

# WE CAN BE HEROES

## A STUDY OF MYTHISTORIC GENEALOGIES IN THE ROMAN REPUBLIC

By  
STEVEN THOMAS

A thesis  
submitted to the Victoria University of Wellington in fulfilment of the  
requirements for the degree of Master of Arts

Victoria University of Wellington  
(2020)

*At vos, Troiugenae, vobis ignoscitis et quae turpia cerdoni Volesos  
Brutumque decebunt.*

Juvenal, *Satires* 8.181-2

**We Can Be Heroes:**  
**A Study of Mythistoric Genealogies in**  
**the Roman Republic**

By

Steven Thomas

Supervised by

Prof. W. Jeffrey Tatum

## Declaration

I declare that this thesis is entirely my own work, and except where otherwise stated, describes my own research.

Steven Thomas  
Victoria University of Wellington

## Abstract

Mythistoric genealogies, the claims of divine or heroic ancestry made by the Roman elite during the Republic, provide an alternative lens through which to understand social constructs and political experiences of Romans. However, the relationship between *mos maiorum* and these mythistoric genealogies remains unexplored in modern scholarship in a detailed and focused manner. This research sets out to demonstrate that mythistoric genealogies were a natural evolution of the Romans' ancestral veneration which is implicit in *mos maiorum*.

This thesis focuses on three of the most politically prolific *gentes* whose social influence spanned the 500 years of the Republic. First, each case study assembles and analyses the evidence (numismatics, literature, sculpture and architecture) that preserved the claims made by each *gens* and arranges them in such a way as to furnish a linear account of the genealogies. Second, each case study presents and analyses a member of each *gens* to demonstrate how he exemplifies, retains, or emulates the attributes, instructions and morality of their described genealogy. The historical person is analysed through the lenses of mythistoric genealogy, Paradigmatic Pressure, and Social Capital.

The three case studies demonstrate that the clans of Aemilius, Fabius, and Valerius used their mythistoric genealogies to anchor themselves to the majesty of Rome's past and that mythistoric genealogy was an integral part of *mos maiorum*. Furthermore, the connection of mythistoric genealogy, as an evolved element of *mos maiorum*, is emphasised through the following factors: they serve an educational function; serve as binding instructions; display the retention of events, lives and deeds of heroes; serve as examples meant for the emulation of the past morality; and, finally, can be shaped and reconstructed to suit present situations or political agendas. The results of this research contributes directly to the ongoing discussion of *mos*

*maiorum*, discusses the social concepts held by elite Romans during the Republic, demonstrates how inter-generational connections were crucial to ideals held by the *nobiles*, and engages with *mos maiorum* in-depth (in terms of myth and legend) in a way that has not been done in a ‘per *gens*’ manner in scholarship, filling a gap in the study of social history during the Republic.

## Acknowledgements

In random order, this thesis would not be possible without:

Sheila McCaffrey. With kind words and firm encouragement on Easter Sunday and during our week at Lyme Regis she steered me back onto the path that is my passion for the Roman Republic.

My supervisor, Professor Jeffrey Tatum, whose advice and enthusiasm have been constant before and during the marathon. He has been both patient and necessarily critical. Any faults that remain are my own.

The OK520 Brain Trust (Claudia, Eilish, Ziming & Jakob). Their contagious passion for Classics, incubated in a positive and creative work space, allowed for dedicated typing time as well as discussion.

My F.A.F. teammates who made those specific days tolerable.

The Classics Department at Victoria University, especially my three tutoring roles for Professor Arthur Pomeroy, Professor Jeffrey Tatum, and Associate Professor Simon Perris. Inspiration drawn from all three courses have made a positive impact on my thesis.

Jessica Wood: the Optimus Maximus to my Iuppiter; the Hercules to my Fabius; and, the wine to my cheese. The last three years have been hard, fun, exciting, and often strange - here's to the rest of them!

Tom Baragwanath and Jessica Wood and their critical eyes for grammar, spelling, and punctuation.

Dad, Mum, and Robert whose understanding and support have always followed the sharp life-turns I take when boredom strikes.

## Abbreviations

CIL	<i>Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum</i> . Berolini: apud Greimerum, 1863.
FGrH	Jacoby, Felix. <i>Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker</i> . Berlin: Weidmann, 1923.
FRH	Cornell, Tim, ed. <i>The Fragments of the Roman Historians</i> . Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press, 2013.
Gloss. Lat.	Lindsay, W. M. <i>Glossaria latina</i> . Vol. 4. Hildesheim: Olms, 1965.
LGRR	Wiseman, T. P. 'Legendary Genealogies in Late-Republican Rome'. <i>Greece and Rome</i> 21, no. 2 (1974): 153–164.
MRR	Broughton, T. Robert S. <i>The Magistrates of the Roman Republic</i> . American Philological Association, 1951.
OCD	Hornblower, Simon, Antony Spawforth, and Esther Eidinow, eds. <i>The Oxford Classical Dictionary</i> . Fourth edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.
RRC	Crawford, Michael H. <i>Roman Republican Coinage</i> . London: Cambridge University Press, 1974.
Sk.	Skutsch, Otto. <i>The Annals of Q. Ennius</i> . Oxford: New York: Clarendon Press; Oxford University Press, 1985.



# Contents

Abstract .....	iv
Acknowledgements.....	vi
Abbreviations.....	vii
Contents.....	viii
Chapter 1	
Introduction .....	1
Genealogy.....	2
<i>Mos Maiorum</i> .....	3
The <i>Nobiles</i> .....	5
The <i>Gens</i> .....	6
The Patricians .....	8
Chapter 2	
Literature Review.....	11
Chapter 3	
Methodology.....	20
Chapter 4	
The <i>Gens</i> of Assaracus.....	29
Marcus Aemilius Scaurus.....	40
Chapter 5	
The <i>Gens</i> of Hercules.....	49
Quintus Fabius Maximus Allobrogicus.....	56

Chapter 6	
The <i>Gens</i> of Volusus.....	63
Lucius Valerius Flaccus .....	72
Chapter 7	
Conclusion .....	78
Bibliography .....	83
Appendix I	
Coinage.....	91
Appendix II	
Vaults of Social Capital.....	93
Appendix III	
Paradigmatic Pressure .....	101

# Chapter 1

## Introduction

The vision of the thesis is to explore mythistoric genealogy as a natural evolution of *mos maiorum*, and to examine how the claims of elite Romans served as a practical feature in their political careers as well as their religious duties during the Republic. The claims made by the *gentes maiores* that they were descended from someone who elevated their *gens* above the others will be outlined and discussed, as will the alleged divine heritage that gave them an edge over their contemporaries and defined them as better suited to govern, command, and sacrifice. This thesis will assert that these advertisements of family-owned heroic paragons, whose virtues and actions served as life exempla passed on from father to son, were fuelled by the societal expectations and assumptions that those who had come before had done ‘the Roman thing’ better than the rest. The focus of this thesis is the mythistoric genealogies of the *Aemilii*, *Fabii*, and *Valerii*. These were ancient patrician *gentes*: nobles before the liberation of Rome from the monarchy and pre-eminent throughout the five centuries of the Roman Republic. Their mythistoric genealogies anchored them to the majesty of their past.

What, for a Roman patrician, is a mythistoric genealogy? In a well-known article, Peter Wiseman outlined the concept as “a form of family pride shared by many aristocrats in the Late Republic.”<sup>1</sup> As applied by the Roman nobility, mythistoric genealogy was a claim made by a *gens* of their descent from a *princeps gentis* who was a mythic or historical eponymous ancestor. The claim served as an aetiological tale to make a connection between the *gens* and the foundation or liberation legends of Rome, the Alban Kings, various Trojan heroes, the gods, or any

---

<sup>1</sup> Wiseman, ‘LGRR’, 153.

combination of the four. The genealogies were a product of ‘Paradigmatic Pressure’, in the form of *mos maiorum*, originating from either internal or external motivations, in relation to the individual or *gens*,<sup>2</sup> and served as a method to polish and dust-off deposits in their vault of ‘Social Capital’.<sup>3</sup> To illustrate the form of these genealogies, I propose the following definition as a model for the research. Firstly, mythistoric genealogy identifies the person who gave their name to the *gens*; secondly, it connects the *gens*, through ancestry, to the incubation and realisation of Roman ideals, specifically *mos maiorum*, by the compression of time and the reinforcement of past high-ranking achievements.

### Genealogy

Simply put, genealogy is “a line of descent traced continuously [through time] from an ancestor.”<sup>4</sup> The line of descent is used to connect an individual or group with those who have come and gone before. According to Julia Bennett, we should call the genealogical process a “self-making narrative” in which one creates a sense of belonging in an ever-changing and fluctuating social environment.<sup>5</sup> In this process the ‘self’ can be represented and constructed around the myths and figures of the past.<sup>6</sup> By its own nature, genealogy is a process of inclusion and exclusion, which allows for the design and production of a lineage which suit one’s individual requirements.<sup>7</sup> Anne-Marie Kramer maintains that genealogy is used to map connections through

---

<sup>2</sup> Walters, ‘Time and Paradigm in the Roman Republic’.

<sup>3</sup> Hölkeskamp, *Reconstructing the Roman Republic: An Ancient Political Culture and Modern Research*, 107: defines Social Capital as a permanent network of current and potential social resources which are mutually acknowledged or accepted.

<sup>4</sup> Stevenson, *Oxford Dictionary of English*.

<sup>5</sup> Bennett, ‘Narrating Family Histories’, 450.

<sup>6</sup> Bennett, 450.

<sup>7</sup> Kramer, ‘Kinship, Affinity and Connectedness’, 380.

kinship, the living and the dead, as well as give one a geographical and/or temporal “place to stand.”<sup>8</sup>

Roman society during the Republic was a “society of memory”<sup>9</sup> in which the fashioning and application of genealogy flourished. Roman society went through serious political and geographical change during the third and second centuries.<sup>10</sup> The Romans faced and reacted to these changes not least by concerning themselves with preserving the memory of the past,<sup>11</sup> largely conceptualised as the preservation of *mos maiorum*. Enter the influence of the Greeks, whose genealogies were characterised as intentional histories telling aetiological tales about family and the roots of elite status.<sup>12</sup> The Romans appropriated genealogy as a genre of history, as an aetiological tool and as a process of self-making to preserve what modern scholars often refer to as Cultural Memory.

### *Mos Maiorum*

Cultural Memory, an expression coined by Jan and Aleida Assman and elaborated for the study of Roman culture by Karl-Joachim Hölkeskamp, refers to “the collectively shared knowledge of a given society, the peculiar set of certainties and convictions it has of itself and, in particular, about its historical roots.”<sup>13</sup> Cultural memory in Rome operates, in many respects, by way of the Romans’ strong inclination toward ancestral veneration. In the first place, Cultural Memory “has an educational function, disciplining and integrating the

---

<sup>8</sup> Kramer, 392.

<sup>9</sup> Flower, ‘Were Women Ever “Ancestors” in Republican Rome?’, 158.

<sup>10</sup> See Walbank, *The Rise of Rome to 220 BC*; Astin, *Rome and the Mediterranean to 133 BC*.

<sup>11</sup> Flower, ‘Were Women Ever “Ancestors” in Republican Rome?’, 158.

<sup>12</sup> For a discussion on the influences see Varto, ‘Stories Told in Lists’, 120.

<sup>13</sup> Hölkeskamp, ‘Images of Power: Memory, Myth and Monument in the Roman Republic’, 251; Assmann, *Religion Und Kulturelles Gedächtnis: Zehn Studien*; Assmann, *Das Kulturelle Gedächtnis: Schrift, Erinnerung Und Politische Identität in Frühen Hochkulturen*; Assmann and Hölcher, *Kultur Und Gedächtnis*.

members of a society and thereby reinforcing its cohesion.”<sup>14</sup> Secondly, “the society’s shared cultural knowledge possesses a normative dimension as it contains binding ‘instructions’ about how to act in the present and in the future.”<sup>15</sup> And thirdly, Cultural Memory ensures the retention of events, and the lives and deeds of heroes only so long as they remain meaningful, resulting in the permanent and continuous construction or reconstruction of the society’s history.<sup>16</sup>

The Roman realisation of Cultural Memory is arguably *mos maiorum*. Typically translated as the traditions of the ancestors, I would emphasise the didactic nature of the concept by further translating *mos maiorum* as the moral code set by the traditions of the ancestors. *Mos* directly translates as ‘tradition’ or ‘customs’, but Robert Maltby recommends *moralis*, ‘of morality’, for contextual definition.<sup>17</sup> The philosophy of tradition (Cic. *Fat.* 1) and moral philosophy (Cassiod. *Inst.* 2.3.7) suggest the teaching power of tradition and how *mos maiorum* was connected to, and fashioned, the Romans’ sense of morality. The edifying power of *mos maiorum*, manifested in the collection of correct and successful actions and traditions as carried out by the ancestors,<sup>18</sup> formed as a core element in Roman society as the value system which generated the institutions of the Roman State,<sup>19</sup> and the rules binding these institutions and society together. The moral behaviours and principles of the ancestors served as an example meant for the emulation of the past morality and behaviour of Roman archetypes. *Mos maiorum* helped form the social norms which Roman political figures sought to replicate in themselves,<sup>20</sup> enforced from generation to generation. The emulation and replication of *mos maiorum* ensured the continued success of Rome’s institutions.

---

<sup>14</sup> Hölkeskamp, ‘Images of Power: Memory, Myth and Monument in the Roman Republic’, 251.

<sup>15</sup> Hölkeskamp, 251.

<sup>16</sup> Hölkeskamp, 251–52.

<sup>17</sup> Maltby, *A Lexicon of Ancient Latin Etymologies*, 393.

<sup>18</sup> Blom, *Cicero’s Role Models*, 12.

<sup>19</sup> Kenty, ‘Congenital Virtue’, 429.

<sup>20</sup> Kenty, 430.

However, *mos maiorum* was always open to reinterpretation, meaning the ideas and morals of the Roman ancestors were shaped and reconstructed to suit present situations or political agendas: an aspect of society controlled by the *nobiles*.<sup>21</sup>

### The Nobiles

Derived from *nobilis* meaning ‘known’, *nobiles* is most often taken by modern scholars as indicating the descendants of men who had wielded the *imperium* of a consul, a consular tribune, or a dictator.<sup>22</sup> The essence of the Roman *nobilis* is thus knitted deep into the political fabric of the city, wielding its power through the magistracies and the Senate.<sup>23</sup> To be ‘known’ was to have had an ancestor who had held these highest offices of the Roman Republic. These three magistracies were highly coveted seats of fame and power whose terms were in short supply and over quickly.<sup>24</sup> To be ‘known’ was to have had the opportunity to wield greater *auctoritas*,<sup>25</sup> to dominate the ancient sources that survived and to view themselves as ‘the best men’, *optimates*.<sup>26</sup> Roman *nobiles* were an elite group that depended on the people in the lower classes electing them into their higher social

---

<sup>21</sup> Blom, *Cicero's Role Models*, 12; Flower, ‘Were Women Ever “Ancestors” in Republican Rome?’, 158.

<sup>22</sup> Tatum, *QUINTUS CICERO: A Brief Handbook on Canvassing for Office*, 181. The word *nobilitas* is undefined in ancient sources and is furnished by Gelzer, *The Roman Nobility*. For the alternative view that the descendants of consuls, consular tribunes, dictators, and curule magistrates, as well as patricians, were granted nobility see Brunt, ‘Nobilitas and Novitas’, 1–17. For a general discussion see Scullard, *Roman Politics, 220-150 B.C.*, 10.

<sup>23</sup> Astin, ‘Roman Government and Politics, 200-134 B.C.’, 169.

<sup>24</sup> The consulship lasted a year, and so did the consular tribunate when they were used in the Early Republic (450 to 367) see *MRR*. The dictatorship was created under the terms that the office should last no longer than six months or until the crisis for which the dictator was elected was over; whichever came first. The dictatorship would be shelved as an office during the second century and the first half of the first, until resurrected by Sulla in 82: see CHAPTER 6: LUCIUS VALERIUS FLACCUS (below).

<sup>25</sup> Discussed in CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY (below) but can be simplified as ‘Roman political authority’, cf. Balot, *A Companion to Greek and Roman Political Thought*, 28.

<sup>26</sup> Hopkins, *Death and Renewal*, 37.

status.<sup>27</sup> Therefore, being ‘known’ was subject to the memories and attention spans of those in the lower classes of the city.

History and ancestry were important in Roman society, especially in the aristocracy. Noble ancestry was a significant mark of status and success which served as an enhancement of a man’s political prospects.<sup>28</sup> The *cursus honorum* (sequence of magistracies)<sup>29</sup> was the endgame of most aristocratic Roman men, the biggest motivator and target of all ambitions. Electioneering required winning at least three elections over a minimum of three years,<sup>30</sup> and combined with a considerably low life expectancy,<sup>31</sup> helped generate a fluid environment in which the Roman *nobiles* had to navigate and survive whilst remaining dependent on wealth and status. Aspirations of taking on the *cursus honorum* were helped by the ambitious politician’s membership to a societal group whose name was already politically well-established and on brand with *mos maiorum*.

### The Gens

*Gens* was the term used to define a collection of Roman *familiae* (families). Cicero defines the *gens* as those with the same *nomen* in common, born from the same ancestors who have never been enslaved nor suffered loss of civil capacity (Cic. *Top.* 29). The *nomen gentilicium* served as the equivalent of the English surname and was invariable and the most identifiable feature of a Roman *gens*,<sup>32</sup> for example; Iulius in Gaius Iulius Caesar, or Cornelius in Lucius Cornelius Sulla. The *Tria Nomina*, the three names that formed the Roman naming system, were subject to rigid convention with the

---

<sup>27</sup> Tatum, *QUINTUS CICERO*, 8; Flower, ‘Were Women Ever “Ancestors” in Republican Rome?’, 158.

<sup>28</sup> Hopkins, *Death and Renewal*, 31.

<sup>29</sup> Tatum, *QUINTUS CICERO*, 6.

<sup>30</sup> Hopkins, *Death and Renewal*, 33.

<sup>31</sup> Parkin and Pomeroy, *Roman Social History*, 44–45.

<sup>32</sup> Salway, ‘What’s in a Name?’, 125; Farney, *Ethnic Identity and Aristocratic Competition in Republican Rome*, 24.



names of the newborn restricted to those inherited from the ancestors of the *familia*.<sup>33</sup> The *nomen* was inherited from the family agnates who were the legitimate male descendants of a common ancestor, the *princeps gentis* (Suet. *Tib.* 1; Liv. 2.16.4; D.H. 5.40.3).<sup>34</sup> However, the importance of the continuation of the *nomen* superseded the continuation of the bloodline, making adoption commonplace in Roman society.<sup>35</sup> The *nomen* had to live on to serve as the identifier of the members' *gens*,<sup>36</sup> and to define a clan of members connected by patrilineal descent to a *princeps gentis*, but not solely by blood kinship.

In his consequential work on the Roman *gens*, Christopher Smith presents the translation of *gens* as either 'clan', 'house', or 'lineage'.<sup>37</sup> Robert Parkin defines 'lineage' as a descent group which is shallow enough for all the members "to be known and traceable", whilst a 'clan' reaches further back into unwritten history to a mythical or historical figure.<sup>38</sup> 'Clan' suggests a connection between the members of their *gens* in the present and their *princeps gentis* in the past, sharing "the blood of the same ultimate parent" (Ulpian D. 50.16.195.4).<sup>39</sup> The *familia* case of Ulpian suggests that the *familiae*, and the *gens* by extension, was a fluid social construction.<sup>40</sup> The *gens* moved forward in time, changing its form but never its identity by the passing on of *potestas* (paternal power) and the *nomen* from father to son or sons.<sup>41</sup> The agnate relationships between the *familiae* and the legal definitions of *pater familias* acted as the cement binding the collective *corpus* that was the *gens*; a clan of Roman families who all identified with a

---

<sup>33</sup> Salway, 'What's in a Name?', 127.

<sup>34</sup> Smith, *The Roman Clan*, 15, 42.

<sup>35</sup> Salway, 'What's in a Name?', 42.

<sup>36</sup> A *gens* may not have comprised of all the families with the same *nomen*, considering the difference between patricians and plebeians, see Salway, 16.

<sup>37</sup> Smith, *The Roman Clan*, 32.

<sup>38</sup> Parkin, *Kinship*, 17.

<sup>39</sup> Smith, *The Roman Clan*, 33; Frier, McGinn, and Lidov, *A Casebook on Roman Family Law*, 18.

<sup>40</sup> Smith, *The Roman Clan*, 32.

<sup>41</sup> Frier, McGinn, and Lidov, *A Casebook on Roman Family Law*, 18.

*princeps gentis*, mythic or legendary, from whom they inherited their *nomen*.

### The Patricians

The patricians were a hereditary and ancient class of Romans who enjoyed almost exclusive and unrivalled access to the *cursus honorum* in the early years of the Republic from 509 to 367 (all dates are B.C.E. unless otherwise stated).<sup>42</sup> Traditionally, later Romans believed their status was owed to an ancestor's inclusion into the Senate under a Roman king. Livy suggests that Romulus appointed one hundred men to the first Senate, separating them from the rest of society by the rank of *patres* or 'fathers', and that their descendants were the patricians (Liv. 1.8.7). Dionysius of Halicarnassus claims that Romulus first divided the population of Rome into *patres* and plebeians before selecting one hundred of the *patres* as his first senators. These *patres* became the major administrators of his kingdom, filling the roles of advisors, magistrates, priests and judges (D.H. 2.8, 9.1).<sup>43</sup> Therefore, the plebeians, by founding myth, were the clients of these *patres*, and/or later immigrants to Rome (D.H. 2.9-11).<sup>44</sup>

Forty-four years later, according to legend, Tullus Hostilius became the third King of Rome. His reign saw the inclusion of the Albans into Rome and the razing of the ancient city founded by Ascanius. Tullus added the chief men amongst the Albans as new *patres* between 672 and 640 (Liv. 1.30.2).<sup>45</sup> Included in these new Alban additions to the Senate were men from the *gentes Iulii*, *Servilii* and the *Quinctii*. In the Early Republic the patricians enjoyed unrivalled success in the *cursus honorum* until 367, when the Licinio-Sextian laws were passed

---

<sup>42</sup> Broughton, *MRR*, 1951, 1:1–111.

<sup>43</sup> Mitchell, *Patricians and Plebeians*, 2–3.

<sup>44</sup> Smith, *The Roman Clan*, 169–70; Brunt, *The Fall of the Roman Republic and Related Essays*, 400–414.

<sup>45</sup> See Livy (1.27-29) for the cowardice and betrayal of Dictator Mettius Fufetius and Alba Longa's fall.

declaring at least one consul each year must be a plebeian (Liv. 35.4-6). The competition for the highest magistracy was heightened by the added numbers of eligible candidates and ended the patricians' unrivalled occupation of the magistracies.

The patrician *gentes* were divided into *maiores* and *minores* (major and minor) with the *gentes maiores* comprising the *Aemilii*, *Fabii*, and *Valerii*, the *gentes* to be discussed in the thesis, and the *Claudii* and *Cornelii*. The argument is made that the *Manlii* can be included in the *gentes maiores* as they exercised a political predominance into the second century.<sup>46</sup> The *maiores* were “the highest of the aristocracy,” writes Alföldi, arguing that only the *maiores* could have climbed high enough to attain the position of *princeps senatus* in the early Republic.<sup>47</sup> Münzer suggests that the *Manlii* were of significantly lower rank, and should be excluded from the big five *gentes*.<sup>48</sup> Every consulship attained brought its holder immense prestige and elevated one's status both within the Senate and on the streets of Rome. Every consulship won gave one ample opportunity to further the standing of their family, and by proxy their *gens*, regardless of whether they worked as part of a cohesive political group or not.<sup>49</sup>

With the inclusion of these extra *gentes* comes an issue. How can we argue their dominance in Roman politics, points made by Münzer and Scullard,<sup>50</sup> if their *auctoritas* in the *cursus honorum* waned for periods greater than a generation or two? I agree with Keith Hopkins who warns that exaggerating the continuity of Roman political life for sake of analysis obscures the rise and fall of *familiae* and *gentes*,<sup>51</sup> an occurrence that appears to be mutually inclusive to mythistoric

---

<sup>46</sup> Scullard, *Roman Politics, 220-150 B.C.*, 9; Smith, *The Roman Clan*, 17; Mitchell, *Patricians and Plebeians*, 3.

<sup>47</sup> Alföldi, *Early Rome and the Latins*, 161.

<sup>48</sup> Münzer, *Roman Aristocratic Parties and Families*, 95.

<sup>49</sup> For a discussion of the modern approaches to the *gens* in terms of legal discourse, social anthropological, and ethnographic terms see Smith, *The Roman Clan*, 65–113.

<sup>50</sup> Scullard, *Roman Politics, 220-150 B.C.*, 9; Münzer, *Roman Aristocratic Parties and Families*, 95.

<sup>51</sup> Hopkins, *Death and Renewal*, 37.

genealogies. The return of a *gens* to political prominence, despite the decades of political impotence that passed, must surely attest to the social might of their deposits of high-ranking magistracies; their ability to manipulate *mos maiorum*, history, myth, and their genealogies; and the resilience of the Roman *gens*.<sup>52</sup> Although many aristocratic families endeavoured to enhance their status using mythistorical genealogies, this thesis will focus on those claims of the *Aemilii*, *Fabii*, and *Valerii*.

---

<sup>52</sup> See APPENDIX III: PARADIGMATIC PRESSURE.

## Chapter 2

### Literature Review

The first logical stepping stone lies with the aetiological element of the mythic and legendary genealogies. Aetiology, from the Greek word meaning ‘cause’, answers the question “why do we do this?”<sup>53</sup> Jaclyn Neel states that it was broadly common in Rome for at least one aetiology to be traced back to the city’s founder, Romulus. A process labelled ‘Romulization’, to express the desire to prize tradition over novelty. Anything associated with the founder was immediately old and therefore respectable. As a result, many customs were associated with Romulus, even if they were already associated with another figure in Rome’s history.<sup>54</sup>

In her study investigating identity and nostalgia that can be asserted through genealogy, Julia Bennet argues that the process of tracing one’s bloodline back into the distant past presents itself as a coping mechanism for change.<sup>55</sup> The study suggests that genealogy offers a feeling of belonging which in turn gives a person a sense of continuity. The belonging is created through self-making narratives and forms a positive window through which to view the impact of change on self and society whilst anchoring a person within an identifiable group.<sup>56</sup>

To clarify, Anne-Marie Kramer characterises genealogy as a process of inclusion and exclusion by personalising the past in order to account for the self in the present.<sup>57</sup> Her concluding statements are more than fitting definitions for the period of the Late-Republic, that genealogy is used to map connections through kinship, and can be used as a source for identity work as well as allowing the sense of belonging

---

<sup>53</sup> Neel, *Early Rome*, 5.

<sup>54</sup> Neel, 5.

<sup>55</sup> Bennett, ‘Narrating Family Histories’.

<sup>56</sup> Bennett.

<sup>57</sup> Kramer, ‘Kinship, Affinity and Connectedness’.

in time by providing a geographical and/or temporal ‘place to stand’. These modern definitions highlight an important factor, that genealogy can be used to fight the change in one’s social environment and can be applied to the nobility of the Republic.

The social environment of the nobility was influenced by aspirations of ascending the *cursus honorum*, the demands of winning at least three elections over a minimum of three years,<sup>58</sup> and a considerably low life expectancy. These influences helped generate a fluid environment for the nobility to navigate in conjunction with their dependency on status and wealth. Added to the fluidity is the irony that Rome’s political aristocracy was elected by their subordinates in the election of magistrates through the popular assemblies.

A heroic or divine first ancestor presents itself as a foundation on which to base the *gravitas*, *pietas*, *dignitas*, *virtus*, and *auctoritas* of the nobility in a ‘constitution’ that was increasingly being dominated by fewer and fewer ‘great’ individuals. The apparent weakness in the family’s high status allows for the inclusion of an extra means to legitimise or justify their elevation above the general populace, an element of self-invention.<sup>59</sup>

The introduction of mythistorical genealogies into the competitive nature of the *cursus honorum* suggests a mirrored competitive nature of the genealogies themselves, remembering that winning office required prestige above all other candidates. Political competition occurred between a relatively narrow group of Roman families and of a comparatively tiny number of ‘new’ families.<sup>60</sup> Yet, by the end of the Republic over fifty families claimed descent from a Trojan ancestor (D.H. 1.85.3), which steers the topic towards the *gens*. Peter Wiseman states:

---

<sup>58</sup> Hopkins, *Death and Renewal*, 33.

<sup>59</sup> Flower, *Ancestor Masks and Aristocratic Power in Roman Culture*.

<sup>60</sup> Smith, *The Roman Clan*, 34.

