SCRIPTA MINORA
REGIAE SOCIETATIS HUMANIORUM LITTERARUM LUNDENSIS
Studier utg. av Kungl. Humanistiska Vetenskapssamfundet i Lund
1960—1961:2

LEGENDS AND FACTS OF EARLY ROMAN HISTORY

By EINAR GJERSTAD

LUND CWK GLEERUP

For a study of early Roman history, the archaeological material must form the basis, because it constitutes the only primary source of evidence. In 1905, Giovanni Pinza published a systematic compilation of all the archaeological material available at that time,[1] i.e. the finds from the Quirinal and the Esquiline necropolis and from the tombs up till then discovered by Boni near the Temple of Antoninus and Faustina. Inez Scott Ryberg has confirmed this recording work with very valuable contributions,[2] and a most useful survey of the discoveries up to the date of its publication, in 1938, is given by A. M. Colini.[3]

Much new material has been added by the work of our own generation. I mention Colini's investigations on the Capitoline[4] and below the church of S. Omobono, on the Forum Boarium, where remains of Archaic temples have been found;[5] further, the systematic work organized by Romanelli on the Palatine and in the Forum Romanum: on the Palatine, Salvatore Puglisi[6] and Maria Marella Vianello[7] have carried out stratigraphic

[1] Pinza, Monumenti primitivi di Roma e del Lazio antico (Monum. antichi XV, 1905).

[2] Scott, Inez, Early Roman Tradition in the Light of Archaeology (Mem. Amer. Acad. in Rome VII, 1929, pp. 7 ff.); Scott-Ryberg, Inez, An Archaeol. Record of Rome from the 7th to the 2nd Cent. B.C. (Studies and Documents ed. by Kirsopp Lake and Silva lake, XIII, Part 1, 1940).

[3] Atti V Congr. Naz. di Studi Rom. II, 1938, pp. 205 ff.

[4] Capitolium III, 1927/28, pp. 383 ff.; Bull. Comun. LXVII, 1939, p. 200; op. cit. LXIX, 1941, pp. 83 ff.; op. cit. LXX, 1942, p. 22.

[5] A preliminary report has been published in Bull. Comun. LXVI, 1938, pp. 279 ff.

[6] Monum. antichi XLI, 1951, pp. 1 ff.

[7] A report on the discovery of the tombs of two children belonging to the hut-habitation examined by the excavator has been published in Antichità, fasc. II, parte III, 1950, pp. 1 ff. It is to be hoped that the results of these important excavations will soon be published in full.

excavations, and on the same hill Gian-Filippo Carettoni has unearthed the remains of an Archaic house and has also discovered a tomb situated beneath the so-called House of Livia and dating from the 8th century B.C.[1]; between the Arch of Augustus and the Temple of Caesar, at the eastern end of the Forum Romanum, Gamberini-Montgenet — in collaboration with Puglisi and myself — has made several stratigraphic soundings with interesting results[2]; and to finish this account of excavation work, I must also mention my stratigraphic excavation in the Forum Romanum, to the S.W. of the Equus Domitiani[3], a similar examination of the stratigraphy of the Sacra Via, between the Regia and the precinct of Vesta[4], and a new excavation in the area of S. Omobono on the Forum Boarium.[5] Finally, there is the important material excavated by Boni 50—60 years ago and never published by him. The finds from his stratigraphic soundings on the Palatine have been studied by Puglisi[6] and Marella Vianello[7], while I have had the opportunity to investigate the stratified material found by Boni in the occupation levels on top of the necropolis near the Temple of Antoninus and Faustina.[8]

A study of this archaeological material will enable us to establish a reliable chronology of the periods in question, to determine their cultural characteristics, and to trace some general outlines of the political and religious activity, but only the written records can give us concrete conceptions and individual traits of the historic reality. Scientific specialization has resulted in archaeologists usually concentrating on the archaeological material and historians on the written records, but only a combination of both these fields of study can give us a key to the door leading to the fascinating world of early Roman history. We know that almost all the written

[1] For the Archaic house, still unpublished, cf. Early Rome III, p. 78, and for the tomb, see p. 14.

[2] Bull. Paletn. Ital. 64, N.S. IX, 1954/55, pp. 277 ff.; Early Rome III, pp. 265 ff.

[3] Early Rome I, pp. 21 ff.

[4] Op. cit. III, pp. 321 ff.

[5] Op. cit. pp. 378 ff.

[6] Monum. antichi XLI, 1951, pp. 16 ff.

[7] Antichità, fasc. I, parte III, 1947, pp. 3 ff.

[8] Early Rome I, pp. 86 ff.

records are secondary in the sense that they are posterior to the time to which they refer — the few inscriptions give little historical information — and they must therefore be subjected to a penetrating and comprehensive criticism in order to ascertain whether they contain an element of genuine tradition or not. We also know that from the Renaissance to our own day, critical scholars have discredited many of the legends and novelettes which have grown up around early Roman history. The sceptical attitude of the historians towards the possibility of obtaining a real knowledge of that history is therefore easily understood. Archaeological excavations have, however, changed the situation. These excavations have shown that the tradition about early Rome as preserved in the literary records is not always altogether incorrect. Moreover, in cases when a critical analysis of a written record does not lead to definite results, the archaeological material may serve as a touchstone in determining the intrinsic value of the record in question as a historical source of knowledge. Further, the archaeological material is useful for a purpose of no less importance: the determination of its chronological sequence will enable us to make a similar stratigraphical arrangement of the evidence preserved in the written records. The archaeological material will provide us with fixed points to which to attach the facts of these records.

The preserved literary tradition concerning the early history of Rome is often wrongly placed chronologically by the records. If the correct chronology can be determined, we shall find that the confused and suspect features of the tradition often disappear, and that the political, social and religious institutions will be organically combined with the stages of cultural development determined on archaeological evidence. In this way we shall be able to restore some concrete elements of early Roman history, and the possibility of doing so will be increased the more we are able to establish the mutual connections between the written records and the archaeological facts.

So much for the general principles.[1] I shall here deal with three groups of problems: namely those connected with the pre-urban epoch of Rome, the foundation of that city, and the introduction of the Republic.

[1] Quoted from the Preface of Early Rome I, pp. 8 f.

1. THE PRE-URBAN EPOCH

As indicated by the name, the pre-urban epoch is that dating before the foundation of the city, the Urbs. In 1954, I read a paper[1] from which I quote: "The history of Rome begins in the 8th century B.C., in small villages of wattle-and-daub huts, on the Palatine, the Oppius, and the Quirinal." Five years later that statement was already antiquated when excavating in the Forum Boarium, in the area of the temples of Fortuna and Mater Matuta, I found a considerable quantity of Bronze Age pottery of the so-called Apennine culture.[2] This pottery was found in filling earth beneath the platform of the temples, a platform which, after the fire of the temples in 213 B.C., was raised about 4.50 m in 212 B.C., when Hannibal was '*ante portas*': this remarkable raising of the platform of the temples was due to the construction of fortification walls facing an interior agger in order to defend the area of the Tiber harbour. These works had to be carried out in haste, and therefore the place from which the filling earth was taken (that is the site of the Bronze Age habitation) cannot have been far away. We may therefore suppose that the earth was taken from the slopes of one, two or all three of the hills surrounding the Forum Boarium, namely the Capitoline, the Palatine, and the Aventine. The other hills are too far from the dumping place to be taken into consideration. The slope of the Aventine towards the Forum Boarium has not been examined from an archaeological point of view, and its history of habitation is therefore unknown. We know that the Bronze Age people of Italy sometimes lived in caves and the well-known Lupercal and other caves on the Palatine and Capitoline slopes are immediately brought to mind. As will be shown presently, there are clear indications that the cult practised in the Lupercal goes back to pre-Roman times, and that cave and the adjoining region must therefore be considered as one of the Bronze Age sites in Rome. Unfortunately, no real attempts have been made to discover the Lupercal.[3] The solution of this topographical problem

[1] Acta Congr. Madvigiani, I, p. 378.

[2] Early Rome III, pp. 378 ff.; 462 f.

[3] In Bull. Comun. LXII, 1934, pp. 75 ff., Prof. GIOACCHINO DE ANGELIS D'OSSAT has presented the geo-hydrological indications for discovering the Lupercal, which on that evidence is situated well beneath the level reached by the excavations.

may require some time, but even now it can be ascertained that about 700—800 years have been added to the pre-urban epoch of Rome which the Bronze Age pottery brings back to about 1600—1500 B.C.

There is evidence for dating the beginning of that epoch still earlier. When during the 1870's, the modern quarters of Rome were being laid out on the Esquiline and in the Castro Pretorio district, the attention of all the learned world in Rome was drawn to the discoveries. Among those interested was Leone Nardoni who himself picked up several objects from the excavated earth, while others were acquired from the workmen. Nardoni was very careful to record the location of each object, whenever that was known, and his statements are reliable in that respect. There is no evidence whatsoever that it would have been in the interest of Nardoni to indicate an Esquiline provenance for a single object, if it had not been true. Nardoni collected antiquities from other places, both in and outside Rome; he indicated the find-spots for these objects as carefully as for the Esquiline finds, and he never tried to use the Esquiline provenance for some particular purpose, as shown by his reports published on these discoveries.[1] It should also be mentioned that Nardoni's indications of the find-spots on the Esquiline are confirmed by observations of professional scholars of that time. I have made this apology for Nardoni because the authenticity of the find-spots for the objects in his collection has sometimes been doubted. Nardoni's collection was acquired by Museo Preistorico in Rome from the son of the collector, partly as a purchase, partly as a gift.

The Esquiline objects of Nardoni's collection form a continuous series of specimens from the Chalcolithic Age to the end of the Archaic period, including sporadic items of still later date. In this context, I wish to draw attention to the Chalcolithic finds. They consist of tools and weapons made of flint, stone and copper. Their find-spots cover the whole area from the South of the Esquiline to the table-land east of the Viminal and the Quirinal, indicating an extensive habitation during the time in question, with a remarkable concentration of the finds in the central area,

[1] For this question and a discussion of the Chalcolithic period in Rome, cf. my paper in Acta archaeol. XXXII.

the districts of S. Eusebio, S. Antonio, S. Maria Maggiore and the railway station. It should be mentioned that the Esquiline part of Nardoni's collection includes two Bronze Age axes, which form evidence in metal corresponding to that in pottery from the filling layers in the Forum Boarium, and show that the area within the boundaries of ancient Rome inhabited by Bronze Age tribes did not only include the neighbourhood of the Forum Boarium but also the Esquiline.

Chalcolithic remains of a kind similar to those in Rome are represented, as we know, in several places within Latium and its adjacent regions.[1] Anthropological examinations of the skeletons discovered have shown that certain ethnic groups of a non-Mediterranean character existed in Chalcolithic Italy, but they have also shown that the Mediterranean race seems to have been predominant.[2] There is also linguistic evidence of a Mediterranean culture proved by a large number of place-names as shown by Ribezzo.[3] Further, there are several Mediterranean survivals in Roman religion to which I shall soon return.

Until now Chalcolithic remains are the earliest within ancient Rome, but there are even Stone Age remains not far from the boundaries of the ancient city and within the boundaries of modern Rome.[4] Some day such remains may be found within the boundaries of the ancient city. The fact that the pre-urban epoch of Rome goes back to the Chalcolithic period, i.e. to the first half of the second millenium B.C., makes it clear that the earliest history of Rome — irrespective of possible finds of Neolithic or Palaeolithic remains within the ancient city — forms an integral part of that of Latium, in a wider sense of that of Italy, and that it goes back far beyond the time which the Romans associated with Romulus.

This is so far entirely in agreement with the Roman tradition

[1] Reference to these find-spots is found in Bernabò Brea, Gli Scavi nella caverna delle Arene Candide (Collez. monogr. preist. ed arch. Ist. Stud. Liguri I: 1, 2, 1956, pp. 257 f.).

[2] Sergi, Italia. Le origini, pp. 82 ff.; Arch. Antrop. & Etnol. XX, 1890, pp. 345 ff.; op. cit. XLIV, 1914, pp. 93 ff.; Riv. Scienze preist. II, 1947, pp. 291 ff., with further references; op. cit. III, 1948, pp. 113 ff., with further references.

[3] Riv. Indo-gr.-ital. IV, 1920, pp. 83 ff.; 221 ff.

[4] Rellini, Orig. civ. Ital. pp. 22 ff.; 88 ff.

that the site of their city had been inhabited before they settled there, but the tradition as it appears in the various versions given by the ancient authors is principally based on learned construction and speculation.[1] It should be noted, however, that there is a similar chronological sequence as regards the literary and archaeological material: the tradition about the Sicels as the first inhabitants of Rome and their expulsion by the Aborigines forms the two principal periods of the literary material, and corresponds to the two principal archaeological periods, the Chalcolithic period and the Bronze Age. The concluding phase of the "period of the Aborigines", if I may say so, is represented, as we know, by the arrival of Evander and his Arcadians.[2] That this is a pure legend is a well-known fact, invented to explain Palatium as derived from the Arcadian Pallanteion, and the festival Lupercalia as an imitation of that celebrated to the Lycaean Pan in Arcadia.

This carries us on to the Lupercalia. If the Chalcolithic and Bronze Age periods in Rome are to be something more than a systematic arrangement of pottery, flints and metal objects, we have to study the sacred life which may be associated with these periods. Some efforts have been made to trace pre-Roman elements in the Roman religion, e.g. by Frazer, Pestalozza and Marconi.[3] Now that pre-Roman remains of culture have been found within Rome itself, I feel that we stand on solid ground. I shall select some instances of cults which seem to contain pre-Roman elements and I shall start with the Lupercalia. According to tradition, Evander had instituted that festival, but that does not prove that it dates from pre-Roman times, because, not even taking into account that Evander originally probably was a form of Pan,[4] his association with the Palatine had to be assigned to the time before Romulus in order to explain everything this story was intended to explain, as will be shown below (pp. 40 f.). The pre-Roman elements of the Lupercalia have to be elicited by a study of the rites of the festival itself. Plutarch says that the Lupercalia

[1] A survey of the material is given by Ciaceri, Le origini di Roma, pp. 121 ff.

[2] Livy I, 5, 1—2; Dion. Halic. I, 31, 40.

[3] Frazer, The Fasti of Ovid, II, pp. 327 ff.; Pestalozza, Religione Mediterranea, pp. 323 ff.; Marconi, Reflessi Mediterranei, pp. 209 ff.

[4] Franklin, The Lupercalia, p. 56.

was a ceremony of purification[1], and this interpretation is also given by other ancient authors.[2] The celebrants of the rites met at the cave called Lupercal, and the first act of the festival seems to have been the sacrifice of goats and of a dog. Cakes made of *mola salsa* were offered by the Vestals. Of the Luperci, the sacerdotes of this ceremony, two youths of high rank, were brought forward; their foreheads were smeared with the blood from the sacrificed goats, and then the blood was wiped off with wool dipped in milk. When this was done, the two youths were obliged to laugh. Then all the Luperci girt themselves with the skins of the sacrificed goats and had a sacred meal together. After that, still clad in the skins but otherwise naked, they ran for some distance outside the Lupercal but not around the boundaries of the Palatine hill. This has been the *opinio communis* which I have also shared, but Agnes Kirsopp Michels has submitted the sources to a critical analysis, showing that the running of the Luperci around the Palatine is only an hypothesis which has been accepted as a fact.[3] When running in the district not too far from the Lupercal, they whipped persons whom they met, above all women, with strips cut from the skins of the goats. These strips were called *februa*[4]; the whipping did not, however, only serve as a means of purification, but was also considered to stimulate fertility. Lustration and promotion of fertility may be, as we know, two sides of the same thing. The whole ceremony suggests remote antiquity and is quite foreign to the usual Roman ritual. The goat as a lustration animal is also an anomaly in Roman cult, in which the sheep serves such a function — either alone or together with the swine and the bull in the suovetaurilia sacrifice. It was uncertain to which god the festival belonged. He was identified with several deities: Lupercus, Faunus, Faunus-Lupercus, Liber, Februus and Lycaean Pan.[5] Livy says that the god was Lycaean Pan whom the Romans afterwards called Inuus.[6] The truth seems to be the reverse: the original name

[1] Plut. Rom. XXI, 31.

[2] Varro, Ling. Lat. VI, 34.

[3] Transact. Amer. Philol. Assoc. LXXXIV, 1953, pp. 35 ff.

[4] Ovid, Fasti II, 19 ff.

[5] Cf. Warde-Fowler, Rom. Festivals, p. 312; Franklin, op. cit. pp. 18, 36 ff., 82, n. 55.

[6] Livy I, 5, 2: *Lycaeum Pana venerantes ... quem Romani deinde vocarunt Inuum.*

of the god was Inuus and afterwards he was identified with Pan by *interpretatio graeca*. The etymology of the name Inuus is dubious, and so far a Latin derivation has proved impossible.[1] Perhaps the name is indigenous, Mediterranean. The etymology of Luperci, in spite of all the efforts to solve this problem, is also uncertain. Walde-Hofmann says: "Bildung und genaue Bedeutung unklar."[2] I shall not make a new etymological attempt, but I wish to say that I do not think that the first compound of the word has anything to do with *lupus*. There is not a single trace of a wolf in the rites of the Lupercalia in spite of all that has been written about the association of wolves with this festival and, as I intend to show (pp. 40 f.), the wolf of the Lupercalia is entirely mythological.

