

# The Ancient History Bulletin

---

VOLUME THIRTY-SIX: 2022

NUMBERS 1-2

---

## **Edited by:**

Monica D'Agostini ✦ Edward Anson ✦ Catalina Balmaceda  
Charlotte Dunn ✦ Andrea Gatzke ✦ Timothy Howe  
Alex McAuley ✦ Sabine Müller ✦ Nandini Pandey  
John Vanderspoel ✦ Conor Whately ✦ Pat Wheatley



ISSN 0835-3638 ✦ eISSN 1700-3334

# ANCIENT HISTORY BULLETIN

Volume 36 (2022) Numbers 1-2

## EDITED BY:

Edward Anson  
Catalina Balmaceda  
Monica D'Agostini  
Andrea Gatzke  
Alex McAuley  
Sabine Müller  
Nandini Pandey  
John Vanderspoel  
Conor Whately  
Pat Wheatley

**Senior Editor: Timothy Howe**

Assistant Editor: Charlotte Dunn



## CONTENTS OF VOLUME THIRTY-SIX NUMBERS 1-2

- 1 José Miguel Gallego Cañamero, *Virtus y strategemata en la conquista de Qart- Hadasht*
- 59 Fabrizio Biglino, *The Army and Movement of People during the Roman Republic*
- 81 Marian Helm, *Between urbs and tribus, The expansion and organization of the ager Romanus in the Early Republic*
- 99 Pamina Fernández Camacho, *The foundation legend of Gades: inventions, interpretations and developments through the ages*

## NOTES TO CONTRIBUTORS AND SUBSCRIBERS

The Ancient History Bulletin was founded in 1987 by Waldemar Heckel, Brian Lavelle, and John Vanderspoel. The board of editorial correspondents consists of Elizabeth Baynham (University of Newcastle), Hugh Bowden (Kings College, London), Franca Landucci Gattinoni (Università Cattolica, Milan), Alexander Meeus (University of Mannheim), Kurt Raaflaub (Brown University), P.J. Rhodes (Durham University), Robert Rollinger (Universität Innsbruck), Victor Alonso Troncoso (Universidade da Coruña)

AHB is currently edited by Timothy Howe ([howe@stolaf.edu](mailto:howe@stolaf.edu))

AHB promotes scholarly discussion in Ancient History and ancillary fields (such as epigraphy, papyrology, and numismatics) by publishing articles and notes on any aspect of the ancient world from the Near East to Late Antiquity. Submitted articles should normally be in English, but the journal will consider contributions in French, German, Italian or Spanish.

### SUBMISSION GUIDELINES

AHB adheres to the usual North American editorial policies in the submission and acceptance of articles but imposes no House Style. Authors are, however, asked to use the abbreviations of *L'Année philologique* (Aph) for journals, and of the *Thesaurus linguae latinae* (TLL) for Latin authors. Please send submissions to the editor most closely identified with your field of enquiry or, in case of doubt, to Timothy Howe ([howe@stolaf.edu](mailto:howe@stolaf.edu)). Articles must be submitted in electronic format, preferably generated by MS Word. Greek font or other special characters must convert such to Unicode and should be accompanied by a PDF version. Authors will receive PDF offprints of their contributions. Copyright is retained by the author. Books for reviews and enquiries concerning book reviews should be directed to Joseph Roisman ([jsroisma@colby.edu](mailto:jsroisma@colby.edu)).

### SUBSCRIPTION INFORMATION

The subscription rate for individual and institutional subscribers is USD 25.00. Detailed instructions about subscriptions and access to digital content can be found on the AHB website:

<http://ancienthistorybulletin.org>

### PAYMENT

Payment may be made via the subscription portal on the AHB website:

<http://www.ancienthistorybulletin.org/subscribed-users-area/membership-levels/>

*Cover image courtesy of The Nickle Arts Museum, University of Calgary*

## Between *urbs* and *tribus*

### The expansion and organization of the *ager Romanus* in the Early Republic

Marian Helm

**Abstract:** The Roman conquest of Italy and the Mediterranean rested on the shoulders of its citizens. It is therefore surprising that Roman republican scholarship has paid little attention to the majority of the *cives Romani* living in the steadily expanding rural *tribus*, which reached their final number of 35 with the Quirina and Velina. Although the conditions and historical circumstances of new *tribus* varied greatly between 387 and 241, some remarkable general features can be discerned. In contrast to the *coloniae Latinae*, the *tribus* seem to have relied on a grass-roots organization for the levying of taxes and soldiers and lack large urban sites. This article argues that the central Roman authorities consciously avoided the creation of elaborate administrative structures in regard to the *ager Romanus* in the fourth and third century BC.

**Keywords:** *urbs*, *tribus*, space, territorial organization, administration, central places, *tributum*, *civitas Romana*, *comitia centuriata*, Roman expansion in Italy

The Roman conquest of Italy and the Mediterranean provides one of history's conspicuous examples of empire building. Its success in, and ability for, expansion and integration have been duly acknowledged and remain at the forefront of the scholarly debate.<sup>1</sup> In comparison, the consequences and challenges created by the expansion of the *ager Romanus*, which had increased to an area of ca. 6.000 km<sup>2</sup> with approximately 250.000 to 350.000 citizens by the third century BC, have received less attention.<sup>2</sup> The extraordinary size and dispersion of the citizen body throughout the Italian peninsula is all the more intriguing since there existed only a handful of Roman settlements with the *civitas optimo iure* before the introduction of large citizen colonies in the 2<sup>nd</sup> century BC.<sup>3</sup> Major urban centers were either scarce or of a legal status that restricted their potential for political or judicial actions during the fourth

