Omnium Annalium Monumenta: Historical Writing and Historical Evidence in Republican Rome

Edited by

Kaj Sandberg
Christopher Smith

BRILL

LEIDEN | BOSTON

Contents

PART 5
History and Monuments

CHAPTER 3

The Discovery of Numa's Writings: Roman Sacral Law and the Early Historians

*Hans Beck**

The study of documentary evidence is pivotal for the historian. As always, Herodotus sets the benchmark. When visiting Thebes in Boeotia, Herodotus was intrigued by a series of inscribed tripods in the Temple of Apollo Ismenios that allowed him not only to reconstruct the genealogy of the Labdakids of Thebes – or independently confirm his reconstruction of it – but also to explore the early history of writing in Greece (5.59–61). Documentary evidence thus provided external authority to the *apodeixis* of Herodotus' inquiries, and has continued to do so ever since throughout the history of the genre. From tangible objects with tiny scribbles to modern day statistics, which are essentially nothing more than hyper-convoluted compilations of external data, documentary evidence amplifies the interpretative force of the display of history.

The world of republican Rome was full of tangible objects that had their own histories to tell. Modern historians have given much consideration to the countless monuments in the city of Rome and its places of memory, both in examinations of individual *lieux de mémoire* and in systematic memory studies. From this emerges an increasingly thick description of Rome and its memorial cityscape in the era of the Republic; incidentally, it is worthwhile asserting that this description of memory markers at Rome, and the message and meaning they convey, has become more compact, if not crowded, than that of any other urban realm in premodern times.[1]

Documentary evidence, understood in a very broad way, comes in shapes and sizes that tend to be less imposing than those of magnificent monuments.

* Thanks are due to Christopher Smith and Kaj Sandberg for a superbly organized conference at the Finnish Institute and the British School. At McGill, Mike Fronda, François Gauthier, Alex McAuley, and Katrina Van Amsterdam have offered valuable comments that helped to improve this paper.

1 See the collection of Stein-Hölkeskamp – Hölkeskamp (2006). Roman memorial culture in the republic has been studied extensively and from multiple perspectives, see, for example, Walter (2004); Hölkeskamp (2005); Id. (2012); Dyson (2010); Roller (2013) (Augustan period); Muth (2014).

On the Capitoline Hill, for instance, when the foundations of the Temple of Iuppiter Optimus Maximus were laid, the workers were said to have found a human skull. This skull was believed to be the *caput Oli*, the head of a certain Olus or Aulus, who was thought to foreshadow the future greatness of Rome.[2] Once the temple was built, the right wall of its *cella* was covered with iron nails, the *clavi annales*, which counted the years that had passed since the inauguration of the temple.[3] And from its doorstep, visitors were able to point out a small and unimpressive block of black marble that was situated a few hundred metres away on the Forum, the Lapis Niger.[4] As unengaging as each of those objects may seem – a skull, a set of rusty nails, a rock with an inscription – they were quintessential to the history of the Republic as the Romans saw them. In the rationale of recent 'thing theories' as fostered by Bill Brown (2001 and 2004), they surpassed their physicality as mere objects through the cultural backdrop of the world that surrounded them, thereby becoming 'things' (rather than objects). The nails from the temple wall not only bore testimony of a long forgotten cultural practice, they were also time-measuring devices that helped historians establish a chronological grid. The site of the Lapis Niger in turn added a spatial layer to the grid. The shrine that was built around it marked a place of memory in the more literal sense of the word. The inscription on the five-sided block was an 'authentic voice' from the past. Although the inscribed words were mostly unintelligible to later Romans, it was held that they cited an early ritual prescription; as such, they spoke to the religious foundations of the community.[5] The prophecy of Olus, finally, filled the historical narrative with meaning. The skull also attested that those objects were not only fragments of history but that they were related to one another and tied into an extensive web of narratives. Their true authority resulted from their force as objects that provided for material, spatial, and chronological authentications of history and, in their interrelatedness, validated the broad stream of past traditions at Rome.

2 The provenance of *Caput Oli*: Fabius Pictor *FRHist* 1 F 30 = *FRH* 1 F 16 (who might have been behind the aetiological assertion of Capitol and *Caput Oli*), with Liv. 1.55.5; Dion. Hal. 4.59–61; Plin. *nat.* 28.15. On the association with the Vibenna brothers Aulus and Caeles, cf. Cornell (1995), 145.

3 Cincius Alimentus *FRH* 2 F 1, from Liv. 7.3.5–8 (*lex de clavo pangendo*). See *FRHist* 1, 183 for an argument that this belongs to the antiquarian Cincius.

4 Coarelli (1983), 178–188. The inscription on it: *CIL* 1^2 1 = *ILLRP* 3.

5 The inscription may well be the one which Dionysius (2.45.2) believed contained the deeds of Romulus.

For Rome's earliest historians, tangible items were both a source of knowledge and an interpretative challenge. Their physicality provided a hardwired control unit for the historians' work: they were pieces of extra-textual authority, and the scholarly debate over the objects – their origins, context, meaning – amounted to nothing less than a marker of the authority of the histories, and thus their authors' own reliability as historians. No wonder, then, that the early historians paid particular attention to documentary evidence wherever they could, and they engaged in in-depth discussions with one another over their meaning as historical monuments.[6] Polybius, in a famous note, turned the axiom of physicality around and took the lack of a material copy of the Philinus treaty – which he was unable to find in the state archive – as one of the main arguments against its historicity.[7]

In 181 BCE, one of the most exciting pieces of historical evidence surfaced at Rome. During construction work at the foot of the Ianiculum a stone chest was found in the ground, covered with a lid that was fastened with lead.[8] Upon being opened, the chest revealed the writings of king Numa. The discovery was a huge sensation; it is no wonder the incident has left broad traces in the Roman historiography of the republican period, and beyond.[9] The earliest historian to report the issue was Cassius Hemina (*FRHist* 6 F 35 = *FRH* 6 F 40, from Plin. *nat.* 13.84–88) who was a teenager at the time of the discovery. Hemina,

6 The aforementioned Lapis Niger, for instance, was believed by some to mark the grave of either Romulus or his foster-father Faustulus, while other historians declared it was the tomb of Hostus Hostilius, the father of the third king of Rome: Fest. 104 L. See also the discussion of the "Marcian Shield" (first mentioned in Acilius *FRHist* 7 F 3 = *FRH* 5 F 6), which was kept in the Capitol. Cf. Liv. 25.39.11–13 and 16–17, who sums up the stories that clustered around L. Marcius. Jaeger (1997, 124–131) brilliantly discusses the interaction of the shield, as a physical piece of evidence, with the historical space constructed by Livy's text and Roman memory.

7 Pol. 3.26 = in part Philinos *BNJ* 174 F 1 (C. Champion), the so-called Philinos treaty. The discussion over its authenticity is of no concern here. It appears that the inexistence of the treaty was a discursive reality to the Romans.

8 The site in question is in close proximity to the conference venue, a few hundred metres to the east of the Villa Lante al Gianicolo, the seat of the *Institutum Romanum Finlandiae*. In the early 16th century Baldassarre Turini, the first owner of the villa, commissioned a fresco depicting the discovery of Numa's writings with the Villa Lante in the background. This painting by Polidoro da Caravaggio, which used to adorn the ceiling in the salone of the villa, is now in the Palazzo Zuccari.