A Roman aristocrat with a critical conscience might have said that the greatness of his *gens* made it appropriate, even if not strictly true, to trace it back to a divine founder.<sup>61</sup>

Using the definition of *gens* from the Introduction, the emphasis on patrilineal ancestry to help define *gens* membership, as reported by Benet Salway,<sup>62</sup> can be expanded by focusing on the *nomen* as an invariable element that subjugated the *praenomen*, reducing them to a set of standard abbreviations.<sup>63</sup> In the beginning, according to myth, the earliest figures in Roman history had only one name: Romulus, Remus, and Faustulus.<sup>64</sup> I suggest that the nature of nomenclature is a form of mythistorical genealogy, and begs the question: who was the first Metellus, Julius and Aemilius? And, are they themselves attached to some form of mythic representation and use, for example: L. Iunius Brutus (cos. 509) or L. Quinctius Cincinnatus (dict. 458, 439)?

The history of Rome is hard to separate from myth. Romulus was said to have founded the senate, with the original members forming the beginnings of the patrician *gentes*. The plebeians, by founding myth, were the clients of these first senators, and/or later immigrants to Rome (D.H. 2.9-11).<sup>65</sup> From an ‘original Roman noble’ perspective or claim, the plebeians had sought to separate themselves from these submissive mythistorical roles to the patrician *gentes*, and by the second century saw themselves as equal in their *nobilitas* to the patriciate. The *nomen* was inherited through the male line, of legitimate descendants of a common male ancestor: agnates. These grouping of agnates and their respectively direct family members formed a *gens*. Salway asserts that the *tria nomina* formed a system subject to rigid convention: symptomatic of a society that held *mos maiorum* in such high

---

<sup>61</sup> Wiseman, ‘LGRR’, 159.

<sup>62</sup> Salway, ‘What’s in a Name?’, 126.

<sup>63</sup> Salway, 125.

<sup>64</sup> Smith, *The Roman Clan*, 18.

<sup>65</sup> Smith, 169–70; Brunt, *The Fall of the Roman Republic and Related Essays*, 400–414.

reverence.<sup>66</sup> Ergo, the literature suggests an unexplored and significant link between *mos maiorum* and mythistorical genealogy.

The question that arises from reading the literature is: did the mythistorical genealogies evolve from *mos maiorum* to replicate the virtues and values of Rome's ancestors? Henriette Van de Blom points out that the ancestors created *mos* (behaviour, character, morals) and these collective actions and customs of the ancestors was termed *mos maiorum*, which was subject to interpretation and reinterpretation.<sup>67</sup> In this manner the Romans looked to the past not only for solutions but for qualifications for present situations which suited their own agenda. *Mos maiorum* instilled a sense of responsibility to live up to the standard of the ancestors within the family. The application to the thesis could be extracted by asking if this was a driving factor on wanting to incorporate the values directly into one's family by creating a direct link via blood or kinship to the prime exempla of such virtues. Since the gods had favoured the ancestors, an imitation of the *maiores* and their actions secured the continuation of this favour, a moralising element, which made history a series of good and bad actions of the ancestors.<sup>68</sup> In her article Joanna Kenty proposes that *mos maiorum* was an emulation of paradigmatic figures, rather than forward-looking notions of progress, determining the standards and norms of actions for Rome's public figures.<sup>69</sup> A senator's individual ancestry forms a basis of social and political identity, dictating the standard to which he was expected to match or to surpass in his political career. Kenty argues:

Each political conflict, in this view, becomes an opportunity to look back to the past and to pay quasi-religious obeisance to the founders of the family by reifying and renewing the family legacy for future generations.<sup>70</sup>

---

<sup>66</sup> Salway, 'What's in a Name?', 127.

<sup>67</sup> Blom, *Cicero's Role Models*, 14.

<sup>68</sup> Blom, 14.

<sup>69</sup> Kenty, 'Congenital Virtue'.

<sup>70</sup> Kenty, 431.



The next step is the connection between the *gens* of the ‘present’ and their origins in the past; the *princeps gentis*. The singular *nomen* of the early Roman figures and the majority of first ancestors form an interesting parallel with the gods. Another focus is the dualities of Rome and Alba Longa; Rome and Latium; and Roman Latium and the rest of Italy.<sup>71</sup> The *princeps gentis* also appears as a mythical and/or historical figure who clearly displays the virtues and attributes desired by the family or person. For example, *libertas* in the case of M. Iunius Brutus, co-assassin of C. Iulius Caesar, descendant of the liberator and founder of the Republic L. Iunius Brutus (cos. 509).<sup>72</sup>

The *princeps gentis* can have up to three clear core elements that drive the genealogy; a person, a place and a divinity. For the *Caecilii Metelli* it is Caeculus, founder of Praeneste, and son of Vulcan.<sup>73</sup> For the great *Aemilii* it is Amulius, king of Alba, and son of Iuppiter.<sup>74</sup> And most famous of all the *Iulii*, descended from Aeneas of Troy, and son of Venus.<sup>75</sup> Also, the *princeps gentis* can form the basis of a more realistic genealogy as seen in the genealogies written by Atticus for Scipio and Maximus; the *Fabii* and *Aemilii*.<sup>76</sup>

It is important to note Christopher Smith’s points on mythistorical genealogies. Whether or not it was important for each *gens* to have a mythical *princeps*, the stories were not fixed, elaboration and reinvention were permissible and so were competitive genealogies. Many of the stories relate to ritual activity but not all ritual activity relates to one of these stories. Whilst the function of the *princeps gentis* is often to give the *nomen* to the *gens*, it seems that ingenuity is needed to make the link,<sup>77</sup> such as folk etymology for example. I emphasise these points and elaborate by asking if there existed a *princeps gentis*

---

<sup>71</sup> Smith, *The Roman Clan*, 39.

<sup>72</sup> Marshall, ‘Atticus and the Genealogies’, 308.

<sup>73</sup> Wiseman, ‘LGRR’, 155.

<sup>74</sup> Wiseman, 153.

<sup>75</sup> Wiseman, 153.

<sup>76</sup> Marshall, ‘Atticus and the Genealogies’, 311–12.

<sup>77</sup> Smith, *The Roman Clan*, 41.

hierarchy or who were the most preferred and popular mythistorical ancestors? According to Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Trojan ancestry was in vogue (1.85).<sup>78</sup> Furthermore, the literature needs expansion concerning the traits that made the *princeps gentis* appealing. How did they represent the Republican virtues that the descendant wished to claim, emulate or replicate?

By the end of the Republic genealogies had become ‘businesses’ with some authors specialising.<sup>79</sup> Achias, a client of Cicero, had created a genealogy for the *Caecilii Metelli*, *Licinii Luculli* and the great Marius (Cic. *Att.* 1.16.15; Cic. *Arch.* 19).<sup>80</sup> C. Iulius Hyginus wrote *De familia Troianis* (Serv. *A.* 5.389) and Atticus had written three genealogies (Nep. *Att.* 18.3-4) and all three seem to have been written between 47 - 45.<sup>81</sup> On the other side of the fence was Asclepiades of Myrlea (c. 100) who divided history into three categories; the true, the semi-true (comedies, mime) and the false (genealogies, the only type considered false).<sup>82</sup> Genealogy stood outside the traditional genres of historiography, biography, and funeral and honorary *laudationes* and were compiled privately by great families for generations.<sup>83</sup>

M. Terentius Varro wrote *De familias Troianis* tracing the *Iunii* and *Aemilii* back to Aeneas. Peter Toohey does a great deal of work trying to reconstruct the context of these works. I would like to adapt and apply his technique to other genealogies as follows; identify the years of publication as accurately as possible; identify the author’s patrons or contemporaries; and place the work in its political context.<sup>84</sup> I aim to achieve this by adhering to the rule that we should always be asking at least these three questions when dealing with the scholarly evidence.

---

<sup>78</sup> Toohey, ‘Politics, Prejudice, and Trojan Genealogies’, 5.

<sup>79</sup> Farney, ‘The Mamilii, Mercury and the Limites: Aristocratic Genealogy and Political Conflict in Republican Rome’, 252.

<sup>80</sup> Farney, 251.

<sup>81</sup> Marshall, ‘Atticus and the Genealogies’, 307.

<sup>82</sup> Wiseman, ‘LGRR’, 158.

<sup>83</sup> Marshall, ‘Atticus and the Genealogies’, 307.

<sup>84</sup> Toohey, ‘Politics, Prejudice, and Trojan Genealogies’, 7.

Who was the target audience? What is the *raison d'être* of the work? And what was the work's intended reaction?

There appears to be a gap in the inclusion of art and inscriptions in the study of mythistorical genealogies. In her book Harriet Flower refers to the *elogia* of the *Forum Augustum* as especially suggestive of the type of inscriptions associated with ancestral images.<sup>85</sup> I would ask if they are also evidence of mythistorical genealogies. If so, their context must be considered, especially as they appear after the period on which the research is focused.

The use to which the genealogies were put begins with, like so much of Republican social elements, the *cursus honorum*. Were they used as propaganda or, as Toohey states, as advertising metaphors? Flower suggests that successful advertising is most often based on familiar concepts and values, and that advertising is especially concerned with name-recognition.<sup>86</sup> Again, the *princeps gentis* and *mos maiorum* appear to have a clear link to mythistoric genealogies. Cicero's treatment of *maiores* shows the areas of public life most subject to interpretation based on tradition; the treatment of provinces and enemies; the code of conduct of magistrates and political decision making by political bodies; legal sentencings and punishments; and religious matters.<sup>87</sup>

If there is an arguably strong connection between *mos maiorum* and mythistorical ancestry, then these areas should apply as possible uses of genealogy. The question that remains is how do these genealogies apply? Was mythistorical genealogy used to back up proposed legislation as argued by Toohey regarding Caesar and the *lex Cassia*?<sup>88</sup> Smith raises the question that if the connection to a common ancestor was fictitious, then how genuine was the kinship between the members

---

<sup>85</sup> Flower, *Ancestor Masks and Aristocratic Power in Roman Culture*, 5.

<sup>86</sup> Flower, 12.

<sup>87</sup> Kenty, 'Congenital Virtue', 433.

<sup>88</sup> Toohey, 'Politics, Prejudice, and Trojan Genealogies', 8.

of the *gens*? Ergo, I would ask how seriously they took these mythistorical genealogies when out of the public eye considering public perception of oneself was the defining factor of political life.<sup>89</sup>

There are a great many questions left un-answered. Who were the intended audiences? Were they dinner guests, companions in the baths, the forum crowd, or funeral attendees?<sup>90</sup> Who set the precedent? Caesar used it famously (Suet. *Jul.* 6.1) but who used it for political advantage first? And if the purpose was for the commonality of ancestors (shared traits, desirable virtues, mythology, historiography, or blood) how does that fit in with the modern debate over factions and the solidarity of *gens* in the *cursus honorum*? What constructive use can be made of heritage?<sup>91</sup>

If - like Brutus - heritage has a tradition of enforcing *libertas* during the Republic's history (509 - 46) then the heritage can be applied to highlight one's own political career as a continuation of enforcing *libertas*. Or heritage can fit with the idea of political and dynastic polishing as with M. Claudius Marcellus (cos. 50), as husband of Octavia, and father of Octavian's heir apparent.<sup>92</sup> The rounding out of the rough edges of one's *gens* and the un-desirable actions of one or two relatives can leave the more desirable actions of worthy ancestors as the defining features of the *gens*.

For example: Farney suggests that the coinage of the declining *Mamilii* was an act of desperation.<sup>93</sup> In his view the minting of coins depicting their ancestry was an innovation, having been the first to do so, L. Mamilius in 189 - 180, and was born from their "political impotence".<sup>94</sup> Again, using their mythistorical heritage towards one

---

<sup>89</sup> Smith, *The Roman Clan*, 15.

<sup>90</sup> Wiseman, 'LGRR', 159.

<sup>91</sup> Marshall, 'Atticus and the Genealogies', 309.

<sup>92</sup> For the argument pertaining to the polishing of M. Claudius Marcellus' anti-Caesarean political leanings see Marshall, 311; cf. Münzer, *Roman Aristocratic Parties and Families*, 334, 381, 391-94 and Cicero, *Pro Marcello*.

<sup>93</sup> Farney, 'The Mamilii, Mercury and the Limites: Aristocratic Genealogy and Political Conflict in Republican Rome', 254.

<sup>94</sup> Farney, 254.

aim which was the recovery of their footing in the great and only game: the *cursus honorum*. If mythistorical genealogy applies to the running for office, how do they affect the sources of power,<sup>95</sup> and if they do affect these sources of power, how do they fit into the divisions and disputes that formed ‘political groupings’, the coherence and continuity of such political groupings, and the motivations of these groupings as they formed?

The review of the scholarship highlights important aspects that suggest there is a strong link between mythistoric genealogies and *mos maiorum* that has yet to be explored. Firstly, that mythistoric genealogies served as aetiological connections with founders to provide the *gens* with a means for paradigmatic emulation in the form of a *princeps gentis*. Secondly, that the fluidity of political and social groupings added to the uncertainty of political life, which made the genealogies a popular way to advertise desired virtues that existed within *mos maiorum*. Thirdly, that the political motivations of the *nobiles* ran foremost in the composition of these genealogies. And lastly, that the dependence on tradition during most of the Republican era encouraged the reinvention of heritage in a way that reinforced older virtues.

---

<sup>95</sup> Such as senatorial hierarchy; the obligations of favour; *amicitia*; or magistrates in office, as emphasised by Astin, ‘Roman Government and Politics, 200-134 B.C.’, 168.

## Chapter 3

### Methodology

Kenneth Walters employs the expression Paradigmatic Pressure in describing the reduction of force, effect, or value in the Romans' sense of causation, in terms of the past.<sup>96</sup> This reduction was due to the recurring nature of annual consular 'dates', or eponymous names of years as labelled by consular pairs who often ran for re-election repeatedly.<sup>97</sup> The concept focusses on the comparison of the extraordinary acts of virtuous ancestors as self- or community-based motivations which influenced a person's reactions to personal and political matters.<sup>98</sup> Walters argues that Paradigmatic Pressure can operate in Rome because the Romans tended to deny that any fundamental societal change had occurred during four or more centuries (the era ranging from the Liberation from the kings in 509 through to the assassination of C. Iulius Caesar in 44).<sup>99</sup> This compression of time results, as theorised by Walters, from the annual recording of history through the *fasti*, which assessed the small number of *nobiles* who held *imperium*, the repetition of their virtuous acts within the different *gentes*, and their restrictive use of *praenomen* (the first name in Roman nomenclature). When combined, these elements facilitated the compression of the gap between the living and the dead.<sup>100</sup> Paradigmatic Pressure manifested due to the "narrowness" and restrictive use of nomenclature by the *nobiles*, the rituals surrounding *imagines*, and the way Romans reckoned time.<sup>101</sup>

---

<sup>96</sup> Walters, 'Time and Paradigm in the Roman Republic', 80; the theory of Walters fits in with the perspective of patrilineal lineage and the focus on the *nomen* as argued in Salway, 'What's in a Name?'

<sup>97</sup> Walters, 'Time and Paradigm in the Roman Republic', 80.

<sup>98</sup> Walters, 80.

<sup>99</sup> Walters, 97.

<sup>100</sup> Walters, 69.

<sup>101</sup> Walters, 97.

If genealogy is defined as a coping mechanism and a means to create a sense of belonging in a fluctuating and changing society, how does it exist in a community denying any fundamental change over four centuries? Despite appearing paradoxical on the surface, Paradigmatic Pressure will be considered here as an enabler of mythistoric genealogy. The pressure applied by one's ancestors to enforce the emulation of their actions and accomplishments by their descendants manifests itself in the reconstruction of the mythic past to reinforce those in the present. Thus, a means to measure Paradigmatic Pressure is required. The thesis will approach measuring the intensity of the compression of time and the expectations of *mos maiorum* by the amount of Social Capital a *gens* stored, used, and re-used.

In Hölkeskamp's *Reconstructing the Roman Republic*, he applies the concept of Social Capital to Roman Republican social history, to the *cursus honorum*, and importantly to *mos maiorum*.<sup>102</sup> Hölkeskamp defines Social Capital as a permanent network of current and potential social resources which are mutually acknowledged or accepted. Therefore, by definition, these resources are institutionalised relationships based upon membership in a group such as the *gens*. Hölkeskamp indicates that Social Capital was created by the ancestral accumulation of achievements that were universally acknowledged as prestigious and pre-eminent, which provided the members of a *gens* with social security and credibility, resting on the premise that these formal achievements were recognised by society. The achievements were surely ranked, as were most aspects of Roman life, from the classes to the offices of the *cursus honorum*, and are termed as 'deposits'.<sup>103</sup> Examples of straightforward deposits are consulships, dictatorships, triumphs, and praetorships.<sup>104</sup> Complicated deposits included virtuous aims such as being the best orator, a skilful

---

<sup>102</sup> Hölkeskamp, *Reconstructing the Roman Republic*, 107–24.

<sup>103</sup> Hölkeskamp, 109.

<sup>104</sup> Hölkeskamp, 109–10.

commander, having many male heirs, and displaying supreme wisdom as a senator.

All these Roman values, magistracies and processions counted in the *gentes* vault of Social Capital. Hölkeskamp suggests that new deposits were better than older ones, however the older deposits needed to be renewed on a regular basis, lest they be forgotten, and the vault depleted within a few generations.<sup>105</sup> The eventual decay of older deposits of Social Capital in the vault of a *gens* may be the only issue with melding the theories of Paradigmatic Pressure and Social Capital as one methodology. The point to note is that these two concepts should be understood as tendencies in Roman society, rather than invariable laws governing Roman attitudes to their own fluid social constructs. On the one side, Romans tended to project and replicate their past on to their present; conversely, families that failed to amass new and current deposits found that recent achievements eclipsed ancestral ones when their efforts were surpassed by new rivals.

However, it is not unreasonable to insist that the greater the deposit the longer the achievement lasted as a forerunning choice in the vault, if one recognises that the higher, scarcer magistracies and honours reaped greater Social Capital than the lower offices and were more *nobilis*, more ‘known’. According to my interpretations of Paradigmatic Pressure and Social Capital, dusting off the older investments in the vault of a *gens* was made easier by the compression of the Romans’ perception of time; using the moral examples of the ancestors as motivation and philosophy; aiming for the highest magistracies, always; and Paradigmatic Pressure, not only as the compression of time but as the expectation for a man to surpass the prestige of his father, allies and rivals. These elements assert that the ability to generate new interest from the old deposits of a generation or two before was not insurmountable if such a gap appeared in the fluidity of the political ambition of individuals within the *gens*.

---

<sup>105</sup> Hölkeskamp, 115.



Therefore, the length of a considerable gap in successful electioneering and politicking must be standardised within the research. To do so required the collation and analysis of the straightforward deposits of high-ranking achievements of the *gentes maior*.

The flow of these high-ranking ‘deposits’ through the half millennium of Republican civic life is illustrated in Paradigmatic Pressure lists for each of the *gentes*.<sup>106</sup> In the winning of the highest magistracies, the celebrations of triumphs, and the holding of priesthoods, each *gens maiores* rarely skipped a generational gap, and when they did, the gap was filled by other, lower deposits of Social Capital. The identification of a significant gap between high-ranking ‘deposits’ begins by identifying the length of a significant gap in the presence of a *gens* in the political and social environment of the city between their attainment of high-ranking ‘deposits’. Accepting the life expectancy of a Roman at birth to average between twenty to thirty years,<sup>107</sup> a gap of more than twenty years stresses a significant break in the flow of civic momentum of a *gens*. By breaking down these rare gaps to periods of less than twenty years, the thesis will emphasise the dominance of the *gentes maiores* through the Republic’s five-hundred-year existence and help stress a higher ‘water-mark’ of their *auctoritas*.

To further Walter’s theory, by moving away from the point of view of the historians of antiquity where the consulships served as the recording of time, but as an enforcer of *mos maiorum*, the discussion needs to include all those other high-ranking deposits that the *nobiles* sought to emulate in their own careers. The exclusion does not allow for the depth of Paradigmatic Pressure that I believe Walters tries to convey in his paper. For example, the two consequences of Walters’ theory of the recurring dating are: firstly, that the difficulty in distinguishing the ‘before’ and ‘after’ to get the sense of the order of

---

<sup>106</sup> See APPENDIX III: PARADIGMATIC PRESSURE for the separate lists of each of the *gentes* of the case studies.

<sup>107</sup> Parkin and Pomeroy, *Roman Social History*, 44–45.

events in the past, thus the perception of cause and effect; and secondly, that the events associated with the repetition of the same or similar consular names were easily seen as paradigms of each other. These two consequences are why Walters believes that Roman historiography was so obsessed with personality and moral *exempla*.<sup>108</sup> The practical manifestation of these consequences take form in the

paradigmatic pressure to act, either self-motivated or external, a pressure that compelled [one] to replicate the deeds of the past, as if nothing had changed in four and a half centuries.<sup>109</sup>

The realisation of the theory must go deeper. The greater push from the past must have resulted in the greater pressure on the relative present, therefore Paradigmatic Pressure needs more fuel. Surely, 500 years of history and achievements belonging to a specific *gens* were greater than 100 years, considering the scarcity of the highest magistracies and honours. With the two factors (firstly, ambiguity of ‘before’ and ‘after; secondly, repetition of consular names) forming the core incendiary element of the theory, the other high-ranking deposits must be the fuel to further feed the realisation of Paradigmatic Pressure. Here, where the core and fuel burn together is where *mos maiorum* manifests and where the mythistoric genealogies of the *gentes* enters the discussion.

As an illustration, if the achievements of the *gens Fabia* were restricted to the repetition of *nomen* paired consuls, as argued by Walters, we get a significantly lesser sense of Paradigmatic Pressure compared to when all the high-ranking deposits of the *gens* are listed chronologically. By adhering to the consular listing, we end up with eight pairs of consuls that a Fabius belongs to, essentially with only eight Fabian paradigms that exerted pressure on descendants in the present. This discussion does not aim to diminish the achievements of these eight paradigms and insists that they do form the foundation of the pressure in the vein of the original proposition of Paradigmatic

---

<sup>108</sup> Walters, ‘Time and Paradigm in the Roman Republic’, 80.

<sup>109</sup> Walters, 81.

Pressure.<sup>110</sup> However, the magnitude of the pressure of the *mos maiorum* developed over the centuries is lost by the restriction to these eight examples.

On the other hand, if the other high-ranking deposits of Military Tribunes with Consular Powers, Censorships, Dictatorships, Masters of the Horse, and Praetorships/Promagistracies are included, the expansion as proposed stresses the build-up of pressure during the Republic. All these magistracies (except Praetorships and Promagistracies) can be found on the *Fasti Consulares Capitolini* which stresses their importance in terms of Paradigmatic Pressure. The value of any, or each, of these magistracies cannot be overstated in terms of their scarcity, social impact and the *auctoritas* that they continually added to the vaults of Social Capital. Each ancestor's achievements were also recorded by their *gens* and, regardless of accuracy, would have looked more like the list in Appendix III, and thus exerted more pressure. A simplified way to express the greater pressure from the inclusion of the other higher-ranking deposits is to analyse the average gap in years between the deposits, in the case of the *Fabii* every four years, and conclude that every four years<sup>111</sup> the deposit of such *imperium* wielding magistracies meant that: one, they exerted a great deal of expectation on the new generation; and two, they compressed time with the repetition of recycled nomenclature. In the case of the *Fabii* the recurring pattern that was Quintus Fabius Maximus, son of Quintus, Grandson of Quintus, certainly aides Walters' theory and is further illustrated with the inclusion of the other deposits.

I suggest that, from the expansion of the theory of Paradigmatic Pressure, it was natural to start to identify with a *princeps gentis*, and eponymous progenitor, of whom the members of the *gens* helped place

---

<sup>110</sup> The obvious case in these pairings is Q. Fabius Maximus Verrucosus Cunctator, who was part of three separate pairings. Fabius Cunctator is mentioned more than once within the thesis and serves as an ideal example of a paradigm.

<sup>111</sup> On average, which is less than the gap between each census.

themselves in the present time. The temporal placement occurred whilst remaining connected to the teachings of *mos maiorum* using the methods of ancestral worship already in place. If the list of achievements becomes a continuous ranking of achievements by members of the *gens* with essentially the same name, appearing as such, it may have been simpler to identify with a single ancestor, preferably one who is resplendent with the inner virtues and ideals that *mos maiorum* were teaching the current members. An element which was enforced by a historiography obsessed with personality and *exempla*. Therefore, a *princeps gentis* aptly serves as the paradigm, paragon, and progenitor of these repeating actions, deeds, virtues, and political competence, serving as an example of the Republic's nobility's stamina, fortitude and enduring strength. The adoption of each of the case study *gentes* of a mythistorical figure as their *princeps gentis* certainly supports the idea that a mythistorical emblem of their virtues and achievements stood out from the blur of the repetitive deposits. In each of the case studies the continual deposit of high-ranking achievements, and lower achievements where there are significant gaps in those higher deposits, emphasise the continual flow of *auctoritas* for each *gens*. Considering that, from the outside, the teachings of *mos maiorum* appear to weave a confusing but known corpus of precedents and rules that the *nobiles* managed to follow, reflective of the nature of the *cursus honorum*.

A thematic approach to the three case studies proved to be the most useful method to illustrate the process of emphasising the *auctoritas* of the *gentes maiores*: “the substance on which real influence is based”.<sup>112</sup> *Auctoritas* needed to be constantly validated and reacquired with deposits of Social Capital that gave the members of the *gens* elected to the *cursus honorum* the ‘special insight’ to lead and govern (Suet. *Tib.* 27).<sup>113</sup> The mythistoric genealogies illustrate four key themes that form

---

<sup>112</sup> Galinsky, *Augustan Culture*, 15.

<sup>113</sup> Galinsky, 13.

the basis of this right to rule: sources, the emphasis of the mythistoric genealogies in the literature; strength, the illustration and *exempla* of the strength of the *gens*; space, the occupation and control of public space and monuments in the City of Rome (the heart of power); and sanctity, the responsibility and dedication to *religio* and maintenance of the *pax deorum*.

Accepting the definition of *auctoritas* as the “basis of Roman political authority”,<sup>114</sup> the nature of how *auctoritas* is granted is of greater concern. Karl Galinsky proposes that *auctoritas* needed constant renewal and validation.<sup>115</sup> In terms of the nature of Roman nobility, Galinsky’s argument certainly sounds evocative of the essence of the *nobiles*. If a Roman’s elevation to the aristocracy is based on their electioneering successes, and their *auctoritas* is granted by those around them and needs constant validation, then the perception of the political authority of an individual or *gens*, by those beneath them, appears to be particularly vulnerable. However, the opposite is true of the *gentes maiores*. Thanks to their continuous banking of high-ranking deposits, the big five’s *auctoritas* was unceasingly revalidated by those around them over the 500 years of the Republic: a critical point to acknowledge and remember. But, if *auctoritas* was also a “special insight”, something from within, that worked to ensure that advice given, or requests made, were almost certainly accepted (Suet. *Tib.* 27),<sup>116</sup> any extra reasoning or explanation imagined for validating and perpetuating the innate ability to possess *auctoritas* was adopted and used to ensure the basis of political power did not run dry.

The continuous flow of great *auctoritas* and political activity of the *gentes maiores* will not only highlight the significance of dusting off and using the older high-ranking deposits, through which the flow of

---

<sup>114</sup> Balot, *A Companion to Greek and Roman Political Thought*, 28.

<sup>115</sup> Galinsky, *Augustan Culture*, 6.

<sup>116</sup> Galinsky, 13.

offices is firstly measured, but also further illustrate the perception of the compression of time as argued by Paradigmatic Pressure. Once the continual flow of Social Capital deposits for each *gens* is established, illustrating and emphasising their political and social pre-eminence, the genealogy(s) will be described and summarised to emphasise each *princeps gentis* as an anchor to the past, as well as how they might have provided a sense of belonging by the imitation of, or moral philosophy of, the ancestors through *mos maiorum*. Finally, each genealogy will be analysed to indicate how they enforced Cultural Memory to the advantage of each *gens*, through temple dedications, festivals, *religio*, the *cursus honorum*, *laudationes* and funeral processions. The conclusions to be drawn from these three analytical approaches (Social Capital, Paradigmatic Pressure' and the perpetuation of *auctoritas*) are that mythistoric genealogies were a natural and inevitable development of *mos maiorum*; and subsequently, they were a mechanism drawn upon by members of a *gens* to emphasise their ancestry, dedication to the Republic, and the right to high office.

## Chapter 4

### The *Gens* of Assaracus

The following discussion will look at the two mythistorical ancestors at the base of the various genealogies associated by our sources with the family's various branches. I will begin with the Alban king Amulius, through whom the *Aemilii* celebrated descentance from Iuppiter and Aeneas. The resulting implication of this connection of the *gens* to Amulius was the protection of *pax deorum* as well as the period preceding the mythic foundation of Rome. Secondly, through Mamercus, son of either Numa Pompilius or his advisor Pythagoras, the *gens* celebrated and claimed Sabine and Spartan ideals or values as well as emphasised their religious observance as a direct result of their relationship with Numa, founder of Rome's religious institutions.

