

Zeitschrift: Entretiens sur l'Antiquité classique
Herausgeber: Fondation Hardt pour l'étude de l'Antiquité classique
Band: 13 (1967)

Artikel: The origins of the Roman Republic
Autor: Gjerstad, Einar
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-660744>

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist die Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften auf E-Periodica. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Zeitschriften und ist nicht verantwortlich für deren Inhalte. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern beziehungsweise den externen Rechteinhabern. Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen sowie auf Social Media-Kanälen oder Webseiten ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. [Mehr erfahren](#)

Conditions d'utilisation

L'ETH Library est le fournisseur des revues numérisées. Elle ne détient aucun droit d'auteur sur les revues et n'est pas responsable de leur contenu. En règle générale, les droits sont détenus par les éditeurs ou les détenteurs de droits externes. La reproduction d'images dans des publications imprimées ou en ligne ainsi que sur des canaux de médias sociaux ou des sites web n'est autorisée qu'avec l'accord préalable des détenteurs des droits. [En savoir plus](#)

Terms of use

The ETH Library is the provider of the digitised journals. It does not own any copyrights to the journals and is not responsible for their content. The rights usually lie with the publishers or the external rights holders. Publishing images in print and online publications, as well as on social media channels or websites, is only permitted with the prior consent of the rights holders. [Find out more](#)

Download PDF: 04.04.2026

ETH-Bibliothek Zürich, E-Periodica, <https://www.e-periodica.ch>

EINAR GJERSTAD

The Origins of the Roman Republic

It is now a fact that a detailed study of the problems suggested by the origin of the Roman Republic.

The pre-Republican period comprises two principal periods: the pre-urban epoch and the epoch of the Archaic City.

The earliest remains of the pre-urban epoch discovered within the boundaries of ancient Rome date from the Chalcolithic period and belong to a settlement on the Aventine. Bronze Age remains have also been found on the Esquilines and in the Volturnum valley, between the Palatine and the Capitoline. Although the material from these periods is still insufficient in quantity, it is historically important by proving that there was uninterrupted habitation in Rome from the early half of the 2nd millennium B.C. down to c. 700 B.C. when Iron Age tribes settled there.

The pre-urban epoch of the Iron Age can be divided into two phases, the first phase dating from the 8th cent. B.C. and the second phase from 700 to 575 B.C. The cultural pattern of the first phase may be summed up in this way: primitive communities of small farmers and shepherds living in scattered villages of wattle-and-daub huts on the hillsides, with their means of earning a livelihood based on the principles of natural economy and domestic industry, moving about in groups to new places when necessary for their sustenance, all the time continuing their traditional and secluded life, without contact with the world beyond the nearest Italic regions.

In the second phase, settlement extended to the valleys between the hills, but there was no tendency towards urbanization of the villages. As before, the dwellings

THE ORIGINS OF THE ROMAN REPUBLIC

A survey of the pre-Republican history of Rome is needed as a basis for a discussion of the problems connected with the origins of the Roman Republic.

This pre-Republican history comprises two principal periods : the pre-urban epoch and the epoch of the Archaic City.

The earliest remains of the pre-urban epoch discovered hitherto within the boundaries of ancient Rome date from the Chalcolithic period and belong to a settlement on the Esquiline. Bronze Age remains have also been found on the Esquiline and in the Velabrum valley, between the Palatine and the Capitoline. Although the material from these periods is still inconsiderable in quantity, it is historically important by proving that there was uninterrupted habitation in Rome from the early half of the 2nd millennium B.C. down to c. 800 B.C. when Iron Age tribes settled there.

The pre-urban epoch of the Iron Age can be divided into two phases, the first phase dating from the 8th cent. B.C. and the second phase from 700 to 575 B.C. The cultural pattern of the first phase may be summed up in this way : primitive communities of small farmers and shepherds, living in scattered villages of wattle-and-daub huts on the hilltops, with their means of earning a livelihood based on the principles of natural economy and domestic industry, moving about in groups to new places when necessary for their sustenance, all the time continuing their traditional and secluded life, without contact with the world beyond the nearest Italic regions.

In the second phase, settlement extended to the valleys between the hills, but there was no tendency towards urbanization of the villages. As before the dwellings

consisted of primitive wattle-and-daub huts and the villages were not yet united into a single community, but were situated on either side of a brook running across the Forum valley to the Tiber. The topographical connection of the Janus monuments with the Forum brook and the association of Janus Medius with war and peace show that this water-course had once been a frontier. Agriculture and cattle-breeding were still the economic basis of the villages of the second pre-urban phase. Professional handicraft became a successful competitor to domestic industry, but trade had not yet become an economic factor of importance and there is no evidence of overseas trade. Only towards the end of the pre-urban epoch there are signs of an incipient inland trade. In spite of a certain technical advancement in handicraft production, the incipient economic and social differentiation of the society, the economic, political and cultural pattern of this society remained essentially the same as before. We are in the concluding phase of the pre-urban epoch and not in the initial stage of the epoch of the Archaic City¹.

For the epoch-making transformation of the villages into a single community of urban character, a city, the archaeological evidence is clear and ample. In the intersection between the previous villages, a market-place, a civic centre, was laid out, the first Forum Romanum. To make room for the forum the pre-urban huts existing at that place and dating from the end of the pre-urban epoch were demolished and the pebble floor of the forum was laid immediately on top of the levelled remains of the huts. Regular streets were constructed and another market-place, the Forum Boarium, was laid out near the Tiber harbour, this latter forum also placed on top of demolished huts from the end of the pre-

¹ For the pre-urban epoch, see *Early Rome* IV, pp. 25-329, the summary, pp. 330-348 and *Acta archaeol.* XXXVI, 1965, pp. 1 ff.

urban epoch. Temples were erected, to begin with of modest size, but adorned with figurative or non-figurative terracotta sculptures : art sculpture made its entry into Rome, where only primitive sacred images had existed in the pre-urban epoch. Frank Brown's excavations of the Regia have shown that the earliest walls of that building, the cult premises of the rex, the sovereign of the city-state, are founded directly on remains of huts dating from the end of the pre-urban epoch ; further, the earliest finds from the Temple of Vesta, from the Sacellum on the Comitium, and from the cult-place dedicated to Fortuna and Mater Matuta on the Forum Boarium are associated with Greek Attic and Laconian pottery assignable to 580-560 and with architectural terracottas dating from second quarter of the 6th cent. B.C. Both the final date of the pre-urban remains and the initial date of the earliest objects connected with cult-places and buildings of the Archaic City are thus linked together, without a chronological gap. No doubt this transformation and unification of the pre-urban villages into a city are the real foundation of Rome in as much as Urbs and Roma are synonymous.

The city founded c. 575 B.C. was not defended by a continuous enceinte. A city-wall was not built before the early 5th cent. The urbanization started in the centre of the city. A well-known proverb says that all roads lead to Rome ; but in Rome itself all roads lead to the Forum Romanum : all the principal streets from the different parts of the city met there like a cobweb. It is a significant fact that the foundation of Rome was not connected with the construction of a fortification wall of the city, but with its civic centre. The Forum Romanum is the birth-place of Rome. It extends on both sides of the earlier frontier between the pre-urban villages. Thus the pre-urban frontier was removed and the political significance of the foundation of the city was expressed by the location of this forum.

The urbanization was, however, not only an event but a process. Starting in the centre it extended gradually to the periphery of the community. This is not only shown by the date of the city-wall, but also by the fact that architectural terracottas dating from the first phase of the Archaic city have only been found in the centre of the city, whereas the terracottas found in the peripheral parts of the city are nowhere earlier than its second phase, that is about 530-500 B.C. It is also self-evident that all the huts existing at the time of the foundation of the city did not disappear at once. This is shown by hut remains assignable to the initial phase of the Archaic City and found at the Sacra Via and also in other parts of the city. Towards the middle of the 6th cent. B.C., however, wattle-and-daub huts were no longer normal dwellings for the Roman citizens, who instead lived in houses built on stone foundations, with walls of sun-dried bricks, revetted with painted stucco and covered by tiled roofs ¹.