The animal sacrificed at the Lupercalia, the goat, plays only an insignificant role in Roman cult outside that of Veiovis and of Juno Caprotina. This goddess, as we know, wore a cult-dress of a goatskin. On the Nones of July, the festival of this goddess was celebrated in Rome in the Campus Matrius at the Goat's Marsh (*Caprae Palus*), where the women feasted under a wild fig-tree — or goat-fig, the *caprificus*, and offered the goddess the milky juice of the tree and cut branches from the tree. They also roamed about, jeering at all whom they met, and engaged in a sham fight with each other, in which sticks were used and stones thrown.[3] It is possible, as suggested by Preller[4], that this festival of the women coincided with the artificial fertilization *(caprificatio)* of the fig-trees which was practised by the Romans about this time of the year.[5] It seems therefore that the fertilization of the cultivated fig-tree and the fertilizing power of the goat-fig were thought to influence the fecundation of the women. The essential combination in this cult is that of the goat and the fig in order to promote fertilization. In the Lupercalia, there is the same combination: the *ficus Ruminalis* was close by the Lupercal, and although it is not represented in the cult ceremonies, its association with the

[1] Walde-Hofmann, Lat. etym. Wörterb.[2] s.v.

[2] Op. cit. s.v.

[3] Varro, Ling. Lat. VI, 18; Macrob., Sat. I, 11, 36—40; Plut. Rom. 23; Cam. 33.

[4] Preller, Röm. Mythol.[3] I, p. 287.

[5] Palladius, De re rust. IV, 10, 28; Columella, De re rust. XI, 2, 56.

cult practised in the Lupercal is indicated by its topographical connection with that sacred cave.

Frazer has published some very striking African parallels to the combination of goat and fig-tree represented in the Roman rites referred to here.[1] Among some tribes in Kenya, the body of a barren woman is smeared with the milky juice of a fig-tree, and sometimes a twig of the fig-tree is placed over the vagina of the woman, proving that the fig-tree is considered to possess a procreative power. These fig-tree rites are combined with the sacrifice of a goat, or sometimes a sheep, and with the pouring of the blood of the animal on the woman. It also occurs that the woman is tied to a fig-tree with strips cut from the intestines of the sacrificed animal. These ritual parallels help us to understand the intimate association between the goat and the fig-tree in the pre-Roman fertility rites: to understand why the women were whipped with strips of goatskin at the Lupercalia, and why they feasted under a caprificus, cut a twig of the tree and extracted its milky juice on the festival of Juno Caprotina. We also understand why two youths of the Luperci were smeared on their foreheads with the blood of the sacrificed goats: it is only a faint and conventional survival of the pouring of blood of the sacrificed animal, by which means the youths, purified themselves, were able to perform the lustration rites of the community, or — and this amounts to the same thing — with their vitality strengthened by the blood of the goat, they were able to transfer his fertility power to the women.

To conclude this exemplification of Mediterranean elements remaining in Roman religion, I should like to draw attention to the cult of Juno Lucina on the Esquiline.[2] She was a goddess promoting childbirth, and her cult goes back much further than the construction of her temple founded in 375 B.C. In the grove of the goddess, there was a cult-tree earlier than the temple. It was not a fig-tree this time, but seems to be a kind of elm, identified with *Celtis australis*. Pliny says that he estimated its age as 500 years.[3] We do not know when one of its predecessors was chosen as a cult-tree. The roots of the preceding trees of this Celtis australis, however, went deep down in the soil of Mediterranean culture.

[1] Frazer, op. cit. II, pp. 347 ff.

[2] Wissowa, Rel. u. Kult. d. Röm.[2], pp. 183 ff.

[3] Pliny, Nat. Hist. XVI, 235.

In his Fasti,[1] Ovid tells us the story about the barren Sabine women who went with their husbands to the grove of Juno Lucina, praying to the goddess for children. The leaves of the cult-tree trembled, and these words were heard: "Let the sacred he-goat go into Italian matrons." This oracular saying was interpreted by an augur in such a way that he slew a he-goat, and at his bidding the women offered their backs to be beaten with thongs cut from the hide. That cured the infertility of the Sabine women, and thanks were given to Juno Lucina. This aetiological legend shows that the goat and the tree were associated in the cult of Juno Lucina, as in that of Juno Caprotina, although the tree this time was not a fig-tree. The rite of beating women with strips of goatskin connects cult-practices employed in the grove of Juno Lucina with those used at the Lupercalia — and this Ovid does in telling the aetiological legend.[2]

These indications of Mediterranean survivals in Roman religion have been mentioned to serve as examples. They can be easily multiplied. As in Greek religion many Mediterranean elements have survived from the Minoan culture, so in a corresponding way such elements were absorbed by Roman religion and for similar reasons: the pre-Indoeuropean population of Italy was not exterminated by the immigrating Italic tribes, and several beliefs, thoughts, and rites of that earlier population were taken over by the Indo-Europeans.[3] A systematic study of these Mediterranean survivals in Roman religion will help us to understand some essential parts

[1] Ovid, Fasti II, 425 ff.

[2] It has been rightly pointed out by Franklin, op. cit. p. 61, that the story told by Ovid would have been pointless if not based on cult practices, "or at least upon a recollection of them, employed at the shrine of Juno Lucina".

[3] Several hypotheses have been put forward about the arrival of the Indo-europeans in Italy and the dates of their immigrations (an excellent survey of the various opinions is given by Puglisi in his Civiltà appenninica, pp. 87 ff.), but these hypotheses are in my opinion very uncertain and, as far as I can see, there is no cogent reason to identify the non-Mediterranean, brachycephalic groups appearing in the Chalcolithic period and the Bronze Age with any people or peoples known to us, whether Indo-european or not. As regards Latium so much seems certain that Latin-speaking groups were represented there from the beginning of the Iron Age. For further discussion of these problems I refer to Early Rome IV.

of the intellectual and emotional life of the Chalcolithic and Bronze Age inhabitants of Rome.

With the initial Iron Age culture, about 800 B.C., a new era begins in the pre-urban history of Rome. This part of the pre-urban epoch can be divided into four periods, to which the following dates can be assigned: Period I 800—750 B.C., Period II 750—700 B.C., Period III 700—625 B.C., and Period IV 625—575 B.C. Needless to say, these dates are approximate, with a chronological margin of 25 years in either direction. The chronological framework has been constructed on the basis of the contexts of Italic and Greek pottery. Late Geometric Greek pottery of the 8th century B.C. has supplied evidence for the dates of Periods I and II; Protocorinthian and Subgeometric Greek pottery of the 7th century B.C. has formed the chronological evidence for dating Period III; finally, Early and Middle Corinthian contexts have furnished material for establishing the chronology of Period IV.[1]

During Periods I and II, habitation was confined to some of the hills: the Palatine, the Esquiline, and the Quirinal; perhaps also on the Caelius, although it cannot be proved as systematic excavations of the earliest remains on that hill have not yet been carried out. On the other hand, we can ascertain that the Capitoline was uninhabited at that time; excavations of the strata down to the rock have shown that this hill was not inhabited before the first half of the 6th century B.C.[2] Also uninhabited were the valleys between the hills, and the hillsides were in part used as burial places. The tombs discovered by Boni in the valley of the Forum Romanum[3] form part of a necropolis belonging to the settlement on the Palatine. Evidence is formed by the pottery found in the tomb discovered by Carettoni beneath the so-called House of Livia on the Palatine[4]: this pottery is identical in shape

[1] For this periodization and the evidence for the absolute dates, see my paper Discussions concerning Early Rome 2, in Opusc. Rom. IV, pp. 1 ff.

[2] Capitolium III, 1927/28, p. 384, Figs. 3, 4; p. 386, Fig. 6; Early Rome III, pp. 190 ff.; Bull. Comun. LXVII, 1939, p. 200; Early Rome III, pp. 206 f.

[3] Notizie Scavi, 1902, pp. 96 ff.; 1903, pp. 123 ff., 375 ff.; 1905, pp. 145 ff.; 1906, pp. 5 ff., 253 ff.; 1911, pp. 157 ff.; Early Rome II, pp. 13 ff.

[4] Carettoni's report of his important discovery is published in Bull. Paletn. Ital. 64, N.S. 12, 1954/55, pp. 261 ff.; cf. Early Rome III, pp. 72 ff.

and ornament to that represented in the tombs found by Boni in the valley of the Forum Romanum. The discovery of the tomb on the Palatine throws a flash of lightening on the very scattered and isolated habitation during this time (the tomb can be assigned to the end of Period I). It was found on the North-west slope of the deep and narrow ravine dividing the summits of the Palatine, Germal to the N.W. and Palatual to the S.E. Only these summits were inhabited and the ravine between them was in part used as a burial place.

For the sake of convenience, I have used the name Esquiline to indicate one of the pre-urban habitation sites, but the Esquiline, as we know, is the table-land behind the three summits, Fagutal, Oppius and Cispius, where the pre-urban Iron Age habitation seems to have been concentrated, but there was not a continuous habitation on these summits. At least we know that the Esquiline necropolis, with its pre-urban tombs, penetrated between the Oppius and the Cispius.[1] The area between the Fagutal and the Oppius has not been examined, but it would not be surprising if some part of it should prove to have been occupied by tombs. The Quirinal consisted of four summits[2], Latiar to the South, Mucial and Salutar in the middle, and Quirinal to the North, this latter name being by and by used to indicate the whole hill. Two pre-urban tombs have been found beneath the Augustan forum just below the Latiar, and probably belong therefore to a settlement on that summit.[3] Other pre-urban tombs have been discovered just to the North of the Quirinal[4] and are therefore likely to be associated with a settlement on that summit. In the middle of the hill, around the summits Mucial and Salutar, the pre-urban topographical conditions are still entirely unknown.

In any case, what we know about the pre-urban topography during Periods I and II is sufficient to show that habitation in Rome was at that time of a disintegrated character, even on each hill divided into several groups of wattle-and-daub huts, with uninhabited areas between them and with larger districts of wilderness between each hill.

[1] Monum. antichi XV, Pl. XXV.

[2] Op. cit. Pl. XXVI.

[3] Early Rome II, pp. 266 ff.

[4] Op. cit. pp. 271, 274 ff.

This disintegrated and isolated type of village habitation corresponds to a cultural particularism shown by the arts and crafts from the different villages. Taking instances from the pottery types, it is a fact that some forms, e.g. conical bowls with projections at the rim, shallow bowls with a horizontal handle below the rim, hut urns, reticulate urns, braziers, etc., are common on the Palatine, and missing or represented sporadically by the Esquiline material, whereas other forms, e.g. cups with a crescent-shaped or saddle-shaped handle, jugs with wide short neck and a vertical handle on the shoulder, and amphorae with horizontal handles, etc., are common in the Esquiline tombs but missing or rare in the Palatine finds. Further, pottery of a similar form has often a different shape on the Palatine and on the Esquiline.[1] The Palatine people used both to cremate and inhume the deceased.[2] On the Esquiline inhumation was practised almost exclusively: from Period I there is only one, somewhat uncertain case of cremation, and from Period II one certain case.[3]

Turning to the Quirinal hill, we find that the contents of the tombs, probably belonging to the settlement on the Latiar summit, show close stylistic affinity to the Palatine material, and the deceased of these tombs had been cremated; whereas the finds from the tombs of the Northern group are similar to the Esquiline, although in part related to the Palatine group.[4]

These cultural peculiarities shown by the arts and crafts from habitation sites not very far from each other are not astonishing considering the pattern of production prevailing in Rome at that time. It can be classed as domestic industry. There was not yet a professional handicraft in the proper sense of the word. Very few things were acquired from outside the community itself. Most of the things were produced within the family or group of families. If therefore some families left their place of residence and moved to another place, they did not change the types of their domestic industry as easily as they changed their abode, and when they made new pots to replace those which had broken, they continued to make them in the same way as before. This tenacious adherence

[1] Opusc. Rom. IV, pp. 29 ff.
[2] Early Rome II, p. 151.
[3] Op. cit. p. 262.
[4] Opusc. Rom. IV, pp. 47 f.

to inherited forms of culture is very typical of peoples living in economically and socially firmly consolidated groups[1], and there is not only archaeological material to prove it, but much ethnological material as well.[2]

In spite of these local peculiarities, it cannot be doubted that they are all of Latial character: the pre-urban villages of the Palatine, the Esquiline and the Quirinal are specific representatives of the Latial Iron Age culture, the Palatine village closely associated with those of the Alban hills, and the Esquiline material similar to that found at Tivoli and in Southern Latium. Usually Sabine tribes are supposed to have settled in Rome almost as early as the Latins — some scholars think even somewhat earlier than the Latins — and they are generally thought to have lived on the Quirinal. As far as the archaeological evidence goes, there are no indications of Sabines in Rome during Periods I and II, either on the Quirinal or on any other hill. True there are a few tombs discovered close by and beneath the Temple of Caesar, in which pottery was found of the so-called Boschetto type represented in tombs of the Alban hills. It seems to indicate non-Latin associations, but it is not possible to assign it to any particular people, and there is no reason to consider it to be a Sabine product. Of these tombs, only one dates from Period II, whereas the other three are of Period III.[3] I shall return to the question of the Sabines in Rome.

When I talk of cultural particularism and isolated village habitation during Periods I and II, this does not of course mean that the villages formed hermetically closed settlements. There was contact between them, shown both by similar stylistic and morphological features in the arts and crafts, and it is thanks to these connecting links that it is possible to prove that the periods on all the pre-urban hills of Rome are synchronistic, and that the Iron Age habitation began at approximately the same time on the Palatine, the Esquiline and the Quirinal.[4]

About 700 B.C., with the beginning of Period III, a new phase

[1] Heichelheim, Wirtschaftsgesch. d. Altert. I, pp. 83 ff., 263 ff.
[2] Svärdström, Die Bauernmalerei in Dalarna, p. 26; Strömbom, Handwerksmässig und Volkstümlich, in Folkliv XXI—XXII, 1957/58, pp. 163 ff. I am much obliged to Prof. Sigfrid Svensson for these references.
[3] Early Rome II, pp. 86 ff. (Tomb 1); pp. 111 ff. (Tombs 2—4).
[4] Opusc. Rom. IV, pp. 29—49.

opens in the pre-urban history of Rome. Evidently the space for the increasing inhabitants was too small on the hills and, in consequence, habitation began to extend to the valleys between the hills. The hillsides, in so far as they were now within the area of habitation were of course no longer used as a burial place, and we find that huts were built on top of the earlier tombs, for instance in the Palatine necropolis in the Forum valley near the Temple of Antoninus and Faustina[1], and near the Temple of Caesar.[2] Children were, however, buried beneath the floors of these huts, or in their vicinity.[3] The custom of burying children beneath the floors of the dwellings is well known and was practised among various peoples down to late times.[4] The idea underlying that custom has been interpreted in different ways by different scholars.[5]

After a drainage of the marshy land within the lowest part of the Forum valley, it was possible to extend the habitation even to that area, as proved by the remains of huts found in a stratigraphic excavation close by the foundation of the Equus Domitiani.[6] These huts can be assigned to Period IV, about 625—575 B.C. The drainage in question, a pre-urban predecessor of the Cloaca Maxima, was thus made about 625 B.C.