The pairing of Iuppiter and heroic traits with King Amulius is peculiar. There are three versions of Amulius and his part in the birth of Romulus. His roles appear to be set as the opposing force in the myth of Rome's foundation, instead of a constructive force in establishing the majesty of the Roman Republic and is portrayed differently by three main sources: Quintus Ennius, C. Licinius Macer and Silius Italicus.<sup>117</sup> Writing early in the second century, Q. Ennius is alluded to, recognised, quoted or paraphrased by Virgil, Silius, Cicero, Gellius, Varro, Festus, and Livy, and this list is restricted to only those authors who are raised and discussed in the case studies. The context of the discussion requires the reminder that Cato the Elder was writing around the same time as Ennius. Cato's legacy as the "inventor" of Latin historiography also extended down through the centuries with his life serving as an *exemplum* in Plutarch's *Cato Maior*, as an inspiration for

---

<sup>117</sup> For an introduction to Ennius see Skutsch, *The Annals of Q. Ennius*; and for Macer see Cornell, *FRH*, 1:320–31. For the context and intertextuality of Silius' *Punica* see Augoustakis, *Brill's Companion to Silius Italicus*.

the *novus homo* Cicero as his “chosen ancestor” (*Verr.* 2.5.108; *Mur.* 66), and his virtues worthy of praise by Livy (39.40.4-12). The meeting of these two authors (historian and poet, Roman and immigrant) and pairing them with the symbolism of myth and history creates an idyllic foundation for mythistoric genealogies. Yet, they do not form the only basis of the myth considering there are many competing founding legends in Rome, which remained current during the Empire.

With that said, Ennius describes Amulius and his role in the birth of Romulus in the *Annales*. The poem describes Aeneas as having twin daughters who, after his death, became Vestal virgins under Amulius the King of Alba Longa.<sup>118</sup> Told through a dream sequence in the poem, the youngest twin Ilia was left pregnant with twins Romulus and Remus by Mars (Ennius *Annales* 34-50 Sk.). After Ilia gave birth to the twins, Amulius ordered that she be drowned in the Tiber as punishment for being a Vestal non-virgin and that the twins be set adrift down the river (57; 58 Sk.) After washing ashore, the twins were suckled by a she-wolf under a ficus by the *Lupercal* cave at the foot of the Palatine Hill. Ilia survives her drowning and is wed to the river-god Anio (61 Sk.).<sup>119</sup> In Ennius’ account we see Amulius going against the divine bloodlines of Aemylia and Aemylos, in his failed execution of Ilia, to protect the sacrosanctity of the Vestal priestesses. The outcome of which was essentially ‘no harm, no foul’ and saw Romulus found the city of Rome, arguably because Amulius had ordered the twins set afloat down the flooded Tiber.

The protection of the sacrosanctity of the priesthood of the Vestals is, from the perspective of the Aemilian *princeps gentis*, the paramount concern and driver of the narrative. The sentencing against the crime of *incestum* and the execution of the punishment, by direct consequence, pave the path the twins ultimately took towards the mythic foundation of Rome. The incident was clearly common

---

<sup>118</sup> Wiseman, *The Myths of Rome*, 138–40.

<sup>119</sup> Wiseman, 140.



knowledge in Rome and cited in the sources and the stark contrast between Amulius who is emphasised at protecting the *pax deorum* in a traditional manner, also in the *gens* Aemilia's connection to Numa (which is reinforced below), versus the semi-chaotic and conflicting auguries of Romulus and Remus that ends in murder, is significant. The story indicates King Amulius' concern for protecting the *pax deorum*, and that his decision to have Ilia drowned instead of buried alive in the centre of the city leads directly to the twins' survival. The theme is consistent with the *gens* as the *Aemilii* asserted the connection and protection of the Vestal priesthood in another genealogy (below). However, the peculiarity of the tale describing a Vestal virgin without the sacred fire and altar in the forum of Rome to tend to, and the city inconveniently unfounded at this time, is the least implausible aspect of this ancestral claim.

The mythic reputation of Amulius was further altered by C. Licinius Macer (Pr. 68; Tr.Pl. 73) writing in the mid-first century of which we only have fragments of his history. Robert Ogilvie stresses that Licinius used the history of Cn. Gellius as the foundation for his own work whilst incorporating his own additions, which this discussion accepts.<sup>120</sup> In the case study of the *Aemilii*, Licinius' changed the narrative by altering the mythic elements of Rome's history to incorporate the more human motivations of betrayal and murderous political gambits.<sup>121</sup> This adaptation from one source to another, is reflective of early Latin literature's predisposition to reshape and renovate Greek works in a process called *vortere*, or 'turning'.<sup>122</sup> As an adaptation of the history most likely composed by Gellius, the history of Licinius shows the repetition of *vortere*, but used on Latin historiography to turn one's previous source into one's own version of history. Before suffering prosecution and conviction for extortion (Cic.

---

<sup>120</sup> Ogilvie, *A Commentary on Livy Books 1-5*, 9.

<sup>121</sup> Wiseman, 199. For the life of C. Licinius Macer Cornell, *FRH*, 1:320–21; and, Ogilvie, *A Commentary on Livy Books 1-5*, 7–12.

<sup>122</sup> O'Bryhim and Franko, *Greek and Roman Comedy*, 151.

*Att.* 1.4.2; *Val. Max.* 9.12.7; *Plut. Cic.* 9.1-2), Licinius altered the mythic elements from the story by adding the age-old human motivations of betrayal, lust and murderous political gambits. As a politician for the people (*Sal. Hist.* 3.48M), Licinius favoured political motivation as a driver of events over the religious, as evident in his insinuated remarks towards Romulus' murder of Remus (*Liv.* 6.3-4) and Titus Tatius' death (*Liv.* 14.1-3).<sup>123</sup> In Licinius' version Rhea was ravished in the grove of Mars, not by the god of war, but by Amulius. The story also claimed that the twins were not suckled by a she-wolf but the shepherdess Lykaina (*lukaina*, Greek for she-wolf), a proposed *princeps gentis* for the plebeian *gens Licinii* (*FRH C.* Licinius Macer 27 F12). Despite the alterations by Licinius, Amulius' part in the foundation myth remained. The link to Aeneas, Alba Longa and the *Aemilii* remained intact. No matter how small or speculative the connection was at the time, the claim survived in the sources and Licinius is discussed further in Chapter 5 (below).

Following the historical attempts at dating the Fall of Troy in 1184/3 by Eratosthenes of Kyrene (*FGrH* 241 F1) and the foundation of Rome in 813/4 by Timaios of Tauromenium (*FGrH* 566 F60; *D.H.* 1.74.1) a new era needed to be explained away. The 371-year gap challenged the version that Aeneas' daughter Ilia was the mother of Romulus as told by Ennius.<sup>124</sup> The thirteen Kings of Alba Longa were presented to fill the gap that Ennius had been unaware of, or had chosen to ignore, under poetic licence.<sup>125</sup> The Alban Kings allowed for Aeneas' bloodline to traverse the four-century gap by asserting that his son Iulus had founded Alba Longa (*Verg. A.* 1.267). In the Alban King tradition, Amulius was the brother to King Numitor who had a daughter Rhea Silvia. Desiring the throne, Amulius cheated Numitor out of the Kingship and, to prevent a male heir, made his niece Rhea a Vestal

---

<sup>123</sup> See Ogilvie, *A Commentary on Livy Books 1-5*, C. Licinius Macer 11–12; Romulus 54; Titus Tatius 81.

<sup>124</sup> Eratosthenes of Kyrene c.285-194; Timaios of Tauromenium, Sicily c. 350-260.

<sup>125</sup> For the list of Alban Kings and the foundation legend see Wiseman, *The Myths of Rome*, 140. Cf. *Liv.* 1.3.6-10; *D.H.* 1.70; *Ov. Met.* 14.609-21, *Fast.* 4.39-55.

(Liv. 1.3.10-11; D.H. 1.76-9). Rhea gave birth to the twins following the same narrative as the Ilia version. The difference is that in this version Romulus and Remus kill their great uncle Amulius and restore their grandfather Numitor to the throne of Alba Longa. They then return to the site whence they had washed up to found cities of their own (Liv. 1.6.3-7; D.H. 1.85). Amulius' desire for kingship here is puzzling considering the traditional anti-monarchist temperament of the Roman people, the *nobiles* especially, and the portrayal of the claimed Aemilian *princeps gentis* as a blood-lusting tyrant. Amulius goes on to convict Rhea Silvia of *incestum*, but the justification for the sentencing appears to have moved away from the protection of the priesthood, and the duty of the King in terms of *religio*, towards his urgency to retain the throne. The result is a 'good guy, bad guy' portrayal and presents the discussion with a dilemma, considering the bad guy version is the more popular of the annalistic tradition. The resilience of the portrayal of Amulius, which became the more popular tradition, suggests the *gens Aemilia* could not get their favoured version at the forefront of this particular myth.

Returning to the *Annales*, a connection of the *Aemilii* to Amulius by Ennius as a prestigious Latin poet carried certain *gravitas*, his poems emphasising Roman national spirit whilst simultaneously Hellenising Latin literature.<sup>126</sup> The tale as told by Ennius was ancient by the time Italicus had inserted the claim into the *Punica* two-hundred years later (below), despite the violent alteration made by Licinius Macer and is by far the more favourable towards the *Aemilii* of the three versions. Active as a Roman poet between 200 (end of the Second Punic War) and 169 (end of the Second Macedonian War), Ennius was under the patronage of M. Fulvius Nobilior who along with M. Porcius Cato (who had brought Ennius to Rome in 202/3)<sup>127</sup> were united politically against the dominance of the *Cornelii Scipiones* leading up to the turn

---

<sup>126</sup> Scullard, *Roman Politics, 220-150 B.C.*, 112.

<sup>127</sup> Scullard, 112.

of the second century.<sup>128</sup> However, after 179 when Fulvius and Aemilius Lepidus were elected Censors and publicly reconciled (Liv. 40.45.6-46.16; Cic. *Prov. Cons.* 20; Val. Max. 4.2.1), Skutsch points out that “praise of the *Aemilii* is [to] be expected and can be seen in [book] XIV.x”,<sup>129</sup> and suggests that Fulvius, who was in a weaker position, had sought out the partnership with Aemilius in opposition to his former ally against the *Scipiones*, Cato. The background of the shifting political ties illustrates the connection between the *Aemilii* and the *Cornelii Scipiones*, the latter of whom possessed a statue of the poet on the façade of their famous tomb outside the *Porta Capena* (Liv. 38.56.3) and who wrote the poem *Scipio* (Cic. *De. Or.* 2.276).<sup>130</sup> On this basis it is not unreasonable to suggest that this favoured version of the myth was written by an Ennius who was at least sympathetic to the *Aemilii*, but in no way a pet poet.

Turning to the *Punica*, L. Aemilius Paullus claims to be descended from Iuppiter through Assaracus in a speech about duty to family and country (*Pun.* 8.295-6), a vivid reflection of the key themes attached to Aeneas (great-grandson of Assaracus) in Vergil’s *Aeneid*. The association, made through the sorrowful speech of Aemilius to Fabius Maximus, that if they do end up going into battle at Cannae, then Aemilius’ duty demands it of him. He swore an oath to the Tarpeian Rock which sat at the foot of the Temple of Iuppiter Optimus Maximus on the Capitoline (Sil. *Pun.* 8.340). The origins of the cliff, where traitors were hurled to their deaths on the Forum below, were depicted on the frieze of the Basilica Aemilia. The oath emphasises, not only Aemilius’ duty to the Republic in opposition to the theme of treachery, but his Sabine heritage and the strength that he inherited from the genealogy linking the *Aemilii* to Numa, and the continuation of Spartan strength in Italy. Aemilius also swore an oath to Iuppiter, his progenitor

---

<sup>128</sup> See Skutsch, *The Annals of Q. Ennius*, 552; 572, who traces the hostility through the *Annales*.

<sup>129</sup> Skutsch, 2.

<sup>130</sup> Skutsch, 2.

and the reason for his strength, a trait no one could deny if they saw Aemilius fight (8.296; 8.340). Aemilius was aware that if the Roman army engaged Hannibal in battle at Cannae he would not be returning to Rome alive; asserting he would no longer be thinking of the *Assaraci de gente*, ‘the gens of Assaracus’ (8.346).

Aemilius had already proven his worth as a leader with his victory in Illyria in 219 (Polyb. 3.16.7; 18-19). His only choice was to go into battle with his fellow consul, Varro commanding in turn, but only after acknowledging that Q. Fabius Maximus Cunctator’s policy of delay had helped turn the tide against Hannibal’s invasion of Italy. The same Fabius who moved the colossal statue of Hercules from Tarentum to the Capitoline in 209. In Plutarch (where we learn about the statue of Hercules), as well as in the *Punica*, Fabius urges Aemilius to restrain the madness of Varro and that Aemilius’ strength lay in acknowledging his own weaknesses (Plut. *Fab.* 14). Aemilius rejects Fabius’ plea claiming that he would rather face the spears of the Carthaginians than to stand for re-election. As he dies he asks a messenger, a young Cornelius Lentulus, to tell Fabius that he remained true to his convictions, and by proxy his *pietas* (Plut. *Fab.* 16.5-8). Fabius’ exhibited strength is portrayed as a continuation of the strength that his clan, the gens of Assaracus, had inherited from Iuppiter but is also doubled up with his descendance from the Sabines.

The emphasis of strength is also expressed in the coinage of the respective *gentes*. Ancestry was a common element of Roman coinage as indicated on the repetition of themes of the coins of Mn. Aemilius Paullus in 114 (*RRC* 291/1) and of M. Aemilius Lepidus in 61 (*RRC* 419/1d).<sup>131</sup> The reverse of both coins depicts a statue of a victorious Aemilian ancestor on horseback, and there are no grounds for regarding the first moneyer Mn. Aemilius Paullus as the name of the first

---

<sup>131</sup> See APPENDIX I for images of coins. Coins are identified by the typology set out in Crawford, *Roman Republican Coinage*, 305–6; 443–44, which is the primary typology for identifying coins of the Roman Republic.

horseman standing atop the aqueduct, showing the precedent of portraying an ancestor on a coin. Michael Crawford suggests that the horseman on the coin of 61 portrays the statue erected to M. Aemilius Lepidus (cos. 187) for acts of bravery during the Second Punic War.<sup>132</sup> That these coins represent the same statue and the same Aemilian paragon is certainly a realistic explanation, and a symbol of the continuation of the paradigm of strength in battle as possessed by members of the *gens Aemilia*.

The *gens Aemilia* were further connected to the Trojan hero Aeneas and his mother the goddess Venus in two genealogies. The first through Aeneas' Latin wife Lavinia, with whom he had a daughter Aemylia (Plut. *Rom.* 2; Festus, *Gloss. Lat.* 121) who became a Vestal Virgin. Plutarch mentions that Aemylia, having laid with the god Mars, gave birth to Romulus.<sup>133</sup> However, the mention of Aemylia is brief and among many other claims establishing that there were many maternal variations for the great founder. The specific problem with Aemylia as the mother of Romulus is the four-century gap between the Trojan exodus and the mythic foundation of Rome. The *Aemilii* also claimed to have descended from another Aemilia. She was a *Vestalis maxima* who, with a prayer to Vesta, had relit the sacred fire by laying the linen from her dress on the cold ashes (Val. Max. 1.1.7; D.H. 2.68.3-5).<sup>134</sup> Unfortunately, the other evidence we have for a Vestal for the *gens Aemilia* is for an Aemilia who, along with a Licinia, and a Marcia were accused of *incestum* in 114, and only Aemilia was condemned by the pontifices (*MRR* 534) which is discussed below.

We are also told that Aeneas had a son Aemylos who was a brother to Iulus (Festus, *Gloss. Lat.* 121),<sup>135</sup> a convenient link between the *Aemilii* and the *Iulii*. Aemylos is not mentioned by name in any other

---

<sup>132</sup> Crawford, 444.

<sup>133</sup> Wiseman, *The Myths of Rome*, 56; Wiseman, *Roman Drama and Roman History*, 110–11.

<sup>134</sup> Wiseman, *Roman Drama and Roman History*, 111.

<sup>135</sup> Wiseman, 'LGRR', 153; Smith, *The Roman Clan*, 35; Wiseman, *Roman Drama and Roman History*, 111.

sources, yet Livy accepts the possibility of Aeneas having other sons (Liv. 1.3.2).<sup>136</sup> How the legacies of Aemylia or Aemylos survived the four hundred years between the foundations of Alba Longa and Rome to become the *gens* Aemilia remains untold. The relationship between the *gens* and the two children of Aeneas is left unwritten and in false etymological implication. Further discussion leans dangerously close towards speculation. However, the tales would have made for an epic on a grand scale had the *Aemilii* invested in the telling of such a tale to enforce their *gens* as descendants of Venus and Aeneas. Perhaps they were merely beaten to the task by Vergil and the *Iulii*. Yet, their connection to the heroes of Troy and Alba Longa remains, however small.

The *Aemilii* were connected to the early years of the Roman Kingdom and the city's foundation through Numa. The *princeps gentis* in the genealogy was named Mamercus, which was used as a *praenomen* and *cognomen* by the *gens* Aemilia.<sup>137</sup> Mamercus Aimylos was either the son of the Philosopher Pythagoras (Plut. *Aem.* 2) or Numa (Plut. *Num.* 8.11). The son Mamercus, either by Numa or Pythagoras, was nicknamed *Aimylos* ('graceful') because he was such an agreeable person (Festus, *Gloss. Lat.* 121; Plut. *Aem.* 2; *Num.* 8.19).<sup>138</sup> The less plausible version of the Pythagoras mentioned was the Philosopher (c.600) who, by the third century, was memorialised in a statue erected in the Forum.<sup>139</sup> According to the traditional dates of the kings of Rome, Numa reigned from 716 - 672.<sup>140</sup> The Philosopher Pythagoras lived nearly a century too late, meaning the Philosopher who advised Numa must have been another Pythagoras. Pythagoras appears as a later addition having been invented by Aristonexus and

---

<sup>136</sup> Smith, *The Roman Clan*, 35.

<sup>137</sup> Wiseman, *The Myths of Rome*, 14; Broughton, *MRR*, 1951.

<sup>138</sup> Wiseman, 'LGRR', 155; Münzer, *Roman Aristocratic Parties and Families*, 144; Smith, *The Roman Clan*, 36; Maltby, *A Lexicon of Ancient Latin Etymologies*, 12; Wiseman, *Roman Drama and Roman History*, 103.

<sup>139</sup> Ogilvie, *A Commentary on Livy Books 1-5*, 89. Statue erected in the *comitium* which was the area north of the Forum and at the foot of the Capitoline Hill.

<sup>140</sup> Hornblower, Spawforth, and Eidinow, *OCD*, 1181.

adopted by Diodorus and Ovid.<sup>141</sup> However, Ennius places Egeria, a fountain nymph and inspirer of wisdom as Numa's advisor (Ennius *Annales* 113 Sk.; Liv. 1.21.3).

The second Pythagoras possibility is the Spartan Olympian who had won the foot race at the 713 Olympics (D.H. 2.58.3). The connection here seems more plausible when considering one of the four origin stories for the Sabini in the ancient sources.<sup>142</sup> The Spartans are attributed by the Romans as the parent race of the Sabines (*FRH* Cn. Gellius 14 F20; Cato 5 F51; D.H. 2.49.4; Plut. *Rom.* 16.1; *Num.* 1).<sup>143</sup> The Spartans, fleeing the rule of Lykourgos, had sailed to Italy and settled in Sabinum (D.H. 2.49.4). From Sabus the Spartan, the founder of Sabinum, the Sabines had learnt to be the toughest of all men, a trait which the Romans had inherited after adopting their customs (*FRH* Cato 5 F51).<sup>144</sup> The Sabine connection is made more apparent when considering Numa, a traditional founder of Roman *religio*, was from the Sabine town of Cures (Liv. 1.18.1; Plut. *Num.* 3; D.H. 2.58.2).

In the version where Mamercus Aemylus is one of the four sons of Numa, whose descendants, some say, still survive (*FRH* Cn. Gellius 14 F22), the name reflects the King's admiration for his teacher Pythagoras (Plut. *Num.* 8.11) and supports the Sabine lineage of the *Aemilii* through the second king. Firstly, before the Sabine heritage is considered, it should be noted that Numa was considered the second founder of Rome as the religious counterpart to the martial Romulus (Liv. 19.1; Verg. *A.* 6.810-11).<sup>145</sup> Having been accredited with the institution of the *Flamines*, the *Vestal Virgins* (note the contradiction to the Vestal under Amulius), the *Salii*, and the Calendar reforms (Liv.

---

<sup>141</sup> Skutsch, *Sk.*, 265.

<sup>142</sup> Vanotti, 'Sabini'.

<sup>143</sup> Farney, 'The Name-Changes of Legendary Romans and the Etruscan-Latin Bilingual Inscriptions: Strategies for Romanization', 150.

<sup>144</sup> Farney, *Ethnic Identity and Aristocratic Competition in Republican Rome*, 101; Cornell, *FRH*, 2013, 2:159.

<sup>145</sup> Ogilvie, *A Commentary on Livy Books 1-5*, 88.



1.19.6-20.4), an association with the second king meant association with the religion of the Roman state.

The *gens* Aemilia continued their celebration of Sabine and foundation origins in their friezes on the Basilica Aemilia, specifically the Rape of the Sabine Women and the killing of Tarpeia (Sculpture 1 & 2). The Rape is defended as the inclusion of the Sabines into the Roman bloodline through ‘marriage by capture’ (Plut. *Rom.* 15)<sup>146</sup> and the sharing of citizenship, Roman possessions and the privilege of having Roman descendants (Liv. 1.9.14-16). Dionysius goes further, agreeing with other sources, emphasising the act was a design to institute an alliance with the Sabines, desired because of an affinity for Sabinum culture and celebrated the *Consualia* festival even in his time (D.H. 2.31.1-2).

The depiction of the killing of Tarpeia from the Basilica Aemilia is related to the Tarpeian Rock, a cliff at the steps of the Temple of Iuppiter Optimus Maximus on the Capitoline from which criminals and traitors were hurled to their deaths. Named for three *Tarpeii*, the Basilica version presents Tarpeia, a Vestal Virgin who had let her father Titus Tatius into Rome to avenge the Rape of the Sabine Women (Plut. *Rom.* 17.5).<sup>147</sup> The Tarpeian Rock is also described as being named after Lucius Tarpeius who opposed Romulus over the Rape (Festus, *Gloss. Lat.* 464), or a Spurius Tarpeius who failed to defend the Capitoline against Titus Tatius (Plut. *Rom.* 17.5). All three versions advertise the mixing of Roman and Sabine blood and culture, and along with the two friezes, advertises the Sabine and Roman ancestry of the *gens* Aemilia under the kings.

---

<sup>146</sup> Wiseman, *The Myths of Rome*, 144.

<sup>147</sup> Wiseman, 145.

## Marcus Aemilius Scaurus

The *gens Aemilius* had attained many marvellous achievements worthy of remembrance as reflected by their vault of Social Capital.<sup>148</sup> One optimal example for the *gens* was the triumphator L. Aemilius Regillus who also stands out as the Praetor who destroyed Antiochus the Great's fleet at Myonnessus in 190 (Liv. 37.2.10, 4.5, 14-15, 17-19, 21.6-22, 26-32, 47.3-4; Polyb. 21.7-8, 10; App. Syr. 26-27), the naval battle that preceded the Seleucid's final defeat at Magnesia (Liv. 37.1.7-10, 2.2-3, 4.1-4; Val. Max. 5.5.1).<sup>149</sup> Another was the triumphator M. Aemilius Lepidus who built the *Via Aemilia* (Liv. 39.2.10; CIL I<sup>2</sup>.2.617-20),<sup>150</sup> the *Pons Aemilius* (Liv. 40.51), and who, as Censor in 179, built the *Basilica Aemilia et Fulvia* (Liv. 40.46.16, 51-52; Varro *Ling.* 6.4) with his former enemy and fellow Censor M. Fulvius Nobilior (Liv. 40.45.6-46.16; Cic. *Prov. Cons.* 20; Val. Max. 4.2.1).<sup>151</sup> Two members of this *gens* held the distinguished position of *princeps senatus*, namely M. Aemilius Lepidus (179 to 154) and M. Aemilius Scaurus (115 to 89) who will be discussed below.

The *gens Aemilia*'s largest gap is the thirty years between the consulship of T. Aemilius Mamercus in 467 and the military tribunate with consular powers of Mam. Aemilius Mamercinus in 438, which can be shrunk to a twenty-one-year gap with the election of Mamercinus as one of the first quaestors in 446 (along with a Valerius Potitus).<sup>152</sup> An appointment that, as the first quaestors in the sixty-three years since Tarquinius Superbus was expelled and the Republic

---

<sup>148</sup> High-ranking Social Capital (minimum estimates) of the *gens Aemilia* from 509 to 31: 37 consulships (4% of total consulships during the period); 10 triumphs; 12 military tribunates with consular powers; 6 censorships; 7 dictatorships; 25 praetorships or pro-magistracies; 13 (years) *princeps senatus*; 2 *pontifex maximus*, 6 *pontifices*; 2 *augures*; 1 *flamen martialis*. See APPENDIX II: *GENS AEMILIA*.

<sup>149</sup> Broughton, *MRR*, 1951, 1:356; Venning and Drinkwater, *A Chronology of the Roman Empire*, 135–36.

<sup>150</sup> Broughton, *MRR*, 1951, 1:368.

<sup>151</sup> Broughton, 1:392.

<sup>152</sup> Broughton, 1:51.

established, carried a significant amount of prestige and weight as a social credit deposit for any Aemilius who followed. The other two significant gaps (extant due to the void of reliable sources for the holding of priesthoods before the middle-Republic) are periods of twenty-two and twenty years preceding the year 255 and are separated by a period of sixty-six years. The twenty-two-year gap between the consulships of L. Aemilius Mamercinus in 363 and L. Aemilius Mamercinus Privernas in 341 is bridged, firstly, by the appointment of L. Aemilius Mamercinus (cos. 363) as an interrex along with five other ex-consuls in 355 (Liv. 7.17.10-12; 18.1); secondly, by the Master of the Horse appointment of L. Aemilius (Mamercinus) who served under a Julian dictator in 352 (Liv. 7.21.9); and thirdly, by the appointment of T. Aemilius (cos. 339) to a special commission of five to fix a debt crisis in 352 (Liv. 7.21.5-8).<sup>153</sup> The second significant high-ranking gap between the censorship of Q. Aemilius Papus in 275 and the consulship of M. Aemilius Paullus in 255 sits at twenty years, and although no evidence exists, the gap can be shortened by the expectation that, by at least 258, M. Aemilius Paullus had been elected as a praetor before going on to win the consulship.

The discussion must address the struggle of M. Aemilius Scaurus in his rise through the *cursus honorum* and by doing so illustrate how his career enforced the aspect and ideals of the mythistoric genealogy of the *gens Aemilia*, of whom he belonged. So, what do we know about M. Aemilius Scaurus except that the progenitor of his *familia* had prominent or swollen ankles,<sup>154</sup> and that a distant ancestor had lost the

---

<sup>153</sup> One major issue with the early *fasti*, an important source for the listing of these Social Capital deposits, are that many figures are later confections (see Ridley, 'Falsi Triumphi, Plures Consulatus', 372–82). However, these additional achievements work to enforce the importance of each *gens* keeping those old deposits clean and forefront within the current memory of Rome's society, even if that means filling in gaps with embellished achievements listed in funeral speeches as true accomplishments in the *fasti*.

<sup>154</sup> For Scaurus meaning 'prominent' or 'swollen' ankles see Kajanto, *The Latin Cognomina*, 242; Chase, 'The Origin of Roman Praenomina', 110; Dyck, *Speeches on Behalf of Marcus Fonteius and Marcus Aemilius Scaurus*, 86.

senatorial status of the *Aemilii Scaurii*?<sup>155</sup> We know that Cicero testified:

I did not merely admire that famous man [Scaurus], as all have done, but I was also particularly fond of him. When I was burning with a keen desire for glory, he gave me the first impulse to hope that, without the backing of a fortune I could arrive at my goal by hard work and consistent application (*Scaur.* F5).<sup>156</sup>

Scaurus was especially well known for his “staunch conservatism”, particularly his *gravitas* and *severitas* (Cic. *Brut.* 110-13, 116, 135; *De Or.* 1.214).<sup>157</sup> Most important to the discussion of the genealogies is that Cicero claimed Scaurus struggled like a new man to be regain his *family's* lost senatorial status (Cic. *Scaur.* F5).<sup>158</sup> However, the discussion needs to address how hard this new man-like struggle was, considering Cicero was using Scaurus as an exemplar in a court case defending the man's son,<sup>159</sup> and that from his consulship onwards was selected *princeps senatus* in six consecutive censorships and senatorial revisions.<sup>160</sup>

The *princeps senatus* was a distinguished position and brought high honour to the man named to the role, and an extra layer to that concept of a *nobilis*, a known man. The *princeps senatus* had: the right to speak first on issues before the Senate as the *primus rogatus*; had significant influence pertaining to controversial issues and setting out at least one solution to those issues when they arose; and had a significant input

---

<sup>155</sup> Blom, *Cicero's Role Models*, 217.