This general and rapid change from primitive villages to a city-like community, from wattle-and-daub huts to advanced house and temple architecture, from artless sacred images to art sculpture included also a change of the economic basis of the society. If we compare the quantity of Greek pottery imported into Rome during the time of the Archaic City with that of the pre-urban epoch, we find that during the whole pre-urban epoch of the Iron Age, covering a period of about 225 years only 28 vases of Greek origin have been found in Rome, whereas in the period of the Archaic city, lasting about 125 years, the number of Greek vases so far found in Rome amounts to 451. The small number of Greek vases found in pre-urban Rome

¹ The archaeological material bearing upon the foundation of the City is published in *Early Rome* IV, pp. 349-581, the summary, pp. 581-599, and in *Acta archaeol.* XXXVI, 1965, pp. 22 ff.

indicates no regular and direct commercial connections with Greece. The situation changed immediately after the foundation of the Archaic city. The culmination is reached in the 30 years between 530 to 500 B.C., when 203 vases are imported. The import from Greece shows some decrease between 500 and 450 B.C. but is still of considerable quantity, being represented by 145 vases¹. By comparison with the amount of Greek pottery imported to the principal cities of Etruria it becomes evident that the overseas trade of Rome was of the same dimensions as that of the biggest Etruscan cities². Overseas trade as an important economic factor is thus a feature that characterizes Archaic Rome.

After about 450 B.C. the commercial connections with Athens were reduced to a minimum. This is illustrated by the fact that only 2 Attic Red-Figured vases assignable to 450-420 have been found in Rome, marking a real hiatus in the middle of the 5th cent. B.C., and it is not until the end of the 5th cent. that the commercial connections with Greece slowly begin to revive again³.

As shown by the archaeological evidence mentioned, the foundation of Rome is a union, a political *synoikismos* of the two village settlements on either side of the frontier brook, the later Cloaca Maxima. This is entirely in agreement with the Roman legend both about the battles between the Sabines of Titus Tatius and the Latins of Romulus fought in the frontier area of the later Forum Romanum and the unification of the settlements after the battles. That the inhabitants on the Quirinal were Sabines and those on the other side of the frontier were Latins is also in agreement with the legend. The subsequent removal of the Sabine

¹ *Early Rome* IV, pp. 514 ff.

² VILLARD, *La céramique grecque de Marseille* (Bibl. écoles franç. d'Athènes et de Rome, fasc. 195), p. 124.

³ *Early Rome* IV, pp. 517 f.

king, on the other hand, and the installation of the Latin king as the sole sovereign of the state belong, of course, entirely to the fictitious part of the legend, as Romulus and Titus Tatius themselves. In reality the Sabine Numa was the first king of the unified city and there are indications that the Sabines played a dominant role in the formation of the city¹. Another important factor not mentioned by the legend is the role played by the Etruscans for the foundation of Rome. About 700 B.C. a culture of city-state structure was introduced into Italy for the first time by the Greeks and the Etruscans. When the Etruscans became the dominant power in Central Italy, the transformation of the earlier villages into cities was the necessary political effect of the total incorporation of this part of Italy into the Etruscan sphere of dominion. The foundation of the Roman city-state is therefore by no means a unique phenomenon. After all, about the same time as the pre-urban villages of Rome were moulded into a city-state, other Archaic cities were founded in Latium, having evolved like Rome from villages into cities and for the same reason². This does not mean that Etruscans all the time were supreme rulers of Rome and the other cities in Latium: that country was only a transitional area for the Etruscans on their way to fertile Campania, and the list of the Roman kings from Numa to Tarquinius Superbus indicates that four kings were of Latin or Sabine origin and that Etruscans, represented by the two Tarquins, were supreme rulers only occasionally.

I think the list of the kings is authentic³, although several scholars doubt it. There may be opportunity to return to this problem in the discussion after my lecture. Here I only wish to emphasize that all archaeological evidence assigns

¹ *Scripta Minora Reg. Soc. Hum. Lund.*, 1960-1961: 2, pp. 41 ff.

² *Etruscan Culture*, p. 148.

³ *Historisk Tidskrift*, 1949, pp. 327 ff.

the foundation of Rome to about 575 B.C., that, accordingly, *ab urbe condita* is the time after that date and that the reign of Numa cannot be dated earlier than about 575 B.C.

Another fixed point is given by the date of the temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus on the Capitoline and the ceremonies connected with it¹. According to tradition Tarquinius Priscus started building the temple 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 mentions Servius Tullius as having had charge of the construction of the temple², a late and worthless notice, evidently created on account of the suspicious omission of this king as one of the builders of the temple. Some scholars say that this is not surprising, since notices of the constructions of temples refer only to the vow and the dedication of the temples³. In this case, however, both the Etruscan kings are engaged upon the construction of the temple. True, Tarquinius Priscus made the vow, but Tarquinius Superbus was not the dedicator. Other scholars 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. These scholars see no way out of the difficulty except by adhering to the opinion that the two Tarquins are only a reduplication of one person and that Tarquinius Superbus alone built the temple. The fact that some events and acts in the annalistic novellae 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.

¹ *Scripta Minora Reg. Soc. Hum. Lund.*, 1960-1961 : 2, pp. 50 ff.

² *Tac. Hist.* III, 72.

³ *Rhein. Mus. f. Phil.* C, 1957, p. 91.

There is sufficient material to show that the two Tarquins should be considered as two historical individuals. The reasons for the actual reduplications 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 Capitoline temple, the only possible explanation I am able to give is that the original tradition mentioned a king Tarquinius, namely 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 temple and of laying its foundations¹, while the rest of the construction is assigned to Tarquinius Superbus². There is, however, a notice telling another story. Pliny, quoting Varro, informs us that Tarquinius Priscus summoned the Etruscan artist Vulca from Veii and ordered him to make the terracotta cult-statue for the Jupiter temple and also the terracotta quadrigae on

¹ Cic. *De rep.* II, 20 (36); Liv. I, 38.7; 55; Dion. Halic. III, 69; IV, 59; Tac. *Hist.* III, 72; Plut. *Popl.* 14; Macrobian. *Sat.* III, 4, 7 ff.

² Cic. *In Verr.* V, 19, 48; Liv. I, 55 f.; Dion. Halic. IV, 59; Tac. *Hist.* III, 72; Plut. *Popl.* 14.

the roof¹. This shows that the temple was already roofed in the time of Tarquinius Priscus and even that the decoration for the exterior was being made then. If the temple was completed in the reign of Tarquinius Priscus, as indicated by Varro's statement, it is reasonable to assume that the dedication of the temple also took place during the reign of that king or immediately after it. Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that 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 not difficult. Varro's testimony has been given to us as a plain statement without consideration of chronological questions and political context. 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 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 him and the rest of the work to Tarquinius Superbus. It is, however, noteworthy that no text of this contrived tradition mentions

¹ Plin. *Nat. Hist.* XXXV, 157: *praeterea* (sc. Varro tradit) *laboratam hanc artem* (sc. plasticen) *Italiae et maxime Etruriae; Vulcam Veiis accitum, cui locaret Tarquinius Priscus effigiem in Capitolio dicendam; 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.*

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 of the temple. Only the fictile quadrigae to be placed on the roof are by a single author, namely 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 baked, it expanded instead of shrinking, and this was considered by the Veientes to be an omen foreboding the future greatness of Rome and, on that account, the Veientes 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 Veientes 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 others of the second group of testimony 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.

That Tarquinius Priscus completed the construction of the Jupiter temple is also confirmed by other evidence.