---

<sup>1</sup> S. Eckstein 2006 on the anarchic Italian interstate setting in which the rise of Rome occurred. The various articles in Jehne/Pfeilschifter 2006 have persuasively pointed out the Roman policy of 'benign neglect' in Italy while the articles in Roselaar 2012, Cooley 2016, and in Bradley/Farney 2018 focus on long-term and mostly indirect processes of integration, cooperation and conflict in the course and aftermath of the Roman conquest. In regard to the importance of elite cooperation Hantos 2003 and Pfeilschifter 2007 have discussed how military service might have contributed to the establishment of hierarchies and relationships. In contrast, Nicola Terrenato has formulated a more radical position, which interprets the Roman conquest as a federal enterprise of Italian elites with Rome and its center. His various arguments are presented in Terrenato 2019. Continuing along similar lines, Johnston/Mogetta 2020 have offered a more cautious and intriguing interpretation based on the literary evidence in combination with the recent archaeological activities of the Gabii Project.

<sup>2</sup> Brunt 1998, 61-83; Cornell 1995, 351; Helm 2022, 232-248 on the consequences of the Latin War and idem, 360-364 on Roman expansion in the early 3<sup>rd</sup> century.

<sup>3</sup> Galsterer 1976, 64-70. All following dates are BC.

and third century BC. This peculiar characteristic of the Roman rural countryside during the conquest of Italy raises a number of crucial questions in regard to the governance of the vast *ager Romanus* as well as the relationship between the central *urbs* and the outlying citizen districts.<sup>4</sup>

The following article will explore these questions by examining the genesis and historical development of the fourteen new *tribus* added in the first half of the republican period (c. 500-241 BC). Both the specific situational context and characteristics of each founding, and the occurrence of general patterns, will be examined to gain a better understanding of the Roman ability to sustain enormous territorial growth without fundamentally changing the slim political and administrative structures centered in the *urbs*. It will be demonstrated that the various stages of territorial expansion conform to a general practice of either curtailing the potential service functions of urban centers for Roman citizens or avoiding them altogether. The resulting shallow level of administrative penetration contrasts starkly with the Roman citizen body's overall cohesion and its ability to mobilize enormous resources and manpower, especially in times of crisis. While the article focuses on analyzing the founding circumstances and development of the newly founded *tribus* of the 4<sup>th</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> century it will also explore how the political, legal, and religious predominance of the *urbs Roma* melded with local governance in the rural districts, and how this interaction played out within the wider republican framework of the *res publica Romana*.

## 1. Emergence and development of the Roman *tribus*

By the 6<sup>th</sup> century BC at the latest, the city of Rome had turned into a considerable urban settlement, featuring impressive structures like the Forum Romanum, the Cloaca Maxima, the Circus Maximus, and the imposing temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus on the Capitoline Hill. Any reconstruction of Rome's early history has to contend with an extremely difficult body of evidence, yet there can be little doubt that the Roman community had become the most powerful city in Latium during the Regal Period.<sup>5</sup> It controlled the largest territory in Latium – estimated at around 800 km<sup>2</sup> – and was organized in 21 *tribus rusticae* and four *tribus urbanae* at the beginning of the Republican Period. Most of the former bore the names of patrician *gentes*, suggesting that these elites exercised some form of control, an issue that featured prominently in the so-called “Struggle of the Orders”.<sup>6</sup> Interestingly enough, the

---

<sup>4</sup> Gargola 2017, 21-25, 55-59 discusses the spatial and temporal order of Rome and draws attention to the fact that “neither Cicero nor Polybius regarded the organization of power away from the city as relevant to his purpose” (p.23).

<sup>5</sup> Cornell 1995, 173-214. See Kolb 2002, 74-114, Hopkins 2016, 66-122 and Bradley 2020, 155-187 for the Regal Period and building program. Cf. Liv. 1.42-44, Dion. Hal. *ant. Rom.* 4.15.1-19.4, Cic. *rep.* 2.39 on the Servian reforms, which were interpreted as a crucial step by later authors.

<sup>6</sup> Rieger 2007, 278-468 discusses the early *tribus* in detail. The migration of the *gens Claudia* to Rome is a case in point, since the area settled by Attus Clausus and his followers became the *tribus Claudia*: Liv. 2.16.3-5: *namque Attius Clausus, cui postea Appio Claudio fuit Romae nomen (...) magna clientium comitatus manu, Romam transfugit.* Dion. Hal. *ant. Rom.* 5.40 mentions 5.000 men while Plut. *Publ.* 21 speaks of 5.000 families and Serv. Aen. 7.706 of 5.000 *clientes* and *amici*. Suet. *Tib.* 1 dates the episode to the time of Romulus and App. reg. 12 to the reign of Tarquinius. Hermon 2001, 56-67 and Forsythe 2005, 163-122 discuss the episode in detail. For the ‘struggle of the orders’ s. Cornell 1995, 242-292, 327-344; the articles of Ungern-Sternberg 2006 and Linke 2010 provide concise summaries of the debate. Hölkeskamp 2011 is still obligatory for the later stages of the conflict. S. Humm 2006, 40-50 and Armstrong 2016, 146-171 for the conflicts over land in the Early Republic.

first conquest of the young republic, nearby Crustumerium, broke with this tradition and was integrated as the *tribus* Clustumina. The inhabitants of the area were thus integrated into the *res publica* as a distinct unit with the ability to exert influence in the tribal assembly instead of being distributed among the existing *tribus*. This early example emphasizes that the Roman conquest was not simply a military phenomenon but deeply intertwined with political and social issues. It is therefore necessary to trace the different stages in Roman territorial organization to gain a better understanding of the historical evolution of governing structures and practices in the rural districts.