<sup>156</sup> Translated by Dyck, *Speeches on Behalf of Marcus Fonteius and Marcus Aemilius Scaurus*, 101.

<sup>157</sup> Blom, *Cicero's Role Models*, 218.

<sup>158</sup> Dyck, *Speeches on Behalf of Marcus Fonteius and Marcus Aemilius Scaurus*, 101.

<sup>159</sup> For the discussion pertaining to the trial of M. Aemilius Scaurus in 53 and the corrupt and complicated campaigns of M. Aemilius Scaurus, Cn. Domitius Calvinus, C. Memmius, M. Valerius Messalla Rufus, and C. Claudius Pulcher see Dyck, 142ff.; Tatum, *The Patrician Tribune*, 231ff.; Blom, *Cicero's Role Models*, 217–22.

<sup>160</sup> For a comprehensive discussion of Scaurus' political career and a discussion of the modern scholarship (namely Münzer, Badian and Gabba) see Bates, 'Rex in Senatu'.

into the wording of a *senatus consultum* (a senatorial decree).<sup>161</sup> After the censors had revised the senatorial list, the *lectio* was read aloud from the rostra and the *princeps senatus* was the first man whose name was read (Cic. *Dom.* 84),<sup>162</sup> a public act ensuring that the *princeps senatus* was known. The reasonable conclusion for the basis of choosing the *princeps senatus*, as argued by David Rafferty, was that he was judged by the censors as the ‘foremost of all the Romans’ (Liv. *Epit.* 27.11.9-11) with the shortlist of candidates consisting of patrician *censorii* (ex-censors).<sup>163</sup> However, this was not always the case as was evident with the naming of M. Aemilius Scaurus as *princeps senatus* when he was finally elected consul in 115, six years before he was elected censor in 109.

At a first glance, the build up to his consulship appears as a typical patriciate approach to the *cursus honorum*. He attained distinction whilst serving in the military in Spain, rising through the ranks because of his character rather than his patrician birth. Yet, as Richard Bates notes, it was unlikely that he began as a *gregarius miles* (common soldier) considering he was in fact a patrician.<sup>164</sup> In 126 Scaurus served under L. Aurelius Orestes in Sardinia at the same time as C. Sempronius Gracchus (quaestor in the same year). In 123 Scaurus was co-opted into the college of augurs, or pontifices, or both,<sup>165</sup> and his acceptance into the college indicates support for Scaurus from within, or without, the priestly college. In 122 he was elected Curule Aedile and Praetor by 119 during which he opposed the claim of Jugurtha to the throne of Numidia (Auct. *Vir. Ill.* 72.4).<sup>166</sup>

This first glance does not stress any significant struggle that one types as out of the ordinary during a Roman aristocrat’s path to the

---

<sup>161</sup> Rafferty, ‘Princeps Senatus’, 2.

<sup>162</sup> Rafferty, 1.

<sup>163</sup> Rafferty, 3.

<sup>164</sup> Bates, ‘Rex in Senatu’, 252.

<sup>165</sup> For a brief and to the point discussion regarding the different modern scholarship regarding these two priesthoods see Bates, 253.

<sup>166</sup> Broughton, *MRR*, 1951, 1:526.

consulship. Despite some personal uncertainty at the beginning of Scaurus' career as whether he should be a banker or a politician (Auct. *Vir. Ill.* 72.2),<sup>167</sup> Scaurus went on to be what Bates contends as being “in many respects the heir to Cato the Elder,”<sup>168</sup> in terms of his Roman sense of moralising and advocacy of *mos* (tradition, custom).<sup>169</sup> The struggle that Cicero infers during his defence in the trial of Scaurus' son must be in terms of his failed campaign for the consulship of 116 and his proclivity for being named in lawsuits, in all of which he was acquitted.<sup>170</sup>

Any campaign for the consulship by the late second century was arguably a struggle, even for a man patrician birth. The consulship was limited to one patrician per term, and thirty times during the second century both elected consuls were plebeian, most notably the four years preceding 116 and the three years following 115.<sup>171</sup> As a patrician candidate in 116, Scaurus was not only electioneering against the plebeian candidates but also for one, uncertain patrician slot which he lost to Q. Fabius Maximus Eburnus, who with his colleague as censors in 108, reappointed Scaurus *princeps senatus*.<sup>172</sup> However, Scaurus was elected the following year in 115 and named *princeps senatus* during his consulship by the censors of that year (Sall. *Iug.* 25.4; Plin. *NH.* 8.223), above the more traditional claims of Q. Fabius Maximus Eburnus (cos. 116) and Q. Fabius Maximus Allobrogicus (cos. 121).<sup>173</sup> Despite his hard campaigning in 116, by the end of 115, Scaurus was a formidable political player in Rome having attained the consulship, named *princeps Senatus*, laying the foundation for running for the censorship, and was in the college of pontifices (or augurs, or both).

---

<sup>167</sup> Bates, ‘Rex in Senatu’, 252.

<sup>168</sup> Bates, 251.

<sup>169</sup> Bates, 253.

<sup>170</sup> Bates, ‘Rex in Senatu’; Broughton, *MRR*, 1951.

<sup>171</sup> In the second century there were thirty years (out of a hundred) when both consuls were plebeian (172, 171, 170, 167, 153, 149, 139, 135, 133, 132, 129, 128, 125, 124, 122, 120, 119, 118, 117, 114, 113, 112, 110, 109, 107, 105, 104, 103, 102, 101) for names and sources see Broughton, *MRR*, 1951.

<sup>172</sup> Bates, ‘Rex in Senatu’, 255; Broughton, *MRR*, 1951, 1:530.

<sup>173</sup> Bates, ‘Rex in Senatu’, 256.

In terms of the genealogy of the *gens Aemilia*, the significance of Scaurus' co-option into the college of pontifices is based around the trial of the Vestals in 114. Accused of *incestum*, the breaking of the vow of chastity, the Vestals Licinia, Marcia, and Aemilia were tried before the pontifical college. The outcome of the case saw Aemilia alone condemned, the punishment: buried alive (Liv. 22.57.3). Licinia and Marcia were acquitted only to be found guilty the following year after the appointment of a special prosecutor after public dissatisfaction of the outcome.<sup>174</sup> As a member of the college Scaurus was one of those men to convict Aemilia, whilst acquitting the other two. The connection to the Vestals through the favourable version of Amulius in Ennius provides the motivation for Scaurus, as an influential senator and moral authority with stern *auctoritas*,<sup>175</sup> for pushing for Aemilia's conviction. The version had become lore since Ennius penned his poem in the early second century and provides a precedent for Scaurus to turn his *severitas* on Aemilia. The resulting condemnation of a member of his own *gens* in the protection of the sacrosanctity of the Vestal priesthood and maintenance of the *pax deorum* is clear.

Scaurus' severe and high expectations of his own *gens* is further illustrated by his treatment of his son who fled the battle against the Cimbri at the river Athesis, abandoning his commander the Consul Q. Lutatius Catulus (Val. Max. 5.8.4).<sup>176</sup> Valerius Maximus describes Scaurus', "the light and ornament of his country", as sending his son the following message:

He [Scaurus] would rather come upon the bones of his son killed in action than see him in person guilty of so disgraceful a flight; therefore, if he had any remnant of shame left in his heart, he would

---

<sup>174</sup> Broughton, *MRR*, 1951, 1:534–37.

<sup>175</sup> Bates, 'Rex in Senatu', 257.

<sup>176</sup> Bates, 265.

avoid the sight of the father from whom he had degenerated.  
(5.8.4).<sup>177</sup>

Scaurus' son, despairing in his father's reactions to his cowardice, "was driven to use his sword more bravely against himself than he had used it against the enemy" (Val. Max. 5.8.4). The disgrace of his son is emphasised by Scaurus' ancestor L. Aemilius Paullus who fell at the Battle of Cannae against Hannibal. Whilst Paullus fell in battle, his consular colleague C. Terentius Varro (instigator of the battle) fled from the invaders of the north, the same direction from whence came the Gallic sackers of Rome in 387, the memory of which still tormented Rome in the first century,<sup>178</sup> as did the invasion of Hannibal in 218.<sup>179</sup> That Aemilius Paullus fell in a battle he knew the Romans would lose, an act deserving of the *gens Aemilia* and their descentance from Iuppiter through Assaracus, the act of cowardice on Scaurus' son's behalf was not fitting to the Aemilian brand. Scaurus' denunciation of his son ensured his son knew his actions were disgraceful, and more importantly that the people of Rome knew his thoughts on how those who failed to fulfil their duty ought to be treated; traitors that they were.<sup>180</sup>

In the period that Scaurus was politically active the *Basilica Aemilii* stood long and proud in the Roman Forum. On the frieze the *gens Aemilia* advertised their connection to the Tarpeian Rock, the ominous cliff at the foot of the Temple of Iuppiter Optimus Maximus from where traitors were hurled to their death on the Forum below. The frieze of the *Basilica Aemilia* is argued to have been built in 179 with consequent restorations in 78, 55, and 14 CE.<sup>181</sup> The main narrative of the frieze is of Romulus and the events surrounding the founding of

---

<sup>177</sup> Valerius Maximus, *Memorable Doings and Sayings*, 534–37.

<sup>178</sup> Holland, *Rubicon*, 234–38.

<sup>179</sup> Kneale, *Rome*, 10ff.; Venning and Drinkwater, *A Chronology of the Roman Empire*, 95–96.

<sup>180</sup> Bates, 'Rex in Senatu', 265.

<sup>181</sup> For a summary of the arguments of modern scholarship regarding the building, rebuilding and restoration of the frieze see Albertson, 'The Basilica Aemilia Frieze'.



Rome, but importantly the emphasis on Romulus' *pietas* is reflected in the frieze's execution,<sup>182</sup> and by proxy the caretakers of the Basilica who were constantly upgrading and maintaining the 179 building. The duty of the *gens Aemilia* to Rome and her majesty is also stressed in the motivation of L. Aemilius Paullus before the Battle of Cannae (Sil. *Pun.* 8.295-6) and in the actions of Scaurus towards his un-dutiful son.

In terms of Paradigmatic Pressure, the *gens Aemilia* had attained many marvellous achievements worthy of remembrance as reflected by their vault of Social Capital. A candidate who, as an ancestor, exerted Paradigmatic Pressure on Scaurus was M. Aemilius Lepidus, who was *princeps senatus* from 179 to 154. In 179, Lepidus was the Censor who built the *Basilica Aemilia et Fulvia* (Liv. 40.46.16, 51-52; Varro *Ling.* 6.4) with the friezes that connected the *gens* to the Tarpeian Rock and the *pietas* of Romulus. He was the same Aemilius who was politically active and influential during the time Ennius was writing the *Annales*. Despite the two men's differing branches of the *gens Aemilia*, the exemplarity of Lepidus for Scaurus, a man whose father, and or grandfather, had failed to maintain the senatorial rank of the *Scaurii*, is a reasonable connection to make. Lepidus had been elected consul twice (187, 175), had celebrated a triumph (175), and had been elected pontifex maximus (180). Scaurus managed to emulate most of these achievements, celebrating a triumph (115), elected as censor (109) if only for a short period, and was co-opted into the college of pontifices. The achievement that put him on equal footing with his ancestral paradigm was the six consecutive appointments as *senatus princeps*. The Paradigmatic Pressure of this one ancestor alone, along with the themes of the mythistoric genealogies of the *gens Aemilia*, appear to be highly influential motivators of M. Aemilius Scaurus during his political career and his morality. Afterall, Scaurus was the man who

---

<sup>182</sup> Albertson, 808.

Cicero claimed to have governed almost the whole of the world by his nod (Cic. *Font.* 24).<sup>183</sup>

---

<sup>183</sup> Blom, *Cicero's Role Models*, 217.

## Chapter 5

### The Gens of Hercules

The following discussion focuses around two genealogical associations of the *gens Fabia*. The first is the importance of their *princeps gentis* Fovius, son of Hercules and Pallantia, born on the area to become the *Forum Boarium*. By proxy, the *gens* claimed further descentance from Iuppiter and Mercury. The connection of the *Fabii* to the presence of Hercules in the city will be illustrated, emphasising the relationship between them, centred at the *Forum Boarium*. Second, the *Lupercalia* and the role of the *Fabii* as the descendants of the followers of Remus will be clarified to further insist the connection of the *Fabii* to the *Forum Boarium*.

The *gens Fabia*'s specific mythistoric genealogy originates with the *Fovii*, descendants from Fovius, the man who taught the proto-Romans how to capture wolves and bears in *fovea*, ditches (Festus, *Gloss. Lat.* 204; Plut. *Fab.* 1.2).<sup>184</sup> Fovius, the pit-digging *princeps gentis* of the *Fabii*, was the son of Hercules (Ov. *Fast.* 2.237; Sil. *Pun.* 2.3, 7.34, 7.44; Juv. 8.14). The son of Iuppiter had stopped on the banks of the Tiber with the cows he had taken from Geryoneus during his tenth labour (Sil. *Pun.* 6.627-36).<sup>185</sup> Here he met with Evander, son of the gods Mercury and Carmentis (Liv. 1.7.8; Ov. *Fast.* 1.618). Evander had moved from Arcadia to Italy and was in the process of founding a city called Pallantium on the Palatine Hill (Liv. 1.5; D.H. 131.4; Paus. 8.43.2; Serv. A. 8.51; Varro. *Ling.* 5.21, 53). The mother of the Fabian *princeps gentis* was his daughter Pallantia who was unable to resist the attraction of Hercules' divine stature (Sil. *Pun.* 6.633-4). On the banks of the bend in the Tiber, the site which became the *Forum Boarium* (Varro. *Ling.* 5.146; Festus, *Glos. Lat.* 129), Hercules and Pallantia lay

---

<sup>184</sup> Smith, *The Roman Clan*, 36.

<sup>185</sup> For Geryoneus see Hes. *Theog.* 287-294.

together in a *fovea* where the strongman had made his riverside camp.<sup>186</sup> The genealogy emphasises the *princeps gentis* of the *Fabii* having both divine and Arcadian blood within their veins, giving the *gens* a lineage that placed them on the site of Rome before the city's foundation.

The association of the *Forum Boarium* continues as the *gens Fabia*, along with the *Quinctii*, were tied back to Romulus and Remus by the ancient cult of the *Lupercal*.<sup>187</sup> The *gentes* formed the two *collegia* of *Luperci*, named the *Fabiani* and the *Quinctiales* (Festus, *Gloss. Lat.* 364; Ov. *Fast.* 11.375-8; CIL. 6.1933, 33421, 11.3205).<sup>188</sup> The *Lupercalia* was celebrated in the *Lupercal*, a cave at the foot of the Palatine Hill where Romulus and Remus had been suckled by the she-wolf. This ritual was celebrated exclusively by the *Fabii* and *Quinctii* in an entrance to the Underworld on the edge of the *Forum Boarium*, in the centre of Rome.<sup>189</sup> After the celebrations, the *Luperci* ran around the Palatine, through the Forum and down the *Sacra Via*, wearing only loin cloths made of freshly-cut goat skin from the sacrifice made within the cave. With strips of goat skin, they whipped whomever they passed, including women of child-bearing age, for improved fertility.<sup>190</sup>

The origin story of the *Lupercalia*, as told by Ovid writing in the late first century, describes Romulus and Remus preparing for the sacrifice of a she-goat to the pastoral deity Faunus (*Fast.* 11.359-80). The day was hot, and the twins undressed to do their exercises when a shepherd informed them of the theft of their bullocks.<sup>191</sup> Still naked, Remus ran one way, followed by members of the *Fabii*; and Romulus, with the *Quinctii*, ran in another direction. Remus and the *Fabii* caught

---

<sup>186</sup> Wiseman, *The Myths of Rome*, 28.

<sup>187</sup> Wiseman, *Roman Drama and Roman History*, 67.

<sup>188</sup> Wiseman, 'The God of the Lupercal', 12.

<sup>189</sup> For the *Forum Boarium* as a Cattlemarket originally see D.H. 1.40.6; Ov. *Fast.* 1.582, 6.477-8; Prop. 4.9.19-20.

<sup>190</sup> Wiseman, 'The God of the Lupercal', 13; Brandt, 'Blood, Boundaries, and Purification. On the Creation of Identities Between Memory and Oblivion in Ancient Rome', 202.

<sup>191</sup> Brandt, 'Blood, Boundaries, and Purification. On the Creation of Identities Between Memory and Oblivion in Ancient Rome', 202.

the robbers, rescued the bullocks and returned to the sacrifice. They found the entrails cooking and chose to eat them as their reward.<sup>192</sup> Romulus and the *Quinctii* returned empty-handed to find only the sacrificed bones were left. Romulus laughed out loud and grieved that he and his *Quinctii* could not eat the sacrifice. The story mirrors the aspects of the *Lupercalia* celebrations within the cave and connects the *Quinctii* and *Fabii* to the ancient festival. These two *gentes* were the only patricians to use the *praenomen* Kaeso, derived by Mommsen from the verb *caedere*, to beat. The name served as a symbolic reference to the ritual of the *Lupercalia*, where the young men of the *Luperci* ran through the Forum thrashing the bystanders.<sup>193</sup>

Licinius Macer's history also makes claim to the *Forum Boarium*. Despite his apparent turn from mythic elements, Macer also proposed a *princeps gentis* for his own plebeian *gens* the *Licinii* with the inclusion of the shepherdess Lykaina based on his etymology on the Greek *lukaina* for she-wolf (*FRH* C. Licinius Macer 27 F12).<sup>194</sup> That the introduction of his ancestress into his histories happened in a vacuum cannot be considered plausible: firstly, nothing in Rome happened in a vacuum; and secondly, Macer's account was more likely an imitation of a narrative from a previous history, notably that of Gellius. Ogilvie also argues that Licinius "had both a special interest in and a privileged access to Fabian history" considering "a member of the *gens*, Fabius Pictor, had already written a history".<sup>195</sup> The argument is based on a friendship developed between the two *gentes*, notably illustrated by the consulship of C. Licinius Geta and Q. Fabius Maximus in 116,<sup>196</sup> as well as their praetorships by 119 and their

---

<sup>192</sup> Rissanen, 'The Hirpi Sorani and the Wolf Cults of Central Italy', 126.

<sup>193</sup> Mommsen, *The History of Rome*, 17; Wiseman, 'The God of the Lupercal', 13.

<sup>194</sup> Wiseman, *The Myths of Rome*, 199; Jeffreys, Jeffreys, and Scott, *The Chronicle of John Malalas*, 95–96.

<sup>195</sup> Ogilvie, *A Commentary on Livy Books 1-5*, 8.

<sup>196</sup> Ogilvie, 9–10.

censorships of 108,<sup>197</sup> and the parallel between the two *gentes* continues.

The etymological wordplay on Lykaina, the *princeps gentis* of the *gens Licinii*, is reminiscent of the pit-digging son of Hercules, Fovius (Ov. *Fast.* 2.237; Sil. *Pun.* 2.3, 7.34, 7.44; Juv. 8.14). What is more noteworthy is the apparent connection to the *Forum Boarium* that both *gentes* claimed through their progenitors. Both have their origins around the *Lupercal*: the *Licinii*, with Lykaina suckling Romulus and Remus in Rome's entrance to the underworld; and with the *Fabii*, the men who served as the *Fabiani* during the *Lupercalia*, the secret rituals of which, were carried out in the same cave to celebrate fertility and the purification of the city. The circularity of both claims begins with Hercules siring the eponymous Fabius in a pit on the banks of the Tiber in what was to become the *Forum Boarium*. Sometime after, Lykaina suckled Romulus and Remus, who went on to become the leaders of the first *Fabii* and *Quinctii* respectively, and institute the ancient *Lupercalia*.

The connection to the historian Q. Fabius Pictor proves interesting, considering his account of the foundation legend included Hercules (*FRH* Q. Fabius Pictor 1 T7).<sup>198</sup> Pictor was the first Roman to write a history of Rome from the beginnings of the city down to his own time (216-213), and was writing until the 190s or later.<sup>199</sup> His inclusion of Hercules is contrasted by the fact that the surviving versions of the foundation and regal legends are significantly lacking prominent roles of the ancestors of the *gens Fabia*, suggesting the first Fabian historian was honest and beyond the temptation to rewrite history in the interests of his *gens'* pride.<sup>200</sup> However, the mention of Hercules remains

---

<sup>197</sup> Broughton, *MRR*, 1951, 1:548–49.

<sup>198</sup> Cornell, *FRH*, 2013, 1:176.

<sup>199</sup> For a detailed study and examination of Pictor's history, style, context including a discussion of modern scholarship see Cornell, 1:163–78.

<sup>200</sup> Momigliano, *The Classical Foundations of Modern Historiography*, 1:176.

significant, even as a slight nod to the *princeps gentis*, if we accept that the historian's father was one of the first moneyers in Rome.

Minted in 269 in Rome, the coins of the consuls C. Fabius Pictor and Q. Ogulnius Gallus marked the beginning of silver coinage in the city (Plin. *NH* 33.44),<sup>201</sup> and the coins were struck with the head of Hercules Victor on the obverse (*RRC* 20/1).<sup>202</sup> Each consul's connections to either side of the coin suggest that they at least wielded some influence on, or the authorisation of, the imagery on these important coins.<sup>203</sup> The coin is the earliest example of the Fabian ancestor, with the She-wolf suckling the twins on the reverse, reinforcing not only the theme of strength but also of the *gens Fabia*'s claim to the *Forum Boarium*: the space in Rome that saw the encampment of Hercules, the birth of the first Fabius, as well as the place where the founder of Rome was raised after his exposure. 142 years later, in the year 127, Q. Fabius Maximus minted coins with the head of Hercules on the obverse (*RRC* 265/3),<sup>204</sup> and again, in 124, Q. Fabius Labeo followed suit with the reissue of the same design (*RRC* 273/2),<sup>205</sup> on the reverse of which was a prow alluding to the triumphator Q. Fabius Labeo's naval victory,<sup>206</sup> for which he celebrated a triumph based on his liberation of four thousand Roman and Italian captives on the island of Crete (Liv. 37.60). An additional triumphal deposit for the vault of the *gens Fabia*, the coin enforced the *Fabii*'s claim to the triumphal route, highlighted by the head of

---

<sup>201</sup> Broughton, *MRR*, 1951, 1:199; Evans, *The Art of Persuasion*, 60–61.

<sup>202</sup> Wiseman, *The Myths of Rome*, 123; Crawford, *RRC*, 714. See APPENDIX I for image of the coin.

<sup>203</sup> Crawford argues that there can be no connection between the coin type and C. Fabius Pictor since the connection between the *gens Fabia* and Hercules was an Augustan fiction, which relies on the responsibility of Censors for the successive issues of the didrachm coinage, see Crawford, *Roman Republican Coinage*, 42–43; 714. However, with the coins reflecting these elements, for the inclusion of the statue erected by brothers Ogulnius as aediles in 296, the strong connections between the *Ogulnii* and *Fabii*, and the beginnings of Hercules in aspects of the *gens Fabia* from this date suggest that the consuls at least authorised the imagery of the moneyers, if not actively influenced the design of these coins see Evans, *The Art of Persuasion*, 60–61.

<sup>204</sup> See APPENDIX I.

<sup>205</sup> See APPENDIX I.

<sup>206</sup> Crawford, *RRC*, 294.

Hercules on the obverse of the coin and a reminder of the dressed-up *Hercules Triumphalis*.

By 31, the monumental presence of Hercules in Rome was substantial, with at least eight temples and statues enforcing the hero's presence in the social memory of the city's population. High on the Capitoline was the colossal statue of the hero by Lysippus (Bronze sculptor from Sicyon c. 372-309),<sup>207</sup> transferred from Tarentum to Rome and placed adjacent to the statue of Q. Fabius Maximus Cunctator,<sup>208</sup> whose policy of delay helped win the war against Hannibal and had conquered Tarentum in 209 (Plut. *Fab.* 22.6; Pliny. *NH.* 34.46);<sup>209</sup> a rather specific act of symbolic advertisement that must have been noticed by the general population. One wonders if these two statues, side by side, were visible from the *Forum Romanum* and the *Forum Boarium*. On the *Campus Martius* was the temple of *Hercules Magnus Custos*, built following the instructions left in the Sibylline Books (Ov. *Fast.* 6.209-12) and the temple of *Hercules Musarum*, with the statues of nine muses and one of Hercules playing the lyre within (Plin. *NH.* 35.66; Ov. *Fast.* 6.797-812).<sup>210</sup> Directly north of the *Circus Maximus* and in the *Forum Boarium* was the *Ara Maxima*, the oldest site of the Hercules cult in Rome; the temple to *Hercules Invictus ad Circum Maximum*,<sup>211</sup> which housed a statue of the hero by Myron (Plin. *NH.* 34.57); the two temples to *Hercules Victor (ad Portam Trigeminam and in Foro Boario)*;<sup>212</sup> and the statue *Hercules Triumphalis*, which stood along the triumphal route somewhere in the *Forum Boarium* and traditionally associated as having been dedicated by Evander (Plin. *NH.* 34.16).<sup>213</sup>

---

<sup>207</sup> Hornblower, Spawforth, and Eidinow, *OCD*, 876.

<sup>208</sup> Q. Fabius Q. f. Q. n. Maximus Verrucosus Cunctator: cos 233, 228, 215, 214, 209. See APPENDIX II: *GENS FABIA*.

<sup>209</sup> Gruen, 'The Roman Oligarchy: Image and Perception', 217.

<sup>210</sup> Richardson, *A New Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome*, 187.

<sup>211</sup> Ziółkowski, *TMRR*, 46.

<sup>212</sup> Ziółkowski, 46.

<sup>213</sup> Richardson, *A New Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome*, 186.



The cluster of the temples and statues in the *Forum Boarium* created an epicentre for Hercules worship in Rome between the Capitoline, Palatine and Aventine, the three most significant hills of Rome. The public space was an important hub: business was facilitated by three gates in the Servian Walls, the *Porta Trigemina*, *Carmentalis*, and *Flumentia*; access to the two oldest bridges over the Tiber, the *Pons Aemilius* and *Pons Sublicius*; and the heavy thoroughfare along the *Vicus Iugarius*, which ran west around the foot of the Capitoline, branching north towards the *Campus Martius* and south through the forum towards the *carceres* (starting gates) of the *Circus Maximus*.<sup>214</sup> As the population of Rome rose, the public areas of the forum became encroached with *insulae* (apartment blocks) and *horrea* (granaries and storehouses) despite the area's susceptibility to flooding and fire (Liv. 24.47.15-6). The rise of population density in and around the forum increased the daily flow of people through the area. The traffic that flowed through the *Forum Boarium* was more significant on election days when the inhabitants of the Aventine and the slums growing on the sides of the *via Appia* headed north to assemble in their centuries or tribes on the *Campus Martius*; passing the temples of *Hercules Magnus Custos* and *Hercules Musarum* on their way. The impact of the concentration of monuments to Hercules must have been noticeable to the Romans that passed through the epicentre for Rome's worship of the father of the Fabian *princeps gentis*.

During a triumph the statue of *Hercules Triumphalis*, in the *Forum Boarium*, was dressed in the *vestis triumphalis*, the clothing of a triumphator, which comprised of a purple tunic with embroidered palm branches, a purple toga with embroidered golden stars, and a golden wreath.<sup>215</sup> The symbolism during the celebration of a Fabian triumphator and his mythistoric *princeps gentis* added more prestige to the already near divine procession of the conquering general who,

---

<sup>214</sup> Richardson, 163.

<sup>215</sup> Versnel, *Triumphus*, 56.

through his victory in war over Rome's enemies, had ensured the perpetuation of the majesty of the Republic. Coupled with the instigation of the *transvectio equitum* by a Fabius in the 4<sup>th</sup> century, the *gens* appeared to have a proclivity for grand parades.<sup>216</sup> In terms of triumphs, the *Acta Triumphorum Capitolina* (CIL I<sup>2</sup>.43-50) records that 14 out of 193 traditional and historic triumphs celebrated during the Republic up to the year 44, were awarded to men of the Fabian *gens* (the highest amount awarded to the *maiores gentes*).<sup>217</sup> The symbolism of the decorated *Hercules Triumphalis* coupled with the grand and archaic monuments to the demigod's visitation to the *Forum Boarium*, and the other monuments in the city, emphasised the *gens Fabia*'s claims of being Roman since before Romulus had founded the city. Their claimed descent from Hercules could not have gone unnoticed as the people of Rome passed through the space where Fovius had been born and had taught the proto-Romans how to use *fovea* to capture bears and wolves. These were all symbolic of the *gens Fabia* as being older than the city of Rome and therefore served as a trusted and long-living representation of *mos maiorum*.