The temple, the triumph, the Circus Maximus and the Ludi Magni are 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 Maximus¹. Both the erection of the Circus, the institution of the triumph, and the Ludi Magni are assigned to Priscus². A further indication of the contemporary construction of the Circus and the Capitoline temple is shown by the record that both were built with spoils from Apiolae conquered by Tarquinius Priscus³. The triumphal procession surely cannot have taken place before the Capitoline temple was finished and the cult-statue of Jupiter was erected in its place in the central cella of the temple. The tradition that ascribed the triumphal institution to Priscus caused a chronological conflict when the reign of that king was dated between 616 and 578 B.C. and the year of the dedication of the temple was 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.⁴ *Sat sapienti!*

Tradition says that Tarquinius Priscus captured Crustumerium. In Livy II, 19 we read about the events in 499 B.C.: *Fidenae obsessae, Crustumeria capta*. Niebuhr⁵ saw that we have here a documentary notice attached to the *Fasti* of the *pontifices* and 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 date of that conquest, we may infer that Tarquinius

¹ MOMMSEN, *Röm. Forsch.* II, pp. 42 ff.

² Cic. *De rep.* II, 20, 36; Liv. I, 35.7-9; Dion. Halic. III, 68; Plut. *Popl.* 16, 1; Aurel. Vict. *De vir. ill.* 6, 8; Eutrop. 1, 6.

³ Liv. I, 35.7.

⁴ Plut. *Popl.* 16, 1.

⁵ NIEBUHR, *Röm. Gesch.* II, p. 5.

Priscus still reigned in 499 B.C. It has been said¹ that this is one of the "duplicates" occurring in early Roman history that is sometimes explained as due to repeated events—for instance, the 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. We know that there are cases which can be proved to be duplicates of one or other of the categories mentioned, but this case cannot be proved to be such a duplicate.

Some scholars² have advanced the opinion that the archaeological evidence for an urbanization of Rome about 575 B.C. does not refer to the foundation of the city but to an urbanization begun by Tarquinius Priscus and continued by his successors. The earlier part of the Regal period, covering the reigns of Numa, Tullus, and Ancus, should therefore be assigned to the time before 575 B.C. In this way it would be possible to bring the reign of Tarquinius Priscus in better chronological contact with the conventional date of that reign and in this way it would be possible to maintain that the construction of the Capitoline temple had been begun by Tarquinius Priscus about 575 B.C., 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*. The urbanization has, however, also been brought into connection with Servius Tullius³, as that would bring it in still better chronological accordance with the conventional dates of the reigns of the kings: the reign of Servius Tullius, as we know, was fixed between 578 and 534 B.C. The idea lying behind these

¹ *Rhein. Mus. f. Phil.* C, 1957, p. 91; *Bull. Comun.* LXXIV, 1951/52, pp. 50 f.

² *Arch. class.* XII, 1960, p. 35; *Riv. stor. ital.* LXXIII, 1961, p. 805; *Cultura e Scuola*, 1962, p. 71.

³ *Studi etruschi* XXXI, 1963, p. 15.

views is obviously that the conventional dates of the reigns of the kings are trustworthy or approximately so. We have seen that archaeological evidence shows that Rome consisted of pre-urban hut-villages until about 575 B.C. and it is absolutely incredible that the enormous change from primitivism to architectural 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. Domestic architecture was still of a modest character in the 3rd quarter of the 6th cent. B.C. and it is only in the last quarter of that century and in the early 5th cent. that houses of a more complicated plan and advanced technique are represented¹. Sacred architecture shows the same gradual development: both the actual remains of the temples and their terracotta revetments dating before the last third of the 6th cent. are all of small size². Even the idea of the colossal Capitoline temple is inconceivable before the last third of the 6th cent. On the other hand, its construction cannot have begun later, since it was dedicated in 509 B.C. The process of urbanization 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.

The period of the Archaic City before the last third of the 6th cent. is represented by sanctuaries and cults which do not indicate Etruscan origin or associations. The Regia³ and the Temple of Vesta⁴ date both from the initial phase of the city, and in tradition the construction of their earliest

¹ *Early Rome* I, pp. 130 ff.

² *Op. cit.*, III, p. 203, Fig. 127: 8, 9; p. 251, Fig. 156; p. 289, Fig. 189; p. 291, Fig. 190.

³ *Op. cit.*, IV, pp. 383 f.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, III, pp. 320, 372 ff.

buildings are connected with Numa¹. The cult of Vesta is represented in Latium but there are no sure traces of a Vesta cult outside Latium², in any case not in Etruria. In the Regia there was a *sacrarium Martis* and a *sacrarium Opis Consivae*³, but the principal cult was that of Janus and the *rex sacrorum* was his special priest⁴. All the deities gathered within the precinct of the Regia are thus non-Etruscan, as Vesta, and their cults are certainly even of pre-urban origin, which was the case with many cults practised in the early phase of the Archaic City.

Turning from these sanctuaries in the Forum Romanum to those on the Capitoline hill we find supplementary evidence for a pre-Etruscan initial phase of the Archaic City. In fact, the earliest temple on the Capitoline built by an Etruscan king of Rome is the temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus. Tradition tells us that there were shrines of other deities on the site intended for this temple, and that these cults were removed when the Jupiter temple was built, except that of Terminus⁵. There was, however, another Jupiter temple on the Capitoline considered to be earliest in Rome, namely the temple of Jupiter Feretrius. It was said to have been built by Romulus, which means that it was assigned to a time immediately after the foundation of the city⁶. The temple was enlarged by Ancus Marcius⁷.

¹ Plut. *Numa*, 11, 14; Dio Cass. fr. 5.3; Festus 320 L.; Dion. Halic. II, 66.1; Ovid. *Fasti* VI, 262 ff.; Solinus I, 21. The occasional reference to Romulus as founder of the Temple of Vesta is only based on secondary consideration (Pauly-Wissowa, *RE*, Vesta, p. 1724).

² *Op. cit.*, pp. 1720 ff.

³ Varro, *De ling. lat.* VI, 21; Festus, 202 L.; Dio Cass. XLIV, 17.2; Gellius IV, 6.2.

⁴ Varro, *De ling. lat.* VI, 12; Ovid. *Fasti*, I, 318.

⁵ Dion. Halic. III, 69; Festus, 160 L.; Liv. I, 55.3 f.; Ovid. *Fasti* II, 667 ff. Later Iuventas joined Terminus in this story.

⁶ Liv. I, 10.5, 6; IV, 20.3; Plut. *Rom.* 16; Dion. Halic. II, 34.

⁷ Liv. I, 33.8.

The cult was aniconic, an indication of its great age : the cult object was a sacred flint-axe, a symbol of the thunderbolt, and the god is therefore also called Jupiter Lapis. That an early state cult was represented by this god is shown by the fact that he formed the central part of the old Roman triad, Jupiter, Mars and Quirinus, existing before the triad of Jupiter, Juno and Minerva worshipped in the Etruscan Capitoline temple. The old triad was a sacred symbol of the foundation of the city. Mars and Quirinus represent the Palatine and Quirinal villages united into the city of Jupiter. When *spolia opima* were offered, and in the ritual of the Fetiales, Jupiter Feretrius or Lapis forms together with Mars and Quirinus the triad of gods involved. The same triad is also represented in the ritual of the Salii, the Latin-Sabine *sodalitates* of Mars and Quirinus¹. Janus and Vesta at the Forum Romanum formed a sacred unit with the old Roman triad on the Capitoline, illustrated even in Late Republican times by the order of precedence of the supreme priests : *rex sacrorum*, the *flamines maiores* and the *pontifex maximus*. The *rex sacrorum*, the special priest of Janus, represented that god ; the *flamines maiores* represented the triad Jupiter, Mars and Quirinus ; the *pontifex maximus*, the legal representative of the Vestals, was therefore considered and called *sacerdos Vestae*². This central group of Latin and Sabine cults associated with sanctuaries and institutions assignable to the earliest phase of the city proves that Roman tradition of a pre-Tarquinian city is right, a city governed by Latin and Sabine kings : Numa, Tullus and Ancus.