### 1.1 The *tribus* of 386 – Arnensis, Tromentina, Stellatina, Sabbatina

The first addition of new *tribus* occurred at the beginning of the 4<sup>th</sup> century after the astonishing conquest of the Etruscan city Veii, which expanded Roman territory by roughly 600 km<sup>2</sup> (an increase of around 60%). This constituted the first major step in Roman expansion and was widely remembered and glorified in the figure of the legendary M. Furius Camillus.<sup>7</sup> Parts of the *ager Veientanus* were given to Roman citizens as individual allotments (*adsignatio viritim*), though a large part of the conquered population also received Roman citizenship, which might have been helped along by the Gallic Sack. The whole area was organized in 387 into four new *tribus* – Stellatina, Sabbatina, Tromentina, Arnensis – excepting the northern border regions that were detached to form the *coloniae Latinae* Sutrium and Nepes.<sup>8</sup>

In contrast to the activities regarding the rural areas, the urban site of Veii seems to have been of little interest and rapidly decayed down to a mere hamlet. Although still a market and defensive place, Veii lost its importance as a religious or political site, which is emphasized by the Roman *evocatio* of the city goddess Iuno Regina.<sup>9</sup> As a result of the emaciation of the city of Veii, the citizens in the rural areas now lacked a central urban space unless they were willing to reach Rome, which would have taken one day for each leg of the trip at least.<sup>10</sup> Therefore, a large part of the administration of the new area must have been organized in a subsidiary fashion, probably with the help and through the networks of elites like the *gens Manlia* that had also acquired land there.<sup>11</sup> From a modern perspective, this organization might seem rudimentary but it also granted a lot of autonomy and freedom to

<sup>7</sup> Oakley 1997, 376-379; Walter 2000, *passim*. Cf. Bruun 2000, 57-63, who suspects that the commander Furius Medullinus might have formed a historical base for later embellishments.

<sup>8</sup> Taylor 2013, 47-49.

<sup>9</sup> Liv. 5.22.5-8, 5.23.7, 5.31.3, 5.52.10; Plut. *Cam.* 6.1-2; Dion. Hal. *ant. Rom.* 13.3; Val. Max. 1.8.3. The decline of Veii was commented on by: Prop. 4.10.9, 4.10.29-30: *nunc intra muros pastoris bucina lenti / Cantat, et in vestris ossibus arva metunt*; Flor. 1.12.10-11, Strab. 5.2.9. Di Giuseppe 2012, 359-365.

<sup>10</sup> For the travel distance see 'Omnes Viae': [https://omnesviae.org/de/#liter\\_TPPlace1203\\_TPPlace1223](https://omnesviae.org/de/#liter_TPPlace1203_TPPlace1223), which gives XVIII Milia Passuum (ca. 27 kilometers). Since a traveler can make 4-6 km/h it would have been possible to reach Rome and get back within a day, but that would have left little time for doing anything in Rome itself. The equation is a different one when traveling by horse, which would have made it possible to cover the distance in 1 to 2 hours, indicating the different access levels enjoyed by the different strata of Roman society.

<sup>11</sup> Liv. 6.14.10 mentions that M. Manlius Capitolinus sold his property in the *ager Veientanus* to ransom indebted Roman citizens. Taylor 2013, 230-231.

the established local structures on the ground, which might explain why the integration of the *ager Veientanus* progressed smoothly and without any revolts.

## 1.2 The *tribus* of 358 – Publilia and Pomptina

The second addition to the Roman *tribus* followed the conclusion of Roman campaigns against the Hernici in 358 and consisted of the *tribus* Publilia and Pomptina, which were founded in the northern areas of the *ager Pomptinus* between the Oufens and Astura and in the upper Trerus-valley.<sup>12</sup> Notably, these *tribus* were separated from the *ager Romanus* by a chain of medium-sized Latin towns south of the Mons Albanus and by Praeneste to the north. It is therefore all the more surprising that there are no indications of significant urban sites in these areas.<sup>13</sup> Since the renewal of a treaty with the Latins is reported for the same year – Livy is certainly thinking along the lines of the *foedus Cassianum* here<sup>14</sup> – it seems that the Latin cities and colonies played a part in securing the new *tribus* and provided centers for economic exchange and defense, though small fortified Roman settlements, similar to the one at La Giostra, might also have been able to provide these functions.<sup>15</sup> Curiously enough, Livy also reports two incidents following the founding of the two *tribus* that restricted the freedom of Roman citizens to assemble outside of Rome. In the first instance, the passage of the *lex Poetelia de ambitu* in 358 limited political activities outside of Rome and its immediate environment. Although Livy has been suspected of retrojecting later legislation, it should be noted that the episode is not part of the larger narrative and that the law had little to do with later *leges* regarding *ambitus* since it did not refer to bribery but prohibited *homines novi* from canvassing in the *conciliabula*.<sup>16</sup> It is conspicuous, that such restrictions were introduced in parallel to the creation of the Pomptina and Publilia and becomes even more so when considering another measure aimed at securing the primacy of the *urbs* over the rural districts that took place in the following year: while in camp at Sutrium, the consul Cn. Manlius Capitolinus had allowed the soldiers of his army to assemble by tribes and pass a law establishing a five per cent tax on manumission in 357. The law itself was not repealed but it caused political uproar in Rome and was followed by a tribunician bill that made it a capital offence to convene the Roman people outside their usual meeting place in Rome.<sup>17</sup> Both cases emphasize that the relation between the urban center and the new rural districts was actively negotiated in the process of Roman expansion. Unlike the *ager Veientanus*, the new areas in eastern Latium were too remote to automatically align themselves with the city of Rome, which apparently caused some tension that was eventually resolved in favor of the *urbs*. While Roman citizens could meet and mingle in any urban area, they could only make

---

<sup>12</sup> Taylor 2013, 50-53.