9 Sources: Hemina *FRHist* 6 F 35 = *FRH* 6 F 40; Piso *FRHist* 9 F 14 = *FRH* 7 F 13; Sempronius Tuditanus *FRHist* 10 F 3 = *FRH* 8 F 7; Valerius Antias *FRHist* F 25 F 9a/b = *FRH* 15 F 9–10; Liv. 40.29.3–14; Val. Max. 1.1.12; Plut. *Num.* 22; Fest. 178 L; Lact. *inst.* 1.22.5; Aug. *civ.* 7.34 (Terentius Varro). Cf. Broughton, *MRR* I, 384.

referenced by Pliny, says that a scribe Cn. Terentius, while digging over his land, excavated the chest that contained the remains of Numa, along with his books on papyrus rolls. Pliny next cites Hemina's *Annales* verbatim, indicating that, among the many mysteries and rumours that surrounded the books, their physical nature and the question of how they survived such a long time were the most surprising. This is the direct quotation from Hemina: "Other people were amazed at how those books were able to survive; he (*scil.* Cn. Terentius) gave the following explanation: in roughly the middle of the casket there was a square-cut stone, bound up in all directions by waxed cords. The books had been placed in that stone, in its upper part; for this reason, he supposed, they had not rotted. Moreover the books had been treated with citron-oil; for this reason he supposed insects had not touched them."

The scholarly debate on the nature of the books, the circumstances of their discovery, and their actual contents, is as long as it is controversial.[10] The only area of consensus concerns the ultimate fate of the books. In accordance with a decree issued by the senate, they were burnt under the surveillance of the *praetor urbanus*. Consequently, soon after they were retrieved from the ground, the books went up in flames, though the sources imply that a certain amount of time – several days or possibly weeks – lapsed between the opening of the chests and the burning of the scrolls. The man who originally found them, the secretary Terentius,[11] presumably read through the materials first and circulated them to friends and others who were interested. At some point the discovery was brought to the attention of the city praetor, Q. Petilius Spurinus, who then consulted with the senate before he took action. Other sources claim that an appeal was made to the tribunes who in turn referred the issue over to the senate. When the praetor Petilius offered to swear an oath that the books ought not to be read or preserved, because of their seemingly dangerous contents, the senate ordered by decree that they be burnt. They were then brought into the Comitium and were consigned to the flames by an ad hoc college of *victimarii*.[12]

10 See among others, Garbarino (1973), I, 64–69, II, 244–258; Grilli (1982); Linderski (1985); Rosen (1985); Gruen (1990); Santini (1995): 185–195; Willi (1998); Rosenberger (2003).

11 Livy (40.29.3) gives the name of the clerk on whose property the chest was discovered as L. Petilius, a *familiaris* of the praetor Q. Petilius, but this is almost certainly erroneous: Gruen (1990), 165.

12 Rosenberger (2003, 44–48) surveys similar instances of book discoveries, and subsequent burning, in Greek and Roman culture. He concludes that the incident of 181 is unique (48), which makes it even more notable.

The question as to why this was done is of a different calibre. I do not intend to engage in the debate on *Quellenkritik* here,[13] nor would I want to survey all of the prevalent scholarly positions that have emerged from that debate. For instance, Hemina says that only one chest was discovered, which contained the remains of Numa and his writings.[14] Livy (40.29.5–6) speaks of two chests, but Numa's body is conspicuously absent. Some sources say that the books contained either Pythagorean writings and/or treatises that also betrayed the Hellenic roots of Numa's teachings; in the spirit of the day, this made them unwelcome and unfit for public consumption.[15] Hemina is vague about the contents, speaking merely of *philosophiae scripta* (F 40 *FRH*). Sempronius Tuditanus (F 7 *FRH*) relates that the book rolls comprised certain *decreta* of Numa's. Piso (F 13 *FRH*) mentions seven books of pontifical law, plus the same number of Pythagorean books; Valerius Antias twelve books in each category, respectively (F 9a and b *FRH*). According to Varro, whose work is referenced by Augustine (*civ.* 7.34), the books contained information on the original reasons "why this or that rite had been instituted". Augustine himself goes on to explain that the books were burnt because they filled the hearts of the senators with fear (*ibid.*); "they were too afraid merely to bury them" so they had to "destroy by fire every trace of such monstrous wickedness".

In a magisterial piece of source analysis and interpretation, Erich Gruen argued that the Helleno-Pythagorean contents were in themselves a hoax.[16] Prosopographical observations on the identity of the *scriba* and his relation to the praetor, along with other ingenious conclusions, led Gruen to posit that the whole affair was nothing but a charade. Terentius and Petilius had "worked hand in hand" (165) to stage the discovery of Numa's writings. The ultimate goal of their ruse was, according to Gruen, that the books "were 'discovered' precisely to be burnt" (166). The broader meaning of the manoeuvre was to demonstrate "that Roman religious tradition had separated itself from its Hellenic underpinnings. To confront the Greek component was to expose

13 For the rise of divergent versions in the tradition, see Forsythe (1994), 207–215; Rosenberger (2003), 40–44.

14 Rosenberger (2003), 43 with n. 9.

15 The reference to Pythagorean contents in the sources has led some, first Delatte (1936), to view the incident a full-fledged attack of the senate on the (assumed) spread of Pythagorism at Rome. In this sense, the event is seen as a follow-up to the Bacchanalian affair a few years earlier (below). But it is questionable, I believe, if the rise of a competitive belief system that was based in Pythagorean traditions and principles was at all on the agenda of Roman society at the time. See Humm (1996) and Id. (1997) on the associated problems and challenges.

16 Gruen (1990), 163–170.

its estrangement". Effectively, the burning of the books represented "a form of exorcism" (170) and the "renunciation not of Numa but of Numa's Hellenism. The event signified avowal of native values inherent in the community" (170). Rather than seeing the affair as an ingenious move by a circle of ringleaders who competed for power and influence, or a contest between so-called philhellenic and antihellenic forces, Gruen suggests that the entire nobility was behind this move: "Unanimity rather than divisiveness prevails. The event was well orchestrated to display the solid front of the nobility" (169). Effectively, a very large number of senators, and with them their families, friends, clients, and other associates, must have been in the know about the fraud.

