of references to Tibur as a new type of place, a calm suburban retreat from the urban chaos of Rome. This shift in Roman references to Tibur took place decades after the city was enfranchised in 90 BCE, demonstrating that the earlier cultural memory of the city persisted after Tibur’s relationship with Rome had changed permanently.

**A. Tibur’s Antiquity**

Like many of her sister cities in Latium, Tibur already had a significant urban presence in the period before Rome’s rise to prominence in the region. Archaeological evidence suggests that the site was frequented in the Bronze Age and shows extensive Iron Age habitation and elaborate cemeteries with burials dated from the 8th–7th centuries. It is clear that the Romans were conscious of the relative antiquity of Tibur, which is discussed in literature of the late Republic and Empire. This knowledge is also reflected

---

182 Recent summary of material in Fulminate 2003, 45-50. For Bronze Age material found at several sites at Tibur (Grotta Polesini, Osteria del Curato, S. Angelo in Arcese, and Colle Ripoli), see Mari and Sperandio 1985, Mari 1993. Burials dating to the 8th–7th centuries BCE were found at Tibur. See also Mari 1993 on proto-historic habitation in the territory of Tibur generally.
in poetic references to the city that account for the fact that Tibur was believed to have predated the legendary foundation of Rome in 753 BCE by depicting Tibur as an active participant in the “golden age” of heroes in Latium prior to the arrival of Aeneas. Pliny’s *Natural History* describes the people of Tibur as having an origin earlier than the city of Rome in the course of identifying the oldest trees in Latium; he computes the relative age of Tibur’s foundation through the legendary city founder of Tiburnus, who is said to be the son of Amphiraus, who fought at Thebes in the generation before the Trojan War.¹⁸³ Statius also references the perceived antiquity of Tibur (and its trees) in his *Silvae*, when he asks rhetorically whether he should speak about the venerable old age of the groves at Manilius Vopiscus’ villa in Tibur.¹⁸⁴ Dionysius of Halicarnassus names Tibur as one of the cities built by the Aborigines as they conquered the Italian peninsula, having come to Italy as colonists from Arcadia well before the Trojan War. He claims that not many of the Aboriginal cities survived, as most had been destroyed by wars and other disasters; Tibur, Antemnae, Tellenae, and Ficulea are the only cities still inhabited in his day.¹⁸⁵ This makes Dionysius’ claim about the antiquity of Tibur more than a general statement about the history of cities in Latium before Aeneas’ arrival and Rome’s foundation, as Tibur is a rare survival belonging to this earliest phase of foundations.

The poetic narratives of the “Golden Age” of heroes in central Italy in Ovid and Vergil also situate Tibur in this era of Latin cities founded as colonies by Greek heroes. In the opening to the fourth book of the *Fasti*, Ovid begins the month of April, Venus’ month, by narrating the ancestry of the Julian line obliquely through Venus’ son

¹⁸³ Pliny *NH* 16.87.2
¹⁸⁴ Stat. *Silv*. 1.3.38-9
¹⁸⁵ Dion. Hal. 1.14.1
Aeneas. Before Aeneas’ descendant Romulus founded Rome and began the calendar known to Ovid’s readers, the poet says, “already the walls of watery Tibur were standing” (iam moenia Tiburis udi/stabant, emphasis mine). The temporal adverb iam, repeated from earlier in line 71 (et iam Telegoni, iam moenia Tiburis udi) emphasizes the temporal priority of Tibur, along with a few other Italian cities—Tusculum, Patavium, Formiae, and Falerii—over Rome. The list is brief, as in Dionysius (although only Tibur appears on both lists), which suggests that the Romans attributed particular antiquity to some cities extending beyond the general impression of an active culture in Latium prior to the arrival of Aeneas. Tibur appears in Vergil among a larger group of Italian cities arrayed against the Trojans in the second half of the Aeneid: when the gates of war are opened and “calm Ausonia burns,” Vergil says, “their anvils set up, five such great cities make weapons anew: mighty Atina and proud Tibur, Ardea and Crustumeria and turreted Antemnae.” Vergil later refers to the eponymous founder of the city, whose name is given as Tiburtus: his brothers, the twins Catillus and Coras leave the walls of Tibur along with “the people called by the name of their brother” (i.e. the Tiburtenses). The brothers are described as Argive youths (Argiva iuventus), referencing the legendary

---

186 The poet mentions the name of Augustus’ adopted family only briefly at lines 39-40 (venimus ad felix aliquando nomen Iuli,/unde domus Teucros Iulia tangit avos) before returning to the age of legend. See especially Pasco-Pranger 2006 on the fourth book of the Fasti and its characterization of Venus, as well as (on the length of the Fasti) whether the absence of the books dealing directly with the Julian line is deliberate.

187 Ov. Fast. 4.71-2 et iam Telegoni, iam moenia Tiburis udi/stabant, Argolicae quod posuere manus (and already were standing the walls of Telegonus, of well-watered Tibur, which Argive hands placed)

188 Verg. Aen. 7.623, 29-31

189 Verg. Aen. 7.670-2 Tum gemini fratres Tiburtia moenia linquent/fratris Tiburti dictam cognomine gentem/Catillusque acerque Coras, Argiva iuventus (Then the twin brothers leave the Tiburtine walls—Catillus and Coras, Argive youths—and the race called by the name of their brother Tiburtus)
background of the city’s foundation as a Greek colony.\textsuperscript{190} The brothers associated with Tibur’s foundation join another implied list of ancient Italian communities by their inclusion here in Vergil’s so-called “catalogue of Italian heroes.”\textsuperscript{191} The majority of references to Tibur’s foundation associate it with the family of the aforementioned eponymous hero Tiburtus/Tiburnus.\textsuperscript{192} In Roman sources Tibur is thus consistently described as one of the earliest city foundations in Latium, even when the list of earliest cities changes from author to author. It is closely tied to early waves of Greek settlement in Italy and is thus firmly associated, in both historiographical accounts of prehistorical Italy and poetic depictions of the age of heroes, with an independent existence that is both prior to Aeneas’ arrival and thus, necessarily, pre-Roman.

\textit{B. Resistance to Roman Integration}

The most pervasive element in the Roman memory of Tibur is the city’s continued resistance to Rome—more specifically, to integration with Rome. This thread can be traced through sources treating Tibur’s history from the 6\textsuperscript{th}-1\textsuperscript{st} centuries BCE, despite the overwhelming bias of Roman sources towards treating integration with Rome—particularly admission to Roman citizenship—as a desirable goal. I identify two categories of references to Tibur’s behavior as a civic entity that fall under the theme of

\textsuperscript{190} Verg. \textit{Aen.} 7.672
\textsuperscript{191} Aventinus (the Aventine hill), Caeculus (Praeneste), Messapus (the Faliscans), Clausus (the Sabines), Halaesus (Falerii), Oebalus (Campania), Ufens (the Aequi), Umbro (the Marsi), Virbius (Aricia), Camilla (the Volsci) and Turnus (the Rutulians). The opening characters, Mezentius and Lausus, are from Etruria, but as the Mezentius of the \textit{Aeneid} has been exiled from Etruria as a tyrant and is living with Turnus, we can assume that he is not leading his own people into battle but is fighting with the Rutulians.\textsuperscript{192} In various iterations, a figure named Catillus is responsible for the actual foundation, but he is still said to be the brother or father of Tiburtus.
resistance to Rome: (1) references to Tibur’s ongoing hostility towards Rome, through
direct military opposition or support of other enemies of Rome, and (2) evidence for
Tibur’s ongoing independence from Rome, with a relationship governed by
treaties and negotiations long after the time when most other Latin cities are no longer
negotiating with Rome as independent entities.¹⁹³

Though Livy does not list the members of the Latin League of the 6th-5th century,
it seems likely from his isolation of one city (Praeneste) as having left the alliance of
Latin cities immediately prior to the battle of Lake Regillus that Livy would have named
any other Latin cities that were known to have abstained from fighting against Rome. We
can probably assume, therefore, that the impression later Romans held of Tibur’s military
activity at this early date was similar to that of the Latin League generally—engaging in a
series of skirmishes with the Roman state through the 5th century—and that references to
the Latin League and the Latins, while they may not specifically refer to Tibur, are
representative of the general impression held by contemporaries of Livy and Dionysius of
Halicarnassus regarding Tibur at the beginning of the Republic. Livy and Dionysius of
Halicarnassus figure the actions of the Latin cities fighting against Rome in this period
somewhat differently. Livy, in saying that the Latin city of Praeneste “revolted from the
Latins to Rome” (Praeneste ab Latinis ad Romanos descivit) in the lead-up to the battle
of Lake Regillus, suggests that the Latin and Roman causes were firmly established in

¹⁹³ In the absence of explicit acknowledgements in Roman sources of Tibur’s
constitutional status with respect to Rome at this time period, such characterizations are
the best evidence for the Roman memory of Tibur at this point in time holding sufficient
power to insist on continued independence as most Latin cities were subsumed into the
Roman citizen body and thus lost the right to self-governance. On Roman citizenship and
the allies, the citizenship sine suffragio, and municipia, see (among many others), e.g.
opposition to one another in the years prior to the war: for his statement to make sense, we must assume that there was an expectation that all Latin cities would remain allied with the other Latin cities, and that any alliance with Rome would be a revolt from their anticipated loyalties. However, while Livy depicts a world in which Rome and the Latins are already assumed to be enemies prior to the battle of Lake Regillus, he does not specify what formal arrangements (if any) determined the political relationship between Rome and the Latin League at this time. Dionysius, on the other hand, explicitly refers to a preexisting treaty between the Romans and Latins that the Latin League was breaking (ἐπειδὴ δὲ πρότεροι τὰς σπονδὰς ἐλυσαν Λατῖνοι). Dionysius’ account also reports the previous year’s consul Servius Sulpicius “enumerating all the revolts of the Latins” (τὰς ἀποστάσεις τῶν Λατίνων ἀπάσας ἔξαρθμεσάμενος), contributing to an impression of the Latins of the early 5th century as not only frequently battling with the Romans, but frequently rebelling against them in violation of agreed-upon peace. While late Republican historiography suggests the Romans remembered Tibur as included in the group of Latin cities who fought in frequent opposition to Rome in the early Republic as part of the Latin League, and we can assume that the Roman cultural opposition to one another in the years prior to the war: for his statement to make sense, we must assume that there was an expectation that all Latin cities would remain allied with the other Latin cities, and that any alliance with Rome would be a revolt from their anticipated loyalties. However, while Livy depicts a world in which Rome and the Latins are already assumed to be enemies prior to the battle of Lake Regillus, he does not specify what formal arrangements (if any) determined the political relationship between Rome and the Latin League at this time. Dionysius, on the other hand, explicitly refers to a preexisting treaty between the Romans and Latins that the Latin League was breaking (ἐπειδὴ δὲ πρότεροι τὰς σπονδὰς ἐλυσαν Λατῖνοι). Dionysius’ account also reports the previous year’s consul Servius Sulpicius “enumerating all the revolts of the Latins” (τὰς ἀποστάσεις τῶν Λατίνων ἀπάσας ἔξαρθμεσάμενος), contributing to an impression of the Latins of the early 5th century as not only frequently battling with the Romans, but frequently rebelling against them in violation of agreed-upon peace. While late Republican historiography suggests the Romans remembered Tibur as included in the group of Latin cities who fought in frequent opposition to Rome in the early Republic as part of the Latin League, and we can assume that the Roman cultural

194 Livy 2.19.1-2 T. Aebutius deinde et C. Vetusius. His consulibus Fidenae obsessae, Crustumeria capta; Praeneste ab Latinis ad Romanos descivit, nec ultra bellum Latinum, gliscens iam per aliquot annos, dilatum. (The next year, T. Aebutius and C. Vetusius were consuls [499 BCE]. During their consulship, Fidenae was besieged and Crustumeria captured; Praeneste revolted from the Latins to the Romans, and the Latin war, which had been building up for several years, was not put off any longer.)

195 Dion. Hal. 6.20.5 Livy’s statement that Praeneste revolted from the Latins to Rome is compatible with the existence of a treaty such as the one Dionysius describes existing prior to the Cassian treaty, as the two sides could have remained very much politically opposed to one another even if military conflict was prevented for some stretch of time by a treaty or a truce.
memory of Tibur at this time largely echoes that of the other cities of Latium, Tibur is distinguished (along with Praeneste) in the historiographic sources by an extended and exceptional history of hostility and resistance to Rome.

Tibur is first mentioned in a military campaign in Livy when the city appears in an escalating conflict with the Romans in 361 BCE. When the Romans lead an army against the Hernici and capture Feretinum, they find that the people of Tibur had closed their gates to them (*eis Tiburtes portas clausere*).\(^{197}\) Though Livy has not articulated any agreement between Rome and Tibur before this point that would require Tibur to allow free passage through their city to Rome, the gesture is interpreted by the Romans as hostile. No reason is given for this provocation, but it is described as the final event in a series of escalating complaints between Tibur and Rome; with this new offense, the fetial priests formally declare war against Tibur.\(^{198}\) Though this war was temporarily put off when the Gauls approached the city of Rome once again, it escalated once the Tiburtines allied with the Gauls in 360 BCE.\(^{199}\) Tibur also provided supplies to the Gauls before

---

\(^{197}\) Livy 7.9.1 *Insequenti anno cum C. Sulpicius et C. Licinius Calvus consules in Hernicos exercitum duxissent neque inventis in agro hostibus Ferentinum urbem eorum vi cepissent, revertentibus inde eis Tiburtes portas clausere.* (In the following year, when the consuls C. Sulpicius and C. Licinius Calvus led an army against the Hernici and did not find the enemy in the field, they took Ferentinum—a city of the Hernici—by force. The Tiburtines closed their gates to the returning Romans.)

\(^{198}\) Livy 7.9.2. *Ea ultima fuit causa, cum multae ante querimoniae ulturn citroque iactatae essent, cur per fetiales rebus repetitis bellum Tiburti populo indiceretur,* (This was the final reason, although many complaints were thrown out from one side to the other previously, why war was declared against the populace of Tibur by the fetial priests, having demanded satisfaction.)

\(^{199}\) Livy 7.11.1 *Et hercule tanti ea ad universi belli eventum momenti dimicatio fuit ut Gallorum exercitus proxima nocte relictis trepide castris in Tiburtem agrum atque inde societate belli facta conmmeatque beneigne ab Tiburtibus aditutus mox in Campaniam transierit.* (And by god, that fight [the duel between Torquatus and the Gaul] was an event of such great importance for the whole war that the army of the Gauls, having
they retreated into Campania to recuperate after one of their number was defeated in his
duel with T. Manlius Torquatus. For this reason (*ea fuit causa*), Livy states, the next
year’s consul C. Poetelius Balbus was entrusted with a campaign against the Tiburtines
while his colleague M. Fabius Ambustus fought the Hernici. The Romans take Tibur’s
support of the Gauls, even support that has thus far only taken the form of material
provisions, as sufficient provocation to send an army headed by one of the consuls
against them. The Gauls soon returned from Campania—according to Livy, in order to
aid their allies, the Tiburtines—and this foe was thought worthy of a dictator. The newly
appointed dictator, Q. Servilius Ahala, had the consular army continue to hold Tibur at
bay while his own recently levied army engaged the Gauls near the Colline Gate. The
Gauls, after being defeated, “fled to Tibur as if it were the stronghold of the Gauls” (*Fuga
Tibur sicut arcem belli Gallici petunt*). This explicit statement by Livy that the Gauls
were treating Tibur as their own fortress indicates both that there was believed to be a
strong alliance between the two groups at this time—the Gauls are using the fortifications
of Tibur as their own rather than just being provided with provisions and men—and,
more importantly, that the apparent closeness of this relationship was thought worthy of
comment by the Romans.

*abandoned their camp the next night in a state of confusion, went into the area of Tibur
and, having made an alliance and having been aided generously with supplies by the
Tiburtines, they soon crossed into Campania.)*

200 Livy 7.11.2 *ea fuit causa, cur proximo anno C. Poetelius Balbus consul, cum collegae
eius M. Fabio Ambusto Hernici provincia evenisset, adversus Tiburtes iussu populi exercitum duceret.* (It was for this reason that in the next year the consul C. Poetelius
Balbus, when the territory of the Hernici fell to his colleague M. Fabius Ambusto, led an
army against the Tiburtines by the order of the people.)*

201 Livy 7.11.3-6.

202 Livy 7.11.7.
Poetelius, the consul who had been put in charge of the Tiburtine war before the Gauls appeared, was awarded a double triumph, while the dictator Fabius celebrated only an ovation for his victory over the Hernici, as this seemed sufficient to him.\footnote{Livy 7.11.9 \textit{Poetelius de Gallis Tiburtibusque geminum triumphum egit; Fabio satis visum, ut ovans urbem iniret.} (Poetelius held a double triumph over the Gauls and the Tiburtines; it seemed sufficient to Fabius that he enter the city in an \textit{ovatio}.)} The \textit{Fasti Triumphales} from the Capitoline records a triumph celebrated over the Gauls and the Tiburtines by a consul in this year, though the name of the \textit{triumphator} is not preserved. Livy records a striking reaction to Poetelius’ triumph by the people of Tibur, who are said to have ridiculed his celebration on the grounds that the only Tiburtines he fought were those few who went outside the city to watch the Gauls fleeing and retreated back within Tibur’s walls when they found that the Romans were slaughtering all those they encountered without discrimination.\footnote{Livy 7.11.10-11 \textit{Inridere Poeteli triumphum Tiburtes: ubi enim eum secum acie conflixisse? Spectatores paucos fugae trepidationisque Gallorum extra portas egressos, postquam in se quoque fieri impetum viderint et sine discrimine obvios caedi, recepisse se intra urbem: eam rem triumpho dignam visam Romanis} (The Tiburtines laughed at the triumph of Poetelius: for where had he encountered them in battle? A few spectators of the flight and terror of the Gauls who had gone outside the gates, after they saw that there was an assault on them as well and that those who were encountered were being killed without distinction, withdrew into the city: this seemed deserving of a triumph to the Romans.)} Irritated at the perceived arrogance of the Romans and unwilling to let them gloat, the Tiburtines marched on Rome itself the next year, reaching the city in the silence of the night.\footnote{Livy 7.11.12-7.12.1.} Tibur is described by Livy here as stubborn in its rebellion; unwilling to let itself be defeated, and even more offended that the Romans are celebrating their defeat, Tibur makes an ill-fated attempt on the city of Rome in retaliation. According to Livy, the attack was a fiasco: the army from Tibur could not even withstand the first strike of the Roman defenders. The incident’s narration, with the
emphasis on irritation and wounded pride rather than military strategy as a motivation for Tibur’s action, depicts the Latin city as stubbornly refusing to submit to Rome’s manifest superiority.

Records survive of a series of skirmishes with Tibur through the next few decades, as the city continued to resist Rome’s growing power in Latium. In 356-55 BCE, the consul M. Popilius Laenas, who was assigned the war with Tibur while his colleague M. Fabius Ambustus went to war against the Faliscans and Tarquinienses, forced the people of Tibur inside their walls and ravaged their fields.\(^\text{206}\) The next year, the Romans took the town of Empulum from Tibur without any memorable struggle.\(^\text{207}\) Finally, in the next year (353 BCE), Tibur was forced to submit to Rome and lost the town of Sassula; however, Livy relates, since Tibur laid down arms and surrendered to the consul, it received much lighter treatment than it otherwise might have.\(^\text{208}\) Livy records a triumph over the Tiburtines; the \textit{Fasti Triumphales} also has a triumph over the Tiburtes this year celebrated by the consul M. Fabius Ambustus. Livy does not give details of the settlement between Rome and Tibur after the latter’s defeat and loss of Sassula in 353 BCE beyond noting the celebration of a triumph and that the Romans were otherwise mild in their treatment of the conquered (\textit{Triumphatum de Tiburtibus; alioquin mitis victoria fuit}).\(^\text{209}\) These incidents in 354 and 353 BCE occur alongside other Roman-Latin battles in the mid-4\(^\text{th}\) century BCE in which the aftermath of Roman victory is the gradual confiscation of Latin lands—incidents that build Latin resentment gradually in

\(^{206}\) Livy 7.17.1.  
\(^{207}\) Livy 7.18.2.  
\(^{208}\) Livy 7.19.1-2.  
\(^{209}\) Livy 7.19.2.
the years leading up to the rebellion of Latin towns in 339-8 BCE. The Roman memory of these incidents, though not recorded in detail, focuses on the expansion of Roman power in the region, characterized particularly by land seizure, and the Latin cities are characterized as resentful of this growing influence and desiring the return of their land; we must infer from their ongoing actions, which Roman sources depict as “rebellions,” that they also desired freedom from Rome’s growing influence.\footnote{See e.g. Livy 8.12.5 Latinos ob iram agri amissi rebellantes in campis Fenectanis fuderunt castrisque exuerunt. (The Latins, who were rebelling out of anger over their lost lands, were routed in the Fenectane plains and driven away from their encampment.)}

The next major interaction between Rome and Tibur in Livy’s narrative is in the context of the lead-up to the Latin War of 338, when Livy lists attempts by a number of Latin cities, Tibur among them, to regain towns and territory previously lost to Rome. L. Furius Camillus defeated the rebelling cities and, emboldened by his victory, decided to press onwards and seek the complete conquest of Latium.\footnote{Livy 8.13.8 placuit inde iam maiore conatu animoque ab unius expugnatione urbis ad perdandum Latium victorem circumducere exercitum. nec quievere antequam expugnando aut in deditionem accipiendo singulas urbes Latium omne subegere. (It was decided to march the conquering army right then to thoroughly subdue Latium, by means of a greater effort and the courage coming from the capture of the one city, and to not rest before they subjugated the entirety of Latium by capturing or receiving in surrender every single city.)} Livy does not spend a great deal of time narrating the battles of 338 BCE, although they are later seen as an important turning point; more interesting is his account of the post-battle renegotiation of the relationship between Rome and Latium. The negotiation is decidedly one-sided, and nearly every city either incurs a punishment for rebellion or receives a reward for loyalty to Rome. After several hundred years of gradually removing a few rights and liberties from each city, a process depicted from the Roman point of view as a way to both...
manage current problems and incentivize future good behavior, the Romans finally take
dramatic steps to remove most rights of independent governance from a large number of
Latin cities and reduce the war-readiness of some cities. Some of Antium’s ships are
burned, Velitrae has its walls torn down and its senate banished, and new Roman
colonists were sent to both. Livy claims that Tibur and Praeneste are punished by the
Senate for their exceptional disloyalty; because they had allied with the Gauls against
Rome (not merely because of fighting alongside all of the other Latin cities), they are
deprived of their territorial holdings:

\[ \text{Tiburtes Praenestinique agro multati, neque ob recens tantum rebellionis}
commune cum aliis Latinis crimen, sed quod taedio imperii Romani cum Gallis,}
gente efferata, arma quondam consociassent. \]

The Tiburtes and the Praenestines were punished with [the loss of] land, not only
because of the recent offense of rebellion, which they had in common with the
other Latins, but because out of loathing of Roman control they had formerly
joined arms with the Gauls, a savage race.\(^2\)

Livy’s text is very clear in attributing the unique status of Tibur and Praeneste to
an exceptional punishment imposed as a consequence of their alliance with the Gauls:
Tibur and Praeneste are the only two cities to receive this punishment, and he notes that it
was issued for an offense beyond the common rebellion. At the same time, however,
Livy’s presentation implicitly demonstrates the strength of Tibur and Praeneste, which
are not said to have lost any fundamental rights despite having participated in actions
clearly condemned by the Romans passing judgment on the Latin cities. In fact, we can
assume that Tibur lost fewer rights than the cities that were invited into Roman
citizenship but did not receive the vote, although the latter is presented by the Romans as

\(^{2}\) Livy 8.14.9.
a desirable outcome. In the end result of the settlements described by Livy, Tibur and Praeneste avoid losing any political independence or self-governance whatsoever, despite the loss of territory formerly under their control. Only two things can be definitely stated based on Livy’s account: Tibur and Praeneste received the exceptional penalty of having land confiscated and were not among the small number of Latin cities who are said by Livy to have been granted full Roman citizenship as a reward for loyalty or service. 213 Though Livy frames receiving Roman citizenship as a benefit, it is possible that Tibur and Praeneste were resistant to Roman hegemony.

Perhaps the explanation that best accounts for the absence of an explicit record of Rome imposing a new status on Tibur at any point in this process (not until 90 BCE, in fact) is Baranowski’s suggestion that Praeneste and Tibur were sufficiently powerful to have their relationship with Rome enshrined in a series of regularly renegotiated treaties

---

213 The only cities that are said to receive full citizenship are Lanuvium, Aricium, Nomentum, and Pedum; additionally, Tusculum retained the Roman citizenship it had been awarded in 381 BCE. Velitrae and Antium receive colonies from Rome; Capua, Fundi, Formiae, Cumae, and Suessula are said to have received the citizenship “sine suffragio.” A wide variety of scholars have stated that the status of *civitates sine suffragio* was also bestowed on the Latin cities not specifically said to have been granted a different status, and that this status continued to be awarded to newly conquered cities and regions as a sort of first step in a process of Romanization that ended in full citizenship. This position is most fully and specifically articulated in Humbert 1978 (*Municipium et Civitas Sine Suffragio*), but is also present in the work of Mommsen, Salmon, Brunt, Gabba, and others. Mouritsen 2007 notes that early references to the grant in Livy “are so obscure that it has been construed both as a reward and as a punishment,” (150) and argues that the evidence suggests a much more uneven distribution of rights to different communities in different circumstances. The attribution of these different relationships between Rome and other Italian communities to a cohesive plan is better thought of, he argues, as “a later rationalization of earlier more complex patterns of relationships between Rome and the Italians” (157).
between the late 4th and early 1st centuries. The earliest recorded treaty between Rome and Tibur was the so-called Cassian treaty (foedus Cassianum) of c. 496 BCE. Livy does not discuss this treaty extensively or by name, but Dionysius of Halicarnassus addresses the treaty in some detail and includes Tibur on the list of Latin League cities who sent ambassadors for the purpose of seeking such a treaty from Rome. In Livy’s account, the Latins and Romans do not come to an accord after the battle of Lake Regillus until, three years after that conflict, the Latins alert the Romans that the Volsci

214 Though Rome clearly had some treaties with the Latins generally after 338 BCE (hence, texts such as the Senatusconsultum de Bacchanalibus refer to nominis Latini and socii as separate groups of foederata), references to specific rights retained by Tibur and Praeneste among the Latins suggest that they were engaged in separate negotiations with Rome: see Baronowski 1988, 172-8. In opposition, see Sherwin-White 1973, 30-33 and 96-7, who believes no foedera of this type existed after the Cassian treaty; he sees Rome’s relationships with Praeneste and Tibur as having settlements with Rome that stemmed from, respectively, Praeneste’s defeat in 380 BCE (Livy 6.29), and Tibur’s defeat in 353 BCE (Livy 7.19). As Rome ended both these wars as the victor, having seized the control of several smaller towns from both Praeneste and Tibur, this would suggest that the settlements that governed Rome’s relationships with Praeneste and Tibur from the 4th century through the Social War were advantageous to Rome.

215 Livy gives the date when the Romans and Latins came to a truce after the battle of Lake Regillus as 496 BCE (specifically, three years after the battle in 499 BCE) and I have retained his chronology in order to be consistent with the Livian dates given elsewhere in the chapter. However, Dionysius of Halicarnassus (whose account of the treaty I rely on more heavily in this section, as it is more extensive than Livy’s) gives a date of 493 BCE.

216 Dion. Hal. 6.18.1 states that ambassadors from all of the cities who had gone to war as part of the Latin League came to the Senate to seek a peace treaty after their defeat at Lake Regillus (πρέσβεις ἀπὸ τοῦ κοινοῦ τῶν Λατίνων ἥκον ὡς αὐτοὺς ἐξ ἀπασῶν τῶν πόλεων ἐπιλεχθέντες); he had previously listed all of the cities, including Tibur, that sent representatives to the Latin League prior to the battle in 5.61.3 (οἱ δ’ ἐγγραψάμενοι ταῖς συνθήκαις ταῦτα πρόβουλοι καὶ τοὺς ὄρκους ὁμόσαντες ἀπὸ τούτων τῶν πόλεων ἡσαν ἀνδρες, Ἀρδεατων, Ἀρηκηνων, Βοιλλανων, Βουβενατων, Κάρυνων, Καρπενατων, Κιρκαιητων, Καρπανων, Καβανων, Φορτινεων, Γαβίων, Λαυρεντίων, Λαβικανων, Λαβικατων, Λαβινιατων, Λαβινιατων, Μουεντανων, Μουεντανων, Ντανων, Παμεντανων, Πεδανων, Παμεντανων, Πεδανων, Πεντανων, Τελληνων, Σατρικανων, Σκαπτηνων, Σητηνων, Τιβουρτινων, Τυσκλανων, Τοληρινων, Τελληνων, Ουελιτρανων)
and Hernici are planning to attack them; gratified by their aid, the Romans finally grant the peace Latin ambassadors had been seeking for the intervening years and return Latin prisoners. Dionysius states some of the terms of the treaty: the Roman Senate agreed to grant the Latin ambassadors their previous “friendship and alliance” (φιλίαν καὶ συμμαχίαν) if they release Roman prisoners, return deserters to Rome, and expel the exiled king Tarquin and his companions.

The next formal arrangement between Rome and Tibur mentioned in extant sources is the settlement at the end of the Roman-Latin war in 338 BCE: epigraphic evidence demonstrates that Tibur was neither fully absorbed into Rome as a municipium nor governed by Rome as a colonia, though we have no evidence for the arrangement between Rome and Tibur that established this status quo. We have no surviving literary

---

217 Livy 2.22.4-7
218 Dion. Hal. 6.21.2 ἀνθ᾽ ὡν εὐροντο παρὰ τῆς βουλῆς τὴν ἄρχαίαν φιλίαν καὶ συμμαχίαν καὶ τοὺς ὀρκους τοὺς ὑπὲρ τούτων ποτέ γευμένους διὰ τῶν εἰρημοδικῶν ἀνενεώσαντο. Though the ultimate result of the actions described in Livy and Dionysius is very similar, some differences are notable: Livy describes the treaty as coming from Roman gratitude towards the Latins (after a period where the Romans refused to grant the desired treaty), and it is therefore accompanied by a release of Latin prisoners by Rome; Dionysius describes the treaty as reluctantly granted by the Romans soon after their victory, and accordingly the terms under which the peace is granted are much more favorable towards the Romans, who themselves receive prisoners from the Latins. Dionysius also ties the treaty much more closely to the aftermath of the regal period, as he records the fate of the expelled Tarquin and his exiled royalist supporters as an essential precondition for the peace—the perceived willingness of the Latin League to serve as an ally to exiles from Rome is an impediment to a truce between the peoples, and the Latins must take actions to remedy this before the treaty can exist.
219 See e.g. Mouritsen 2007, Sherwin-White 1973 and 1980, Baranowski 1988, Humbert 1978, Bispham 2007a, Nicholet 1988, Kendall 2013. The titles of magistrates in Tiburtine inscriptions are consistent through this period, though the appearance of IIviri and IIIviri in inscriptions from other Latin cities allows the transition to a municipal government to be identified, which strongly suggests that Tibur did not undergo any formal changes in governance during this time period.
record of the relationship between Tibur and Rome from 338 BCE until the late Republic, but one inscription recording an official communication between Rome and Tibur provides some insights into the balance of power between the two cities in the 2nd century BCE. This inscription, known as the *Epistula ad Tiburtes* (*CIL* I² 586), was preserved on a bronze tablet found in modern Tivoli in 1581, and has been dated to the middle or latter half of the 2nd century BCE by studies focused on features of its language, including orthography and archaisms.²²⁰ The inscription records a letter from a praetor by the name of L. Cornelius to the city of Tibur reporting a *senatusconsultum* issued by the Roman Senate in response to an embassy of the Tiburtines defending themselves against unknown accusations. The text of the inscription, with the abbreviations expanded in parentheses, reads as follows:

L. Cornelius Gnaei filius pr(aetor) sen(atum) cons(uluit) a. d. III nonas Maias sub aede Kastorus. | Scr(ibendo) adf(uerunt) A. Manlius A. f., Sex. Iulius …., L. Postumius S(p.) f. | Quod Teiburtes v(erba) f(ecistis) quibus de rebus vos purgavistis ea senatus | animum advortit ita utei aequom fuit. Nosque ea ita audiveramus, | ut vos deixsistis vobeis nontiata esse. Ea nos animum nostrum | non inducebamus ita facta esse propter ea quod scibamus | ea vos merito nostro facere non potuisse, neque vos dignos esse | quei ea faceretis neque id vobeis neque rei poplicae vostrae | oitile esse facere. Et postquam vostra verba senatus audivit, | tanto magis animum nostrum inducimus, ita utei ante | arbitrabamur, de eieis rebus af vobeis peccatum non esse. | Quonque de eieis rebus senatuei purgati estis, credimus vosque | animum vostrum inducere oportet, item vos populo | Romano purgatos fore.²²¹

²²⁰ The inscription is now lost, and is known only from descriptions and transcriptions of the text. On the inscription’s sociopolitical context, see Brennan 2000 Vol. 1, 117-8 and Bispham 2007a, 131-2. The dating of the inscription has generally been done on the basis of orthography and archaisms: see Clackson and Horrocks 2007 and Flobert 1991. Brennan identifies the praetor named in the inscription as L. Cornelius Lentulus Lupus, who was consul in 156 BCE and so must have been praetor circa 159 BCE (Vol I, 118), and dates the inscription more specifically because of this identification.