Professor Frank Brown's excavations of the Regia have produced further chronological confirmation. On top of the earliest modest Regia buildings, temples of a more

¹ Wissowa, *Rel. u. Kultus d. Röm.*², pp. 117 f., 555.

² *Op. cit.* pp. 503 f.

monumental character were erected with foundations of huge blocks of cappellaccio, 3 ft. long¹. In Archaic Rome cappellaccio blocks of these dimensions are only used for the construction of one other building, namely the Temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus². It cannot therefore be doubted that these two buildings are approximately contemporaneous. The new Regia is dated by its antefixes assignable to about 530-525 B.C.³, thus confirming the date for the construction of the Jupiter temple on the basis of other evidence.

The necessity for dating the whole construction of that temple in the last third of the 6th cent. B.C., the association of the 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, belongs to the first half of the 5th cent. and, in fact, there is both archaeological and literary evidence for such a date.

Tradition connects Servius Tullius, as we know, with the institution of centuries and the new division of the Roman territory into tribes. No good reason can be found why this 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 been ascribed anachronistically to that king. The new tribes were originally 21 in number⁴. 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 pontifical notices attached to the *Fasti* is recognizable from their laconic style, and they appear as simple facts

¹ Information from Prof. Frank Brown.

² *Early Rome* III, p. 174.

³ Information from Prof. Frank Brown.

⁴ HIRSCHFELD, *Kleine Schriften*, pp. 248 ff.

without any context what-so-ever with the annalistic stories told by Livy to have happened that year. Combining the notice about the establishment of the 21 tribes in 495 with the tradition of Servius Tullius as originator of the new tribes we may infer that Servius Tullius was reigning in 495 B.C. It has been argued that the notice about the 21 tribes does not necessarily mean that the new institution of the tribes took place in 495, only that the tribes attained the number of 21 in that year¹, but cf. Livy VI, 8 about the new tribes added in 387 B.C.: *Tribus quattuor ex novis civibus additae, eaeque viginti quinque tribuum numerum explevere*. The only natural interpretation of the notice in Livy II, 21 certainly is that in 495 B.C. 21 tribes were created in Rome. For an unusual interpretation particular and cogent reasons are required, but, as far as I can see, there are no such reasons in this case.

There is also archaeological evidence for dating the reign of Servius Tullius in the early 5th cent. The earliest temple of Fortuna and Mater Matuta on the Forum Boarium was built, according to tradition, by Servius Tullius². The earliest remains of this temple belong to the third floor of the Forum Boarium and this floor can be assigned to the early 5th cent. B.C. on the basis of the pottery found beneath it³; such a chronology is also confirmed by the date of the architectural sculptures belonging to this temple: the

¹ KUBITSCHKEK, *De Rom. trib. orig.* (Abh. arch.-epigr. Sem. Univ. Wien III, 1882) p. 14; DE SANCTIS, *Storia dei Rom.* II, p. 20; ROSS TAYLOR, *Vot. Distr. of Rom. Rep.*, pp. 6, 36 f. Some scholars, e.g. MOMMSEN (*Röm. Staatsrecht*³, III, p. 167), BELOCH (*Röm. Gesch.*, pp. 268, 270) and others are of opinion that Tribus Clustumina has been added to the 16 rustic tribes considered to have gentile names. ALFÖLDI (*Early Rome and the Latins*, pp. 296 ff.) has shown that some of the tribes have local names; he rejects the notice in Liv. II, 21, about the 21 tribes in 495 B.C. and advances a theory on the establishment of these tribes without any support of the sources.

² Liv. V, 19.6; Dion. Halic. IV, 27.7.

³ *Early Rome* III, p. 458.

style of these sculptures assigns them to a date not earlier than about 480 B.C. ¹.

Roman tradition is unanimous in assigning the construction of a fortification agger to Servius Tullius, and Tarquinius Superbus is said to have strengthened this agger by raising its height and widening the ditch in front of it ². 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 of 378 B.C. In several places remains of an agger have been found that is earlier than that of the city-wall of 378 B.C. It is interesting that this earlier agger shows two distinct building periods which agrees with tradition assigning the construction of the pre-Republic agger to the two kings Servius Tullius and Tarquinius Superbus ³. From the agger of the second period no finds are reported. In the agger of the first period some Late Archaic 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. ⁴. As the vase must 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 for the reign of Servius Tullius cannot therefore be earlier than about 500 B.C.

A fixed point for the chronological determination of the reign of Tarquinius Superbus is given by the notice of the written records that this king built a temple to Semo Sancus which was dedicated in 466 B.C. ⁵. It seems unlikely that

¹ *Loc. cit.*

² Liv. I, 44.3; Dion Halic. IV, 54.2.

³ *Early Rome* III, pp. 32 ff.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, p. 40.

⁵ Dion. Halic. IX, 60.

the dedication of a sanctuary already constructed would be postponed for at least 40 years. In this temple there were several objects connecting it with its builder, for instance, the *foedus Gabinum*¹ inscribed on a wooden shield covered by ox-hide and settling the relations between Rome and Gabii, which had been conquered by Tarquinius Superbus. This is an indication that this king reigned in the sixties of the 5th cent. B.C.

A piece of evidence referring to all of the last three kings in the occurrence of Etruscans as Roman magistrates recorded by the *Fasti*. First of all, we should bear in mind that Rome even during the reigns of the Etruscan kings, remained a Latin city and that the Etruscan kings 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 beginning with P. Volumnius, eponymous magistrate in 461, includes further L. Tarquitius who was *magister equitum* in 458 and Lars or Sp. Herminius who was eponymous magistrate in 448. After that date the Etruscans disappear as Roman magistrates. This is remarkable and still more the fact that the Etruscan names do not appear at random in the *Fasti* but are concentrated in two chronological groups, the first one covering the time from 509 to 490 and the second one from 461 to 448 B.C. It can be seen that these two groups of magistrates with Etruscan names coincide approximately with the chronological evidence

¹ *Op. cit.*, IV, 58.

for the reigns of the two Tarquins just mentioned and the intermediate period is represented by the non-Etruscan king Servius Tullius ¹.

It may be asked : what will become of the Roman history of the first part of the 5th cent. if the Regal period 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. In order to restore historical reality we have to exchange the *rex sacrorum* for a real king and make him the sovereign in the Roman state until about the middle of the 5th cent. B.C. The two magistrates mentioned in the *Fasti* as eponymous remain the supreme magistrates of the state, but the king is the sovereign. These 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 *praetores*, and in his capacity of eponymous being in rank superior to his colleagues, he was called *praetor maximus* ². 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 ⁴ of all the *celeres*, with three

¹ *Opusc. Rom.* III, pp. 101 f.

² HANELL, *Das altröm. eponyme Amt*, pp. 156 ff.

³ DE FRANCISCI, *Primordia civitatis*, pp. 542 ff.

⁴ Dion. Halic. III, 39.2 f. ; 40.4 ; 41.4 ; IV, 3.2.

tribuni celerum as subordinate commanders. 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, as Alföldi has pointed out¹. 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 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, as emphasized by De Francisci². A theory has been advanced that the Roman kings during the later part of the Regal period—even if that is supposed to have ended 509 B.C.—had lost almost all their political and military power and had properly only retained their sacred functions, a Roman parallel to the last Athenian kings³, but there is no evidence, as far as I can see, that the power of the Roman kings had been reduced to that extent. The picture of Tarquinius

¹ ALFÖLDI, *Der frühbröm. Reiteradel*, p. 90 ; DE FRANCISCI, *op. cit.*, pp. 544 f.