### Quintus Fabius Maximus Allobrogicus

Analysis of the high-ranking deposits of Social Capital for the *Fabii* stresses two significant gaps in their political activities during the Republic:<sup>218</sup> the first, of twenty-three years, between the consulships of

---

<sup>216</sup> The *transvectio equitum*, was established by the censor Q. Fabius Rullianus in 304 and served as a grand parade where the Roman knights rode through the streets of the city, wearing whatever symbols of conquest they had, numbering up to 5,000. The event occurred every five years until gradually lapsing before being revived by Augustus. For a summary of the parade on the 15<sup>th</sup> July and ancient sources see Scullard, *Festivals and Ceremonies of the Roman Republic*, 127; 164–65.

<sup>217</sup> The number may look low, but relative to the proportion of consulships, dictatorships, and military tribunates with consular powers to triumphs it is the second highest at 5 triumphs to every 22 *imperium* wielding magistracies (the *gens Claudii* sit at 4 to every 15).

<sup>218</sup> High-ranking Social Capital (minimum estimates) of the *gens Fabia* from 509 to 31: 46 consulships (6% of total consulships during the period); 14 triumphs; 15 military tribunates with consular powers; 6 censorships; 6 dictatorships; 6 Masters of

M. Fabius Dorsuo in 345 and Q. Fabius Maximus in 322; and the second, of sixty years, between the censorship of Q. Fabius Maximus in 108 and the praetorship of Q. Fabius Maximus in 48, before entering office as *consul suffectus* in 45.<sup>219</sup>

The gap in time between Dorsuo and Maximus can be compressed by considering the appointment of Q. Fabius Ambustus as Master of the Horse under the dictator P. Valerius Publicola, resulting from prodigies to establish festivals in 344 (Liv. 7.28.7-8);<sup>220</sup> the interrex M. Fabius in 340 (Liv. 8.3.5); and the election of M. Fabius, with two others, to lead a colony to Cales in 333 (Liv. 8.16.13-14).<sup>221</sup> Of greater significance is the career of Q. Fabius Maximus who was elected curule aedile in 331 (Liv. 8.18.4-5); served as Master of the Horse under dictator L. Papirius Cursor, escaped the death penalty ordered by Papirius for disobeying the dictator's orders (Liv. 8.3-36; Val. Max. 2.7.8, 3.2.9);<sup>222</sup> and went on to win the consulships in 322, 308, 297, and 295.<sup>223</sup>

The sixty-year gap between 108 and 48 cannot be compressed with magisterial or priestly offices with the extant evidence. After the censorship of Q. Fabius Maximus, the *gens* appear to have failed to make any easily measurable deposits to their social credit vault until Q. Fabius Maximus' praetorship in 48 and his triumph as *consul suffectus* in 45.<sup>224</sup> Despite the significant sixty-year gap in the last century of the Republic, the *gens* Fabia struck a consistent generational course through the Republic's existence.

Our discussion must address the triumph of Q. Fabius Maximus Allobrogicus and his rise through the *cursus honorum*. By doing so the

---

the Horse; 32 praetorships or pro-magistracies; 10 (years) *princeps senatus*; 4 *pontifices*; 2 *augures*; 1 *flamen Quirinalis*. See APPENDIX II: *GENS FABIA*.

<sup>219</sup> Broughton, *MRR*, 1951, 2:304.

<sup>220</sup> Broughton, *MRR*, 1951, 1:132.

<sup>221</sup> Broughton, 1:139.

<sup>222</sup> Broughton, 1:149–8.

<sup>223</sup> Broughton, 1:150,164,175,177.

<sup>224</sup> Broughton, *MRR*, 1951, 2:273, 305.

discussion will illustrate how his career enforced the aspects and ideals of the mythistoric genealogy of the *gens Fabia*. So, what do we know about Q. Fabius Maximus Allobrogicus except that the progenitor of his *familia* had been the eldest,<sup>225</sup> and according to Münzer he was the “last worthy descendant of the *Fabii Maximi*”?<sup>226</sup>

We know that he had been elected quaestor in 134 (Val. Max. 8.15.4) and in 129 he organised a public banquet for the Roman people in honour of his uncle P. Cornelius Scipio Aemilianus Africanus, who had died suddenly that year (Cic. *Pro Mur.* 75-6; Val. Max. 7.5.81).<sup>227</sup> Fabius had been elected praetor by 124 and spent 123 as a governor of a Spanish province, where his stern treatment of the provincials saw him formally censured by a decree of C. Sempronius Gracchus (Plut. *CG.* 6).<sup>228</sup> However, the oppressive extraction of the corn by Fabius in Spain did not prove a setback to his political ambitions and he was elected consul in 121.<sup>229</sup>

In the year of his consulship, Fabius marched to the aid of the proconsul C. Domitius Ahenobarbus in Gaul in the war against the Arverni and Allobroges;<sup>230</sup> consequently he was absent from Rome when Gracchus was killed.<sup>231</sup> The Arvernian army augmented by the remnant of the Allobrogian army, led by their king Bituitus, crossed the Rhône and were defeated by Fabius and his Roman legions.<sup>232</sup> After the devastating defeat of the Gallic army Fabius erected a temple to

---

<sup>225</sup> Chase, ‘The Origin of Roman Praenomina’, 111.

<sup>226</sup> Münzer, *Roman Aristocratic Parties and Families*, 260.

<sup>227</sup> Scullard, *Roman Politics, 220-150 B.C.*, 24; for sources on the death of Africanus see Broughton, *MRR*, 1951, 1:505.

<sup>228</sup> Broughton, *MRR*, 1951, 1:512, 514.

<sup>229</sup> Plutarch, *Rome in Crisis*, 503.

<sup>230</sup> The conflict began in 125, when the Salluvii invaded the territory of Massilia, who had asked Rome to come to their aid against the invaders. According to Coleman Benedict, the request for aid began the true beginning of Rome’s conquest of Gaul, with the founding of the colony at Norba in 118, which dominated trade between Rome, Gaul and the Spanish provinces, and the establishment of the *Aquae Sextiae* as a military stronghold. For a full discussion see Benedict, ‘The Romans in Southern Gaul’, 40ff.

<sup>231</sup> Benedict, 45.

<sup>232</sup> Benedict, 45–46.

Hercules (and a temple to Mars) at the site of his victory on the shore of the river (Strab. 4.1.11),<sup>233</sup> and took the *cognomen* Allobrogicus.

The dedication of the temple to Hercules stressed the acceptance, or at least the continued perpetuation of the public image, of Allobrogicus and his claimed descentance from Hercules. More importantly, the dedication of these victory temples, outside of Roman territory, marked Rome's claim to the province of Gallia Narbonensis, the first of these types of Roman victory monuments.<sup>234</sup> Allobrogicus was stamping Rome's victory to the area, with the cult of Hercules acting as his own design.<sup>235</sup> The dedication of the temple came 148 years after his ancestor had minted the hero's head on the first Roman silver didrachm (*RRC* 20/1), 88 years since Cunctator relocated Lysippus' giant statue of the hero to the Capitoline, and about 70 years since Pictor's history. The battlefield where Allobrogicus had defeated the two tribes was memorialised as the spot where a descendant of Hercules had exerted the might of the *gens Fabia* and the majesty of Rome.

After his victory over the Gauls in the West, Allobrogicus ordered the construction of the *Fabianus Fornix* in 121. The triumphal arch spanned the gap between the house of the Vestals and the *Regia*, crossing over the *Sacra Via*.<sup>236</sup> If the Roman Forum was the heart of the city then the *Sacra Via* was the aorta,<sup>237</sup> and the importance of the arch's placement in that part of the city cannot be overstated. The *fornix* became the first triumphal arch in or around the Roman Forum,<sup>238</sup> giving the city's centre a monumental gateway advertising the glory of the *gens Fabia*. According to Amy Russell the construction of the *fornix Fabianus* gave the Forum an architectural identity of its own,

---

<sup>233</sup> Broughton, *MRR*, 1951, 1:521.

<sup>234</sup> For a complex and thorough examination of Rome's adoption of, use and placement of victory monuments, or *tropaia*, see Hölscher, 'The Transformation of Victory into Power: From Event to Structure', 32ff.

<sup>235</sup> Hölscher, 32.

<sup>236</sup> Richardson, *A New Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome*, 154.

<sup>237</sup> The *Sacra Via* was the most famous, and the oldest, street in Rome. For the history, naming and various courses of 'the sacred way' through Roman history see Richardson, 338–40; Platner, *A Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome*, 456–59.

<sup>238</sup> Richardson, *A New Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome*, 154.

with the arch distinguishing the political heart of the city from the gradual widening of the *Sacra Via*.<sup>239</sup> The surviving inscriptions from the *fornix* suggest the arch had sported three statues on top: Q. Fabius Maximus, curule aedile; L. Aemilius Paullus, twice consul, censor, augur, triumphator thrice; and P. Cornelius Scipio Africanus, consul twice, censor, augur, triumphator twice (*CIL I*<sup>2</sup> p.198).<sup>240</sup> The reverence towards his triumphal lineage is clear, and was advertised with the building of a monument celebrating the procession which publicly anointed members of his *gens*, including himself, as paradigms of the triumphant *imperator*.<sup>241</sup> More critical is the placement of the arch along the triumphal route, along with other Herculean monuments, and inscribed the *gens* and Allobrogicus into all subsequent celebrations of the triumph.

In 120 Allobrogicus was awarded his triumph over the Allobroges by the Senate, which suggests a balance between his glory attained through the battle and an acceptance by his peers: the senatorial order and *nobiles*.<sup>242</sup> On the day of his grand procession through the streets of Rome, Allobrogicus had been dressed in *vestis triumphalis*, as described above in the description of the *Hercules Triumphalis*, son of Iuppiter. The purple toga, palm embroidered tunic, red face paint, laurel crown and the eagle topped sceptre in his hand were all a direct mirror of the twelve Fabian *triumphatores* who had come before him, stretching back to Romulus; first *triumphator* of Rome (Liv. 1.10.5).<sup>243</sup> A demigod for a day, like his *princeps gentis*, he entered Rome through the *Porta Triumphalis* which was one of the two gates in the double

---

<sup>239</sup> Russell, *The Politics of Public Space in Republican Rome*, 67, 71.

<sup>240</sup> Aemilius Paullus was Allobrogicus' grandfather and Scipio his uncle. Two of L. Aemilius Paullus' sons had been adopted: one by the *Cornelii Scipiones* and the other (Allobrogicus' father) by the *Fabii Maximii*. For a discussion on the inscription see Flower, *Ancestor Masks and Aristocratic Power in Roman Culture*, 72.

<sup>241</sup> Pittenger, *Contested Triumphs*, 35; Cf. Versnel, *Triumphus*, 371–97.

<sup>242</sup> For a detailed and up to date summary of the three branches of the Roman constitution, as famously described by Polybius (6.11–18), and their determinations in awarding an *imperator* a triumph see Pittenger, *Contested Triumphs*, 33–53; for the concept of the ritual homecoming of a victorious *imperator* and further implications see Versnel, *Triumphus*, 371–97.

<sup>243</sup> Pittenger, *Contested Triumphs*, 33, 277.

arched *Porta Carmentalis*.<sup>244</sup> The other gate carried significant symbolism as the *Porta Scelerata* (the infamous gate), out of which 300 *Fabii* had marched against Veii and found their doom on the banks of the Cremera River (Liv. 2.48-50; DH. 9.20-22).<sup>245</sup> Contrasted, Allobrogicus was the victorious Fabius returning through the gate, riding his chariot through the celebrations of the people and ending in the Temple of Iuppiter Optimus Maximus. His name was inscribed into the *Fasti Triumphalis*, immortalising his victory and name along with all the other *imperators* of Rome; the best of those ancestors as held high by *mos maiorum*. Allobrogicus' triumph was the symbol of his worthiness of those other Fabian *triumphatores* and ancestors who had defeated Rome's enemies, or had fallen fighting for the majesty of the Republic.

An ancestor who must have exerted the greatest Paradigmatic Pressure on Allobrogicus was Q. Fabius Maximus Cunctator, the famous general whose policy of delay against the invasion of Hannibal was world famous in Rome.<sup>246</sup> Cunctator was Allobrogicus' great-great-grandfather and a paradigm of Rome during the Second Punic War. He had been elected consul five times, an unusual feat which was extremely hard to accomplish when tackling the *cursus honorum* and was appointed dictator twice.<sup>247</sup> Although he was accused of cowardice based on his military tactics and war of attrition against Hannibal, the devastating defeat of the Roman army at Cannae in 216 by Hannibal saw Rome continue his policy of delay afterwards.<sup>248</sup> Cunctator captured the city of Tarentum, which had revolted, and moved the giant statue of Hercules to Rome. He had been appointed *princeps senatus*

---

<sup>244</sup> For the location of the *Porta Triumphalis* in the *Porta Carmentalis* see Richardson, *A New Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome*, 301.

<sup>245</sup> The sources describe a disastrous defeat of the mobilised *gens Fabia* at the river Cremera in 478. For the detailed analysis of the three sources (Livy, Dionysius and Diodorus Siculus) and the role of the *Fabii* in the war against Veii see Smith, *The Roman Clan*, 290–95.

<sup>246</sup> The same Fabius who had counselled Aemilius Paullus in the discussion of the Aemilius Scaurus in CHAPTER 1.

<sup>247</sup> Brice, *Warfare in the Roman Republic*, 75.

<sup>248</sup> Brice, 75.

in 209, and again in 204 but died in 203.<sup>249</sup> He had been elected censor, appointed pontifex and augur. Allobrogicus had managed to emulate, not only the *gentes* association with Hercules, but some of the career of his famous ancestor.

The new image of the *Fabii*, as re-defined by Cunctator and his policy of delay, must have impacted Allobrogicus' actions and career. Before Cunctator's war of attrition the *gens Fabia* had a headstrong - act first and think afterwards - attitude attributed to the rashness of youth.<sup>250</sup> The two examples that illustrate their pre-Cunctator image are the mobilisation of the *gens Fabia* against the Veientes, and their resulting defeat at Cremera; and their rash engagement at Clusium against the Gauls which led to the catastrophic sacking of Rome.<sup>251</sup> These associations of his *gens* were unfavourable, in all understandings of Roman social history, and the resulting reimagining of Cunctator was a public image sought to be continued. Allobrogicus' defeat of the Gauls in 121 was another nail in the coffin of the old reputation, finally punishing the Gauls for the defeat at Clusium, and the public memorial a testament to the further restraint of the *gens*. A striking contrast considering the possibility that both these men, Allobrogicus and Cunctator, had participated in the highly coveted *Lupercalia* which was restricted to the *Fabii* and *Quinctii*. As members of the *Fabiani*, they had run through the streets of Rome, in a reversed and miniature version of the triumphal route, wearing freshly cut goatskins and lashing the people they passed.

---

<sup>249</sup> Brice, 75.

<sup>250</sup> Wiseman, 'The God of the Lupercal', 11.

<sup>251</sup> Wiseman, 11.



## Chapter 6

### The *Gens* of Volusus

The discussion will move on to the Valerian mythistoric genealogy which begins with the Sabine (ergo Spartan) Volusus Valerius.<sup>252</sup> Volusus had come to Rome under Titus Tatius during the reign of Romulus and discovered a subterranean altar to Dis Pater and Proserpina in the Tarentum, north-western section of the *Campus Martius*. Firstly, this chapter will search for an association between the *Valerii* and the *ludi Tarentini* which were held every hundred years, as well as a further connection to Mars through the annual *Equus October*. Secondly, this section will focus on Volusus' son, Publicola (mentioned above), who played a central role in the Liberation of Rome, held the first *ludi Tarentini*, and helped foil the conspiracy to reinstate the fallen King Tarquinius.

The Tarentum is a Valerian cult site on the *Campus Martius* where the *ludi Tarentini* were held. This site, it has been argued, was linked by the Romans with the Spartan colony of Tarentum in Southern Italy. At the same time, owing to this Spartan connection, the site marked the Sabine ancestry of the *gens*.<sup>253</sup> The Valerian *princeps gentis* Volusus Valerius was the descendant of a Spartan emigrant from the town of Cures in Sabinum (Sil. *Pun.* 2.8-10).<sup>254</sup> Volusus moved to Rome with Titus Tatius after the Rape of the Sabine Women (D.H. 4.67). According to Plutarch writing in the late first century C.E., Volusus was influential in ensuring the realisation of the peace between the Romans under Romulus and the Sabines under Titus (Plut. *Pub.* 1). Plutarch's account goes against the other retellings where the women themselves

---

<sup>252</sup> Also, Volesus. The thesis will use the *praenomen* as recorded in Kajanto, *The Latin Cognomina*, 178; Broughton, *MRR*, 1951, 1:2ff.

<sup>253</sup> Farney, *Ethnic Identity and Aristocratic Competition in Republican Rome*, 102.

<sup>254</sup> Farney, 90.

are responsible for the peace between the Romans and Sabines.<sup>255</sup> The version in Plutarch's *Publicola* adds the element of a Valerius having a defining role in the destiny of Rome.<sup>256</sup> After the agreement Volusus and another two high Sabine families stayed to settle in Rome with their dependants under the joint rule of Romulus and Titus (D.H. 2.46.3). After the death of Romulus, an embassy of senators was selected to travel to Cures to persuade the Sabine Numa Pompilius to ascend the Roman throne (Cic. *De rep.* 2.25; Liv. 1.17.7-11, 18.5; D.H. 2.58-60; Plut. *Num.* 3, 5). One of these senators was Volusus Valerius who represented the followers of Titus. The main goal of the embassy was to persuade Numa that he was the only one who could save the new kingdom of Rome from civil war and strife (Plut. *Num.* 6).<sup>257</sup>

The Tarentum was a hallowed district of Rome (*Gloss. Lat.* 441). Volusus Valerius was claimed to have found an altar to Dis Pater and Proserpina at a depth of six metres where he established a cult to the chthonic deities on the spot which became a preserve of the *gens Valeria*.<sup>258</sup> In his handbook of memorable deeds and sayings, Valerius Maximus describes the long journey of his *princeps gentis* after receiving instructions from a voice to take his sick daughter and two sons down the river Tiber (Val. Max. 2.4.5). At night they saw smoke rising from a spot on the banks of the river and Valerius headed to the smoking spot where he built a fire and warmed water taken from the river. After drinking the water his children were healed. Valerius then went to Rome to buy an altar, ordering his servants to dig the foundations. However, they dug up an altar inscribed to Dis Pater and Proserpina. He celebrated for three consecutive nights with the sacrifice of black animals. Here, on the subterranean altar, sacrifices were offered to Dis Pater and Proserpina during the *ludi Tarentini* (Liv. *Epit.* 49; Censorinus, *ND* 17.8-9; Phlegon, *Peri Macrob.* 5.4).<sup>259</sup>

---

<sup>255</sup> For the different accounts see Wiseman, *Roman Drama and Roman History*, 78.

<sup>256</sup> Wiseman, 79.

<sup>257</sup> Wiseman, 79.

<sup>258</sup> Uggeri, 'Tarentum'.

<sup>259</sup> Richardson, *A New Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome*, 110–11.

Roman tradition claimed that P. Valerius Publicola, *consul suffectus* and descendant of Volusus Valerius, had introduced the *ludi* to Rome in 504, which Varro named the *ludi Tarentini*,<sup>260</sup> laying further Valerian claim to the sacred space. Tradition insisted the *ludi Tarentini* were performed in the Republic every century.<sup>261</sup> In 249 the *Tarentini* were instituted as a standing festival when, after lightning struck a section of the city's wall, the Sibylline Books ordered the repeat of the festival of 348, in a response to pestilence and fear.<sup>262</sup> There are arguments for both dates of 348 and 249 as the first historical *ludi Tarentini*,<sup>263</sup> but if tradition held that the first were instituted as the *ludi Tarentini* in 504, followed again in 449 and then every century until Augustus Caesar's reinvention of the festival as the *ludi Saeculares* in 17 C.E.,<sup>264</sup> a strong argument can be made for a Valerian dominance of the space, the Tarentum, and the prestigious festival.

The administration of such rare and meaningful festivals was highly coveted. Either tradition, or the hierarchy of the magistracies, or the priesthoods played a significant role in the determination of the leaders of the games and sacrifices. During festivals Roman magistrates, preferably the consuls, performed the major sacrifices under the supervision of the priesthoods.<sup>265</sup> The preservation and active leading participation of the festival and space by the *gens Valeria* manifested in either or both branches of Roman civic life; the magistrates and the priests, and their active duty in protecting the *pax deorum* in the times of fear and pestilence was noted and deposited in their vault of Social Capital, as well as the tradition of the festival as a whole. If a continuity of ritual leadership can be emphasised between the festival and the *Valerii*, then it is not presumptuous to insist on a prominent relationship

---

<sup>260</sup> Satterfield, 'The Prodigies of 17 B.C.E. and the Ludi Saeculares', 326.

<sup>261</sup> Taylor, 'New Light on the History of the Secular Games', 113–14.

<sup>262</sup> Taylor, 113–14.

<sup>263</sup> See Beard, North, and Price, *Religions of Rome*, 71 for 249 BC; Taylor, 'New Light on the History of the Secular Games', 107–15 for 348 BC.

<sup>264</sup> Satterfield, 'The Prodigies of 17 B.C.E. and the Ludi Saeculares', 325–48.

<sup>265</sup> Szemler, *The Priests of the Roman Republic. A Study of Interactions Between Priesthoods and Magistracies*, 21.

between the two and the resulting mythistoric genealogy. Unfortunately, there are no direct links between the *ludi Tarentini* and the *gens Valeria*. The argument relies on demonstrating that in the years that the festival occurred a Valerius was the highest available magistrate to carry out the sacrifice and was within the *pomerium*, the ritual boundary of the city.<sup>266</sup>

Plutarch describes the festival's conception in 504 as a response by P. Valerius Publicola to the frightening prodigies of premature and imperfect births of all Roman women during his fourth consulship (Plut. *Publ.* 21), and Valerius Maximus calls Publicola's imitation of his *princeps gentis* a response to his concern for his colleagues (Val. Max. 2.4.5). By order of the Sibylline Books, Publicola sacrificed and celebrated three nights of games to Dis Pater and Proserpina.<sup>267</sup> In 449 L. Valerius Publicola was elected consul but had to deal with the *decemviri* (committee for the Twelve Tables) who were decidedly disinterested in giving up their office and took up the commands against the invasions of the Sabines and Aequi. Valerius and his colleague Horatius opposed the extended authority of the *decemviri*, most of whom were exiled after a popular uprising.<sup>268</sup> Valerius then spent time outside Rome fighting against the Aequi and celebrated a triumph (Liv. 3.39-41, 49-64; DH. 11.4-6, 19-24, 38-50). In 348 M. Valerius Corvus, who had defeated a Gaul in single combat with the aid of a divine raven in 349 (Liv. 7.26.10; DH. 15.1; Val. Max. 3.2.6; 6.15.5), won his first consulship and is not stated in the sources as being involved in any military command or action outside of Rome for the year. In addition, on the reverse of the coins minted by L. Valerius Ascululus there is the head of the Sibyl looking right with a laurel wreath as a border, the symbols of the *Saeculum* (RRC 474/3a),<sup>269</sup>

---

<sup>266</sup> For a narrative account of the religious and social implications of crossing the *pomerium* see Holland, *Rubicon*, 63–74; see also Tatum, *QUINTUS CICERO*, 14; Jaeger, *Livy's Written Rome*, 26, 89.

<sup>267</sup> Taylor, 'New Light on the History of the Secular Games', 116.

<sup>268</sup> Broughton, *MRR*, 1951, 1:47–48.

<sup>269</sup> See APPENDIX I.

which illustrates that the *Valerii* were keeping the festival in mind, as the civil wars had ensured the failure of the festival's celebration.<sup>270</sup> These links provide a stronger base than expected, yet without any clear evidence for the celebrations in the 240s and 140s (Liv. *Per.* 49.6) the possible Valerian participation in the *ludi* is harder to establish.

For the years 149 or 146 (Censorinus, *ND* 17.11), there is only one possible Valerian candidate that goes beyond the standard operations of a Roman festival for a Valerian candidate for running of the *ludi*: the *flamen Martialis* L. Valerius Flaccus who was elected in 154. However, the proposal is problematic. Firstly, the *ludi Tarentini* were under the advisory jurisdiction of the [*quin*]*decemviri sacris faciundis*; the priesthood who were charged with the interpretation and protection of the Sibylline Books.<sup>271</sup> As the *ludi Tarentini* was traditionally prescribed to be instituted as a permanent festival by prophecy set out in the Sibyl's books, the *decemviri* supervised the magistrate performing the sacrifices at the altar of Dis Pater and Proserpina.<sup>272</sup> Secondly, despite both consuls of 149 departing to Africa in commands against Carthage, there most certainly was a praetor in the city to perform the sacrifice under the watchful eyes of the *decemviri*. In addition, for the year 146 there is no evidence to suggest that Cn. Cornelius Lentulus had left the city of Rome. The importance of the centenary festival in the year that Rome destroyed Carthage and sacked Corinth, ending any doubt of Rome's dominance in the Mediterranean world, could not have gone unnoticed by the remaining *Cornelii* consul, an opportunity not readily or purposefully let slip by. In the years between 250 and 245 there is another significant absence of evidence for any member of the *gens Valeria* in a high-ranking office to lead the sacrifices for the *ludi Tarentini*. But the efforts of the thesis are not in vain if there is evidence for a Valerius in the *decemviri* in any

---

<sup>270</sup> Taylor, 'New Light on the History of the Secular Games', 118.

<sup>271</sup> Hornblower, Spawforth, and Eidinow, *OCD*, 1339.

<sup>272</sup> Szemler, *The Priests of the Roman Republic. A Study of Interactions Between Priesthoods and Magistracies.*, 21.

of the periods, and more importantly in the years that they were not in high office.

The sources provide evidence for the *Valerii* in the college of priests who presided over all matters Sibylline. Firstly, there is mention of a L. Valerius in the *Quindecemviri* in 76,<sup>273</sup> which unfortunately lies in the period between *ludi Tarentini* and we have no other evidence of the further political progression of this Valerius. But there is mention of a M. Valerius Messalla in the college of *decemviri* from 172 onwards (Liv. 47.28.10, 13). M. Valerius Messalla may refer to either the consul of 183 or his son the consul of 161. The question here is: which Valerius Messalla was a member of the *decemviri*? The argument that the son was the member of the priestly college is not improbable,<sup>274</sup> and fits the proposal of a Valerius as an advisor, on behalf of the Sibylline Books, advising the magistrate during the sacrifice to Dis Pater during the festival. M. Valerius Messalla was elected praetor in 164 and censor by 154, a mere five years preceding the date of the festival. He was the more likely candidate considering age and lifespan, yet the argument relies solely on the assumption that the Valerius *decemvir* was there supervising the sacrifice. However, it is possible that the father (cos. 183) lived long enough to participate. The point remains that it is not illogical to believe that a Valerius of high-ranking status was actively involved in the *ludi Tarentini* of 149 or 146 despite not being the magistrate to carry out the sacrifice, which leaves only the *ludi Tarentini* of the third century without the prestige of a collegial Valerius.

The competitive nature of the *cursus honorum* explains the *Valerii* missing out on the one of possible five *ludi Tarentini* with the limitation of major sacrifices to those of the highest magistracies, the availability

---

<sup>273</sup> Szemler, *The Priests of the Roman Republic. A Study of Interactions Between Priesthoods and Magistracies.*, 165; The college enlarged from ten to fifteen during the dictatorship of L. Cornelius Sulla, probably in 81, see Broughton, *The Magistrates of the Roman Republic: Vol. 2: 99 B.C. - 31 B.C.*, 75.

<sup>274</sup> Szemler, *The Priests of the Roman Republic. A Study of Interactions Between Priesthoods and Magistracies.*, 161.

of which was finite, and excluding the one instance the evidence exists showing membership to the *decemviri*. However, the Valerian connection to the *Campus Martius*, the field where the Tarentum was located, and continued association to their *princeps gentis* Volusus Valerius may have been emphasised, especially during the years surrounding the *ludi Tarentini* of 149/6 through the priesthood of *flamen Martialis*, notably held by L. Valerius Flaccus (cos. 131) and his son (cos. 100; cens. 97). The priest of Mars had an active role in terms of the field consecrated to Mars throughout the centuries of the Republic. One of the most important responsibilities of the *flamen Martialis* was the festival of the October Horse.