²²¹ I have rendered the expanded text here as given in the *CIL*. The orthographic variants have been left as in the original inscription, as they are important for dating the text; the punctuation and capitalization have been adjusted for ease of reading.
CIL I² 586

The praetor Lucius Cornelius, son of Gnaeus, consulted the senate on the third day before the Nones of May (May 5th) before the temple of Castor. Aulus Manlius son of Aulus, Sextus Iulius [...], and Lucius Postumius son of Spurius were present at the writing. As to the fact that you Tiburtes made a speech and as to the affairs in connection with which you exculpated yourselves, the Senate turned its mind to these things, just as was fair. We also had heard things in same the way as you said they had been reported to you. We were determining that these things were not done in such a way on account of the fact that we knew you would not be able to do these things because of what we deserve, and that you are not deserving of being people who do those things, and that it would not be useful to you or to your polity to do them. And after the Senate heard your words, we are all the more resolved that—just as we were already thinking—there is no fault by you in these matters. Since you have been exculpated with regard to these matters by the Senate, we believe, and you also ought to resolve, that you likewise will be exculpated by the people of Rome.

The document comes from a Roman source—the praetor who wrote the letter—and speaks from a Roman perspective—the senate that passed the senatus consultum it discusses—but we have less information about the intended audience. The letter directly addresses “the Tiburtines” (Teiburtes) and uses the second person to refer to them, but we do not know to whom the letter was addressed, if a more specific addressee existed, or to whom it was delivered. Nor do we know who chose to inscribe the letter—it could either have been delivered in bronze form or inscribed as a copy of a more ephemeral document—for what audience it might have been intended, or where it would have been displayed, as we have no excavation context for the inscription other than the general location of its discovery in modern Tivoli. Although the document shows Rome asserting a degree of power over Tibur, without this context it is impossible to tell what the Tiburtine response to such an assertion would have been.

The inscription highlights the implied roles of both cities, albeit in the rhetoric of the party that wrote the letter: the Tiburtines have come to Rome to declare their
innocence in response to some unspecified rumors, while Rome (and specifically the Senate) is characterized as the ultimate arbiter of the truth about the rumors against which the Tiburtines have defended themselves. It is the Roman Senate’s judgment on the three articulated criteria that determines whether the allegations about the Tiburtines are true, not the Tiburtines’ declarations of innocence—the Senate specifically that they were already coming to the same determination prior to the Tiburtine embassy—the two states are not depicted as equals in a disagreement, but as judge and defendant, despite the curious lack of formal legal language. In fact, the Senate does not attribute their decision to believing in what the Tiburtines have said in their own defense—they note that they have listened to what the Tiburtines said, but not whether they believed their words, and the evaluation of guilt or innocence is based on external factors and only reassured by the words of the Tiburtines.

The letter notes three criteria for the Senate’s determination that the rumors are false: first, that the Tiburtines “would not be able to do these things because of what we deserve” (*quod scibamus ea vos merito nostro facere non potuisse*); second, that the Tiburtines are “not deserving of being people who do those things” (*neque vos dignos esse quei ea faceretis*); and third, that it would not have been beneficial to them or to their polity to do them” (*neque id vobeis neque rei poplicae oitile esse facere*). The first reason cited, that the Senate “knew that you [the Tiburtines] could not have done these things, on account of what we deserve” (*quod scibamus ea vos merito nostro facere non potuisse*), suggests that Rome expected loyalty from Tibur, whether in return for some action of the Romans or on account of Rome’s status. The phrase *merito nostro* is difficult to interpret without more context because the passage lacks the constructions
that often complete the meaning of the verb *mereor*. The phrase could simply mean “what we (Romans) deserve” in general, or it could mean “that thing on account of which we (Romans) deserve things from you (Tiburtines).” If *meritum* is being used here in the second, specific sense, it would have to allude to a particular service or favor done by the Romans for the Tiburtines as a reason why the Senate believes the Tiburtines would not have acted unfavorably towards the Romans. The second set of uses cited in the *Thesaurus Latinae Linguae* for *meritum* points towards the second meaning given for the passive *mereor*, where *mereri* is almost the same as *dignum esse*: “to make it the case, by means of actions, that something ought to be bestowed on us: to be deserving (of either a good thing or a bad thing)”). The *TLL* cites the *Epistula ad Tiburtes* as an example of this definition for which the thing owed is a negative thing (*mala re*)—that is, something that is deserved on account of ill behavior. The logic of the Senate’s argument, then, is that the Tiburtines could not have performed the actions about which they were defending themselves (i.e. presumably negative actions) because the Romans had not performed an action against the Tiburtines that would have been deserving of a negative

---

222 Employing the noun *meritum* derived from the substantive use of the adjectival form *meritus*, s.v. *mereor* *TLL* Vol. VIII, p. 814, lin. 1

223 *i. q. factis efficere, ut tribui nobis aliquid debeat: dignum esse [tam bona re quam mala].* *TLL* Vol. VIII, p. 818, lin. 33-64; for the second definition of *mereor*, see Vol. VIII. p. 807, lin. 54-7. This meaning of *meritum* appearing in the ablative with a possessive adjective, as in this inscription, is attested as early as Plautus and appears frequently in classical prose. This second set of definitions of *meritum* particularly notes the use of *meritum* in the ablative with a personal adjective and a form of *facio* in a different person to mean that the person in the ablative case is deserving that the subject of *facio* should do something. When applied to *merito nostro facere* in the inscription (where the subject of *facere* is *vos*, the Tiburtines, as the infinitive *facere* is complementary to the verb *potuisse*, which is itself in the infinitive form with the accusative subject *vos* in *oratio obliqua* following *scibamus*), this definition results in *Romanos dignos sunt, ut Tiburtes faciant...*, i.e. “The Romans are deserving that the Tiburtines do something or act in a certain way”
action in return. The Senate does not go so far as to imply that actions that Rome took in
the past benefitted the Tiburtines and on account of this the Romans are now owed good
treatment, but it does assert a lack of actions taken by Rome that harmed the Tiburtines.

The second reason offered by the Epistula in support of the Senate’s decision is
that the Tiburtines themselves are not worthy (dignos) of having committed the acts in
question. This statement repeats a great deal of the substance of the first reason, but
focuses on what the Tiburtines are worthy of rather than what the Romans deserve. The
uses of dignus fall into two broad categories: uses similar to decens, aptus, conveniens,
which suggest “deserving” in the sense of “suitable or worthy of some thing”, that is to
say, due to an inherent characteristic, and another set of uses that suggest “deserving” in
the sense of “owed or due some thing, entitled to some thing (i.e. some reward).” The
use of the infinitive esse and a relative clause of characteristic to complete dignos implies
that the first general definition is meant, as it suggests that the sentiment refers to a state
of being or characteristic that is not in keeping with what the subject deserves. In

---

224 definitions under I. in the TLL entry, praevalet sensus comparationis i. decens, aptus,
conveniens, and definitions under II. in the TLL entry, praevalet sensus meriti et pretii
225 Similar uses of dignus are attested in literary comparanda within a half-century of the
inscription’s likely date: a fragment of the orations of C. Sempronius Gracchus, probably
written in the 130s BCE, displays a form of this construction (dignus esse qui), as does a
fragment from Pacuvius’ Armorum Iudicium, written prior to 140 BCE. Fragment of C.
Sempronius Gracchus: Festus 150M (38.1) eo exemplo instituto dignus fuit, qui malo
cruce periret; cited as evidence for the masculine gender of crux by its use with malo in
this quotation. The speech probably dates to the five years before his death (i.e. 138-133
BCE), as he was not quaestor until 137 BCE (prior to which he served as military
tribune) Fragment of Pacuvius: Arm. Iud. fr. 32, from Nonius 473.12 (commenting on the
use of certatur for certat). An quis est qui te esse dignum quicum certetur putet? (And
who would think you to be worthy to be one with whom he might contend?) Though the
date of the composition or first performance of this play is not known, it must date to the
period roughly between 200 BCE (twenty years after Pacuvius’ birth in 220 BCE) and
addition to asserting the absence of any actions by the Romans that would cause them to
deserve ill treatment from Tibur, therefore, the inscription also references the Tiburtines
as having some intrinsic quality that makes them the type of people who would not
commit the acts against which they had been defending themselves. By referring to a
history of interactions between the cities as a basis for their beliefs about the current state
of affairs, and implying that they hold a certain image of Tibur that depends, in part, on
those past interactions, the Senate is essentially describing their own collective memory
of the interactions between Rome and Tibur. Although we do not have a record of many
interactions between Rome and Tibur in this time period, the Senate’s statements in the
Epistula ad Tiburtes demonstrate the Romans’ continued awareness of a legacy of past
interactions with Tibur and suggests that their memory of the recent past contained fewer
hostile interactions with Tibur than characterized their 4th century BCE relationship.226

The final reason given for determining the Tiburtines’ innocence is that it would
not be “useful” to the Tiburtine addressees or to their polity for them to have committed
the actions in question (*neque id vobeis neque rei poplicae vostrae oitile esse facere*).
Taken in combination with the first reason above, this seems to suggest a world in which
Roman power in Latium has grown to the point that the Roman Senate can assume the

140 BCE (ten years before his death circa 130 BCE, as he was said to have written plays
until he was 80 years old).

226 The absence of such a record could, of course, either be due to a lack of interactions or
due to the records of those interactions not surviving to the present. The Senate’s
suggestion that there have not been any incidents between the two cities that would merit
resentment from the Tiburtines points towards an absence of significant military or
political interactions between Rome and Tibur in the decades leading up to the Epistula,
especially as almost all of their interactions prior to the stalemate following 338 BCE
were decidedly adversarial, but the statement could also be ignoring incidents that would
have been interpreted more negatively from a Tiburtine perspective.
Tiburtines know what risks they would face (and what advantages they would forfeit) by defying Rome. It is apparent that the Romans write the letter from a position of authority, but whether that authority was acknowledged by the Tiburtines is not clear—the power implied in the letter comes entirely from the Romans’ depiction of themselves. The letter makes it clear that it is discussing a relationship between two civic entities, despite reporting a decision made by a smaller group (the Senate) acting as a governing body within the civic entity of Rome and addressing what is clearly some subset of the entire population of Tibur. The phrase *vobeis neque rei poplicae vostrae* demonstrates that the addressees, while they are assumed to speak on behalf of the larger community of Tibur (i.e. they are the *vos* referenced in *quod Teiburtes v(erba) f(ecistis) quibusque de rebus vos purgavistis*), are not identical with the civic entity, the *res publica vostra*.

Furthermore, despite the power imbalance between the two cities implied by the circumstances of the letter, the civic entities of Rome and Tibur are conceived of as parallel institutions: both are *res publicae* that have some governing body or smaller group of citizens managing the affairs of—and speaking on behalf of—the wider city.

**C. Exiles at Tibur**

The treaties that would have governed the relationship between Rome and Tibur between c. 338 BCE and 90 BCE had at least one characteristic that is mentioned in several sources—they protected Tibur’s right to host exiles from Rome. References connecting Tibur to exiles appear across genres through the Republic, demonstrating the persistent Roman memory of this characteristic. The origins of this reputation seem to be in the *ius exilii*, one of the traditional “Latin rights,” that most Latin cities lost as part of the Roman
settlement in 338 BCE. Polybius suggests, however, that Praeneste and Tibur retained this right, as he claims that at the middle of the 2nd century BCE, “there [was] safety for exiles in Neapolis and Praeneste and in the city of the Tiburtines, and in other towns with which the Romans hold a treaty.” It is usually assumed that entering *exilium* prohibited someone from entering any community that held Roman citizenship, so the ability to accept exiles from Rome being an exceptional feature of Praeneste and Tibur supports the argument that they were the only two cities of Latium that had been able to maintain an independent, albeit allied, polity in Polybius’ time.

In addition to being tied to political independence in the Roman cultural memory, the *ius exilium* held by Tibur and Praeneste is linked with the spatial relationship of these cities with Rome. At the time of the earliest literary references to the *ius exilium*, Tibur and Praeneste are significantly closer to Rome than the other communities holding this right. Tibur and Praeneste offered a place of refuge for exiles only 35 km from the city and within the bounds of a territory otherwise thoroughly conquered by Rome in Polybius’ day; Neapolis, in contrast, was located more than 225 km away from Rome in a region that was much less integrated with Rome (Campanian cities retained more

---

227 See discussions of the practice and principle of the *ius exilium*: Crifò 1963 (the only monograph on the *ius exilium* specifically; Crifò argues that this was originally conceived of as a right because it was a form of personal liberty for citizens), Kelly 2006, esp. 17-68 (comprehensive study of exile in the Roman Republic; discusses the putative “*ius exilii*” as a social custom rather than a statutory right)

228 Pol. 6.14.8 ἔστι δ᾽ ἁσφάλεια τοῖς φεύγουσιν ἐν τῇ Νεάπολι καὶ Πραινεστίνων, ἐπὶ δὲ Τιβουρίνων πόλει, καὶ ταῖς ἄλλαις, πρὸς ἅς ἔχουσιν ὀρκία (There is safety for exiles in Neapolis and Praeneste, and in the city of the Tiburtes, and in other towns with which [the Romans] hold a treaty.)

229 See Kelly 2006, 100-7 and 196-7 on the geographic constraints of the exile, particularly in the Late Republic. By Cicero’s day, exiles were prohibited from remaining in Italy at all.
independence than Latin cities and were more likely to be civitates foederatae than to have been received into full Roman citizenship). The presence of exiles from Rome in cities so close to home had changed dramatically by the Late Republic, according to Cicero, who depicts exile as synonymous with complete removal from Italy. In the Pro Ligario, for example, he says that Q. Ligarius “is forbidden from Italy; he lives in exile” (Italia prohibitur, exsulat). In little more than a century, Rome seems to have gone from allowing exiles to stay less than 50 km from Rome to insisting that they leave the Italian peninsula completely. Later Romans certainly remembered the time when Tibur hosted exiles as notable for the city’s close proximity to Rome. When narrating an episode involving an “exile” from Rome to Tibur, Ovid notes that in the past Tibur was a place of exile—exilio mutant urbem Tiburque recedunt/exilium quodam tempore Tibur erat—suggesting that some part of the audience is expected to be surprised or confused by a story in which exiles flee not across the sea but right down the road to Tibur. Both quodam tempore and erat focus the reader’s attention on the temporal contrast between

---

230 Campania was also culturally distinct from Rome in many ways, as were the majority of the cities within the area of Magna Graecia; Neapolis had several cultural features (including the use of Greek as the dominant language and the continued prevalence of Greek customs even after the Romans established a formal alliance and brought the region into its sphere of influence) that would probably have seemed significantly more foreign to Rome than Tibur and Praeneste right down the road. Though Neapolis itself stayed allied with the Romans, Campania was also home to some who had defected to the Carthaginians during Hannibal’s march up the Italian peninsula about 50 years earlier.

231 Cic. Lig. 11, see also Cic. Rab. Per. 37 and Mil. 104. The legal accuracy of Cicero’s characterization is supported by the fact that the Lex Julia Municipalis of 45 BCE, found inscribed on two bilingual bronze tablets near the site of Heraclea Lucania in Magna Graecia, makes reference to exiles who are not permitted to be in Italy, as they have been condemned by a public court (queiue iudicio publico Romae/ condemnatus est erit, quocirca eum in Italia esse non liceat, neque in integrum restitus est erit). CIL I 206; Dessau, ILS 6085.117-8 (see note on restitus, “Scr. restitutus”)

232 Ovid Fasti 6.665-6.
the story and the reader’s own day. Ovid himself later contrasted this earlier state of affairs with his own day while living in exile on the coast of the Black Sea, banished well beyond the bounds of Italy: in the *Epistulae Ex Ponto*, he asks rhetorically “Why should I speak about the ancient men of the Roman race, among whom Tibur was the most remote land for exiles?” (*quid referam veteres Romanae gentis, apud quos/exulibus tellus ultima Tibur erat?*)

A number of episodes in which exiles take refuge at Tibur are preserved in Roman literary sources. The earliest ones date from periods when there are no surviving records of treaties between Rome and other Latin cities, so there is no way to confirm whether formal agreements about the *ius exilium* or merely conventional practices underlie these stories. Even in the absence of any records of treaties or explicit references to a *ius exilium*, however, these stories, when taken together, demonstrate that later Romans had a collective memory of Tibur playing host to those disaffected from Rome over many centuries. In fact, the earliest mention of Tibur in Livy is in the context of the city playing host to an exile: at the conclusion of his narrative of the decemvirate, Livy describes how the combined public outrage occasioned by the death of Verginia and the spectacle of an elderly veteran exposing his scarred back for whipping caused the overthrow of the decemvirs, who went into exile and forfeited their property. Marcus Claudius—the freedman of Appius Claudius who had brought the legal action that led to Verginia’s abduction and rape by the decemvir—is brought to trial and convicted; as

---

233 Ovid *Pont.* 1.3.81-2
234 Livy 3.58.9 *Bona Claudi Oppique tribuni publicavere; collegae eorum exsilii causa solum verterunt; bona publicata sunt.* (The tribunes confiscated the goods of Claudius and Oppius; their colleagues left the country in order to go into exile, and their goods were confiscated.)
Verginius remits the “ultimate penalty” (i.e. death), M. Claudius is instead sent into exile at Tibur (ipso remittente Verginio ultimam poenam dimissus Tibur exsulatum abitit).\(^{235}\)

Livy also describes a strange minor incident involving Tibur that occurred in 311 BCE—in fact, Livy himself says that he “would pass over it as too inconsequential for discussion, except that it seems to be pertinent to religion” (eiusdem anni rem dictu parvam praeterirem, ni ad religionem visa esset pertinere).\(^{236}\) Rome’s flute-players, angered by the fact that the censors have forbidden them to hold their customary feast in the Temple of Jupiter, perform a sort of secession to Tibur.\(^{237}\) The Roman senate, alarmed by the prospect of lacking flute-players for religious rituals, enjoins Tibur to make sure they return; when persuasion in the Tiburtine senate fails, the people of Tibur resort to tricking the flute-players into drunkenness and carting them back to Rome while intoxicated.\(^{238}\) Though not a story about exile in the most literal sense, the episode is interesting because it reveals that the flute-players had some expectation that Tibur would be hospitable to a group leaving Rome in indignation. This does not necessarily suggest the presence of legal protections for Rome’s disaffected at Tibur in the early 4th century BCE (indeed, the fact that the Tiburtines themselves decide to trick the flute-players and send them back to Rome does not quite align with the attitude or behavior one might

\(^{235}\) Livy 3.58.10 
Et M. Claudius, adsertor Verginiae, die dicta damnatus, ipso remittente Verginio ultimam poenam dimissus Tibur exsulatum abitit

\(^{236}\) Livy 9.30.1

\(^{237}\) Livy 9.30.5

\(^{238}\) Livy 9.30.5-10; also told by Ovid in Fast. 6.665-92, Plutarch in his Roman Questions 277F, and Valerius Maximus 2.5.4.
associate with such a legal and social practice), but it does imply that widely circulating opinions about Tibur indicated it would be an advisable destination for the flute-players in their “secession.” This episode has a long history in Latin literature, and in each of its incarnations the activities of the flute-players are tied to Tibur. When he retells the story in his *Fasti*, Ovid describes the departure of the flute-players as an exile (*exilio mutant urbem Tiburque recedunt*).\(^{239}\) The presence of this story in Plutarch’s *Roman Questions* demonstrates that the episode was still associated with Tibur by the end of the 1st century CE.\(^{240}\)

Livy reports another incident involving exiles at Tibur from the second century BCE, and this episode involved the formal exercise of the *ius exilium* was certainly exercised: the trial of P. Furius Philus and M. Matienus in 171 BCE ended with the defendants going into voluntary exile at Praeneste and Tibur, respectively.\(^ {241}\) Furius and Matienus were charged with exploiting the Hispani during their terms as praetors; this event therefore becomes Baranowski’s *terminus ante quem* for the existence of treaties between Rome and Tibur and between Rome and Praeneste that assured the *ius exilii*.\(^ {242}\) As their trial in 171 BCE was within a few decades of the time of Polybius’ writing, there seems to be a relatively secure basis for the housing of exiles as a legally protected right at Tibur and Praeneste in the middle of the 2nd century BCE.

\(^{239}\) Ovid *Fasti* 6.665; see 6.657-92 for the entire episode.

\(^{240}\) Plut. *Quaest. Rom.* 55

\(^{241}\) Livy 43.2.10 *gravissimis criminiibus accusati ambo ampliatique; cum dicenda de integro causa esset, excusati exilii causa solum vertisse. Furius Praeneste, Matienus Tibur exulatum abierunt.* (Both (P. Furius Philus and M. Matienus) were accused of very grave crimes and [their trials] were adjourned; when the undecided case was about to be re-discussed/debated/argued, it was pled in their defense that that they had emigrated to go into exile—Furius had gone off as an exile to Praeneste, Matienus to Tibur.)

\(^{242}\) Baranowski 1988, 173.
In addition to being mentioned as a refuge for exiles from Rome, Tibur developed a reputation as a frequent (and desirable) location for people who were otherwise on unfriendly terms with Rome. Though no sources discuss Tibur’s status as a refuge for exiles later than the middle of the 2nd century BCE, a number of incidents appear in literary sources from the Late Republic where Tibur is associated with the flight of rebels and exiles. In particular, a collection of references to Tibur during the civil wars reinforce the idea that the city was associated with people fleeing Rome and suggest that anxiety over Tibur’s perceived desire for independence continued to be a part of the way Romans thought about Tibur through the end of the Republic. Appian reports that when Cinna fled Rome in 87 BCE, he went among some of the Italian cities that had recently gained citizenship, including Tibur, in an attempt to incite revolt and raise funds for his cause. Praeneste, Tibur, and Nola are named as cities Cinna expected might be receptive to his plans for rebellion against Rome. Tibur and Praeneste are significantly closer to Rome—geographically, politically, and culturally—than Nola, and it is notable that Cinna nevertheless believes he has some hope of mustering support there. Much as Polybius grouped Praeneste and Tibur with Neapolis as cities in which exiles were legally protected, Appian describes the two major Latin cities in juxtaposition with a city in a region that was further removed from Rome and was not conquered and integrated into Rome for many decades after the majority of Latium: because of their persistent history
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243 App. B.Civ. 1.65.2 ...ἐξέδραμεν ἐς τὰς ἄγχοι πόλεις τὰς οὐ πρὸ πολλοῦ πολιτιδας Ῥωμαίων γεγομένας, Τίβυρτόν τε καὶ Πραινεστόν καὶ ὅσαι μέχρι Νόλης, ἐρεβίζων ἀπαντᾶς ἐς ἀπόστασιν καὶ χρήματα ἐς τὸν πόλειμον συλλέγων. (“...he [Cinna] rushed to the towns nearby, which had not been citizens of Rome for much time—Tibur and Praeneste, and the ones all the way to Nola—inciting them all to revolution and collecting money for war.”)
of independence from Rome, in some ways Tibur and Praeneste seem to be thought of as less similar to their Latin neighbors than they are to major cities in regions further afield.

During the civil war between Caesar and Pompey, Cicero mentions Tibur in a letter in Atticus as one of the places to which Domitius is rumored to have fled from Rome in March of 49 BCE (probably L. Domitius Ahenobarbus, who was with Pompey during the battle of Pharsalus in 48 BCE). A few years later, when the tides of civil war had turned after the death of Caesar and his former co-consul Antony was clashing with the Senate and Octavian, who was now claiming to be the legitimate successor of Caesar, Antony also retreated from Rome and spent time in Tibur. In his 13th Philippic, Cicero depicts Antony’s actions the previous year in the aftermath of Caesar’s assassination, seeking an Italian city at which he can raise an army and from which he can mount an attack on Rome. Cicero then describes Antony “marching” into Rome with an entourage of allies (characterized as an army—quo comitatu vel potius agmine) and threatening to attack the city and divide it up among his supporters, after which, Cicero says, he withdrew to Tibur. There he is described as returning to his troops (amassed not too far outside the city, if they are waiting at Tibur) and holding some “destructive assembly” (ibi pestifera illa Tiburi contio), which Cicero evidently expects to be sufficiently familiar to his audience for no further explanation to be necessary.

The description of Antony in this section of the 13th Philippic echoes that of a general on

---

244 Cicero Att. 8.14.3
245 Cic. Phil. 13.18 prorupit subito Brundisium ut inde agmine quadrato ad urbem accederet (he rushed suddenly to Brundisium so that, when an army had been arranged, he could lead an attack on the city (i.e. Rome) from there)
246 Cic. Phil. 13.19
247 Cic. Phil. 13.19
the eve of besieging a city of enemies; in Cicero’s narrative, it is only the accident of
Antony hearing news of the fourth legion approaching Rome that averted the threat for an
attack on Rome by an army of Romans.\textsuperscript{248} An earlier letter from Cicero to Atticus
suggests that this depiction of Antony as an invading general about to march on Rome
from his encampment at Tibur is not entirely a fiction of the highly polemical \textit{Philippics},
but was based in part on the contemporary perception that Antony was behaving as if he
held power and legitimate political authority while encamped at Tibur and in defiance of
the Senate and Caesar’s legitimate heir, Octavian. Cicero references Atticus making a
visit to Antony at Tibur wherein Atticus made his peace with Antony and even expressed
gratitude to him—both of which Cicero treats as shrewd political moves in view of
Antony’s power, which was apparently significant enough for Cicero to approve of
Atticus seeking to avoid Antony’s enmity.\textsuperscript{249} Appian’s \textit{Bellum Civile} has a more
extended description of Antony’s behavior at Tibur, possibly drawing on other
Ciceronian material, in the competing speeches of Cicero and Piso for and against,
respectively, declaring Antony a public enemy.\textsuperscript{250} Piso, objecting that Cicero has
inaccurately characterized Antony at Tibur as “holding court” and receiving supplication
from a line of senators coming from Rome to grovel in fear, describes the scene instead
as one of great voluntary allegiance by the same men who are now disclaiming Antony,
including Cicero himself.\textsuperscript{251} In objecting to Cicero’s characterizations of Antony at Tibur,
Piso’s speech expands on how Cicero and Antony’s other enemies attacked his behavior

\textsuperscript{248} Cic. \textit{Phil.} 13.19
\textsuperscript{249} Cic. \textit{Att.} 16.3.1
\textsuperscript{250} App. \textit{B.Civ.} 3.50
\textsuperscript{251} App. \textit{B.Civ.} 3.58
at Tibur: they seem to have described him as an enemy waiting just outside the gates, supported—or at least tolerated—by the people of Tibur. Appian also mentions Tibur in the civil war between Octavian and Lucius Antonius: the temple of Hercules Victor at Tibur is one of those from which Octavian borrows funds to support himself in the war, as L. Antonius had access to the proceeds of his brother’s profitable provinces, while Octavian had found himself assigned lands that were nearly all at war.\textsuperscript{252} It is unclear how this incident would have been interpreted at the time, but by Appian’s day—by which point Octavian had very clearly been the correct choice to back—Tibur’s provision of funds to Octavian seems like providing support to the legitimate ruler against the rebelling L. Antonius.

Unlike her neighbor Praeneste, Tibur did not raise arms against Rome with any of these military figures; however, the Roman record of the period preserves both the perception that Tibur and Praeneste would be receptive to figures disaffected from Rome and the memory of Tibur allowing some of those same individuals to stay there, continuing to serve as a refuge for those who were functionally exiled even after it lost the legal privilege of the \textit{ius exilium}.\textsuperscript{253} In the early 80s BCE, Tibur appears as a potential ally for a rebel fleeing Rome and trying to assemble an army. While the city did not choose to rebel against Rome on that occasion, it also does not seem to have refused entry to others fleeing through Italy in the next few decades. As the end of the civil wars

\textsuperscript{252} App. \textit{B.Civ.} 5.24

\textsuperscript{253} It is possible that the \textit{ius exilium} was lost from Tibur’s treaties with Rome at some time after 171 BCE (the trial of Furius and Matienus); at the absolute latest, we can state with certainty that it would have disappeared in 90 BCE, at which point Tibur must have been granted Roman citizenship if (as seems likely) they did not already hold it, along with all other Italian cities that did not raise arms against Rome in the Social War.
approach, however, Tibur is depicted in a context that is at the very least neutral, as Appian shows the religious site of Hercules Victor at Tibur acting alongside official Roman cult sites to support the Roman state rather than allying with any of the rebels.

III. INDIVIDUALS

Despite the unusual history of relations between Tibur and Rome’s growing power in central Italy (unique among the cities of Latium vetus other than Praeneste in that the city remained a nominally independent polity for centuries after Rome’s victory over the Latins in 338 BCE), individuals associated with Tibur begin to gain power, influence, and citizenship at Rome later in the Republic. Wiseman’s 1971 study of novi homines entering the Roman Senate demonstrates the relatively predictable political trajectory of elite families from across central Italy entering the ranks of the nobiles at Rome through a network of alliances and patronage, along with political maneuvering, in the years after their cities were conquered and absorbed into the Roman citizen body.\(^{254}\) This suggests that familial associations with former enemy cities, even if they continued to be remembered by other Romans, were not suspect on an individual level. This process generally took place in the late 4\(^{th}\) and early 3\(^{rd}\) centuries BCE for the prisci Latini, regardless of whether or not the relevant city was granted full citizenship immediately. For example, a member of a family from Tusculum, which gained Roman citizenship around 381 BCE, became consul in 322 BCE (see Chapter One, Section II.A), and a

---

\(^{254}\) Wiseman 1971.
member of a family from Nomentum, which was incorporated after 338 BCE as a
*municipium sine suffragio* became consul for the first time in 290 BCE.\(^{255}\)

In contrast to the pattern observed from these other cities, the process of families
associated with Tibur climbing the social ladder at Rome is delayed. No Tiburtines are
known to have entered the *cursus honorum* until the first decades of the 1\(^{\text{st}}\) century
BCE—after Tibur received Roman citizenship in 90 BCE, despite the fact that Tiburtines
could have attained Roman citizenship on an individual basis earlier (and at least two
families did).\(^{256}\) After Tibur received Roman citizenship and families associated with
Tibur began attaining political office at Rome, the names of these Tiburtine families
continued to appear in inscriptions from Tibur of late Republican and Augustan dates.\(^{257}\)
This suggests continued comingling of elite families from the two cities rather than a one-
way migration from Tibur to Rome involving the abandonment of all ties to the former in
favor of political ambitions in the latter.

*A. Tiburtine Novi Homines: The Coponii and the Cossinii*

One politically successful family of the Late Republic, the *gens Coponia*, is known to
have immigrated from Tibur and offers examples of several different ways in which
individuals might have been associated with the city of Tibur in the minds of

---

\(^{255}\) Wiseman acknowledges examples when the gap is longer—i.e. over a century for
families from Gabii, and two centuries for families from Lanuvium—but is unwilling to
characterize these examples as a group based on the argument *ex silentio*: the only group
for which he believes the relative paucity of senators needs an explanation is that of
Roman citizen colonies.

\(^{256}\) L. Munatius Plancus C.f. (possibly Sulla’s legate in 87 BCE) is the earliest example
provided by Wiseman 1971 (no. 261 in the prosopography, p. 242), and the political
offices he held are not clearly attested.