<sup>13</sup> Liv. 7.15.9-12. De Haas 2011, 6-18 on Roman designs regarding the Pontine region.

<sup>14</sup> Liv. 7.12.7.

<sup>15</sup> Moltesen/Brandt 1994, 12, 139-145 and especially 157 on similarities with Ostia. S.a. Bourdin 2012, 507-513 on Roman border fortifications.

<sup>16</sup> Liv. 7.15.11-13: *eodem anno duae tribus, Pomptina et Publilia, additae; ludi votivi, quos M. Furius dictator voverat, facti; et de ambitu ab C. Poetelio tribuno plebis auctoribus patribus tum primum ad populum latum est; eaque rogatione novorum maxime hominum ambitionem, qui nundinas et conciliabula obire soliti erant, compressam credebant.* Oakley 1998 175-177, cf. Beck 2016, 139-146 on the later legislation in the 2<sup>nd</sup> century. On the objectives of the *plebiscitum* of 358 s. Develin 1985, 130-135, Cornell 1995, 469 FN 33. For the wider political context s. Hölkeskamp 2011, 83-85, 118-122.

<sup>17</sup> Liv. 7.16. Elster 2003, 16-19; Hölkeskamp 2011, 95-96.

full use of their political and legal privileges in the city of Rome, a condition that was probably helped along by Rome's gradual eclipse of its neighboring cities in terms of population, power, and public building-programs.

### 1.3 The *tribus* of 332 – The Maecia and Scaptia

The desire to maintain the exclusive status of the *urbs* is also apparent in the following addition to the Roman *tribus* in 332, when the Maecia and Scaptia were founded on territory taken from the cities defeated in the Latin War.<sup>18</sup> Although large parts of the original population were enfranchised, a barrier seems to have remained between old and new citizens in the Maecia, since a clear distinction was drawn between the *populus Romanus* and the newly enfranchised Lanuvini in regard to Lanuvium's sanctuary to Iuno Sospita, which was to be shared between the two groups. Furthermore, it became obligatory for the consuls to visit the sanctuary upon entering office, which must have served as a visible reminder of the new balance of power, at least in the immediate aftermath of the Latin War, under which both the civic and religious space of Lanuvium were subordinated to the *urbs Roma* and its magistrates.<sup>19</sup>

The situation in the Scaptia was similar since it received large parts of Velitrae's territory but did not include the city itself. Instead, Velitrae received the *civitas sine suffragio* and was deliberately emaciated in 338: not only were its senators deported and their land distributed to Roman citizens, it was also decided to raze the walls of the city and to install a garrison.<sup>20</sup> Further incidents, for example the (failed) prosecution of the whole Tusculan population in 323, demonstrate that the new 'citizens' and their political centers were forcefully subordinated to the *urbs*, a process which quickly turned the incorporated Latin cities of Nomentum and Pedum into 'ghost towns'.<sup>21</sup> Although Tusculum, Aricia, and Lanuvium survived as urban centers, their appeal must have suffered somewhat since the Tusculan elite – the Fulvii, Mamilii, Coruncanii, Porcii, and Fonteii – hastened to join the nobility and the political arena in Rome.<sup>22</sup> Overall, the creation of the Maecia and Scaptia was accompanied by the emaciation of autonomous governing structures of those cities that had been absorbed by Rome after the successful conclusion of the Latin war.

### 1.4 The *tribus* of 318 – Oufentina and Falerna

The decline of urban centers in the wake of the foundation of new *tribus* in Latium might be explained as a side-effect of the realignment of the economic, sacral, and political networks

---

<sup>18</sup> Taylor 2013, 53-55.

<sup>19</sup> Liv. 8.14.2-4; Humbert 1978, 191-193. Schultz 2006, 223 "this episode reminds us that Romanization could also take the form of usurpation and incorporation".

<sup>20</sup> Liv. 8.1.3, 8.14.5-7. S. Hantos 1983, 67-68 on the distribution of the other incorporated Latin cities of Aricia (*tribus* Horatia), Nomentum (*tribus* Cornelia), Pedum (*tribus* Menenia), Tusculum (*tribus* Papiria), Lanuvium (*tribus* Maecia). S.a. Taylor 2013, 79-80.

<sup>21</sup> Liv. 8.37.8-12; Val. Max. 9.10.1, s.a. Plin. *nat.* 7.136. Taylor 2013, 214, 302, Toynbee 1965 I, 325; Humbert 1978, 158-159, Oakley 1998, 755-757. On the 'Geisterstädte' s. Hartmann 2010, 240-242.

<sup>22</sup> Hölkeskamp 2011, 179.

of Latium in the wake of successful Roman expansion. This certainly played a role and will be discussed in detail below, but it nevertheless seems that this was also part of a deliberate strategy of firmly anchoring the rural districts' point of reference on the city of Rome. The addition of the Oufentina and Falerna further supports the hypothesis that the establishment of autonomous urban centers of Roman citizens was generally avoided. The Oufentina was located in the area between the Oufens and the Sacco while the Falerna consisted of the Campanian *ager Falernus*.<sup>23</sup> These regions possessed large urban centers at Capua (*urbs maxima opulentissimaque Italiae* according to Livy 7.31.1) and Privernum. However, both cities were limited to the *civitas sine suffragio*, which gave them the Roman citizenship with all its obligations but little of its privileges.<sup>24</sup> Although the settlements could serve as military and economic centers, they were irrelevant as political spaces. Their magistrates, for example, were not representatives of the *populus Romanus* and thus lacked any authority over the nearby Roman settlers.<sup>25</sup> This might not have been the only fields impacted since Roselaar has recently shown that the legal status also affected the economic options of the respective parties.<sup>26</sup> Non-Romans might have been able to participate in the Roman conquest but they had to follow rules and expectations that were not of their own making.