The *Equus October* was held on the Ides, the focal point of the festival which was the *Campus Martius*, and undoubtedly was a festival of magnificent proportions. The festival began with a two-horse chariot race in the *Campus Martius*.<sup>275</sup> The right horse of the winning chariot was led to an altar to Mars in the *campus* where the *flamen Martialis* sacrificed the animal by way of a spear. The tail and genitals were rushed to the Regia so that the blood could cleanse the sacred hearth.<sup>276</sup> In addition, the head was nailed to the wall of the Regia if the inhabitants of the *Sacra Via* beat those who lived in *Suburra* in the battle for the bloody prize.<sup>277</sup> The symbolism of the festival is abound, the essence of the *Equus October* clearly warlike, the victim a winning war horse killed with a spear thrust by the priest of Mars,<sup>278</sup> a public spectacle that was annually unique as the *Equus October* was the only known sacrifice of a horse at Rome.<sup>279</sup> The link to Numa through the Regia, traditionally considered as his residence during his reign (Ov. Fast. 6.263 f.; Tac. Ann. 15.41; Cass. Dio fr. 1.6.2; Plut. *Num.* 14; Fest.

---

<sup>275</sup> Scullard, *Festivals and Ceremonies of the Roman Republic*, 193.

<sup>276</sup> Scullard, 193.

<sup>277</sup> Scullard, 193.

<sup>278</sup> Dumézil, *Archaic Roman Religion, with an Appendix on the Religion of the Etruscans*, 154–55.

<sup>279</sup> Dumézil, 154–55.

346-348; 439), and the association of the second king as an emblem of *religio* is relevant when Volusus Valerius is considered.

Volusus Valerius was a Sabine from the town of Cures, just as Numa was a Sabine from the town of Cures and remembering that Volusus was part of the envoy that went to Cures to convince Numa to ascend the throne. The origin of the ritual of the *Equus October*, like most publicly witnessed acts of *religio* in Rome, was ascribed to the age of the kings, especially during the reign of Numa.<sup>280</sup> However, the emphasis of strength and war can also be claimed by the *Valerii*. Sparta as strength, ancestors of the Sabines (*FRH* Cn. Gellius 14 F20; Cato 5 F51; D.H. 2.49.4; Plut. *Rom.* 16.1; *Num.* 1) as strength compounds with the root of Valerius, *valere* ‘to be strong’ and contextually associated as a good omen on the battlefield, by Cicero at least (*Div.* 1.102; also, Festus, *Gloss. Lat.* 248).<sup>281</sup> As Georges Dumézil stated:

Mars will always patronize physical force and the spiritual violence whose principal application is war and whose outcome is victory.<sup>282</sup>

Mars is further emphasised by the *Lapis Satricanus* (c. 500) where we have a “dedication by the companions of a Publius Valerius to the god Mamers (Mars)”,<sup>283</sup> a connection the *Valerii* had shared with the God of War since the foundation of the Republic. The links of strength, Mars and the *Campus Martius*, thus the Tarentum, continued. When L. Iunius Brutus swore to avenge the rape of Lucretia, he invoked Mars and consecrated the field to the God of War,<sup>284</sup> a connection that the *gens Valeria* included in their mythistoric genealogy.

Publius Valerius Volusi Publicola, the son of Volusus Valerius, became the Republic’s third Consul in 509 after playing a major role

---

<sup>280</sup> Cornell, *The Beginnings of Rome*, 252; Scullard, *Festivals and Ceremonies of the Roman Republic*, 13.

<sup>281</sup> Scullard, *Festivals and Ceremonies of the Roman Republic*, 13.

<sup>282</sup> Dumézil, *Archaic Roman Religion, with an Appendix on the Religion of the Etruscans*, 156.

<sup>283</sup> Momigliano, ‘The Origins of Rome’, 97–98.

<sup>284</sup> Dumézil, *Archaic Roman Religion, with an Appendix on the Religion of the Etruscans*, 155.



in the expulsion of the Roman kings.<sup>285</sup> Valerius was actively involved in the Liberation from the inciting incident through to the establishment of the new constitution and consulships. The Liberation of Rome began when the beautiful and disgraced Lucretia sent out two letters after Sextus Tarquinius, the heir to the Roman throne, had forced himself on her (Liv. 1.58-9). One letter went to her husband Lucius Tarquinius Collatinus who returned to her with the liberator Lucius Iunius Brutus, and the other went to her father Spurius Lucretius who returned with Valerius. Lucretia described her traumatic treatment under Sextus and demanded that the four men swear to avenge her and her dignity, which they did. Following the men's oaths Lucretia drew a knife and stabbed herself in the heart. Brutus withdrew the knife dripping with blood and swore an oath that Rome would no longer suffer a king on the throne. Valerius and the other two men took turns holding the knife and repeating the same oath. The version in Dionysius' differs with Valerius telling Brutus that Lucretia had committed suicide and the two join Lucretius and Collatinus where they swear their oaths on the dripping blade over Lucretia's dead body (D.H. 4.70). Following the oaths Valerius helps the liberator Brutus drive out the kings (Plut. *Publ.* 1).

Following the establishment of the Republic and the election of Brutus and Collatinus as the first consuls of Rome, Valerius was still involved in protecting the state from the return of the King by foiling the conspiracy. As told by Dionysius and Plutarch (D.H. 5 ff.; Plut *Publ.* 3 ff.),<sup>286</sup> an embassy of Tarquinius met secretly with some dissatisfied nobles. The dissenters were Brutus' two sons, the *Vitelli*, who were Brutus' brothers-in-law, and the nephews of Collatinus, *Aquillii*. Vindicius, a slave of the *Vitelli*, overheard the conspirators swearing an oath on bowls of human blood to reinstate Tarquinius as

---

<sup>285</sup> Farney, 'The Name-Changes of Legendary Romans and the Etruscan-Latin Bilingual Inscriptions: Strategies for Romanization', 154; Wiseman, *Roman Drama and Roman History*, 79.

<sup>286</sup> Wiseman, *Roman Drama and Roman History*, 81.

King of Rome. Fearing the familial connection of the consuls to the conspirators, Vindicius decided to inform Valerius of the plot as he was known for his *philanthrōpia*, his kind-heartedness and humanity (Plut. *Publ.* 1.2, 4.4).<sup>287</sup> With a band of clients and friends, Valerius had the house of the conspirators surrounded and entered in search of proof of correspondence between the dissenters and Tarquinius, which he found in the form of letters. Valerius had the traitors dragged before the two consuls where Brutus condemned and ordered the execution of his own sons. The *Vitelli* demanded their slave Vindicius, but their request was denied by Valerius, fearing the wrath they might bring down on the whistle-blower. When Collatinus failed to follow Brutus' example, Valerius demanded the man's resignation from the consulship. Collatinus went off into exile and Valerius was appointed *consul suffectus*, the disgraced consul's replacement.

### Lucius Valerius Flaccus

Traditionally, the *Valerii* were associated with their favourable disposition toward to the average Romans on the street, as illustrated by the *cognomen* *Publicola*.<sup>288</sup> The first of whom, P. Valerius Publicola (cos. 509), was credited with the legislation that limited the magistrate's power to scourge or execute anyone without first appealing to the people.<sup>289</sup> From that first Consul Suffix onwards, in terms of their accumulation of high-ranking Social Capital,<sup>290</sup> the *gens Valeria* only exhibit one significant break in their long-running

---

<sup>287</sup> Wiseman, 197 n. 43.

<sup>288</sup> Hölkeskamp, *Reconstructing the Roman Republic*, 117; Kajanto, *The Latin Cognomina*, 256.

<sup>289</sup> Hölkeskamp, *Reconstructing the Roman Republic*, 117; Ogilvie, *A Commentary on Livy Books I-5*, 252–53; Broughton, *MRR*, 1951.

<sup>290</sup> High-ranking Social Capital (minimum estimates) of the *gens Valeria* from 509 to 31: 48 consulships (6% of total consulships during the period); 11 triumphs; 22 military tribunes with consular powers; 5 censorships; 5 dictatorships; 9 Masters of the Horse; 48 praetorships or pro-magistracies; 3 (years) *princeps senatus*; 4 *pontifices*; 2 *augures*; 1 *flamen Dialis*; 2 *flamen Martialis*. See APPENDIX II: *GENS VALERIA*.

standings in the lifespan of the Republic, a gap in time which is easily compressed by lower-ranking achievements. The one significant gap in the vault of the *gens Valeria* sits between the consulship of M. Valerius Flaccus in 437 and the military tribunate with consular powers of C. Valerius Potitus in 415.<sup>291</sup> The gap cannot be dissected by the deposits of high-ranking social credit. However, the gap can be filled with the explanation that the military tribune with consular powers L. Valerius Potitus, in 414, was the son of a consul in 449, L. Valerius Publicola Potitus, and despite the gap, was elected consul in the years 393 and 392, as well as another four terms as a military tribunate with consular powers.<sup>292</sup>

In these terms, we must examine L. Valerius Flaccus' election to the consulship in 100 along with C. Marius, his term as *interrex*, and subsequent four years as Master of the Horse under the dictatorship of L. Cornelius Sulla Felix (cos. 88). His political career is complicated, eclipsed in the beginning by the achievements of Marius during the turn of the first century and the uncertainty and turmoil of Sulla's dictatorship in the 80's. Despite appearing as the lapdog for both rivals, traditionally associated as the heads of the *populares* versus *optimates* political tendencies, closer examination of Flaccus will show him as adhering to the legacy of Volusus Valerius, *princeps gentis* of the *gens Valeria*.

L. Valerius Flaccus was the son of the consul in 131 and the *Flamen Martialis* from 154 onwards.<sup>293</sup> Flaccus was appointed and elected to both offices held by his father during his political career. As moneyer in 108, Flaccus had minted the coins depicting Mars walking left, holding a spear and a trophy, alongside the *apex* (cap of the *flamines*) and an ear of wheat on the reverse, with the draped bust of Victory on the obverse (*RRC* 306/1).<sup>294</sup> The spear is reminiscent of the immolating

---

<sup>291</sup> See APPENDIX III: *GENS VALERIA*.

<sup>292</sup> Broughton, *MRR*, 1951.

<sup>293</sup> Broughton, 1:451.

<sup>294</sup> Crawford, *RRC*, 306. see APPENDIX I for image of coin.

weapon of the *Flamen Martialis* for the sacrifice of a war-horse during the *Equus October*. L. Valerius Flaccus was *Flamen Martialis* until 69,<sup>295</sup> and the priesthood is recalled by the *apex*. The ear of wheat suggests that Valerius Flaccus sought to recall the efforts of a Valerian aedile, most likely that of L. Valerius Flaccus in 201 who, with his colleague, were known for the grand *ludi Romani* of that year as well as the huge quantity of grain made available at four *asses* a measure (Liv. 31.4.4-6).<sup>296</sup> The ear of wheat served as a reminder of the favourable disposition of the *gens Valeria* to the common people and was a throw-back to Volusus. The coins also further the connection of the *gens Valeria* to Mars, through the Tarentum, and the strength that the God of War patronizes.

Flaccus was elected praetor by 103,<sup>297</sup> and in 100 was elected consul along with C. Marius who, according to Rutilius Rufus, overshadowed his patrician colleague (*FRH*. P. Rutilius Rufus F14). Marius had campaigned for his sixth consulship with vigorous and unscrupulous tenacity, which included bribing the voters to elect Flaccus as his colleague over Q. Caecilius Metellus Numidicus (cos. 109). Accepting that Marius was a *popularis*,<sup>298</sup> the alliance between the two men is not surprising considering the reputation of the *gens Valeria* as well disposed towards the common man.

The accusation laid against Flaccus by Rutilius, that he acted more like a servant or slave to Marius than a fellow consul, is more of a

---

<sup>295</sup> According to Cicero (*Brut.* 135), in Crawford, 316, the priesthood was held by an Albinus during the time Flaccus was the moneyer in 108. However, no mention of an Albinus can be found in Broughton, *MRR*, 1951, 2:454. Regardless, the connection remains significant as does the son's appointment to the head priest of Mars. See APPENDIX I for image of coin.

<sup>296</sup> Broughton, *MRR*, 1951, 1:320.

<sup>297</sup> The latest date possible under the *Lex Villia*, the first law regulating the legal age of election to magistracies. For sources see Broughton, *MRR*, 1951, 1:388, 563.

<sup>298</sup> Those political careers that followed the traditional methods of politicking in the Republic came to be labelled as *optimates*, whilst those who appealed to the wider popularity among the citizen body were known as *populares* - see Tatum, *QUINTUS CICERO*, 183-84; Seager, 'Cicero and the Word *Popvlaris*', 328-38; Tatum, *The Patrician Tribune*; for an introduction to the career of C. Marius in the *cursus honorum* see Boatwright, *The Romans: From Village to Empire*, 163-67; also, Brunt, *The Fall of the Roman Republic and Related Essays*.

reaction against Marius, than a true reflection of Flaccus. Whether the fragment in Plutarch originates from Rutilius' *Histories*, or his biography, the self-noted personal hostility of Rutilius (Plut. *Mar.* 28) towards Marius came from the author's well-founded belief that Marius was responsible for his conviction and subsequent exile in 92.<sup>299</sup> Rutilius' connection to Metellus Numidicus, and his apparent 'optimates' sympathies further enhanced his enmity towards Marius.<sup>300</sup> Naturally, the enmity extended to the candidate who won the consulship over Metellus, due to Marius' alleged unscrupulous behaviour leading up to the elections.

At first glance, the implication that Flaccus was involved in the nefarious activities leading to his consular election appears contrary to the image of his *princeps gentis*. However, the only suggestion that Flaccus' election was the result of bribery is based on the account of Rutilius, and despite Plutarch's assurance that he was a man of truthful accounts (Plut. *Mar.* 28), the hostility affects the reliability of the account. The election saw Marius attain his sixth consulship, a man popular amongst the voters until his reputation began to fail him due to his activities in office during 100.<sup>301</sup> The amount of expenditure invested into the alleged bribery of the assembly is of concern, considering the *auctoritas* and clout that Marius was wielding in the 90's as only the second man to have been elected consul six times (Plut. *Mar.* 28).<sup>302</sup> As the endorser of Flaccus' candidature, Marius' influence affected the election of Flaccus, regardless of the amount of unscrupulous electioneering of Marius on Flaccus' behalf. Furthermore, the allegation against Marius does not clearly incriminate

---

<sup>299</sup> Cornell, *FRH*, 2013, 1:281.

<sup>300</sup> For a discussion on the fragments of Rutilius and the possible influences of the political landscape surrounding his writing (regarding Marius and Metellus) see Cornell, *FRH*, 2013, 1:278–81; 3:287; Badian, *Studies in Greek and Roman History*, 39.

<sup>301</sup> See Boatwright, *The Romans: From Village to Empire*, 165–67; cf. Holland, *Rubicon*; Brunt, *The Fall of the Roman Republic and Related Essays*.

<sup>302</sup> Apart from M. Valerius Corvinus (cos. 348); see APPENDIX II: *GENS VALERIA*.

Flaccus in the dealings, although to think otherwise is naïve, but at least Flaccus appeared to be in the position to deny any involvement.

Flaccus' election to the censorship in 97 is without complications in the sources. Along with his colleague, M. Antonius (cos. 99), they expelled the tribune M. Duronius from the Senate after he repealed a sumptuary law, the *lex Licinia* (Val. Max. 2.9.5; Cic. *De Or.* 3.10), and reappointed M. Aemilius Scaurus as *princeps senatus*.<sup>303</sup> Later in 86 as the only living patrician ex-censor, Flaccus was appointed *princeps senatus* (Liv. *Per.* 83). The position of honour and influence cementing his prestige in Rome for the years to follow.<sup>304</sup>

As *interrex*, Flaccus held the elections to revive the office of the dictatorship and that, for the people's best interest, Sulla be the one to hold the office.<sup>305</sup> Flaccus, through the legal channels of the Republic, gave control of Rome to the autocratic leadership of one man, to make and amend legislation in a way he deemed best for the Republic (App. *BC.* 1.99). The holding of these elections highlighted the traditional nature of Sulla's office, and ran consistently with the actions of Flaccus' *princeps gentis*, Volusus Valerius Publicola, as well as his initial progression through the *cursus honorum* and early political tendencies.

In a thorough discussion of the *lex Valeria*, Frederik Vervaet analyses the technicalities and implications of the law passed by Flaccus that saw Sulla's appointment to the dictatorship.<sup>306</sup> According to Appian, the Senate chose Flaccus as *interrex* in the hopes he would hold a consular election to replace the consuls of the year 82 (App. *BC.* 1.98), C. Marius (the 26-year-old son of Marius) and Cn. Papirius Carbo (cos. 85).<sup>307</sup> However, Sulla wrote a letter instructing Flaccus to

---

<sup>303</sup> Broughton, *MRR*, 1951, 2:6–7.

<sup>304</sup> For a discussion on the *princeps senatus* see Chapter 1: M. Aemilius Scaurus (above).

<sup>305</sup> Vervaet, 'The "Lex Valeria" and Sulla's Empowerment as Dictator (82-79 BCE)', 39.

<sup>306</sup> Vervaet, 'The "Lex Valeria" and Sulla's Empowerment as Dictator (82-79 BCE)'.

<sup>307</sup> Broughton, *MRR*, 1951, 2:65–66.

hold elections to revive, and appoint Sulla to, the dictatorship. The account in Appian, again, provides a less favourable image of Flaccus as the underling of a more powerful man, in this case Sulla. Importantly, Vervaet points out that Cicero records the *lex Valeria* as commissioning Flaccus to nominate Sulla as dictator and then himself as Master of the Horse (Cic. *Att.* 9.15.2), whilst also ratifying Sulla's past acts (with detailed provisions regarding the proscriptions).<sup>308</sup> The concluding point was that, through the *lex Valeria*, Sulla's appointment as dictator was the explicit will of the people,<sup>309</sup> as was his responsibility to restore law and order to the civil war-stricken Republic (App. *BC.* 1.98).

By proxy, and as Master of the Horse under Sulla, Flaccus' actions were not only in accordance with the will of the people, but also in the restoration of peace within the republic. Flaccus remained Master of the Horse under the dictatorship of Sulla from the years 82 to 79.<sup>310</sup> Flaccus retired from the magistracy in 79 when Sulla had stepped down as dictator and remained active in civic life only as the *Flamen Martialis* until his death in 69 (Cic. *Rab. Perd.* 27; *Div.* 1.104). Through the appointment, and the retirement, of Sulla to the dictatorship, Flaccus was adhering, not only to the laws of the Republic, and therefore *mos maiorum*, but was doing so in the interest of the people of Rome. A successful imitation of his *princeps gentis*, Volusus Valerius, and his legal defence of the people during the establishment of the Republic and the emanation of *mos maiorum*. Furthermore, his role as *Flamen Martialis* saw him constantly interacting with *religio* in the service of Mars.

---

<sup>308</sup> Vervaet, 'The "Lex Valeria" and Sulla's Empowerment as Dictator (82-79 BCE)', 40.

<sup>309</sup> Vervaet, 41.

<sup>310</sup> For ancient sources see Broughton, *MRR*, 1951, 2:67–83.

## Chapter 7

### Conclusion

Our three case studies have demonstrated how the three *gentes* (Aemilius, Fabius, and Valerius) used their mythistoric genealogies to anchor themselves to the majesty of Rome's past. They also demonstrate how mythistoric genealogy was an integral part of, if not a natural evolution of, *mos maiorum*. In the introduction I outlined the social construction of *mos maiorum* as the moral code set by the traditions of the ancestors. Furthermore, the connection of mythistoric genealogies as an evolved factor of *mos maiorum* was emphasised through the following factors (as defined in the introduction): firstly, they served an educational function, disciplining and integrating the members of society and reinforcing its cohesion. Secondly, they operated as binding instructions about how to act in the present and the future. Thirdly, they displayed the retention of events, lives and deeds of heroes. Fourthly, they offered examples meant for the emulation of the past morality and behaviour of Roman archetypes. And lastly, because they were malleable, they were shaped and reconstructed to suit present situations or political agendas.

In terms of serving an educational function for the integration of the members of the *gentes* into society and reinforcing their cohesion, the case of the *gens Aemilia* illustrated the incorporation of Pythagoras into the story of Numa. As an advisor to Numa, Pythagoras, whether the philosopher or Olympian runner, is the emphasised aspect of the genealogy. This connection, whether as the father of or subsequent advisor to Mamercus, is the advisory aspect and establishes the ancestor's *auctoritas*. The implication is that the *auctoritas* of the *gens Aemilia*, reported by Plutarch 600 years after the liberation and claimed to originate from the time when Numa was establishing stability in the city, subsists into the late republic. The example of M. Aemilius Scaurus highlighted the importance of *auctoritas*, not only for members



of the *gens Aemilia*, but also for more influential Romans after the first senator's political career had ended, specifically exhibited in Cicero's speech defending the son of the Scaurus.

Likewise, Fovius, the *princeps gentis* of the *Fabii*, existed in a pre-foundation world and taught the proto-Romans to dig pits to capture wolves. The theme of wolves was repeated in their participation in the *Lupercalia*, explaining their annual participation in the purification and fertility festival year after year. The integration of members of the *gens Fabii* into society went further, as shown by the case study, with their continued association with the monuments of Hercules throughout the city, specifically the statue by Lysippus on the Capitoline and the *Hercules Triumphalis*, and the focus of the other temples and altars around the busy parts of the city (*Forum Boarium*; *Vicus Iugarius*; *Circus Maximus*). The example of Fabius Maximus Allobrogicus highlighted how one member of the *gens* of Hercules used the genealogy to integrate his *gens* into the Cultural Memory of Rome with the building of the *Fornix Fabianus*, building upon all the above-mentioned monuments to Hercules. Furthermore, every other Fabius who Triumphed after would pass under that first triumphal arch built in the Roman Forum.

As binding instructions on how to act in the present and the future the example of Aemilius Scaurus illustrated how the *princeps senatus* demonstrated the same reverence to the *pax deorum* in the conviction of the vestal Aemilia and duty to the Republic through his condemnation of his son as a traitor. Both situations mirror those instructional elements of *mos maiorum* as emphasised by the mythistoric genealogies of the *gens Aemilii*. In the case of *incestum*, Amulius was the protector of the sacrosanctity of the Vestal Virgins as written by Ennius. The attitude of Aemilius is contrasted by the account of Aemilia, *Vestalis maxima*, who relit the sacred fire against the vestal he helped convict in 114. In the case of duty, the oath of Aemilius Paullus on the Tarpeian Rock, linked to the *gens* as early as 179 on the frieze of the *Basilica Aemilia*, and to Iuppiter Optimus Maximus, stress

the duty of the members of the *gens Aemilia* to the Republic as well as the reinforcement of the strength demanded of them as is evident in the coinage of Mn. Aemilius Paullus in 114 (RRC 291/1) and M. Aemilius Lepidus in 61 (RRC 419/1d). The duty through strength is reinforced by the associations of strength originating from the races of Sabinum and Sparta, which the mythistoric genealogy of the *gens Aemilii* claimed to have inherited.

The case studies illustrate how aspects of the genealogies are retained through the timelines of the *gentes*. The coinage of 114 (RRC 291/1) and 61 (419/1d) of the *gens Aemilii* exhibit the retention of the idea of strength through the repetition of the same iconography. In the case of the *Fabii*, the first silver coin from Rome, minted in 269, was stamped with the head of Hercules on the obverse (RRC 20/1), and again in 127 (RRC 265/3) and 124 (RRC 273/2) with the inclusion of a prow referencing the victory of a Fabian ancestor on the coins from 124. In the case of the *Fabii*, the *Fornix Fabianus* also symbolises the retention of events, lives and deeds of the *Fabii*. In the case of the *Valerii*, the preservation of the altar to Dis Pater and Proserpina in the Tarentum and the continued involvement in the *ludi Tarentini* (504, 249, 348, 449), factual or implied, with the coinage of 108 (RRC 474/3a) further stress the retention of mythistoric genealogy as part of *mos maiorum*.

The nomenclature of the three clans also serves to illustrate the retentive nature of their genealogies. The use of the *cognomen* Mamercus, or Mamercinus, directly references their *princeps gentis* as associated with Numa and Pythagoras in Plutarch. The repetition of *gens* specific nomenclature is also evident in the *gens Fabii* and their use of the *praenomen* Kaeso, directly linked to the *Lupercalia*, and can serve as folk etymological retention of the past as with the *Valerii* (*valere*, ‘be strong’) and their connection to the *Equus October* and to Mars as the patron of physical force and strength.

The mythistoric genealogies of the *gens Aemilia* are reflective of the malleable nature of *mos maiorum*, changing because of the reshaping and reconstruction of the past to suit present situations. The *princeps gentis* Amulius was portrayed differently by three main sources over 200 years: Ennius (239 - 169), Macer (110 - 66), and Italicus (25 C.E. - 101 C.E.). Ennius portrayed Amulius as the protector of the sacrosanctity of the Vestal Virgins, punishing *incestum* as well as setting events in motion for the foundation of Rome. The propensity for the political landscape to shift is demonstrated in the discussion of the reconciliation of Fulvius and Aemilius in relation to the *Cornelii Scipiones*. Macer would alter the events and characterisation of Amulius to reflect his more ‘populist’ political tendencies, adapting from Gellius to suit his own motivations and goals. The events would undergo further alteration after the dates set by Eratosthenes and Timaios with the inclusion of the line of Alban Kings. Finally, Italicus would emphasise the duty to family and country of the myth in his *Punica*.

Volusus, *princeps gentis* of the *gens Valerii*, was inserted into the account of the Rape of the Sabine Women as the agent who insured the peace between Romulus and Titus Tatius. A defining role in the establishment of Rome’s destiny to be the master of the world. Volusus also included in the embassy sent to Numa in Cures, Sabinum, to save the new kingdom of Rome from civil war and strife with the resulting establishment of *religio* in Rome. These changes were reflected in the insertion of Publicola into the group of men who watched Lucretia commit suicide and Brutus swear that Rome will not suffer another king on the throne, as well as being actively involved in thwarting the conspiracy of the *Vitelli* and the *Aquillii*.

The research, and resulting conclusions, of the case studies in the thesis contribute directly to the discussion of *mos maiorum* and expand on the ideas expressed in an important article, ‘Legendary Genealogies

in Late-Republican Rome’, by Peter Wiseman.<sup>311</sup> The three case studies actively engage with social concepts held by Romans during the Republic and make inter-generational connections that were crucial to ideals held by the *nobiles*. They engage with *mos maiorum* in-depth, in terms of myth and legend, in a way that has not been done on a ‘per gens’ manner in scholarship and fill a gap in the study of social history during the Republic. Each case study provides an outline of the mythistoric genealogies of each of the *gentes*, provides a discussion on the formation and sources of each genealogy, and analyses a member of each *gens* through the lenses of mythistoric genealogy, Paradigmatic Pressure, and Social Capital, on a scale that emphasises a connection with a claimed *princeps gentis*.

---

<sup>311</sup> Wiseman, ‘LGRR’.

## Bibliography

- Akademie der Wissenschaften der DDR, Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, and Preussische Akademie der Wissenschaften. *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*. Berolini: apud Greimerum, 1863.
- Albertson, Fred C. 'The Basilica Aemilia Frieze: Religion and Politics in Late Republican Rome'. *Latomus* 49, no. 4 (1990): 801–15.
- Alföldi, Andreas. *Early Rome and the Latins*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1965.
- Assmann, Jan. *Das Kulturelle Gedächtnis: Schrift, Erinnerung Und Politische Identität in Frühen Hochkulturen*. München: Beck, 1992.
- . *Religion Und Kulturelles Gedächtnis: Zehn Studien*. Vol. 1. Beck'sche Reihe. München: Beck, 2000.
- Assmann, Jan, and Tonio Hölscher, eds. *Kultur Und Gedächtnis*. Vol. 724. Suhrkamp Tb. Wiss. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1988.
- Astin, A. E. 'Roman Government and Politics, 200-134 B.C.' In *The Cambridge Ancient History*, edited by A. E. Astin, F. W. Walbank, M. W. Frederiksen, and R. M. Ogilvie, 2nd ed., 8:163–196. The Cambridge Ancient History. Cambridge, 1989.
- Astin, A. E., F. W. Walbank, M. W. Frederiksen, and R. M. Ogilvie, eds. *Rome and the Mediterranean to 133 BC*. Vol. 8. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- Augoustakis, Antony, ed. *Brill's Companion to Silius Italicus*. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2010.
- Badian, E. *Studies in Greek and Roman History*. Oxford, 1964.
- Balot, Ryan K., ed. *A Companion to Greek and Roman Political Thought*. Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World. Literature and Culture. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009.
- Bates, Richard L. "'Rex in Senatu": A Political Biography of M. Aemilius Scaurus'. *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 130, no. 3 (1986): 251–88.