\(^{257}\) E.g. the *gens Coponia* (sometimes *Cauponia*): CIL XIV 3538, 3540, 3740, CIL V
1027
contemporary and later generations of Romans. The Coponii first appear in the historical record in the mid-1st century BCE, when a Coponius is said to have been one of the sculptors who worked on Pompey’s theater-temple in Rome c. 55 BCE. Cicero refers to members of the gens Coponia in two speeches delivered in 56 BCE—to Titus Coponius and his grandsons Gaius and Titus Coponius in the Pro Balbo, and to Gaius and the younger Titus again in the Pro Caelio. In the Pro Balbo, Cicero explicitly connects the Coponii with Tibur: he claims that until very recently they were Tiburtine citizens, but that T. Coponius (the elder) and his countryman L. Cossinius both gained Roman citizenship after their successful prosecutions of T. Caelius and C. Masso, respectively, which indicates that the family became Roman citizens prior to the general grant of citizenship to Tibur as a whole in 90 BCE. At least one member of the gens Coponia in the late Republic, Gaius Coponius, seems to have deliberately evoked specific connections to Tibur through the figure of Hercules Victor, who was associated with the

---

258 Pliny NH 36.4.12-3
259 Cic. Balb. 53, Cael. 24. Another Coponius of the generation of T. Coponius is well-known in rhetorical works as the subject of a lawsuit about inheritance argued in the late 90s BCE; this Coponius died without having sons (and so cannot be the T. Coponius mentioned by Cicero, who had at least two grandsons holding his family name—see De Or. 1.180, 2.140-1, Brutus 194-8. The will of the deceased Coponius named M’. Curius as heir if he died without sons who reached adulthood. A relative, M. Coponius, challenged the inheritance on the grounds that a literal reading of the will left the elder Coponius intestate, as he did not have sons who died before adulthood, but had never had sons at all.
260 Cic. Balb. 53 quo modo igitur L. Cossinius Tiburs, pater huius equitis Romani, optimi atque ornatissimi viri, damnato T. Caelio, quo modo ex eadem civitate T. Coponius, civis item summa virtute et dignitate,—nepotes T. et C. Coponios nostis,—damnato C. Masone civis Romanus est factus? (“How, then, was Lucius Cossinius of Tibur, the father of this Roman knight (an excellent and very illustrious man) made a Roman citizen after Titus Caelius had been condemned; and how was Titus Coponius from the same city, also a most virtuous and dignified citizen (his grandsons Titus and Caius Coponius are well-known), made a Roman citizen after Caius Maso had been condemned?”)
city because of its temple to the god (see Section IV of this chapter). Gaius Coponius, the first in his family to attain political office (and only two generations after his family received citizenship) was highly regarded by his contemporaries. In addition to referencing how well-known Gaius and his brother Titus were in the Pro Balbo, Cicero refers to them flattering in the Pro Caelio; the praise occurs while he is introducing them as witnesses, and so is expected as a matter of building their credibility, but more important than the compliments is the fact that the youths are sufficiently prominent that Cicero can reference them as examples and expect the audience to accept this evidence. Velleius Paterculus also describes C. Coponius as a noble and honest senator in the face of the chaos and disloyalty of the civil wars. C. Coponius issued denarii as praetor in 49 BCE together with Q. Sicinius as triumvir monetalis (RRC 444/1a-c); these have as their reverse type an upright club with a lion’s skin (with head), bow, and arrow, and the legend PR·S·C·COPONIVS. The iconography of the club and lion’s skin is clearly recognizable as referring to Hercules; given the well-attested ties between the Coponii and Tibur, the coin therefore appears to allude to the city of Tibur by referencing its major cult site. Read together with the many other coin types issued by families of Latin origin in the late Republic alluding to their ancestral city, this coin suggests that gens Coponia in Rome in the mid 1st century BCE both traced their origins to Tibur and

---

261 RRC 444/1a-c (Crawford 1974, Vol. 1, 89) obverse: Q·SICINIVS III·VIR, Head of Apollo right, hair tied with band, star below, border of dots; reverse: PR·S·C·COPONIVS, upright club on which hangs lion's skin with head in profile, arrow and legend on left, bow and legend on right, border of dots.

262 Crawford 1974 Vol. 2, 737 tentatively identifies the reverse as alluding to Hercules as Hercules Victor; Farney 2007, 275 identifies the type as alluding specifically to the cult of Hercules Victor because of the association between the Coponii and Tibur.
viewed those origins as politically advantageous—worthy of being advertised on their coins.  

While prominent Roman politicians from Tibur appear relatively late, once Tiburtines begin entering the *cursus honorum*, some of them participate in self-advertisement based on their origins at Tibur similar to that of their peers tracing descent from other cities. It is not only the evidence for Roman politicians *advertising* themselves as associated with Tibur that does not appear until the late Republic—this would be completely unsurprising, as such advertisements of family origin appear to be a late Republican phenomenon—but the evidence for Roman politicians with any association with Tibur, whether self-advertised, ascribed to them by others, or demonstrated by external evidence, only appears in the 1st century BCE. Although we have no surviving record of active military conflict between Rome and Tibur between the major defeat of the Latin League in 338 BCE, in which Tibur was punished with the loss of a significant amount of her territory, and the city’s presumed enfranchisement in 90 BCE, it seems that the cultural memory of the city figured it as distinctly “other” than Rome until after Tibur was finally made fully and decisively “Roman” by the *Lex Julia*. The enfranchisement of Tibur is not itself a satisfying causal explanation for the appearance of Tiburtine *novi homines*, however. First, enfranchisement is fundamentally

---

263 Farney 2007 provides a systematic survey of these coin types.
264 While fewer examples of overt allusions to Tibur on coins issued by Roman magistrates are known than is the case for other Latin cities, we should note that we may be missing many of the references to Tibur that would have been intelligible to a contemporary audience. This is true for Tibur to an even greater degree than is generally the case, as the symbols that could possibly associated with the legendary founder Tiburtus/Tiburnus are quite generic (i.e. a tree) and not instantly recognizable to us, but may have been more obvious in antiquity combined with a known Tiburtine name or some other feature.
a symptom, not a cause, of changing relationships between polities—the first question to be answered is why Tibur entered the Roman citizen body after nearly two and a half centuries of apparently stagnant relations between the two cities. The only other community of the prisci Latini that was not enfranchised until the beginning of the first century BCE, Praeneste, was associated with senatorial and consular novi at a significantly earlier date—the first Praenestine known to have entered the cursus did so in 304 BCE, and the first consul associated with Praeneste is elected in 284 BCE (see Chapter Three, Section III.A).

The Tiburtine men adduced by Cicero in the Pro Balbo as arguments for the validity of Roman citizenship gained via prosecution demonstrate that Romans of the Late Republic would have thought of Tibur as a place just recently incorporated into the Roman citizenry, despite its geographical, cultural, and social proximity to Rome. Cicero looks to men from Tibur for examples of Latin citizens gaining Roman citizenship within the living memory of his audience, and he emphasizes how recently the Coponii had entered the Roman public sphere. Furthermore, he is able to produce two examples of Tiburtine families in recent memory that gained citizenship not through a grant to the entire city, but individually on the basis of successful prosecutions. This process presumably would not have taken place after the entire city of Tibur had been given Roman citizenship. Tibur’s very recent past as non-Roman is clearly fresh in the memory of the Roman audience Cicero anticipates, and furthermore, other Romans could associate (i.e. Cicero) or recall the association of (i.e. his audience) specific families and individuals with the city of Tibur, even after those Tiburtines had gained Roman citizenship.

265 Cic. Balb. 53
citizenship. One of those families, the *gens Cossinia*, seems to have experienced an swift rise through the Roman elite upon gaining citizenship—Cossinius may have been a *novus civis* as well as a *novus homo* when he entered the *cursus honorum* as praetor in 73 BCE.266

**B. The Munatii Planci and Tibur**

The most successful family known to have been associated with Tibur in the late Republic is the Munatii Planci, a branch of the plebeian Munatii that rose to prominence in the 1st century BCE.267 The family’s association with Tibur at the end of the Republic is well attested by the dedication of Horace’s *Ode* 1.7 on the idyllic landscape of Tibur to a Plancus, thought to be the L. Munatius Plancus who was consul in 42 BCE.268 Watkins has argued that the family had its true geographical origins in the area of Caieta and Formiae and developed a connection with Tibur sometime in the late second or early first century BCE, and that the latter should be seen as secondary to a hereditary link with Caieta (where Plancus was eventually buried).269 It is clear, however, that Plancus’ contemporaries associated him with Tibur—seemingly expecting him to see Tibur as an

---

266 Wiseman 1971, 7.
267 While the Munatii held minor political roles in Rome in the first half of the first century BCE—a Munatius Rufus was a comrade and biographer of M. Porcius Cato Uticensis (see Plut. *Cato Min.* 25.1)—the family entered the senate only with this L. Munatius Plancus, sometime soon before 54 BCE, when he held a post as Caesar’s legate in Gaul (Caes. *Gall.* 5.24)
268 Porphyrio on Hor. *Carm.* 1.7.1 *Hac ode Munatium Plancum consularem adloquitur, qua indicat se praecipue Tiburtina regione delectari, omnibusque eam sua sententia praeponendam adfirmat.* ([Horace] addresses the consul Munatius Plancus in this ode, in which he declares that he is particularly charmed by the Tiburtine countryside, and he asserts that, in his opinion, it is preferable to all others); Acron on Hor. *Carm.* 1.7.1 *Munatium Plancum alloquitur consularem uirum Tiburtem oriundo, in cuius gratiam dicit... sibi † Tiburtem esse laudandam.*
269 Watkins 23-9
idyllic “home” in contrast to the “away” of his military campaigning—and later Romans, including two commentators on Horace, certainly received the tradition that he was tied to Tibur by birth, suggesting that the association with Tibur was more historically lasting than that with Formiae and Caieta. In addition to Horace’s juxtaposition of L. Munatius Plancus and Tibur, the connection between the Munatii Planci and Tibur is suggested by coins issued by Lucius’ brother Gnaeus. Cn. Munatius Plancus, who was adopted by an L. Plautius and took the name L. Plautius Plancus, may have used imagery associated with both his birth family’s hometown of Tibur and an ancestor of his adoptive family, the Plautius who was consul with Appius Claudius Caecus in 312 BCE. A denarius issued by L. Plautius Plancus has on its obverse a head of Medusa, perhaps a dramatic mask, and on its reverse a winged figure leading four horses, interpreted by Bourne as Aurora. Together, she takes the images as referencing the episode of the flute-players’ flight to Tibur and their peaceful return aided by the consul Plautius. The coin would thus reference both the origin of L. Plautius Plancus’ birth family, Tibur, and his adoptive family’s ancestor, tying together the deeds of the ancient Plautius and the Tiburtines’ cooperation with Rome.

Velleius Paterculus records an episode in which two of the few families associated with Tibur, the Munatii Planci and the Coponii, came into conflict in the chaos of the civil wars at the end of the Republic. L. Munatius Plancus, who became well known for his frequent reversals of allegiance (see Watkins 1997), was confronted by C.

---

270 Crawford 453/1; see Bourne 1916, 21. Crawford identifies the figure on the reverse as Victory, but Bourne interprets the winged figure as Dawn. The combination of a Medusa-head, possibly a dramatic mask, on the obverse, and Dawn on the reverse.

271 See Ovid Fasti 6.657-92 (Plautius appears in line 685); Littlewood 2006, 202-4.

272 Vell. Pat. 2.83
Coponius on the occasion of Plancus betraying Antony for Octavian. As Velleius reports, “When the recent deserter Plancus was hurling many and scurrilous words in the Senate at the absent Antony, Coponius—a most dignified former praetor, the father-in-law of P. Silius—said, not unreasonably, ‘By Hercules, Antonius did many things the day before you left him!’” (Haud absurde Coponius, vir e praetoriis gravissimus, P. Silii socer, cum recens transfuga multa ac nefanda Plancus absenti Antonio in senatu obiceret, multa, inquit, mehercules fecit Antonius pridie quam tu illum rellinqueres.)

The episode is strikingly vivid in Velleius Paternculus’ narrative: it includes one of the few quotations in direct speech in his work (they appear in only 8 out of a total 131 chapters in Velleius’ second book) and pauses the forward narrative to present a vivid view of a small scene that brings to life the constitutional untrustworthiness of the man. This character flaw is highlighted by the contrast with the noble Coponius, who appears in Velleius’ telling as Plancus’ perfect opposite; the contrast would be all the more striking (and memorable) if it was motivated by a common origin in Tibur. Why is Coponius, of all figures, the one who stands up against Plancus? He is not particularly prominent or notable, despite having served at one time in Pompey’s forces. It could be that military service under Pompey makes him a suitable foil for the former Caesarian L. Munatius Plancus, the archetypal fair-weather friend, as Coponius’ career demonstrates that one could survive siding with the losing forces in the civil wars and even recover social standing without betraying and denouncing one’s allies when it became clear that the winds were...

273 Vell. Pat. 2.83.3
274 Other examples are in 2.4, 2.14, 2.67, 2.70, 2.86, 2.104, and 2.107 (in the final two examples, Velleius was actually present serving in the military for the episodes narrated and the quotations come from his personal recollections). morbo proditor: 2.83.1
changing. This contrast, and the relationship between the two more generally, would have been much more politically fraught if they were members of two of the few Tiburtine families participating in Roman politics at the time. Coponius’ condemnation of Plancus’ behavior could then be read as an attempt to distance himself from his countryman and to reject such an association with disloyalty. It does not seem that Velleius Paterculus was aware of such a connection between the men, if one did exist, as he almost certainly would have mentioned it (it fits too well with the characterization of Plancus he is advancing, and is too similar to his interest in reporting all of the ties of present and former allegiances between characters when explaining the divided loyalties of the civil wars, for us to reasonably assume he would have left it out). It is possible, however, that Velleius received the story from a source that was aware of a connection or perceived connection between the men through their respective associations with Tibur.

C. Connections with Tibur during the Empire

Though examples of families from Tibur entering the political elite at Rome appear late in the Republic, when they do appear, they suggest that individuals associated with Tibur successfully pursued political office uninhibited by their connections to the Latin city. Some of these individuals even occasionally promoted their associations with Tibur in order to participate in a common language of aristocratic self-definition and advertisement. However, Tacitus reports an incident in 33 CE that suggests individuals from the city of Tibur still might be thought of as “provincial” in the early Julio-Claudian period. Julia, the daughter of Drusus the Younger and former wife of Nero Julius Caesar (son of Germanicus and Agrippina the Elder), was offered in marriage to Rubellius
Blandus, “whose grandfather many remembered was a Roman *eques* from Tibur

(*denupsit in domu Rubellii Blandi, cuius avum Tiburtem equitem Romanum plerique meminerant*)

The marriage is described as a contributing cause of the grief of the Roman people, among many other sorrows (*tot luctibus funesta civitate pars maeroris fuit*), in a year that included the deaths of Asinius Gallus, Drusus, Agrippina the Elder, Cocceius Nerva, and Plancina, all either at their own hands or while imprisoned by Tiberius. While the exact reason why Julia’s marriage causes such sorrow is not given, the description of Rubellius Blandus suggests that it was one of these personal attributes that made him an unsuitable husband for Julia. Rubellius is characterized by the popular memory of his grandfather, who has two characteristics assigned to him: he was an *eques* at Rome, and he was from Tibur. Both of these characteristics, it is implied, make him an unsuitable husband for Julia; the inferiority of a member of the equestrian class to the imperial family is clear, but the inferiority of a family recently emigrated from Tibur implied here is unique. Moreover, the statement that “most people remembered” (*plerique meminerant*) these characteristics of Rubellius’ grandfather confirms both that familial associations with Tibur were noted by others and that those associations could remain attached to a family for several generations. Tiburtines who have moved to Rome, even wealthy Tiburtines, continue to be perceived as “outsiders” to the very center of the Roman world: the imperial court.

---

275 Tac. *Ann.* 6.27.1 *Tot luctibus funesta civitate pars maeroris fuit quod Iulia Drusi filia, quondam Neronis uxor, denupsit in domum Rubellii Blandi, cuius avum Tiburtem equitem Romanum plerique meminerant.* (While there were so many lamentations in the mournful populace, part of the sorrow was the fact that Julia, daughter of Drusus and once Nero’s wife, was married off into the household of Rubellius Blandus, whose grandfather most people remembered was a Roman *eques* from Tibur.)
Though they began to enter the public sphere at Rome in the late Republic, individuals associated with Tibur never achieved great success or prominence in politics. There are relatively few families who appear in the historical record possessing ties to Tibur, and only one example is known of a family with ties to Tibur exploiting those ties for political advertisement on coinage (with one other possible example).\textsuperscript{276} There are several possible explanations for this situation: It is possible that associations with Tibur were generally undesirable or disadvantageous in politics and so were avoided (or shed) by families seeking political advancement at Rome. This would be compatible with the general depiction of Tibur as a civic entity in the Republic, as the city aligns itself against Rome on several occasions—even going so far as to ally with the Gauls, which seems to have been taken as a notable betrayal—and the city’s reluctance to join the Roman citizen body is noticed and recorded. However, this would not account for the relative paucity of references from other Romans referring to individuals as having ties to Tibur, or the fact that what references we do have mostly pertain to the same small number of families who have already been associated with Tibur in some other way, and it is difficult to reconcile with the fact that we do have concrete evidence for at least one member of a formerly Tiburtine family making allusions to the city on coinage through its dominant cult, allusions that are fairly explicit when read through the lens of other contemporary coins referencing Latin cities of family origin.

\textsuperscript{276} The coinage of L. Plautius Plancus, even if it does deliberately allude to his Tiburtine ancestry by birth, still seems to be relying more on the positive associations with his adoptive ancestor Plautius than on the tie to the location of Tibur for any potential political benefit.
However, we have evidence from a later period of individuals making an enthusiastic claim of Tiburtine origins in the form of an inscription associated with the funerary monument of Flavius Agricola, dated to c. the second quarter of the 2nd century CE, which was found in the Vatican necropolis (inscription now lost and presumed destroyed, but recorded as *CIL* 6.17985a; monument now in Indianapolis Museum of Art).\(^{277}\) The 15-line inscription began with a declaration of identity, “*Tibur mihi patria, Agricola sum vocitatus/Flavius idem, ego sum discumbens ut me videtis,*” which presents his origins at Tibur as the first piece of information Flavius wants presented to the world after his death, even prior to his name. References to birthplace or place of origin on gravestones are normally preceded by name, filiation, and sometimes voting tribe, which makes the prominence of Tibur on Flavius Agricola’s funerary monument all the more striking.\(^{278}\) Though Flavius Agricola’s funerary monument is dated to a period significantly later than the events Tacitus presents in *Annals VI*, the kline monument and the epitaph would have been carved in a context not far removed from the time when Tacitus was writing. The monument is dated to the Antonine period (138-192 CE), between 100 and 150 years later than Tiberius’ reign but only roughly 25-75 years after the composition of the *Annals* (a date on the earlier side of the Antonine period should probably be preferred—see below); at the very least, the composition of the *Annals* and Flavius Agricola’s inscription belong to the same general political climate, though the inscription is separated by a number of revolts and political upheavals from the early

\(^{277}\) Indianapolis Museum, Accession Number IMA72.148

\(^{278}\) References to birthplace or place of origin are more likely to be included if the deceased died away from his or her birthplace, as Flavius did, and so are most common on the gravestones of soldiers, who were likely to die far away from their home.
Julio-Claudian context of Rubellius Blandus’ marriage. While the attitudes implied by the reactions Tacitus reports to Rubellius and Julia’s marriage may not still have been current at the time of his writing, they were not so foreign to his audience that he thought it necessary to insert an explanation about previous generations’ prejudice against men of municipal origin. Given the patterns displayed in the gradual assimilation of incorporated Latin cities over time, attitudes towards men like Rubellius Blandus would be expected to have improved between Tiberius’ day and the reigns of Trajan; it does not seem, however, that the memory of those prejudices faded beyond recall. Furthermore, though Tacitus writes about the reaction of Romans to a Tiburtine identified as an outsider, expecting that an audience of Romans will understand this reaction, while Flavius Agricola was a member of the Tiburtine group with which he identifies, Flavius was buried at Rome and among Romans, so we would expect the public presentation of his identity after his death to reflect the anticipated reactions of Romans. It is almost

---

279 Some scholars push the date to the 3rd century CE, presumably on account of the coins of the emperor Gallienus which were reportedly found together with the funerary monument and its inscription; since the monument was located in a necropolis that continued to be used and frequented by relatives of the decedents at least through the 3rd quarter of the 3rd century CE, it is not unexpected that later coins might have been deposited by visitors (the last mausoleum to be constructed is dated to the middle of the 3rd century CE, but new burials in previously constructed family tombs continued after that, with some sarcophagi dating to c. 270-80 CE). For further discussion of the Vatican necropolis see Borg 2013, especially 124-39 on long-term use of mausolea. That an earlier date should be preferred for Flavius Agricola’s burial is demonstrated by the fact that the kline monument, incorrectly identified in many discussions as a sarcophagus, is in fact intended for the deposit of cremated ashes of the deceased. The relatively uncommon kline monuments are most popular from the Flavian to the early Antonine periods, preceding the large-scale popularity of sarcophagi. While cremation continued occasionally into the beginning of the 3rd century CE, inhumation burials rose sharply over the course of the second century, making it far more likely that this kline monument for cremated ashes should be dated to the early Antonine period at the very latest. On kline monuments and their dating, see Friedland et al. (2015) 397-9.
certainly true that Flavius was buried among other Roman citizens who had origins outside of the city of Rome, and that he himself held Roman citizenship, yet he identified—unlike those buried around him—with his municipal patria of Tibur.

IV. TOPOGRAPHY AND MONUMENTS

While the more well-known literary image of Tiburtine topography is that preserved in imperial poetry depicting the city under the Empire as a lush peaceful refuge from the concerns of business and politics, a coherent Roman conception of the earlier physical landscape of Tibur can also be constructed from a wide range of literary sources. The features of this literary landscape are remarkably consistent and many persist over time, though eventually they are reinterpreted in light of the new role of Tiburtine topography as an elite retreat. By considering this literary image of Tibur in conjunction with the archaeological evidence for change in important features of the city’s topography during the centuries of its gradual incorporation into the Roman state, this section of the chapter addresses the role of the physical space of the city in the Roman historical memory of Tibur.

A. Tibur at the Edge of Latium

Strabo’s description of Tibur provides the most extensive ancient description of the city’s topography and introduces a number of categories that appear consistently in references to the physical space of Tibur. Strabo first presents Tibur in terms of the city’s geographic relationship to Rome: “the [Via] Valeria begins at Tibur, and leads to the Marsi, and to Corfinium, the metropolis of the Paeligni. On the same road are the Latin cities Varia, Carseoli, and Alba, and the city of Cuculum is nearby. Tibur, Praeneste, and
Tusculum are visible to people in Rome.” Tibur is described first, in Strabo’s account, as the origin of a road leading towards foreign territories and hostile peoples: the Marsi led a coalition of allies in rebellion against Rome in the Social War, the Paeligni joined the Marsi in rebelling, and the city of Corfinium was chosen by the Italian allies to serve as their capital. The area to which Strabo connects Tibur in this introduction was less socially connected to Rome in the Augustan era than Latium, the region to which Augustan authors usually assign Tibur, and had fewer historic cultural similarities with Rome than did her Latin neighbors: the Marsi and Paeligni originally spoke languages in the Osco-Umbrian family, not Latin, and both allied with the Samnites against Rome in the 4th century BCE. By highlighting Tibur’s place as the origin of the road leading to these peoples, Strabo positions Tibur as being only marginally located in Latium. Tibur is characterized as physically close and well-connected to the more foreign and hostile

---

280 Strabo 5.3.11 ἡ Ὄυαλερία δ’ ἀρχεται μὲν ἀπὸ Τιβουρῶν, ἂγει δ’ ἐπὶ Μαρσοῦς καὶ Κορφίων τὴν τῶν Πελίγυνων μητρόπολιν. εἰσὶ δ’ ἐν αὐτῇ Λατῖναι πόλεις Ὀυαρία τε καὶ Καρσέολοι καὶ Ἀλβα, πλησίον δὲ καὶ πόλις Κούκουλον. ἐν δὲ εἰσὶ τοῖς ἐν Ῥώμῃ Τίβουρᾳ τε καὶ Πραινεστὸς καὶ Τούσκλου.

281 The close association between the Marsi and the Social War is attested by the many contemporary references to the war as the “Marsic War”: see e.g. the Fasti Capitolini (Bellum Marsicum), Cicero (de Div. 1.99, Marsico bello) Velleius Paterculus (2.21, bello Marsico), and Strabo (V.4.2, ὁ Μαρσικός καλούμενος πόλεμος).

282 In addition to evoking the very recent memory of the Social War and this region’s rebellion against Rome, referring to the Marsi and Paeligni also recalls the Roman attitude towards the bellicose Samnite tribes with whom they previously allied; even during periods when these groups are allied with Rome, they are best known for their ferocity as warriors. On the Marsi and Paelae as warriors, see i.e. Horace, Carm. 2.20.17-18, where the Scythians are only pretending not to be afraid of the Marsic troops (qui dissimulat metum/Marsae cohortis Dacus), and Vergil, G. 2.167, where the Marsi are described as haec genus acre virum; additionally, a potentially spurious fragment of Ennius preserved in Pompeius refers to the troops of the Marsi and Paeligni as well, though with so little context that all we can say is that the author was discussing their military forces (Marsa manus, Paeligna cohors, Vestina virum vis” (Pompeius, ap. G.L., V, 303, 19 K); see also Dench 1995 on perceptions of peoples from the central Apennines.
territory beyond, including cities and peoples closely associated in recent memory with rebellion against Rome. Strabo goes on to clarify that Tibur was not immediately adjacent to these cities and that a few “Latin cities” could also be found on the Valerian Way (i.e. between Tibur and the territory of the Marsi and Pelaegni): Varia, Carseoli, Alba [Fucens], and nearby Cuculum. These towns, though referred to by Strabo as Λατιναι πόλεις, belong by origin to some of the many Italic peoples who were in conflict with Rome throughout the Republic: Carseoli and Alba Fucens were towns of the Aequi that were defeated by the Romans, occupied by Roman colonies, and later granted Latin status, while Varia was originally Sabine.\(^{283}\) The otherwise unattested Κούκουλον is alternately identified as a site near the modern town of Cucullo, which is located in territory that could have been either Marsic or Paelignian, or as an error for Aikouikoulon, i.e. a town of the Aequiculi (Strabo himself uses Αἰκουοί for Aequi, and the form Αἰκωικλοί for Aequicoli/Aequiculi is found in the 2\(^{nd}\) century CE mathematician and geographer Claudius Ptolemy).\(^{284}\) Pliny’s account of the regions of Italy lists Tibur to these tribes and characterizes the group as “perhaps the strongest peoples of Italy” (gentium vel fortissimarum Italiae).\(^{285}\) While studies of the regiones have demonstrated that ethnic identity—though it overlaps, in many cases, with the geographic boundaries

\(^{283}\) The process and timeline of Varia’s incorporation as a Latin city, if Strabo is correct in grouping it in this category with Alba Fucens and Carseoli, is not known. Varia was geographically located in Sabine territory according to Pliny’s delineation of Latin and Sabine lands, Strabo’s near contemporary Horace describes men from his Sabine farm being sent to Varia (Ep. 1.14.3 quinque bonos solitum Variam dimittere patres) and a scholiast on Horace explicitly names Varia as a Sabine town. (Schol. Cruq. ad loc., Oppidum in Sabinis olim, nunc vicus).

\(^{284}\) Ptol. Geog. 3.1.56; see Purcell’s commentary for his map of Latium and Campania in the Barrington Atlas (663).

\(^{285}\) Pliny NH 3.106.
between *regiones*—is an oversimplistic explanation for the groupings, Pliny’s characterization suggests that Tibur may have been seen as sharing qualities with the fierce tribes further along the Via Valeria.\textsuperscript{286}

Turning his eyes and his focus from the hinterland towards Rome, Strabo describes Tibur, along with Praeneste and Tusculum, as “within the eyesight of those in Rome.”\textsuperscript{287} Paradoxically, Tibur is both local to Rome (to such an extent that their physical proximity is described as literally perceptible) and distanced (spoken of in close connection with tribes across the Apennines). The reference to eyesight is particularly important, as it highlights the potential threat posed by cities close enough to launch an attack on Rome. In Florus’ epitome of Livy, Pyrrhus is said to have looked out (prospexit) upon Rome from the citadel of Praeneste (Tibur’s neighbor, and a direct comparandum in Strabo’s passage), and Rome is described as being already nearly conquered once Pyrrhus was within eyesight of Rome: the cities are so close that the cloud of smoke and dust raised by Pyrrhus’ army at Praeneste can be seen at Rome as a looming threat (literally, “the sight filled the eyes of the anxious citizenry,” oculos trepidae civitatis).\textsuperscript{288} The final statement Strabo makes about Tibur at the end of this passage contributes to this sense of Tibur as presenting an imposing physical threat, as he notes that both Tibur and Praeneste are well-fortified (ἐρυμὴν) in their respective

\textsuperscript{286} Bispham 2007b, 49.  
\textsuperscript{287} Strabo 5.3.11  
\textsuperscript{288} Flor. 1.13.24 *Victor primo proelio Pyrrhus tota tremente Campania Lirim Fregellasque populus, prope captam urbem a Praenestina arce prospexit et a vicesimo lapide oculos trepidae civitatis fumo ac pulvere inplevit.*
mountainous locations. The emphasis on Tibur’s fortifications, and thus its defensibility, recalls the hostility Tibur had previously displayed towards Rome and emphasizes one of the city’s sources of strength to resist Rome’s military power. Framing Tibur as a city at the point in the road that looks away from Rome towards her potential enemies and connects to those same peoples, but remains constantly within the immediate awareness of those at Rome, demonstrates how Tibur’s physical presence might influence perceptions of the city in broader contexts.

**B. Natural Advantages of Tibur’s Topography**

Strabo mentions three further characteristics of Tibur that are commonly associated with the city by Roman sources: the location of a temple of Hercules at Tibur, a multitude of waterways, and the presence of stone quarries. He describes the waters around Tibur as including the famous waterfall made by the Anio, a navigable river that falls from a great height into a deep wooded chasm near the city and flows out from there to a very fertile plain, and sulfur springs called the Albula waters, which are beneficial to drink and bathe in for treating various diseases. The Anio flows past quarries of the so-called “Tiburtine stone” (travertine/lapis Tiburtinus), as well as lapis Gabinus and tufo lionato, and as a result removing stone from the quarries and transporting it is quite convenient. Strabo also notes that a great many—the majority, he says—of the buildings at Rome are constructed of stone from the area of Tibur (τῶν πλείστων ἔργων τῆς Ῥώμης ἐντεύθεν

---

289 Strabo V.3.11 (though Praeneste is naturally well-fortified to a greater degree than Tibur—ἐρυμνὴ μὲν οὖν ἐκατέρα, πολὺ δ᾽ ἐρυμνοτέρα Πραινεστός).
290 Strabo V.3.11
The common use of the toponym *Tiburtinus* to describe travertine, which was used extensively in Roman buildings of the late Republic and Empire, suggests that the geographic origin of the stone was widely known, while the presence of the Anio as a spatial marker for Tibur in many poetic texts demonstrates that the river’s close association with the city extended beyond the interests of a geographer.\textsuperscript{292} Finally, Strabo briefly mentions two other related characteristics strongly associated with the topography of Tibur: its fertile agricultural fields (the plains are described as *πεδίον ἐὐκαρπότατον* where the Anio encounters them) and its well-wooded groves (he uses the very rare *καταλσῆ*, derived from *ἄλσος*, to describe the valley at the base of the Anio’s waterfall).

As described by Strabo, the Tibur of the late Republic and early Empire is a significant urban presence at the edge of Latium, potentially impressive or imposing depending on the perspective of the viewer. The city has access to abundant natural resources and holds a position with natural strategic advantages in both war and peace, while its location between the turbulent forces of Italic tribes in the Apennines and the Roman sphere of influence gives Tibur a degree of control over transit and trade. It is unsurprising, in light of Strabo’s description, that modern estimates suggest Tibur was one of the very few cities in central Italy that had rivaled Rome’s territorial holdings for

\textsuperscript{291} Strabo V.3.11. While *ἔργον* could itself refer to either sculptures or buildings, as the Romans used travertine mostly for buildings and the word *ἔργον* is used with *κατασκευάζω*, here meaning “build, construct,” *ἔργον* should be taken as referring to buildings rather than sculptures.

\textsuperscript{292} See i.e. Propertius 3.22.23 *Anio Tiburne*
Strabo’s characterization of Tibur as simultaneously local and foreign is a common motif in Roman discussions of the city, which often situate it between Rome’s closest neighbors in Latium and the more distanced and different peoples beyond Latium. This placement of Tibur at physical edges is echoed in the frequent confusion (whether rhetorical or real) of Latin and Sabine territory in the area of Tibur. Though most prose authors place Tibur in Latium, Pliny the Elder includes Tibur on a list of cities in Sabine territory. As Pliny does not explain or argue for Tibur’s place in this list, it may best be explained as an error; however, other authors do frequently reference Tibur as if it is immediately proximate to Sabine territory. Livy mentions an army marching “through the Sabine territory to Tibur” (*per agrum Sabinum Tibur*), and Catullus refers to a property that some call Sabine and others call Tiburtine, suggesting that the two territories directly adjoined one another and that some borders were contested or, at the least, the cause of some confusion.