Ultimately, the main decisions were taken in Rome, a process in which only Roman citizens could partake. The *tribus* of 318 provide additional examples for the Roman determination to ensure the continuation of this exclusivity by emphasizing the dominance of the city of Rome. Parallel to the founding of the new *tribus*, the *praetor urbanus* also dispatched *praefecti iure dicundo* to Capua.<sup>27</sup> Despite our limited knowledge of their activities and the fact that this might have been a temporary measure, this nevertheless constituted a direct interference in the internal affairs of Capua by Roman magistrates.

<sup>23</sup> Taylor 2013, 55-56.

<sup>24</sup> Humbert 1978, 279-284 and Oakley 1998, 544-559 on the inferior quality of the *civitas sine suffragio*. Galsterer 1976, 81 and Mouritsen 2007, 142-147 suspect a later glorification. Toynbee 1965 I, 205-206: "It is more likely that the inferior status had been intended originally to be permanent, and that it was subsequently discarded from the Roman repertory of constitutional devices because it had been found, by experience, to be unsatisfactory."

<sup>25</sup> This is emphasized by the differentiated treatment of the Campanians after the Roman victory in the Latin War: the city itself received the *civitas sine suffragio* but 1600 *equites Campani* were granted the privilege of the *civitas optimo iure*, which allowed them to participate in Roman politics, that is politics in Rome. Liv. 8.11.16 explicitly mentions that the treaty was recorded in a bronze tablet on the temple of Castor and Pollux, Oakley 1998, 513-515. Vell. Pat. 1.14.3 on the *civitas sine suffragio* for the Campanians, cf. Liv. 8.17.12; Vell. Pat. 1.14.4. Fest. 126L specifies that the Cumani, Acerrani, and Atellani were *cives Romani* and served in the legions but were unable to hold magistracies. The measure did not impact the internal politics of Capua but it certainly established a two-class system which secured the primacy of Rome since the privileged Campanian elites had access to politics in Rome. Cf. Frederiksen 1984, 191-193; Terrenato 2019, 129-130. Gargola 2017, 88-95 discusses the complex relation between legal status and the spatial organisation of the Roman sphere of influence.

<sup>26</sup> Roselaar 2019, 14-23. Most notably, the *viae publicae* mainly ran through Roman and Latin territories, which consequently benefited most from the investments in infrastructure and improved transportation.

<sup>27</sup> Reported for 318 (Liv. 9.20.5), cf. the Roman intervention of 314 (Liv. 9.26.5-9, Diod. 19.76.1-5), s. Galsterer 1976, 29-30. Terrenato 2019, 129-130 interprets the episode as part of a larger power struggle between different factions in Capua. Since Rome also meddled in the internal affairs of other cities (e.g. Antium, s. Liv. 9.20.10) in its sphere of influence it stands to reason that the intervention by Roman magistrates was not a singular affair but part of a larger pattern. Gargola 2017, 97-99 argues that the *praefecti* were part of "informal and poorly defined zones around the city" and over time "came to cover with a "set of supervisory centers" the territory inhabited by Roman citizens" (p. 99). Sisani 2011, 702-727 and Gallo 2018, 27-54 provide a detailed list of the prefects' activities.

The case of Privernum provides further support for this argument. The city had recently been involved in an ill-judged rebellion against Rome and was subdued by Roman forces in 329. As a consequence, its whole senate was deported *trans tiberim* and the land of the ejected elites given to Roman settlers who would form a large chunk of the Oufentina.<sup>28</sup> The deportation of the local elites will have considerably weakened the administration of the city and it is therefore entirely plausible that Festus lists Privernum among the *praefecturae*, which subordinated the local political and administrative structures to Roman officials.<sup>29</sup> In consequence, both examples emphasize the need for a fine differentiation between the political and legal spheres of allied, or even partly enfranchised communities, and those of the Roman citizens in a nearby *tribus*. The urban spaces in question could serve both groups equally in economic and military terms, but possessed a different legal and political quality determined by the respective status of the group in question.

### 1.5 The *tribus* of 299 – Aniensis and Teretina

The Oufentina and Falerna were connected within two decades by the *tribus* Teretina in the Liris-valley in 299, which was paired with the Aniensis in the upper Anio-valley after both areas had been subjected to extraordinary purges of their Auruncan and Aequian populations.<sup>30</sup> The ensuing virgane allotments in the Liris valley were close to various urban sites (e.g. Fundi, Cales, Interamna Lirenas, Fregellae) but these were for the most part *coloniae Latinae*, while the city of Fundi was a *municipium sine suffragio*. A notable exception to the lack of fully enfranchised settlements were the two *coloniae civium Romanorum* Minturnae and Sinuessa, deducted shortly after the creation of the Teretina in 296. Although each featured a forum and sacral places, their very limited size of 300 colonists of uncertain status prevented them from developing any significant role for the surrounding *ager Romanus* in legal, political, or religious terms.<sup>31</sup> They did, however, provide security and centers of economic interaction, functions that will have been shared by the various smaller Roman settlements in the area and ultimately by the large Latin fortress-colonies. While we are less well informed about the Aniensis, the deduction of the Latin colonies Alba Fucens and Carseoli, a former Aequian settlement, in 302 or 298 and the existing Latin colony at Sora suggest a similar constellation there.<sup>32</sup>

### 1.6 The *tribus* of 241 – the Velina and Quirina

Roman activity in regard to creating new *tribus* slowed down after 299, and it took over 50 years before the next pair, the Velina and Quirina, were formed in 241.<sup>33</sup> Exceptionally, these

---

<sup>28</sup> Taylor 2013, 56.