- Beard, Mary, John A. North, and S. R. F. Price. *Religions of Rome*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- Benedict, Coleman H. 'The Romans in Southern Gaul'. *The American Journal of Philology* 63, no. 1 (1942): 38–50.
- Bennett, Julia. 'Narrating Family Histories: Negotiating Identity and Belonging through Tropes of Nostalgia and Authenticity'. *Current Sociology* 66, no. 3 (1 May 2018): 449–65.
- Blom, Henriette van der. *Cicero's Role Models: The Political Strategy of a Newcomer*. Oxford Classical Monographs. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Boatwright, Mary T., Daniel J. Gargola, Noel Lenski, and Richard J. A. Talbert, eds. *The Romans: From Village to Empire*. 2nd ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- Boatwright, Mary Taliaferro, ed. *The Romans: From Village to Empire*. 2nd ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- Brandt, J. R. 'Blood, Boundaries, and Purification. On the Creation of Identities Between Memory and Oblivion in Ancient Rome'. In *Attitudes towards the Past in Antiquity: Creating Identities: Proceedings of an International Conference Held at Stockholm University 15-17 May 2009*, edited by Brita Alroth and Charlotte Scheffer, 201–16. Stockholm: Stockholm University, 2014.
- Brice, Lee L., ed. *Warfare in the Roman Republic: From the Etruscan Wars to the Battle of Actium*. Santa Barbara, California: ABC-CLIO, 2014.
- Broughton, T. Robert S. *The Magistrates of the Roman Republic: Vol. 1: 509 B.C. - 100 B.C.* Vol. 1. 2 vols. American Philological Association, 1951.
- . *The Magistrates of the Roman Republic: Vol. 2: 99 B.C. - 31 B.C.* Vol. 2. 2 vols. American Philological Association, 1951.
- Brunt, P. A. 'Nobilitas and Novitas'. *The Journal of Roman Studies* 72 (1982): 1–17.
- . *The Fall of the Roman Republic and Related Essays*. Oxford, 1988.
- Chase, George. 'The Origin of Roman Praenomina'. *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 8 (1897): 103.

- Cornell, Tim. *The Beginnings of Rome: Italy and Rome from the Bronze Age to the Punic Wars (c. 1000-264 B.C.)*. Routledge History of the Ancient World. London; New York: Routledge, 1995.
- , ed. *The Fragments of the Roman Historians*. Vol. 1. 3 vols. Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press, 2013.
- , ed. *The Fragments of the Roman Historians*. Vol. 2. 3 vols. Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press, 2013.
- , ed. *The Fragments of the Roman Historians*. Vol. 3. 3 vols. Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press, 2013.
- Crawford, Michael H. *Roman Republican Coinage*. London: Cambridge University Press, 1974.
- Degrassi, Attilio. *Inscriptiones Latinae Liberae Rei Publicae, Fasciculus alter / curavit Attilius Degrassi*. Firenze: La Nuova Italia, 1963.
- Dumézil, Georges. *Archaic Roman Religion, with an Appendix on the Religion of the Etruscans*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970.
- Dyck, Andrew R. *Speeches on Behalf of Marcus Fonteius and Marcus Aemilius Scaurus*. Clarendon Ancient History Series. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- Evans, Jane DeRose. *The Art of Persuasion: Political Propaganda from Aeneas to Brutus*. University of Michigan Press, 1992.
- Farney, Gary D. *Ethnic Identity and Aristocratic Competition in Republican Rome*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- . ‘The Mamilii, Mercury and the Limites: Aristocratic Genealogy and Political Conflict in Republican Rome’. *Athenaeum* Vol.96(1) (2008): 251–60.
- . ‘The Name-Changes of Legendary Romans and the Etruscan-Latin Bilingual Inscriptions: Strategies for Romanization’. *Etruscan Studies* 13, no. 1 (2010): 149.
- Flower, Harriet I. *Ancestor Masks and Aristocratic Power in Roman Culture*. Oxford, 1996.
- . ‘Were Women Ever “Ancestors” in Republican Rome?’ In *Images of Ancestors / Ed. by Jakob Munk Højte*, edited by Jakob Munk Højte, 159–84. Aarhus: Aarhus University Pr., 2002.

- Frier, Bruce W., Thomas A. J. McGinn, and Joel Lidov. *A Casebook on Roman Family Law*. New York: Oxford University Press USA - OSO, 2003.
- Galinsky, Karl. *Augustan Culture: An Interpretive Introduction*. Princeton, N.J: Princeton University Press, 1996.
- Gelzer, Matthias. *The Roman Nobility*. Translated by Robin Seager. Oxford: Blackwell, 1969.
- Gruen, Erich S. 'The Roman Oligarchy: Image and Perception'. In *Imperium Sine Fine: T. Robert S. Broughton and the Roman Republic*, edited by Jerzy Linderski. Historia. Einzelschriften, Heft 105. Stuttgart: F. Steiner Verlag, 1996.
- Hölkeskamp, Karl-Joachim. 'Images of Power: Memory, Myth and Monument in the Roman Republic'. *Scripta Classica Israelica* 24 (2005): 249–71.
- . *Reconstructing the Roman Republic: An Ancient Political Culture and Modern Research*. Translated by Henry Heitmann-Gordon. Princeton, N.J: Princeton University Press, 2010.
- Holland, Tom. *Rubicon: The Last Years of the Roman Republic*. 1st Anchor Books ed. New York: Anchor Books, 2005.
- Hölscher, Tonio. 'The Transformation of Victory into Power: From Event to Structure'. In *Representations of War in Ancient Rome*, edited by Sheila Dillon and Katherine E. Welch, 27–48. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Hopkins, Keith. *Death and Renewal*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1983.
- Hornblower, Simon, Antony Spawforth, and Esther Eidinow, eds. *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*. Fourth edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- Jaeger, Mary. *Livy's Written Rome*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1997.
- Jeffreys, Elizabeth, Michael Jeffreys, and Roger Scott, eds. *The Chronicle of John Malalas*. Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 1986.
- Kajanto, Iiro. *The Latin Cognomina*. Roma: G. Bretschneider Editore, 1982.
- Kenty, Joanna. 'Congenital Virtue: Mos Maiorum in Cicero's Orations'. *The Classical Journal* 111, no. 4 (2016): 429–62.



- Kneale, Matthew. *Rome: A History in Seven Sackings*. London: Atlantic Books, 2017.
- Kramer, Anne-Marie. 'Kinship, Affinity and Connectedness: Exploring the Role of Genealogy in Personal Lives'. *Sociology* 45, no. 3 (2011): 379–395.
- Maltby, Robert. *A Lexicon of Ancient Latin Etymologies*. Reprint. ARCA 25. Cambridge: Cairns, 2006.
- Marshall, Ann. 'Atticus and the Genealogies'. *Latomus* 52, no. 2 (1993): 307–17.
- Mitchell, Richard E. *Patricians and Plebeians: The Origin of the Roman State*. Ithaca [N.Y.]: Cornell University Press, 1990.
- Momigliano, A. 'The Origins of Rome'. In *The Cambridge Ancient History*, edited by A. E. Astin, F. W. Walbank, M. W. Frederiksen, and R. M. Ogilvie, 2nd ed., 7:52–112. The Cambridge Ancient History. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- Momigliano, Arnaldo D. *The Classical Foundations of Modern Historiography*. Vol. 54. Sather Classical Lectures. Berkeley, 1990.
- Mommsen, Theodor. *The History of Rome*. Translated by William P. Dickson. London: Richard Bentley, 1881.
- Münzer, Friedrich. *Roman Aristocratic Parties and Families*. Translated by Therese Ridley. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999.
- Neel, Jaclyn, ed. *Early Rome: Myth and Society: A Sourcebook*. Historical Sources in Translation. Hoboken, USA, 2017.
- O'Bryhim, Shawn, and George Fredric Franko. *Greek and Roman Comedy: Translations and Interpretations of Four Representative Plays*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 2001.
- Ogilvie, R. M. *A Commentary on Livy Books 1-5*. Oxford, 1965.
- Parkin, Robert. *Kinship: An Introduction to Basic Concepts*. Oxford, UK; Cambridge, MA: Blackwell Publishers, 1997.
- Parkin, Tim G., and Arthur John Pomeroy, eds. *Roman Social History: A Sourcebook*. Routledge Sourcebooks for the Ancient World. London; New York: Routledge, 2007.
- Pittenger, Miriam R. Pelikan. *Contested Triumphs: Politics, Pageantry, and Performance in Livy's Republican Rome*. Nachdr. Berkeley, Calif.: Univ. of California Press, 2009.

- Platner, Samuel Ball. *A Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome*. Edited by Thomas Ashby. London: Oxford University Press, 1929.
- Plutarch. *Rome in Crisis: Nine Lives*. Translated by Ian Scott-Kilvert and C. B. R Pelling. London; New York: Penguin, 2010.
- Rafferty, David. 'Princeps Senatus'. *Melbourne Historical Journal* 39, no. 2 (May 2011).
- Richardson, Lawrence. *A New Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1992.
- Ridley, Ronald T. 'Falsi Triumphi, Plures Consulatus'. *Latomus* 42, no. 2 (1983): 372–82.
- Rissanen, Mika. 'The Hirpi Sorani and the Wolf Cults of Central Italy'. *Arctos: Acta Philologica Fennica* 46 (2012): 115–35.
- Russell, Amy. *The Politics of Public Space in Republican Rome*. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press, 2016.
- Salway, Benet. 'What's in a Name? A Survey of Roman Onomastic Practice from c. 700 B.C. to A.D. 700'. *The Journal of Roman Studies* 84 (1994): 124–45.
- Satterfield, Susan. 'The Prodigies of 17 B.C.E. and the Ludi Saeculares'. *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 146, no. 2 (2016): 25.
- Scullard, H. H. *Roman Politics, 220-150 B.C.* 2nd ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973
- . *Festivals and Ceremonies of the Roman Republic*. London: Thames and Hudson Ltd, 1981.
- Seager, Robin. 'Cicero and the Word Popvlaris'. *The Classical Quarterly* 22, no. 2 (1972): 328–38.
- Skutsch, Otto. *The Annals of Q. Ennius*. Oxford: New York: Clarendon Press; Oxford University Press, 1985.
- Smith, Christopher John. *The Roman Clan: The Gens from Ancient Ideology to Modern Anthropology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Stevenson, Angus, ed. *Oxford Dictionary of English*. Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Szemler, G. J. *The Priests of the Roman Republic. A Study of Interactions Between Priesthoods and Magistracies*. Bruxelles: Latomus, 1972.

- Tatum, W. Jeffrey. *The Patrician Tribune: Publius Clodius Pulcher*. Chapel Hill; London: The University of North Carolina Press, 1999.
- . *QUINTUS CICERO: A Brief Handbook on Canvassing for Office (Commentariolum Petitionis)*. Oxford University Press, 2018.
- Taylor, Lily Ross. ‘New Light on the History of the Secular Games’. *The American Journal of Philology* 55, no. 2 (1934): 101–20.
- Toohy, Peter. ‘Politics, Prejudice, and Trojan Genealogies: Varro, Hyginus, and Horace: Stemmata Quid Faciunt? Juvenal, “Sat.” 8.1’. *Arethusa* 17, no. 1 (1984): 5–28.
- Uggeri, Giovanni (Florence). ‘Tarentum’. *Brill’s New Pauly*, 1 October 2006. <https://referenceworks.brillonline.com/entries/brill-s-new-pauly/tarentum-e1200690>.
- Valerius Maximus. *Memorable Doings and Sayings*. Translated by D. R. Shackleton Bailey. Loeb Classical Library 492–493. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 2000.
- Vanotti, Gabriella (Novara). ‘Sabini’. *Brill’s New Pauly*, 1 October 2006. <https://referenceworks.brillonline.com/entries/brill-s-new-pauly/sabini-e1026390#>.
- Varto, Emily. ‘Stories Told in Lists: Formulaic Genealogies as Intentional Histories’. *Journal of Ancient History* 3, no. 2 (2015): 118–149.
- Venning, Timothy, and J. F. Drinkwater, eds. *A Chronology of the Roman Empire*. London; New York: Continuum, 2011.
- Versnel, H. S. *Triumphus*. Leiden: Leiden, Brill, 1970.
- Vervaeke, Frederik Juliaan. ‘The “Lex Valeria” and Sulla’s Empowerment as Dictator (82–79 BCE)’. *Cahiers Du Centre Gustave Glotz* 15 (2004): 37–84.
- Walbank, F. W., A. E. Astin, M. W. Frederiksen, and R. M. Ogilvie, eds. *The Rise of Rome to 220 BC*. Vol. 7. The Cambridge Ancient History. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- Walters, Kenneth R. ‘Time and Paradigm in the Roman Republic’. *Syllecta Classica* 7, no. 1 (1996): 69–97.
- Wiseman, T. P. ‘Legendary Genealogies in Late-Republican Rome’. *Greece and Rome* 21, no. 2 (1974): 153–164.

- . ‘The God of the Lupercal’. *The Journal of Roman Studies* 85 (1995): 1–22.
- . *Roman Drama and Roman History*. Exeter Studies in History. Exeter, Devon, UK: University of Exeter Press, 1998.
- . *The Myths of Rome*. Exeter, Devon, UK: University of Exeter Press, 2004.
- Ziółkowski, Adam. *The Temples of Mid-Republican Rome and Their Historical and Topographical Context*. Saggi Di Storia Antica 4. Roma: ‘L’Erma’ di Bretschneider, 1992.

## Appendix I

### Coinage

The coins discussed were located using the *Coinage of the Roman Republic Online (CRRO)*, an online version of Michael Crawford's *Roman Republican Coinage (RRC)*.<sup>312</sup> The following coins are identified by the typology set out in *RRC* (primary typology for coins of the Roman Republic) as well as their identifiers for the respective collections to which their images belong. All coin images listed below are licensed under the Public Domain Mark and arranged in order as discussed in the thesis.



Obverse



Reverse

#### ***RRC 291/1***

Silver Denarius of Mn. Aemilius  
Paullus (114-113 B.C.E.)  
Courtesy of the American Numismatic  
Society (ANS): 1944.100.3323



Obverse



Reverse

#### ***RRC 419/1d***

Silver Denarius of M. Aemilius  
Lepidus (61 B.C.E.)  
Courtesy of the ANS: 1937.158.192

---

<sup>312</sup> Crawford, *RRC*.



Obverse



Reverse

***RRC 20/1***

Silver Didrachm of C. Fabius Pictor  
and Q. Ogulnius (269-266 B.C.E.)  
Courtesy of the ANS: 1944.100.15



Obverse



Reverse

***RRC 265/3***

Bronze Quadrans of Q. Fabius  
Maximus (127 B.C.E.)  
Courtesy of the ANS: 1947.97.8



Obverse



Reverse

***RRC 273/2***

Bronze Quadrans of Q. Fabius Labeo  
(124 B.C.E.)  
Courtesy of the ANS: 1998.85.51



Obverse



Reverse

***RRC 474/3a***

Silver Denarius of L. Valerius  
Acisculus (45 B.C.E.)  
Courtesy of Bibliothèque nationale de  
France: [Monnaie. Denarius]



Obverse



Reverse

***RRC 306/1***

Silver Denarius of L. Valerius Flaccus  
(108-107 B.C.E.)  
Courtesy of the ANS: 1941.131.107

## Appendix II

### Vaults of Social Capital

The high-ranking deposits of Social Capital for each *gens* are tallied and arranged alphabetically by *cognomen* for ease of reference. Each row represents the year (B.C.E.) in which the member of the *gens* served as the corresponding magistrate in the *cursus honorum* column. Under the *religio* columns the numbers represent the periods spent in the corresponding priesthoods. The sources consulted were the indispensable: *The Magistrates of the Roman Republic* by T. Robert S. Broughton (1951); *Corpus inscriptionum Latinarum. Vol. 1, Pars 1: Inscriptiones Latinae antiquissimae ad C. Caesaris mortem* (1973); and Attilio Degrassi's *Inscriptiones Latinae Liberae Rei Publicae, Fasciculus alter / curavit Atilius Degrassi* (1963).<sup>313</sup>

### Abbreviations

Cos.	Consul.
Tr.	Triumph.
MTcp.	Military Tribune with Consular Powers.
Cens.	Censor.
Dict.	Dictator.
Mag.Eq.	Master of the Horse.
P/PrM.	Praetor or Pro-magistrate.
P/S	Princeps Senatus.
Pont.	Pontifex.
P. Max.	Pontifex Maximus.
Aug.	Augur.
Rex. Sac.	Rex Sacrorum.
Q. Flam.	Flamen Quirinalis.
D. Flam.	Flamen Dialis.
M. Flam.	Flamen Martialis.

---

<sup>313</sup> Broughton, *MRR*, 1951, vol. 1, vols 1 & 2; Akademie der Wissenschaften der DDR, Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, and Preussische Akademie der Wissenschaften, *CIL*; Degrassi, *Inscriptiones Latinae Liberae Rei Publicae, Fasciculus alter / curavit Atilius Degrassi*.

## Gens Aemilia

			Cos.	Tr.	MTep	Cens.	Dict.	Mag. Eq	P/PM	P/S	Pont.	P. Max.	Aug.	Rex.Sac.	Q.Flam	D.Flam	M.Flam
<i>Total</i>			38	10	12	6	7	5	25	13	6	2	2	0	0	0	1
L.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Barbula	281	280		269											
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Barbula					285										
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Barbula	230														
Q.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Barbula	317 311	310													
M'	<b>Aemilius</b>	Lepidus	66						69								
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Lepidus	285														
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Lepidus	232										? to 216				
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Lepidus							218 216 213								
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Lepidus	187 175	175		179			191 190	179 174 169 164 159 154	199 to 152	180 to 152					
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Lepidus	158						161								
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Lepidus	126						129								
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Lepidus	78						81 80								
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Lepidus	46 42					46 45 44	49		60 to 12	44 to 12					
Mam.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Lepidus	77						81	70	73 to 60						
M'	<b>Aemilius</b>	Lepidus	50						53								
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Lepidus	137						143								
C.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Mamercinus			394 391												
L.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Mamercinus			389 387 383 382 380												
L.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Mamercinus	366 363		377			368									
Mam.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Mamercinus		426	438		437 434 426										



M'	<b>Aemilius</b>	Mamercinus	410		405 403 401												
L.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Mamercus	484 478 473														
T.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Mamercus	470 467														
T.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Mamercinus	339						341								
L.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Mamercinus	341 329	329			335 316	352									
L.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Papus	225	225		220											
L.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Papus						205									
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Papus					321										
Q.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Papus	282 278			275											
L.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Paullus	182 168	167		164			191				192 to 160				
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Paullus	302														
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Paullus	255	253													
L.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Paullus	219 216								? to 216						
L.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Regillus		189					190 189								
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Regillus							217								? to 205
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Scaurus	115	115		109			119	115 108 102 97 92 89	123 to 89						
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Scaurus							63 62 61 55		60 to ?						
Total			38	10	12	6	7	5	25	13	6	2	2	0	0	0	1
			Cos.	Tr.	MTep	Cens.	Dict.	Mag. Eq	P/PrM	P/S	Pont.	P. Max.	Aug.	Rex.Sac.	Q.Flam	D.Flam	M.Flam

## Gens Fabia

			Cos.	Tr.	MTcp	Cens.	Diet.	Mag. Eq	P/PaM	P/S	Pont.	P. Max.	Aug.	Rex. Suc.	Q. Flam	D. Flam	M. Flam
<i>Total</i>			45	14	17	6	5	6	29	10	4	0	2	0	1	0	0
	<b>Fabius</b>				387												
	<b>Fabius</b>				383												
	<b>Fabius</b>	Albus			382												
C.	<b>Fabius</b>	Ambustus	358														
C.	<b>Fabius</b>	Ambustus						315									
K.	<b>Fabius</b>	Ambustus			404 401 395 390												
M.	<b>Fabius</b>	Ambustus			381 369	363											
M.	<b>Fabius</b>	Ambustus	360 356 354	360  354			351	322		?							
N.	<b>Fabius</b>	Ambustus			407 406 390												
Q.	<b>Fabius</b>	Ambustus					321	344									
Q.	<b>Fabius</b>	Ambustus			390												
M.	<b>Fabius</b>	Buteo	245			241	216			214 213 212 211 210							
M.	<b>Fabius</b>	Buteo							201								
N.	<b>Fabius</b>	Buteo	247					224									
N.	<b>Fabius</b>	Buteo							173								
Q.	<b>Fabius</b>	Buteo							196								
Q.	<b>Fabius</b>	Buteo							181 180								
C.	<b>Fabius</b>	Dorsuo									? to 390						
M.	<b>Fabius</b>	Dorsuo	345														
Q.	<b>Fabius</b>	Labeo	183	188					189 188 182 181		180 to ?						
C.	<b>Fabius</b>	Licinus	273														
M.	<b>Fabius</b>	Licinus	246														
Q.	<b>Fabius</b>	Maximus	213						214								
Q.	<b>Fabius</b>	Maximus											203 to 196				
Q.	<b>Fabius</b>	Maximus							181								
Q.	<b>Fabius</b>	Maximus	45	45					48								
Q.	<b>Fabius</b>	Maximus	145						149								

									144 143								
Q.	<b>Fabius</b>	Maximus	121	120					124 123 120								
Q.	<b>Fabius</b>	Maximus	116			108			119 115								
Q.	<b>Fabius</b>	Maximus	292 276	290 276		289			291	?							
Q.	<b>Fabius</b>	Maximus	265														
Q.	<b>Fabius</b>	Maximus	322 310 308 297 295	322 309 295		304		325 302	309 307 296	?							
Q.	<b>Fabius</b>	Maximus	142						145 141 140		141						
Q.	<b>Fabius</b>	Maximus	233 228 214 215 209	233		230	221 217		209 204		216 to 203		265 to 203				
C.	<b>Fabius</b>	Pictor	269														
N.	<b>Fabius</b>	Pictor	266	266 266													
Q.	<b>Fabius</b>	Pictor							189						190 to 167		
K.	<b>Fabius</b>	Vibulanus	484 481 479						478								
M.	<b>Fabius</b>	Vibulanus	483 480														
M.	<b>Fabius</b>	Vibulanus	442		433												
N.	<b>Fabius</b>	Vibulanus	421		415 407												
Q.	<b>Fabius</b>	Vibulanus	485 482														
Q.	<b>Fabius</b>	Vibulanus	467 465 459	459													
Q.	<b>Fabius</b>	Vibulanus	423 412		416												
<i>Total</i>			45	14	17	6	5	6	29	10	4	0	2	0	1	0	0
			Cos.	Tr.	MTep	Cens.	Diet.	Mag. Eq	P/PrM	P/S	Pont.	P. Max.	Aug.	Rex.Sac.	Q.Flam	D.Flam	M.Flam

## Gens Valeria

			Cos.	Tr.	MTcp	Cens.	Diet.	Mag. Eq	P/PrM	P/S	Pont.	P. Max.	Aug.	Rex.Sac.	Q.Flam	D.Flam	M.Flam
Total			48	11	22	6	5	9	48	2	4	0	2	0	0	1	2
M'	Valerius						501										
M.	Valerius										340						
M.	Valerius	Falto							201								
									200								
P.	Valerius	Falto	238														
Q.	Valerius	Falto	239	241					242								
									241								
C.	Valerius	Flaccus						321									
C.	Valerius	Flaccus							183							209 to 174	
C.	Valerius	Flaccus	93						95								
									92								
									85								
									84								
									83								
									82								
									81								
L.	Valerius	Flaccus	261														
L.	Valerius	Flaccus	195			184			199	184	196 to 180						
									194								
L.	Valerius	Flaccus	152						155								154 to ?
L.	Valerius	Flaccus							117								
L.	Valerius	Flaccus	131						134								
L.	Valerius	Flaccus	100			97		82	103	86							? to 69
								81									
								80									
								79									
L.	Valerius	Flaccus	86						92								
									91								
L.	Valerius	Flaccus							63								
									62								
P.	Valerius	Flaccus	227														
M.	Valerius	Flaccus	437	437													
M.	Valerius	Lactucinus			398												
					395												
C.	Valerius	Laevinus							179								
M.	Valerius	Laevinus	220						227								
			210						215								
									214								
									213								

									212							
									211							
									209							
									208							
									207							
									205							
									201							
									200							
L.	Valerius	Laevinus							182							
P.	Valerius	Laevinus	280													
M'	Valerius			494			494					?				
												to				
												463				
M.	Valerius	Maximus	312	312												
			289													
			286													
M.	Valerius	Corvus	348	301		307	342		347		340					
			346				302		308							
			343													
			335													
			300													
			299													
M'	Valerius	Maximus	456													
M.	Valerius	Maximus	226													
M'	Valerius	Maximus	263	263		252										
M.	Valerius	Messalla	188						193							
M.	Valerius	Messalla	161			154			164							
M.	Valerius	Messalla							36							
									31							
M.	Valerius	Messalla	61			55			64		73					
											to					
											57					
M.	Valerius	Messalla	53						62				55 YEARS			
M.	Valerius	Messalla							32							
Q.	Valerius	Orca							57							
									56							
L.	Valerius	Publicola			394											
					389											
					387											
					383											
					380											
M.	Valerius	Publicola	355					358								
			353													
P.	Valerius	Publicola	509	509												
			508													
			507													
			506	505												
			504	504												
P.	Valerius	Publicola	475	475												

			460														
P.	Valerius	Publicola	352				344	332	350								
L.	Valerius	Publicola	449	449													
C.	Valerius	Potitus			370												
C.	Valerius	Potitus	331					331									
L.	Valerius	Potitus	483														
			470														
L.	Valerius	Potitus	393		414			390									
			392		406												
					403												
					401												
					398												
P.	Valerius	Potitus			386												
					384												
					380												
					377												
					370												
					367												
C.	Valerius	Potitus	410		415												
					407												
					404												
M.	Valerius	Volusus	505														
Total			48	11	22	6	5	9	48	2	4	0	2	0	0	1	2
			Cos.	Tr.	M.Tcp	Cens.	Dict.	Mag. Eq	P/PM	P/S	Pont.	P. Max.	Aug.	Rex.Sac.	Q.Flam	D.Flam	M.Flam

## Appendix III

### Paradigmatic Pressure

The high-ranking deposits of Social Capital for each *gens* are tallied and arranged chronologically by date of the magistracy to visually convey the theory of Paradigmatic Pressure. Each row presents the full name of the magistrate, the name and year of the office held, and the number of years since the last member of the *gens* held a high-ranking magistracy. The sources consulted to construct the tables were: *The Magistrates of the Roman Republic* by T. Robert S. Broughton (1951); *Corpus inscriptionum Latinarum. Vol. 1, Pars 1: Inscriptiones Latinae antiquissimae ad C. Caesaris mortem* (1973); and Attilio Degrassi's *Inscriptiones Latinae Liberae Rei Publicae, Fasciculus alter / curavit Attilius Degrassi* (1963).<sup>314</sup>

### Abbreviations

Cos.	Consul.
Tr.	Triumph.
MTcp.	Military Tribune with Consular Powers.
Cens.	Censor.
Dict.	Dictator.
Mag.Eq.	Master of the Horse.
P/PrM.	Praetor or Pro-magistrate.
P/S	Princeps Senatus.

---

<sup>314</sup> Broughton, *MRR*, 1951, vol. 1, vols 1 & 2; Akademie der Wissenschaften der DDR, Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, and Preussische Akademie der Wissenschaften, *CIL*; Degrassi, *Inscriptiones Latinae Liberae Rei Publicae, Fasciculus alter / curavit Attilius Degrassi*.