In this way, during Period III, the originally isolated villages were gradually growing together into a single community, and during Period IV this process was further intensified. This synoikismos in the proper sense of the word had the effect that the cultural particularism, characteristic of the handicraft products of the earlier villages, gradually disappeared, but there are also other important factors which contributed to this result. First, the domestic industry yields to professional handicraft in many branches, and products of the same style were therefore acquired by the villagers from the same craftsmen. Standardized production in metal, pottery and other materials, pots turned on the wheel and imitating the same prototypes were highest fashion and no longer

[1] Early Rome I, pp. 118 ff.
[2] Op. cit. p. 128, n. 3; op. cit. II, pp. 111 ff.
[3] Op. cit. I, pp. 129 f.
[4] Op. cit. p. 129, n. 4; op. cit. II, pp. 155 f.
[5] Cf. op. cit. p. 155, nn. 1—5.
[6] Op. cit. I, pp. 72 f.

the handmade, homemade pots. Secondly, not only the cultural barrier between the villages was broken but, at the same time, the door was opened to a world beyond the horizon of Latium, to the Etruscan high-culture, and the uniform character of the arts and crafts during Periods III and IV is, to a high degree, due to an initial influence from Etruscan culture and, via the Etruscans, from Greece. Etruscan metalwork and Bucchero pottery were imported during Period IV from Veii and Caere together with Etruscan imitations of Greek pottery in Protocorinthian and Corinthian style. Also Greek originals of these styles were acquired by the inhabitants in Rome.[1] To begin with, this influence did not affect the pre-urban way of living very much, nor the institutions of the pre-urban communities in Rome, as far as we know. As before, the villagers lived in wattle-and-daub huts and their economical life was principally based on agriculture and cattle-breeding. Carbonized grains of wheat, barley and millet, horse-beans, grass peas and grape pips found in the occupation levels and in the tombs give evidence of the agricultural variety, while bones of cattle, sheep, goats, pigs, horses and dogs show the principal domestic animals.[2]

The increased economic possibilities introduced by the commercial connections initiated are, on the other hand, clearly demonstrated by the finds of Periods III and IV. The tombs of these periods show a considerable difference in wealth among the equipment, indicating a clear economic differentiation in the society, whereas the tombs of Periods I and II are characterized by a monotonous similarity as regards the comparatively poor finds.[3]

This economic differentiation has also formed the basis for an incipient social inequality, probably due to intermarriage between

[1] San Giovenale, p. 137.
[2] For plant remains and animal bones, cf. Early Rome I, Index, pp. 161 ff. (Animal bones, Barley, Eincorn, Emmer, Horsebean); op.cit. II, Index, pp. 322 ff. (Barley, Beans, Bones of animal, Eincorn, Emmer, Grass Pea, Horsebean, Millet, Vine, White Beam); op cit. III, pp. 464, 470—473; Index, pp. 479 ff. (Bos, Canis, Equus, Hordeum sp., Ovis, Sus, Triticum dicoccum and monococcum).
[3] Cf. Early Rome II, pp. 19—88 with pp. 88—145; pp. 166—197 with pp. 198—258.

the wealthy families,[1] and we have clear evidence that the leaders of the community were distinguished by marks of honour. This can be concluded from the finds in the Esquiline tomb 94[2] assignable to a somewhat advanced stage of Period III, say about 650 B.C. In this tomb, which was of the fossa type, a man had been buried in a cist of tufa slabs; he was clad in armour, with spear, a shield of leather or wood (from which fragments of the bronze mounting with ornament in *repoussé* are preserved, and a calotte-shaped bronze helmet. Further, there were remains of the iron mountings of a war chariot, probably placed on top of the cist. The discovery of the chariot is important because such a vehicle was certainly reserved for a person of rank, in fact the chief commander and the political leader of the community. I shall return to this question when dealing with the written records bearing upon the political organization of pre-urban Rome (p. 31).

I wish to emphasize that this chief of the Esquiline community had been buried in a fossa as all the other Esquiline inhabitants of Periods III and IV, and not in a chamber-tomb indicating some kind of a house as a residence for him when still alive. Further, no remains of houses, only huts, have been found during the pre-urban period on the Palatine, along the Sacra Via, at the Temple of Caesar, beneath the Forum Romanum, beneath the Forum Boarium, in all the places where remains of pre-urban dwellings have so far been found. Persons of rank, as well as common people, lived in huts during the pre-urban period.[3] Naturally the huts of important persons may have been larger and more finely furnished than usual. It may be pointed out that during the Swedish excavations at S. Giovenale, two large huts of the 7th century B.C. have been found, of which the largest[4] is c. 11.50 m. in length and 6.50 m. in width. Huts of these dimensions may have existed also in Rome as dwellings for the leaders of the different villages, but

[1] The proibition of marriage between patricians and plebeians abrogated in 445 B.C. (cf. p. 61) I believe to be a legalization of an earlier practice which had gradually formed the necessary social conditions for such a proibition.

[2] Op. cit. II, pp. 232 ff., Fig. 209.

[3] Op. cit. I, pp. 45 ff., 72 f., 118 ff.; III, pp. 48 ff., 265 ff., 379 ff., 457.

[4] Recently excavated; the other, slightly smaller hut (11.0 x 5.75 m.) is mentioned in San Giovenale, pp. 307 f.

there are no traces of developed house-architecture or urbanistic planning of the community. In spite of the cultural advance mentioned, Period III and IV form the concluding phase of the pre-urban epoch and not the initial stage of the epoch of the Archaic city.

The two principal phases of the pre-urban epoch — the first one when habitation was restricted to the hills, and the second one when habitation extended to the valleys between the hills — are not only indicated by the archaeological material, but also by the written records. We know that every social institution of the Romans had also a sacred aspect and required its corresponding cult form. The religion is more conservative than the social institutions. When these were modified in accordance with the demands of later times, remains of the original conditions were often left in the cult ceremonies and the sacred law. These are well known facts, and I shall only mention two instances, serving to illustrate the particular case here in question, namely the two principal phases of the pre-urban epoch.

I shall first draw attention to the Sacra Argeorum, and in particular to the procession that went to the Sacella Argeorum.[1] This ceremony belonged to the '*sacra publica*' but, as we know, there were different categories within the '*sacra publica*', as Festus informs us: the first category comprising '*sacra publica pro populo*' and the second category '*sacra publica pro montibus, pagis, curiis, sacellis*.[2] Only the festivals of the first category are state cults in the proper sense of the word, only these are mentioned in the list of the State festivals recorded in the calendar, whereas the '*sacra publica*' of the second category are missing in that list. They were public festivals and were in later times celebrated by the whole people, though originally their celebration was so firmly connected with a certain region or locality or a certain institution that they were not detached from this connection, but continued to be done in accordance with the original rules prescribed by local or institutional restrictions. In the procession of the Sacra Argeorum, the pontifices, the Vestals and the praetors took part as official representatives as well as the *flaminica Dialis*, who on this occasion had to lay aside her bridal dress and appear in mourning.[3] In the

[1] Varro, Ling. Lat. V, 45—54.

[2] Festus (ed. Lindsay) p. 284.

[3] Dion. Halic. I, 38, 3; Ovid, Fasti V, 621 ff.; Plut. Quaest.Rom. 32, 86.

form as we know it, this festival belonged therefore to the '*sacra publica*', but it belonged to their second category, and more precisely to the group within that category called '*pro sacellis*'. There were 24 sacella Argeorum, 6 in each of the four regions forming the earliest city[1], and there were two processions every year to these chapels. One procession took place in March, and on that occasion rush-puppets were probably placed in the chapels. In any case, on the 14th of May, when the second procassion took place, rush-puppets called Argei were collected from the chapels and thrown into the Tiber from the Pons Sublicius.[2] The interpretation of this rite has been a matter for endless descussion, but the important thing for our purpose is to examine where the chapels were situated and not to attempt an interpetation of the rite. Doing so, we find that all the chapels, in so far as their localization can be exactly determined, were on top of the hills included in the four regions of the earliest city, on the Palatine, including Velia, the Caelius, the Esquiline and the Quirinal, including the Viminal. It is significant that no chapel was situated outside the boundaries of these hills. There was no chapel on the Capitoline and no chapel in the Forum Romanum or in the other valleys between the hills.[3] The procession started on the Caelius, then proceeded to the Esquiline, the Viminal, the Qurinal, the Palatine, to end on the Velia. It did not however form a continuous circuit around the city, but four separate circuits, the one added to the other, around the boundaries of the pre-urban settlements. This indicates a pre-urban origin of the festival, and reflects the phase of habitation when each village formed an independent community, and there were circuits of lustration around the boundaries of each of these villages. In other words, the festival is a sacred survival of rites practised originally in the first pre-urban phase, comprising Periods I and II.

[1] The supposed late date of the Sacra Argeorum (Wissowa, Ges. Abh. z. röm. Rel.-und Stadtgesch. pp. 211 ff.) cannot be accepted (cf. Warde Fowler, Rel. Exp. of Rom. People, pp. 321 ff.). For a full discussion of the Sacra Argeorum and the number of the sacella I must refer to Early Rome V.

[2] Jordan, Topogr. d. Stadt Rom II, p. 286.

[3] Richter, Topogr. d. Stadt Rom, pp. 38 ff., Pl. 3. In Rhein Mus. f. Philol. N.F. XCVI, 1953, p. 22, Prof. von Gerkan locates the sixth chapel of the Regia Suburana in the Subura district instead of on the summit of the Caelius, but without good reason (cf. Opusc. Rom. I, 1954, p. 63, n. 2).

There is another festival, namely the Septimontium[1], which has connections with the second phase of the pre-urban epoch, Periods III and IV. This festival belongs also to the second category of the sacra publica and, more precisely, to the group called '*pro montibus*'. It was celebrated on seven montes within the boundaries of the Palatine, the Caelius and the Esquiline, while the Quirinal and the Viminal were excluded from it. These montes were Palatual, Germal, Velia, Sucusa, Fagutal, Oppius and Cispius.[2] It is interesting

[1] Wissowa, op. cit. pp. 230 ff.; Id. Rel. u. Kult. d. Röm.[2] pp. 439. It does not seem to me that Mrs. Louise Adams Holland (Transact. & Proceed. Amer. Phil. Assoc. LXXXIV, 1953, pp. 16 ff.) has brought forth sufficient evidence for interpreting Septimontium as Saeptimontium, the feast of the saeptimontes "intended to invoke the blessing on the enclosure and its barrier". As rightly pointed out by Mrs. Holland, Varro confuses the montes of the Septimontium with those of the later city (Varro, Ling. Lat. V, 7, 41; VI, 3, 24). It is also true that in Varro's time the dipthong *ae* was pronounced with the single vowel in the country districts, but this dipthong was still pronounced in Rome at that time. Moreover, Varro knew the antiquarian word from his studies, as well as hearing it, and he must have known how it was spelt. If it had been spelt with *ae*, Varro would certainly not have brought it into an etymological connection with *septem*, and his confusion of the two groups of 7 montes has of course no orthographical bearing. Finally, there is so far no archaeological evidence for an artificial fortification of the pre-urban villages (Early Rome III, pp. 26 f.), and the natural defence of the hills in question would hardly justify calling them *saepti* in a more specific way than any other hills.

[2] In the transmitted text ultimately going back to Antistius Labeo and via Verrius Flaccus preserved in Festus (ed. Lindsay), pp. 458, 459 (Pauli excerpta), 474, 476) eight hills instead of seven are mentioned, viz. Palatium, Germalus, Velia, Subura, Caelius, Fagutal, Oppius, and Cispius. Wissowa (Gesamm. Abh. z. röm. Rel. u. Stadtgesch. pp. 230 ff.) has conclusively restored the text. Subura cannot be the notorious quarter in Rome with that name, because it was no hill but a part of the valley between the Quirinal, Viminal and Esquiline. As one of the seven hills, Subura stands for Succusa, a summit on the Caelius. Succusa and Subura were mixed up to a great extent and Reg. I was called, as we know, Regio Suburana, though in inscriptions abbreviated Suc. with the original name surviving (cf. Festus (ed. Lindsay) p. 402: *Suburam Verrius alio libro a pago Succusano dictam ait; hoc vero maxime probat eorum auctoritatem, qui[a] aiunt, ita appellatam et regionem Urbis et tribum a stativo praesidio, quod solitum sit succurrere Esquilis, infestantibus eam partem Urbis Gabinis; indicioque esse, quod adhuc ea tribus per c litteram, non b scribatur.* As Antistius Labeo knew that Subura used by him to indicate a summit on the Caelius could easily be mistaken for the more known quarter with that name, he added a refe-

to observe that the festival was not celebrated jointly by the inhabitants on the hills in question, but separately by the inhabitants of each hill[1], though on the same day.[2] The restriction of the festival to the area mentioned indicates a stage before that of the unified city, as has been the opinion of several scholars. The fact that the independence of each community is clearly reflected by the organization of the festival seems to indicate only a kind of confederation based on a sacred coalition and a religious community, a transitional stage between that of the isolated villages and that of the unified city. This stage is that of the second phase of the pre-urban epoch, when the isolation of the villages was broken and the habitation extended to the territory between them. In other words, between c. 700 and 575 B.C., the historical situation is found which is reflected by the festival of the Septimontium.

Some further information about the sacred political and military organization of the pre-urban villages may be obtained, I think, from a study of the Roman calendar and some other festivals, which in addition to those mentioned now can be assigned to the pre-urban epoch.

2. THE INSTITUTIONS OF THE PRE-URBAN EPOCH AND THE FORMATION OF THE UNIFIED CITY.

The three principal epochs of Roman culture in pre-Republican times — the pre-urban epoch, the early and late periods of the unified city — are each represented by a specific type of calendar.

In this context I cannot set forth all the evidence bearing upon the early history of the Roman calendar, and I must therefore refer to a paper of mine in Acta archaeologica XXXII, and shall here confine myself to a summary of the conclusions arrived at in that paper. In the pre-urban calendars, the month was divided into two halves — in the first half, the days were counted from the day when the new moon was observed and invoked, and in the latter half, from the day of the full moon. As each month did not begin until

rence to the Caelius in order to avoid that mistake. Verrius Flaccus does not seem to have caught the point, and he must therefore be responsible for the introduction of the Subura and the Caelius as two hills of the Septimontium.

[1] C. I. L. VI, 32455.

[2] Wissowa, op. cit. p. 231.

the new moon was observed, the length of the months must have been fairly irregular and we do not know the total number of months of each year. The moon was invoked until it was half and these days of invocation were called Kalendae — later on, as we know, only the first day of the month was called so. On the day of the half-moon, the festivals of the months were announced.

The Numan calendar, the earliest calendar of the unified city was based on a sequence of months containing alternately 29 and 30 days. This fixed length of the month indicates that, if, for some reason or other, the new moon could not be observed on the first day of the month, the day was still proclaimed as Kalendae, and the alternation of short and long months shows the intention of bringing the months into agreement with the lunar phases, a synodic month comprising, as we know, approximately 29½ days. The Numan calendar was thus composed of conventionalized synodic months. The month was still divided into two halves, and the days of the first half were, as before, reckoned from the Kalendae and in the second half from the Idus. There were only ten calendarian months. The two missing months were September and November. In these two months, there were no ancient festivals, and they therefore fell outside the religious sphere of the calendar. Their Kalendae were not announced, they were counted only as chronological units, profane time, and not included into the series of sacred calendar months.

The earliest festivals in the originally non-calendarian months can be assigned to the Tarquin epoch: in September, for instance, the earliest sacred ceremonies are connected with the cult of Jupiter Optimus Maximus and with the celebration of the Ludi Romani, both introduced by Tarquinius Priscus. This is also in agreement with the most trustworthy of the ancient testimonies, regarding the time for the introduction of the 12-month calendar, namely that of Junius Gracchanus, who assigns that calendar reform to a king Tarquinius. In this calendar, the days were counted backwards, as we know, from the nearest Nonae, Idus or Kalendae: February had 28 days, March, May, July and October 31 days, the other months 29 days. In this way, the connection of the months with the lunar phases was broken, and the number of days in each month was determined by number-magic — the odd numbers being considered propitious and the even numbers fatal; only

February had an even number of days, but that month was so sinister anyhow that it was a hopeless case!

The chronological phases of the calendar thus distinguished enable us to assign several festivals to the pre-urban epoch, and in this way considerable material is obtained for the study of the sacred, political and military institutions of the pre-urban epoch.

Wissowa has distinguished earlier and later parts within the Numan calendar of festivals (cf. above).[1] The festival names derived from those of a god or a goddess belong to the later group. All the exactly dateable cults connected with these festivals can be assigned to the time of the formation of the unified city, or very soon after, e.g. the Vestalia associated with the Temple of Vesta built at the time of the foundations of the Urbs, as confirmed by the earliest finds discovered there[2]; further, the Opalia and the Opiconsivia connected with the Regia, as is proved by archaeological evidence, built at approximately the same time as the Temple of Vesta[3], both situated near the eastern end of the Forum Romanum, on either side of the Sacra Via; associated with the western end of the Forum Romanum are the cults of the Saturnalia and the Volcanalia. For the institution of the Volcanalia, no precise date can be given within the cycle of the early period of the unified city. The temple of Saturn was dedicated in 497 B.C.[4], but, before that, there was a sanctuary without a temple, an open cult-place with an altar as a sacred centre, and this phase is, by tradition, assigned to the time of Tullus Hostilius, the second king of the unified city.[5] Further, the Terminalia are connected with the shrine of Terminus on the Capitoline. As shown below, p. 56, n. 2 this shrine is older than the temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus constructed in the last third of the 6th cent. B.C. but, on the other hand, it cannot be earlier than c. 575 B.C. when habitation began on the Capitoline hill and it was added as a stronghold to the unified city formed c. 575 B.C. (pp. 14,33). The Terminalia seem therefore to be assignable to the time of the formation of that city or very soon after. Finally, the Matralia, the festival of the Matres, i.e.

[1] Op. cit. p. 29.
[2] Early Rome III, pp. 310 ff.
[3] Op. cit. pp. 295 ff.
[4] Homm. Grenier (forthcoming).
[5] Macrob. Sat. I, 8, 1.

Mater Matuta and Fortuna, at the Forum Boarium, where excavations have shown that the cult of this place goes back to the time of the foundation of the city, but not further.[1]

The earlier group contains festivals with names not derived from a god or goddess, but indicating, for instance, the sacrificial act without reference to a particular deity, as the Agonium, or the date, as the Quinquatrus, or the locality, as the Lupercalia, the Sacra Argeorum and the Septimontium, or the victim, as the Equus October, or the ritual act, as the Tubilustrium, the Armilustrium, the Regifugium, the Poplifugia, etc. We have already seen that the Lupercalia date from the Bronze Age, or perhaps earlier, that the Sacra Argeorum can be assigned to the earliest pre-urban phase of the Iron Age, and the Septimontium is associated with the second pre-urban phase of the Iron Age.