This characterization of Tibur’s physical location is closely tied to

---

293 Estimates of 6th century territorial holdings as first hypothesized by Beloch 1926, 178: Rome, 822 km²; Tibur, 351 km²; Praeneste 262.5 km². None of the other cities reach 200 km², and all but Ardea and Lavinium are less than 100 km². Further discussion in CAH VI. 243-7 includes comparative charts and map. See also more recent discussion, population figures, and estimates of productive capacity in Cornell 2000, 204-8.  
294 Pliny *NH* 3.108... *Sabinorum Amiternini, Curenses, Forum Deci, Forum Novum, Fidenates, Interamnates, Nursini, Nomentani, Reatini, Trebulani qui cognominantur Mutuesci et qui Suffenates, Tiburtes, Tarinates.* “...among the tribes of the Sabines are the people of Amniternum, Cures, Forum Deci, Forum Novum, Fidenae, Interamna, Nursia, Nomentum, Reate, Trebula which is called Mutuesca and Trebula which is called Suffena, Tibur, and Tarinum.” Authors who refer to Tibur as a Latin city include Diodorus Siculus, who gave a list of “ancient cities, which used to be called the cities of the Latins” (7.9 *urbes antiquas, quae antea Latinorum vocabantur*), and Dionysius of Halicarnassus, who refers to it as one of the cities of the “Latin nation” (5.61.2 τοῦ Λατίνων γένους, Dion. Hal. 5.61.2).  
295 Livy 22.12.1 *Dictator exercitu consulis accepto a Fulvio Flacco legato per agrum Sabinum Tibur...venit.* “The dictator, having received the consul’s army from the legate,
aspects of the city’s history and culture: on a historical level, the location of Tibur as the final Latin city before the lands of tribes often hostile to Rome gave Tibur the power to allow the Gauls to retreat and regroup, and later to reinvade Latium and attack Rome, while the risk posed by the proximity of Tibur to these hostile territories may contribute to the characterization of Tibur as persistently hostile and resistant to integration by Rome under the Republic.

Like Strabo, many Roman authors (both of poetry and prose) emphasized the abundant water and stone at Tibur as characteristic of the city. These physical features are particularly important because they can be characterized as either peaceful or threatening: the rocks can be quarried and carved into objects for elite consumption or can form tall cliffs and walls to barricade the city from conquest, while the river can form limpid pools in peaceful groves or thunder with destructive force from a cataract. Propertius best exemplifies the description of Tibur’s bodies of waters in a tranquil setting in his love elegies; in one, he poetically refers to the waters of the Anio by the name of the nymph imagined to inhabit them, transforming the Tiburtine countryside into a mythic pastoral landscape. In *Odes* 3.29, addressed to Horace’s patron Maecenas, Tibur is described as “well-watered” (*udum Tibur*) and placed alongside Aefula and Tusculum, which is named obliquely through its heroic aetiology as the foundation of Odysseus and Circe’s

Fulvius Flaccus, went through the Sabine territory to Tibur...”; Catullus 44.1 *O funde noster, seu Sabine seu Tiburs*, “Oh my country-estate, whether Sabine or Tiburtine.”

Prop. 3.16.4 *cadit in patulos nympha Aniena lacus*, (“the Aniene nymph [the Anio river] falls into wide lakes”)
son Telegonus. In contrast, in an ode dedicated to the praise of Tibur, Horace characterizes the Anio with the slightly ominous preceps—which perhaps points to the potential for an out-of-control danger in the wild beauty of the falls—though he tempers this wording somewhat by referencing the “nimble streams” (mobilibus rivis) that water an orchard. Mobilis has a range of meanings, however, and could be read here as “easily moveable” (a reasonable characterization of water that seems to have been manipulated by humans to water their crops), “swift, rapid” (a neutral trait, but one that could quickly become dangerous in combination with the preceps river), or even “inconstant, changeable” (dangerous traits for a river running through cultivated and inhabited land, as it could flood homes or parch crops). The centrality of the Anio to the conceptualization of Tibur as a physical space is also demonstrated by the location of two Republican-era temples to gods of local significance immediately overlooking the dramatic falls of the Anio. Even the Roman aqueduct system, typically an example of the one-sided flow of natural resources to the consumer Rome from her environs acting as suppliers, incorporated concessions to Tibur that highlight the importance of water to the region. Four major aqueducts of Rome came through Tiburtine territory, among which the Anio Vetus featured an unusual double channel designed to divert a certain amount of water directly to Tibur for the use of the city and the surrounding territory, while each of the remaining three aqueducts in the area at some point diverted a portion
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297 Hor. Carm. 3.29.6-8 ne semper udom Tibur et Aefulae/declive contepmpleris arvum et/Telegoni iuga parricidae (“lest you be always gazing at well-watered Tibur and the sloping land of Aefula and the ridges of the parricide Telegonus”)
298 Hor. Carm. 1.7.11-14
299 TLL s.v. mobilis (vol. VIII, p. 1197, lin. 19 - p. 1201, lin. 43)
300 Coarelli 1982, 92-4; Boethius 1978, 158-63; see also Giuliani 1970.
of their water to Tibur before continuing on the Rome.\footnote{See Frontinus \textit{Aq.} 6.5 on aqueducts and water usage around Tibur and Evans 1993 on the history of water usage at Tibur (comparing archaeological evidence to the testimony of Frontinus).} Closely tied to the unusual water features of Tibur is the city’s rocky topography: located in the foothills of the Apennines and immediately bordering the Sabine hill country, the city holds a commanding position elevated over the Campagna. Steep drops around the city create beautiful scenery like the dramatic falls of the Anio, but also provide easily defensible borders and limit the potential approaches of an attacking army. In \textit{Odes} 3.4, in a dedication to the Muses, Horace characterizes the city as “sloping Tibur” (\textit{Tibur supinum}), which acknowledges the city’s mountainous topography but characterizes it as a much more mild environment—rolling foothills instead of steep crags.\footnote{Hor. \textit{Carm.} 3.4.24.}

\textbf{C. The Antiquity of Tibur’s Landscape}

Romans came to associate the physical traits that defined their conception of Tibur in the present and recent past with the archaic city of Tibur, as is evidenced by the treatment of the city’s legendary past in Roman literature. Elements of the city’s topography are themselves utilized as evidence for the antiquity of the city as a physical space, as when Pliny uses one of the many trees in Tibur’s groves to demonstrate that the Latin city predates Rome’s foundation. Pliny claims that the one of the two trees besides the lotus tree on the Vulcanal known to be older than the foundation of Rome is located in Tibur, whose people “also have an origin far earlier than the city of Rome” (\textit{Tiburtes quoque...}
originem multo ante urbem Romam habent). Three oak trees living there predate the nominal founder of the city, Tiburnus (as he is said to have stood near them when he was inaugurated); since Tiburnus is said to have been the son of Amphiaraus, who belongs to the generation before the Trojan War, Pliny traces Tibur’s foundation to around the Trojan War, if not earlier. Pliny’s emphasis on comparing the relative ages of city and tree (e.g. aequaeva urbi, vetustior urbe) serves a dual purpose: while the well-known and clearly enumerable age of the city provides a point of comparison for the otherwise uncountable age of the trees, the trees also provide a tangible physical marker of the more abstract concept of the early city. Like the so-called casa Romuli, these aged trees—if the viewer thinks of them as contemporaneous to the city’s foundation—tangibly commemorate the great age of the cities they inhabit and remind the viewer of the cities’ antiquity. Statius also uses the perceived antiquity of the woods at Tibur as evidence for the venerability of the whole site in his Silvae, when he asks rhetorically whether he should speak about the venerable old age of the groves (venerabile dicam/lucorum
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303 Pliny’s chapter on trees in the Natural History includes a discussion of the oldest known trees: while the oldest tree of known age still standing within the city of Rome is the lotus tree near the Vulcanal, which dates to the time of Romulus and is described as being “equal in age to the city” (aequaeva urbi), Pliny notes trees in two of the surrounding areas of Latium that are yet more venerable (Pliny NH 16.86.1 Verum altera lotos in Volcanali quod Romulus constituit ex victoria de decumis, aequaeva urbi intellegitur, ut auctor est Masurius.) The other ancient tree is an oak tree on the Vatican hill which Pliny describes as “older than the city” (vetustior autem urbe, i.e. Rome); as a proof of this, he explains that a bronze inscription in Etruscan letters on the tree demonstrates not only its age but also that it was already important in the days before the foundation of the city (Pliny NH 16.87.1 Vetustior autem urbe in Vaticano ilex in qua titulus aereus litteris Etruscis religione arborem iam tum dignam fuisse significat.) Notably, Pliny seems to associate the presence of writing in non-Roman alphabets with the time prior to the foundation of Rome.
senium?) at Manilius Vopiscus’ villa in Tibur. Within the panegyric context of Silvae 1.3, Statius’ citation of the age of the groves should be taken as evidence that such antiquity was seen as adding to the impressiveness of the villa.

Both Ovid and Vergil situate Tibur’s foundation in the legendary era of Greek heroes establishing colonies on the Italian peninsula and depict Tibur as already existing full-grown when Aeneas and the seeds of the Roman people were only just arriving on Italian soil. In the opening to the fourth book and the month of April, Venus’ month, in the Fasti, Ovid begins to tell the story of the ancestry of the Julian line obliquely through Venus’ son Aeneas. Before Aeneas’ descendant Romulus founded Rome and began the calendar known to Ovid’s readers, the poet says, “already the walls of watery Tibur were standing” (iam moenia Tiburis udi/stabant).

The temporal adverb iam, repeated from earlier in line 71 (et iam Telegoni, iam moenia Tiburis udi) emphasizes the priority of Tibur, along with a few other Italian cities—Tusculum, Patavium, Formiae, and Falerii. The list is limited, as in Dionysius of Halicarnassus’ account of Aboriginal city foundations (note however that the lists do not overlap, except for Tibur), which suggests that the Romans attributed particular antiquity to some cities, in addition to holding a general impression of active culture in Latium prior to the arrival of Aeneas. Tibur consistently appears among the cities credited with such antiquity, and the specific physical features which are consistently associated with its age—both in explicit
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304 Stat. Silv. 1.3.38-9 venerabile dicam/lucorum senium?, “Shall I speak about the venerable old age of the groves?”
305 The poet mentions the name of Augustus’ adopted family only briefly at 4.39-40 (venimus ad felix aliquando nomen Iuli,/unde domus Teucros Iulia tangit avos) before returning to the age of legend. See Fantham 1998.
306 Ov. Fast. 4.71-2
statements and by being presented as already present in the city long ago—include the physical attributes of the city that Roman authors frequently label as important or memorable aspects of the city’s landscape in their own era.

Tibur appears in the pre-Roman era in Vergil as well, albeit among a significantly larger group of Italian cities arrayed against the Trojans in the second half of the *Aeneid*. When the gates of war are opened and “all Ausonia burns,” “five great cities set up their anvils and make weapons anew, mighty Atina and proud Tibur, Ardea and Crustumeria and turreted Antemnae.”

Tibur, again appearing among a short list of cities believed to have existed as significant entities prior to Rome’s foundation, is described amidst these venerable powers as “proud Tibur” (*Tibur superbum*). Vergil references the eponymous founder of the city, Tiburtus (though he does not appear), as the Tiburtines prepare to ride into battle: his brothers, the twins Catillus and Coras, are said to leave the walls of Tibur along with the people who bear their brother’s name (*Tiburti*).

Within the seven lines that describe the brothers, Vergil references the presence of walls (*Tiburtia moenia*), a high mountain peak (*cum vertice montis ab alto*), and a great forest (*ingens silva*) in the

---

307 Verg. *Aen.* 7.623 *ardet inexcita Ausonia atque immobiles ante*, *Aen.* 7.629-31 *quince adeo magnae positis incudibus urbes/tela novant, Atina potens Tiburque superbum,/Ardea Crustumerique et turrigerae Antemnae*. Note that these five cities are described as “remaking” or “making anew” (*novant*) their weapons, which contributes to the sense of an extended history for these Latin cities prior to the arrival of Aeneas and the eventual foundation of Rome—they have been around for long enough to have already once made weapons and put them down, taking them up again now in the light of the new threat.

308 Verg. *Aen.* 7.670-2 *Tum gemini fratres Tiburtia moenia linquunt,/fratris Tiburti dictam cognominem gentem,/Catillusque acerque Coras, Argiva iuventus* (“Then the twin brothers leave behind the Tiburtine walls and the race called by the name of their brother Tiburtus, Catillus and piercing Coras, the Argive youths”)
Tiburtine landscape. Horace also makes reference to the walls of Tibur as ancient features of the town, referencing the *moenia Catili* and thus tying their construction to the legendary era of Tibur’s past.

Tiburtus/Tiburnus and his family are associated with the foundation of the city of Tibur in a tangible way through topographical features at Tibur that are said to have been associated with the city founder. Buchet reads Horace’s mention of a *Tiburni lucus* at Tibur as not merely metonymic, as the “walls of Telegonus,” but as literally referencing a cult site for the founder, and suggests that Tiburtus was worshipped at physical sites in the city. Even if none were set aside for formal cult practices, the accumulation of topographic associations with a legendary figure would suggest an early introduction of the character into the local mythology, analogous to the hut of Romulus and *ficus ruminalis* at Rome. In Roman sources, Tibur is consistently described as one of the earliest city foundations in Latium, even when the remainder of the list of earliest cities changes from author to author. It is closely tied to early waves of Greek settlement in Italy and is thus firmly associated, in both historiographical accounts of prehistorical Italy and poetic depictions of the age of heroes, with an independent existence that is both prior to Aeneas’ arrival and thus, necessarily, pre-Roman.

*D. Aristocratic Villas at Tibur in the Late Republic*

The final aspect of the physical space of Tibur that recurs in Roman descriptions of the city is the built environment. Largely absent from the writing of Strabo, who as a
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309 Verg. *Aen.* 7.670-7
310 Hor. *Odes* 1.18.2
311 Buchet 2012, 359; Hor. *Odes.* 1.7.13
geographer is primarily concerned with the natural landscape of the city, the built
environment nevertheless contributes to the broader Roman cultural conception of the
city. Tibur is most famous in the modern world as the site of imperial retreats, Hadrian’s
villa the largest among them, but both archaeological and literary sources testify to the
appearance of a substantial collection of elite villas at Tibur in the late Republic even
earlier than the emergence of the more widespread *villa suburbana* culture of the very
late Republic/Augustan era. Catullus 44, in the earliest attestation of a historical figure
claiming ownership of a suburban property in the vicinity of Tibur, refers to the poet’s
farm as either Sabine or Tiburtine depending on the whims of the person naming it:

_O funde noster seu Sabine seu Tiburs_
*(nam te esse Tiburtem autumant, quibus non est
cordi Catullum laedere; at quibus cordi est,
quovis Sabinum pignore esse contendunt),
seu Sabine sive verius Tiburs,
fui libenter in tua suburbana
villa...*_312_

Oh my country-estate, whether Sabine or Tiburtine
(for they assert that you are Tiburtine, those for whom it is
disagreeable to hurt Catullus: yet those for whom it is pleasing
to do so swear at any wager that you are Sabine),
but whether you are Sabine or more truly Tiburtine,
it pleased me to be at your suburban hearth.

In the opening line of the poem Catullus refers to his property not as a _villa_ but as a
*fundus*; as he labels it a _villa suburbana_ in lines 6-7 it is unclear how factual this
distinction is meant to be (i.e. he does not clarify whether the property serves primarily as
a working farm rather than as a vacation house). The use of _fundus_ may be a poetic
gesture, in a comically self-deprecating characterization of his property as more rustic

*_312* Catullus 44.1-7
than elite retreat; alternatively, it could indicate a lack of consensus at this early date (the second quarter of the 1st century BCE) on the terminology for the estates that are almost universally known as *villae suburbanae* in modern scholarship. It does seem that distinctions in degree of status associated with villas outside of Rome were already being established and were already a matter of concern to some segments of society (though Catullus himself may be poking fun at such fussy categorization and stratification).

The construction of these villas represents more than a physical change in the topography of Tibur, as their presence is closely associated with a specific cultural trope of elite leisure outside the hustle and bustle of the urban center at Rome. Two specific aspects of the *otium* associated with the experience of *villae suburbanae* at Tibur emerge from these references: *otium* as deliberately apolitical, held in opposition to the *labor* of exercising political power at Rome and abroad, and *otium* as leisure time for the life of the mind, including creative activities like the production of poetry. In *Odes* 1.7, Horace praises Tibur as a setting for fleeing from troubles, placing the rural retreat specifically in opposition to travels far across the world. Champlin refers to the *suburbium* and the *villa suburbana* as the “ideal setting” for this *otium litterarum* because the location avoided both the *negotium* of Rome and the undesirably extreme “rustication” of returning to one’s “distant homeland.” For the Roman citizens who purchased or built villas at Tibur in the late Republic, Tibur existed in a location between center and periphery—

---

313 Though the word villa appears frequently in ancient literary references to such buildings and the use of *suburbana* to characterize land and property in particular spaces is not uncommon, the use of the term *suburbium* as a coherent concept is notoriously problematic—see i.e. the discussion in Champlin 1992, 97-99.

314 See i.e. Propertius 2.32, 3.16.1-4; Horace *Odes* 1.7, 2.6, 3.4, 4.2.27-42, 4.3.10-12, and *Epistles* 1.7.44-5; Martial 5.71; Statius *Silvae* 1.3

sufficiently close to Rome so as to allow continued participation in the elite social environment in which, for example, one’s philosophical and poetic compositions might be shared and appreciated, but sufficiently far from Rome to allow time and space for those creative activities outside the social and political demands of urban life in the same social circles. This way of thinking about the physical location of Tibur is significantly different from that which rules it both too close to the city of Rome for comfort in the event of hostilities and yet so theoretically distant from Rome so as to be conceptually tied to the harsh lands of the Oscan tribes of the central Appenines (see Section I of this chapter).

Notably, few of these literary references discuss any native Tiburtines owning villas at Tibur or refer to the “local population” of Tibur interacting with vacationing Romans in any way, although the emergence of documented connections between some families in political office at Rome and elite families at Tibur in the 1st century BCE (see Section III in this chapter) suggests that there would have been opportunities for interaction between local and Roman elites within the cultural milieu that these poets discuss. The ode is dedicated to a “Plancus” usually identified as L. Munatius Plancus, cos. 42 BCE, whose gens is thought to have had ties to Tibur (see Section III.B), and Horace refers to the town as “Tiburis...tui,” suggesting a tie to the city that was more extensive and permanent than an affiliation created by mere property ownership, despite Plancus’s ongoing political career at Rome.316 Annalisa Marzano recognizes that in the first half of the second century BCE, when large basis villae sites appear in the area close to the urban center of Tibur (in contrast to the early villae rusticae developing in Tibur’s

316 Horace Carm. 1.7.15-21
western territory), these *villae suburbanae* would have been occupied by a mix of Roman senators and the “rising local elite of Tibur.” Unlike cities like Tusculum, the trajectory of the development of luxury villas at Tibur in the late Republic is interrupted by a major political change in 90 BCE. Tusculum received Roman citizenship in 381 BCE, ostensibly as a reward for service to the Romans and had been continuously integrating into Roman society, politics, and culture since that date—throughout the period in which the development of suburban villas is studied as a trend. For Praeneste and Tibur, on the other hand, this period of development was interrupted by the change from allied independent city to community of Roman citizens. Admittedly, there may have already been very close cultural and social ties between Romans and Tiburtines in the decades leading up to the *Lex Julia*—indeed, we can reasonably expect that the *Lex* was preceded by a longer period of Rome exercising gradually increasing influence over Tibur. However, there was certainly a significant change in the political relationship between the Roman and Tiburtine peoples in the early 1st century BCE that is absent from the historical trajectory of almost all Latin towns in relation to Rome during this time period.

### E. Public Building at Tibur in the Late Republic

Soon after the emergence of these large villa sites, Tibur underwent a number of large and expensive construction projects in public spaces; this boom of public building at the end of the second century BCE is roughly contemporary with the inscription recording a dispute between Tibur and the Senate at Rome (see Chapter Two, Section I). In the same time period, there is evidence for the involvement of Tiburtine merchants in large trade.

---

ventures as far abroad as Greece.\textsuperscript{318} Some scholars have connected the emergence of successful Tiburtine international trade with these architectural renovations, noting, for example, the presence on dedicatory inscriptions in Tibur of the name Octavius Graechinus, whose family is thought to have acquired their cognomen through trading in Greece.\textsuperscript{319} Major changes to the public landscape of Tibur continued, surprisingly, with little interruption through the turbulent beginning of the 1\textsuperscript{st} century BCE. In particular, the construction of the massive sanctuary complex dedicated to Hercules Victor demonstrates prosperity and success in the city at a time of strife in many neighboring communities. Conventionally dated to the middle of the first century BCE, c. 50 BCE, the complex of the Temple of Hercules Victor is an elaborate expansion of the theater-temple type that is first attested in Latium at in the Gabine sanctuary of Juno.\textsuperscript{320} The complex dedicated to Hercules at Tibur has many similarities to the theater-temple shrine of Fortuna Primigenia built by Tibur’s neighbor Praeneste, which seems to have been constructed, at least in an initial form, around the 120s-110s BCE, but was certainly built no later than 80 BCE.\textsuperscript{321} The excavator, Giuliani, dated the temple of Hercules Victor to the middle of the first century BCE—roughly 50 BCE, and potentially as late as the early Augustan period. Coarelli rejects this date in favor of one in the first half of the 1\textsuperscript{st} century BCE on the basis of the the style of the corbels seen on a fragment of a marble cornice, and he objects to a post-Sullan date on the grounds that this would produce too

\textsuperscript{318} Cébeillac-Gervasoni 1998.  
\textsuperscript{319} Buchet 2012, 357.  
\textsuperscript{320} On the dating of the temple of Hercules Victor at Tivoli (rediscovered only recently in the early 20\textsuperscript{th} century, and still undergoing excavation) see Giuliani 1970, 164-201, disputed by Coarelli (see e.g. 1987, 93-7).  
\textsuperscript{321} See Chapter Three, Section IV.
brief an interval between the use of a still irregular opus incertum on the site of the Temple of Hercules and the early form of opus reticulatum seen at Tibur in the era of Caesar. To produce a more specific date, Coarelli points to inscriptions associated with the construction of the sanctuary complex. The first inscription, which records the construction of a covered road, probably to be identified as one of the arcades associated with the sanctuary complex, reads as follows: L. Octavius L. f. Vitulus / C. Rustius C. f. Flavos iter(um) / (quattuor)vir(i) d(e) s(enatus) s(ententia) / viam integendam curaverunt. (The quattuorviri L. Octavius Vitulus, the son of Lucius, and C. Rustius Flavus, the son of Caius (serving for a second time), in accordance with the decision of the senate, ordered the road to be roofed over). The presence of quattuorviri, the magistrates of Tibur after its incorporation by Rome, dates the inscription to after 90/89 BCE, but Coarelli notes that the viae intectae that were constructed as part of the sanctuary of Hercules Victor must have been completed very early in the construction, as they run under parts of the sanctuary: while it is possible that some minor aspects of the construction associated with the sanctuary may have begun prior to the Social War, this inscription demonstrates that construction was still in its early stages, if not the very beginning, in 90/89 BCE. The second inscription lists four quattuorviri, none of whom overlap with the officials of the first inscription, and commemorates the construction of porticos, an exedra, and a pronaos: C. Lutiitus L. f. Aulian(us) / Q. Plausurnius C. f. Varus / L. Ventilius L. f. Bassus / C. Octavius C. f. Graechin(us) / (quattuor)vir(i) / porticus

Coarelli 1983, 195-7
Two copies exist—the CIL enumerates them separately, but all of the other corpora treat the inscription as one entry. CIL I2 1117-1118 = XIV 3667 = ILS 5388 = ILLRP 679 = I.I. IV 1, 21. See Coarelli 1983, 195-7
Coarelli 1983, 196
p(edum) CCLX et exsedram et pronaon / et porticum pone scaenam long(am) p(edes)
CXL / s(enatus) c(onsulto) f(aciunda) c(uraverunt).

Though this inscription was not found inside the sanctuary of Hercules Victor, I agree with Coarelli that its association is clear—the combination of buildings mentioned clearly belongs to a temple-theater complex, and no other is known in Tibur. Unfortunately, the inscription is now lost, though its form was recorded. While the loss of the original stone makes it impossible to do any detailed analysis of the style of the inscription, the surviving description confirms that it is not of imperial date, and Coarelli argues it also could not belong to “the final years of the Republic” (ultimi anni del periodo repubblicano), as the stylistic feature in question, large square “points” as dividers between words, is last seen in inscriptions of Sullan date.

The final official mentioned on the inscription, C. Octavius Graechinus, is also attested in roughly the same time period both in literary source material and in another inscription from Tibur that names him as military tribune. Plutarch and Frontinus report that one of Sertorius’ lieutenants in Spain between 76-72 BCE bore the same nomen and cognomen. Coarelli argues that the works listed in the second inscription

---

325 CIL V 1492 = XIV 3664 = ILS 5546 = ILLRP 680 = I.I. IV 1, 19.
326 Coarelli 1983, 196. Coarelli also points to the archaic spelling of exedra (exsedra) as evidence from the text of the inscription for a date no later than the early 1st century BCE, but the presence of archaism in official inscriptions, particularly those relating to temples and other institutions of great (or presumed great) antiquity, has been challenged as a reliable criterion for dating, as some inscriptions show evidence of archaism known to have been out of date by the time of the event recorded by the inscription—see Penney 2011.
327 Coarelli 1983, 197; Plut. Sert. 26. 2 and Frontin. Strateg. II.5.31; CIL XIV 3629.
Coarelli narrows the date range down even further by analyzing the possible career trajectories of Graechinus. As the Graechinus who was with Sertorius would almost certainly have been proscribed, and thus unable to return to Tibur and continue a normal political career even if he survived the proscriptions by virtue of being in Spain, and the formal features of the inscription rule out a sufficiently late date for the quattuorvir to be
must belong to the final stages of construction, and so the *completion* of the temple complex in its original form cannot date later than Sulla.

Though the date of the sanctuary at Tibur is still much later than that at Praeneste, since the majority of the construction in the sanctuary of Hercules Victory most likely took place in the years immediately following the city’s admission to Roman citizenship, the monumental construction project offers a window into life at Tibur during a time of great change in Tibur’s political and social role in Latium. On the most basic level, this chronology demonstrates that Tibur was not experiencing excessive hardship after 90 BCE; while the city undoubtedly lost political power due to the loss of independence that accompanied the acquisition of Roman citizenship, it does not seem to have suffered economically. The dedication of a massive temple to a god of local importance after the city had officially become part of the Roman citizen body is also striking, particularly as this temple to Hercules Victor at Tibur is built *after* the Romans had already dedicated a temple to Hercules Victor in Rome.

328 Though a temple to Hercules Victor at Tibur predated the introduction of his cult at Rome, the immense investment of both Tiburtines

the son of the proscribed Graechinus, Coarelli estimates that the inscription cannot be any later than around 80 BCE, at which point he believes Graechinus must have fled Italy to avoid the Sullan proscriptions. The text of these two inscriptions therefore provides Coarelli with his very specific *terminus post quem* of 89 BCE and *terminus ante quem* of 80 BCE. Though I do not believe such an exact deadline for Graechinus’ departure from Italy is necessarily supported by the evidence, I nevertheless agree that his presence on the inscription points to a roughly Sullan date for the construction of these portions of the complex.

328 Though the identification of these temples known to have been dedicated to Hercules with the extant remains of temples associated with Hercules at Rome is contentious (see Ziolkowski 1988 and 1992; Coarelli 1987 and 1988; Strong and Ward-Perkins 1960), based on a dedicatory inscription found on the Caelian, we can definitively say that L. Mummius Achaicus, cos. 146 BCE, dedicated a temple to Hercules Victor out of the booty from the sack of Corinth approximately half a century before the foundation of this major complex at Tibur. Inscription: *CIL I²*.626=*CIL VI.331=ILLRP* 122.
and non-Tiburtines in the temple complex built c. 89-80 BCE, as is attested by dedicatory inscriptions found on site, after the cult had already been established in Rome suggests that the topographic location of Hercules Victor in the Tiburtine countryside holds some specific importance. For the Tiburtine aristocrats that invested in the construction of the temple and the Tiburtine senate that approved its construction, the expansion of a preexisting cult site dedicated to Hercules Victor into a large complex built to attract visitors (as is suggested by, for example, the seating for a substantial audience at the theater in the sanctuary and the presence of an oracle that visitors could consult) may have served as a way to assert their community’s continued relevance in light of the increasing centrality of Rome. The construction of the massive shrine to Hercules at Tibur belongs to a series of large-scale temple-theater complexes built by Latin cities in the roughly hundred years c.150-50 BCE, including the Temple of Juno at Gabii (c. mid-2nd century BCE) and the Temple of Fortuna Primigenia at Praeneste (c. end of 2nd century BCE-beginning of 1st century BCE). Together with these cities, Tibur was participating in a local version of a much larger process: the active adaptation of Greek and native Italian architectural forms and ritual traditions occurring in Campania, Samnium, Sardinia, and Latium as these areas responded to the influence of Hellenistic theaters from Sicily. The construction of the temple is only one of the building projects at Tibur in the late Republic that correspond to major construction booms in similar central Italian cities; parallels for the terracing activity, building techniques, and locus of building activity can be found at sites including Praeneste, Pietrabbondante, Aletrium,
and Ferentinum.\textsuperscript{330} In addition to its overall plan, the temple has aesthetic connections with contemporaneous complexes: the decoration of the terrace is shared with that of the portico of the temple of Fortuna Primigenia at Praeneste, a late Republican portico in the Forum Holitorium at Rome, and the preserved first-story façade of the Tabularium in the Forum Romanum (built in 79 BCE).\textsuperscript{331} The decision of the Tiburtine elite to build this ambitious complex, dedicated to a local cult and built in a Latin style, asserts Tibur’s continued relevance as more than a vacation home for the Roman elite. That the Tiburtine senate was deeply involved in the planning and construction of the temple is attested by the many inscriptions that refer to officials acting in accordance with the will of the senate, or by the orders of the senate, all of which display the active participation of local government in this project.\textsuperscript{332}

Other religious buildings in Tibur, however, demonstrate that Roman intervention into building projects in the city began to have an impact on the city’s built environment in the last century of the Republic and the early Augustan era. The so-called “round temple” at Tibur, a smaller but important religious site in the early city, underwent restoration at Roman hands after city was incorporated by Rome. Originally built in the late 2\textsuperscript{nd} or early 1\textsuperscript{st} century BCE—contemporaneous with a large campaign of public building around the city—the temple was once identified as a temple of Vesta on the basis of its architectural similarities to the famous round temple of Vesta in the Roman

\begin{footnotes}
\item[330] Wallace Hadrill 2008, 137-8
\item[331] Boethius 1978, 155-6.
\item[332] See e.g. I.I. IV 1.19-1.21
\end{footnotes}
forum, but this identification has since been challenged. Alternate suggestions for the dedicatee of the round temple include the tenth sibyl, Albunea, who is known to have been worshiped at Tibur, the legendary founder Tiburnus, or (occasionally) Hercules. All of these possibilities are gods of highly local importance to Tibur, yet the name of a Roman magistrate not known to be associated with Tibur in any other way was prominently displayed on the temple shortly after the city became part of the Roman citizenry: a badly damaged inscription on the temple records the name of L. Gellius L.f. as a restorer or benefactor of the temple. Coarelli identifies this Gellius with L. Gellius L. f. Poplicola, cos. 72, and (accepting an identification of the temple’s dedicatee as Albunea) argues that L. Gellius may have been involved with the transfer of Albunea’s sortes to the Sibylline corpus in Rome. Albunea was a local goddess, a nymph of the Anio said to have brought sortes out of the river to the people of Tibur, and according to Lactantius her name become known to the Romans as a direct result of her sortes being

---

333 Dated both by the use of opus incertum for the cella wall and by the elaborate variation of the Corinthian order; see Coarelli 1982, 92-3. On the identity of the dedicatee: a papal bull regarding the jurisdiction of the bishop of the “civitas Tyburtina” dating to the 10th century CE, when far more of the ancient remains were visible at the city, confirms that the cathedral was built on top of a 1st century BCE basilica on the ancient forum and refers to an adjacent gate that was in the vicinity of the temple of Vesta. This identifies the Tiburtine forum as encompassing the modern Piazza del’Duomo and adjoining areas and confirms that the round temple overlooking the Anio, which stands roughly 500m away, cannot be the temple of Vesta. See Smith 1203; for the papal bull, see Marini 316. According to local popular legend, the original Christian cathedral in Tibur was built by the emperor Constantine himself shortly after he passed the Edict of Milan (313 CE), confirming the edict of toleration issued by Galerius in 311 CE with the goal of stopping the persecution of Christians that had been re-legalized by Diocletian in 303 CE. While unlikely to be true, this tradition points to the long local memory of this central space in the city as being an important seat of local authority. 334 Coarelli 1987, 106-10
removed from Tibur and brought to Rome. Though Lactantius’ narrative bears no signs of resistance or hostility to this process, and there is no evidence that the Tiburtines actively resisted the loss of the *sortes*, the example of Rome’s desire to remove the oracle of Fortuna Primigenia (and thus her power to produce an unfriendly fate) from Praeneste to Rome suggests that Rome’s acquisition of oracles from across Latium may have been perceived as removing a source of local religious authority. Notably, Gellius’ name seems to have been written over an erased or obscured earlier name; Coarelli suggests that the temple may have previously borne the name of a Marianist magistrate, as Cinna was known to have sought help at the oracular cities of Praeneste and Tibur upon his exile in 87 BCE, and Buchet further argues that the re-inscription of Gellius’ name was associated with a punitive acquisition of the oracles by Rome, intended to re-establish the correct relationship between Rome and Tibur. The prominent inscription of a Roman magistrate’s name on a temple of local significance to Tibur and situated on the ancient acropolis of the city, presents itself as a visual re-assertion of Roman power over Tibur.