*Gens Aemilia*

<i>PRAE.</i>	<i>NOMEN</i>	<i>COGNOMEN</i>	MAG	Year B.C.E.	Years Between
L.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Mamercus	Cos.	484	-
L.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Mamercus	Cos.	478	6
L.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Mamercus	Cos.	473	5
T.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Mamercus	Cos.	470	3
T.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Mamercus	Cos.	467	3
Mam.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Mamercinus	MTcp.	438	29
Mam.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Mamercinus	Dict.	437	1
Mam.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Mamercinus	Dict.	434	3
Mam.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Mamercinus	Tr.	426	8
Mam.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Mamercinus	Dict.	426	0
M'	<b>Aemilius</b>	Mamercinus	Cos.	410	16
M'	<b>Aemilius</b>	Mamercinus	MTcp.	405	5
M'	<b>Aemilius</b>	Mamercinus	MTcp.	403	2
M'	<b>Aemilius</b>	Mamercinus	MTcp.	401	2
C.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Mamercinus	MTcp.	394	7
C.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Mamercinus	MTcp.	391	3
L.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Mamercinus	MTcp.	389	2
L.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Mamercinus	MTcp.	387	2
L.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Mamercinus	MTcp.	383	4
L.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Mamercinus	MTcp.	382	1
L.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Mamercinus	MTcp.	380	2
L.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Mamercinus	MTcp.	377	3
L.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Mamercinus	Mag.Eq.	368	9
L.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Mamercinus	Cos.	366	2
L.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Mamercinus	Cos.	363	3
L.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Mamercinus	Privernas Mag.Eq.	352	11
L.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Mamercinus	Privernas Cos.	341	11
T.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Mamercinus	P/PrM	341	0
T.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Mamercinus	Cos.	339	2
L.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Mamercinus	Privernas Dict.	335	4
L.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Mamercinus	Privernas Cos.	329	6
L.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Mamercinus	Privernas Tr.	329	0
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Papus	Dict.	321	8
Q.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Barbula	Cos.	317	4
L.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Mamercinus	Privernas Dict.	316	1
Q.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Barbula	Cos.	311	5
Q.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Barbula	Tr.	310	1
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Paullus	Cos.	302	8
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Lepidus	Cos.	285	17
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Barbula	Dict.	285	0
Q.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Papus	Cos.	282	3
L.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Barbula	Cos.	281	1



L.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Barbula	Tr.	280	1
Q.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Papus	Cos.	278	2
Q.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Papus	Cens.	275	3
L.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Barbula	Cens.	269	6
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Paullus	Cos.	255	14
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Paullus	Tr.	253	2
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Lepidus	Cos.	232	21
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Barbula	Cos.	230	2
L.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Papus	Cos.	225	5
L.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Papus	Tr.	225	0
L.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Papus	Cens.	220	5
L.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Paullus	Cos.	219	1
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Lepidus	P/PrM	218	1
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Regillus	P/PrM	217	1
L.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Paullus	Cos.	216	1
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Lepidus	P/PrM	216	0
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Lepidus	P/PrM	213	3
L.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Papus	P/PrM	205	8
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Lepidus	P/PrM	191	14
L.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Paullus	P/PrM	191	0
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Lepidus	P/PrM	190	1
L.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Regillus	P/PrM	190	0
L.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Regillus	Tr.	189	1
L.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Regillus	P/PrM	189	0
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Lepidus	Cos.	187	2
L.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Paullus	Cos.	182	5
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Lepidus	Cens.	179	3
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Lepidus	P/S	179	0
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Lepidus	P/S	179	0
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Lepidus	P/S	178	1
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Lepidus	P/S	177	1
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Lepidus	P/S	176	1
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Lepidus	Cos.	175	1
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Lepidus	Tr.	175	0
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Lepidus	P/S	175	0
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Lepidus	P/S	174	1
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Lepidus	P/S	174	0
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Lepidus	P/S	173	1
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Lepidus	P/S	172	1
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Lepidus	P/S	171	1
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Lepidus	P/S	170	1
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Lepidus	P/S	169	1
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Lepidus	P/S	169	0
L.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Paullus	Cos.	168	1
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Lepidus	P/S	168	0
L.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Paullus	Tr.	167	1

M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Lepidus	P/S	167	0
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Lepidus	P/S	166	1
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Lepidus	P/S	165	1
L.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Paullus	Cens.	164	1
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Lepidus	P/S	164	0
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Lepidus	P/S	164	0
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Lepidus	P/S	163	1
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Lepidus	P/S	162	1
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Lepidus	P/PrM	161	1
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Lepidus	P/S	161	0
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Lepidus	P/S	160	1
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Lepidus	P/S	159	1
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Lepidus	P/S	159	0
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Lepidus	Cos.	158	1
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Lepidus	P/S	158	0
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Lepidus	P/S	157	1
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Lepidus	P/S	156	1
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Lepidus	P/S	155	1
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Lepidus	P/S	154	1
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Lepidus	P/S	154	0
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Lepidus	P/S	153	1
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Lepidus	P/S	152	1
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Lepidus	P/S	151	1
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Lepidus	P/S	150	1
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Lepidus	P/S	149	1
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Lepidus	P/S	148	1
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Lepidus	P/S	147	1
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Lepidus	Porcina P/PrM	143	4
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Lepidus	Cos.	137	6
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Lepidus	P/PrM	129	8
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Lepidus	Cos.	126	3
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Scaurus	P/PrM	119	7
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Scaurus	Cos.	115	4
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Scaurus	Tr.	115	0
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Scaurus	P/S	115	0
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Scaurus	P/S	114	1
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Scaurus	P/S	113	1
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Scaurus	P/S	112	1
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Scaurus	P/S	111	1
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Scaurus	P/S	110	1
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Scaurus	Cens.	109	1
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Scaurus	P/S	109	0
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Scaurus	P/S	108	1
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Scaurus	P/S	107	1
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Scaurus	P/S	106	1
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Scaurus	P/S	105	1

M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Scaurus		P/S	104	1
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Scaurus		P/S	103	1
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Scaurus		P/S	102	1
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Scaurus		P/S	101	1
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Scaurus		P/S	100	1
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Scaurus		P/S	99	1
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Scaurus		P/S	98	1
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Scaurus		P/S	97	1
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Scaurus		P/S	96	1
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Scaurus		P/S	95	1
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Scaurus		P/S	94	1
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Scaurus		P/S	93	1
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Scaurus		P/S	92	1
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Scaurus		P/S	91	1
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Scaurus		P/S	90	1
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Scaurus		P/S	89	1
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Scaurus		P/S	88	1
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Scaurus		P/S	87	1
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Lepidus		P/PrM	81	6
Mam.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Lepidus	Livianus	P/PrM	81	0
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Lepidus		P/PrM	80	1
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Lepidus		Cos.	78	2
Mam.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Lepidus		Cos.	77	1
Mam.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Lepidus	Livianus	P/S	70	7
M'	<b>Aemilius</b>	Lepidus		P/PrM	69	1
M'	<b>Aemilius</b>	Lepidus		Cos.	66	3
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Scaurus		P/PrM	63	3
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Scaurus		P/PrM	62	1
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Scaurus		P/PrM	61	1
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Scaurus		P/PrM	55	6
M'	<b>Aemilius</b>	Lepidus		P/PrM	53	2
M'	<b>Aemilius</b>	Lepidus		Cos.	50	3
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Lepidus		P/PrM	49	1
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Lepidus		Cos.	46	3
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Lepidus		Mag.Eq.	46	0
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Lepidus		Mag.Eq.	45	1
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Lepidus		Mag.Eq.	44	1
M.	<b>Aemilius</b>	Lepidus		Cos.	42	2
Average gap between deposits (years):						3

*Gens Fabia*

<i>PRAE.</i>	<i>NOMEN</i>	<i>COGNOMEN</i>	MAG	Year BC	Years Between
M.	<b>Fabius</b>	Vibulanus	Cos.	485	-
K.	<b>Fabius</b>	Vibulanus	Cos.	484	1
M.	<b>Fabius</b>	Vibulanus	Cos.	483	1
Q.	<b>Fabius</b>	Vibulanus	Cos.	482	1
K.	<b>Fabius</b>	Vibulanus	Cos.	481	1
M.	<b>Fabius</b>	Vibulanus	Cos.	480	1
K.	<b>Fabius</b>	Vibulanus	Cos.	479	1
K.	<b>Fabius</b>	Vibulanus	P/PrM	478	1
Q.	<b>Fabius</b>	Vibulanus	Cos.	467	11
Q.	<b>Fabius</b>	Vibulanus	Cos.	465	2
Q.	<b>Fabius</b>	Vibulanus	Cos.	459	6
Q.	<b>Fabius</b>	Vibulanus	Tr.	459	0
M.	<b>Fabius</b>	Vibulanus	Cos.	442	17
M.	<b>Fabius</b>	Vibulanus	MTcp.	433	9
Q.	<b>Fabius</b>	Vibulanus	Cos.	423	10
N.	<b>Fabius</b>	Vibulanus	Cos.	421	2
Q.	<b>Fabius</b>	Vibulanus	MTcp.	416	5
N.	<b>Fabius</b>	Vibulanus	MTcp.	415	1
Q.	<b>Fabius</b>	Ambustus	Cos.	412	3
N.	<b>Fabius</b>	Vibulanus	MTcp.	407	5
N.	<b>Fabius</b>	Ambustus	MTcp.	407	0
N.	<b>Fabius</b>	Ambustus	MTcp.	406	1
K.	<b>Fabius</b>	Ambustus	MTcp.	404	2
K.	<b>Fabius</b>	Ambustus	MTcp.	401	3
K.	<b>Fabius</b>	Ambustus	MTcp.	395	6
K.	<b>Fabius</b>	Ambustus	MTcp.	390	5
N.	<b>Fabius</b>	Ambustus	MTcp.	390	0
?	<b>Fabius</b>	?	MTcp.	387	3
?	<b>Fabius</b>	?	MTcp.	383	7
?	<b>Fabius</b>	Albus	MTcp.	382	8
M.	<b>Fabius</b>	Ambustus	MTcp.	381	6
M.	<b>Fabius</b>	Ambustus	MTcp.	369	14
M.	<b>Fabius</b>	Ambustus	Cens.	363	19
M.	<b>Fabius</b>	Ambustus	Cos.	360	9
M.	<b>Fabius</b>	Ambustus	Tr.	360	0
C.	<b>Fabius</b>	Ambustus	Cos.	358	2
M.	<b>Fabius</b>	Ambustus	Cos.	356	2
M.	<b>Fabius</b>	Ambustus	Cos.	354	2
M.	<b>Fabius</b>	Ambustus	Tr.	354	0
M.	<b>Fabius</b>	Ambustus	Dict.	351	3
M.	<b>Fabius</b>	Dorsuo	Cos.	345	6
Q.	<b>Fabius</b>	Ambustus	Mag.Eq.	344	1

Q.	<b>Fabius</b>	Maximus	Rullianus	Mag.Eq.	325	19
M.	<b>Fabius</b>	Ambustus		Mag.Eq.	322	3
Q.	<b>Fabius</b>	Maximus	Rullianus	Cos.	322	0
Q.	<b>Fabius</b>	Maximus	Rullianus	Tr.	322	0
Q.	<b>Fabius</b>	Ambustus		Dict.	321	1
C.	<b>Fabius</b>	Ambustus		Mag.Eq.	315	6
Q.	<b>Fabius</b>	Maximus		Dict.	315	0
Q.	<b>Fabius</b>	Maximus		Cos.	310	5
Q.	<b>Fabius</b>	Maximus		P/PrM	309	1
Q.	<b>Fabius</b>	Maximus	Rullianus	Tr.	309	0
Q.	<b>Fabius</b>	Maximus		Cos.	308	1
Q.	<b>Fabius</b>	Maximus		P/PrM	307	1
Q.	<b>Fabius</b>	Maximus		Cens.	304	3
Q.	<b>Fabius</b>	Maximus	Rullianus	Mag.Eq.	302	2
Q.	<b>Fabius</b>	Maximus		Cos.	297	5
Q.	<b>Fabius</b>	Maximus		P/PrM	296	1
Q.	<b>Fabius</b>	Maximus		Cos.	295	1
Q.	<b>Fabius</b>	Maximus	Rullianus	Tr.	295	0
Q.	<b>Fabius</b>	Maximus	Gurges	Cos.	292	3
Q.	<b>Fabius</b>	Maximus	Gurges	P/PrM	291	1
Q.	<b>Fabius</b>	Maximus	Gurges	Tr.	290	1
Q.	<b>Fabius</b>	Maximus	Gurges	Cens.	289	1
Q.	<b>Fabius</b>	Maximus	Gurges	Cos.	276	13
Q.	<b>Fabius</b>	Maximus	Gurges	Tr.	276	0
C.	<b>Fabius</b>	Licinus		Cos.	273	3
C.	<b>Fabius</b>	Pictor		Cos.	269	4
N.	<b>Fabius</b>	Pictor		Cos.	266	3
N.	<b>Fabius</b>	Pictor		Tr.	266	0
N.	<b>Fabius</b>	Pictor		Tr.	266	0
Q.	<b>Fabius</b>	Maximus	Gurges	Cos.	265	1
N.	<b>Fabius</b>	Buteo		Cos.	247	18
M.	<b>Fabius</b>	Licinus		Cos.	246	1
M.	<b>Fabius</b>	Buteo		Cos.	245	1
M.	<b>Fabius</b>	Buteo		Cens.	241	4
Q.	<b>Fabius</b>	Maximus	Verrucosus	Cos.	233	8
Q.	<b>Fabius</b>	Maximus	Verrucosus	Tr.	233	0
Q.	<b>Fabius</b>	Maximus	Verrucosus	Cens.	230	3
Q.	<b>Fabius</b>	Maximus	Verrucosus	Cos.	228	2
N.	<b>Fabius</b>	Buteo		Mag.Eq.	224	4
Q.	<b>Fabius</b>	Maximus	Verrucosus	Dict.	221	3
Q.	<b>Fabius</b>	Maximus	Verrucosus	Dict.	217	4
M.	<b>Fabius</b>	Buteo		Dict.	216	1
Q.	<b>Fabius</b>	Maximus	Verrucosus	Cos.	215	1
Q.	<b>Fabius</b>	Maximus	Verrucosus	Cos.	214	1
Q.	<b>Fabius</b>	Maximus		P/PrM	214	0
M.	<b>Fabius</b>	Buteo		P/S	214	0

Q.	<b>Fabius</b>	Maximus		Cos.	213	1
M.	<b>Fabius</b>	Buteo		P/S	213	0
M.	<b>Fabius</b>	Buteo		P/S	212	1
M.	<b>Fabius</b>	Buteo		P/S	211	1
M.	<b>Fabius</b>	Buteo		P/S	210	1
Q.	<b>Fabius</b>	Maximus	Verrucosus	Cos.	209	1
Q.	<b>Fabius</b>	Maximus	Verrucosus	P/S	209	0
Q.	<b>Fabius</b>	Maximus	Verrucosus	P/S	208	1
Q.	<b>Fabius</b>	Maximus	Verrucosus	P/S	207	1
Q.	<b>Fabius</b>	Maximus	Verrucosus	P/S	206	1
Q.	<b>Fabius</b>	Maximus	Verrucosus	P/S	205	1
Q.	<b>Fabius</b>	Maximus	Verrucosus	P/S	204	1
Q.	<b>Fabius</b>	Maximus	Verrucosus	P/S	203	1
Q.	<b>Fabius</b>	Maximus	Verrucosus	P/S	202	1
M.	<b>Fabius</b>	Buteo		P/PrM	201	1
Q.	<b>Fabius</b>	Maximus	Verrucosus	P/S	201	0
Q.	<b>Fabius</b>	Maximus	Verrucosus	P/S	200	1
Q.	<b>Fabius</b>	Buteo		P/PrM	196	4
Q.	<b>Fabius</b>	Pictor		P/PrM	189	7
Q.	<b>Fabius</b>	Labeo		P/PrM	189	0
Q.	<b>Fabius</b>	Labeo		P/PrM	188	1
Q.	<b>Fabius</b>	Labeo		Tr.	188	0
Q.	<b>Fabius</b>	Labeo		Cos.	183	5
Q.	<b>Fabius</b>	Labeo		P/PrM	182	1
Q.	<b>Fabius</b>	Buteo		P/PrM	181	1
Q.	<b>Fabius</b>	Labeo		P/PrM	181	0
Q.	<b>Fabius</b>	Maximus		P/PrM	181	0
Q.	<b>Fabius</b>	Buteo		P/PrM	180	1
N.	<b>Fabius</b>	Buteo		P/PrM	173	7
Q.	<b>Fabius</b>	Maximus	Aemilianus	P/PrM	149	24
Q.	<b>Fabius</b>	Maximus	Aemilianus	Cos.	145	4
Q.	<b>Fabius</b>	Maximus	Servilianus	P/PrM	145	0
Q.	<b>Fabius</b>	Maximus	Aemilianus	P/PrM	144	1
Q.	<b>Fabius</b>	Maximus	Aemilianus	P/PrM	143	1
Q.	<b>Fabius</b>	Maximus	Servilianus	Cos.	142	1
Q.	<b>Fabius</b>	Maximus	Servilianus	P/PrM	141	1
Q.	<b>Fabius</b>	Maximus	Servilianus	P/PrM	140	1
Q.	<b>Fabius</b>	Maximus	Allobrogicus	P/PrM	124	16
Q.	<b>Fabius</b>	Maximus	Allobrogicus	P/PrM	123	1
Q.	<b>Fabius</b>	Maximus	Allobrogicus	Cos.	121	2
Q.	<b>Fabius</b>	Maximus	Allobrogicus	P/PrM	120	1
Q.	<b>Fabius</b>	Maximus	Allobrogicus	Tr.	120	0
Q.	<b>Fabius</b>	Maximus	Eburnus	P/PrM	119	1
Q.	<b>Fabius</b>	Maximus	Eburnus	Cos.	116	3
Q.	<b>Fabius</b>	Maximus	Eburnus	P/PrM	115	1
Q.	<b>Fabius</b>	Maximus	Eburnus	Cens.	108	7

Q.	<b>Fabius</b>	Maximus	P/PrM	48	60
Q.	<b>Fabius</b>	Maximus	Tr.	45	3
Q.	<b>Fabius</b>	Maximus	Cos.	45	0
Average gap between deposits (years):					4

*Gens Valeria*

<i>PRAE.</i>	<i>NOMEN</i>	<i>COGNOMEN</i>		MAG	Year B.C.E.	Years Between
P.	<b>Valerius</b>	Publicola		Cos.	509	-
P.	<b>Valerius</b>	Publicola		Tr.	509	0
P.	<b>Valerius</b>	Publicola		Cos.	508	1
P.	<b>Valerius</b>	Publicola		Cos.	507	1
P.	<b>Valerius</b>	Publicola		Cos.	506	1
M.	<b>Valerius</b>	Volusus		Cos.	505	1
P.	<b>Valerius</b>	Publicola		Tr.	505	0
P.	<b>Valerius</b>	Publicola		Cos.	504	1
P.	<b>Valerius</b>	Publicola		Tr.	504	0
M'	<b>Valerius</b>			Dict.	501	3
M'	<b>Valerius</b>			Tr.	494	7
M'	<b>Valerius</b>			Dict.	494	0
L.	<b>Valerius</b>	Potitus		Cos.	483	11
P.	<b>Valerius</b>	Publicola		Cos.	475	8
P.	<b>Valerius</b>	Publicola		Tr.	475	0
L.	<b>Valerius</b>	Potitus		Cos.	470	5
P.	<b>Valerius</b>	Publicola		Cos.	460	10
M'	<b>Valerius</b>	Maximus	Lactuca	Cos.	456	4
L.	<b>Valerius</b>	Publicola	Potitus	Cos.	449	7
L.	<b>Valerius</b>	Publicola	Potitus	Tr.	449	0
M.	<b>Valerius</b>	Flaccus		Cos.	437	12
M.	<b>Valerius</b>	Flaccus		Tr.	437	0
C.	<b>Valerius</b>	Potitus	Volusus	MTcp	415	22
L.	<b>Valerius</b>	Potitus		MTcp	414	1
C.	<b>Valerius</b>	Potitus	Volusus	Cos.	410	4
C.	<b>Valerius</b>	Potitus	Volusus	MTcp	407	3
L.	<b>Valerius</b>	Potitus		MTcp	406	1
C.	<b>Valerius</b>	Potitus	Volusus	MTcp	404	2
L.	<b>Valerius</b>	Potitus		MTcp	403	1
L.	<b>Valerius</b>	Potitus		MTcp	401	2
M.	<b>Valerius</b>	Lactucinus	Maximus	MTcp	398	3
L.	<b>Valerius</b>	Potitus		MTcp	398	0
M.	<b>Valerius</b>	Lactucinus	Maximus	MTcp	395	3
L.	<b>Valerius</b>	Publicola		MTcp	394	1
L.	<b>Valerius</b>	Potitus		Cos.	393	1
L.	<b>Valerius</b>	Potitus		Cos.	392	1
L.	<b>Valerius</b>	Potitus		Mag.Eq.	390	2
L.	<b>Valerius</b>	Publicola		MTcp	389	1
L.	<b>Valerius</b>	Publicola		MTcp	387	2
P.	<b>Valerius</b>	Potitus	Publicola	MTcp	386	1
P.	<b>Valerius</b>	Potitus	Publicola	MTcp	384	2
L.	<b>Valerius</b>	Publicola		MTcp	383	1



L.	<b>Valerius</b>	Publicola		MTcp	380	3
P.	<b>Valerius</b>	Potitus	Publicola	MTcp	380	0
P.	<b>Valerius</b>	Potitus	Publicola	MTcp	377	3
C.	<b>Valerius</b>	Potitus		MTcp	370	7
P.	<b>Valerius</b>	Potitus	Publicola	MTcp	370	0
P.	<b>Valerius</b>	Potitus	Publicola	MTcp	367	3
M.	<b>Valerius</b>	Publicola		Mag.Eq.	358	9
M.	<b>Valerius</b>	Publicola		Cos.	355	3
M.	<b>Valerius</b>	Publicola		Cos.	353	2
P.	<b>Valerius</b>	Publicola		Cos.	352	1
P.	<b>Valerius</b>	Publicola		P/PrM	350	2
M.	<b>Valerius</b>	Maximus	Corvus	Cos.	348	2
M.	<b>Valerius</b>	Maximus	Corvus	P/PrM	347	1
M.	<b>Valerius</b>	Maximus	Corvus	Cos.	346	1
P.	<b>Valerius</b>	Publicola		Dict.	344	2
M.	<b>Valerius</b>	Maximus	Corvus	Cos.	343	1
M.	<b>Valerius</b>	Maximus	Corvus	Dict.	342	1
M.	<b>Valerius</b>	Maximus	Corvus	Cos.	335	7
P.	<b>Valerius</b>	Publicola		Mag.Eq.	332	3
C.	<b>Valerius</b>	Potitus		Cos.	331	1
C.	<b>Valerius</b>	Potitus		Mag.Eq.	331	0
C.	<b>Valerius</b>	Flaccus		Mag.Eq.	321	10
M.	<b>Valerius</b>	Maximus	Corvinus	Cos.	312	9
M.	<b>Valerius</b>	Maximus	Corvinus	Tr.	312	0
M.	<b>Valerius</b>	Maximus	Corvus	P/PrM	308	4
M.	<b>Valerius</b>	Maximus	Corvus	Cens.	307	1
M.	<b>Valerius</b>	Maximus	Corvus	Dict.	302	5
M.	<b>Valerius</b>	Maximus	Corvus	Tr.	301	1
M.	<b>Valerius</b>	Maximus	Corvus	Cos.	300	1
M.	<b>Valerius</b>	Maximus	Corvus	Cos.	299	1
M.	<b>Valerius</b>	Maximus	Corvinus	Cos.	289	10
M.	<b>Valerius</b>	Maximus	Corvinus	Cos.	286	3
P.	<b>Valerius</b>	Laevinus		Cos.	280	6
M'	<b>Valerius</b>	Maximus	Messalla	Cos.	263	17
M'	<b>Valerius</b>	Maximus	Messalla	Tr.	263	0
L.	<b>Valerius</b>	Flaccus		Cos.	261	2
M'	<b>Valerius</b>	Maximus	Messalla	Cens.	252	9
Q.	<b>Valerius</b>	Falto		P/PrM	242	10
Q.	<b>Valerius</b>	Falto		Tr.	241	1
Q.	<b>Valerius</b>	Falto		P/PrM	241	0
Q.	<b>Valerius</b>	Falto		Cos.	239	2
P.	<b>Valerius</b>	Falto		Cos.	238	1
P.	<b>Valerius</b>	Flaccus		Cos.	227	11
M.	<b>Valerius</b>	Laevinus		P/PrM	227	0
M.	<b>Valerius</b>	Maximus	Messalla	Cos.	226	1
M.	<b>Valerius</b>	Laevinus		Cos.	220	6

M.	<b>Valerius</b>	Laevinus	P/PrM	215	5
M.	<b>Valerius</b>	Laevinus	P/PrM	214	1
M.	<b>Valerius</b>	Laevinus	P/PrM	213	1
M.	<b>Valerius</b>	Laevinus	P/PrM	212	1
M.	<b>Valerius</b>	Laevinus	P/PrM	211	1
M.	<b>Valerius</b>	Laevinus	Cos.	210	1
M.	<b>Valerius</b>	Laevinus	P/PrM	209	1
M.	<b>Valerius</b>	Laevinus	P/PrM	208	1
M.	<b>Valerius</b>	Laevinus	P/PrM	207	1
M.	<b>Valerius</b>	Laevinus	P/PrM	205	2
M.	<b>Valerius</b>	Falto	P/PrM	201	4
M.	<b>Valerius</b>	Laevinus	P/PrM	201	0
M.	<b>Valerius</b>	Falto	P/PrM	200	1
M.	<b>Valerius</b>	Laevinus	P/PrM	200	0
L.	<b>Valerius</b>	Flaccus	P/PrM	199	1
L.	<b>Valerius</b>	Flaccus	Cos.	195	4
L.	<b>Valerius</b>	Flaccus	P/PrM	194	1
M.	<b>Valerius</b>	Messalla	P/PrM	193	1
M.	<b>Valerius</b>	Messalla	Cos.	188	5
L.	<b>Valerius</b>	Flaccus	Cens.	184	4
L.	<b>Valerius</b>	Flaccus	P/S	184	0
C.	<b>Valerius</b>	Flaccus	P/PrM	183	1
L.	<b>Valerius</b>	Flaccus	P/S	183	0
L.	<b>Valerius</b>	Laevinus	P/PrM	182	1
L.	<b>Valerius</b>	Flaccus	P/S	182	0
L.	<b>Valerius</b>	Flaccus	P/S	181	1
L.	<b>Valerius</b>	Flaccus	P/S	180	1
C.	<b>Valerius</b>	Laevinus	P/PrM	179	1
M.	<b>Valerius</b>	Messalla	P/PrM	164	15
M.	<b>Valerius</b>	Messalla	Cos.	161	3
L.	<b>Valerius</b>	Flaccus	P/PrM	155	6
M.	<b>Valerius</b>	Messalla	Cens.	154	1
L.	<b>Valerius</b>	Flaccus	Cos.	152	2
L.	<b>Valerius</b>	Flaccus	P/PrM	134	18
L.	<b>Valerius</b>	Flaccus	Cos.	131	3
L.	<b>Valerius</b>	Flaccus	P/PrM	117	14
L.	<b>Valerius</b>	Flaccus	P/PrM	103	14
L.	<b>Valerius</b>	Flaccus	Cos.	100	3
L.	<b>Valerius</b>	Flaccus	Cens.	97	3
C.	<b>Valerius</b>	Flaccus	P/PrM	95	2
C.	<b>Valerius</b>	Flaccus	Cos.	93	2
C.	<b>Valerius</b>	Flaccus	P/PrM	92	1
L.	<b>Valerius</b>	Flaccus	P/PrM	92	0
L.	<b>Valerius</b>	Flaccus	P/PrM	91	1
L.	<b>Valerius</b>	Flaccus	Cos.	86	5
L.	<b>Valerius</b>	Flaccus	P/S	86	0

C.	<b>Valerius</b>	Flaccus	P/PrM	85	1
L.	<b>Valerius</b>	Flaccus	P/S	85	0
C.	<b>Valerius</b>	Flaccus	P/PrM	84	1
L.	<b>Valerius</b>	Flaccus	P/S	84	0
C.	<b>Valerius</b>	Flaccus	P/PrM	83	1
L.	<b>Valerius</b>	Flaccus	P/S	83	0
L.	<b>Valerius</b>	Flaccus	Mag.Eq.	82	1
C.	<b>Valerius</b>	Flaccus	P/PrM	82	0
L.	<b>Valerius</b>	Flaccus	Mag.Eq.	81	1
C.	<b>Valerius</b>	Flaccus	P/PrM	81	0
L.	<b>Valerius</b>	Flaccus	Mag.Eq.	80	1
L.	<b>Valerius</b>	Flaccus	Mag.Eq.	79	1
M.	<b>Valerius</b>	Messalla	P/PrM	64	15
L.	<b>Valerius</b>	Flaccus	P/PrM	63	1
L.	<b>Valerius</b>	Flaccus	P/PrM	62	1
M.	<b>Valerius</b>	Messalla	P/PrM	62	0
M.	<b>Valerius</b>	Messalla	Cos.	61	1
Q.	<b>Valerius</b>	Orca	P/PrM	57	4
Q.	<b>Valerius</b>	Orca	P/PrM	56	1
M.	<b>Valerius</b>	Messalla	Cens.	55	1
M.	<b>Valerius</b>	Messalla	Cos.	53	2
M.	<b>Valerius</b>	Messalla	P/PrM	36	17
M.	<b>Valerius</b>	Messalla	P/PrM	32	4
M.	<b>Valerius</b>	Messalla	P/PrM	31	1
Average gap between deposits (years):					3