As the rites of the Lupercalia can be traced back to the Bronze Age, or perhaps earlier, it can be concluded that the history of the sacerdotal functionaries in charge of the cult, i.e. the history of the Luperci also goes back to the Bronze Age. In Roman times there were originally two collegia, Luperci Quinctiales and Luperci Fabiani.[2] A third collegium, Luperci Julii, was organized in honour of Caesar in 44 B.C., but suspended already in 43 B.C. and not revived by Augustus.[3] When the other two gentilitial collegia were instituted cannot be ascertained. In any case, the fact that the gens Fabia was associated with cults on the Quirinal does not prove that the two groups of Luperci represent two originally separate collegia which were united when the unified city was formed, by means of a synoikismos between the Septimontium and the Quirinal. This is impossible because, as far as we know, there was no festival or cult similar to those of the Lupercalia on the Quirinal: this festival is alone and indissolubly connected with the Lupercal on the Palatine. Wissowa may be right in considering the Luperci Fabiani as a duplicate of the original collegium, and formed, when the city was founded, as a sacred symbol of the unification of the Palatine and the Quirinal[4], and, in that case, the date for

[1] Early Rome III, pp. 460 ff.
[2] Wissowa, op. cit. p. 559.
[3] Loc. cit.
[4] Op. cit. pp. 559 f.

the formation of the two groups of Luperci would be c. 575 B.C., but it is equally possible that the two collegia can be explained as mere instances of the custom to commit the performance of a cult to the care of a certain gens.[1] Gradually, some modifications of ritual details must have been made: let me remind of the smearing of blood from the sacrificed goats on the foreheads of two of the Luperci, which probably is a substitute for an originally more profuse pouring of blood (p. 12), but, on the other hand, much of the original ceremony was preserved — for instance, the nudity of the Luperci, only girt with the skins of the sacrificed goats, and the whipping of women with strips cut from the skins of the goats must be real remains of the original practice.

The Luperci seem to have a longer history in Rome itself than the other pre-urban cult collegia; at least, so far, no other cult organization can be proved to go back to the Bronze Age culture of Rome. We shall now turn to some sacred representatives of the pre-urban Iron Age culture. The rites of the pre-urban festival Quinquatrus included a lustration of arms.[2] This festival enters as a link into a coherent system of feasts forming two calendaric correspondences: one group of feasts in March corresponding to a single festival in October. The Equirria, Quinquatrus and Tubilustrium belong to the March festivals, while the October festival is represented by the Armilustrium.[3] The March group forms the sacred preparation for the war period, and the October festival represents the sacred conclusion of that period. With all these festivals, the Salii were associated, and they took part in the sacred ceremonies by performing their ritual war-dances. There were two corporations of Salii, Palatini and Collini, of which the Salii Palatini were in the service of Mars and, as indicated by their name, connected with the Palatine, while the Salii Collini were associated with the Quirinal and were in the service of Quirinus. Each of these collegia was presided over by its own magister, had its own administration office (the one on the Palatine and the other on the Quirinal), had their own ritual books and protocols.[4] This dualism indicates

[1] Op. cit. pp. 404, 481.
[2] Warde-Fowler, op. cit. pp. 57 ff.
[3] Op. cit. pp. 44 ff., 62 ff., 271 ff., 250 f.
[4] Wissowa, op. cit. pp. 555 ff.

that the origin of the institution of the Salii goes back to a time when the Palatine and the Quirinal were independent communities: an opinion that has already been expressed by several scholars.[1] Another indication of their pre-urban origin is given by the fact that they were represented in several other communities in Latium, in Alba Longa, Lavinium, Tibur, Tusculum, Aricia, Anagnia[2], and there is no evidence that they were introduced to these places from Rome. In Tibur, they were not in the service of Mars or Quirinus, but of Hercules Victor, the principal and protective god of that city[3], and, in Tusculum, they were considered to be earlier than in Rome.[4] Further, there is archaeological evidence that sacred institutions of a similar kind existed in other parts of Italy during periods contemporary with the pre-urban epoch of Rome as shown, for instance, by figurative representations of war-dancers on a bronze vase found in a tomb from the early 7th century B.C. at Bisenzio[5] and by armour, similar to that used by the Salii, found both in Italy and Greece and dating from the time of the early Iron Age, although in part derived from Bronze Age types.[6] Thus there is both direct and indirect evidence of the pre-urban origin of the Salii. Literary tradition about the origin of the Salii is not trustworthy. If we disregard the theories concerning a Samothracian[7], Arcadian[8] or Etruscan[9] origin, the usual tradition assigned the institution of the Salii to Numa (either both the collegia or only that of the Salii Palatini), whereas Tullus Hostilius was sometimes considered the founder of the collegium of the Salii Collini.[10] As we have seen, the institution of the Salii is much older than the canonic tradition stated, and the uncertainty of the

[1] Cf. op. cit. p. 555.
[2] C.I.L. VI, 2170, 2171; X, 5925, 5926; XIV, 390, 391, 2171, 3601, 3609, 3612, 3673, 3674, 3689, 4258.
[3] Macrob. Sat. III, 12, 7 f.; Serv., Ad Aen. VIII, 285.
[4] Serv. loc. cit.: *habuerunt sane et Tusculani salios ante Romanos.*
[5] Vighi and Minissi, Il nuovo Museo di Villa Giulia, Pl. 9.
[6] Mem. Acad. Inscr. et Belles Lettres XXXVII: 2, 1906, pp. 205 ff.; Mél. d'Archéol. et d'Hist. LXX, 1958, pp. 7 ff.
[7] Serv. op. cit., II, 325; Festus (ed. Lindsay), p. 439.
[8] Plut. Numa, 13; Serv. op. cit. VIII, 285, 663; Festus, loc. cit.; Isidor. Etymol. XVIII, 50.
[9] Serv. op. cit. VIII, 285.
[10] Pauly-Wissowa, R.E. I A, 2, Art. Salii, pp. 1875 f.

tradition is explained by the remote origin of the institution in question.

Another group of priests belonging to the same cultural stratum as the Salii is formed by the Flamines. We know that a flamen Palatualis was in charge of the sacrifice called Palatuar[1], performed at the pre-urban festival, Septimontium. As a sacred institution, the flamines are therefore certainly pre-urban, but not all of the 15 flamines (of which we know the names of thirteen) are of such ancient origin. The cult of some deities associated with flamines cannot be proved to be older than the unified city.[2]

The sovereign of this unified city was called *rex*, as we know, but the chief of the pre-urban villages was also probably called *rex*, as can be inferred from the pre-urban festival Regifugium.[3] The formation of that name is characteristic of the pre-urban epoch, as we have seen, and the Salii, whom we know to be of pre-urban origin, were associated with the rites of the Regifugium.[4] The best proof that the rites and the name of this festival were quite incomprehensible to the Romans of the late Republic is the fact that they believed that the expulsion of Tarquinius Superbus was commemorated on this day.[5] The ritual counterpart of this feast was the Poplifugia[6], which was explained as commemorating the flight of the Roman people from an army of Fidenae, after the withdrawal of the Gauls from Rome[7], or as a memorial of the flight of the people after the disappearance of Romulus in the darkness of an eclipse or sudden tempest.[8] These explanations show that even learned scholars of the late Republic did not know much, if anything, about the significance of the rites of the pre-urban festivals. Modern scholars have also tried to interpret these festivals, but our testimonies are too few, our material too scanty,

[1] Festus (ed. Lindsay), p. 476.

[2] Wissowa, op. cit. p. 23.

[3] Warde-Fowler, op. cit. pp. 327 ff.

[4] Festus (ed. Lindsay), p. 346.

[5] Ovid, Fasti II, 685 ff. Ovid quotes probably Varro and common opinion to which Verrius Flaccus refers (Festus, loc. cit.; cf. Paul. Epit. p. 347).

[6] Warde-Fowler, op. cit. pp. 174 ff.

[7] Varro, Ling. Lat. VI, 18; Macrob. Sat. I, 11, 37 (cf. op. cit. III, 2, 14), where the enemies are called Etruscans, but that may be the same version, as the Fidenates were sometimes called Etruscans (Livy I, 15, 1).

[8] Dionys. Halic. II, 25; Plut. Rom. 29.

to allow for safe and definite conclusions. I shall therefore not venture upon a new interpretation of the rites here in question, those of the Regifugium. For our purpose, it is sufficient to know that the name of this festival indicates the existence of chiefs called *reges* in the pre-urban villages of Rome. These pre-urban kings are, and will always be, anonymous and should not be confused with the kings of the unified city, whose names are known to us from Numa Pompilius to Tarquinius Superbus.

To this heortological evidence of the existence of pre-urban kings may be added the archaeological indications of a pre-urban chief, given by the finds in the Esquiline tomb 94, dating from about 650 B.C., and mentioned in the first chapter (p. 20). The festival Regifugium, and the remains of a chariot in the tomb, seem to give us the right to call this chief a king, *rex*. We know that the Etruscan kings took the field in war-chariots. Both actual finds in the tombs and representations in art show that the war-chariot was a royal prerogative.[1] We have seen (pp. 18 f.) that initial influence from the Etruscan culture is already apparent in Rome in the pre-urban Period III or about 700—625 B.C. — that is exactly the period of the burial in the Esquiline tomb 94. The pre-urban festivals, Equirria and Equus October, confirm the use of war-chariots in Rome during that epoch.[2] From the interpretation of the *sella curulis* as the sella placed on the currus, Mommsen inferred that the sovereign of the Archaic period, the rex, had the prerogative also of using a chariot in the city when he was performing his official duties.[3] Helbig has drawn attention to the similarity between the war-chariot of the Archaic period and the chariot used by the *triumphatores*, indicating that this connection was due to the fact that the king, returning home from a victorious war, performed the triumphal procession standing in his war-chariot.[4]

The king must have had some subordinate military officers at his disposal. A study of the organization of the collegium of the Salii may elucidate the question, because this collegium forms the sacred aspect of the army. The collegium was directed by a magister

[1] Mommsen, Röm. Staatsr. I³, pp. 395 f., 398 f., Mém. Acad. Inscr. et Belles Lettres XXXVII:2, 1906, pp. 205 ff.

[2] Warde-Fowler, op. cit. pp. 44 ff., 271 ff.

[3] Mommsen, Röm. Staatsr. I³, pp. 395 f.

[4] Mélanges Perrot, pp. 167 ff.

Romanum, can be assigned, as pointed out above (p. 18), to the first quarter of the 6th century B.C., and the latest finds from the huts beneath the floor of the first Forum Romanum date also from that same quarter.[1] On the other hand, the earliest finds associated with the buildings of the city date from the second quarter of the 6th cent. The latest pre-urban finds are dateable on the basis of their context with Early and Middle Corinthian pottery, as we have seen, and the find-groups from the earliest phase of the unified city can be very closely dated from the Attic and Laconian Black Figure pottery belonging to these groups. In particular, I want to draw attention to the finds from the Temple of Vesta[2], the Sacellum on the Comitium[3], and the cult-place dedicated to Mater Matuta and Fortuna in the Forum Boarium.[4] Everywhere, the sequence of pottery begins 580—560 B.C. Evidently, the life of the city flares up all of a sudden about 575 B.C. Thus there is no doubt that this date is epoch-making in the history of Rome, marking the transition from a primitive and rustic type of habitation to a monumental and urbanistic form of culture. This transformation from 'pagi' to 'urbs' is the real foundation of Rome, in as much as Urbs and Roma are synonymous. This rapid transition from village-habitation to city organization is not a process that took place only in Rome, but should be seen in a wider historical context. We know of the same phenomenon from, e.g. Veii[5], Ardea[6], and Satricum[7], and it was no doubt the normal process when the Iron Age villages of Central Italy were included into Etruscan civilization. In respect of politics, this civilization, as we know, was based on an organization of city-states, and, when the Etruscans became the dominant power in Central Italy, the transformation of the villages into cities was the necessary political effect of the total incorporation of this part of Italy into the Etruscan sphere of dominion.

[1] Op. cit. I, pp. 72 f.
[2] Op. cit. III, pp. 320, 372 ff.
[3] Op. cit. p. 253.
[4] Op. cit. p. 457.
[5] Monum. antichi XL, pp. 177 ff.; Harvard Stud. Class. Phil. LXIV, 1959, pp. 14, 25, n. 5; Pap. Brit. Sch. Rome XXVII, 1959, p. 78.
[6] Boëthius, Ardeatina, in Apophoreta Gotoburgensia Vilelmo Lundström oblata, pp. 346 ff.
[7] Monum. antichi XV, pp. 477 ff.

These conclusions, based upon an interpretation of the archaeological material and the written records which in my opinion contain elements of a genuine and reliable tradition, are interesting and instructive to confront with the canonic and comprehensive view of the origins and foundation of Rome, as represented by the ancient authors, in order to see the evidence — or rather, lack of evidence — for this view, and also to trace, in some cases, the connection between the legendary and the genuine tradition. The latter point of view is important because the Romans knew that most things told about their olden times were stories, and not history. Well known are these words of Livy: "The history of the Romans from the founding of the City of Rome to the capture of the same, at first under kings and afterwards under consuls and dictators, decemvirs and consular tribunes, their foreign wars and their domestic dissensions, I have set forth in five books, dealing with matters which are obscure, not only by reason of their great antiquity — like far off objects which can hardly be described — but also because, in those days, there was but slight and scanty use of writing, the sole trustworthy guardian of the memory of past events, and because even such records as existed in the commentaries of the pontiffs and in the other public and private documents nearly all perished in the conflagration of the city."[1]

In the preface to his work, Livy has declared his own sceptical view on the tales about the origin of Rome, that is the tales of which he subsequently gives a comprehensive summary. His own view he expresses in this way: "Such traditions as belong to the time before the city was founded, or rather was presently to be founded, and are rather adorned with poetic legends than based upon trustworthy historical proofs, I propose neither to affirm nor refute. It is the privilege of antiquity to mingle divine things with human, and so to add dignity to the beginnings of cities; and if any people ought to be allowed to consecrate their origins

[1] Livy VI, 1, 2: *Quae ab condita urbe Roma ad captam eandem Romani sub regibus primum, consulibus deinde ac dictatoribus decemvirisque ac tribunis consularibus gessere, foris bella, domi seditiones, quinque libris exposui, res cum vetustate nimia obscuras velut quae magno ex intervallo loci vix cernuntur, tum quod rarae per eadem tempora litterae fuere, una custodia fidelis memoriae rerum gestarum, et quod, etiam si quae in commentariis pontificum aliisque publicis privatisque erant monumentis, incensa urbe pleraque interiere.*

University of Michigan Library

and refer them to a divine source, so great is the military glory of the Roman people that when they profess that their father and the father of their founder was none other than Mars, the nations of the earth may as well submit to this with as good a grace as they submit to Rome's dominion. But to such legends as these, however they shall be regarded and judged, I shall for my own part attach no great importance".[1] Livy was not a great historian in our modern sense of the word, and it would of course be very anachronistic to put forward such a point of view about him, but he was a person of good judgment and common sense. Although many modern scholars share these good qualities with Livy, and of course do not consider the legendary tales about the origins of Rome as historically trustworthy, opinions are sometimes expressed that there is a remarkable agreement between the traditional date for the foundation of Rome, namely 753 B.C., and the archaeological date for the earliest Iron Age hut-habitation found there, namely the beginning of the 8th century B.C.[2] This approximately chronological agreement is entirely irrelevant because the date 753 B.C. is not based on documentary evidence but only on speculations. This is a well-known fact, and we may therefore content ourselves by referring to some main points of the chronological speculation and the legendary construction.