This interpretation has much in its favour, although we ought to acknowledge that it is not representative of a *communis opinio*; I will return to this aspect soon. At the moment, however, it suffices to extricate the operating assumptions underlying Gruen's interpretation. For our purposes, it is best to do this by shaping a minimalist reading of the affair and its surrounding events. Such a minimalist view reads as follows: in 181 BCE certain books surfaced that were associated with Numa, the second king of Rome. Whether there were mortal remains or not is unclear.[17] The discovery triggered a lively debate, in the senate and beyond; indeed, Livy (40.29.9) says that the existence of the books had become public knowledge and, we might add, that the debate over them created a discursive reality. In this vein of inquiry it does not matter if the books were fake or not. As long as the public opinion held them to be authentic, they were true and real – as real as the skull of Olus and other pieces of documentary evidence. The second operating assumption is that the evidence was burnt because the papyri were considered unwelcome as a result of the debate that has evolved around them. Consequently they were declared dangerous, if not pernicious. Note that we hear nothing about a potential challenge to

17 While the earliest authority (Hemina) speaks of one chest only with the bones included in it, Livy has two sarcophagi of which the one with the grave inscription of the deceased king was empty, the remains having rotted away after such a long time. In Hemina's tradition, one wonders what had happened to the bones, and why they were not kept and/or buried in a shrine. Dion. Hal. 2.76.6 attests Numa's tomb at the foot of the Janiculum independently from the affair in 181 BCE. Cicero, too (*leg*. 2.56), implies that Numa's tomb was located in that spot, see *LTUR s.v.* '*sepulchrum, Numa Pompilius*'. There is no mention in the sources that the excavated bones were transferred there. Livy's version avoids the question of the relics and their potentially sacred aura, but Livy is not trouble free either. If one of the chests had the *titulum sepulti regis* (40.29.5) written on it, what happened to it? We are left to think that it was discarded, or re-buried in the tomb mentioned by Cicero. Rosenberger (2003) also addresses the question of the missing body from a comparative perspective.

the decision to burn them. This is an argument from silence, yet it is possible to turn this point over and frame it in positive terms: from the sources we get the impression that everyone in Rome agreed that burning the books was the best thing to do.

The papyrus rolls were burnt shortly after their discovery, and so the finest piece of documentary evidence we could have had on Rome's single most important founding authority in the field of religion and cultural traditions went up in flames. According to Livy, during his reign Numa had provided the Romans with "written directions, full and accurate, for the performance of the rites of worship" (*sacra omnia exscripta exsignataque*: 1.20.5). Some five hundred years later those written directions re-surfaced, and, apparently, everyone agreed it was best to destroy them. According to Erich Gruen's interpretation this was done because the entire incident was a carefully planned charade. Numa's writings were made to materialize miraculously so that they could be eliminated in a forceful pronouncement of *Romanitas*; challenging the widely acknowledged legend of Numa's Hellenic background would have been pointless if not impossible. It was more promising to declare that such a background no longer suited the circumstances of the day.

Much speaks in favour of such a reading, but, if we follow this avenue of reasoning, it should be recognized that the charade was somewhat risky, if not hazardous. As noted above, from the time at which the evidence was discovered to when it was destroyed there were multiple moments of debate and decision-making. Those who pulled the strings must have been confident enough that they would get away with their plot – accordingly they must have been convinced that no one would raise a different opinion; no one would get too curious or inquisitive about the books; and no one would point to their eminent value as historical documents, let alone their aura and authority as sacred scripts.

For instance, the nature of the Sibylline Books was not dissimilar to the written legacy of Numa. This is also true for their notorious Hellenic provenance, something that was considered particularly shady about the Numa files. The Sibylline Books were a collection of oracular utterances that served the Roman state as a last resort in times of crisis. According to the Roman tradition, the rolls were purchased by the last king of Rome, Tarquinius Superbus, from the Sibyl in Cyme. The senate kept tight watch over the books. They were locked away in a vault beneath the Temple of Iuppiter Optimus Maximus on the Capitol. In the second century BCE, access was limited to the *decemviri sacris faciundis* who consulted the scripts after a corresponding senatorial decree in order to discover religious observances necessary to avert calamities and to

expiate prodigies.[18] Before 181 BCE, the last time these books had been consulted was apparently in 205/204 in the crisis of the Hannibalic War. The last *ludi* in honour of Cybele (*ludi Megalenses*) were held about a decade before the discovery of the Numa books, in 194 or 191. Most likely, the scripts were referenced in one way or the other during those games.[19] As to all intents and purposes, an authentic document from the earliest history of Rome that offered the community a tangible link to its foundational period under the Tarquinii, the Sibylline Books were surrounded with an almost magical aura, motivating the construction of no less than eight temples at Rome, notwithstanding the ceremonies and cults that were considered to be inaugurated on account of their consultation.[20]

In comparison to the Sibylline Books, Numa's writings would have carried even more authority, on the grounds of their higher age and weight of authorship. The ring leaders of the charade – if indeed it was a charade – must thus have been confident that no one would raise the issue that the books were a potential asset and benefit for the Roman state in whatever crisis that lay ahead; or they felt confident enough that they would be able to effectively counter such an argument. This is not impossible, but such reasoning would require further explanation. Again, the perpetrators played a game with a very high jackpot: the most sacred Roman writings of all times. Few discoveries could have sparked more talk and public interest, with all the uncertainties attached to the trajectories and turning points of the debate. In Gruen's interpretation, the most pressing question is how the svengalis could have hoped that the nobility would be united in its desire to articulate its cultural identity and play along so that they might succeed with their heist. It is worthwhile to explore the preconditions on which it was possible to work towards the desired outcome of the charade.

A hint comes from the statement in the sources that the writings were of a religious content that was time-honoured; they were old. Roman religion was not a book religion with one sacred text at its centre serving as its central source of authority. This has often been noted, and the consequences for the religious practices at Rome have been carefully considered. Most notably, the lack of one single source of authority opened the door to a highly compartmentalized

18 Cf. Latte (1960), 160–161; Beard – North – Price (1998), 62–63, 69, 205; Orlin (1997); Engels (2007), 739–744.

19 Consultation in 205 BCE: Liv. 29.10.4 (introduction of the *Magna Mater* from Asia Minor). The *ludi*: Livy (34.54.3) places them in 194, Valerius Antias (*FRHist* 25 F 44 = *FRH* 15 F 41) in 191, cf. Bernstein (1998), 193 ff.

20 Orlin (1997), 97–98.

expertise, or "knowledge of giving the gods their due" (*scientia colendorum deorum*, Cic. *nat. deor*. 1.116), accumulated in and administered by multiple colleges of priests: for instance, how to perform rites and observe cult practices; or how to govern the communication with the gods and interpret the expressions of their will. The notion of expert knowledge should not be confused here with secret knowledge or arcaneness. The knowledge of those experts was, for the most part, not secret but accessible to those who were not in the know.

In general terms, in Rome's republican performance culture, the celebration of festivals and religious ceremonies was always a public affair with the community present to observe and participate in the exercise of the *sacra publica*. The colleges of the main priesthoods all resided in the centre of the city, in close proximity to the Forum; the *pontifex maximus*, as is well known, in the Domus Publica adjacent to the Regia, situated on the eastern side of the Forum. Before his house, the *pontifex maximus* displayed a *tabula dealbata* that informed the public about his measures and doings. Cato (*FRHist* 5 F 80 = *FRH* 3 F 4,1) and Ennius (*ann*. 153 Skutsch), both of whom saw the *tabula* with their own eyes, attest that it listed eclipses of the sun and moon and also bad harvests – so the table documented the activity of the *pontifex*, including information on types of days (dies fasti, nefasti) and months, public affairs that were subject to prior consultation of auspices, as well as measures to restore good relations with the gods. To be sure, the *tabula* recorded *omina* and measures of expiation, but not necessarily the ultimate recipe for it. But much of the *pontifex maximus*'s activity became transparent through the *tabula*, and everyone was able to approach the Regia and see what the adequate course of action in response to any dubious omen was.[21] Other colleges might have done the same and published their minutes on boards or stone slabs, although the earliest evidence for this comes only from later periods.[22]

The chief pontiff's practice was discontinued only half a century after the discovery of the Numa books, under the *pontifex maximus* P. Mucius Scaevola (between 130 and 115 BCE), who published the contents of the various *tabulae* that he had collected over time (up to 390 BCE?) in a monograph later known

21 On this public aspect of the *tabula*, cf. now *FRHist* 1, 141–159 (J. Rich), esp. 144: "In fact, the board must have been posted to inform the Roman people of recent events … . As many scholars have supposed, the initial focus may have been … on events which had some religious significance that brought them within the (admittedly wide-ranging) concerns of the pontifical college". See also *FRH* 1², 32–37 and Rich (this volume).