By the Augustan era, all literary evidence of any Tiburtine resistance to Roman authority—however slight—had dropped away. Changes to the physical fabric of the city at this time reflect that peaceful dynamic as Romans show an increasing interest in publically and visibly displaying their association with Tibur: new additions to the forum are prominently and proudly labeled with the names of their donors. A structure adjoining the basilica on the forum containing two *mensae ponderariae* (tables of weights

---

335 Lactantius 1.6.12; see also Tib. 2.5.69
336 See Chapter Three, Section II.
338 See Chapter Three, Section IV for similar examples shortly after the Sullan conquest of the city.
and measures), which seems to have been originally built in the mid-1st century BCE or earlier, has an inscription reporting its renovation at the expense of M. Varenus Diphilus, identified as a *magister Herculaneus*. The inscription prominently identifies the restorer of the *Ponderarium* by his name, his title, and the family from whom he gained his freedom. The same name appears in an inscription on an adjacent building identifying it as an *Augusteum* erected in gratitude for the emperor’s safe return to Rome, probably dating to 19 BCE. The large-scale expenditure by M. Varenus Diphilus on public display in highly visible public spaces in Tibur is echoed by the construction of private monuments that associate their builders with the physical city of Tibur. In the early first century CE, the *gens Plautia* built a massive family tomb closely modeled on the Mausoleum of Augustus adjacent to the bridge that brought the Via Tiburtina into the city. The ultimate origin of the *gens Plautia* has been much debated, but the scholarly consensus at this time points to a family home not in Tibur but in the nearby Trebula Suffenas, where many inscriptions related to the family have been found and which belonged to the *tribus Aniensis* found in inscriptions naming members of the Plautii,

---

339 Coarelli dates the structure based on construction techniques.
340 The donor’s title, abbreviated in the inscription as *mag. Hercul.* is usually restored as *magister Herculaneus*, though a few early scholars give it as *magister Herculi* or *magister Herculeus*; the term has been variously interpreted as head of a commercial guild and as referring to a college of priests (either priests of Hercules himself, perhaps associated with the temple nearby, or some sort of *augustales* associated with Hercules, due to the presence of Varenus’ name on the *Augusteum* next door). Mercantile activity and the worship of Hercules might be connected; see e.g. the title *Hercules ponderum* on inscriptions found in the Forum Boarium and outside the Porta Flaminia (*CIL* VI. 282, 336) and the presence of Hercules’ name inscribed on a stone weight found near Teramo in Abruzzo (reported in “Archaeological News” in *AJA* 9 (1894) 465) 341 Pacifici 90.
rather than the *tribus Camilia* of Tibur. The absence of any demonstrable Tiburtine origin for the Plautii does not make the presence of the Tomb of the Plautii in Tibur any less interesting; on the contrary, the family’s choice to build a monumental, visible tomb at the neighboring city of Tibur rather than near their ancestral home in Trebula Suffenas suggests the perceived advantage of locating such familial self-advertisement in the Tiburtine landscape. No association with Tibur is necessarily asserted by the features of the tomb—none of the surviving inscriptions give a reason for the tomb’s location or proclaim a connection between family and city, nor is there any iconography referencing Tibur—so the physical location of the tomb must be examined for significance. The choice to built a monumental family tomb in such a location suggests a desire to capitalize on some positive traits associated with proximity to the city; it is a gesture designed to tie the family to Tibur more closely in the minds of the general public, most of whom were required to pass by the prominent tomb on their way into the city. The type of prominent display exemplified by the Tomb of the Plautii characterizes much of the imperial construction at Tibur, as subsequent generations of wealthy Romans built increasingly extravagant villas in the Tiburtine countryside. The enduring popularity of the most famous example, the villa of Hadrian, as a tourist site demonstrates one of the crucial features of these expensive building projects—like monumental tombs along the road, enormous villas advertise the wealth and power of their constructors to the public passing by. The extent to which the hills of the Tiburtine countryside were filled with such conspicuous displays demonstrates the desirable attributes that Romans came to

---

342 Coarelli 1982: 44.
associate with the topography of Tibur, in stark contrast to the imposing scenery described by Strabo at the beginning of the Empire.

V. CONCLUSION

The image of Tibur preserved by the Roman cultural memory of the city is one of strong contradictions that are never explicitly addressed, let alone resolved. The city’s history during the era of Republican Rome’s early expansion and conquest of Latium features violent opposition to Rome that goes well beyond the resistance of most of her Latin neighbors. While the majority of the Latins band together with their cultural and geographic neighbors to oppose Rome’s incursions into their territory, Tibur actually allies with the invading Gauls against Rome—a grievance that is still remembered in Livy’s day. Not only did Tibur ally with the sackers of Rome, Livy claims, they actually imitated the Gauls and themselves marched on the city of Rome, as their neighbors the Praenestines had done in 380 BCE. While the Romans may have reassured themselves, in retrospect, with the belief that they were more than capable of defending themselves against attackers—who were, after all, not terrifying barbarians but their next-door neighbors—clearly the Tiburtines and Praenestines did not share the view that resistance to Roman power was futile. Though Livy reports the defeat of the Tiburtines in 359 BCE as an easy rout, the Romans nevertheless thought the Tiburtines sufficiently worthy opponents to record their defeat alongside that of the Gauls in the *Fasti Triumphales*. The potential threat posed by the city of Tibur is explained, in part, by the many literary references to the city’s imposing topography and advantageous position, the effect of

---

343 Livy 6.28.6-7
which is amply demonstrated by Tibur’s ability to control the passage of the Gauls to safe
territory beyond Roman reach. Rome’s response to Tibur after 338 BCE shows the effect
of the Latin city’s hostility to Rome combined with its natural strategic advantages: while
most of the Latin cities clearly pass into Rome’s control, though only some of them are
fully incorporated as citizens at that time, Tibur, like Praeneste, seems to have retained
independence as an allied state. The fact that Livy does not explicitly state this, though he
mentions the fact that both were punished for their alliance with the Gauls by Rome’s
seizure of territory, is perhaps indicative of the way Roman historical memory recalled
the event. Nevertheless, it is clear that Rome did not have full control over Tibur in the
3rd-2nd centuries BCE, though some equilibrium prevented either city from attacking the
other. While Roman sources are silent on the city until the late Republic, archaeological
evidence shows continued prosperity at Tibur and active engagement with the wider
Italian world and beyond. The social integration of Rome and Tibur was slow compared
to that of the other prisci Latini, but it did eventually occur in a similar manner. Elite
families, who probably had ongoing social ties in the intervening centuries, began
actively moving between Rome and Tibur by the beginning of the first century BCE, as is
shown by the emergence of Tiburtine families entering the cursus honorum at Rome and
Romans building and occupying villas in the Tiburtine countryside. Contemporaneous to
these developments, in 90 BCE Tibur is granted Roman citizenship along with Praeneste
and the other Italian allies, though the event seems to have had surprisingly little
immediate impact on Tibur or Roman sources on Tibur. In the absence of sources
showing the relationship between Rome and Tibur in the intervening centuries, the cause
and timeline of the changes that led to Tibur abandoning her history of hostility to Roman
integration and accepting Roman citizenship can only be tentatively reconstructed. The *Epistula ad Tiburtes*, our only major documentary source from this period, suggests that by roughly 150-100 BCE the Roman state held an acknowledged position of power over Tibur, but that this power was not being exercised violently. Whatever changes took place in the relationship between Rome and Tibur from 338 BCE-c. 150 BCE in order to allow this relatively peaceful status quo between the cities provided the necessary preconditions for Tibur to receive Roman citizenship in 90 BCE after centuries of being one of only a few cities in *Latium vetus* without it. Afterwards, many of the same changes that seem to have occurred in the cultural memory of Tusculum and other Latin cities with citizenship earlier in the Late Republic begin to be visible in the interactions of Romans and Tiburtines as well.

Further complicating the picture, however, despite the apparent lack of Tiburtine resistance to Roman integration in 90 BCE, shortly afterwards the city began a massive building campaign to construct the sanctuary complex dedicated to Hercules Victor—a local site for a cult that already had a temple at Rome, but which was nevertheless visited by a number of Romans, and the site of an oracle whose predictions could only be sought by visiting the temple at Tibur. Over the course of the 1st century BCE, the Tiburtine countryside was transformed into a landscape of Roman leisure, occupied by the villa retreats of Roman elite families with no apparent hereditary connection to Tibur. The Roman presence is felt across the topography of the city, with highly visible inscriptions marking the renovation of temples to Tiburtine cult figures by Romans and the insertion of the *Augustales* into the Tiburtine Forum. By the last half of the 1st century BCE, Roman literary references exclusively reflect this newly “Romanized” landscape when
talking about the contemporary Tibur, though they continue to describe the most archaic features of Tibur as belonging to an era of rugged Italian heroes who predate Rome. No sense of the city as a continuing threat can be found in Imperial sources: the conquest of Tibur, though ultimately nonviolent, seems to have been so complete that it obscured most associations between the violent and powerful Tibur of the 4th century BCE and the peaceful suburban Tibur of the turn of the millennium. At most, Tibur suffers from an ongoing sense that the once-mighty city is now home to socially inferior families, as is suggested by Tacitus when Drusus’ daughter Julia is offered in marriage to the grandson of an eques from Tibur.\(^{344}\)

In contrast, the city of Praeneste (see Chapter 3), which shares many features and a great deal of its history with Tibur during the Republic, and is frequently grouped with it by Roman sources, seems to never have completely escaped the Roman memory of the city as a viable threat, even after it has been nominally pacified, incorporated into Rome, and converted into a peaceful suburban site much like Tibur. Despite this fact, individual Praenestines actually begin entering Roman society much earlier than Tiburtines, and even advertise their association with a city that had resisted Roman hegemony for centuries and was consistently associated with negative characteristics in Roman cultural memory.

\(^{344}\) See Section III.C of this chapter.
CHAPTER THREE: PRAENESTE

I. INTRODUCTION

In the early years of the Roman Republic, Praeneste, like Tibur, controlled a substantial amount of territory and was frequently at odds with Rome. Strabo’s description of the city explains why it held an even more strategically advantageous location than her neighbor Tibur:

ἐρυμνὴ μὲν οὖν ἐκατέρα, πολὺ δ’ ἐρυμυνοτέρα Πραινεστός: ἀκράν γάρ ἔχει τῆς μὲν πόλεως ὑπέρθεν ὄρος ὑψηλόν, ὃπιοθὲν δ’ ἀπὸ τῆς συνεχούσης ὅρειν ἀυχένι διεξευμγένου, ὑπεραιρόν καὶ δυσὶ σταδίοις τούτου πρὸς ὀρθίαν ἀνάβασιν. πρὸς δὲ τῇ ἐρυμύνοτητὶ καὶ διώρυξι κρυπταῖς διατέτρηται πανταχόθεν μέχρι τῶν πεδίων ταῖς μὲν ὑδρείας χάριν ταῖς δὲ ἐξόδων λαβραίων, ὥστε ἐν μίᾳ Μάριος πολιορκούμενος ἀπέθανε. ταῖς μὲν οὖν ἄλλαις πόλεσι πλεῖστον τὸ εὐερκὲς πρὸς ἀγαθὸν τίθεται, Πραινεστίνοις δὲ συμφορά γεγένηται διὰ τὰς Ρωμαίων στάσεις, καταφεύγουσι γὰρ ἐκεῖσε οἱ νεωτερίσαντες: ἐκπολιορχθέντων δὲ, πρὸς τῇ κακώσει τῆς πόλεως καὶ τῆς ἱερείας ἀπαλλοτριοῦσθαι συμβαίνει, τῆς αἰτίας μεταφερομένης ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀναιτίους.

So then each city [Praeneste and Tibur] is fortified, but Praeneste is much more well-fortified: for it has a high mountain above the city as a citadel, separated from the mountain range behind it by a narrow pass. Raised above this pass by two stades, the mountain climbs straight uphill. In addition to this fortification, the city is pierced by hidden passages on all sides as far out as the plains — some for the sake of water and others for secret exits, in one of which Marius perished while he was under siege. Now for most other cities, being well-fortified is regarded as a benefit, but for the Praenestines it has been a misfortune on account of the Romans’ political upheavals. For all those who have attempted to revolt flee for refuge to Praeneste and, when they are forced by siege to surrender, in addition to the damage to the city, it comes to pass that their territory is confiscated, as the guilt is transferred to the guiltless.\(^\text{345}\)

Strabo identifies the single most significant asset held by Praeneste—its naturally advantageous physical position. If this was the only feature mentioned by Strabo, we might expect Praeneste to be a successful military power capable of defending herself and her allies, perhaps even controlling a wide swath of territory, and this certainly was

\(^{345}\) Strabo 5.3.11
true for a significant portion of the city’s existence. However, Strabo also acknowledges that physical advantage has in reality caused problems in the city’s interactions with her neighbors: in addition to sheltering Praenestines from conflict, the natural citadel has also attracted others seeking shelter who have brought conflict to the city. By the Augustan-era date when Strabo’s *Geographica* was composed, Praeneste had suffered both in reputation and in reality after serving as the base for a number of rebels looking for a stronghold from which to oppose Rome; when these figures of civil discord eventually lost, Praeneste was punished alongside them. Praeneste appears in this passage as a city whose memory is associated with two things: the imposing physical features that make it a threatening location for a hostile city, and the extended history of involvement between the city and those rebelling against Rome.

In this chapter I reconstruct a picture of the cultural memory of Praeneste and its conquest at Rome and establish the major characteristics mentioned in depictions of the city. My primary goal is not to reconstruct the historical events associated with the city’s conquest and gradual assimilation into the expanding Roman empire, but to identify loci of anxiety about the nature of Praeneste’s historical relationship to Rome. The challenge posed by Praeneste’s physical and topographical features is made manifest by the city’s extended history of resistance to Rome, betrayal of alliances, and harboring of rebels. Roman references to Praeneste consistently present these events as part of a pattern of behavior by Praeneste that continues through several centuries of conquests and alliances until the city is violently defeated and subjected to Roman rule as a colony.

The use of the words *Praeneste* and *Praenestinus*, along with their Greek equivalents, in ancient sources may indicate any one of these options: the civic entity united under the name of Praeneste, people associated with this city, or the physical space of the city.
In looking at the post-conquest sources that preserve this history, how is the city’s past of resistance shown to interact with its eventual role as a constituent part of Rome’s growing empire? How is the city’s history, particularly its history of aggression and conflict, remembered and commemorated, and in what ways is the history forgotten, re-shaped, or re-told? I examine these questions by looking at written sources, both historiographic accounts of the city’s past and literary references to the contemporary city, together with iconography referencing the city and monuments associated with the city or its relationship with Rome. I discuss the trends that emerge in this material as representing important features of the Roman-era cultural memory of Praeneste—the themes, issues, and events that would have been evoked by a reference to the city.

II. CIVIC ENTITY

A few clear trends in the cultural memory of Praeneste when considered as a civic entity emerge. First, the city is associated with a number of betrayals, rebellions, and changes of affiliation, as well as with housing those disaffected from Rome—more so than any other Latin city, with the exception of her close neighbor and frequent ally Tibur. Second, the city repeatedly sought to remain independent from Rome and avoid integration; references to this trend, while not absent from the Roman sources, are clearly a locus of some anxiety or confusion, and the sources are often trying to reconcile Praeneste’s behavior with Roman expectations and assumptions. Finally, and despite the similarities between the two cities, the cultural memory of Praeneste at Rome often figures Praeneste as alien. This pattern of “othering” Praeneste provides a way for future Romans to understand the city’s history of hostility to Rome and resistance to becoming Roman, as
well as justifying the eventual violent subjugation of the city. Taken together, these characteristics of Praeneste as a civic entity depict a group that is hostile, volatile, and foreign to Rome: an enemy that must be conquered for the safety of the city.

A. Disloyalty and Betrayal

Betrayal is a particularly frequent motif in Livy’s narrative of the relationship between Praeneste and Rome. When Praeneste first appears in Livy’s text, the city is mentioned by name because it is abandoning its Latin allies: it was a member of a group of Latin cities organized against Rome in the early years of the fifth century, but immediately prior to the fateful battle of Lake Regillus Praeneste “revolted from the Latins to the Romans” (*Praeneste ab Latinis ad Romanos descivit*).\(^{347}\) Praeneste’s abandonment of the Latin cause is closely linked, in Livy’s narrative, to the outbreak of war: in the next clause, Livy reports that “the Latin war, which had been building up for several years, was not put off any longer” (*nec ultra bellum Latinum, gliscens iam per aliquot annos, dilatum*).\(^{348}\) It is difficult, if not impossible, to confirm whether Praeneste was part of a “Latin League” that existed in the 6\(^{th}\)-5\(^{th}\) century, let alone whether Praeneste might have abandoned that league on the eve of a crucial battle and whether that caused the outbreak of this Roman-Latin war at the beginning of the 5\(^{th}\) century. The sources for this early version of the league are notoriously problematic; for example, the best account of the so-
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\(^{347}\) Livy 2.19.1-2 *T. Aebutius deinde et C. Vetusius. His consulibus Fidenae obsessae, Crustumeria capta; Praeneste ab Latinis ad Romanos descivit, nec ultra bellum Latinum, gliscens iam per aliquot annos, dilatum*. The next year, T. Aebutius and C. Vetusius were consuls [499 BCE]. During their consulship, Fidenae was besieged and Crustumeria captured; Praeneste revolted from the Latins to the Romans, and the Latin war, which had been building up for several years, was not put off any longer.

\(^{348}\) Livy 2.19.2 (see previous note)
called *foedus Cassianum* comes in Dionysius of Halicarnassus, who gives a long list of Latin cities he claims were signatories, including Praeneste, but otherwise almost never distinguishes among the actions of various Latin cities and describes them acting instead as an undifferentiated unit.\textsuperscript{349} It is unclear which side Praeneste started on and whether the city switched sides immediately before battle, as well as in what capacity Praeneste would have signed the *foedus Cassianum*, if they did—as one of many Latin allies with the same goals against Rome, or as a recent enemy reconciling herself to her neighbor cities. However, it is not necessary to be able to confirm the historical reality of Praeneste’s actions prior to Battle of Lake Regillus: for my purposes, what is most interesting is that Livy records some memory that existed in his day, whether derived from popular belief or lost sources, of Praeneste switching allegiances during the earliest years of the Republic. Praeneste is depicted as the only Latin city willing to abandon her allies to be on the winning side.

Praeneste switches sides again in Livy’s narrative of the early fourth century, as Livy reports that a “rumor” (*fama*) reached Rome of a revolt (*defectione*) brewing at Praeneste in 383 BCE.\textsuperscript{350} In conjunction with this *fama*, the people of Tusculum, Gabii, and Labici bring to Rome an explicit complaint of hostile incursions by Praeneste. The

\textsuperscript{349} See Introduction, Section III.B for a discussion of the evidence related to the historical existence of a formal Latin League at various points in the history of Archaic Latium, including the full text of the list of signatories found at Dion. Hal. 5.61.3.

\textsuperscript{350} Livy 6.21.9 *De Praenestinorum quoque defectione eo anno primum fama exorta; arguentibusque eos Tusculanis et Gabinis et Labicanis, quorum in fines incursatum erat, ita placide ab senatu responsum est ut minus credi de crimini bus, quia nol lent ea vera esse, appareret.* (A rumor about a revolt of the Praenestini also arose in this year for the first time, but the senate responded so calmly to the Tusculans, the Gabini, and the Labicans—into whose borders the invasion had taken place—accusing the Praenestini that it was clear that there was too little belief in the accusations since the senate did not want them to be true.)
senate is not particularly disturbed by this complaint, however. This, Livy reports, was
due to a desire not to believe that the report was true rather than a considered evaluation
of the threat Praeneste potentially posed. The city is soon discovered to be providing
troops to aid in the revolt of the Roman colony at Velitrae—in fact, the majority of the
troops are found to be Praenestine rather than Veliternian. Rome reacts rather more
strongly to the evidence of hostility from Praeneste than to the betrayal of the
Veliternians, in Livy’s account. They had perhaps been biased by the missives sent from
the victorious Roman army, which Livy reports were harsher (acriores) towards the
Praenestini than towards the Veliternians—and the senate declares war on Praeneste in
382 BCE. The Praenestini join forces with the Volscians and attack another Roman
colony, Satricum; they are said to have treated the sacked colony with horrible violence
(vi expugnarunt foedeque in captis exercuere victoriam), and the Romans are
understandably irritated by this continued aggression towards their colonies. In

351 Livy 6.22.2 ad Velitras aduersus maiora paene auxilia Praenestinorum quam ipsam
colonorum multitudinem secundo proelio...(In the following battle at Velitrae against
auxiliaries from Praeneste which were almost more numerous than that group of
colonists.)
352 Livy 6.22.3 litterae Romam ad senatum cum uictoriae nuntiis acriores in
Praenestinum quam in Ueliternum hostem missae. (The dispatches to the senate
announcing the victory were more severe towards the Praenestines than towards the
Veliternians.)
353 Livy 6.22.4-5 itaque ex senatus consulto populique iussu bellum Praenestinis
indictum; qui coniuncti Volsci anno insequente Satricum, coloniam populi Romani,
pertinaciter a colonis defensam, vi expugnarunt foedeque in captis exercuere victoriam.
Eam rem aegre passi Romani M. Furius Camillus sextum tribunum militum creavere.
(Therefore, in accordance with a decree of the senate and people of Rome, war was
declared with the Praenestines who, having allied with the Volsci, in the following year
violently assaulted Satricum, a colony of the Roman people that was defended stubbornly
by the colonists, and administered/prosecuted their victory cruelly in relation to the
captives. Having endured this affair with anger, the Romans made M. Furius Camillus a
consular tribune for a sixth time.)
response, they elect M. Furius Camillus as consular tribune and entrust him with the war against the Volscians—and presumably, by extension, against their Praenestine allies. In Livy’s account of this conflict, Praeneste’s changing alliances are highlighted. Though he has not given an explicit statement of the status quo between Rome and Praeneste at the opening of the 4th century, the actions of the Praenestines that begin the conflict are figured as a defectio, a desertion from an existing alliance.354 Next, we learn that the Praenestines are not only fighting for their own ends, but have also allied themselves with a colony rebelling against Rome; the reader receives this news with the same apparent surprise as the Roman Senate, which learns about the betrayal from battlefield dispatches and reacts immediately and harshly. Finally, after they are defeated by the Romans at Velitae, the Praenestines do not concede defeat, but instead switch sides again and find a new, more hostile ally in the Volscians.

The war with Praeneste then becomes part of the backdrop for the continued class conflict that exemplifies Livy’s treatment of the middle of the fourth century, as Livy reports that the patricians used the hostilities with Praeneste, other Latin tribes, and the Hernici as an excuse to subdue their plebeian opponents by distracting and diverting them with the necessity of defending the city. This gambit by the senate initially fails, as the tribunes refuse to allow an army to be levied, but the news of internal sedition reaches Praeneste and the city elects to take advantage of the opportunity to march on Rome itself. When the Praenestine army manages to march all the way to the Colline gate, both patricians and plebeians realize the gravity of the situation and agree to put aside partisan struggles and elect T. Quinctius Cincinnatus as dictator. Livy’s depiction of the dramatic

354 Livy 6.21.9
moment where the Praenestine army unexpectedly reaches the boundary of the city recalls the attack of the Gauls at the end of the previous book, less than ten years earlier, and shows Praeneste (in conjunction with the problems of civil disorder) as a threat to the very walls of Rome. The army of Praeneste deliberately seeks this association in the Roman mind by choosing to stand and fight at the Allia, hoping that the memory of the threat of the Gauls will inspire terror in the Romans:

…similem pavorem inde ac fugam fore ac bello Gallico fuerit; etenim si diem contactum religione insignemque nomine eius loci timeant Romani, quanto magis Alliens i die Alliam ipsam, monumentum tantae cladis, reformidaturos? species profecto iis ibi truces Gallorum sonumque vocis in oculis atque auribus fore. has inanium rerum inanes ipsas volventes cogitationes fortunae loci delegaverant spes suas.

…there would be the same fear and flight as there was in the Gallic war; for if the Romans feared the day which was touched by superstition and marked with the name of that place, how much more than the day of the Allia would they dread the Allia itself, the memorial of such a disaster? Truly the ferocious image of the Gauls would be there in their eyes and the sound of their voice would be in their ears. Reflecting on these idle thoughts, the Praenestines entrusted their hopes to the fortune of the place.

This Praenestine strategy, dismissed by Livy as a frivolous reliance on fortune (fortunae loci delegaverant spes suas), backfires miserably as the Romans instead consider what a small threat the familiar Latins, their neighbors and previous allies, pose in comparison to

---

355 An enemy actually reaching the walls is a particularly threatening event. See Livy 26.10—when Hannibal reaches the walls of Rome (like the Praenestine army, he approaches the Colline gate), the consul Fulvius Flaccus is indignant at the sight of the enemy able to leisurely peruse the very walls of Rome. Due to the disturbances that arise from this exceptional threat, all former dictators, consuls, and censors are invested with imperium until the enemy retires from the walls of the city (donec recessisset a muris hostis).

356 Livy 6.28.6-7
The mention of fortune, and particularly the Praenestine generals’ overreliance on the goodwill of Fortune, may be meant to evoke the association between Praeneste and the worship of Fortuna—the Praenestines put all of their hope not just in fortuna, but in Fortuna. Without a doubt, by the time of Livy’s composition the shrine of Fortuna Primigenia was renowned around the whole central Italian countryside for her oracular powers; Livy’s readers would most likely have recognized the implied connection between the temple of Fortuna and the Praenestine soldiers, whose boldness is about to leave them quite unlucky.

The newfound Roman confidence in their superiority over the Latins, Praeneste included, results in a decisive victory that ends with the Romans chasing their opponents all the way back to Praenestine territory, laying waste to nine smaller towns, then receiving the surrender of the city of Praeneste itself. This is a sharp change from the status quo depicted between Rome and the Latins in the aftermath of the battle of Lake Regillus, when it seems that the sides were fairly evenly matched, despite Rome’s victory.

---

357 Livy 6.28.7-8 Romani contra, ubicumque esset Latinus hostis, satis scire eum esse quem ad Regillum lacum deuictum centum annorum pace obnoxia teneuert: locum insignem memoria cladis inritaturum se potius ad delendam memoriam dedecoris quam ut timorem faciat, ne qua terra sit nefasta uictoriae suae; (The Romans, on the other hand, understood that wherever the Latin enemy might be, they knew well enough that it was the same one who had been defeated at Lake Regillus in obedient peace for a hundred years: the place, being distinguished by the memory of defeat, would incite them more to erase the memory of the disgrace rather than to create a fear that any land might be inauspicious for their victory.)

358 Livy 6.29.6-7 octo praeterea oppida erant sub dicione Praenestinorum. ad ea circumlatum bellum deincepsque haud magno certamine captis Velitrae exercitus ducus. eae quoque expugnatae. tum ad caput belli Praeneste ventum. id non vi, sed per deditionem receptum est. There were eight towns under the control of Praeneste: the war was brought to them, and when they were captured one after another without a great battle, the army was lead to Velitrae; this town was also captured. Then they came to Praeneste, the leader of the conflict. It was captured not by force, but by surrender.
on the battlefield, and concluded a treaty that does not seem to have treated the Latins as the weaker party. In this rout, Rome is described as dealing a major blow to Praenestine overconfidence (while also explicitly boosting Roman confidence) and simultaneously depriving Praeneste of eight subject cities; together, these accomplishments point towards a shift in the way the relationship between Rome and Praeneste is depicted in Livy’s account.

Livy reports that Quinctius was awarded a triumph for his victory over Praeneste and returned to Rome with a statue of Jupiter Imperator, which was set up with an inscription recording his successes as dictator for posterity. Livy supplies an example of the sort of inscription that the statue bore—*Iuppiter atque diui omnes hoc dederunt ut T. Quinctius dictator oppida nouem caperet*, “Jupiter and all the gods have granted that T. Quinctius seize nine towns”—but notes that it was “approximately” (*ferme*) these words that adorned the monument, perhaps implying that he had not seen the inscription himself. This statue and inscription would have joined a growing body of triumphal displays in the city, contributing to the ethos of displaying visible signs of the city’s conquests and successes via an ever-growing pile of trophies and spolia, as well as contributing to the individual glory of the general who deposited them. Setting up the statue of Jupiter Imperator brought from the defeated Praeneste, particularly in

---

359 Unfortunately, as this year falls during one of the lacunae in the *Fasti Triumphales Capitolini*, there is no easy reinforcement of Livy’s narrative here as for many other triumphs.

360 Livy 6.29.9

361 As this victory is roughly contemporary with the construction of several victory temples, including the temple of Mars near the Porta Capena (founded 388 BCE) that Livy attributes to the same T. Quinctius who defeated Praeneste, it is likely that Quinctius was familiar with the increasingly competitive display by generals and would have displayed his spoils from Praeneste quite prominently.
conjunction with a dedicatory inscription of the sort described by Livy, would have created a prominent physical marker within Rome of the Praenestine defeat, similar to the establishment of the cult of Juno Regina after her *evocatio* from Veii in a prominent site on the Aventine (as her status as a foreign goddess relegated her cult outside the *pomerium*). Quinctius’ victory was well-represented in the historiographic tradition—unlike most episodes involving republican-era battles with Praeneste, which are found only in Livy, this story also appears in Dionysius of Halicarnassus (the surviving fragment emphasizes the impressive “nine towns in nine days” victory) and Diodorus Siculus (who notes as the only Roman accomplishment for that year that they slaughtered the *Praenestini* in battle). Furthermore, as Chaplin observes, setting up a monument to a decisive victory won at the site of a previous defeat allows the statue and inscription to celebrate not only the defeat of the Praenestines but also Rome’s triumphant resurgence from their own defeat by the Gauls.

Even after this decisive victory by the Romans, however, Praeneste continued to be a troublesome presence for Rome: Livy describes the Praenestines as rebelling once

362 Livy 5.21; see Orlin 2009, 36-41.

363 Dion. Hal. 14.5.1 κρατήσας τῶν πολεμίων καὶ τὴν στρατιὰν ἐπικλύσας ταῖς ὀφελείαις Τίτος Κοίντιος δικτατορεύων ἐν ἡμέραις ἐννέα πόλεις ἐννέα πολεμίων ἔλαβεν. ληφθέντες ἀμφοτέρωθεν ἀγεληδόν οἱ θεοστυγεῖς κατεκόπησαν. (Having conquered the enemy and swamped the army with spoils, Titus Quinctius—who was serving as dictator—in nine days took nine cities of the enemy). Diod. Sic.15.47.8 κατὰ δὲ τὴν Ἑταλίαν Ρωμαίοι πρὸς Πραινεστίους παραταξάμενοι καὶ νικήσαντες τοὺς πλεῖστους τῶν ἀντιταξαμένων κατέκοψαν. (Meanwhile in Italy, the Romans were drawn up in battle-order against the Praenestini and after prevailing in battle destroyed the majority of those who had stood against them).

364 Chaplin 1993, 110.
again in the very next year, this time having stirred up Latin towns along with them.\(^{365}\)

Though the episode is not developed any further in Livy and is therefore unlikely to represent a major confrontation, the mere fact that Praeneste rose up again immediately after such a major defeat—or, at least, that some Roman historiographic sources described the Praenestines as capable of such an quick recovery from a defeat that should have allowed the Romans to enjoy calm on the Praenestine front—paints a picture of Praeneste as a ongoing threat. Even if they are kept at bay for several years at a time, the image of the city suggested by this consistent pattern of rebellion evokes a constant implied peril located right down the road. The next major interaction between Rome and Praeneste in Livy’s narrative is in the context of another rebellion in the lead-up to the Latin War of 338. In 8.12 and 8.13 Livy lists attempts in 339-338 BCE to regain towns and territory previously lost to Rome by a number of Latin cities, Praeneste among them, who were “rebelling on account of the anger at their lost lands” (*Latinos ob iram agri amissi rebellantes*).\(^{366}\) Though Livy has not provided an explicit statement of the terms of the settlement between Rome and Praeneste after their skirmishes in 380/79, it is not necessary to figure out exactly what the legal status of the city was at this point to understand the impression that Livy’s narrative generates: Praeneste remains grouped with the Latin cities who are rebelling (*rebellantes*) against the Romans. Whatever status

---

\(^{365}\) Livy 6.30.8 *id modo extremo anno tumultuatam quod Praenestini concitatis Latinorum populis rebellarunt.* (At the end of the year, the only disturbance was that the Praenestini rebelled, the nations of the Latins having been stirred up.)