There are various dates given both by Greek and Roman authors,

[1] LIVY I, Pref. 6—8: *Quae ante conditam condendamve urbem poeticis magis decora fabulis quam incorruptis rerum gestarum monumentis traduntur, ea nec adfirmare nec refellere in animo est. Datur haec venia antiquitati ut miscendo humana divinis primordia urbium augustiora faciat; et si cui populo licere oportet consecrare origines suas et ad deos referre auctores, ea belli gloria est populo Romano ut cum suum conditorisque sui parentem Martem potissimum ferat, tam et hoc gentes humanae patiantur aequo animo quam imperium patiuntur. Sed haec et his similia, utcumque animadversa aut existimata erunt, haud in magno equidem ponam discrimine.*

[2] PALLOTTINO, Le origini di Roma, in Archeol. Class. XII, 1960, p. 9: "Posto che la tradizione accolga, come presumibilmente accoglie, il ricordo dei fatti concernenti il primo addensamento palatino, è possibile che di questi fatti si sia dimenticata totalmente la prospettiva, la misura cronologica, sino al punto di doverla ricercare attraverso un computo puramente fittizio? ... Anche qui ci troviamo dunque di fronte ad una probabile sostanziale convergenza dei fatti dei dati di scavo con la tradizione. Non mi sentirei davvero il corraggio di condividere il giustizio sommario del Gjerstad che attribuisce la coincidenza ad un mero caso, pure chance."

before the Varronian date 753 B.C. finally became generally accepted. When Dionysios from Halikarnassos discusses this subject, he begins with these words: "As there is great dispute concerning both the time of the building of the city and the founders of it, I have thought it incumbent upon me also not to give merely a cursory account of these things, as if they were universally agreed on".[1] Referring to Dionysios from Halikarnassos and to other ancient authors for the various Greek versions as well as to the modern scholars dealing with this subject,[2] I may be brief and it suffices to say that in the Greek legends there is either a woman, usually of Trojan origin, called Romē, after whom the city is named, or a man called Romos who is supposed to be the founder of the city. These legendary figures appear in stories connected with the arrival of Aeneas in Italy, or with that of Odysseus, or with that of a group of Achaeans who, on their return from Troy, were overtaken by a violent storm and landed in Latium, where the captive Trojan women, urged by one of them called Romē, burned the ships, fearing that the Achaeans would carry them into slavery. This latter version seems to be the earliest as it already existed in the time of Hellanikos who associated Romē with Aeneas and made the latter founder of Rome, calling it so in honour of Romē. This would bring the foundation date of Rome to about 1180 B.C.[3] Usually, however, in the Greek legends, the foundation takes place in the second generation after Aeneas and Odysseus.[4]

[1] DION. HALIC. I, 72, 1: Ἀμφισβητήσεως δὲ πολλῆς οὔσης καὶ περὶ τοῦ χρόνου τῆς κτίσεως καὶ περὶ τῶν οἰκιστῶν τῆς πόλεως οὐδὲ αὐτὸς ᾤμην δεῖν ὥσπερ ὁμολογούμενα πρὸς ἁπάντων ἐξ ἐπιδρομῆς ἐπελθεῖν.

[2] For a critical survey of the Greek legends concerning the origin of Rome, I refer to WIKÉN, Die Kunde der Hellenen von dem Lande und den Völkern der Apenninenhalbinsel bis 300 v. Chr., pp. 77, 82, 109, 119, 127 ff., 131, 147, 170 ff.

[3] After the fall of Troy, assigned to 1184 B.C. as confirmed by Eratosthenes who probably accepted the date given by Ktesias, the nostoi of Aeneas were usually considered to have lasted 2 years. In the third year, i.e. 1181 B.C., he founded Lavinium, and in 1180 B.C. he became king of the Latini (cf. LEUZE, Röm. Jahreszählung, p. 85).

[4] We know that NAEVIUS and ENNIUS believed Romulus to be a grandson of Aeneas (SERV. Ad Aen. I, 273; VI, 778) and thus belonging to the second generation after Aeneas. The famous Ennian verses quoted by VARRO, De re rust. III, 1, 2 (*septingenti sunt paulo plus aut minus anni, augusto augurio postquam inclita condita Roma est*) cannot of course be used as an exact indication of the "Ennian date" for the foundation of Rome.

The Romans could not accept such dates in the 12th century B.C. for the foundation of their city. They had their list of seven kings and the date for the introduction of the Republic, somewhat varying due to different redactions of the Fasti, but sometime in the last decade of the 6th century B.C. Starting from these premises, L. Cincius Alimentus assigned the foundation date of Rome to 729 B.C.[1] As the initial date of the Republic, he accepted the year 504 B.C. Further, he seems to have made his calculations on the basis of counting three generations in 100 years, i.e. $33^1/_3$ years for each generation, the ordinary length of a generation in the ancient chronological system, although there are also generations of 35 and 40 years.[2] As Tarquinius Superbus was expelled, his generation was apparently reduced to 25 years. Consequently: 6 generations, each of $33^1/_3$ years equals 200 years, plus 25 years makes 225 years. Adding these to the initial date of the Republic, 504, we obtain 729.[3] In this way, Cincius Alimentus calculated the foundation date of Rome, as it seems without any connection with the arrival of Aeneas and the chronological complications caused by it.[4]

But Aeneas was there, and the problem was how to combine the date for the fall of Troy and the arrival of Aeneas in Italy with the foundation date dictated by the Roman list of seven kings and their initial date of the Republic. One solution mentioned by Dionysios from Halikarnassos[5], and probably derived from a Campanian origin, was to make two foundations of the city, the first city founded a little after the Trojan War, then deserted for some time, and finally founded again many generations later. This solution was rejected by the Romans who only accepted the later foundation of the city and filled up the chronological gap between that and the time of Aeneas with the list of fictitious Alban kings. Their number varied, however, from time to time. In the version used by Vergil, there are, as we know, 3 years be-

[1] Dion. Halic. I, 74, 1.

[2] For the different length of the generations and the chronological system based on it, cf. Burn, Dates in Early Greek History (Journ. Hell. Stud. LV, 1935, pp. 130 f.).

[3] Leuze, op. cit. pp. 97 f.

[4] Op. cit. p. 101.

[5] Dion. Halic. I, 73, 1—3.

tween the arrival of Aeneas in Italy and the foundation of Lavinium, 30 years from that to the foundation of Alba, and then 300 years to the foundation of Rome: in all 10 Alban generations. As the voyage of Aeneas from Troy to Latium was usually estimated to have lasted two years, the foundation date of Rome, according to this version, would be 848 B.C. The same version is used by Pompeius Trogus.[2] This was too early a date for the Roman annalists, and also the date proposed by Timaios, 813 B.C.[3], this date being based on a synchronism of the foundations of Rome and Carthage. For the reasons mentioned, the Romans wanted to date the foundation of the city well down in the 8th century B.C., and a decisive contribution to the accepted solution was taken by Fabius Pictor, who assigned the foundation of Rome to the first year of the 8th Olympiad, i.e. in 748 B.C.[4] — consequently, 3 generations or 100 years later than the version used by Vergil. For Fabius Pictor, as for Cincius Alimentus, the initial date of the Republic was 504 B.C., so that the total sum of the reigns of the kings amounted to 244 or, with inclusive reckoning, 245 years, which corresponds to seven generations, each of 35 years. The foundation dates given by Cato, Polybios, Varro and Dionysios from Halikarnassos all centre around 750 B.C.[5], and the slight variations depend on the slightly different initial date of the Republic. Varro, whose chronological system became canonical, fixed the initial date of the Republic, at 509 B.C., i.e. 5 years earlier than Fabius Pictor. The date for the foundation of Rome had therefore to be fixed 5 years earlier than 748 or 753 B.C. In this way, the holy date of 753 has been created.

If the Greek chronology for the foundation of Rome could not be accepted by the Romans, the same held good, though in a lesser degree, for the eponyms and founders of the city suggested by the Greeks. Of course, the woman called Romē could not be accepted as an eponym, nor was Romos entirely accepted. There was in Rome an old patrician gens Romilia, the ancestor of which must have had the name Romulus. This name, as Romos, is derived

[1] Vergil, Aen. I, 265 ff.

[2] Justinus XLIII, 1, 13.

[3] Dion. Halic. I, 74, 1.

[4] Dion. Halic. loc. cit.

[5] Cam. Anc. Hist. VII, pp. 321 f.

from the same root as Rome, but, contrary to Romos, it is a Roman name. In a typical Roman way, Romos was, however, not rejected as pointed out by several scholars but transformed into Remus, the twin brother of Romulus. Thus this name, too, formed a part of the Roman nominal system, because Remus is the ancestor of the Remmii.[1]

Romulus as an eponym and founder of Rome is no more an historical person than Romos. The birth of Romulus can be assigned to the 4th century B.C., when he is first mentioned by Alkimos[2], and the earliest Roman proof of the legend of the twins is the bronze statue of the she-wolf suckling the twins erected by the Ogulnii at the Lupercal in 296 B.C.[3] By this chronological evidence, the locality of the legend is also indicated: the Palatine, or more precisely the neighbourhood of the Lupercal. Why the Palatine? Evidently because the legend included that element of a migratory tale that consists in putting children in a trough to be carried down a river. The trough carrying the Roman twins on the Tiber had to land on some of the hills close to the river. Of the hills imaginable, the Aventine was excluded because that hill was outside the pomerium until the reign of Claudius.[4] The Capitoline was also outside the earliest pomerium of the city of the four regions[5], and this hill was therefore unfit as a locality for the birth of Rome. There was only one hill close to the Tiber and fit for the purpose: that hill was the Palatine, and the birth-place associated with the legend was the earliest cult-place on that hill, the Lupercal. This place was also brought to notice from another point of view: the etymology met with no difficulty. That the first syllable was the root of lupus, wolf, seemed obvious; the widely spread legends of animals suckling children[6], and among them, those about she-wolves suckling children, were known in Italy, as proved by an early stele from Bologna with relief representation of a child sucking

[1] Roscher, Mythol. Lex. Art. Romulus, Romos, Remus, pp. 164 ff. (Carter).

[2] Wikén, op. cit. p. 181.

[3] Livy X, 23, 12.

[4] Gellius XIII, 14, 7; Fontes ad Topogr. Romae pertinentes, II, pp. 127 ff.

[5] Tac. Ann. XII, 24; Opusc. Rom. I, p. 64.

[6] Frazer, Fasti of Ovid II, pp. 375 ff., has collected interesting material bearing upon the origin of these stories.

a she-wolf.[1] It is not necessary, though possible, that similar Greek myths (for instance, that of Miletos suckled by she-wolves)[2] have contributed to the diffusion of such tales in Italy. However, that the Lupercal was thought to be called so because Romulus and Remus were once suckling a she-wolf there is clearly stated for instance by Ovid who asks in Fasti II, 381 f.: "Perhaps you may also ask why that place is called Lupercal, and what is the reason for denoting the day by such a name?"[3] Ovid answers by telling the story about the exposure of the twins and the she-wolf taking care of them. Thus Romulus was associated with the Palatine, and when he grew up and wanted to found a city, the site chosen for it was the Palatine because he himself had been reared there as Livy says.[4] Romulus was the first king, and, as he founded the city on the Palatine, that must be the earliest city of Rome. One legend creates the other.

But the legend of Romulus and the Palatine is not the only one connected with the foundation of Rome. There is also the supplementary legend of Titus Tatius and the Capitoline. This legend, if interpreted in accordance with the facts known to us, will contribute to our historical conception of the foundation of Rome. Titus Tatius came from the Sabine town Cures.[5] He took the Capitoline and he was in possession of that commanding part of Rome after the treaty of divided kingship with Romulus, while the Romans were reduced to their Palatine hill.[6] Propertius has pictured the political situation in a poetical vision: "What was Rome in those days, when the trumpeter of Cures made the neighbouring cliffs, where Jupiter sits throned, tremble before his longdrawn blast, and when Sabine javelins stood in the Roman Forum, where now laws are given to the conquered world?"[7] In his laconic prose

[1] Monum. antichi. XX, p. 531.

[2] Roscher, op. cit. Art. Miletos, p. 2971.

[3] Ovid, Fasti II, 381 f.: *Forsitan et quaeras, cur sit locus ille Lupercal, quaeve diem tali nomine causa notet.*

[4] Livy I, 7, 3: *Ita solus potitus imperio Romulus; condita urbs conditoris nomine appellata. Palatium primum, in quo ipse erat educatus, muniit.*

[5] Varro, Ling. Lat. VI, 68; Dion. Halic. II, 36, 3; 46, 2; 48, 1.

[6] Livy I, 11, 5—8; 12; Dion. Halic. II, 38—46.

[7] Propertius IV, 4, 9—12.: *Quid tum Roma fuit, tubicen vicina Curetis cum quateret lento murmure saxa Iovis, atque ubi nunc terris dicuntur iura subactis, stabant Romano pila Sabina foro?*

Tacitus refers to the same event: "The Forum and the Capitol, it was believed, were added to the city not by Romulus but by Titus Tatius."[1] The legend, as can be seen from the mentioning of the temple of Jupiter Stator built after a vow in 294 B.C.[2], is fairly late but contains memories of earlier events and can only be understood as a narration, in legendary form, of the foundation of Rome as a union of Latin and Sabine settlements. Let us confront the legend with the facts! We have seen that the archaeological and written records indicate unanimously that the city of Rome was founded as an act of synoikismos between the settlements of the Septimontium and those on the Quirinal and the Viminal, with the Capitoline added as a common stronghold and the Forum Romanum included into the unified city as a civic centre. In the legend, the Septimontium is represented by the Palatine part of it, because in the legend Romulus was associated only with the Palatine. Titus Tatius is, in the legend, associated principally with the Capitoline and the Forum Romanum, and not with the Quirinal. True, after the treaty with Romulus, he incorporates the Quirinal[3], and he is said to have encamped on the Quirinal before conquering the Capitoline[4], but that is not sufficient to connect him with the Quirinal and he is supposed to have had his house all the time on the Arx.[5] If we turn our attention from legend to historic tradition, the view changes, and the Quirinal enters into the picture. Numa Pompilius is the historic counterpart of the fictitious Titus Tatius.[6] Both come from Sabine Cures, both appear as cult organizers.[7] Numa lives on the Quirinal[8], and in the time of Plutarch his house was still shown there. Although it could hardly have been his house, the Sabine origin of Numa, the first king of the unified city, and the numerous ritual and

[1] Tac. Ann. XII, 24: *Forumque et Capitolium non a Romulo sed a Tito Tatio additum urbi credidere.*

[2] Livy X, 36, 11; 37, 15.

[3] Dion. Halic. II, 50, 1.

[4] Varro, Ling. Lat. V, 51.

[5] Solinus I, 21.

[6] Pais, Storia crit. di Roma I: 2, pp. 434, 448, has also emphasized the connection between Titus Tatius and Numa.

[7] Op. cit. p. 448; cf. Dion. Halic. II, 50, 3; Varro, Ling. Lat. V, 74.

[8] Solinus I, 21; Plut. Numa, XIV, 1.

linguistic indications of Sabine elements in Rome[1], as well as the unanimous tradition of Sabines in Rome, cannot be disregarded. Well known is the arrival of Attus Clausus in Rome with a large band of clientes in 504 B.C.[2] Appius Claudius, as he was called in Latin, was enrolled in the Senate and was in a short time regarded as one of its leading members. The gens Claudia had its abode on the Quirinal, as we know from finds of their residence there[3], and they had their tomb at the foot of the Capitoline.[4] Thus they show the topographical connection of the Sabines, both with the Quirinal and the Capitoline, in the same way as *Capitolium vetus* on the Quirinal does.[5] We have seen that the archaeological material of the 8th century B.C. does not indicate a Sabine habitation on the Quirinal, but we have also seen that from the 7th century, in Period III and still more in Period IV, the standardized *koine* of the arts and crafts does not allow a neat distinction between groups of peoples living within the same cultural area. Sabine infiltrations of the same kind as that of Attus Clausus might therefore have occurred during the 7th century B.C. without leaving any trace in the archaeological material. This pacific penetration of Sabines should perhaps not be interpreted as confined only to the Quirinal, but the evidence is in favour of a certain concentration of the Sabine influx on that hill. By the end of the pre-urban period, this gradual Sabine infiltration must have been of such an importance that the Sabines were able to play a dominant role in the formation of the unified city, as shown not only by the fact that the first king, Numa, was of Sabine origin but the succeeding two kings of the pre-Etruscan dynasty were also of Sabine descent: the father of Tullus Hostilius was married to a Sabine woman[6], and Ancus Marcius was the son of a daughter of Numa himself.[7] The Sabine contribution to the foundation of Rome is by no means

[1] Ribezzo, Roma delle origini, Sabini e Sabelli, in Riv. indo-gr.-ital. XIV, 1930, pp. 59 ff.

[2] Livy II, 16, 4; IV, 3, 14; X, 8, 6; Dion. Halic. V, 40, 3—5; Tac. Ann. IV, 9; XI, 24; XII, 25; Suet., Tib. 1, 1.

[3] Jordan-Huelsen, Topogr. Stadt Rom III, p. 420.

[4] Suet. Tib. 1, 1.

[5] Varro, Ling. Lat. V, 158.

[6] Dion. Halic. III, 1, 1 f.

[7] Livy I, 32, 1.

to be interpreted as a conquest of the city. The Latin character of Rome was preserved, as it was also during the dominion of the Etruscan kings, but the legend of the Sabines dominating the Capitoline and the fact that the first three kings were entirely or in part of Sabine extraction indicate the important contribution of the Sabines to the birth of Rome.

3. THE INITIAL DATE OF THE REPUBLIC

During the 3rd century B.C., from the chronicals of the pontifices in particular, that picture of the early history of Rome was formed which in its essential details has been transmitted to us.[1] From the beginning, the Fasti were the chronological backbone of the annalistic description of this history. During the 3rd century B.C. the consuls were eponymous magistrates. The consulate was the supreme magistrate of the Republican state, the consulate embodied the idea of Republican power and it was therefore considered as a matter of course that the consulate and the Republic had been created at the same time. In view of the fact that the consular Fasti began in 509 B.C., the conclusion was drawn that the Republic was introduced that same year. This is easily understood, but still the premises of that conclusion are uncertain. The introduction of the Fasti was a calendar reform, a method of counting years by means of eponymous magistrates, and that is not the same thing as a change of mode of government. This has been emphasized by Hanell in his book Das altrömische eponyme Amt.[2] The Fasti do not prove that the magistrates mentioned in them were created for the first time in 509 B.C., but only that they became eponymous that year. The magistrates may very well have existed before that year as non-eponymous magistrates, in the same way as we know that the archons of Athens existed before 683 B.C. when one of them was made eponymous. An opinion similar to that of Hanell has also been expressed by other scholars, both before and after the publication of his book. We may, for instance, quote Täubler in Tyche (1926), where he says: "So sind in Sparta neben die Könige die Ephoren, in Athen neben den König die

[1] HANELL, Das altröm. eponyme Amt, pp. 54 ff.
[2] Op. cit. pp. 95 ff.