² DE FRANCISCI, *op. cit.*, pp. 764 ff.

³ 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 e 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, soprattutto, cioè a dire del passaggio dalla monarchia alla repubblica in Roma : c'è qualcosa di veroe nella teoria rivoluzionaria e in quella evoluzionista ; la prima ci avvicina di più ai fatti, la seconda al senso e al significato dei fatti ”.

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 exceptions to the rule. The traditions of the wars waged by Tullus against Alba¹, by Ancus against Politorium, Tellenae, Ficana², by Tarquinius Priscus against Apiolae, Collatia, Corniculum, Ficulea, Cameria, Crustumium, Ameriola³, and by Tarquinius Superbus against Gabii⁴, 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 cent. (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.

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 a representative of the king, in charge of the administration of the law and other urgent business, as Tacitus informs us⁶.

¹ Liv. I, 28, 33; Dion. Halic. III, 31; Strabo V, 231; Serv. *Ad Aen.* II, 113.

² Liv. I, 33.1; Dion. Halic. III, 37 ff.; 43.

³ Liv. I, 35.7; 38; Dion. Halic. III, 49 ff.

⁴ Liv. I, 53.4—55.10; Dion. Halic. IV, 53 ff.

⁵ Liv. I, 30.2.

⁶ Tac., *Ann.* VI, 11: *qui ius redderet ac subitis mederetur*; Livy I, 59.12; MOMMSEN, *Röm. Staatsrecht*³, I p. 45; DE FRANCISCI, *op. cit.*, pp. 415, 597 f.

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 ascribed to Tarquinius Priscus, as mentioned before. The *triumphator* used to wear the dress of the king, and the king 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 together¹. The first triumphs celebrated by persons without *auspicia* were those of the two legates of Caesar, Q. Fabius Maximus and Q. Pedius, in 45 B.C.² The person in possession of the *auspicia* was *triumphator*, irrespective of whether he or one of his officers 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 others³. 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

¹ MOMMSEN, *op. cit.*, pp. 130 f.

² *Op. cit.*, p. 130, n. 4.

³ HANELL, *op. cit.*, pp. 191 ff.; DE FRANCISCI, *op. cit.*, pp. 598 ff.

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: *consul auspicio dictatoris Postumi Tuberti... res prospere gesserat*¹.

In the same way as a *magister populi* was appointed for the infantry a *magister equitum* was appointed by the king as a 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 to the king during the Regal period², because that is the only conceivable procedure in view of the king's position as sovereign and supreme commander of war. We know that in the *ordo sacerdotum*, the *rex sacrorum* was the first in rank: *maximus videtur rex*, and the reason for that is significant: *Rex quia potentissimus*³. This conception of the kingdom cannot 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, that is, when he was sovereign of the state, in full possession of *auspicia* and *imperium*, of political power.

¹ Liv. IV, 41.11. A similar system was practised during the principate: *Monum. Anc.* 4: ... *res a [me aut per legatos] meos auspiciis 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...*

² DE FRANCISCI, *op. cit.*, p. 612.

³ Festus, 198. L.

Trustworthy tradition states that T. Larcus was the earliest *magister populi* known in Rome. The year of his dictatorship was 497 B.C.¹ It is interesting that the earliest Roman *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 proposed by me. This sets his dictatorship on a line with the eponymous Roman magistrates of Etruscan origin and therefore more plausible in that political milieu than if we suppose that Tarquinius Superbus was expelled from Rome in 509 and that an Etruscan *dictator* was appointed there about a decade after the expulsion of the kings.

Political events of an external and internal kind brought an end to this regime of declining kingdom about the middle of the 5th cent. B.C. Numerous written and archaeological sources give evidence of this statement. We know that the demands for a codification of the law were realized in 451, that prohibition of marriage between patricians and plebeians was abrogated in 445, that the military tribunate was established in 444 and the censorship in 443 B.C. There is also reason to believe that the assembly of the tribes, the *comitia tributa*, was constituted about the middle of the 5th cent. B.C. In the Twelve Tables the *comitiatus maximus*² probably refers to the *comitia centuriata*, constituted in about 495 B.C. In any case *maximus* indicates that the three kinds of assemblies existed about the middle of the 5th cent. B.C., and the constitution of the *comitia tributa* at that time is also indicated by the notice that the quaestors who previously had been nominated by the chief representative of the state were elected by the assembly of the tribes for the first time in 447 B.C.³ All this indicates a social and constitu-

¹ *Hommages Albert Grenier*, pp. 757 ff.

² *Leg. XII tab.* IX, 1.

³ *Tac. Ann.* XI, 22: *Sed quaestores regibus etiam tum imperantibus instituti sunt, quod lex curiata ostendit ab L. Bruto repetita. Mansitque consulibus potestas deligendi,*

tional change about 450 B.C., and a considerable success for the political aspiration of the plebeians. This change of the social and political structure of the Roman state is chronologically connected with the end of the Etruscan regime in Latium and the expulsion of its last king, Tarquinius Superbus. We have seen that this king still reigned in the 460's, but in 453 B.C.¹ a Syracusan expedition to Elba and Corsica showed the collapse of Etruscan power. The Samnite invasion of Campania in 438/7 B.C. is a further confirmation of that fact². The expulsion of Tarquinius Superbus should be seen in this historical context: as already mentioned, the last Etruscan magistrate in Rome is recorded by the *Fasti* for the year 448 B.C. Thus there is chronological concordance between the internal and external causes for the origins of the Roman Republic. Archaeological material affords supplementary evidence. Etruscan art, in sculpture and architecture, continues in Rome during the first half of the 5th cent. B.C., but contact with Etruscan art is suddenly interrupted at the middle of that century. A similar phenomenon is shown by the overseas trade with Greece. It has already been emphasized that this trade was still flourishing during the first half of the 5th cent. but was suddenly broken at the middle of that century³.

The political and social crisis culminating in the middle of the 5th cent. started, however, earlier in that century. In 474 B.C. the Etruscans were beaten by Hieron of Syracuse in a naval battle at Cumae⁴—a forerunner of the Syracusan thalassocracy shown in 453 B.C. Within the sphere of

donec eum quoque honorem populus mandaret. Creatique primum Valerius Po<ti>tus et Aemilius Mamercus sexagesimo tertio anno post Tarquinius exactos [447 B.C.], ut rem militarem comitarentur.

¹ Diod. XI, 88.4 f.

² Diod. XII, 31.

³ *Early Rome* IV, pp. 517 f.

⁴ Pind. *Pyth.* I, 138-140; Diod. XI, 51.

internal policy, the new division of the people into local tribes made in 495 B.C. and the *comitia centuriata* based on this division of the people brought about a change of the social structure of the society and introduced a timocratic system: the political rights were not based on noble birth but on possession of land. The wealthy plebeians were therefore able to obtain some influence in the popular assembly, but were excluded from the supreme magistracy. The poor plebeians had nothing to gain from a timocratic system and a struggle of the orders was therefore inevitable. From this point of view the introduction of the Republic was not only an event but a process, which began gradually during the concluding period of the kings and culminated about 450 B.C.

The constitutional change marking the transition from kingdom to Republic about 450 B.C. did not bring a satisfactory solution of the social and political tension between the patricians and the plebeians. One of the 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 principle 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 B.C. have been considered as interpolated¹, but without good reason. They do not appear at random, but form a significant pattern in two main groups, the one between 400 and 396², during the Veian war, and the other one between 388 and

¹ BELOCH, *op. cit.*, 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, Ch. Genucius Augurinus, L. Atilius Priscus (BROUGHTON, *op. cit.*, p. 87).