\(^{366}\) Livy 8.12.5 *Latinos ob iram agri amissi rebellantes in campis Fenectanis fuderunt castrisque exuerunt.* (The Latins, who were rebelling out of anger over their lost lands, were routed in the Fenectane plains and driven away from their encampment.)
quo had been established, it is clear that the Romans believed Praeneste was violating the terms of that agreement, consistent with the pattern already established in Livy.

In his account of the aftermath of the Roman-Latin war in 338 BCE, Livy claims that Praeneste and Tibur are punished by the Senate for their exceptional disloyalty in allying with the Gauls against Rome (not merely because of fighting alongside all of the other Latin cities), and for this reason they are deprived of their territorial holdings. The evidence in Livy for the Praenestines allying with the Gauls alongside Tibur is scanty and depends on Livy’s explicit statement that Tibur allied with the Gauls in 361/0 BCE and passing reference one chapter later to the Gauls being in the area of Praeneste in 358 BCE. As Oakley’s commentary discusses, the geography of the region strongly suggests that Tibur and Praeneste must have, at the very least, allowed the Gauls to pass through their territory freely: if the two strongholds had defended their mountain passes against the Gauls, the invaders probably could not have remained in central Italy between

---

367 Livy 8.14.9. See Chapter Two, Section II on the interpretation of this passage, particularly the possibility that Tibur and Praeneste’s “punishment” should be attributed to their relative strength compared to Rome.

368 In book 7, Tibur is explicitly said to have formed an offensive and defensive alliance with the Gauls and to be sheltering them in her territory and providing provisions. Livy 7.11.1, …tanti ea ad universi belli eventum momenti dimicatio fuit, ut Gallorum exercitus proxima nocte relictis trepide castris in Tiburtem agrum atque inde, societate belli facta commeatuque beneigne ab Tiburtibus adiutus, mox in Campaniam transierit. (..that fight was an event of such influence on the whole war that the army of the Gauls abandoned their camp hastily the next night and moved from there to the Tiburine countryside, and having made an alliance with them, and aided with abundant supplies by the Tiburtes, they soon moved into Campania.) In the next chapter, Livy suggests that the Gauls were settling in the area controlled by Praeneste, but it is a subject for less fear because the Romans have received reinforcements from the other Latin cities in the intervening time. Livy 7.12.8, quo praesidio cum fulla res Romana esset, levius fuit quod Gallos mox Praeneste venisse atque inde circa Pedum consedisse auditum est (With the Roman cause having been strengthened by this reinforcement, it was taken more lightly that the Gauls were said to have come to Praeneste and settled there, around Pedum.)
the sack of Rome in 390 BCE and the battles of the 360s. Livy’s text is very clear on
the consequences of being accused by Rome of allying with the Gauls, however;
Praeneste and Tibur are the only two cities to receive this punishment, and he specifically
notes that it was issued for an offense beyond the common rebellion.

B. Exiles and Rebels at Praeneste

Like Tibur, Praeneste developed a reputation as a frequent (and desirable)
location for people on unfriendly terms with Rome. Other than Livy’s description of the
trial of P. Furius Philus and M. Matienus in 171 BCE and Polybius’ statement that exiles
could find refuge in Praeneste in his day (see discussion in Chapter Two, Section II) no
other sources discuss Praeneste’s role as a place for exiles in a legal sense. However, a
number of specific incidents appear in literary sources from the Middle and Late
Republic where Praeneste is associated with the flight of rebels and exiles. The earliest
such an incident occurs in 198 BCE, while the Romans were distracted to the east by
Titus Flamininus’ campaign against Philip V in the Second Macedonian War. Though
they had emerged victorious from the Second Punic War a few years prior, the incident
demonstrates that the Romans were still anxious about the potentially harmful influence
of Carthage, as “the state was fearful that the slaves had been incited by the Carthaginian
hostages and captives,” who were still present in the region (in timore civitas fuit obsides
captivosque Poenorum ii moliri). It is clear, on the one hand, that this concern is not
limited to Praeneste, as the praetor contacts other cities of the nomen Latinum to make

370 Livy 32.26.16
sure they are keeping on eye on their captives and slaves. However, Praeneste is the place to which they are said to have planned to flee (haud ita multo post ex eiusdem coniurationis reliquis nuntiatum est servitia Praeneste occupatura), and the fear of slaves occupying Praeneste inspires a harsh reaction: at Setia, the seat of the revolt, L. Cornelius only seizes the ringleaders of the conspiracy, but when he reaches Praeneste he summarily executes some 500 men who were involved in the crime (eo L. Cornelius praetor profectus de quingentis fere hominibus, qui in ii noxa erant, supplicium sumpsit). The decision to head for Praeneste, over 50 miles away and in the opposite direction from the southern Italian cities where any remaining Carthaginian sympathizers might be found, suggests that these rebelling slaves and the Carthaginian hostages with them believed that Praeneste would provide a favorable place in which to face the forces chasing them.

---


(Therefore at Rome there were night-watchmen throughout the streets and minor magistrates were ordered to walk around them, and the triumvirs in charge of the prison at the quarries were ordered to have an increased watch, and letters were sent around the Latin confederacy by the praetor, saying that hostages should be guarded in private and should not be given the opportunity to come out in public, and prisoners should be chained with no less weights of no less than ten pounds and guarded only in no place other than a public prison.) For the meaning of the nomen Latinum, in which periods it may have existed, and the evolution of the nomen Latinum from an ethnic, geographic, and cultural group that was united politically into a term denoting participation in a group holding a particular legal status, see Nicolet 1976, esp. 30-7.

372 Livy 32.26.15-16 haud ita multo post ex eiusdem coniurationis reliquis nuntiatum est servitia Praeneste occupatura. eo L. Cornelius praetor profectus de quingentis fere hominibus, qui in ea noxa erant, supplicium sumpsit. (Not long after this, it was reported that slaves from the remaining members of the same conspiracy were going to occupy Praeneste. Having travelled there, the praetor L. Cornelius inflicted punishment on about five hundred men who were involved in the crime.)
An accumulation of historical accounts of rebels hiding in Praeneste, combined with responses to the city by political leaders hoping to forestall rebels from using Praeneste to their advantage, suggests that the city was known as a potential stronghold for figures rebelling against Rome. The most important, prominent, and extensive of these narratives occurs during the Marian-Sullan civil wars. Appian reports that when Cinna fled Rome in 87 BCE, he went among some of the Italian cities that had recently gained citizenship, including Praeneste, in an attempt to incite revolt and raise funds for his cause.³⁷³ Praeneste, Tibur, and Nola are specifically named as cities Cinna expected might be receptive to his plans for rebellion against Rome. In 82 BCE, Appian reports, the younger Marius (a former ally of Cinna, who had dominated the party of the elder Marius after the latter’s death) retreated to Praeneste after being defeated by Sulla in battle. Appian characterizes the Praenestines as willingly offering shelter to the fleeing army of Marius, first with open gates and then rescuing Marius himself by lifting him over the wall by means of a rope when he approached the gates with Sulla close behind, in a fairly clear demonstration of their continued sympathy for the anti-Sullan party.³⁷⁴ The consequences of their allegiance were harsh: when the city surrendered after learning

³⁷³ App. B.Civ. 1.65.2 ἕξεδραμεν ἐς τὰς ἀγχοῦ πόλεις τὰς οὐ πρὸ πολλοῦ πολιτιδας Ῥωμαίων γενομένας, Τιβυρτόν τε καὶ Πραινεστόν καὶ ὅσα μέχρι Νώλης, ἐρεβίζων ἀπαντας ἐς ἀπόστασιν καὶ χρήματα ἐς τὸν πόλειον συλλέγων. (…[Cinna] rushed to the towns nearby, which had not been citizens of Rome for much time—Tibur and Praeneste, and those as far as Nola—inciting them all to revolution and gathering funds for war.)

³⁷⁴ App. B.Civ. 1.87 κοπτόμενοι γὰρ ἔς Πραινεστόν ἔφευγον ἀπαντες, ἐπομένου τοῦ Σύλλα σὺν δρόμῳ, καὶ οἱ Πραινεστιοὶ τοὺς μὲν πρώτους αὐτῶν εἰσεδέξαντο, Σύλλα δ’ ἐπικειμένου τὰς πύλας ἀπέκλεισαν καὶ Μάριον καλωδίους ἀνιμήσαντο. (The whole worn out army fled to Praeneste with Sulla following at full speed. The Praenestines took in those of the army who arrived first, but when Sulla pressed upon them they closed the gates, and Marius was pulled up by ropes.)
that the entire army of Carbo (their only hope of relief) had been defeated and slaughtered, all of the politicians who had held authority during Marius’ presence in Praeneste were executed.\textsuperscript{375} The general population of the city faced severe punishment as well, as Sulla reportedly divided them up by ethnic background and killed all of the adult male Praenestines and Samnites (though he spared the Roman adults and all women and children) before allowing the town to be plundered.\textsuperscript{376} The city’s legal and political status clearly changed after the Sullan conquest, as Cicero refers to it some forty years later as a \textit{colonia} rather than a \textit{municipium} and inscriptions appear with colonial rather than municipal office titles.\textsuperscript{377} This change in legal status was accompanied by a massive

\textsuperscript{375} App. \textit{B.Civ.} 1.94 Λουκρήτιος δ’ ἐπεὶ Πραινεστῶν ἐλε, τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς βουλῆς ἐνταῦθα Μαρίῳ στρατηγούντων τοὺς μὲν αὐτίκα ἀνήρει, τοὺς δ’ ἐσεβαλλεν: οὕς ὁ Σύλλας ἐπελθὼν ἀνείλε. (When Lucretius took Praeneste, he then seized the men of the senate who had been generals for Marius; some of them he killed immediately, the others he threw into prison: those men Sulla killed when he came through.)

\textsuperscript{376} App. \textit{B.Civ.} 1.94 καὶ τοὺς ἐν Πραινεστῶ προσέταξε χωρίς ὀπλῶν προελθέον ἀπαντας ἐς τὸ πεδίον καὶ προελθόντων τοὺς μὲν ἑαυτῷ τι χρησίμους γενομένους, ὀλίγους πᾶμπαν, ἐξείλετο, τοὺς δὲ λοιποὺς ἐκέλευσεν ἐς τρία ἄπ’ ἀλλήλων διαστήματα, Ἡρωαίοις τε καὶ Σαυνίταις καὶ Πραινεστίοις: ἐπεὶ δὲ διέστησαν, τοῖς μὲν Ἡρωαίοις ἐπεκήρυξεν, οτι καὶ οἶδε ἄξια βανάτου δεδράκαι, καὶ συγγνώμην ἔδωκεν οἷς, τοὺς δὲ ἔτερους κατηκότισεν ἀπαντας: γύναια δ’ αὐτῶν καὶ παιδία μεθῆκεν ἀπαθείς ἀπεναι. καὶ τὴν πόλιν διηρπαξε, πολυχρήματον ἐν τοῖς ἀλίστα τὸτε οὕσαν. (All the others who were taken in Praeneste he ordered to out to the plain without arms, and when they had gone out he removed a very few who had been in some way useful to him, and he ordered that those remaining be divided into three sections: the Romans, the Samnites, and the Praenestines. When they had been separated he proclaimed to the Romans that they were worthy of death, but nevertheless he granted them forgiveness, but he shot down all the others: but he allowed their wives and children to go unharmed. He also plundered the city, which was exceptionally rich at that time.)

\textsuperscript{377} Cic. \textit{Cat.} 1.8.1 \textit{cum te Praeneste Kalendis ipsis Novembribus occupaturum nocturno impetu esse confideres, sensistin illum coloniam meo iussu meis praesidiis, custodiis, vigiliiis esse munitam?} (What? When you were confident that you would seize Praeneste in a nighttime assault on the Kalends of November, did you not see that \textit{that colony} was defended, according to my order, by my garrisons, guards, and watchmen?); for
campaign of resettlement for the Sullan veterans who came as colonists and were established near the base of the hill. The adult male population was almost entirely replaced between the executions and the importation of the veterans’ colony; within one lifespan of 82 BCE, the entire onomastic landscape of epigraphy at Praeneste changes and nearly all of the major gentes disappear.\textsuperscript{378}

Despite the destruction that Sulla wrought on Praeneste, however, in the Late Republic the city remained a destination in which characters instigating rebellion sought refuge. Cicero’s \textit{In Catilinam I} accuses Catiline of attempting to seize Praeneste as a prelude to his planned attack on Rome, perhaps to serve as a base from which to launch his attack, only to find that Cicero has predicted the attack and fortified the town accordingly.\textsuperscript{379} By listing the securing of Praeneste as one of the steps he took to anticipate and counter Catiline’s rebellious actions, Cicero shows us once again the city’s reputation as a place for rebels: he both assumes that the audience will recognize Praeneste as a place that ought to have been fortified if a rebel was on the loose and

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{378} Degrassi 1969, 114-6, calculates that only 20 of the 138 gentes attested at a republican necropolis remain in Praeneste after Sulla; see also CIL XIV p. 289 for Dessau’s original observations on the necropolis and its inhabitants. Even if Appian’s account, or the parallel account in Plutarch’s \textit{Life of Sulla}, are exaggerated for effect, it is clear that a major change in the elite inhabitants of Praeneste occurred at the time of Sulla’s defeat of the city. \textsuperscript{379} Cic. \textit{Cat}. 1.8 \textit{Quid? cum te Praeneste Kalendis ipsis Novembribus occupaturum nocturno impetu esse confideres, sensistin illum coloniam meo iussu, meis praesidiis, custodiis, vigiliis esse munitam?} (What? When you were confident that you would seize Praeneste in a nighttime assault on the Kalends of November, did you not see that that colony was defended, according to my order, by my garrisons, guards, and watchmen?)}
associates Catiline in the audience’s mind with those dangerous figures who did flee to Praeneste and try to stage a rebellion against Rome from there.

During the civil war after Caesar’s assassination M. Antonius’ brother L. Antonius fled to Praeneste with Marcus’ wife, Fulvia, to muster support against Lepidus and Octavian while Marcus Antonius was in Egypt in 41 BCE. In Appian’s account of the conflict in the Bellum Civile, the pro-republican, anti-triumvirate Lucius fled to Praeneste, claiming to fear for his life if he stayed at Rome, where Octavian had an armed guard, after the triumvir failed to uphold promised concessions to allow the consuls to operate freely.\(^{380}\) L. Antonius was joined in Praeneste by Fulvia on the pretext that she feared for her and her children’s lives around Lepidus, but in truth because she had been manipulated into believing that rebellion against Octavian and Lepidus was likely to bring back her husband from Cleopatra’s embrace.\(^{381}\) Velleius Paterculus also discusses

\(^{380}\) See App. B.Civ. 5.19.1 Λευκίω δὲ δντι δημοτικώ καὶ δυσχεραίνουτι τη των τριών ἄρχη, ουδὲ ἐπὶ τῷ χρόνῳ παύσεσθαι νομιζομένη, προσκρούσματα εἰς τὸν Καίσαρα ἐγίγνεντο καὶ διαφοραί μείζους (Lucius Antonius, who was a popularis and opposed to the triumvirate, which was not expected to stop at a fitting time, became engaged in clashes and greater differences with Octavian), App. B.Civ. 5.20 (for the list of the agreements made between Lucius and Octavian), App. B.Civ. 5.21.1 οὐ γιγνομένων δὲ τῶν ἄλλων ἢ βραδυνύμων, ἐς Πραινεστὸν ἄνεχώρει Λεύκιος, δεδείναι λέγων Καίσαρα διὰ τὴν ἄρχην δορυφοροῦμενον, αὐτὸς ἀφρούρητος ὠν. (Since the other agreements were not being carried out, or were being delayed, he went to Praeneste, saying that he feared Caesar [Octavius] having an armed guard due to his magistracy while he himself was unprotected.)

\(^{381}\) App. B.Civ. 5.21.2 ἀνεχώρει δὲ καὶ Φουλβία πρὸς Λέπιδου, ἢδη λέγουσα περὶ τοῖς τέκνοις δεδείναι (Fulvia, on the other hand, departed on account of Lepidus, saying that she was now fearful for her children.) App. B.Civ. 5.19.2-3 …μέχρι τήν Φουλβίαν ὁ Μάνιος πανούργως μετεδίδαξεν ὡς εἵρημενομένης μὲν τῆς Ἰταλίας ἐπιμενεῖν Ἀυτῶν τοῦ Κλεοπάτρα, πολεμοῦμενος δ’ ἀφίξεσθαι κατὰ τάχος. τότε γὰρ δὴ γυναικὸς τι παθοῦσα ἢ Φουλβία τοῦ Λεύκιον ἐπέτριβεν ἐς τὴν διαφοράν. (…until Manius cunningly convinced Fulvia that by telling her that while Italy was peaceful, Antony would remain with with Cleopatra, but that if it were at war he would come back swiftly. Then Fulvia, affected by some womanly passion, inflamed Lucius for conflict.)
this rebellion, crediting Fulvia with a great deal of the ambition and impetus for the movement, while specifically claiming that she “had selected Praeneste as a base of operations for war” (Haec belli sedem Praeneste ceperat.) 382 Finally, in 40 BCE Tiberius Nero—biological father of the emperor Tiberius—also sought refuge in Praeneste during the wars after Caesar’s assassination. As Suetonius reports, Tiberius Nero was a supporter of the tyrannicides and later an ally of Lucius Antonius under the triumvirate. 383 When Lucius’ other allies surrendered, Tiberius Nero fled first to Praeneste before moving on to Neapolis, where he tried to incite a slave rebellion, and then to Sicily. 384 Suetonius’ account provides one final figure who participated in this history of fleeing to Praeneste to seek freedom from those currently holding power at Rome, though Suetonius himself writes from a time well past when Praeneste was thought of as a viable stronghold. These repeated episodes of rebels fleeing (or potentially fleeing) to Praeneste suggest that the Roman cultural memory of Praeneste in the Late Republic still very

382 Vell. Pat. 2.74.3 Ex altera parte uxor Antonii Fulvia, nihil muliebre praeter corpus gerens, omnia armis tumultuque miscebat. Haec belli sedem Praeneste ceperat...

383 Suet. Tib. 4.1-2 tamen Caesare occiso, cunctis turburum metu abolitionem facti decernentibus, etiam de praemiiis tyrannicidarum referendum censuit. praetura deinde functus, cum exitu anni discordia inter triumuiros orta esset, retentis ultra iustum tempus insignibus L. Antonium consulem triumuiiri fratrem ad Perusiam secutos (After Caesar was killed, however, when the others were deciding on an amnesty for the deed out of fear of disturbances, he proposed a referendum about rewards for the tyrannicides. Then, when he had fulfilled the office of praetor, and at the end of the year discord broke out among the triumvirs, he kept the insignia of his office beyond the appropriate time and followed the consul L. Antonius, brother of the triumvir, to Perusia.)

384 Suet. Tib. 4.2 deditione a ceteris facta, solus permansit in partibus ac primo Praeneste, inde Neapolim euasit seruisque ad pilleum frustra uocatis in Siciliam profugit. (Although a capitulation was made by others, he alone persevered in the faction, and escaped first to Praeneste, then to Naples, and—having summoned the slaves to freedom without effect—he fled over to Sicily.)
much reflected the city as a stronghold, as this would not have been a threatening prospect if Praeneste did not maintain, in the Roman mind, some potential to serve as a base for military operations against Rome.

C. Praeneste and Roman Citizenship

One of the reasons why Praeneste had the ability to host legal exiles from Rome (as opposed to the simply disaffected and rebellious) through most of the Republic seems to have been the relative freedom afforded by not taking up Roman citizenship until after the city was converted into a colony after 82 BCE. Understanding the cultural memory of Praeneste’s eventual (late) acquisition of Roman citizenship is complicated by the fact that the surviving sources—nearly all Roman—approach the issue from a fundamentally Roman perspective and thus treat the full franchise as something to be desired. For example, Livy’s account of the end of the Roman-Latin War in 338 BCE is only comprehensible if you approach the narrative with the understanding that receiving the full franchise, as Lavinium did, is a great reward and must be indicative of the city’s high status in Roman eyes, and that even the franchise *sine suffragio* is a desirable step on the road to full Roman citizenship. Without this assumption, Livy’s narrative becomes practically unreadable, as the list of who took what side when and how quickly becomes hopelessly tangled up in a list of responses that seem to bear no resemblance to the actions that allegedly motivated them. However, reading all of the sources on Praeneste and Roman citizenship through the eyes of the Romans will make a few other episodes difficult to explain: the reader must recognize this as a place where the Roman cultural memory of the city has been strongly shaped by specifically *Roman* assumptions about what is desirable and good.
One episode of Praenestine history preserved in Roman historiography contains an important anecdote about the reception of Roman citizenship. This episode, in which Roman citizenship is offered to and refused by a group of soldiers from Praeneste, appears in Livy’s third decade during the narrative of the Second Punic War. Livy reports that Casilinum, a town just outside of Capua, was besieged by Hannibal in 216-15 BCE and defended by a force mostly consisting of Praenestine soldiers, who held out for so long that they were reduced to eating mice, grass, and even the leather from their shields. Frustrated by their continued resistance to his siege and his inability to starve them out, Hannibal agreed to negotiate the release of the city. Livy implies the significance of this accomplishment when he comments that Hannibal had never before permitted a treaty for ransom (\textit{qui nullam antea pactionem auribus admiserat}). Livy reports the aftermath of the treaty as follows:

\begin{quote}
Praenestini maxima pars fuere. Ex quingentis septuaginta qui in praesidio fuerunt, minus dimidium ferrum famesque absumpsit: ceteri incolumes Praeneste cum praetore suo M. Anicio—scriba is antea fuerat—redierunt. Statua eius indicio fuit, Praeneste in foro statuta, loricata, amicta toga, uelato capite, et tria signa cum titulo lamnae aeneae inscripto, M. Anicium pro militibus qui Casilini in praesidio fuerint uotum soluisse. Idem titulus tribus signis in aede Fortunae positis fuit subjectus.
\end{quote}

The majority [of the force] were from Praeneste. Out of the five hundred and seventy who were in the garrison, the sword and famine took less than half: the rest returned unharmed to Praeneste with their praetor, Marcus Anicius, who was formerly a scribe. As proof, a statue of him was erected in the forum of Praeneste—cuirassed, draped in a toga, with veiled head—and three \textit{signa} with a \textit{titulus} inscribed on a bronze tablet: “M. Anicius on behalf of the soldiers who were in the garrison of Casilinum fulfilled his vow.” The same \textit{titulus} was placed below three \textit{signa} placed in the temple of Fortuna.\footnote{The literal meaning of the two sentences as transmitted is difficult to decipher. Though initially only one statue is mentioned at the forum, there are also said to be three.
Though the harsh conditions of the siege took some portion (less than half) of the garrison before it was freed, the majority made it home safe with their leader, one Marcus Anicius, who Livy notes was previously a scribe. A statue of Marcus Anicius was erected in the forum at Praeneste, accompanied by an inscription that also appeared on three items at the sanctuary of Fortuna commemorating the fulfillment of a vow, presumably a dedication to a god in honor of the “victory” over Hannibal. The statue therefore serves as a victory monument as well as an honor paid to Marcus Anicius. The episode seems to have been quite visible at Praeneste, and regardless of whether the physical statue survived until Livy’s day, its memory and the memory of the heroic behavior of the Praenestine cohort clearly did.

In addition to the honors paid to Marcus Anicius as the commander of the Praenestines, Livy also reports that the Romans tried to reward the Praenestine troops for their protection of the garrison of Casilinum: *Praenestinis militibus senatus Romanus duplex stipendium et quinquennii militiae vacationem decreuit; ciuitate cum donarentur ob virtutem, non mutauerunt.*\(^{388}\) The first reward—doubled pay and exemption from military service for five years—the Praenestine soldiers accepted, but they rejected the

---

*signa* (a word that can be used of a statue or any representational object) that bear the *titulus* inscribed on a bronze sheet referring to the incident at Casilinum. Adding to the confusion, the three descriptors attached to the singular statue—*loricata, amicta toga, velato capite*—cannot refer to one and the same object, as the cuirass and toga could not be worn at the same time (the exception being Cicero wandering around in the Forum with a breastplate under his toga to deter assassination by Catiline, but this is marked by its oddity at the time). Weissenborn and Müller correct for this difficulty by bracketing *et tria signa*, leaving one *titulus* inscribed on one statue, but this does not resolve the issue of an apparently impossible statue, so there must be further confusion in this passage (whether introduced by Livy, his sources, or a later copyist).

\(^{388}\) Livy 23.20
second reward—Roman citizenship. Livy explains that when they were offered the citizenship on account of their virtue (*ciuitate cum donarentur ob uirtutem*), “they did not change” (*non mutauerunt*). Most plausibly, this has to mean that they maintained their Praenestine citizenship, although offered the Roman citizenship that most of their fellow citizens were denied. It is important that Livy specifically notes that the citizenship was offered *ob virtutem*, on account of their virtue, both because this highlights the proposed separation between the men and the other Praenestines (citizenship is not offered to all the people of Praeneste, but only to the ones who displayed this virtue) and because it emphasizes that Roman citizenship is being treated by the Romans as a *reward* for virtuous behavior (particularly loyalty to Rome.)

The heroism of the garrison at Casilinum, like the story of T. Quinctius’ victory at the Allia, seems to have had a long memory at Rome. The presence of the episode in a fragment of Cassius Dio demonstrates that the memory of the story lasted into the 3rd century CE, though the surviving fragment mentions “allies” rather than the city of Praeneste specifically.

The episode also apparently became a topic for declamation, possibly a set topic for schoolboys, where the speaker was to argue either in favor of abandoning the garrison and surrendering to Hannibal to avoid starvation or nobly standing at their post until the very

---

*See Coskun 2009 for a discussion of the circumstances under which individuals could be offered Roman citizenship (for virtue, service as a magistrate, etc.)*

*Zonaras 9.2, from Cass. Dio. XV. In this version Romans and about a thousand of their allies (συμμάχοι), presumably the Praenestines, nobly endure hunger and hold the fort as their food runs out; they even manage to trick Hannibal into believing they have extensive siege supplies by deliberately tossing radish seeds over the walls to create the impression, as in Livy, that he will have to wait for the new plants to grow before he can take the garrison. Though it is not possible to tell for how long the story was associated with the city of Praeneste specifically, even in the 3rd century CE it is still associated with allies of Rome, so it continues to communicate the valor of the cohort displaying such honor when they are not even defending their own town.*
end. The *Rhetorica ad Herennium* and Cicero’s *De Inventione* both preserve versions of rhetorical exercises based on the bravery and honor of the garrison resisting Hannibal at Casilinum. Even if the specific details attributing the episode to the Praenestines do not appear in the rhetorical treatises, the fact that the episode appears in two separate rhetorical contexts suggests that it circulated very widely in the late Republic.

The exception to the general statement that the soldiers’ peers were denied Roman citizenship is, of course, those Praenestines who left their city for Rome (such as the families of the Q. Anicius who was aedile in 304 and the C. Fabricius who was consuls in 282, respectively). Though we do not know the exact mechanism by which these branches of Praenestine families gained Roman citizenship, they must have been Roman citizens by the time they stood for office. Nor do we know whether one could maintain Praenestine citizenship while also taking up Roman citizenship at this time period; however, the statement of Livy some 250 years later that the refusal to accept Roman citizenship represented a refusal to “change” their status perhaps suggests that in his day, one could not accept Roman citizenship while maintaining a former citizenship unchanged. Cicero implies that this was the case in the Late Republic, at least, when he

---

*Rhet. Ad. Her.* I.9, in which the episode is presented as an example to show what sort of arguments one ought to use when the contrast is between advocating for safety and honor; and *Cic. De Inv.* 2.171-4, in which Cicero uses the situation to distinguish between two meanings of “necessary,” i.e. it is necessary for the people to surrender Casilinum to Hannibal (they can choose not to but will die trying) vs. it is necessary that Casilinum will fall to Hannibal (one way or another, he will end up taking the fortress either if they surrender or if they all die of starvation). This distinction is used to clarify that one can argue something is necessary—even to starve, forsaking the necessity to eat—if it is in pursuit of honor, since the greatest necessity is to do the honorable thing. The garrison at Casilinum, this rhetorical exercise would suggest, should be remembered for having been able to put aside all other necessities in order to fulfill the highest necessity of doing the honorable thing.
opines to Atticus in the *De Legibus* that he believes all men from *municipia* have “two homelands, one by birth and one by (legal) citizenship” (*Ego mehercule et illi et omnibus municipibus duas esse censeo patrias, unam naturae, alteram civitatis*).\(^{392}\) Livy’s brief description of the Praenestine cohort turning down the citizenship grant (*non mutauerunt*) has enormous implications for our understanding of the relationship of Rome and Praeneste in the Middle Republic, particularly with respect to political and legal status of the *civitas foederata*. The Praenestine soldiers in Livy’s narrative do not react to this offering as something they can take on in addition to their previous identity, a beneficial status that they could hold on top of their identity as citizens of Praeneste, but as something that would change (*muto*) their previous identity, presumably by replacing their Praenestine citizenship. The account given in Livy paints a clear picture of the Praenestines of the Middle Republic—they were willing to fight alongside the Romans against a common threat, but they had no interest in *becoming* Roman.

It is clear that Praeneste had been admitted to Roman citizenship in the aftermath of the Social War, at the very latest, as were the remaining Latin cities that had not received citizenship earlier. Although we lack accounts from Praenestine sources about conflicts over citizenship, even the narrative told by the Roman sources recalling the conquest of Praeneste and its integration into the Roman Republic reflects the fact that citizenship seems to have been one of the defining factors in the relationship between Rome and Praeneste. From the very beginning of the time when Praeneste and other

\(^{392}\) Cic. *De. Leg.* 2.5. Of course, as this takes place after the Social War and the associated changes in municipal citizenship legislation, we should avoid trying to determine citizenship laws of two centuries prior based on this dialogue. Nevertheless, it expresses a sentiment about the choice between one’s legal citizenship and one’s ethnic, local, or familial identity that is relevant to the episode of the Praenestine cohort.
Latin cities began to have formal relationships with the expanding Roman Republic, citizenship was a useful proxy for defining a city’s status in relation to Rome. The “punishment” of refusing to grant citizenship consists of formally designating a city as having secondary status in relation to Rome: the deprivation of citizenship is not a hollow signifier but comes along with very real consequences for an allied city’s freedoms (association, trade, self-government, etc.). Conversely, the award of citizenship marks a city as holding privileged status in relation to Rome and provides tangible benefits for the city in the future.

While it is not the goal of this dissertation to reconstruct a Praenestine perspective on the city’s conquest and assimilation (or lack thereof) by Rome, it is nevertheless an important part of reconstructing the Roman cultural memory of the city to acknowledge places where the Roman cultural memory of Praeneste seems to struggle to explain the other city’s behavior and attitudes. Topics such as this where we can see signs that the narrative provided by surviving authors does not fully account for the surviving evidence suggest possible discontinuities between the surviving Roman account and a hypothetical Praenestine account. How do the Romans talk about a city that shows no interest in becoming Roman? For Livy, a Roman writing years after Praeneste’s incorporation into the Roman citizen body, Praeneste’s previous resistance to political integration cannot be erased from the story, but it also cannot be explained.

D. National Identity and National Characteristics of Praeneste

Praeneste was just down the road from Rome and the cities shared access to a common Latin cultural background: language and literature, art and architecture, religion and
mythology, social practices. Despite Praeneste’s determined independence from Rome, the two cities had far more similarities than differences. In addition to the pan-Latin customs and institutions in which they both participated, there is evidence for direct social interactions between Rome and Praeneste: family names demonstrate close relationships among the elites of both cities, including frequent intermarriage, throughout the Republic, and Romans are known to have come to Praeneste to make offerings at the shrine of Fortuna Primigenia. Nevertheless, examining a few Republican-era references to Praeneste makes it clear that Romans could describe the city as foreign and different in more than a strictly political sense.

An anecdote told in Valerius Maximus suggests that, around the end of the first Punic war, the cults of Praeneste were still considered foreign cults, and that these cults of a Latin allied city belonged to a category distinguishable from “national” cults suitable for consultation by governing bodies at Rome. The anecdote is preserved in slightly different forms in two epitomes, those of Julius Paris and of Januarius Nepotianus:

Lutatius Cerco, qui primum Punicum bellum confecit, a senatu prohibitus est sortes Fortunae Praenestinae adire: auspiciis enim patriis, non alienigenis rem publicam administrari iudicabat oportere. (Paris)

Lutatius Cerco, who ended the First Punic War, was prohibited by the senate from consulting the lots of the Praenestine Fortuna: for they decided that public business ought to be guided by native auspices, not foreign-born ones.