<sup>29</sup> Fest. 262L. This corresponds with Livy's report that a Roman garrison was installed, Liv. 8.20. Humbert 1978, 196-197 compares the status of Privernum to that of *dediticii*. Gallo 2018. Cf. Jehne 2006, 249-250.

<sup>30</sup> Liv. 9.25.9. Taylor 2013, 56-59. Even if we allow for considerable exaggeration by our sources, there can be little doubt that the original inhabitants of these areas suffered dearly in the course of Roman campaigns. S. Forsythe 2005, 303-309 and Grossmann 2009, 97-98 for the historical context of the Second Samnite War.

<sup>31</sup> Roselaar 2009, 614-619, Boos 2011, 22-24.

<sup>32</sup> Vell. 1.14, Liv. 10.3.2, 10.13.1

<sup>33</sup> Taylor 2013, 59-68.

*tribus* were founded with the understanding that they were to be the last addition, thereby fixing the total number of *tribus* at 35. This decision went hand in hand with a major reform of the *centuriae* and *classes* of the *comitia centuriata* which is still imperfectly understood and hotly debated.<sup>34</sup> As a result of these changes, the *prima classis* was reduced to 70 *centuriae* which were then linked with the 35 *tribus*.<sup>35</sup> It is noteworthy that the reform made the presence of citizens from all *tribus*, irrespective of the actual number present, a necessary prerequisite for assembling the *comitia centuriata* and thus guaranteed a broad representation of the citizen body, at least in principle.

In regard to their territorial organization, the two *tribus* followed in the footsteps of the earlier foundations, even though they were exceptionally large in comparison. The Velina in Picenum adjoined the Latin colonies Hadria, Ariminum, and Firmum and also featured the small *colonia civium Romanorum* Castrum Novum. Although there existed several cities of the *socii*, for example Ancona, Asculum, or Interamna Praetuttiorum, the *tribus* once again lacked large urban settlements of Roman citizens. Following the wars against the Celts in the 220s, the Roman territory was thoroughly re-organized. In this context, most of the original settlements, like Interamna Praetuttiorum, were incorporated as *praefecturae* and thus legally subordinate to any orders or magistrates sent from Rome, even if this happened only rarely in practice.<sup>36</sup>

A similar pattern can be discerned in the Quirina, although this *tribus* might have taken a more checkered path due to the long history of the Sabine conquest. Campaigns in Sabinum had been part of the Samnite Wars and had led to increasing Roman control until the consul M'. Curius Dentatus subjugated the area for good in 290.<sup>37</sup> As part of his campaign, Dentatus awarded conquered land to his troops on his own authority and allegedly also settled there himself. The Sabines meanwhile received the *civitas sine suffragio*, which was upgraded to full citizenship in 268 – an exceptionally fast improvement, though it might have been more gradual and complex than our literary sources suggest.<sup>38</sup> Consequently, the existing Sabine towns were turned into Roman cities overnight, although Strabo specifies that only Reate and Amiternum could be called real cities while the only Roman foundations consisted of Forum Novum and Forum Decii.<sup>39</sup> It is therefore striking that all of them were turned into *praefecturae*, which again curtailed the potential for political and legal independence from the *urbs*.<sup>40</sup>

<sup>34</sup> Liv. 1.43.11-13; Cic. rep. 2.39. Hackl 1972, 157-159; Taylor 2013, 67-68. For an overview of the debate s. Hackl 1972, 38-39, Mouritsen 2017, 42-44 and Walter 2017, 196.

<sup>35</sup> S. Hackl 1972, passim. Beck 2005, 42-43: "Wichtigste Implikation für die Abstimmung in den Centuriatcomitien war, daß damit eine dauerhafte Dominanz der Land- über die Stadttribus festgeschrieben wurde."

<sup>36</sup> It is also significant that the Latin colonies issued their own cast bronze coinage based on the so-called Adriatic Italic system, which was probably used to pay allied troops but also emphasizes their importance of economic central places in the area of the Velina; Menozzi/Acconzia 2018, 595-596.

<sup>37</sup> Farney/Masci 2018, 551-552. Organized settlement of Roman citizens is also suggested by the drainage of Lake Velinus in the Reatine plain, possibly conducted during the censorship of Curius Dentatus in 272 (Cic. Scaur. 27, Att. 4.15.5). Fabius Pictor claimed that the conquest of the Sabines marked the point when the Romans became truly wealthy, FRH1 F26 = Strab. 5.3.1, FRH 1F10 = Dion. Hal. ant. Rom. 2.38.3.

<sup>38</sup> Taylor 2013, 60-68. S.a. Roselaar 2010, 44-45.

<sup>39</sup> Strab. 5.3.1; Farney/Masci 2018, 543.

<sup>40</sup> Recent geophysical surveys by the British School at Rome at Forum Novum suggest that the site was not a dense urban space but featured only a couple of buildings. Gaffney/Patterson/Roberts 2001, 76-77 and 2004; Farney 2019, 247.

Despite their peculiarities, these last *tribus* thus followed the established Roman practice of territorial organization, which provided newly settled citizens with an environment of economic and military centers but effectively restricted activities of political and legal significance to the *urbs Roma*. Additionally, the potential for mobilizing political support and interests on the basis of *tribus* affiliation was further limited by locking in the number of *tribus*. After all, the Roman conquest continued and newly settled areas of Roman citizens were still organized as part of a *tribus*, but since no more foundings occurred, these areas were parceled out to existing *tribus*.<sup>41</sup> The long-term effect was a patchwork rug of tribal affiliations which loosened regional cohesion and meant that a *tribus* only manifested itself properly as part of the assemblies in Rome.