22 See, for example, the fragments of the minutes of the Arval Brothers from imperial times, *CIL* VI 2042.

as *Annales maximi*.[23] These *annales* were again openly accessible to everyone who could lay their hands on them to read. Most likely, Scaevola's edition already included a commentary that elaborated on the subject matter and helped people navigate through the convoluted text.[24] If that were not enough, authors such as Numerius Fabius Pictor and Fabius Maximus Servilianus offered contemporaneous *commentarii* on pontifical law that made the expert knowledge of the *pontifices* further accessible.[25]

All the great colleges – the *collegium pontificum*, the *augures*, the *decemviri facis saciundis*, and the *tres/septemviri epulonum* – maintained their own archives with corresponding commentaries, most notably the pontifical and augural archives, the *libri sacrorum* and *auguriorum*.[26] In them, the formative texts of their *disciplina* and *ius* were kept. The collection of *decreta* and *responsa* added on to this, forming the most recent and constantly growing part of their archives. As Jerzy Linderski pointed out in a seminal article from 1986, those records were deliberately "destined for public or at least senatorial consumption, and consequently, they must have been relatively accessible to interested scholars" (2245). The nature of the organization of those *commentarii* made it inevitable that "considerable knowledge was required to find oneself in the labyrinth of augural texts" (2252). This explains at least in part the confusion that at times prevailed among ancient authors with regards to their interpretation. Yet there was nothing arcane about their contents. While the archives of the colleges might have been kept close for anyone to conduct a search, the *commentarii* were readily available for intellectual consumption.

The tendency towards transparency in religious governance at Rome had already begun with the publication of the Twelve Tables; Table Ten included both basic and far-reaching regulations that concerned the exercise of funeral

23 The notorious question of the relation between Scaevola's book version and the records from the *tabulae* is of little concern here; cf. *EAH s.v.* '*Annales maximi*' (G. Forsythe) and *s.v.* 'Mucius Scaevola, Publius' (H. Beck); Rich (this volume).

24 This might be deduced from the monumentality – in a strictly quantitative sense – of the published edition which allegedly comprised 80 books, *FRHist* 1 T 3. See the discussion by J. Rich in *FRHist* 1, 150–156 and in this volume, who points to the problem of sheer massiveness. Beyond the alternatives surveyed by Rich (either an eighty-book version of plain annual records collected by the *pontifices* or a massively expanded compilation by Scaevola or later authors) there lies the possibility of annual priestly records, appended with learned commentaries by Scaevola.

25 On Numerius Fabius Pictor, see Cic. *Brut*. 81 (*BNP* 1 34); cf. Badian (1967), 228. On Fabius Maximus Servilianus (*cos.* 142), see Macr. *Sat*. 1.16.25 (*BNP* 1 29).

26 Linderski (1986), 2242.

ceremonies.[27] In 304, the display of a calendar indicating *dies fasti* and *nefasti* by Cn. Flavius had a similar impact on the publication of some of the community's most basic religious rules.[28] Under Tiberius Coruncanius, consul in 280 and first plebeian *pontifex maximus* in c. 254 BCE, another spurt towards further accessibility of religious knowledge occurred: Coruncanius was the first who had "publically professed" (*publice professum*, in Pomponius) the *scientia* that was associated with his office. Consequently, many *responsa* and *memorabilia* of his were known, two of which are cited in Pomponius.[29] The same goes for the pontifical *commentarii* of the aforementioned Fabii, Numerius Fabius Pictor and Fabius Maximus Servilianus, who related all sorts of *formula* and *responsa*.[30] The early Roman historians did the same on many occasions, including archival materials throughout their works that they explicated, explained, and elaborated on.[31] In sum, there is a strong and broad thread here. The tendency to enhance the authority of written traditions through cross-references with other traditions is obvious, especially reference to the sanctioned sayings and prescriptions of the priestly colleges. In turn, the *scientia* of those colleges was opened up to the public, through teachings, in historical literature, and through public acts that were both visible and, as such, comprehensible to those who participated in them.

One final aspect needs to be considered before we can shelve the idea of a secret or secluded realm of religious knowledge, and that is the human factor. As has been noted by some, the identity of the personnel that occupied the priesthoods, and thus were entrusted with the administration and governance of the *scientia*, usually overlapped with those of the leading magistrates, senators, and members of the ruling elite. Thanks to Jörg Rüpke's magisterial prosopography of Roman priests (2005), we are now able to study the composition of priesthoods at any moment after 300 BCE (for as much as the names survive). With this it has become again obvious that the vast majority of attested and identified priests during the republic were not only religious office-holders, but also members of the senate. Roman aristocrats filled different "roles of

27 Crawford (1996), II, 704–711.

28 Liv. 9.46; cf. Piso *FRHist* 9 F 29 = *FRH* 7 F 30; Licinus Macer *FRHist* 27 F 24 = *FRH* 17 F 19 (with commentaries). See also Humm (2000) and Beck (2005), 178 ff.

29 Pomp. *Dig*. 1.2.2.35 and 38 = *IA* I.5 Bremer. On Coruncanius, see Hölkeskamp (2011), 179.

30 *IA* II.1, III.6, III.8 Bremer, with some confusion of the Fabii.

31 E.g, the *constitutiones* governing food consumption stipulated by Numa (Hemina *FRHist* 6 F 16–17 = *FRH* 6 F 15–16); the senatorial decrees regarding the instauration of games (Fabius *FRHist* 1 F 14 = *FRH* 1 F 19); Sisenna's declared reservation towards dream *prodigia* (*FRHist* 26 F 6 = *FRH* 16 F 5); Coelius Antipater's discussion of the various omens during Flaminius' consulate (*FRHist* 15 F 14 = *FRH* 11 F 20 a–b).

prominence" at the same time; priests and senators were recruited from one and the same pool of potential candidates. Priests would thus find it hard to keep their religious knowledge secret from the senate simply because most of them were also senators.[32]

In 181 BCE, when the books surfaced, C. Servilius Geminus was *pontifex maximus* (praetor 206 and consul 203); his brother M. Servilius Geminus (*cos*. 202) was among the leading members of the *augures*, along with L. Quinctius Flamininus (T. Quinctius' brother, expelled from the senate in 184 but still augur), L. Aemilius Paullus (*cos.* 182) and Sp. Postumius Albinus, an uncle of the later historian Aulus Postumius Albinus. Among the *decemviri sacris faciundis* were C. Servilius Geminus (also *pontifex maximus*), L. Cornelius Lentulus (*cos*. 199) and Ti. Sempronius Longus (also augur). M. Porcius Cato (*cos*. 195) was a member of the *Sodalitas Sacris Idaeis Magnae Matris* and possibly also augur.[33] It is not particularly promising to engage in prosopography games and determine who of the above was in the know of the charade and who was not. Such conjectures, suggestive as they seem, misjudge the political grammar of the Roman nobility, both in the particular case and in principle.[34] Gruen's reference to a united front of the nobility cautiously avoids such a factional reading of Roman politics.[35] But this eminent strength