Lutatium Cerconem, confectorem primi Punici belli, fama exstitit velle ad Praenestinam Fortunam sortes † mittere sive colligere. hoc cognito senatus inhibuit extraria responsa † consultorum disquiri. iussum legatis est aedilibusque in haec missis ut si consuluisset, ad supplicium Romam reduceretur. (Nepotianus)\(^{393}\)

\(^{393}\) Val. Max. 1.3.2
There was a rumor that Lutatius Cerco, who ended the First Punic War, wanted to send lots to Praenestine Fortune or to acquire [lots]. When the senate learned about this, they prohibited inquiring into outside responses by those consulting an oracle. Orders were given to legates and aediles who had been sent so that that if he consulted the oracle, he would be brought back to Rome for punishment.

The fundamental aspects of the story are the same in both versions: the senate objects to Lutatius’s plan to consult the oracle of Fortuna at Praeneste on the grounds that it is improper to consult foreign oracles about Roman affairs; in raising this objection, the anecdote reveals that the cult of Fortuna Primigenia was viewed in the era of the Punic Wars as a foreign cult.394

The objection to these auspices being “foreign-born,” having origins anywhere other than Rome, is particularly interesting as it is here applied to a cult that was imported to Rome shortly after the episode discussed. The cult of Fortuna Primigenia was officially adopted by Rome in the end of the 3rd century BCE as Fortuna Publica Populi Romani, in which guise she was worshipped in a temple on the Quirinal hill.395 The circumstances of the goddess’s importation to Rome (where she remained, technically, “foreign-born,” and as such outside the pomerium) suggest the same desire to have the favor of Fortuna can be seen in the failed attempt to seek the goddess’ advice in the 240s

394 Modern scholars have argued convincingly that the Lutatius referred to in this passage is C. Lutatius Catulus, cos. 242, who presided over the victory at the Aegeates Islands the next year as proconsul and can therefore be plausibly described as responsible for ending the First Punic War, not his brother Q. Lutatius Cerco, who served as consul the following year while Lutatius Catulus was commanding the Romans against the Carthaginians: see Stewart 1998, 48-9; Champeaux 1982, 80; and Ziolkowski 1987. The episode can probably be dated to 242/1 BCE and the occasion for consulting the oracle identified as the lead up to these final battles of the First Punic War.
395 Champeaux II 1987, 5-35. Inscriptions referring to the goddess’ worship at this temple variously name Fortuna publica populi Romani Quiritium primigenia, Fortunae publicae populi Romani Quiritium, Fortunae publicae populi Romani, and Fortunae Primigeniae. See Platner-Ashby, s.v. Tres Aedes Fortunae.
reported in Valerius Maximus. Livy reports that a temple to Fortuna Primigenia was vowed by the consul P. Sempronius Tuditanus in 204 BCE while battling Hannibal near Croton; this temple was dedicated in 194 BCE by Q. Marcius Ralla, who had been made duumvir for this purpose. The decisive victory at Croton associated with Sempronius’ vow, which was soon followed by Hannibal’s return to Carthage, ties the importation of Fortuna Primigenia to Rome to the successful conclusion of the Second Punic War. The eventual importation of the cult to Rome after the Second Punic War, then, can be read together with the desire of the general about to conclude the First Punic War to consult the oracle as indicating a Roman desire to ensure the goddess’ favor in ongoing military endeavors against the looming threat of Carthage. The Roman approach to the cult of Fortuna Primigenia in the Middle Republic demonstrated in this episode implies that the city where Fortuna Primigenia was housed was thought of both as potentially hostile and also as foreign, as distinct from merely being a separate political entity.

In addition to depicting Praeneste as a foreign nation in the Middle Republic, Roman sources also identify specific traits that were associated with Praeneste, some of which point to perceived differences between Praenestines and Romans. A few references survive from the comedies of Plautus; dating to the playwright’s floruit from the end of the 3rd to the beginning of the 2nd century BCE, they are contemporary with the importation of the cult of Fortuna Primigenia to Rome in 204-194 BCE and give further insight into how the Romans thought of Praeneste at the time when they were trying to bring her patron goddess into their own city. While comic depictions may be exaggerated, they nevertheless reflect stereotypes that audience members would

396 For the vow, see Livy 29.36.8. For the dedication, see Livy 34.53.3.
recognize. A number of jokes about Praeneste in comedy reference an accent or odd word usage attributed to Praenestine Latin speakers. In Plautus’ *Truculentes*, when the maid Astaphium mocks the speech of the servant Truculentus for dropping the first syllable of a word, he claims to be speaking as the Praenestines do:

T. tene hoc tibi:
rabonem habeto, uti mecum hanc noctem sies.
A. perii! “rabonem”? quam esse dicam hanc beluam?
quin tu “arrabonem” dicis?
T. “a” facio lucri,
ut Praenestinis “cone” est ciconia.

T. Take this from me:
have it as my ‘curity, that you will be with me tonight.
A. You’re killing me here! “’curity”? What kind of beast will I say this is?
Why don’t you say “security”?
T. I’m keeping the “se” as a profit,
as a stork is an ‘ork to the Praenestines. 397

In Plautus’ *Trinummus*, the senex Callicles receives an answer to his urgent questioning from the slave Stasimus that jokingly uses a supposedly Praenestine phrase: *C. quam
dudum istuc aut ubi actum est? S. ilico hic ante ostium, “tam modo,” inquit Praenestinus.*
(C. When did this happen and where was it done? S. In this place here, before the door,
“so much now,” as a Praenestine says. 398 The somewhat nonsensical *tam modo* for *modo*
was explained centuries later by Festus as the archaic form, which had been preserved in the Praenestine dialect, but there is no reason to believe that Plautus’ contemporaries considered this feature of Praenestine Latin to be old-fashioned—it is enough that it is

397 Plaut. *Truc.* 688-92
398 Plaut. *Trin.* 608-9
These comic jabs against the Praenestine dialect of Latin in Plautus contribute to a general sense of the *Praenestini* as foreign and different in his plays by undermining the similarity between the cities that is suggested by their shared language. Two things are notable: first, the Praenestine dialect or accent was distinguishable as “different” to the Roman ear, and second, Plautus depicts these differences as humorous. Part of the humor must derive from the audience’s assumption that the differences are, in fact, *deviations* from their own (correct) version of Latin. This suggests that the Roman attitude at the turn of the 2nd century BCE held Rome as not just the emerging political center of Italy but the social center as well—the place where the norms of culture and language were determined. Groups that speak differently are depicted as deviations from the standard, albeit humorous deviations.

To understand the effect, the Plautine jokes about Praenestine Latin should be compared to the accents Aristophanes gives to Spartan characters in *Lysistrata*—the effect of having a lone character on stage speaking in a different vernacular from all the other actors is to immediately mark that character as the one who is speaking “incorrectly.”

References to further characteristics of Praeneste and Praenestines appear in Plautus’ *Bacchides* and *Captivi*. In a fragment from the opening of the *Bacchides*, one of the characters says of another, “*Praenestinum opino esse, ita erat gloriosus.*” (He is so

---

399 Festus p. 359 Müll *tammodo antiqui ponebant pro modo, ut Attius, ‘*tammodo ’ inquit Praenestinus*” (The ancients used “*tammodo*” for “*modo*,” as when Plautus has “*’tammodo,’ as a Praenestine says*”).

400 This type of humor based on accents has a later Latin parallel in Catullus 84, where the poet mocks an acquaintance who tries to make his accent sound more sophisticated by adding “*h*” sounds to words beginning with vowels.
boastful that I think he is from Praeneste.) The line is preserved out of context and thus difficult to understand, but at the very least we can assume that the playwright relies on some common opinion, rumor, or stereotype that held people from Praeneste to be particularly prideful. In the Captivi, Praeneste appears on a list of so-called “barbarian” cities of central Italy by which the character Ergasilus swears successive oaths—Cora, Praeneste, Signia, Frusinone, and Alatrium.

When the senex Hegio asks the parasite Ergasilus why he is swearing by these “barbarian cities” (barbaricas urbes), Ergasilus explains that it is “since they are just as harsh (asperae) as you were asserting that your food is.” These cities are therefore joined by their status as “barbaricae urbes” and their shared characteristic of being known as “asperae,” harsh, rough, and potentially savage. The list of cities is odd for a number of reasons: first of all, the play has a nominally Greek setting—the uncertainty over its Greek antecedent, or lack thereof, can be disregarded, as Plautus’ text is explicitly set in

---

401 Plaut. Bacch. fr. xi (viii)
Aetolia and the main characters are captives from Elis. It is possible the playwright is simply bending the realism of the play in order to make the references recognizable to a Roman audience, but if that were a priority, then it is difficult to believe he would have left the main characters as Eleans in Aetolia.\footnote{Of course, if the list is meant to be thought of from the perspective of the Greek characters having the conversation, the cities may be “barbaricas” simply by virtue of being Italian.} If we assume the list is intended to be familiar enough to be recognizable to a Roman audience, the list is still somewhat odd. All of these cities are contained in either Latium vetus or Latium adiectum—not, in fact, “barbarian” cities—and Praeneste, though by far the largest and most developed of the five, is one of the wealthiest cities in the region and not on its face a likely candidate to be described as barbarian.

However, a second part of the humor must come from the facet of these cities that is held up as the feature that allows them to be identified as “other.” The adjective asper can mean rough or uneven to the touch (referring to the senses), like animal fur and rough hair or rough-woven garments; rough-hewn stones, harsh mountains and other geographical features; harsh or unpleasant sounds; harsh or unpleasant foods (frequently wine); harsh or unsophisticated language use; calamitous, harsh, or cruel turns of events; and harsh, rough, austere, rigid, unkind, savage, or rude behaviors or mental states.\footnote{TLL s.v asper} It is easy to see how the word could be applied to the food Hegio has been criticizing—perhaps it was too bitter or too harshly spiced, or maybe even just unsophisticated in its flavoring. When Ergasilus turns the word around and applies it to the “barbarian cities,” however, they seem to be mocked as less “polished”—rough-hewn and provincial, the
country towns of rustic Latium versus the sophisticated city. The juxtaposition between this reference to Praeneste as if it were rough and rustic and the reality of the city at the time period is striking, as Praeneste was in fact quite well-established and reasonably prosperous at the time of Plautus’ writing. The city also had an extensive history of wealth and power, longer even than Rome’s, which would seem to exclude it from any list of cities that could reasonably be labeled as rude or rough in any way. Furthermore, this characterization comes in the work of the same playwright who suggests that Praenestines are well-known for being arrogant and prideful—not a characteristic one expects to see among the rough and savage, let alone cities specifically identified as “barbarian.” This strange conjunction of simultaneous accusations of barbarism and boastfulness may stem, as Emma Dench suggests, from a Roman anxiety about the sophistication and wealth of Praeneste prior to Roman ascent: the solution to fearing your neighbors were refined and urbane before you were is to simultaneously dismiss their sophistication (by labeling them as rustic and primitive) and to accuse them of boastfulness if they acknowledge their own priority. These stereotypes, although played for comic laughs, are relevant to understanding the Roman response to Praeneste because they identify a feature that is thought to be common to all Praenestines simply by virtue of being Praenestine. The conjunction of strangeness and foreignness thrown into an identification of Praeneste as a “barbarica urbs” is dismissive, labeling the city as failing to meet the standard of sophistication and culture set—naturally—by Rome. At the same time as Praeneste is accused of falling of short of Roman standards of civilization,

405 Dench 1995, 75-6.
however, it is implied that the Praenestines think of themselves as elevated to the point of arrogance.

In summary, the Roman cultural memory of the city of Praeneste as a collective civic entity depicts a city that is distanced and foreignized despite its literal and conceptual closeness to Rome and especially to the other cities of Latium. Though Praeneste is sometimes grouped so closely with her Latin compatriots that her presence can only be detected in the historiographic tradition through the actions of the Latins as a group, the city stands out in her consistent resistance to being integrated into or even aligned with Rome. The actions remembered to have been taken by the city, as well as the Roman descriptions of the Praenestines as a group, show that Praeneste remained stubbornly distant from Rome through the majority of the Republic. The difficulty later Romans had in understanding or explaining Praeneste’s motivations in these matters leads to discernible tension in the surviving sources. Even once any remaining political resistance was effectively crushed by Sulla's actions in 82 BCE, the Roman cultural image of Praeneste continued to highlight the city's rebellious past and potentially threatening future.

Certain features of Praenestine national identity as seen through the eyes of the Romans are consistent throughout the republic—almost surprisingly so, given the major changes in structural features of the town's civic identity over the time period discussed by these sources. In particular, the establishment of a colony, with all of the concomitant implications about the city's loss of independence, self-governance, and rights, in conjunction with the execution of a significant portion of the adult men of the city, the citizens who would have been the administrators of the city's institutions and customs,
might reasonably cause a sharp break with the past character of the city. The characteristics associated with the city when defiantly autonomous, however, remain current both in the judgment of the city's Roman contemporaries during the Republic and in the memory of Romans in the Empire reflecting on the period of the city’s independence. These recurring themes of rebellion, political independence, and foreignness are also consistent with one another: when understood as reflecting the Roman response to Praeneste, they form a relatively cohesive picture of the “civitas Praenestina” in the Republican period as an obstinately independent state determined to continue governing itself even in the face of the progressive collapse of the “league” system in which that state had previously existed, willing to grant asylum to exiles from Rome, liable to ally itself with rebels, and frequently changing sides and switching loyalty. The characteristics associated with the city of Praeneste—hostile, foreign, arrogant, alien—are more than separate attributes derived from individual stories about Praeneste. When considered together, they provide a picture of a city that seems to be a real and constant threat to Rome, a city with whom continued armed clashes were inevitable and whose violent conquest was necessary to protect Rome from the damage she could wreak in the future.

The fact that these judgments had cultural currency is demonstrated by Cicero's reference to fortifying Praeneste in the first Catilinarian: if no widespread assumption existed that Praeneste would be (A) capable of serving as a dangerous base for Catiline's anticipated attacks on the city and (B) willing to side with the populist demagogue if he showed up at their doorstep, then the boast from Cicero becomes utterly illogical. As the speech stands, Cicero does not feel the need to add evidence of specific plots to head for Praeneste, intercepted communications, or anything of the sort—the consul presents himself as able to deduce the necessity of fortifying Praeneste without any actionable intelligence and assumes that his audience will understand the significance of his choice to do so and view it as a sane precaution.
III. INDIVIDUALS

Several Roman families with origins that can be traced to Praeneste were associated with the city, either by themselves or by others, even after moving to Rome; examining the occasions for these associations, their content, and their effect, suggests that membership in the Praenestine elite is not a negative to be overcome, but (at least in certain circumstances), an advantageous trait. Two trends become immediately clear in looking at these families: firstly, families from Praeneste turn up in the Roman ruling class very soon after the Roman defeat of the Latins and dissolution of the Latin League in 338 BCE.\(^{407}\) Second, Praenestine association was not an impediment to political success at Rome, and even became a desirable quality in the Late Republic: Praenestine families that move to Rome do not abandon their city of origin, and eventually begin to advertise it on coinage issued by members of the family.

\textit{A. Early Praenestine Novi Homines}

In 282 BCE, C. Fabricius Luscinus, a member of a family with origins in Praeneste (as attested by inscriptions) attained the consulship for the first time.\(^{408}\) The fact that a member of a family with origins at Praeneste attained the consulship for the first time less than 50 years after Praeneste took up arms against Rome is striking, particularly given the importance elite Romans placed on family history. However, associations with recently

\(^{407}\) For a parallel for this phenomenon, see Livy 2.16.4-6 for the story of the immigration of Appius Claudius Sabinus, then called Attus Clausus, and his family to Rome after the Sabines were defeated in battle and could not decide whether to continue fighting Rome. For bringing his family and clients to Rome, abandoning the Sabines who wished to continue fighting, Clausus and his family were granted full citizenship and took Romanized names. The family thus held Roman citizenship well before the majority of Sabines, but were nevertheless still clearly associated with their Sabine origins.

\(^{408}\) CIL XIV 3051-57 and 3128-34. See Forsythe 2005, 344.
conquered cities did not go unnoticed or unmentioned. We do not have any ancient sources discussing this Fabricius’ relationship with the recently conquered Praeneste, but the fact that family ties to the city could be a matter for notice is shown by the similar case of Q. Anicius, the first Praenestine known to have entered the *cursus honorum* at Rome (see Section III. in this chapter). As T. P. Wiseman’s survey of the *homo novus* in the Roman Senate demonstrates, elite families from recently conquered areas regularly made their way into the ranks of the *nobiles* at Rome through a network of alliances and patronage, along with political maneuvering.\(^409\) This suggests that familial associations with enemy cities, although they continued to be remembered by other Romans, were not suspect on an individual level. This is not a characteristic unique to Praeneste, as families from other Latin cities defeated in 338 BCE (Aricia, Lanuvium, and Nomentum, at a minimum) began attaining political office at Rome in the same century.\(^410\) What is unique to Praeneste is that the city both remained constitutionally independent after the initial settlement in 338 and continued rebelling or siding with rebels with some regularity after 338 BCE, even as Praenestine *gentes* won elections at Rome. Families from Tibur, the only Latin city that shares Praeneste's history of continued independence from and conflict with Rome, are not recorded as holding office at Rome until the middle of the 2\(^{nd}\) century BCE. The examples associated with Praeneste therefore demonstrate that the ability of Latin elites to integrate themselves with the aristocratic Roman ruling class was not dependent on the peaceful political integration of the civic entity with which their family was associated.

\(^{409}\) Wiseman 1971 (see especially 173-81.)

\(^{410}\) Wiseman 1971, 184-7.
Furthermore, Anicii and Fabricii continue to appear in inscriptions from Praeneste of various Republican dates. This suggests continued comingling of elite families from the two cities even in an era of intermittent conflict between the cities: for the most part, the branches of the families that stay in Praeneste do not seem to be distinguishable from the branches in Rome, other than through their geographic location.\textsuperscript{411} The gens Anicia appears on both an inscription dated to the Sullan era and on a number of funerary monuments from a cemetery in use from the 3\textsuperscript{rd}-1\textsuperscript{st} century BCE, where the gens Fabricia also appears.\textsuperscript{412} In fact, not only did individuals with Praenestine roots succeed in attaining prominence at Rome while their families maintained a presence at Praeneste, by the late Republic, some families in Rome actually advertised their genealogical affiliations with Praeneste. Families from Praeneste—even plebeian families with political ambitions—participated in the same trend of self-promotion through genealogical ancestry that can be seen among families of consular and senatorial rank during the late Republic.

\textit{B. Praenestine Iconography on Coins of the Caesii and Cestii}

The plebeian gens Caesia seems to have evoked specific connections to Praeneste through Caeculus, the legendary founder of the city. The Caesii have a particularly long history at Praeneste: they appear as local magistrates in both republican and early imperial inscriptions and their presence is attested in the town through the second century

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{411} A few families have branches with a cognomen that seems to be specifically associated with one city, but this is the exception rather than the rule.
\textsuperscript{412} Anicii: \textit{CIL} I\textsuperscript{2} 59, \textit{CIL} XIV 2975, 3051-57; Fabricii: \textit{CIL} XIV 3128-34
\end{flushleft}
The Caesii who pursued careers at Rome, on the other hand, referenced their Praenestine family members on their coinage. A denarius issued by Lucius Caesius in 112 BCE depicts on the reverse the Lares Praestites, who were identified as the uncles of Caeculus, and a head of Vulcan, the father of Caeculus. Crawford’s catalogue entry for this issue in *Roman Republican Coinage* (RRC 298/1) does not identify the significance of the bust of Vulcan, but Farney recognizes that Vulcan and the Lares Praestites taken together represent both sides of the genealogy of Caeculus. This coin therefore appears to allude to the city of Praeneste by referencing its mythological founder, and thus suggests that the family in Rome in the late 2nd century BCE both traced their origins to Praeneste and viewed those origins as politically advantageous in some way—worthy of being advertised on their coins. This Lucius Caesius is the first of the Caesii known to have held political office at Rome, which makes the decision to mint these coins particularly interesting: without a respectable family history at Rome to reference, he chooses instead to draw legitimacy from his extended family connection to Praeneste.

Another reference to family origins at Praeneste comes in the coinage related to the plebeian gens Cestia. A branch of the Plaetorii, the Plaetorii Cestiani, apparently arose from the adoption of a Cestius from Praeneste by the Plaetorii (from Tusculum) no later than the early 70s BCE. The presence of the Cestii at Praeneste is attested by

---

413 *CIL XIV* 2980 (dating to the Sullan colony), 2852 (a dedication dating to the second century CE), and 2966 (of uncertain date, probably early imperial on the basis of comparison to similar inscriptions naming Germanicus and Drusus and Germanicus’ sons Nero and Drusus)

414 Possibly on the basis of an assumed etymological connection between *Praeneste* and *praestites*; see Farney 2007, 258. This would not be the only questionable etymological origin story for Praeneste that circulated in antiquity—Cato *Orig.* 60.1 derives the name from the mountains that it stands before (*praestet*).

415 Crawford 1974, 312; Farney 2007, 258
funerary inscriptions in the Republican-era cemetery. Coinage issued by the most prominent member of this branch, Marcus Plaetorius Cestianus, around 69 BCE makes clear reference to the origin of his natural family, the Cestii of Praeneste. The denarii issued by M. Plaetorius Cestianus depict the head of Fortuna on the obverse with reverses showing either the pediment of a temple (RRC 405/1), a youth holding a tablet inscribed with the word SORS (RRC 405/2), or religious implements (RRC 405/3-5). While types 405/1 and 405/3-5 could possibly be identified with another temple of Fortuna, the presence of the lots on type 405/2 allows the secure identification of this denarius issue with the Fortuna Primigenia of Praeneste, the only shrine of Fortuna where fortunes were taken in the form of lots. Plaetorius’ reference to his natural family’s origins is difficult to interpret in the absence of other evidence, but striking given that the Cestii are not particularly politically important and that he could have chosen instead to reference his adoptive family’s ties to Tusculum, which is certainly referenced in other contemporary coinage. At a minimum, we can conclude that affiliation with Praeneste was not seen as significantly less desirable than a connection with Tusculum in the middle of the 1st century BCE, as this moneyer presumably had the choice of either and selected Praeneste. Since Tusculum had been integrated into Rome relatively early (381 BCE) and peacefully, and now enjoyed full Roman citizenship as the first municipium cum

---

416 *CIL* XIV 3091-5
417 RRC 405/1-5. The dating of the issue is somewhat problematic: Crawford dates the coin and his office as triumvir monetalis to 69 BCE, but this conflicts with the report that Caesius served as quaestor prior to 69 BCE, as the quaestorship usually followed serving as a moneyer. See no. 320 in the prosopography of Wiseman 1971, *MRR* 2.601 and *RE* s.v. Plaetorius vol. 16, 1950.49-53
418 See the dismissive note by Elvers in the *Neue Pauly* entry for the family: “die Familie ist polit. Unbedeutend.” *DNP* s.v. *Cestius*
*suffragio*, choosing Praeneste over Tusculum for advertised family associations suggests that Praenestine ancestry is desirable in its own right.

**C. Quintus Anicius and Marcus Anicius**

A few figures from Praenestine families receive particular notice from ancient authors and are worth discussing individually. The earliest person of Praenestine origins recorded as entering the cursus honorum was Quintus Anicius, who Pliny reports was elected aedile for 304 BCE. Anicus appears somewhat unexpectedly in the 33rd book of Pliny’s *Natural Histories*, which focuses on precious metals, because his co-aedile in 304 was Cn. Flavius, in whose time the wearing of gold rings became common in Rome. Pliny says of this aedileship:

> Frequentior autem usus anulorum non ante Cn. Flavium Anni filium deprehenditur. hic namque publicatis diebus fastis, quos populus a paucis principum cotidie petebat, tantam gratiam plebei adeptus est — libertino patre alieni genitus et ipse scriba Appi Caeci, cuius hortatu exceperat eos dies consultando adsidue sagaci ingenio promulgaratque —, ut aedilis curulis crearetur cum Q. Anicio Praenestino, qui paucis ante annis hostis fuisset, praeteritis C. Poetilio et Domitio, quorum patres consules fuerant.

The use of rings also does not appear to have been rather common before Cn. Flavius, son of Annus. This man, having published the civic calendar, which the people used to seek out daily from a few of the leading men, received such gratitude from the plebs—he was also the son of a freedman and himself was a scribe of Appius Caecus—by whose request he had captured those days, with continual observing and his innate intelligence, and published them—that he was made a curule aedile together with Q. Anicius, a Praenestine, who had been an enemy a few years previously, while C. Potitius and C. Domitius, whose fathers had been consuls, were passed over.\(^{419}\)

On the one hand, it is notable that Anicius was elected in 304—little more than 30 years after the conquest of Praeneste—and would have been elected quaestor even earlier than

\(^{419}\) Pliny *NH* 33.17
that. Pliny even calls attention to this fact, describing Anicius as a man who had been an enemy a few years earlier (*qui paucis ante annis hostis fuisset*). It is unclear whether this should be taken to mean that Quintus Anicius himself had fought against the Romans or that he, as a *Praenestinus*, was one of a group who had been enemies of Rome a few years prior. The former is chronologically unlikely, however, since if he was anywhere near the normal age for holding the aedileship in 304, Anicius would have been a young child when the Romans defeated Praeneste in 338. The fact that Pliny calls him *Praenestinus*, referring to him not as a descendant or family member of people from Praeneste but a Praenestine himself, is interesting as well: in point of fact, Anicius must not have been a current citizen of Praeneste, as the inhabitants of Praeneste did not receive Roman citizenship until the Social War and to have attained the right to stand for office in Rome in the fourth century BCE, Quintus Anicius or his family must have been granted Roman citizenship. Pliny does not describe him as a Praenestine idly, however; this description is placed in contrast with the two men defeated in the election for curule aediles: C. Poetilius and C. Domitius, who had both had fathers of consular rank. The election of Anicius, a “Praenestinus,” and Flavius, a former scribe, over men from more prominent families, is described as a mark of the people’s high favor for Flavius. The fact that this election result is portrayed as notable tells us two things: that Pliny believed it would be seen as surprising that a man from recently-hostile Praeneste defeated men of prominent, older families (implying that he expected being a Praenestine at this point would have been an impediment to election), and also that being a freedman (as was Flavius) and being an immigrant or descendant of immigrants from a recently hostile area are seen as similar impediments.
The Marcus Anicius who served as praetor in 216 BC with the Praenestine cohort that held Casilinum against Hannibal's siege is another member of the same gens.\footnote{See full discussion of this episode in Section II of this chapter.} A statue of Marcus Anicius (whom Livy notes was previously a scribe) was erected in the forum at Praeneste, accompanied by an inscription that also appeared on three items at the sanctuary of Fortuna.\footnote{See discussion of Cn. Flavius and Q. Anicius at the beginning of this section: the elevation of a scribe to a position of honor, especially one in competition with aristocrats, is particularly notable. This is the second time that scribes have been mentioned in close conjunction with an Anicius, and in stories where people seem to rise above their station or have surprising backgrounds (in Pliny’s description of the aedile elections of 304 BCE, the former scribe Cn. Flavius and the former Praenestine citizen Q. Anicius are both resented by their competitors as having been insufficiently illustrious candidates to have defeated men from consular families.)} The statue therefore serves as a victory monument as well as an honor paid to Marcus Anicius, and the prominent location in the forum of Praeneste indicates he was well regarded by the Praenestines as well as by the Romans. If we read the “\textit{tribus signis}” in the second sentence as referring to a dedication made at the temple of Fortuna (whether copies of the same statue in the Forum or some other objects were dedicated), the dedicatory inscription attached to those objects may have been set up in the Forum as well to increase the visibility of Anicius’ vow fulfillment.

The family of the Anicii appears to have enjoyed continued prominence at Praeneste as well as developing influence at Rome very quickly as a family from a recently conquered city. The presence of men from this family in the ruling class at both Praeneste and Rome attests to the possibility of a relatively fluid interchange of elites between the two cities. It does not appear to be the case, for example, that the Anicii at Rome were denied access to positions of power based on their association with Praeneste. Nevertheless, it also must be noted that Pliny does not mention Anicius without
identifying him as a Praenestine, and that he highlights the disgruntled reaction of his
competition in the election at being men from consular families defeated by such a recent
addition to the city. Furthermore, the Anicii who stayed at Praeneste continued to enjoy
positions of prominence in their hometown after members of their family had moved to
Rome and entered the political elite there.

Though Roman sources referring to Praeneste as a civic entity during the
Republic clearly record the cultural memory of the city as a hostile force threatening
Rome with rebellion, revolt, and betrayal, references to Praeneste associated with
individuals are more nuanced in their relationship to the city. Contrary to the impression
generated by the depiction of the 4th-2nd century interactions between Rome and Praeneste
in literary sources, some individuals were clearly able to move freely between the two
cities. Some of the same prominent families appear in the ruling classes of Praeneste and
Rome simultaneously, and members of these families use iconography to reference
Praeneste in a context that is used for political advertisement.

IV. TOPOGRAPHY AND MONUMENTS

The physical space of Praeneste is one of the persistent threatening elements of the city in
Roman sources. Strabo identifies Praeneste’s secure position as an enormous natural
advantage—one that the Praenestines have added to, for example, by digging tunnels out
to the plains that can provide stealthy movement.422 The physical location of the city had

422 See Section I of this chapter for further discussion; the full passage is reproduced
below for reference in this section. Strabo 5.3.11 ἐρυμνη μὲν οὖν ἑκατέρα, πολὺ δ’ ἐρυμνοτέρα Πραινεστός: ἄκραν γὰρ ἔχει τῆς μὲν πόλεως ὑπερθεν ὅρος ύψηλόν,
ὅπισθεν δ’ ἀπὸ τῆς συνεχούσης ὀρεινῆς αὐχένι διεξενυμένον, ὑπεραίρου καὶ δυσὶ
sterolios τούτου πρὸς ὀρθιάν ἀνάβασιν. πρὸς δὲ τῇ ἐρυμνότητι καὶ διώρυξι
κρυπταῖς διατέτρηται πανταχόθεν μέχρι τῶν πεδίων ταῖς μὲν ύδρειας χάριν ταῖς δ’
an enormous impact on its early history, as Praeneste’s powerful position allowed it to control a number of smaller towns and a large swath of territory. As Rome’s power grew, however, this advantage attracted the negative attention of Rome in a number of ways.

A. Natural Advantages of Praeneste’s Topography

The physical space of Praeneste is not only important for reconstructing the historical realities of the city’s growth and decline, however; it also has an impact on the way that the Romans thought about Praeneste: sources that discuss the topography of Praeneste emphasize the potential danger it poses to Rome. In addition to Strabo’s discussion, the city’s position figures into an episode from Pyrrhus’ drive into Italy preserved in the epitomes of Livy’s lost books on the Pyrrhic Wars. In Florus’ epitome of Livy, Praeneste is mentioned as a casualty of Pyrrhus’ drive north from Tarentum. Pyrrhus is said to have looked out from the citadel of Praeneste upon Rome, which is described as being already nearly captured (from Pyrrhus’ perspective?) once he had reached Praeneste: the cities are so close that the cloud of smoke and dust raised by Pyrrhus’ army at Praeneste can be

εξόδων λαθραίων, δόν ἐν μία Μάριος πολιορκούμενος ἀπέθανε. ταῖς μὲν οὖν ἄλλαις πόλεις πλείστον τό εὐερκές πρὸς ἄγαθον τίθεται, Πραινεστίνοις δὲ συμφόρα γεγένηται διὰ τὰς Ῥωμαίων στάσεις. καταφεύγουσι γὰρ ἐκεῖσε οἱ νεωτέρισσαι: ἐκπολιορκηθέντων δὲ, πρὸς τῇ κακώσει τῆς πόλεως καὶ τῇ χώρᾳ ἀπαλλοτριούσθαι συμβαίνει, τῆς αἰτίας μεταφερομένης ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀναίτιους. (So then each city [Praeneste and Tibur] is fortified, but Praeneste is much more well-fortified: for it has a high mountain above the city as a citadel, separated from the mountain range behind it by a narrow pass. Raised above this pass by two stades, the mountain climbs straight uphill. In addition to this fortification, the city is pierced by hidden passages on all sides as far out as the plains — some for the sake of water and others for secret exits, in one of which Marius perished while he was under siege. Now for most other cities, being well-fortified is regarded as a benefit, but for the Praenestines it has been a misfortune on account of the Romans’ political upheavals. For all those who have attempted to revolt flee for refuge to Praeneste and, when they are forced by siege to surrender, in addition to the damage to the city, it comes to pass that their territory is confiscated, as the guilt is transferred to the guiltless.)
seen at Rome as a looming threat. The city possesses a threatening position, imagined as close enough to Rome for the two cities to look out at one another and see the enemy looming—and of course, Praeneste has the advantageous position of being located on an easily defensible/fortified hill, much higher up than Rome). The city's position is threatening not just because of the people who inhabit it, who have already demonstrated their antagonism towards Roman expansion and utilized their advantages of wealth, size, and position to maintain some independence even as nearly all their former Latin allies fall to Rome: the physical location and strength make it a potential threat to Rome in the hands of any of Rome’s enemies that may try to seize it. This focus on the topography of Praeneste in relation to Rome when Livy's epitomators present Pyrrhus as the potential enemy at the gates may inform many of the episodes of rebels hiding at Praeneste that occur when authors refer to the city as a civic entity. Though those episodes do not specifically call attention to the physical space of the city, Praeneste’s strength and fortifications nevertheless loom as an understood threat.