Archonten und ebenso ... in Rom die Prätoren (Konsuln) oder der Prätor getreten; nicht erst auf ihn gefolgt."[1]

Already Mommsen had detected that two traditions originally not associated with each other were connected with the year 509 B.C.[2] One tradition refers to the dedication of the temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus on the Capitoline, and that tradition is connected with one of the consuls of the year, M. Horatius Pulvillus, who dedicated the temple. (I am now using the conventional name, consul, for the eponymous magistrates, but shall return later to the question of their real name.) The other tradition is connected with another of the consuls of the year, the leader of the revolution and the founder of the Republic, L. Iunius Brutus. The dedication of the temple is connected with the calendar reform of 509 B.C., with the introduction of the Fasti. The historical existence of Horatius is therefore confirmed by the Fasti: he represents the original and genuine tradition. It is a different matter with Brutus. A member of the gens Iunia cannot possibly have been one of the supreme magistrates in 509 B.C., a post that was exclusively reserved for the patricians of that time. We know that members of the gens Iunia held plebeian offices during the 5th century B.C. I do not count L. Iunius Brutus, tribune of the plebs in 493 and aedile of the plebs in 492, likewise T. Iunius Brutus, aedile of the plebs in 491 B.C., because they are not entirely free from suspicion of being late inventions[3], but there is no reason whatsoever to suspect the historicity of Q. Iunius, tribune of the plebs in 439 and C. Iunius, tribune of the plebs in 423 B.C.[4] It cannot therefore be argued that the gens Iunia, as some others, was a patrician gens which later became extinct and was then represented only by a plebeian gens. The gens Iunia was plebeian from the beginning, and already represented as such in the 5th century B.C. It is therefore obvious that the name of L. Iunius Brutus as a consul is interpolated, and it cannot have been inserted into the Fasti before the time of the redaction of them which took place in the 3rd century B.C., when the plebeians obtained admittance to the college of pontifices after the passing of the Lex

[1] TÄUBLER, Tyche, p. 205.
[2] MOMMSEN, Röm. Chron. pp. 199 f., 207; HANELL, op. cit. pp. 97 ff.
[3] NICCOLINI, Fasti dei tribuni della plebe, pp. 36 f., 39 f.
[4] BROUGHTON, Magistrates Rom. Rep. pp. 15, 17, 56 f., 68.

Ogulnia in 300 B.C.[1] Towards the end of the 4th century and in the early 3rd century B.C., the gens Iunia played a great political role, and several of its members were dictators, consuls and censors. D. Iunius Brutus Scaeva was magister equitum in 339 B.C. and consul in 325 B.C.,[2] thus obtaining nobility for the gens. His son, D. Iunius Brutus Scaeva was consul in 292 B.C.[3], C. Iunius Bubulcus Brutus was consul in 317, 313, 311, censor in 307 and dictator 302 B.C.[4] His son, C. Iunius Brutus Bubulcus, was consul in 291 and 277 B.C.[5] It seems therefore most probable that as a result of the political power of the gens Iunia during this time, one or some of its members belonging to the college of the pontifices succeeded in inserting the pretended ancestor of the gens as consul of 509 B.C. and the tradition of the introduction of the Republic in the form and version presented to us, with chronological connection with Brutus as consul of 509 B.C., cannot therefore be considered a trustworthy testimony.

This is not, however, the whole problem of the year 509 B.C. In order to penetrate that problem, we have also to study the evidence for the other consuls appearing in the Fasti of that year, namely L. Tarquinius Collatinus, P. Valerius and Sp. Lucretius. In the canonical tradition, as we know, Brutus and Tarquinius were the first consuls elected. Tarquinius soon either abdicated or had his imperium abrogated. As a successor to Tarquinius, P. Valerius was elected consul. Then Brutus was killed at the Silva Arsia in the battle with the Etruscans, and in his place Sp. Lucretius was elected, but, according to Livy, he was not mentioned as consul by some early authors and he died within a few days[6], to be succeeded by M. Horatius Pulvillus, whom some sources mentioned as a direct successor of Brutus, while in other sources used by Polybios he was known as the colleague of Brutus in the first consulate.

[1] NEUMANN, L. Iunius Brutus der erste Consul, in Festschr. z. XLVI. Vers. deutsch. Philol. u. Schulm. 1909, pp. 329 ff., believes that C. Iunius Bubulcus Brutus exercised a decisive influence concerning the creation of the tale of L. Iunius Brutus as consul of 509 B.C.

[2] BROUGHTON, op. cit. p. 147.

[3] Op. cit. pp. 181 ff.

[4] Op. cit. pp. 155, 158, 161, 165, 169.

[5] Op. cit. pp. 182, 194.

[6] LIVY I, 4 f.

Polybios assigns the first treaty between Rome and Carthage to the consulship of L. Iunius Brutus and M. Horatius, and some scholars, accepting that date, have also accepted the treaty as evidence for the consulship of Brutus in 509 B.C., taking it for granted that the eponymous magistrates were mentioned in the treaty. It has, however, been pointed out by Täubler that this can hardly have been the case[1], and Polybios himself seems to me to confirm that the epónyms were not mentioned in the treaty, because he does not include them in his account of the text of the treaty. The source of his dating is therefore probably annalistic and not documentary. Finally, an analysis of the contents of the treaty shows that it must be later than the end of the 6th cent. B.C., that it seems to date from the 4th cent. B.C. and is probably to be identified with that of 348 B.C.[2]

The names of the Fasti are in general authentic, but those of the first year form an exception to the rule. We have already seen that the name of Brutus must be considered interpolated, while that of Horatius is genuine. What about the other names? That the name of Sp. Lucretius is interpolated seems unquestionable: he is not mentioned in the earliest sources as we have seen, and he dies within a few days, having lived long enough to have his name in the Fasti but not too long to prevent the legitimate Horatius from being a consul, and that was good of him. As regards the remaining two names, it must be said that P. Valerius is among the suspect names. He was a consul in 508, 507 and 504 B.C.,[3] and belonged to the powerful Valerian family, who had the interest — as every family — and the capacity — as hardly any other — to place its representative on the tribune of honour as one of the consuls of the first year of the Republic. Tarquinius Collatinus, on the other hand, is not suspect. He plays a dramatic part in the

[1] TÄUBLER, Imperium Rom. p. 271. The objections of HEUSS (Klio, Beiheft XXXI, N.F. 18, 1933, pp. 16 f.) are not convincing.

[2] TÄUBLER, op. cit. pp. 254 ff.; Journ. Rom. Stud. IX 1919, pp. 67 ff. (CARY); Rhein Mus. f. Phil. LXXIX, 1930, p. 373 (SCHACHERMEYR); Rev. Ét. Anc. LIX 1957, pp. 277 ff. (4th cent. B.C., AYMARD); Rhein Mus. f. Phil. CI, 1958, pp. 58 ff. (HAMPL). LAST (Cambr. Anc Hist. VII, pp. 859 ff.) and SCULLARD (Hist. Rom. World, 753—146 B.C.[3], pp. 434 f.) assign the treaty to 509 B.C.

[3] BROUGHTON, op. cit. pp. 5 ff.

story of the revolution. No person was, however, interpolated in the Fasti to serve merely as a name in a good story. The story of the revolution is certainly based on names borne by consuls of the first year of the Fasti, but a name was exclusively interpolated there to glorify the family, and the gens Tarquinia was not existing in Rome when the interpolations of the Fasti took place. Tarquinius Collatinus figures in the Fasti, because he simply is there. He and Horatius are the genuine eponymous magistrates of 509 B.C.

This leads to two conclusions: first, that there were two eponymous magistrates from the beginning of the eponymous list, and secondly, that it is unlikely that Tarquinius Superbus was expelled in 509 B.C. when a member of the family was in charge of the highest office of the State.

Of the persons mentioned as consuls of the first year of the Republic Horatius and Lucretius were not backed by influential families[1] when the foundations of the canonical history of early Rome were laid. Neither of them had therefore a chance to become a legendary leader of the Republican revolution and Tarquinius Collatinus was of course excluded also for other obvious reasons.

There remains, however, P. Valerius who must have been a very strong rival of Brutus as a leader of the revolution, in the same way as he tried to deprive Horatius Pulvillus of the dedication of the temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus, as told by the annalists. Valerius and Horatius drew lots to decide which of them should

[1] The patrician gens Horatia was extinct before the 3rd century B.C., and the patrician gens Lucretia became extinct soon after the Gallic invasions: the praenomen Spurius which is not represented in the patrician gens Lucretia (this praenomen, as a rule, was unusual in the patrician families, cf. Handb. d. klass. Altertumswiss. I², p. 657) but only in the plebeian gens (Sp. Lucretius, praetor in 205 B.C. and his son, Sp. Lucretius, praetor in 172 B.C.), and the fact that the father of Lucretia did not figure in the earliest sources shows that he was not interpolated in the Fasti until the plebeian gens Lucretia had begun to be of some importance, i.e. not until c. 200 B.C. This indicates also that the Lucretia episode is a fairly late part of the revolution legend, and the dramatic-pathetic character of its literary style was possibly due to a drama of one of the early tragedians, either "Brutus" by Accius (Cic. De divin. I, 22, 44) or some other tragedy. In Varro, Ling. Lat. VI, 7; VII, 72, a tragedy "Brutus" by Cassius is mentioned, it may refer to a tragedy by Cassius Parmensis (Schanz-Hosius, Röm. Lit. gesch. I, p. 315) and the name should not therefore be altered to Accius.

dedicate the temple. The lot fell to Horatius, but the friends of Valerius resented that the dedication of this famous temple should be given to the unimportant Horatius and tried all sorts of ways to hinder it, but did not succeed. Finally, they broke in upon the ceremony with news that his son was dead, and declared that, while the shadow of death was over his house, he could not dedicate the temple. Livy says that whether he did not believe the news to be true or possessed great fortitude, we are not informed with certainty, nor, he adds, is it easy to decide. In any case, Horatius did not allow himself to be diverted from his purpose, but finished the ceremony and dedicated the temple.[1] This anecdote reflects the vain attempts by the Valerian gens to deprive Horatius of the honour of dedicating the Capitoline Temple. The only possible explanation for this failure seems to be that the association of Horatius with the dedication of the temple was so firm and inseparable that the Valerians had to resign but I do not think that the name of Horatius was mentioned in the dedicatory inscription on the temple, as asserted by Dionysios from Halikarnassos[2], because this statement is an anachronism and there is no evidence for dedicatory inscriptions on Archaic temples. For the same reason, probably, the Valerians failed in the competition with the Iunians as regards the leadership of the revolution; they fought against a strong tradition, a genuine tradition that was invincible. In my opinion, their failure can only be explained by assuming that, in the oral tradition about the revolution, a prominent role was played by a man of the gens Iunia, and the connection of this Iunius with the events of the revolution was so strong, that he could not be removed and replaced by a Valerius. When the consul L. Iunius Brutus was created, the deeds of the historical Iunius were then attached to that fictitious figure in more and more legendary form. We can guess which political post the historical Iunius was holding: we have seen that some members of the gens Iunia were tribunes of the plebs during the 5th century B.C., and we may therefore assume that he was a tribune of the plebs when he played his role in the drama of the revolution. If the Fasti of the tribunes of the plebs had been without gaps in the 5th century

[1] Livy II, 6—8.

[2] Dion. Halic. V, 35, 3.

B.C., we should perhaps have been able to date the time for the introduction of the Republic fairly exactly, but there are several gaps, and the tribunes of the plebs from the 5th century known to us are either suspect or too late for the probable date of the introduction of the Republic.[1]

Brutus as consul of 509 B.C. has turned out to be a fiction. We have therefore to attempt another way of tracing the approximate and probable initial date of the Republic. To begin with, we must admit that we do not know when the Republic was introduced. Theoretically, it may have been introduced both before and after 509. There is nothing, however, to show that it took place before 509. For an initial date of the Republic after 509, on the other hand, there are several indications, both archaeological and literary, and I shall now turn to them.

I shall first draw attention to the well-known fact that, according to tradition, Tarquinius Priscus started building the temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus on the Capitoline and Tarquinius Superbus completed it, but there is no tradition connecting the king intervening between these two, namely Servius Tullius, with the erection of the temple. Only Tacitus[2] mentions Servius Tullius as having had charge of the construction of the temple, a late and worthless notice evidently created on account of the suspicious omission of this king as a builder of the temple, the more so as this king is otherwise mentioned as a very busy constructor of sacred buildings in Rome. Some scholars[3] say that this is not surprising since notices of the constructions of temples refer only to the vow and the dedication of the temples. In this case, however, both kings are engaged upon the construction of the temple. True Tarquinius Priscus made the vow, but Tarquinius Superbus was not the dedicator. Other scholars[4] are willing to admit that it is strange that the construction of the temple is connected with both Tarquins, since it would make the time of construction very long, according to traditional chronology 75—100 years (the reign of Tarquinius Priscus is dated between 616 and 578 B.C.) These scholars see no way out of the difficulty except by accepting the

[1] Broughton, op. cit. I, pp. 15 ff.
[2] Tac. Hist. III, 72.
[3] Rhein. Mus. f. Phil. C, 1957, p. 91.
[4] Bull. Comun. LXXIV, 1951/52, pp. 49 f.

opinion that the two Tarquins are only a reduplication of one person. The fact that some events and acts in the annalistic novelettes invented about these kings are related to each other and may be regarded as duplicates should not seduce us to believe that the two Tarquins are only reduplications of one person. There is sufficient material to show that the two Tarquins should be considered as two historical individuals. The reasons for the actual duplications are various. Some are due to pure confusion of the acts of one king with those of the other, which is easily explained by their common nomen gentile. Other duplications have to be explained in another way, but it would carry me too far away to go into details. We must admit that it is not an explanation to say that such and such a thing is a duplicate. Assuming a duplicate we have to explain how this duplication came into being. As regards the connection of the two Tarquins with the construction of the temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus, the only possible explanation I am able to give is that the original tradition mentioned a king Tarquinius, i.e. Priscus, as the builder of the temple. As the date of the dedication of the temple fixed by the Fasti at 509 B.C. could not be changed, Tarquinius Superbus, the last king, had also to be connected with the building when in current opinion that year became the first year of the Republic. This explanation is confirmed by a comparison of the different elements of tradition concerning the construction of the temple. In the notices attributing the construction to both the Tarquins, Tarquinius Priscus is in charge of marking out the necessary area for the building[1], while the construction of the temple itself is assigned to Tarquinius Superbus who allotted the spoils from Suessa Pometia for that purpose.[2] There is, however, a notice telling another story. Pliny[3], quoting Varro, informs us that Tarquinius Priscus summoned the

[1] Cic. De rep. II, 20 (36); Livy I, 38, 7; 55. Dion. Halic. III, 69; IV, 59; Tac. Hist. III, 72; Plut. Popl. 14; Macrob. Sat. III, 4, 7 ff.
[2] Cic. In Verr. V, 19, 48; Livy I, 55 f.; Dion. Halic. IV, 59; Tac. Hist. III, 72; Plut. Popl. 14.
[3] Pliny, Nat. Hist. XXXV, 157: *praeterea* (sc. Varro tradit) *elaboratam hanc artem* (sc. plasticen) *Italiae et maxime Etruriae; Vulcam Veis accitum, cui locaret Tarquinius Priscus Iovis effigiem in Capitolio dicandam; fictilem eum fuisse et ideo miniari solitum; fictiles in fastigio templi eius quadrigas, de quibus saepe diximus; ab hoc eodem factum Herculem qui hodieque materiae nomen in urbe retinet.*

Etruscan artist Vulca from Veii and ordered him to make the terracotta cult-statue for the Capitoline temple and also the terracotta quadrigae for the roof. This shows that the temple was under roof in the time of Tarquinius Priscus, and even that the decoration for the exterior was being made then. It connects and synchronizes the reign of Tarquinius Priscus with the artistic activity of Vulca usually assigned to the end of the 6th century B.C.[1] That date cannot be considered as proved, but Varro's statement indicates in any case that the temple was completed during the reign of Tarquinius Priscus, and it is therefore reasonable to assume that the dedication of the temple also took place during his reign or immediately after it. Therefore, one can assume that Tarquinius Priscus was still reigning in 509 B.C., or, in any case, immediately before. The testimony of Varro cannot be put aside. Nor are we entitled to assert that either he or Pliny made a mistake confusing the two Tarquins. We are not entitled to assert that without proving it or making it probable. We are facing two contradictory groups of testimonies and we have to choose. From the point of view of source criticism, the choice is an easy one. Varro's testimony has been given to us as a plain statement without consideration of chronological systems and political contexts. The other group of testimonies is inserted into a fixed chronological system and a historical-political context based upon the view that the Republic was introduced the same year as the temple was dedicated, and the tradition had therefore to be fitted in according to the demands of the accepted chronological system and the current historical opinion. The fact that Tarquinius Priscus was associated with the temple could not be denied, but, as his reign in the accepted chronological system, was assigned to 616—578 B.C., only the preparation of the ground for the temple and the construction of its foundations were attributed to thim, and the rest of the work to Tarquinius Superbus. It is, however, noteworthy that no text that includes the contrived tradition mentions the cult-statue as having been ordered by Tarquinius Superbus, nor does any text of that group connect Vulca with Tarquinius Superbus. In nothing but general terms is this king said to have summoned Etruscan craftsmen from Veii to work on the construction

[1] Pallottino, La scuola di Vulca, p. 24.

of the temple. Only the fictile quadrigae to be placed on the roof were by a single author, viz. Plutarch (who only speaks of one quadriga) connected with Tarquinius Superbus but not with Vulca. It is easy to understand the connection with Superbus. In Plutarch's version, this king ordered the quadriga to be made by some craftsmen in Veii. Before the quadriga was delivered, the king was expelled from the throne. When the quadriga was fired, it expanded instead of shrinking, and this was considered by the Veientines to be an omen foreboding the future greatness of Rome, and, on that account, the Veientines refused to deliver the quadriga to the Romans with the excuse that it had been ordered by Tarquinius Superbus and not by the Romans. Another portent forced the Veientines to deliver the quadriga. It is evident that a principal point in the story narrated by Plutarch would have been lost, if the quadriga had not been connected with Tarquinius Superbus and his expulsion from the throne. So, after all, Plutarch only did what he had to do in order to tell a good story, but he did not do more than was necessary: he did not introduce Vulca into the legend, because that would not have been to the point. The other authors of the second testimony group who did not enter upon this legendary stuff could manage with vague and general terms when dealing with the connections of the Veientine craftsmen and Tarquinius Superbus. To sum up: the testimony of Varro is preferable, because its statement is not dictated by discernable, easily discernable, motives; the contrary is the case with the other testimonies.