32 The point is of some importance here. Although it is often noted that Roman priests were specialists and keepers of expert knowledge, it is imperative to note that their expertise was not confined to the realm of religion. One of the defining characteristics of Roman religion is its governance by individuals who were political, social, and religious leaders of the community at the same time. See Beard – North – Price (1998, 18–30) whose statement deserves to be quoted in full (27): "Priests themselves were not part of an independent or self-sufficient religious structure; nor do they seem ever to have formed a separate caste, or to have acted as a group of specialist professionals, defined by their priestly role. From the third century onwards, the historical record preserves the names of a good proportion of *augures* and *pontifices*; from this it is clear that priests were drawn from among the leading senators – that is, they were the same men who dominated politics and the law, fought the battles, celebrated triumphs and made great fortunes on overseas commands." See also Szemler (1972) and Beck (2008), with regard to the various roles of prominence embodied by Roman aristocrats.

33 Rüpke (2005), 85–86; Broughton, *MRR* III, 170 on Cato.

34 This is not the place for a general refutation of factionalist interpretations of Roman republican history. In the case in question, the priestly colleges were staffed with a vastly diverse group of *nobiles*, men who, in previous factionalist readings, were believed to belong to oppositional parties: notably L. Quinctius Flamininus, a Scipio, Cato, and a *pontifex maximus* who, in the Münzer/Scullard tradition, was associated with the *gens Fabia*.

35 Gruen (1990), 169. However, he does entertain the idea of a personal alliance between Petilius and Cato, which was directed against the Scipios.

of the interpretation points also to an inherent weakness of the argument. As a small sample of the senate and the upper stratum of society, the various priesthoods were staffed with aristocrats who stood in fierce competition with one another. In their attempts to distinguish themselves, raise their esteem, and acquire fame and symbolic capital, these men formulated attitudes and influenced actions on the grounds of *ad hoc* opportunities and agendas. The broad consensus that was necessary to maintain their group identity as ruling elite was thus counterbalanced by the omnipresent readiness for competition. With their authority supplied by a mixture of registers (mastery in politics and war, religious affairs, and also eruditeness and expertise in historical and cultural traditions), internally diversified through the demarcation of aristocratic ranks, old aristocratic families and new ones, and divided between rich, super-rich, and modestly rich families, the Roman nobility was a much more heterogeneous group than has often been assumed. To all members of this aristocracy, the sudden appearance of Numa's writings was of immediate concern. The books impacted the collective source of their identity as ruling elite, and they fed into various branches of their authority. It is hard to imagine that the ringleaders of the charade could have counted on unconditional and univocal support of their ruse.

It is usually agreed that the Numa books related to the wider context of religious control at Rome. Scholarly readings of the affair are often glossed over with the notion of the exercise of religious authority; in this sense, the events from 181 are seen as a follow-up to the suppression of the Bacchanals and the tight control of their rites by senatorial decree five years earlier, in 186 BCE (see below). But the surfacing of documentary evidence from Rome's second king was not simply a religious matter, neatly distinguished from the arena of politics. As we just noted, the interplay between both areas was tight, and it was intense. The overlap of political and social authority is commonplace in Roman history. It was deeply entrenched in the Roman tradition – so deep that it is indeed questionable if a separation of the two spheres is at all helpful.

In Book 10, when relating the debate over the *lex Ogulnia*, Livy stresses the idea that the reception of *auspicium* was a cult practice that was at the centre of all legitimizing acts of the patricians, and then, after the passing of the *lex Ogulnia*, of the nobility in general.[36] Consuls generally fought under their own *auspicium* and *imperium* – the former established through a divine sign that was acknowledged by the *augures*. The role of the *augures* was thus not just to guarantee the success of an undertaking, but also to bestow divine power on

36 Liv. 10.6.1–6 = Elster (2003), no. 46; cf. Hölkeskamp (1988).

the actions of the nobility that gave order and meaning to their role in society.[37] The governing decrees behind this practice were believed to have been prescribed by Numa, who was also considered the *exemplum* for a properly inaugurated leader (Liv. 1.18.6–10).

According to Livy, Tullus Hostilius, who had canonically succeeded Numa, paid very little heed to religious observances during his reign, thinking them unworthy of a king's attention. However, Rome was soon affected by a series of prophecies, including a shower of stones on the Alban Mount. A loud voice was heard on the summit of the mount complaining that the Albans had failed to show devotion to their former gods, and a pestilence struck in Rome. Tullus himself became ill and was filled with superstition. He reviewed the *commentarii* of Numa Pompilius, Livy goes on, and attempted to carry out sacrifices recommended by Numa. Yet he did not undertake the ceremony correctly, and both he and his house were struck by lightning and reduced to ashes as a result of the anger of Iuppiter (Liv. 1.30).

Observance of the auspices as laid down by Numa became an omnipresent, governing practice among the members of the elite, as divine retribution for violation by perpetrators was commonplace in Roman tradition. Beginning at 10.40, Livy describes a battle in the Third Samnite War under the year 293 BCE, when the consul L. Papirius Cursor led his legions against a Samnite army at Aquilonia. Papirius took the auspices, but apparently his *pullarii* disputed the interpretation of the results, something which he only learns after he had given order for battle. Papirius then, essentially, said "as far as is my concern, I was given the auspices correctly, so if there is a problem, then it is the priest who is going to pay for it" (which is precisely what happens as the *pullarius* is struck by a missile the moment battle commences).

The religious attitudes manifested in these and similar incidents are notoriously difficult to decode. Scholarly interpretations tend to chart the development of religious practices at Rome on a matrix that moves from an archaic belief system, grounded in the urban realm and society of Early Rome, to an increasing politicization of religion. While early Roman society is portrayed as a community bound together also by religious sanctions and sacred ties (indeed, part of Early Rome's archaism is explained with reference to the tribal organization of Roman society in *curiae*, which in themselves related to the religious backbone of society),[38] the impact of religion on society in later centuries is conceived of differently. Here, as in so many ways, the era of the Second Punic War is seen as a watershed in this development, when Livy refers to a

37 Cf. Bleicken (1981); Beck (2011); Drogula (2014).

38 Cornell (1995), 114–118; Smith (2006), 198–202.

notable volume of religious observances that appear as functionalistic acts, orchestrated to instil a sense of obedience in the *populus* through a theatrical display of the restoration of the *pax deorum*.[39] Although the development of religious belief systems at Rome is in itself vastly complex, the notion of increasing functionalism is not easily rejected, especially in the last century of the republic. But the transition from true belief to full subordination under the dynamics of politics should not be overstated either. Bernhard Linke has pointed to the shortcomings of this model.[40] Drawing on the basic foundations of Roman *religio*, Linke demonstrates how the people and the aristocracy were united in a religious discourse, the grammar of which was too complex and, in itself, certainly too distinct to be reduced to the modern day binary of true belief versus steps on the ascent to political power. As active agents in this religious discourse, both the *nobiles* and the people were limited in their ability to manipulate the realm of religion by easily dissociating themselves from its governing beliefs.[41] To posit that the Numa books were simply invented by a group of senators who then sought to use them in an elaborate ruse that was swallowed by the nobility as whole discounts, I believe, those considerations. It implies a religious grammar that simply was not in place. Roman society in the early second century BCE did not operate on easy alternatives of religiosity and the abuse thereof in politics; it functioned within its own parameters of belief. In this mindset, the physical discovery and reappearance of the Numa books was simply too significant to be manipulated as part of a sophisticated yearning for cultural identity, elite ideology, or political power.