379 B.C.¹, during the crisis following the Gallic invasion of 390 B.C. Otherwise there are no plebeian names, except one in 444² and another in 422 B.C.³, 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 exceptionally, in times when social disintegration was dangerous for the state and national coalition was needed. By such temporary admittance 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 about 450 and 366 B.C. represents the initial phase of the Republic, a transitional period between the kingdom and the Republic of the nobility.

¹ 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. Albinus, L. Antistius, P. Trebonius, C. Erenucius (Genucius? ; BROUGHTON *op. cit.*, p. 106).

² Liv. IV, 7 (L. Atilius).

³ Liv. IV, 42 (Q. Antonius).

DISCUSSION

M. Waszink: Was it absolutely necessary to have a Jupiter Capitolinus with a temple in order to be able to have a triumph at all ?

M. Hanell: Yes. In the first place, there was a strong connection between the triumph and the Circus Maximus and the *ludi magni*, as Mr. Gjerstad has observed. In the second place, we can refer to the fact that the red face of the statue of Jupiter Capitolinus is also found in the triumphator. Therefore, a *triumphus* at Rome is in fact unthinkable without the Capitoline temple.

M. Alföldi: Was hat nun wirklich die Priorität über den Triumph ?

M. Hanell: Sie meinen doch auch, dass der Triumph in Rom nach dem Tempel gerichtet war, den Tempel zum Ziel hatte ?

M. Alföldi: Ich bin da nicht ganz überzeugt. Es ist nämlich meines Erachtens nicht unmöglich, dass es militärische Umzüge auf dem Mons Albanus gegeben hat, auf dem es bekanntlich keinen Tempel gab. Es ist somit ein militärischer Umzug, bzw. ein Triumph, ohne Tempel möglich.

M. Gjerstad: But the triumph at Rome took place with *Etruscan* emblems. Does this fact not refute the idea of a pre-Etruscan triumph on the Mons Albanus? Further, there is no sure tradition of an early triumph connected with the Mons Albanus.

M. Heurgon: Les caractères étrusques du triomphe romain n'excluent pas la possibilité qu'il y ait eu un triomphe de ce genre dans la ligue latine, si nous reconnaissons, avec M. Alföldi, que des influences étrusques se sont exercées sur les institutions de cette ligue.

M. Gjerstad: Against this conception, I would like to underline once more my conviction of the purely Etruscan character of the triumph.

M. Alföldi : Against this, I want to refer to the costume of the Roman triumphator which can be found, in an identical form, also on Apulian vases. In this fact I see an argument in favour of the hypothesis of a non-Roman origin of the triumph. In addition, I would like to refer to the sceptres carrying an eagle which are also found in Apulia and which point in the same non-Roman direction.

M. Gjerstad : I wonder whether all these representations on the Apulian vases do not rather owe their existence to an inspiration coming from Rome.

M. Alföldi : This is, in my conviction, quite improbable, for the costumes found on Apulian vases do not come at all from Rome, but from Attic tragedy.

M. Hanell : Nach meiner Überzeugung muss man genau unterscheiden zwischen dem römischen Triumph, so wie wir ihn kennen, und militärischen Dankprozessionen an einen sieggewinnenden Gott. Diese letzteren können ein uraltes Erbe sein und brauchen nicht einen Tempel zum Ziel zu haben. Der römische Triumph dagegen ist eine Spezialform. Hier behalten die vorgebrachten Argumente ihre Gültigkeit : Verbindung des Triumphes mit dem Circus Maximus und die Tatsache, dass sowohl das Kultbild des Jupiter Optimus Maximus als der Triumphator das Gesicht mit Menning gefärbt hatten.

M. Riis : Nach Anlass der Bemerkung von Herrn Alföldi möchte ich hervorheben, dass das attische Theaterkostüm des 5. und 4. Jahrhunderts mit der Tracht auf den apulischen Vasen des 4. Jahrhunderts nicht ganz identisch war.

M. van Berchem : M. Gjerstad fait coïncider l'aménagement du Forum romain avec le début de la période urbaine. Et au Forum romain, il associe le Forum Boarium. Or s'il est certain que le Forum romain est une création artificielle et relativement récente dans l'histoire du site, on peut se demander si le Forum Boarium n'est pas antérieur. L'existence d'un passage à travers le fleuve en aval de l'île Tibérine a nécessairement eu pour effet de faire converger les routes sur ce point de la rive du Tibre, aussi longtemps que le Forum romain n'a pas constitué un point

d'attraction plus puissant. A preuve le tracé de la vieille Via Salaria. J'aimerais savoir si les fouilles opérées dans les deux forums n'ont pas fait apparaître cet échelonnement chronologique.

M. Gjerstad : So far, the excavations have shown that the Forum Romanum and the Forum Boarium were laid out at about the same time, but the pre-urban huts found beneath the earliest floor of the Forum Boarium are slightly later than those found beneath the earliest floor of the Forum Romanum, although all these pre-urban huts date from Period IV.

M. Heurgon : La discussion sur le Forum Boarium et sur les temples de Fortuna et Mater Matuta que Tite-Live attribue à Servius Tullius, nous amène peut-être à poser la question de la date du règne de ce roi. M. Gjerstad, dans son exposé, a suggéré que le problème de la séquence des rois de Rome pourrait être discuté aujourd'hui. Qu'il me permette de lui demander pour quelles raisons, lui qui a pris, au sujet de la date de la fondation de Rome et de la fondation de la République, des partis si révolutionnaires, il manifeste à l'égard de la tradition relative à la suite des rois (Romulus excepté) une si totale confiance. En ce qui concerne la Rome pré-tarquiniennne et le caractère non étrusque des cultes de la Regia (Vesta et Janus) et de celui de Jupiter Feretrius au Capitole, son analyse m'a paru parfaite. Je voudrais insister seulement sur ce que la tradition relative aux rois étrusques — Tarquin l'Ancien, Servius Tullius, Tarquin le Superbe — a d'artificiel. Les anciens en avaient eux-mêmes conscience. L'empereur Claude parlait de Servius Tullius comme d'un roi *insertus* entre les deux Tarquins. Et cette « insertion » avait laissé des traces visibles dans le fait qu'on ne savait plus bien si Tarquin le Superbe était le petit-fils ou le fils de Tarquin l'Ancien. Les annalistes du milieu du second siècle, comme Calpurnius Piso, s'étaient aperçus en effet que la tradition antérieure, qui faisait du Superbe le fils de l'Ancien, aboutissait à faire de lui un homme déjà vieux au moment de son avènement ; d'ailleurs si Tanaquil y avait assisté, elle aurait eu 110 ans. Ces corrections, ces remaniements qui se poursuivent au deuxième siècle av. J.-C., nous donnent une idée

de la manière dont Fabius Pictor avait composé la séquence chronologique des rois de Rome, en combinant tant bien que mal des légendes empruntées à des sources hétérogènes, et transmises jusqu'à lui par des *carmina convivalia* ou d'autres traditions orales : légendes de Vulci (Servius Tullius), légendes de Tarquinia (les Tarquins), qui s'offraient à lui parallèlement et qu'il s'était efforcé de mettre bout à bout. Par là s'explique, par exemple, que Servius Tullius n'intervienne pas (sinon dans un témoignage tardif de Tacite) dans la construction du temple du Capitole.

M. Gjerstad : You asked why I have rejected the conventional dates for the introduction of the Republic and for the foundation of Rome but consider the list of the kings to be trustworthy. My answer is : The initial date of the Republic has arbitrarily been identified with the introduction of the eponymous system, and the chronology of the Regal period is entirely based on speculations without documentary evidence. Accordingly, the literary tradition concerning the early history of Rome is often placed in a chronologically wrong context. As regards the list of the kings it cannot be doubted that Romulus is fictitious. He was created in the 4th cent. B.C. and is first mentioned by Alkimos. He was then added to the original list of the kings beginning with Numa and ending with Tarquinius Superbus (*Historisk Tidsskrift*, 1949, pp. 327 ff.). This list must therefore go back to pre-literary times, at least to the 4th cent. B.C. or probably earlier, representing a genuine tradition. With the new chronology the few trustworthy notices about the kings and their activities fit in with archaeological evidence.