The indication that Tarquinius Priscus completed the construction of the temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus is also confirmed by other evidence. The temple, the triumph, the Circus Maximus and the Ludi Magni were united as sacred institutions: the goal of the triumph was the Capitoline temple, and the triumphal procession was followed by the celebration of the Ludi in the Circus Maximus.[1] Both the erection of the Circus and the institution of the triumph and the Ludi Maximi are assigned to Tarquinius Priscus.[2] A further indication of the contemporary construction

[1] Mommsen, Röm. Forsch. II, pp. 42 ff.

[2] Cic. De rep. II, 20, 36; Livy I, 35, 7—9; Dion. Halic. III, 68; Plut. Popl. 16, 1; Aurel. Vict. De vir. ill. 6, 8; Eutrop. 1, 6.

of the Circus and the Capitoline temple is shown in the record that both were built with spoils from Apiolae conquered by Tarquinius Priscus.[1] The triumphal procession surely cannot have taken place before the Capitoline temple was finished and the cult-statue of Jupiter (in whose honour the triumph was given) was erected in its place in the central cella of the temple. This fact caused a chronological conflict between the tradition that ascribed the triumphal institution to Tarquinius Priscus and the dedication of the temple in 509 B.C. considered to be the first year of the Republic. This dilemma was avoided thus: according to Plutarch the triumphal institution was ascribed by some authors to Valerius, one of the consuls of 509 B.C.[2] *Sat sapienti*!

Tradition says that Tarquinius Priscus captured Crustumerium. In Livy II, 19 we read about the event in 499 B.C.: *Fidenae obsessae, Crustumeria capta.* Niebuhr[3] saw that we have here an annalistic notice attached to the Fasti, a notice that has been preserved in its original laconic form. By combining the tradition of Tarquinius Priscus as the conqueror of Crustumerium with the notice in the Fasti about the time of that conquest, we may therefore infer that Tarquinius Priscus still reigned in 499 B.C. It has been said[4] that this is one of the "duplicates" occurring in early Roman history that is sometimes explained as due to iterated events — for instance, a recapture of a region that had been conquered earlier but then lost — and sometimes as due to a projection into an earlier period of events that really took place on a later occasion. There are cases which can be proved to be duplicates of one or other of the categories mentioned, but this particular case does not belong to those. We shall see that there are cases in which events assigned to the Regal period are dated by other evidence to some year in the early half of the 5th century B.C. It does not seem right methodically to consider all these cases as duplicates, without being able to prove them to be so.

The Capitoline temple was a sacred symbol for the new era introduced by the reign of Tarquinius Priscus, and it is therefore

[1] Livy I, 35, 7.

[2] Plut. Popl. 16, 1.

[3] Niebuhr, Röm. Gesch. II, p. 5.

[4] Rhein. Mus. f. Phil. C, 1957, p. 91; Bull. Comun. LXXIV, 1951/52, pp. 50 f.

reasonable to assume that the construction of the temple was begun soon after the initial date of this reign. A temple of the size here in question may have required about 15—20 years to build, if we calculate with a normal speed of construction; and we may therefore fix the initial date of the reign of Tarquinius Priscus at approximately 530—525 B.C. The reigns of the first three kings are thus covered by the time from c. 575 to 530/25 B.C.

Some scholars[1] have objected to these conclusions, and advanced the opinion that the archaeological evidence for the formation of the unified city mentioned above, pp. 33 f., does not refer to that event but to an urbanization of Rome begun by Tarquinius Priscus and continued by his successors. The time before about 575 B.C. is assigned to the earlier part of the Regal period, and the connection of the archaeological evidence for an initial urbanization c. 575 with the reign of Tarquinius would bring that reign in better chronological contact with its conventional date, and it would be possible to maintain that the construction of the Capitoline temple had been begun by Tarquinius Priscus c. 575, almost completed by Tarquinius Superbus at the time of his expulsion, and then dedicated in the first year of the Republic, in accordance with the *opinio vulgata*. As far as I can see, an unanimous archaeological evidence speaks against such an interpretation. We have seen that Rome consisted of a number of primitive hut-villages until about 575 B.C., and it is absolutely incredible that the enormous change from primitivism to monumentality, represented by the Capitoline temple, the largest of its time in Italy, could have happened overnight, so to speak. Archaeological evidence shows that this incredible thing did not happen. Boni's excavations of houses near the temple of Antoninus and Faustina have shown that domestic architecture was still of a modest character in the 3rd quarter of the 6th century B.C., and it is only in the last quarter of the 6th century and in the early 5th century B.C. that houses of a more complicated plan and advanced technique are represented.[2] Sacred architecture shows the same gradual development: the remains of terracotta revetments of the temples dating before the

[1] Arch. class. XII, 1960, p. 35 (Pallottino); Riv. Storica ital. LXXIII, 1961, p. 805 (Momigliano); Cultura e Scuola, 1962, p. 71 (Momigliano).

[2] Early Rome I, pp. 130 ff.

last quarter of the 6th century are all of a small size.[1] The colossal size of the Capitoline temple makes it therefore impossible to assign even its foundations to the time immediately after the hut-habitation. The urbanization process from primitivism to monumentality was rapid in Rome: the astonishing thing is not that this process took 45—50 years, but that it only took such a short time. Finally, it may be pointed out that the written records tell us that some minor shrines had to be demolished when the foundations of the temple of Jupiter were laid.[2] As the excavations on the Capitoline have shown that hill to have been uninhabited until c. 575 B.C. (p. 26), these shrines cannot have been earlier than that date and thus confirm that the foundations of the temple of Jupiter cannot have been laid until some time after 575 B.C.

The necessity of dating the whole construction of the Capitoline temple in the last third of the 6th century B.C., the association of this temple with Tarquinius Priscus as well as the institutions connected with it, the Triumph, the Ludi Magni etc., indicate that the concluding part of the Regal period, the time of Servius Tullius and Tarquinius Superbus, dates from the earlier part of the 5th century, and, in fact, there is both archaeological and literary evidence contributing towards such a date.

Tradition connects Servius Tullius, as we know, with the institution of centuries and the new division of the Romans into tribes. These were originally 21 in number.[3] If we read Livy II, 21, we detect two references to the year 495 B.C.: *Romae tribus una et viginti factae. Aedes Mercuri dedicata est idibus Maiis.* That these again are genuine notices attached to the Fasti is recognizable from the laconic style. Combining the notice about the establishment of the 21 tribes in 495 with the tradition of Servius Tullius as originator of the new tribes and the institution of centuries connected with these tribes, I have concluded that Servius was reigning in 495. It has been argued that the notice about the

[1] Op. cit. III, p. 203, Fig. 127:9; p. 251, Fig. 156; p. 289, Fig. 189; p. 291, Fig. 190.

[2] Only Terminus is said to have refused to allow his cult to be removed from its site when the temple of Jupiter was built and his shrine was therefore preserved in the cella of Jupiter. Later Juventas joined Terminus in this story, her shrine being in the cella of Minerva.

[3] HIRSCHFELD, Kleine Schriften, pp. 248 ff.

21 tribes does not necessarily mean that the new institution of tribes took place in 495, only that the tribes attained the number of 21 in that year. That was the opinion of Kubitschek[1], who thought that there were originally 19 tribes, and that 2 tribes, Claudia and Clustumina, were added in 495. A similar view has also been held by other scholars[2], recently by Lily Ross Taylor.[3] There is, however, no evidence for that view, nor for the one given by Mommsen[4], Beloch[5], and several others, namely that the rustic tribes with gentile names are the earliest, whereas tribus Clustumina is a later addition. It can be proved that the tribus Claudia, i.e. one with nomen gentile, and Clustumina were created at the same time.[6] The most natural interpretation of the notice in Livy II, 21 certainly is that in 495 B.C. 21 tribes were created in Rome, i.e. a new tribal institution comprising 21 tribes was established in that year, and until the contrary has been proved, I think we should accept the most natural interpretation as the preferable one. For an unusual interpretation, particular and cogent reasons are required, but there are no such reasons in this case.

It was mentioned above, p. 25, that for the original Roman calendar of 10 months, the pre-Julian calendar of 12 months was substituted, and that this calendar reform can be assigned to Tarquinius Priscus.[7] This pre-Julian calendar was fitted in with the solar year, not by empirical intercalation as the Numan calendar, but by means of a cyclical insertion of an intercalary month called Mercedonius, and this intercalary system was introduced by Servius Tullius, according to Junius Gracchanus.[8] When did this happen? Varro states that the earliest regulation of the intercalation by means of an intercalary month was that mentioned in the inscription on a bronze column and assigned to 472 B.C., when

[1] KUBITSCHEK, De Rom. trib. orig. (Abh. arch.-epigr. Sem. Univ. Wien III, 1882), p. 14.

[2] DE SANCTIS, Storia dei Rom. II, p. 20.

[3] ROSS TAYLOR, Vot. Districts of Rom. Rep. pp. 6, 36 f.

[4] MOMMSEN, Röm. Staatsr. III³, p. 167.

[5] BELOCH, Röm. Gesch. pp. 268, 270.

[6] Opusc. Rom. III, p. 96.

[7] Acta archaeol. XXXII (forthcoming).

[8] MACROB. Sat. I, 13, 20 f. For a discussion of the different opinions of the Romans about the time of the introduction of the intercalary system, see Acta archaeol. XXXII (forthcoming).

Pinarius and Furius were eponym magistrates.[1] Combining these two parts of the tradition (one of them telling us who introduced the intercalary system, and the other when it was introduced) we may thus conclude that the intercalary cyclical system was introduced by Servius Tullius in 472 B.C., and we may thus sum up the Roman calendar reforms in the later part of the Regal period: the 12-month calendar and the Fasti were introduced by Tarquinius Priscus, and the cyclical intercalation by his successor, Servius Tullius.

Turning now to the archaeological evidence for dating the reign of Servius Tullius, I first want to mention that Roman tradition is unanimous in assigning the construction of a fortification agger across the Quirinal, Viminal and Esquiline to Servius Tullius, and Tarquinius Superbus is said to have strengthened this fortification by raising the agger and widening the ditch in front of it.[2] In several places on the Quirinal and the Esquiline, remains of an agger have been found that is earlier than the Republican city-wall of 378 B.C. The earlier agger is in part cut through by the stone revetment of the Republican wall, in part covered by earth of the Republican agger. Roman tradition does not know of any construction of fortifications between the time of the late Regal period and that of the Republican city-wall in 378 after the Gallic invasion. An interesting fact is that the earlier agger shows two distinct building periods, which agrees with tradition assigning the construction of the agger of the Regal period to Servius Tullius and to Tarquinius Superbus, as just mentioned. From the agger of the second period, no finds are reported; in the agger of the first period, some fragments of roof-tiles and pottery were found. True, the exactly dateable pottery consists only of one Attic Red-figure sherd — in quantity, the smallest possible evidence, but in quality, very good evidence, as it provides a safe dating between 520 and 470 B.C. *Terminus post quem* is thus 520 B.C. As the vase may reasonably be supposed to have been used some time before it was broken and the fragments happened to get into the fill of the agger, the upper chronological limit for the construction of the agger and

[1] Macrob. loc. cit. Varro's statement is discussed in Acta archaeol. XXXII (forthcoming).

[2] Livy I, 44, 3; Dion. Halic. IV, 54, 2.

for the reign of Servius Tullius is therefore indicated to be about 500 B.C.[1]

The next piece of archaeological evidence is based on a large quantity of dateable material found in the excavations of the temples of Mater Matuta and Fortuna in the Forum Boarium.[2] We know that these temples were burnt in 213[3] and restored in 212 B.C.[4] It is further recorded that the temple of Mater Matuta was restored and dedicated by Camillus in 395[5], and both temples were built, according to tradition, by Servius Tullius.[6] Excavations in the area of these temples have so far elucidated the architectural history of one temple beneath the level of those rebuilt in 212 B.C. The earliest remains of the temple — which thus must be that built by Servius Tullius — belong to the third floor of the Forum Boarium, and this floor can be assigned to the early 5th century B.C.,[7] on the basis of the pottery found beneath it. Such a chronology is also confirmed by the date of the architectural sculptures belonging to this temple: the style of these sculptures assigns them to the early 5th century, perhaps as late as 475 B.C.[8] This temple has been repaired, and the restored temple belongs to the 4th level of the Forum Boarium dating to the early 4th century B.C. and thus identifiable with that rebuilt by Camillus in 395 B.C. The close agreement between the literary and the archaeological testimonies, and the clear archaeological evidence indicating a date in the early 5th century for the temple built by Servius Tullius, seem to me a noteworthy argument for assigning the reign of Servius Tullius to the time mentioned.

A fixed point for the chronological determination of the reign of Tarquinius Superbus is given by the notice preserved by the written records that this king built a temple to Semo Sancus which was dedicated in 466 B.C.[9] It seems unlikely that the dedication

[1] Early Rome III, pp. 32 ff.
[2] Op. cit. pp. 378 ff.
[3] Livy XXIV, 47, 15.
[4] Livy XXV, 7, 6.
[5] Livy V, 19, 6; 23, 7.
[6] Livy V, 19, 6; Dion. Halic. IV, 27, 7.
[7] Early Rome III, p. 458.
[8] Loc. cit.
[9] Dion. Halic. IX, 60.

of a sanctuary already constructed would be postponed for at least more than 40 years. In this temple, there were several objects connecting it with its builder, for instance, the *foedus Gabinum*[1], the treaty inscribed on a wooden shield covered by ox-hide and settling the relations between the Romans and Gabii, which had been conquered by Tarquinius Superbus, further a bronze statue of Tanaquil, her distaff and spindle.[2] This is an indication that Tarquinius Superbus reigned in the middle of the sixties of the 5th century, or perhaps, more correctly, his reign cannot have ended much before 466 B.C., in view of the fact that we do not know from this testimony whether he was still king or not at the time of the dedication of the temple: both the *foedus Gabinum* and the other objects mentioned may have been placed in the temple a short time before its dedication.