At this point we have assembled enough evidence, both general and specific, to re-assess the affair arising over the discovery of the Numa books. In 181 BCE, a man identified by the earliest sources as Cn. Terentius discovered one or two stone chests during excavation works on his property, one of which contained

39 See Rüpke (2007, 44–61), who distinguishes the different periods under the labels of 'urbanization', 'politicization' and 'Hellenization'. His cut-off between the latter two comes slightly after the Hannibalic War, in c. 196 BCE with the inauguration of the *tresviri epulonum*, the last new foundation of one of the city's prestigious colleges before late antiquity. Note that Rüpke (2007, 56) conceives of the 'Hellenization' period as an extension of the previous phase.

40 Linke (2000), 269–298.

41 Linke (2000), 294. See also Beard – North – Price (1998), 134–140, whose case study on the feuds between Cicero and Clodius reminds the reader that the disruption of religion in the late republic does not imply a general breakdown of the belief system. Rather, the way in which the quarrels were carried out illustrates the extent to which the religious discourse was alive.

writings. Already a brief glance at the scribbles made it clear that they were old. Upon further examination (the texts were most likely difficult to decipher)[42] it became clear that they were of a religious nature. In light of prevalent legendary traditions about their past, it was obvious to everyone to assign the authorship of the books to Numa Pompilius; in fact, there was no other founding figure who could have been credited with their composition. The inherent mechanics of historical memories at Rome supported such an attribution. Roman exemplarity was associated with individual men or women who were remembered for their embodiment of specific virtues, moral qualities, and achievements. As *exempla virtutis*, they shaped perceptions of the past and they formed the core of obligatory patterns of behaviour in the present day.

The mythical kings were key agents of such a conceptualization of the past. Many of them displayed exemplary virtues themselves, but their quality as founding fathers of the community transcended the notion of exemplarity as displayed in a specific moment or under particular circumstances. The military, cultural, and societal foundations of Rome were all attributed to one of the kings, with each one of them serving as a memorial anchor of society and its defining virtues. In the realm of religion, Numa's authority was omnipresent. It was unchallenged and indisputable.[43]

The Numa books were a societal reality, a truth in the discourse of Roman society. It is noteworthy that no ancient authority, from Hemina to Augustine, ever said they were a forgery. As pieces of documentary evidence, the books were of pivotal importance. This importance is often seen as impacting on the realm of Roman religion: it was argued that their written form might have stirred up the emotions of the masses who, at some point in the near future, would turn to the books as canonical source of authority. Effectively, such a call might have posed a challenge, if not a threat, to the authority of the senate. Faced with this risk, the senate rather opted for an act of *impietas* and burnt the books, not quietly or behind the closed doors of a priestly college, but in an act that fully captured the authority of the *patres*. Livy (40.29.14) says the books were burnt *in conspectu populi*, emphasizing the public dimension of the senate's response.[44] The aspect of deliberate, ostentatious action is usually

42 Note how the *Carmen Saliare*, the origins of which were associated with Numa (Plut. *Num*. 13) was difficult to understand for later Romans as well. By the second century CE, the priests themselves apparently did not understand the words of the hymn: Quint. *inst*. 1.6.40.

43 Poucet (2000); Walter (2004), 51–62, 374–407 (374–382 on Numa). See also Ogilvie (1970), 88–105 and Liou-Gille (1998), 103–192.

44 Willi (1998), 145–146; Rosenberger (2003), 52.

augmented with reference to the struggle for social control. The Bacchanalian affair five years earlier, in 186 BCE, notoriously attests to such an overlap of the governance of religious practices and the quest for social authority, when the senate by decree asserted its religious and political leadership over a mystery cult that had grown increasingly divergent from established rites at Rome.[45]

The question of authenticity obfuscates the nature of the truth of the rolls as believed by Roman society. Whatever might have been extracted from the books in terms of intelligible contents, whether they were by Numa or not, would have posed a similar challenge to the senate. But we can go further than that. For Numa's books were a challenge to the sum of all traditions at Rome. They had the capacity to undermine the expertise of the senate and priesthoods; of writers of *annales, historiae*; of commentators on *leges sacrae, decreta* and *responsa*; and of the full array of cult practices at Rome, including their assigned social meaning.[46] Modern scholarship looks at those traditions through the kaleidoscope of diversified genres, a process that was initialized by, and took shape with, the rise of historiographical traditions at Rome, with Fabius Pictor making a decisive contribution to this diversification. Yet the inherent assumptions of those genres were the same, and in their quest for authority, they were much more closely associated with one another than sometimes assumed. Drawing on the same societal presumptions and, in part, the same body of material and documentary evidence, the traditions that emanated from Roman society were not genre driven, at least not in the first place.[47]

By the early second century at the latest, the 190s and 180s BCE, an all-inclusive, canonical view of the historical and cultural foundations of Rome

45 Liv. 39.8–18 and *ILS* 18; Cassius Hemina *FRHist* 6 F 34 = *FRH* 6 F 39. Cf. Pailler (1988); Bauman (1990); Gruen (1990), 34–78; Nippel (1997); Linke (2000), 269–273; Takacs (2000); Orlin (2002).

46 See Linderski (1985), who sees the possibility that the book would have impacted the augural discipline. Augustine (*civ.* 7.35) makes the interesting point that the writings were burnt because they were incompatible with what was written in the books that existed: *quales si libri illi habuissent, non utique arsissent, aut et istos Varronis ad Caesarem pontificem scriptos atque editos patres conscripti similiter incendissent*. Pomponius (*D.* 1.2.2.39) says that M'. Manilius (*cos.* 149) later published a collection of Numa's laws in seven books, presumably with commentary. It follows that the books themselves were believed to be erratic, rather than the commentaries that were produced to interpret Numa's prescriptions.

47 See also the contribution by Duncan MacRae to this volume, which points to the shortcomings of rigid genre diversification, and also Rich's argument (this volume) on the similarity of Fabius Pictor's and Ennius' approach to early Roman history.

appears to have been in place.[48] The details were of course open to debate and negotiation among those who engaged in this process; for instance, the learned interpretation of divine signs, the correct reading of *aitia*, or the earliest chronology of cult practices were heavily debated amongst authors of *annales, historiae*, and *commentarii*. But on the whole, there was an extremely forceful and impactful canon in place that steered Roman society and appropriated its narrative realms. The actors of this canon operated within the guiding premises of the discourse, with limited potential, if any, for transgression.