B. Sulla and the Landscape of Praeneste

Evidence for Roman intervention into the landscape of Praeneste contemporary with the establishment of the Sullan colony in 82 BCE allows us to consider some of the ways in which the memory of the town’s past was encoded in the physical space of the city and

---

423 The fact that Pyrrhus is shown as looking out towards Rome from the citadel of Praeneste suggests that he had taken the city—either by force, or by one of Praeneste’s frequent capitulations to an invading enemy of Rome. (Flor. 1.13.24 Victor primo proelio Pyrrhus tota tremente Campania Lirim Fregellasque populatus, prope captam urbem a Praenestina arce prospexit et a vicesimo lapide oculos trepidae civitatis fumo ac pulvere inplevit.) The description of Praeneste as the turning place also appears in Eutropius 2.12.1-2, in which Pyrrhus advances through Campania as far as Praeneste (described here also in terms of its proximity to Rome) before retreating in fear of the Roman army.
ways in which attempts to change the city's future also had to address the aspects of its past that are irreversibly tied to the topography. Because this intervention occurred in the context of a conquest, a culturally charged moment associated with the deaths of many Pranestine citizens and the loss of the city’s remaining independence, the contemporary physical changes in the space of the city have the potential to be associated with the circumstances that led to their creation.\textsuperscript{424} These topographic changes can have multiple meanings depending on their audience—a victory temple on the Via Flaminia, for example, signifies very different things to Roman citizens who will never see an enemy at their gate because of their generals’ constant battles at the expanding border of the empire, and to visitors from a province recently conquered by Rome that has been deprived of independent governance but does not yet hold the full rights of citizenship at Rome.

Though the literary evidence for the exceptionally harsh treatment of the human population of Praeneste by Sulla is bountiful, none of these sources mentions the destruction of parts of the city, and excavations of the sanctuary of Fortuna have not shown any evidence of damage caused by Sulla’s forces. Appian refers to the soldiers of Sulla being allowed to sack the city, using the word διαρπάζω—to sack, spoil, plunder—but this is the only reference to soldiers acting on the physical space of the city as opposed to on the people who lived there.\textsuperscript{425} Nevertheless, there is sufficient material to justify looking for reminders of this time of upheaval in the physical space that

\textsuperscript{424} For the concept of \textit{lieux de memoire} applied to the Roman world, see Introduction, Section II.D.

\textsuperscript{425} App. \textit{B.Civ.} 1.94 καὶ τὴν πόλιν διήρπαξε, πολυχρήματον ἐν τοῖς μᾶλλον τότε ὁόσαν. (…and he sacked the city, which was exceptionally rich at that time.)
complement the memory recorded in the literary sources. Scholars have identified changes in three different areas as associated either with Sulla or with the beginning of the 1st century BCE, roughly contemporary with his activities in the area. First, the expansion of residential areas on the south side of the city, lower on the slope of Mt. Ginestro, can be dated to roughly the same time. The most logical explanation for an expansion in the residential area needed for the city in the first century BCE is the relocation of Sullan veterans to the newly-founded colony, and so it seems likely that this expanded urban area is associated with the Sullan *colonia*. Given the reduction in population experienced as a result of Sulla’s slaughter of adult male Praenestines, there is no other known reason why Praeneste might have needed an expanded residential area at this time. It is particularly important that this new urban area is at the southern edge of the city, outside the limit of the walls, as it contributes to an overall shift of the center of the city down the mountainside and away from the heavily fortified citadel.

Secondly, a number of buildings were constructed or enlarged in the terraced area once identified as a lower portion of the temple of Fortuna. This identification has been rejected by recent scholars (most prominently Coarelli) as incompatible with the epigraphic evidence for the functions of individual buildings in the area, which must instead belong to the forum of Praeneste. Though one building in the forum, a three-cell temple, is clearly earlier than the surrounding buildings in construction and predates the axial orientation of the complex, most of the buildings are dateable based on construction techniques and decorative style to the late republic; they are roughly contemporary with

---

426 There is archaeological evidence for only sporadic settlement prior to the 1st century BCE. See Quilici 1989, 29-67; Riemann 1985, 151-65
the buildings of the upper complex, as they use comparable construction techniques, but they were not necessarily built simultaneously. The most recent identifications of these buildings based on formal criteria and comparisons with Pompeii, which has a similar line of public buildings along one side of the forum, include a basilica, a chalcidicum, a vestibule, and a public hall (possibly the curia) with an aerarium underneath. Construction activities in this area that have been linked to Sulla include a fragmentary inscription on an architrave restored by Vaglieri as referring to Marcus Terentius Varro Lucullus, cos. 73 BCE, an ally of Sulla.\(^\text{427}\) This activity is most logically understood as restoration work, since the overall decorative scheme and axial alignment of the lower terrace suggests that it was initially constructed at the same time as the upper terrace. As very little remains of the lower complex (the forum), it is not currently possible to tell how much of the area might have been restored in the aftermath of the Sullan civil war. Vaglieri argues for a large-scale rebuilding in response to massive destruction during Sulla’s sack of the city, but it is not necessary to conjecture such destruction to understand the reasoning behind restorations of the forum. Expansion and improvement of existing buildings is a common form of displayed public beneficence by Roman officials: Augustus’ proud list in the *Res Gestae* of such rebuildings, described with the verb *reficio*, includes no fewer than 82 temples of the gods. Sometimes, Augustus includes a reason why the restoration became necessary—disrepair due to age, or destruction by fire—but for most of the projects listed no particular reason is given. Augustus makes particular note of the projects that he did “without any inscription of [his] own name” (*sine ulla inscriptione nominis mei*), and thus demonstrates the expected

\(^{427}\) Vaglieri 1907
purpose of such restorations: the publication of the sponsor’s name as the generous
benefactor behind the new construction. The purpose of sponsoring a rebuilding of the
forum of Praeneste, whether or not it sustained damage in the war, should be understood
in this light. Finally, Sulla may have been involved in rebuilding activity in the temple of
Fortuna Primigenia (the temple-theater complex located in the upper terraces of the city),
though it seems clear that many earlier studies radically over-read the potential activities
of Sulla in this complex, some going so far as to claim that the entire terraced
construction was his innovation.

C. The Temple of Fortuna Primigenia

The debate over Sulla’s involvement with the construction of the temple of Fortuna at
Praeneste depends in large part on arguments about the date of the temple’s construction,
so they must be treated in some detail here. The most recent scholarly consensus argues
for the original construction of a monumental terraced temple complex dedicated to
Fortuna Primigenia c. 120-110 BCE at the latest. This temple complex is understood to
have developed out of a pre-existing shrine to Fortuna Primigenia associated particularly
with the sortes that were consulted for oracular advice; the worship of this Fortuna
Primigenia at Praeneste seems to date back to the archaic period, but the previous
location of her shrine at Praeneste has not been definitively identified. This shrine is then
understood to have been either replaced or supplemented by the construction of the
massive hilltop temple-theater complex dedicated to the goddess. Fasolo and Gullini, the
post-World War II excavators, argue strongly for a mid-second century BCE date in their
excavation report, based on architectural and stylistic comparisons to contemporary
shrines showing Hellenistic influence. The epigraphic evidence of dedications from the shrine suggests a late second century or early first century BCE date, as the gentes represented include families who disappear after the Sullan executions in 82 BCE, the titles given are associated with offices of the independent civitas rather than the colonia, and freedmen are given cognomina (present in Campanian comparanda no earlier than the 110s). Early studies of Praeneste by Delbrueck 1907 and Vaglieri 1907 attributed the entire construction of the late republican temple of Fortuna Primigenia to Sulla, and thus dated it to the 80s BCE. This argument was adopted by the two major early twentieth century studies of the topography of Praeneste, Magoffin 1908 and Bradshaw 1924, and supported by some scholars of the middle of the century focusing on the temple complex itself, including Von Heintze 1956, Kähler 1958, and Lugli 1954 (lower complex only). The Sullan date in the 80s BCE still appears in some textbooks, but otherwise has largely been abandoned in recent decades in favor of a 120-110 BCE date for original construction.

Even in the most conservative estimates of Sulla’s involvement in the topographic changes at Praeneste in the late Republic—those such as Coarelli’s, which attribute nearly all of the construction of the sanctuary to the end of the 2nd century BCE—must account for the evidence for at least one specific intervention of Sullan date. Pliny mentions a lithostroton that Sulla placed in the temple of Fortuna at Praeneste, which scholars beginning with Delbrueck identified with the famous “Nile Mosaic” recovered from the eastern apsidal hall behind the forum. This is also the opinion of the post-World War II excavators of the uncovered portions of the terraces of the temple of Fortuna, Fasolo and Gullini; the latter defends this position in his 1956 monograph on the mosaics
from Palestrina and a subsequent 1973 article on the dating of the stylistic elements of the sanctuary.\textsuperscript{428} Other scholars reject this identification as inconsistent with the more common use of \textit{lithostroton} to refer to a floor of \textit{opus sectile}, which employs larger pieces of stone, usually worked in regular patterns, as opposed to a tessellated mosaic. Furthermore, if we accept the argument that the actual Temple of Fortuna is to be found only in the upper complex, both the Nile and the Fish Mosaics do not belong to the shrine of the goddess, but to nymphaea associated with the civic space of the forum, and cannot be the floor surfaces referenced by Pliny. While scholarly opinion is divided on whether either the Nile Mosaic or the Fish Mosaic of the western grotto (often referred to as the “Cave of the Lots”) can be identified with the Sullan \textit{lithostroton} mentioned in Pliny—and it seems insufficient to argue on the basis of two mosaics having survived that one of them must necessarily have been the floor referenced by Pliny—no one has disputed the accuracy of Pliny’s statement that some floor surface of a mosaic construction, whether \textit{opus sectile} or \textit{opus tessellatum}, was contributed to the sanctuary of Fortuna by Sulla. If the Nile Mosaic is to be attributed not to a major Sullan intervention, but to major euergetistic activity by local elites at the end of the 2\textsuperscript{nd} century BCE, as Meyboom argues, then the evidence points not a major infusion of culture by Sulla after the city's conquest, but a lively era of cultural innovation by native Praenestines that was interrupted by Sulla's arrival and political reorganization of the city.\textsuperscript{429}

Praeneste had recently participated in a monumental landscape transformation project of their own, if we accept the argument that the Fortuna temple-theater shrine was

\textsuperscript{428} Fasolo and Gulini 1953, Gullini 1956, Gullini 1973.  
\textsuperscript{429} Meyboom 1995 80-91.
constructed, at least in an initial form, around the 120s-110s BCE. This massive building project, which significantly expanded the space allotted to the shrine and the oracle, belongs to a series of large-scale temple-theater complexes built by Latin cities in the roughly hundred years c.150-50 BCE. Along with Gabii (Temple of Juno c. mid-2nd century BCE) and Tibur (Temple of Hercules Victor, first half of the 1st c. BCE), Praeneste was participating in a highly local version of a much larger process: the active adaptation of Greek and native Italian architectural forms and ritual traditions occurring in Campania, Samnium, Sardinia, and Latium as these areas responded to the influence of Hellenistic theaters from Sicily. The construction of the temple is only one of the building projects at Praeneste the 2nd century BCE that correspond to major construction booms in similar central Italian cities; parallels for the terracing activity, building techniques, and locus of building activity can be found at sites including Tibur, Pietrabbondante, Aletrium, and Ferentinum.430 This dialogue among elites in central Italian communities that is not necessarily mediated by Rome (indeed, in the case of building temple-theaters, Rome is decidedly behind the trend) recalls the behavior of aristocratic families actively advertising their genealogical relationship to a Latin city even as that city is being referred to by other Romans as recently hostile. Recognizing the narrative that Praeneste is participating in by constructing this temple complex is a necessary step for understanding Roman interventions into the landscape and the memory landscape of Praeneste, in the same way as Roman references to Praeneste and people from Praeneste are illuminated by understanding the context of Praenestine families deploying their associations with the city.

430 Wallace Hadrill 2008, 137-8
A number of culturally and socially important changes in the physical space of Praeneste occurred after Sulla’s defeat of the city in 82 BCE. The establishment of a major residential area below the main city, shifting the city’s center onto the less defensible slopes of the mountain, and construction or reconstruction of buildings surrounding the forum, attributed to a known ally of Sulla, reinforce the changes in the city’s political life through changes in the lived environment. These topographic changes to the residential and civic areas of the city occurred in conjunction with the legal changes in the city’s status as the Sullan colonia was established, and could have been seen as physical markers of the traumatic events in the city’s recent past and the city’s new status in relation to Rome. Though Sulla did not make the same sort of major changes to the topography of Praeneste that he did in some other cities he conquered in central Italy, the social changes he engineered had an enormous impact on the future of the city. The changes in the physical space of Praeneste that did occur in the era of the Sullan conquest and colony foundation reinforce the nature of those social changes. The expansion of habitation areas at the lowest portion of the city to accommodate the new colonists provides a visible reminder of the attachment of a new group to the city’s populace, while the presence of renovations to the forum recalls the total political reorganization of the city, particularly as those renovations were prominently labeled with the name of a Roman affiliated with Sulla’s activities in the city—possibly one of the original colonists. Though an examination of Roman references to the city’s civic activities reveals that these social changes did not have an immediate effect on Roman

431 For example, the major building campaign in Pompeii included several new civic buildings on the Forum, the temple of Venus, new public buildings (baths and an odeion), and the reconstruction of the temple of Jupiter in the model of the capitolium.
perceptions of Praeneste any more than they had an immediate effect on Praeneste’s actions, by the end of the Republic, it is possible to see a shift in the attributes Romans associated with the city.

D. Aristocratic Villas at Praeneste in the Late Republic

In the Late Republican and Augustan era, a major change occurs in sources discussing Praeneste: the city is referenced as a relaxed suburban retreat of the type that apparently became very popular in the Late Republic.\(^{432}\) In his third book of *Odes*, Horace includes Praeneste in a list of calm retreats (alongside the more famous Tibur and Baiae) to which the muse Calliope carries him.\(^{433}\) This stanza of calm retreats contrasts sharply with the list of dangerous places—battlefields and savage territories—that follow. This contrast is resolved by the appearance of Augustus in line 37, when Horace reveals that the Muse refreshes Augustus is such “Pierian caves” (i.e., the calm retreats of Tibur, Praeneste, and Baiae) when he has finished with the chaotic business of conquest around the world. This description places Praeneste in the world of calm Imperial retreats, like the famous Villa of Hadrian at Tivoli, that serve as respites from the pressures of ruling, a characterization which is supported by Suetonius’ inclusion of Praeneste on a list of the places to which Augustus frequently retreated.\(^{434}\) Not only is Praeneste a peaceful and calm retreat instead of a fractious stronghold, it is a summer home to Roman leaders rather than a

\(^{432}\) i.e., both Augustan-era authors describing Praeneste as it appeared in their day and later authors discussing the Augustan era and referring to Praeneste as it existed (or was presumed to have existed) at that time. Hor. *Epist.* 1,2,2; Stat. *Silv.* 4,4,15; Mart. 4,64,33; Juv. 14,88; Plin. *Ep.* 5,6,45

\(^{433}\) Horace *Carm.* 3.4.21-4 Vester, Camenae, uester in arduos/tollor Sabinos, seu mihi frigidum/Praeneste seu Tibur supinum/seu liquidae placuere Baiae;

\(^{434}\) Suet.*Vit.* Aug. 72
refuge for enemies of the state; the town is so completely removed from its republican reputation in the *Odes* that it actually serves as a counterpoint to the dangerous places where Augustus must do battle with those people who oppose Rome. The threats to Rome have moved outwards, and the cities of central Italy—no matter how resistant to Roman integration they once were, or how recently they sided with Augustus’ opponents—are now being described by Roman authors as firmly under Rome’s sway.

This reputation continued throughout the Empire. A similar reference occurs in Martial 10.30, where Formiae is compared favorably to other calm retreats from one’s cares including Praeneste, Tibur, Tusculum, and Algidum (implying that these cities were already famed as such retreats). In Statius’ fourth book of Silvae, he describes people departing the city for summer retreats in a similar list of towns: Praeneste, Nemi, Algidum, Tusculum, and Tibur. A letter from Pliny compares a new villa in Etruria favorably to those he owns in Tusculum, Tibur, and Praeneste, suggesting that Praeneste was among some countryside retreats that were so thoroughly dedicated to the leisure of the upper class that they had become practically crowded with vacationers.

Contemporaneous with the emergence of this new type of reference to Praeneste, there is a sudden and noticeable absence of references to Praeneste as a threatening entity. The change cannot be attributed to historical fact alone (e.g., no actual
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435 Mart. 10.30.1-7
436 Stat. Silv. 4.4.15-17
437 Pl. Ep. 5.6.45 *Habes causas cur ego Tuscos meos Tusculanis Tiburtinis Praenestinisque praeponam.* (I have reasons why I prefer my Tuscan villa to those in Tusculum, Tibur, and Praeneste).
438 Though some authors writing after the Augustan period do discuss Praeneste’s role in battles and rebellions in the Republic (e.g. Appian).
rebellions occurred at Praeneste during this time, so there is nothing for historians to mention) as the absence extends to potential threats at Praeneste; there are no moments, as in Cicero’s *In Catilinam* 1, when Praeneste is held out as a natural destination for rebels or a location that must be fortified against even the possibility that it might rise in revolt. This accumulation of authors mentioning Praeneste as a site of wealthy villa retreats suggests that the prevailing image of the city in this time period was that of a peaceful country town, not a powerful former enemy. The town is not only depicted as fully subjugated to Rome, but as lacking any potential to be a threat in the future. Praeneste is not shown as little more than a satellite to Rome—there are no references to it as a civic entity or any of the major characteristics that defined the city’s republican-era image in Roman sources. The one exception to this trend is in Tacitus’ account of the life of Nero in *Annals* 15. In the aftermath of the great fire at Rome, Tacitus narrates a number of calamities and foreboding events—the temples of the gods are plundered to make repairs, a large portion of the Roman fleet is destroyed in a storm at Cumae, and a troop of gladiators nearly revolts at Praeneste—followed by a series of negative portents at the end of the year.\(^{439}\) The gladiator revolt at Praeneste is ultimately prevented by soldiers stationed with them, but the event nevertheless causes a stir among the people as it sparks memories of Spartacus’ revolt.\(^{440}\) Tacitus ends the one-sentence episode with a

---

\(^{439}\) The fire and the immediate reaction are discussed in Ann. 15.38-43; 15.44 discusses attempts to propitiate the gods and find human scapegoats in the wake of the fire; 15.45 reports the plundering of the temples and Seneca’s retirement to avoid association with this sacrilege; 15.46 includes the quashed slave revolt at Praeneste and naval disaster; 15.47, the last chapter of the book, reports the ill portents.

\(^{440}\) Tac. *Ann.* 15.46.1 *Per idem tempus gladiatores apud oppidum Praeneste temptata eruptione praesidio militis, qui custos adesset, coerciti sunt, iam Spartacum et vetera mala rumoribus ferente populo, ut est novarum rerum cupiens pavidusque.* (Around the
universal commentary that “the people are both desirous of and terrified by revolutions” (ut est novarum rerum cupiens pavidusque). Though exceedingly brief, this episode in Tacitus reveals that the city of Praeneste had not, in fact, lost all of its threatening associations under the Empire. The city was certainly politically, legally, and militarily tamed; the topography of the city had been given over to shady groves and expansive estates; and the Roman elite thought of it primarily as a place for leisure, completely separated from the politics and business of city living. Nevertheless, some of the threats once associated with the city remained active: on a list of events designed to generate a sense of looming disaster, Praeneste is not out of place. Praeneste still carries the memory of revolts and rebellions, and the danger that floods the people’s minds when the slaves rise up at Praeneste is not just that of Spartacus but the vetera mala more broadly; the overthrowing of order that simultaneously attracts and repulses the people is not just a revolt of slaves against masters, but novae res, revolution in general.

V. CONCLUSION

Praeneste posed a threat to Rome from the day of its foundation simply by virtue of its location. This fundamental threat underlies a number of Roman sources that reference Praeneste as a physical place, whether they overtly describe the city’s natural fortifications, or simply assume that it would be a desirable place to have as a stronghold (presumably on account of those same fortifications.) Over the early centuries of the city’s growth, as it exploited that natural advantage to develop wealth, a wide swath of same time, gladiators at the town of Praeneste attempted an escape and were stopped by a garrison of soldiers, who were present as a guard. The populace was straightaway talking about rumors of Spartacus and past calamities, as it is desirous of and terrified by revolutions.)
territory, and extensive trading networks, the expansion of the city put it on a collision course with the similarly expanding city of Rome: it would not be possible for both to coexist as major powers in Latium. The series of skirmishes between the two cities in the early Republic as recorded in Roman sources are characterized by repeated changes in loyalty, betrayal of allies, and revolt—to a much greater degree than other Latin cities.\textsuperscript{441} This characterization, along with the city’s reputation for harboring people in dispute with Rome—both exiles and fleeing rebels—figure the city as a potential threat to Rome. Additionally, the citizen body of Praeneste is depicted as foreign to Rome and completely unwilling to integrate further with Romans.

However, looking at individuals associated with Praeneste presents a more complicated picture of the relationship between the two cities. While Roman sources may depict a long era of persistent antagonism with Praeneste, it seems that individuals from Rome and Praeneste were in close and friendly contact through much of the same period. Some of the individuals associated with Praeneste made open reference to their ties to the city even as the city as a whole remained stubbornly unwilling to do more than ally with Rome when mutually beneficial. In the interchange of these Praenestine individuals, we see evidence of a dynamic elite culture at Praeneste that was not being gradually forced into subservience or suffering as a provincial backwater in comparison to life at the capital. Instead, by looking at changes in the topography of the city, we can see that Praenestines were shaping their landscape in massive and ambitious building projects in the 2\textsuperscript{nd} century BCE that engaged with similar projects across central Italy. With the

\textsuperscript{441} With only the possible exception of Tibur, who is also blamed for allying with the Gauls and similarly engages in a number of battles with Rome over the decades.
arrival of Sulla, however, the process of subjugation actually began; nevertheless, many
of the characteristics associated with pre-Roman Praeneste continued to be tied to the city
through the end of the Republic.

The sociopolitical effects of Sulla’s presence in the city—the end of Praenestine
self-government, the establishment of a colony of Roman veterans essentially encamped
in the city, the disappearance of many old Praenestine families—seem to have slowly
taken effect under Augustus, as references to Praeneste begin to fit the model of the
suburban villa retreat appearing across Latium. The abundance of such references looks
like evidence that the potential threat is being removed from the Roman cultural memory
of Praeneste; however, Tacitus’ commentary on a foiled slave revolt at Praeneste implies
that, at least for some, the memory of ancient calamities for Rome still lurked under the
surface of this new Praenestine image. The interpretation of the post-Sullan cultural
memory of Praeneste, however, must take into account the effect of Sulla’s decimation of
adult male citizens at Praeneste. This large-scale reduction of the adult male elite
population effectively crippled the political elite at Praeneste, the same group of families
that were responsible for promoting Praenestine ancestry at Rome, as elite families from
other Latin cities had done in the Late Republic. This may have resulted in a smaller
group of families connected with Praeneste—the group that would be expected to be
associated with more positive memories of the Latin city—contributing to the broader
Roman cultural memory of Praeneste.
CONCLUSION

In this dissertation, I have presented a survey of the sources for the Roman memory of three communities in *Latium vetus*—Tusculum, Tibur, and Praeneste—and sought to reconstruct the Roman cultural memory of each of these cities. Building on Assmann’s definition of cultural memory as employing sources including texts, iconography, rituals, images, and monuments to preserve the memories that are important to a cultural group’s identity, I have incorporated a variety of sources, both textual and material, that provide evidence for the Roman cultural memory of the cities at different points in time and from different perspectives.442 I divided the source material for each chapter into three major categories, based on common themes that appear in the corpus of sources when they are examined in a group. Many of the sources for Tusculum, Tibur, and Praeneste speak about cities as social and political collectives, as civic entities that (generally) act as one body; the majority of textual references fall into this category, especially those in historiography. Another group of sources connect individual people to each city—citizens and inhabitants of the city, emigrants from the city who have moved away from their birthplace, and people who have family connections to the city or trace their ancestry there, among others. A final group of sources is related to the physical site of the city: this group includes literary references to the city’s landscape and descriptions of its topography, as well as monuments and other significant sites (*lieux de mémoire*).

In Chapter 1, I examined the Roman cultural memory of Tusculum, which is said to have been the first Latin city to receive Roman citizenship. I identified aspects of

---

442 Found in several works, beginning with J. Assmann 1988: 12-16 and J. Assmann 1992: 56; see also the more recent and comprehensive schematic rendering in J. Assmann 2008, a contribution to a handbook for cultural memory studies.
memory of the city that are characterized in mutually incompatible ways in different sources, and concluded that these sites that show a mixed response to Tusculum are all related to the nature of the relationship between Rome and Tusculum that led directly to Tusculum’s incorporation. I then considered the sources that associate individual people with Tusculum and the sources that discuss the physical city of Tusculum, showing that both groups largely relate to Tusculum’s social and cultural significance in the environment of Late Republican aristocratic self-promotion. In light of that observation, I argued that the apparent conflicts in the Roman cultural memory of Tusculum are tied to the presence of different social groups within the Roman citizenry for whom the memory of Tusculum’s early and unusual incorporation by Rome had different implications.

I then moved from looking at a city that received Roman citizenship earlier than any other Latin city to considering two cities that received Roman citizenship significantly later than the majority of the cities of Latium vetus. In Chapter 2, I showed that the Roman memory of Tibur as an independent city depicts the city as consistently hostile to Rome and focuses on episodes and qualities that emphasize the potential dangers posed by Tibur’s antagonism. This persistent depiction, which continues after Tibur’s eventual incorporation c. 90 BCE, temporarily coexists with a new image of Tibur that emerges in the second half of the 1st century BCE, when Tibur is included in the cities that appear as part of an idyllic landscape of leisure in the suburbium. While the suburban communities in these depictions are associated with overwhelmingly positive attributes and often held up as objects of praise (see e.g. the encomia of Tibur in Horace Ode I.7 and Statius Silvae I.3), their characterization in opposition to the urban political center of Rome simultaneously demotes them to “satellite cities” of Rome with no
ongoing relevance as civic entities. Negative characterizations of Tibur as a civic entity then rapidly drop off, and in the post-Augustan period the Roman cultural memory of Tibur seems to be almost exclusively positive. I proposed that the timeline of this shift in the cultural memory of Tibur is related to the events of the beginning of the 1st century BCE that also led to Tibur receiving Roman citizenship after several centuries as a nominally independent allied city. In the aftermath of these social changes, the Tiburtines had to be integrated into Roman society just as many other conquered Latin peoples had been in the 4th century, and I argued that the significant shift in the cultural memory of Tibur that occurs from the mid-1st century BCE through the early 1st century BCE is the visible aftereffect of this process. This interpretation and timeline is supported by the evidence related to individuals associated with Tibur and to the physical site of the city. No one of Tiburtine ancestry is known to have entered the cursus honorum at Rome before the first decades of the 1st century BCE, although individual Tiburtine families were able to (and did) obtain citizenship earlier; if anyone connected to Tibur gained Roman political office prior to the entire city receiving citizenship, they certainly did not advertise their connection to the city, despite the popularity of ethnic and genealogical claims among contemporary aristocrats. Coins advertising a moneyer’s Tiburtine ancestry do appear in the mid-first century, however, around the same time as the first literary references to Tibur that suggest positive qualities associated with the city. In contrast, building projects in the city of Tibur dating to the century prior to the city’s integration by Rome may suggest efforts to assert the city’s continued relevance in an Italian landscape that was increasingly dominated by Rome.
In the final chapter, I turned to a city that is frequently paired with Tibur in the Roman memory of Latium and shares several important characteristics with the other city, but which is much more inconsistently portrayed in the source material. Chapter 3 focuses on Praeneste, which also remained independent of Roman control in the aftermath of the Roman-Latin wars c. 340-338 BCE and received Roman citizenship along with Tibur c. 90 BCE. The Roman cultural memory of Praeneste as a civic entity is very similar to that of Tibur—the city is remembered as having frequent military clashes with Rome, and recurring features in memories of the city show it as a hostile and foreign community. However, individuals from Praeneste begin obtaining political office at Rome exceptionally early—only decades after the city fought against Rome in the late 4th century BCE—and begin to advertise origins at the city in the Late Republic even before it received Roman citizenship. On the other hand, the Roman memory of Praeneste as an enemy seems to persist much longer than that of Tibur: although Praeneste is one of the cities that begins to be described as a site of elite villas and aristocratic leisure at the end of the Republic and in the Augustan era, unlike Tibur, Praeneste continues to be remembered as a former enemy and characterized as a potential future threat in some sources that coexist alongside these ones well into the Empire. I argue that this is connected to the more active role Praeneste played in the civil wars of the last century of the Republic, particularly the second Sullan civil war, in which Praeneste sided with the younger Marius and was violently punished by Sulla. In addition to prolonging the memory of Praeneste as an enemy city in the Roman imagination, I suggest that this episode may have particularly affected the cultural memory of Praeneste because the massacre of Praenestine citizens and the establishment of a veteran colony at the city
devastated the community of Praenestine families that might have been associated with a collective memory that characterized the city more positively.

In order to perform an initial exploration of my area of interest in this dissertation—the cultural memory of Rome’s earliest territorial expansion—I selected three cities as case studies for this dissertation that each had clearly identifiable unique features in the process by which they were incorporated as Roman citizens. Looking at these cities demonstrated the degree to which the Roman cultural memory of a city that we can recover is affected by these unique characteristics, as they tend to provide the foci around which contradictory memories of a city accumulate. The next step for this project is to expand my study to include other cities in Latium whose relationship to Rome is distinguished by features other than political interactions in order to see whether my thesis about the role of aristocratic family histories and political self-advertisement in the propagation of the cultural memory held by social groups associated with a given city still holds when the defining characteristics of a city’s relationship with Rome are, for example, religious rather than political.

In the course of writing this dissertation, I also became interested in several related questions that branched off from a specific line of inquiry in one or more chapters. The massive building projects that were undertaken at Tibur and Praeneste in the Late Republic to build temple-theater complexes of a type that is seen in several other central Italian cities took place in a time period for which there is little evidence about the formal relationship between Rome and the two Latin cities before their incorporation in 90 BCE. The timing of the expensive and time-consuming projects, combined with the nature of the oracle cults located at each, raises questions about the role of local cults in mediating
the ongoing relevance of cities on the fringes of the expanding Roman world. I hope to expand my study of these two cults and incorporate others including those of Juno Sospita at Lanuvium, Diana at Aricia, the Dioscuri at Tusculum, and Aeneas and the Penates at Lavinium.

In this dissertation, I have brought together a broad range of evidence for the Roman cultural memory of three Latin cities from a variety of sources and across a variety of time periods; by looking at all of this material together, I have been able to identify trends in the cultural memory of each city that are obscured or invisible in any given source or group of sources. Looking at the depiction of Tibur, and Praeneste in Livy, for example, with the contemporaneous depiction of the same cities in Latin poetry allowed me to see the sharp contrast in how the two genres characterize the cities’ hostility or docility. This, in turn, allowed me to see the ways in which the poetic depiction of these cities is only wholly positive from a Roman point of view—to a social group invested in the memory of the city’s independent past, the depiction of Tibur and Praeneste and idyllic suburban retreats actually highlights their new subordination to Rome. Looking at material evidence together with the textual evidence has further expanded my perspective on the cultural memory of these cities: the evidence from numismatic iconography, for example, introduced information about the ways in which individuals associated with Tibur and Praeneste were choosing to present themselves and these cities for an audience of Roman citizens. By examining all of these types of evidence together and attempting to reconstruct a full picture of the cultural memory of each of the cities I consider in this dissertation, I have demonstrated that the Roman memory of pre-Roman Latium can only be understood by considering the multiple social
groups within the Roman community that would have preserved different cultural memories of Tusculum, Tibur, and Praeneste.
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