M. Alföldi : I would like to ask Mr. Gjerstad whether, it is necessary, when he accepts the historicity of Numa Pompilius, to be faithful to the list of all the other kings as well? A queer thing are at all events the double names, in the 7th century, whereas in those early times only one name was usual (think, for instance, of Manios and Numasios in the Manios-inscription).

M. Gjerstad : As far as I can see, there is no reason to consider the kings following after Numa to be historically less trustworthy

than Numa himself. You are quite right that in early times the Latins used only one name, but a patronymicum could be added for better identification of the person. The second name of the non-Etruscan kings may be patronymic, whereas that of the two Tarquins is certainly a *nomen gentile*.

M. Momigliano : I would like to ask Mr. Gjerstad for some information about the text of the passage of Pliny referring to Tarquinius Priscus and Vulca.

M. Gjerstad reads the passage in question (Plin., *N.H.* 35, 157), of which the text is certain in the main lines : *M. Varro tradit... Vulcam Veis accitum, cui locaret Tarquinius Priscus Iovis effigiem Capitolio dicendam, fictilem eum fuisse et ideo miniari solitum, fictiles in fastigio templi eius quadrigas.*

M. Momigliano observes that this text does not say explicitly that Vulca was the maker of the quadrigae. *M. Gjerstad* observes that the really important thing is that Vulca did make the cult-statue for the Capitoline temple, which must then have been under roof during the reign of Tarquinius Priscus. *M. Riis* raises the possibility that the quadriga mentioned by Pliny was an acroterium. *M. Alföldi* observes that the use of the verb *miniari* shows that the cult-statue must have been meant.

M. Brown : If you accept the antefix found on the spot of the temple, you must agree that the temple was smaller than we think.

M. Riis : We must not forget that there may have been two kinds of antefixes on the same building.

M. Gjerstad : An antefix like the one in the Capitoline area has now been found on the site of the temple of Castor (late archaic type : date around 485 B.C.).

M. Brown : A similar antefix was also found near the arch of Titus.

M. Momigliano : Mr. Gjerstad assumes that Servius Tullius was active about 490 B.C. This would mean that *comitia centuriata* of some sort were introduced in Rome about that date. Now, the *comitia centuriata* do not take cognizance of the existence

of a profound cleavage between patricians and plebeians. How would you explain the existence of sharp conflicts between patricians and plebeians just about 490 B.C.? Do you assume that this tradition is wrong and that there was no struggle between patricians and plebeians in this period?

M. Gjerstad: No, certainly not.

M. Hanell: I would like now, for my part, to bring in the question of the names of the Kings. Pompilius and Hostilius may not have been *nomina gentilicia* but *nomina patronymica*. The plebeian gens Hostilia must then later on have changed Hostilius into a *nomen gentilicium*.

So as king-names these names are not necessarily later additions. With the exception, perhaps, of Pompilius, which may have been introduced instead of its equivalent Quintilius, because Numa is generally called a Sabine.

It should also be observed that in later times Numa Pompilius was regarded as the founder of the state, since he was regarded as the founder of the cult, and a cult is a necessary condition for a state. (*Further examples concerning Danish and Swedish family names are given*).

M. Heurgon: M. Hanell a remarqué qu'il était difficile de savoir quand s'était introduit l'usage des gentilices. On peut noter que les premiers noms énumérés dans les *Fasti*, comme Valerii, Iunii, Horatii, sont des gentilices.

M. Alföldi: First of all, I wish to thank for the efforts of our speaker to elucidate the archaeological preconditions of the Early Republic; it does not devalue his archaeological merits if I cannot accept his historical deductions.

The list of the Kings cannot be taken as authentic: whoever does it, takes into account *nolens-volens* the reign of Romulus, counting it with one generation.

It should be observed that the archaeological data do not reflect the events of the constitutional history of Rome, but could be rather connected with external relations of the Roman state, — favourable and unfavourable ones. E.g.: The beginning of

the importation of Greek pottery is certainly connected with urbanization, but not with the rule of "Romulus", whose figure comes from a very old Indo-European mythical stratum along with Remus—maybe in imitation of the myth of King Silvius of Alba Longa. Or: the supposed end of the importation of Greek vases has nothing to do with the end of the monarchy. This import came mostly via Caere, and the Caeretans could well continue the imports under the Republic. Equally inadmissible is the contamination of the list of the kings with the republican list of eponymous magistrates. The authentic feature of the pre-Republican tradition, that the *last* king built the Capitoline temple, cannot be shifted by such a combination to 450 B.C. The royal chronology reposes on late, annalist arithmetics, based on the sack of Troy, as calculated by Eratosthenes. The Etruscan names in the consular lists do not mean that they officiated in the royal epoch.

The list of the Kings shows three kinds of names: (1) the mythical founders; (2) names having the imprint of the Etruscan binominal system, as Numa Pompilius, Ancus Marcius, Tullus Hostilius, Servius Tullius; (3) late fictitious *cognomina* as Priscus and Superbus, impossible before the 4th or 3rd century B.C., when the system of the *tria nomina* was established. The binominal system belongs to the 6th and 5th centuries.

In that list of kings, Servius Tullius is a figure of very old legendary tradition. His miraculous birth is a variety of the birth of Romulus, grandson of Tarchetios of Alba Longa—Tarchetios being a variety of Etruscan Tarchon—, and of the birth of Caeculus, founder of Praeneste. This is a bronze-age myth of the blacksmith-King, son of the heavenly Blacksmith, parallel to the Iranian Kawi, the Blacksmith, and probably of Hittite origin.—But the contamination of Servius Tullius with Mastarna of Vulci is an operation of Fabius Pictor. The chronological position of the Vulcentan occupation of Rome being rather well established, we can be rather sure that Mastarna interrupted the dynastic rule of the Tarquins, for whom we cannot be sure, whether two or more of them occupied the throne of Rome.

I agree completely with E. Gjerstad, that there was a profound political transformation going on around the middle of the fifth century ; I shall try to give the reasons for it in my forthcoming lecture.

M. Gjerstad : If I consider the names of the kings from Numa to Tarquinius Superbus to be authentic, I cannot see that this forces me to accept the fictive Romulus.

The end of the importation of Greek vases coincides with events indicating the introduction of the Republic, and gives therefore evidence of a change of the commercial relations in connection with the political events.

The Etruscan names in the *Fasti* are understandable, if Etruscan kings were reigning when these names occur, but it seems very unlikely that the Roman republic after the expulsion of the Etruscan kings should have elected Etruscans as magistrates. Eponymous magistrates may very well exist during a kingdom, as shown by the Assyrian *limmu* and the Spartan *ephoroi*.

As far as I know, there is no evidence that the identification of Servius Tullius with Mastarna is due to Fabius Pictor, but it is well known that the Emperor Claudius has advanced the opinion that the king called Servius Tullius by the Romans was called Mastarna by the Etruscans. It is very uncertain whether condottieri from Vulci have occupied Rome. If a condottiere called Mastarna has ruled in Rome, it has only been for a short time, and he was not considered as a legitimate king. He was not therefore included in the list of the Kings.

M. Gabba : Bisognerà spiegare perchè la tradizione letteraria fornisce una ricostruzione delle origini di Roma con una cronologia così diversa da quella proposta dal professore Gjerstad. Quanto al passo di Livio II 21, 7 (*Romae tribus una et viginti factae*), si può forse intendere nel senso che in quell'anno, 495 a.C., si raggiunse il *totale* di 21 tribù, non che le 21 tribù siano state istituite in quell'anno. Quanto alla presenza di magistrati con nomi etruschi nel quinto secolo a.C. non sembra necessario ricavare la conclusione che in quel periodo vi fosse ancora la

monarchia dei re etruschi; tanto più che questi nomi sono molto pochi.