In our attempts to disentangle the strands of this discourse, it is difficult to create an interpretative space that allows for critical encounter with patterns of reasoning that are innately 'foreign' to the present day. David Lowenthal (1985) has therefore labelled the past a "foreign country". The appropriation of material objects and documentary evidence into Rome's early history is a good example of the way in which the Romans understood the cultural foundations and earliest history of their society. Everything – places, names, monuments, material evidence, oral traditions – was hyper-referenced with everything else. This narrative web was extremely dense within, but its connectivity with a narrative outside, as expressed in different points of view or in new readings that were based on new discoveries, was limited. The arrival of anything new might have led to its appropriation and integration into the existing narrative, yet it did not alter that narrative, or trigger fundamental renegotiations.[49] To be sure, there was, to borrow Ernst Badian's famous statement, room for the "expansion of the past" (1966), but such an expansion occurred within the limits of a set frame of references. Yet, the confines of the frame themselves were frozen.[50] The great quality of that narrative, and the immense impact it had on society, came from its inherent coherence, with the senatorial elite brand-labelling

48 Cf. now Farney (2007), who discloses how Roman political culture mitigated the issue of initially diverse ethnic identities of many aristocrats, providing them with a very robust frame of reference that tied them together.

49 Note, for instance, the cultic difficulties that arose in the course of the inauguration of the Magna Mater cult, as a result of the consultation of the Sibylline Books in 205 (see above). See the discussion by Gruen (1990, 5–33), claiming (5) that the "spectacle offended Roman sensibilities, obliging the officialdom to exclude citizens from the alien priesthood and to separate the Roman celebration from the Phrygian ceremonies."

50 This also resonates in the realm of priestly colleges, whose individual legendary derivations were interwoven with the grand narrative of Rome's mytho-historical tradition. The last college that was established was that of the *tresviri epulonum* (above note 39). After 196 BCE, the year of their inauguration, changes to the overall organization of priesthoods were made through modifications and alterations of existing colleges, but no new ones were added.

itself as the keeper, engine, and interpretative authority behind this coherence. The arrival of Numa's writings, on the other hand, implied a challenge of adaptation: their language would have been clumsy, the arrangement cluttered, the contents erratic. The Sibylline Books and the *Carmen Saliare* demonstrated the difficulties that existed with texts that were both time-honoured and of sacral nature – something that inevitably challenged the elite's claim for ubiquitous expertise. It would have been even more difficult to streamline books of Numa, sync their contents with existing legends, and segue them into the broad current of traditions that the Romans had established for themselves.

Two years after the discovery of the Numa books, in 179 BCE, the senate ordered the removal of all dedicated objects (*signa*) from the public space that were not sanctioned by itself or the Roman people.[51] This famous first clearing away of spoils has invited different interpretations.[52] What was at stake, I believe, other than the practical aspect that the urban space had become overcrowded, was that multitude of commemorative objects was prone to diversify, and possibly challenge, the coherence of a grand narrative. It is easy to imagine how some of the dedicated *signa* on display might have appeared odd. Some of the trophies and spoils that accumulated over time – the oldest of which would have reached back to the decades after the Gallic sack in the early fourth century BCE – must have appeared strange to present-day observers. If they were accompanied by writing, both the shape and language had developed in the meantime, adding to their inherently alien nature.[53] Such strangeness was certainly the case with Numa's books, which were against the sum of all traditions as they were in place at that time: religious, political, cultural. There was simply no place for them. The fact that everyone agreed on their fate betrays just how strong the prevailing traditions of the day had become, how deeply they were entrenched in Roman society, and how much they mattered.

51 Hemina *FRHist* 6 F 43 = *FRH* 6 F 26 (with commentary); Liv. 40.51.3.

52 Cf. notably Sehlmeyer (1999, 159–161) who assembles the relevant earlier readings. To view the measure as a clearing of statues rather than spoils and trophies (comm. *FRHist*, J. Briscoe) misses the point.

53 The language of the first treaty between Rome and Carthage, which predates the Gallic sack by roughly a century (508 BCE), posed a great interpretative challenge "to the most learned men", as was remarked by Polybius (3.22.3). I take it that the more average reader will have felt the similar discomfort with texts from the first half of fourth century BCE.

1 Postscript

In *The Grand Inquisitor*, one of the great parables in Dostoyevsky's *The Brothers Karamazov*, Jesus returns to 13th-century Seville, where he performs a series of miracles. This causes his arrest by Inquisition leaders. The Grand Inquisitor visits him in his cell on the night before his execution and explains to him why his return interfered with the mission of the Church. The story ends when Christ, silent throughout, kisses the inquisitor instead of answering to his charges. On this, the inquisitor releases Christ but tells him never to return. Christ, still silent, leaves into the dark alleys of Seville, never to be seen again. There was no place for Christ in the Age of the Holy Inquisition, just as there was no more place for Numa in the early second century BCE – despite the fact that everyone agreed that both were the founding figures of the religious, social, and cultural systems that venerated them.

Bibliography

Badian, E. (1967). Review of Cicero, *Brutus* (ed. E. Malcovati) and Cicero, *Brutus* (ed. A. E. Douglas), *JRS* 57: 223–230.

Bauman, R. A. (1990). 'The suppression of the Bacchanals. Five questions', *Historia* 39: 334–348.

Beard, M., North, J., and Price, S. (1998). *Religions of Rome* I–II, Cambridge.

Beck, H. (2005). *Karriere und Hierarchie. Die römische Aristokratie und die Anfänge des* cursus honorum *in der mittleren Republik*, Berlin.

Beck, H. (2008). 'Die Rollen des Adligen. Prominenz und aristokratische Herrschaft in der römischen Republik', in H. Beck, P. Scholz, and U. Walter (Hrsgg.), *Die Macht der Wenigen. Aristokratische Herrschaftspraxis, Kommunikation und 'edler' Lebensstil in Antike und Früher Neuzeit* (München), 101–123.

Beck, H. (2011). 'Consular power and the Roman constitution. The case of *imperium* revisited', in H. Beck, A. Dupla, M. Jehne, and F. Pina Polo (eds.), *Consuls and* res publica*. Holding High Office in the Roman Republic* (Cambridge), 77–96.

Bernstein, F. (1998). Ludi publici*. Untersuchungen zur Entstehung und Entwicklung der öffentlichen Spiele im republikanischen Rom* (Historia Einzelschriften 119), Stuttgart.

Bleicken, J. (1981). 'Zum Begriff der römischen Amtsgewalt. *Auspicium – potestas – imperium', Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Phil.-Hist. Kl.* 9: 257–300.

Coarelli, F (1983). *Il Foro Romano. Periodo arcaico*, Roma.

Cornell, T. J. (1995). *The Beginnings of Rome. Italy and Rome from the Bronze Age to the Punic Wars, c. 1000–264 BC*, London.

Crawford, M. H. (ed., 1996). *Roman Statutes* I–II (BICS, suppl. 64), London.

Delatte, A. (1936). 'Les doctrines pythagoriciennes des livres de Numa', *Académie royale de Belgique, Bulletin de la classe des lettres et des sciences morales et politiques* 22: 19–40.