A piece of evidence referring to all of the last three kings is the occurrence of Etruscan names for the Roman magistrates recorded by the Fasti. It has been said that all, or almost all, of the eponymous magistrates from 509 to about 450 B.C. bear Latin names.[3] First of all, we should bear in mind that Rome, even during the reigns of the Etruscan kings, remained a Latin city. The Tarquins ruled Rome as Roman kings, making use of Roman state organization and of Roman magistrates to a large extent. It is indeed astonishing that the number of Etruscan magistrates is not less than it is: in 509, L. Tarquinius Collatinus is eponymous magistrate, in 506 and 490 that office is held by Sp. Larcius, in 501 and 498 by T. Larcius, in 506 by T. Herminius. This year consequently both the eponymous magistrates were Etruscans. In 497 T. Larcius was magister populi. This is the first group of Etruscan magistrates. The second group of Etruscan names begins with P. Volumnius, eponymous magistrate in 461, includes further L. Tarquitius who was magister equitum in 458 B.C., and Lars or Sp. Herminius, eponymous magistrate in 448 B.C. After that year there are no longer any Etruscans as Roman magistrates. This is remarkable, and so also is the fact that the Etruscan names do not appear at random in the Fasti, but are concentrated in

[1] Dion. Halic. IV, 58.
[2] Pliny, Nat. Hist. VIII, 194; Plut. Quaest. Rom. 30.
[3] Bull. Comun. LXXIV, 1951/52, p. 51.

two chronological groups, the first one covering the time from 509 to 490 B.C., the second one from 461 to 448 B.C., while in the time between the two groups, there is no Roman magistrate with an Etruscan name. It can be seen that the two groups of magistrates with Etruscan names coincide approximately with the reigns of the two Tarquins, as I suggested, and the intermediate period is represented by the non-Etruscan king Servius Tullius.[1]

There are not only these indications for the continuation of the Regal period towards the middle of the 5th century B.C., but there are also indications of a general character.[2] We have first the evidence of cultural history. During the Regal period, Rome was subject to a gradually intensified influence from Etruscan culture. No change in this cultural situation is marked by the year 509. Etruscan art continued to flourish in Rome until about 450 B.C. At that time, contact with the Etruscan high culture is suddenly broken.

Secondly, the evidence for a decline of Etruscan dominion towards the middle of the 5th century B.C. In 474, the Etruscans were beaten by Hieron of Syracuse in a naval battle at Cumae[3], but their dominion in Campania was still maintained by communication over land. In 445, Campania was lost for them through the Samnite invasion.[4] It seems unlikely that Rome would have freed itself from the Etruscan dominion as long as that was not broken in Campania, but it is more likely that this happened in connection with the collapse of the Etruscan dominion south of Rome, as pointed out by Kornemann.

Thirdly, there is the evidence concerning internal politics. In 509 there were quiet and peaceful days in Rome, as far as we know. About 450, on the other hand, there were turbulent times as shown by the realization of the demands for a codification of the law in 451, by the abrogation of the prohibition of marriage between patricians and plebeians in 445, by the establishment of the military tribunate in 444 and of the censorship in 443 B.C. — all this indicating a social and constitutional revolution, a time much more

[1] Opusc. Rom. III, pp. 101 f.
[2] For these indications, which will be set out in detail in Early Rome IV and V, cf. for the time being Bull. Comun. LXXIII, 1949/50, pp. 25 f.
[3] Pind. Pythica I, 138—40.
[4] Diod. XI, 51.

fitting for the introduction of the Republic than 509, when we only know that the Capitoline temple was dedicated and calendaric reforms were carried through.

If the Regal period is in this way extended into the first half of the 5th century B.C., it has been thought strange by some scholars that the kings and their deeds do not figure in the history of that part of the 5th century, and equally strange that the eponymous magistrates mentioned in the Fasti of that same period do not figure in the narrations of the history connected with the kings. These peculiarities are explained if we realize that the history of the kings and that of the early part of the 5th century were written out under the impression that the Republic was introduced in 509. The period of the kings had therefore to be placed before that year and, accordingly, the annalists could not possibly let persons assigned by the Fasti to the early part of the 5th century figure in the history of the kings. *Vice versa*, the kings could not be allowed to reign after they had been expelled in 509. The annalists did their best, and they cannot be blamed for not having done better. They used the oral tradition about the deeds of the kings as the nucleus of their narrations of the Regal period, and the meagre tradition was supplemented by their imagination. For the time after 509, the Fasti formed the necessary backbone of the annalistic account of the historical events. In consequence, the eponymous magistrates mentioned by the Fasti had to be connected with these events and had to play a central role in the narration of them. In this case, too, the genuine oral tradition together with short notices added here and there in the Fasti and a few preserved inscriptions (which, however, could hardly be understood by the annalists) were completed and adorned by stories invented from their joy of fabulizing. Thus the contrived early history of Rome was created, and had to be created on account of the fictitious initial date of the Republic. An accomodation however can never be complete, and there are, as we have seen, several notices which are in conflict with the canonical conception of the history in question. These notices must be assumed to be trustworthy testimonies.[1]

In Livy II, 2,1 we read the following passage concerning the

[1] Opusc. Rom. III, p. 102.

proceedings taken in sacred matters after the introduction of the Republic: "Matters of worship then received attention. Certain public sacrifices had habitually been performed by the kings in person, and so that their absence might nowhere be regretted, a *rex sacrificulus* was appointed".[1] This is entirely in accordance with the accomodated history. In order to restore the historical reality, we have to exchange the *rex sacrorum* for a real king and make him the sovereign of the Roman state until about the middle of the 5th cent. B.C. It may be asked: what will become of the Roman history of the early part of the 5th century when the monarchy is extended to include that time, usually considered to be the initial phase of the Republic? The answer is that all the records bearing on that part of Roman history and proved to be trustworthy tradition will remain as they were before and, as before, they will form the documentary material for our conception of that history. We have only to change our point of view and to interpret the material accordingly. The two magistrates mentioned in the Fasti as eponymous remain the supreme magistrates of the state as before, but the king is the sovereign. The magistrates who became eponymous in 509 B.C. were subordinate to this sovereign after 509 as they had been before that date. One of these magistrates was most probably called praetor, but there were at least three praetors and, in his capacity of eponym being in rank superior to his colleagues, he was called *praetor maximus*.[2] We have met the praetor already in the pre-urban epoch as a military commander subordinate to the king, and his military function must still have been of primary importance. Who was the other eponymous magistrate? In view of the military functions of the praetor, it seems likely that the other eponymous magistrate was also a military commander, and I would therefore suggest that he was the chief commander of the mounted soldiers, the *celeres*. We know that there were probably three *tribuni celerum*.[3] Late sources mention also a chief of all the *celeres*, with three *tribuni celerum* as subordinate commanders. Dionysios from Halikarnassos

[1] Loc. cit.: *Rerum deinde divinarum habita cura; et quia quaedam publica sacra per ipsos reges factitata erant, necubi regum desiderium esset, regem sacrificolum creant.*

[2] Hanell, op. cit. pp. 156 ff.

[3] De Francisci, Primordia civitatis, pp. 542 ff.

calls this chief 'hegemon'.[1] On the other hand, Iunius Brutus is called *tribunus celerum* by Livy, when he speaks of him as the chief of the mounted soldiers.[2] Whatever his title was, it cannot be doubted that there was a chief for the mounted soldiers corresponding to the praetor maximus as chief for the infantry.[3] This is also confirmed by the way of arranging the military command of extraordinary character to which I shall return presently.

The military functions of the two eponymous magistrates were thus of primary importance, but, as time went on, it seems likely that they, as the Athenian archons, increased their authority in relation to that of the king, and the more complicated the state administration became, the more they and the other functionaries in the public service were used in various branches of the civil administration, and extended their influence far beyond their original sphere of activity. From having originally been servants and assistants of the king, these functionaries became state magistrates.[4] A theory has been advanced that the Roman king during the later part of the Regal period had lost almost all his political and military power, and had properly only retained his sacred functions, a Roman parallel to the last Athenian kings[5], but there is no evidence, as far as I can see, that the power of the Roman king had been reduced to that extent. The picture of Tarquinius Superbus as a tyrant is a copy of Greek prototypes, as has been pointed out many times, and most of the events associated with the other kings, too, are not historically trustworthy, but there are

[1] Dion. Halic. III, 39, 2, 3; 40, 4; 41, 4; IV, 3, 2.

[2] Livy I, 59, 7.

[3] Alföldi, Der frühröm. Reiteradel, p. 90; de Francisci, op. cit. pp. 544 f.

[4] De Francisci, op. cit. pp. 764 ff.

[5] For the different opinions on this matter, cf. Mazzarino, Dalla monarchia allo stato repubblicano, pp. 87 ff., 178 ff. Evolution and revolution do not exclude each other. Mazzarino, op. cit. p. 179, has quite rightly emphasized that point: "Nulla avviene, che non sia giustificato o postulato da una 'esigenza', ossia da un generico processo evolutivo; e questa esigenza non diventa 'atto', senza una volontà operante, che non sia tanto determinata, quanto positivamente attiva, sopratutto, cioè a dire del passaggio dalla monarchia alla repubblica in Roma: c'è qualcosa di vero o nella teoria 'rivoluzionaria' e in quella 'evoluzionista'; la prima ci avvicina di più ai 'fatti', la seconda al senso o al significato dei 'fatti'".

exceptions to the rule. The traditions of the wars waged by Tullus against Alba[1], by Ancus against Politorium, Tellenae, Ficana[2], by Tarquinius Priscus against Apiolae, Collatia, Corniculum, Ficulea, Cameria, Crustumerium, Ameriola[3], and by Tarquinius Superbus against Gabii[4], bear the impress of truth. Only the wars against Alba and Gabii are dramatized, and both these cities were renowned historically, above all, Alba; but Alba must have been destroyed at an early date, because the Alban patrician gentes appear already in the first half of the 5th century B.C. (the Cloelii, Curiatii, Geganii, Iulii, Quinctii, Servilii)[5] and the treaty with Gabii is, as we have seen, firmly connected with the temple of Semo Sancus built by Tarquinius Superbus. All the other cities mentioned are of no historical fame, most of them were forgotten at an early date, and their conquest is mentioned in a matter of fact way, often laconically, always without novelistic padding. There seems to be no reason whatsoever to doubt the authenticity of these events. Neither can any good reason be found why the new division into tribes and the institution into centuries should have been falsely ascribed to the initiative of Servius Tullius, although the later division of the centuries into five classes, and other features, have also been ascribed anachronistically to that king.

That the kings were military chiefs is also proved by the fact that when they had to leave Rome for military operations, a *praefectus urbi* was appointed as the representative of the king, in charge of the administration of the law and other urgent business, as Tacitus says.[6]

A clear evidence that the king was the supreme leader in war, even in the later part of the Regal period, is provided by the institution of triumphs by Tarquinius Priscus, as mentioned before. The triumphator used to wear the dress of the king, and the king

[1] Livy I, 28, 33; Dion. Halic. III, 31; Strabo V, 231; Serv. Ad Aen. II, 113.

[2] Livy I, 33, 1; Dion. Halic. III, 37 ff., 43.

[3] Livy I, 35, 7; 38; Dion. Halic. III, 49 ff.

[4] Livy I, 53, 4—55, 10; Dion. Halic. IV, 53 ff.

[5] Livy I, 30, 2.

[6] Tac., Ann. VI, 11: *qui ius redderet ac subitis mederetur;* Livy I, 59, 12; Mommsen, Röm. Staatsr. I³, p. 45; de Francisci, op. cit. pp. 415, 597 f.

must therefore have been the triumphator during the Regal period, This means that he was in possession of auspicia and imperium, because triumph and auspicia belong together[1]. The person in possession of the auspicia is triumphator, irrespective of whether he or one of his officers with *imperium mandatum* had gained the victory.

When the king left Rome, for military operations he appointed a praefectus urbi, as mentioned, to be his vicegerent in the city. On the other hand, when the king could not take the field, either because he was ill or had to attend to questions of a political or sacred nature in Rome, he appointed a vicegerent as a supreme military commander, and this vicegerent was the *magister populi* or, as he was later called, the dictator. This has been made clear by Hanell, de Francisci and several other authors.[2] The question is only what authority the dictator had during the Regal period. During the Republic, his position is known: he was in full possession of auspicia and imperium, and the ordinary supreme magistrates were not removed from office but became subordinate to the dictator. It can hardly have been so in the Regal period, because then the king would have been subordinate to his vicegerent. I suppose therefore that the king retained the auspicia, and that the *magister populi* had an *imperium mandatum*. The relations between the king and the magister populi were therefore probably similar to those between the dictator and the ordinary supreme magistrates in the Republican period. As an instance we may choose the situation which arose in 431 B.C., when Aulus Postumius Tubertus was appointed dictator. One of the eponymous magistrates — Livy calls them consuls — was left behind to protect the city. The dictator and the other consul, Titus Quinctius, set out from Rome to meet the enemy, the dictator encamping with his troops near Tusculum and the consul near Lanuvium. The victory of the latter is thus described: "He had been victorious when consul under the auspices of dictator Postumius Tubertus".[3]

[1] MOMMSEN, Röm. Staatsr. I³, pp. 130 f. The first triumphs celebrated by persons without auspicium were those of the two legates of Caesar, Q. Fabius Maximus and Q. Pedius, in 45 B.C.; see MOMMSEN, loc. cit. n. 4.

[2] HANELL, op. cit. pp. 191 ff.; DE FRANCISCI, op. cit. pp. 598 ff.

[3] LIVY IV, 41, 11: ... *consul auspicio dictatoris Postumi Tuberti ... res prospere gesserat.* A similar system was practised during the principate:

In the same way as a magister populi was appointed for the infantry a magister equitum was appointed by the king as the chief of the mounted soldiers, with imperium mandatum as the magister populi. In Republican times, when the latter was in full possession of auspicia and imperium, he appointed the magister equitum, as we know, but in my opinion de Francisci is right in assigning that act of appointment to the king during the Regal period[1], because that is the only conceivable procedure in view of the king's position as sovereign of the state and supreme commander of war.[2]

The constitutional change marking the transition from the kingdom to the Republic c. 450 B.C. did not, however, bring a satisfactory solution of the social tension between the patricians and the plebeians. One of the principal aims of the plebeians was admittance to the supreme magistracy. As shown by the Fasti, the new Republican supreme magistracy, the military tribunate, was in principal not inaccessible to the plebeians, but the patricians were still as a rule able to keep exclusive possession of it. The plebeian names appearing in the Fasti between about 450 and 366

Monum. Anc. 4: ... *res a [me aut per legatos] meos auspicis meis* ...; SUET. Aug. 21: *Domuit autem partim ductu, partim auspiciis suis Cantabriam* ...; TAC. Ann. II,41: ... *recepta signa cum Varo amissa ductu Germanici, auspiciis Tiberii*...

[1] DE FRANCISCI, op. cit. p. 612. Trustworthy tradition states that T. Larcius was the earliest magister populi known in Rome, but there is a slight disagreement about the date. In a paper now in print (Homm. A. Grenier), I have come to the conclusion that the year of his dictatorship was not 501 but 497 B.C. In any case, it is interesting to see that the earliest magister populi was of Etruscan origin and that he was in that service in one of the last years of the reign of Tarquinius Priscus, in accordance with the chronology here proposed. This makes his dictatorship on a line with the eponymous magistrates of Etruscan origin, during the time of that king, and therefore more plausible in that political milieu than if we suppose that the Etruscan kings were expelled from Rome in 509 B.C. and that an Etruscan dictator had been appointed there about a decade after the expulsion of the Etruscan kings.

[2] We know that, in the ordo sacerdotum, the *rex sacrorum* was the first in rank: *maximus videtur rex* (FESTUS, ed. Lindsay, p. 198), and the reason for that is significant: *Rex quia potentissimus* (loc. cit.). This conception of the kingdom cannot, however, be explained by the formal rank of the king in the *ordo sacerdotum*, but must be considered as a survival from the time when the king was *potentissimus* in the proper sense of the word, i.e. when he was sovereign of the state, in possession of political power.

B.C. have been considered as interpolated[1], but without good reason. They do not appear at random, but form a significant pattern in two principal groups, the one between 400 and 396 B.C.[2] during the Veian war and the other one between 388 and 379 B.C.[3] during the crisis following the Gallic invasion of 390 B.C. Otherwise there are no plebeian names, except in 444 B.C., L. Atilius[4], and in 422 B.C., Q. Antonius[5], and both these years are marked by critical moments for Rome, conflicts with Ardea, the Aequi and Volsci, although of a less serious character than the Veian war and the catastrophe after the Gallic invasion, when the great number of more than 20 plebeian names appear. The plebeians were thus admitted to the supreme magistracy, but as an exception, in times when social disintegration was dangerous for the state and national coalition was needed. By these temporary admittances to the supreme magistracy, the final victory of the plebeians could not be deferred for a long time, and, in fact, it was confirmed by the Licinian-Sextian laws in 366 B.C., introducing the Roman Republic in its classical form. The time between c. 450 and 366 B.C. represents the initial phase of the Republic, a transitional period between the kingdom and the classical Republic.

---

[1] Beloch, Röm. Gesch. p. 253.

[2] In 400 B.C.: P. Licinius Calvus, L. Titinius Pansa, P. Maelius Capitolinus, L. Publilius Philo (Broughton, op. cit. I, p. 84); in 399 B.C.: Cn. Genucius Augurinus, L. Atilius Priscus, M. Pomponius Rufus, C. Duillius Longus, Volero Publilius Philo (Broughton, op. cit. p. 85); in 396 B.C.: L. Titinius Pansa, P. Licinius Calvus, P. Maelius Capitolinus, Cn. Genucius Augurinus, L. Atilius Priscus (Broughton, op. cit. p. 87).

[3] In 388 B.C.: L. Aquilius Corvus (Broughton, op. cit. p. 98); in 383 B.C. M. Trebonius (Broughton, op. cit. p. 103); in 379 B.C.: C. Sextilius, M. Albinius, L. Antistius, P. Trebonius, C. Erenucius (Genucius?; Broughton op. cit. p. 106).

[4] Livy IV, 7.

[5] Livy IV, 42.