## 2. 'Primate city' and the subsidiary organization of the *ager Romanus*

This necessarily brief overview of Roman territorial organization in the age of Italian expansion demonstrates that new *tribus* did not feature potent urban spaces that held relevance for Roman citizens in a political sense. This phenomenon is best interpreted in the context of the dominant role that the city of Rome attained in the 4<sup>th</sup> century. The subjugation and restructuring of the urban network of Latium and Campania after the Latin War and its hierarchization through the implementation of varying degrees of privileges and obligations indicates that the *urbs Roma* had achieved the rank of a 'primate city'. In the field of Urban Sociology, this term refers to a city that is disproportionately larger than any other two combined in the urban hierarchy.<sup>42</sup> Primate cities display a rank-size distribution that is characterized by one very large city with many much smaller cities and towns, and no intermediate-sized urban center. Primate cities also monopolize certain services and functions, which is in accord with the exclusive presence and practice of politics in the city of Rome.<sup>43</sup> The extraordinary and exclusive status of the *urbs* in regard to Roman politics, which in turn determined military, legal, and economic activities to varying degrees, would not only have firmly bound the rural districts to the city but would also have contained centrifugal tendencies in the growing *ager Romanus*. Interestingly enough, the *res publica* did not choose to ensure this by creating an elaborate bureaucratic apparatus and hierarchy. Quite the opposite was the case, since original city-state institutions remained in place and the number of state officials was expanded very modestly in comparison to the ever-increasing dimensions of Roman expansion.<sup>44</sup> This was only feasible because the Roman 'state' pursued a very limited vision of administrative tasks, which were mainly concerned with the levying of troops and taxes for the Republic's wars.

---

<sup>41</sup> Hackl 1972, 135-136; Roselaar 2010, 57 ; Taylor 2013, 79-100. Häussler 2013, 189-190 provides a good example for this practice.

<sup>42</sup> Heineberg 2017, 80-84, 90-104.

<sup>43</sup> This process is particularly visible in regard to the Latin cities Aricia, Nomentum, Pedum, Tusculum and Lanuvium which were incorporated into the Roman community in 338. Pedum and Nomentum ceased to exist as urban centers in a very short time. Tusculum in effect became an affluent suburb of Rome with most of its elites focusing their attention on politics in Rome. In Lanuvium the central cult of Iuno Sospita was dominated by the Roman magistrates in what might be termed a hostile takeover. Helm 2022, 237-258.

<sup>44</sup> Linke 2011, 48-50.

## 2.1 Local government tasks I – *Tributum*

Taxes had become integral to Roman expansion fairly early and recent research has swung back in favor of dating the introduction of the *tributum* and *stipendium* to the end of the 5<sup>th</sup> century in line with the literary evidence.<sup>45</sup> Although the levy of the *tributum* could have been organized by magistrates based in Rome, this practice seems to have been delegated to the little known *tribuni aerarii*. It has been suggested that these mainly consisted of wealthier landowners who would be familiar with the local conditions and could therefore be relied on to levy and forward the *tributum*.<sup>46</sup> Although this might seem to have been an onerous task from a modern perspective, we should also keep in mind that the performance of these duties offered the potential to increase social prestige within one's own district and to cultivate contacts with the central Roman magistrates and elites in Rome. Furthermore, Nathan Rosenstein has shown that the regular expansion of Roman territory and its citizen body would have successively lessened the burden of *tributum* on the individual citizen. The conquest and incorporation of Veii within 10 years of the inception of the war-tax and its eventual abolition after the Third Macedonian War are cases in point.<sup>47</sup> Steady decreases in the amount of the individual *tributum*, often within a lifetime, can therefore be expected to have eased opposition against taxation and in turn increased the readiness of local elites to take on the task. This system was easily replicated in the new areas of the *ager Romanus*, and there is no reason to expect resistance to its execution when the new settlers owed their new property to the successfully conducted wars and probably also to initial material support of the community in setting up their new economic existence.<sup>48</sup>

By leaving the levy of the *tributum* to local communities and representatives, the system also remained flexible and less likely to produce organized resistance to requests by the political center. An instructive example for the greater resistance that politically-independent communities were capable of is provided by the case of the 12 *coloniae Latinae* which in 209 refused to contribute any more troops and cash to the costly struggle of the Second Punic War.<sup>49</sup>

## 2.2 Local government tasks II – Soldiers

The interaction and relation between the powerful urban center of the *urbs* and the subsidiary organization and local administration of the rural districts is also reflected in the Roman practice of levying troops. In the 5<sup>th</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> century BC, the men of military age would assemble in Rome for the *dilectus* but by the 3<sup>rd</sup> century at the latest, the system seems to have become more decentralized with the rural districts sending their military contributions to a point of assembly.<sup>50</sup> Nevertheless, Polybius places special emphasis on the fact that the

---

<sup>45</sup> Liv. 4.59.11; Diod. 14.16.5; Plut. *Cam.* 2. Tan 2019, 53-54 with an overview of the debate.

<sup>46</sup> Nicolet 1976, 46-55 indicated that the state eventually relied upon the *tribuni aerarii*, s.a. Tan 2019, 54. A recent and full discussion is provided by Pearson 2021, 111-119.

<sup>47</sup> Rosenstein 2016, 84-97.

<sup>48</sup> Taylor 2013, 184-315 also draws attention to the fact that the new *tribus* consistently display evidence for the settlement of members of the large Roman *gentes*, suggesting that the newly settled areas were swiftly connected to the existing web of personal relationships and *clientelae*.

<sup>49</sup> Liv. 27.7.7-11.6, 29.15.

<sup>50</sup> On the decentralized *dilectus* see Gargola 2017, 105-118.