Drogula, F. (2014). *Commanders and Command in the Roman Republic*, Chapel Hill, NC.

Dyson, S. L. (2010). *Rome. A Living Portrait of an Ancient City*, Baltimore, MD.

Elster, M. (2003). *Die Gesetze der mittleren römischen Republik. Text und Kommentar*, Darmstadt.

Engels, D. (2007). *Das römische Vorzeichenwesen (753–27 v.Chr.). Quellen, Terminologie, Kommentar, historische Entwicklung* (Potsdamer Altertumswissenschaftliche Beiträge 22). Stuttgart.

Farney, G. D. (2007). *Ethnic Identity and Aristocratic Competition in Republican Rome*, Cambridge.

Forsythe, G. (1994). *The Historian L. Calpurnius Piso Frugi and the Roman Annalistic Tradition*, Lanham, MD.

Garbarino, G. (1973). *Roma e la filosofia greca dalle origini alle fine del II secolo a.C.* I–II, Torino.

Grilli, A. (1982). 'Numa, Pitagora e la politica antiscipionica', *Contributi dell'Istituto di Storia antica dell'Univ. del Sacro Cuore* 8: 186–197.

Gruen, E. S. (1990). *Studies in Greek Culture and Roman Policy* (Cincinnati Classical Studies, n. s., 7), Leiden.

Hölkeskamp, K.-J. (1988). 'Das *Plebiscitum Ogulnium de sacerdotibus*. Überlegungen zu Authentizität und Interpretation der livianischen Überlieferung', *RhM* 131: 51–67.

Hölkeskamp, K.-J. (2005). 'Images of power. Memory, myth and monuments in the Roman Republic', review article on P. J. Holliday, *The Origins of Roman Historical Commemoration in the Visual Arts* (Cambridge 2002), *SCI* 24: 249–271.

Hölkeskamp, K.-J. (2011). *Die Entstehung der Nobilität. Studien zur sozialen und politischen Geschichte der Römischen Republik im 4. Jh. v. Chr.*, 2. erweit. Aufl., Stuttgart.

Hölkeskamp, K.-J. (2012). 'Im Gewebe der Geschichte(n). *Memoria*, Monumente und ihre mythistorische Vernetzung', *Klio* 94: 380–414.

Humm, M. (1996). 'Les origines du pythagorisme romain: problèmes historiques et philosophiques, 1', *LEC* 64: 339–353.

Humm, M. (1997). 'Les origines du pythagorisme romain: problèmes historiques et philosophiques, 2', *LEC* 65: 25–42.

Humm, M. (2000). 'Spazio e tempo civici: riforma delle tribu e riforma del calendario alla fine del quarto secolo a.C.', in C. Bruun (ed.), *The Roman Middle Republic. Politics, Religion and Historiography* (Acta Instituti Romani Finlandiae 23, Rome), 91–119.

Jaeger, M. (1997). *Livy's Written Rome*, Ann Arbor, MI.

Latte, K. (1960). *Römische Religionsgeschichte*, München.

Linderski, J. (1985). 'The *libri reconditi*', *HSCPh* 89: 207–239.

Linderski, J. (1986). 'The augural law', *ANRW* II.16.3: 2146–2312.

Linke, B. (2000). '*Religio* und *res publica*. Religiöser Glaube und gesellschaftliches Handeln im republikanischen Rom', in B. Linke and M. Stemmler (Hrsgg.), Mos maiorum. *Untersuchungen zu den Formen der Identitätsstiftung und Stabilisierung in der römischen Republik* (Historia Einzelschriften 141, Stuttgart), 269–298.

Liou-Gille, B. (1998). *Une lecture 'religieuse' de Tite-Live*, Paris.

Muth, S. (2014). 'Historische Dimensionen des gebauten Raumes – Das Forum Romanum als Fallbeispiel', in O. Dally, T. Hölscher, S. Muth, and R. M. Schneider (Hrsgg.), *Medien der Geschichte – Antikes Griechenland und Rom* (Berlin – Boston), 285–329.

Nippel, W. (1997). 'Orgien, Ritualmorde und Verschwörung?', in U. Manthe and J. von Ungern-Sternberg (Hrsgg.), *Grosse Prozesse der römischen Antike* (München), 65–73.

Ogilvie, R. M. (1970). *A Commentary on Livy: Books 1–5*, second edition, Oxford.

Orlin, E. M. (1997). *Temples, Religion and Politics in the Roman Republic*, Leiden.

Orlin, E. M. (2002). 'Foreign cults in republican Rome. Rethinking the pomerial rule', *MAAR* 47: 1–16.

Pailler, J.-M. (1988). Bacchanalia. *La répression de 186 av. J. C. à Rome et en Italie: vestiges, images, tradition* (Bibliothèque des Écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome 270), Rome.

Poucet, J. (2000). *Les Rois de Rome, Tradition et Histoire*, Bruxelles.

Roller, M. B. (2013). 'On the intersignification of monuments in Augustan Rome', *AJPh* 134: 119–131.

Rosen, K. (1985). 'Die falschen Numabücher. Politik, Religion und Literatur in Rom 181 v. Chr.', *Chiron* 15: 65–90.

Rosenberger, V. (2003). 'Die verschwundene Leiche. Überlegungen zur Auffindung des Sarkophags Numas im Jahre 181 v.Chr.', in B. Kranemann and J. Rüpke (Hrsgg.), *Das Gedächtnis des Gedächtnisses. Zur Präsenz von Ritualen in beschreibenden und reflektierenden Texten* (Marburg), 39–59.

Rüpke, J. (2005). Fasti sacerdotum. *Die Mitglieder der Priesterschaften und das sakrale Führungspersonal römischer, griechischer, orientalischer und jüdisch-christlicher Kulte in der Stadt Rom von 300 v.Chr. bis 499 n. Chr.* I. *Jahres- und Kollegienlisten*; II. *Biographien* (unter Mitarbeit von A. Glock), Stuttgart.

Rüpke, J. (2007). *Religion of the Romans*, Malden, MA.

Santini, C. (1995). *I frammenti di L. Cassio Emina. Introduzione, testo, traduzione e commento*, Pisa.

Sehlmeyer, M. (1999). *Stadtrömische Ehrenstatuen der republikanischen Zeit. Historizität und Kontext von Symbolen nobilitären Standesbewußtseins* (Historia Einzelschriften 130), Stuttgart.

Smith, C. J. (2006). *The Roman Clan. The* gens *from Ancient Ideology to Modern Anthropology.* Cambridge.

Stein-Hölkeskamp, E. and Hölkeskamp, K.-J. (Hrsgg., 2006). *Erinnerungsorte der Antike. Die römische Welt*, München.

Szemler, G. J. (1972). *The Priests of the Roman Republic. A Study of Interactions between Priesthoods and Magistracies* (Collection Latomus 127), Bruxelles.

Takacs, S. A. (2000). 'Politics and religion in the Bacchanalian affair of 186 BCE', *HSCPh* 100: 301–310.

Walter, U. (2004). Memoria *und* res publica*. Zur Geschichtskultur im republikanischen Rom*, Frankfurt am Main.

Willi, A. (1998). 'Numa's dangerous books: The exegetic history of a Roman forgery', *MH* 55: 139–172.