M. Brown : I would like to observe that Weissenborn-Müller's interpretation is based on the fact that Livy had mentioned those names before.

M. Momigliano : How would Varro know about Vulca?

M. Hanell souligne la possibilité de sources étrusques de Varron.

M. Heurgon je suis d'accord avec M. Hanell sur ce point. Dans ces questions si difficiles, il faut procéder avec autant de précision qu'il est possible. Claude ne dit pas que, de son propre chef, il identifiait Servius Tullius et Mastarna; il les considère comme une seule et même personne, dont le souvenir s'était perpétué, à Rome et chez les Etrusques, sous deux noms différents. L'identification, si identification il y a eu, était de toute manière antérieure à Claude, ainsi que l'a montré M. Alföldi : Denys d'Halicarnasse (III 65, 6) prêtait déjà à Servius Tullius les caractères δεξένος και ἄπολις que lui attribuait la légende étrusque.

M. van Berchem : Il est un point sur lequel tout le monde semble tomber d'accord, grâce à l'heureuse combinaison de plusieurs modes de datation, la dédicace du temple capitolin en 509 (ou 508). En cette année-là, selon M. Gjerstad, Rome aurait encore connu un régime monarchique. Or, lors de cette inauguration, le roi, qui exerçait des fonctions religieuses éminentes (voir le futur *rex sacrorum*), devait nécessairement jouer le premier rôle. C'est à lui, du reste, que la tradition attribue toutes les fondations de temples antérieures, et l'exemple de Pyrgi montre que son geste pouvait être commémoré par une inscription. Personne ne met en doute la part qu'un des Tarquins, ou que les deux Tarquins ont eue dans l'érection et l'achèvement du temple de Jupiter. Est-il dès lors concevable que sa présence à l'inauguration ait pu s'effacer dans la mémoire des Romains au profit d'un obscur Horatius, si réellement il avait encore occupé son poste à cette date?

M. Gjerstad: Horatius is dedicator of the Capitoline temple because he was mentioned in the *Fasti* as eponymous magistrate for the year of the dedication of the temple. If the Regal period is extended to the early half of the 5th cent. B.C., it seems strange to some scholars that the kings and their deeds do not figure in that of the 5th century, and that the eponymous magistrates of that same period do not figure in the history of the kings. These peculiarities are explained, if we realize that the annalists wrote the history of the early part of the fifth century under the impression that the Republic was introduced in 509. For the history after 509 the *Fasti* formed the backbone of the annalistic account of the historical events. In consequence, the eponymous magistrates had to be connected with the events of each year and became automatically dedicators of the temples mentioned by the *Fasti* to have been dedicated in the year of their magistracy.

M. Hanell: I should like to point out that the question about the dedication of the Capitoline temple is a very difficult one. In the Roman tradition it is said that M. Horatius performed the dedication, and one often finds in modern works that the tradition relied upon a dedicatory inscription set up by Horatius. As a source for that inscription Dion. Hal. V 35, 3 is referred to. Dionysius says : τὴν δ' ἀνιέρωσιν αὐτοῦ καὶ τὴν ἐπιγραφὴν ἔλαβε Μάρκος Ὀράτιος, i. e. that Horatius took the honour of having performed the work. The phrase τὴν ἐπιγραφὴν λαμβάνειν has that significance and has nothing to do with a dedicatory inscription. I think that Horatius' name stood at the beginning of the list of the eponymous magistrates and that the list began with the year of the dedication as is stated by Polybius in his dating of the first treaty between Rome and Carthage (III 22,1): Κατὰ Λεύκιον Ἰούνιον Βροῦτον καὶ Μάρκον Ὀράτιον, τοὺς πρώτους κατασταθέντας ὑπάτους μετὰ τὴν τῶν βασιλέων κατάλυσιν, ἐφ' ᾧ συνέβη καθιερωθῆναι καὶ τὸ τοῦ Διὸς ἱερόν τοῦ Καπετωλίου.

The tradition tells us that M. Horatius dedicated the temple, and I believe that the tradition is based on the *Fasti*. About the

position of Horatius as a magistrate we do not know anything at all. He was the eponymous of the year and perhaps he was a *praetor*, but that we really do not know.

M. Momigliano: I think that Mr. Hanell's interpretation of Dion. Hal. V 35, 3 is both important and convincing. As he says, this passage does not prove that the name of Horatius stood in an inscription in the temple. But the analogy of the inscription of Q. Catulus (Val. Max. VI 9, 5 *nomenque eius in Capitolino fastigio fulgeret*) still points in that direction also for his predecessor Horatius. The existence of an inscription seems also to be the most economic explanation for the appearance of the name of Horatius in the tradition of the dedication of the temple.

Let us then suppose that Horatius dedicated the temple. If he was a *praetor*, he must have had *imperium* in the republican sense of the word: this implies that there was no king, no Tarquin, above him. I do not quite understand what Gjerstad and Hanell mean by the notion of *imperium mandatum* for the period of the kings. Did an *imperium mandatum* ever exist? Or do I simply misunderstand what Gjerstad and Hanell have said about *imperium*?

M. Hanell: In order to answer this question, one should first know whether there existed an *imperium mandatum* and what it was. I take it that Tarquin dedicated the temple himself.

M. Momigliano: So what you imply is more or less a misunderstanding by Dionysius of Halicarnassus.

M. Hanell: It should be well remembered that eponymity is part of the calendar. When the old calendar (of ten months) was reformed into a calendar of twelve months, this must have taken place about 509 B.C.

M. Gjerstad: Let me add a few remarks. In the 12-month calendar there are two months, namely September and November, in which there are no festivals of an early date. We have here the key to the solution of the problem of the 10-month calendar. The essential purpose of the calendar was to regulate the festivals,

to distinguish the sacred days from the profane ones. As there were no festivals to be celebrated during the two months in question, they were therefore superfluous in sacred respect and were merely added as profane time to the preceding month with which they formed a sort of double-month. There are several ethnological analogies to such a practice. The earliest sacred ceremonies in September and November are assignable to the Tarquin epoch, indicating that the Roman calendar with 12 months dates from that period (cf. *Acta archaeol.* XXXII, 1961, pp. 193 ff.). In this matter I therefore agree with Professor Hanell.

M. Waszink: Is it not so that, as Nilsson asserted in *Ancient Time-Reckoning*, January and February were only added afterwards, and that there was a vacuum in the period end December-beginning of March, when the farmer's work was practically suspended?

M. Gjerstad: Not only Professor Nilsson but several other scholars assumed that the 10-month year ended with the month called December in the 12-month calendar and that the time represented by January and February had originally not been included in the year. This cannot be right, because in January and February there are several early festivals, which must have been regulated by the calendar, and these months must therefore have existed in the 10-month calendar, although with other names: Sextilis was a double-month corresponding to the later Sextilis and September, as I just mentioned; further, September of the 10-month calendar was another double-month corresponding to the later October and November; this implies that October, November, and December of the 10-month calendar corresponded to the later December, January and February. For this problem, see *op. cit.* pp. 205 ff.

M. Waszink: I was only speaking about a vacuum in *work*, which, in my opinion, naturally leads to the manifold feasts and *ludi* mentioned by you. Therefore, I remain convinced that Nilsson is right.

M. Alföldi: I would like to know whether *M. Gjerstad* thinks that the king would have missed the event of dedicating the temple.

M. Gjerstad: The king was probably the dedicator—according to my chronology, Tarquinius Priscus—but, as I have already mentioned, Horatius was later considered to be the dedicator, because he was eponymous magistrate for the year of the dedication of the temple.