Roman legions consciously broke up regional cohesion by mixing the recruits from different *tribus*.<sup>51</sup> In consequence, local structures were responsible for forwarding troops, maybe under the direction of local elites serving in the cavalry or *triarii*, but these were then immediately distributed among different *centuriae* and the various lines of the *triplex acies*. Although the legions thus gave up the morale advantage of a shared regional background, they in turn created a non-regional sense of identity based on the shared social background of the soldiers in each *centuria* and above all on their common Roman citizenship.<sup>52</sup> In this regard, Roman military practice contrasts starkly with the organization of allied troops, which were marshalled in cohorts with a common regional background.

The organization of Roman units thus avoided local and regional identities in favor of a larger identity based on the shared citizenship of the soldiers that reached its ultimate idealization in the ritual of the triumph. The *pompa triumphalis* did not only present the victorious army and its spoils to the people of Rome but also introduced citizen-soldiers from distant rural areas to the *urbs Roma*, all the while showering them with praise and rewards for their service.

### 2.3 Local government and central authority

The raising of taxes and troops demonstrates that the rural districts of the *ager Romanus* were connected and of crucial importance to the center of decision-making in Rome. At the same time, the curious lack of larger Roman citizen communities demonstrates that this relation could apparently operate without intermediary administrative tiers. Instead, the numerous *fora et conciliabula civium Romanorum* managed their affairs in a largely autonomous fashion. A clue to their nature is provided by the larger *municipia*, which organized market days, court days, and festivals autonomously. The same will have been true for the *fora et conciliabula*, though on a much smaller and modest level.<sup>53</sup> Local elites will have played a central role in arranging and in many ways financing some of these events, thereby legitimating their elevated status in the area.<sup>54</sup>

The relation between the center of Rome and the rural districts seems to have been one of benign neglect unless a major infrastructure projects, mostly roadbuilding, was undertaken in the region. The light tax burden and military service will rarely have given cause for much if any resentment, especially when service in the legions and military success opened up opportunities for social advancement and individual enrichment.<sup>55</sup> In the latter context, it should also be noted that the Roman central authorities succeeded in keeping depredations from the *ager Romanus* in Italy after the Samnite Wars with the exception of Hannibal and barbarian incursions into Gallia Cisalpina. This security was also extended to citizens and elites alike in regard to their legal and political status, which was ultimately

---

<sup>51</sup> Pol. 6.20.

<sup>52</sup> First pointed out by Jehne 2006, 250-258, s.a. Rosenstein 2012, 93-103 and Helm 2019, 110-114.

<sup>53</sup> Galsterer 1976, 25-36. The often-claimed preference of the Roman authorities for self-government is not evident before the 2<sup>nd</sup> century and is in large parts based on examples from the period after the Social War, which fundamentally changed the character of the *ager Romanus* and of the Roman population.

<sup>54</sup> Forum Appii is a perfect example in this regard.

<sup>55</sup> Helm 2019, 105-109 with references.

guaranteed by the whole *populus* and safeguarded by the assemblies in Rome.<sup>56</sup> There was thus simply no need and probably also little incentive and time for the yearly elected Roman officials to become active in the countryside unless requests to do so were issued. In this context, the notorious case of Buxentum and Sipontum, two *coloniae civium Romanorum* founded in 194 and discovered to have been abandoned in 186, loses much of its significance since their local communities of 300 colonists each had simply decided to try their luck somewhere else, which further supports the idea that the citizens' connection to Rome was of greater importance than their local affiliation to a specific Roman settlement.<sup>57</sup>

### 3. The basis for Roman local governance

Central to understanding this arrangement is the Roman notion of the *res publica*. Following the Samnite Wars there remained little reason for the Roman center to interfere in local affairs as the yearly elected magistrates were fully occupied with expanding and managing the burgeoning Roman sphere of influence. Pfeilschifter has convincingly argued that the knowledge of events and conditions in far away or remote areas, especially those sidelined by the major *viae publicae*, was at best hazy and that the interest of the Roman authorities in them was limited in the first place.<sup>58</sup> While certainly correct in regard to the *socii* and *Latini* in Italy, the issue seems more complicated in regard to the tens of thousands of Roman citizens spread out over Italy. At the very least, it was necessary to maintain a network for the mobilization of troops and for the mobilization of the voters of the *prima classis*, which played such an important role in the annual elections. On the opposite side, Roman citizens in the rural countryside might have displayed a remarkable lack of political demands, apart from continuing the regular distribution of land to the less fortunate parts of the *populus*, however this should not be seen as political apathy. It instead reflects the contentment of the majority of the citizen body after the successful legislation of the Early Republic.<sup>59</sup> This long struggle had enshrined the right of *provocatio*, abolished the *nexum*, reigned in usury, and acknowledged the binding legal power of the plebeian assemblies as well as equal political rights of all citizens. It is a testimony to the long-lasting impact of these early laws that no comparable legislative activity was seen after the *lex Hortensia* until the Gracchi.<sup>60</sup>

This crucial early republican package of legislation coincided with the first waves of Roman expansion and might explain the Roman reluctance to create potent settlements of *cives Romani*. Such settlements would have required their own apparatus of magistrates which would in turn have raised the question of their position within the wider hierarchy of the republican offices. For the officials in Rome, this held the potential of local representatives articulating specific local demands, which would have varied drastically from the deliberation processes in the Roman assemblies, which (in theory) brought together the whole *populus* to deal with questions affecting the entirety of the citizen body. The strong Roman aversion to such a concept, in effect a federalization of the *ager Romanus*, is reflected by the outrage of Roman authors in regard to turncoat citizens, most notably early Roman

---

<sup>56</sup> Eich/Eich 2005, 10-14 speak of the Republic as a protection selling empire, similarly Cornell 1995, 364-368; Armstrong 2016, 286-289.

<sup>57</sup> Linke 2011, 50.

<sup>58</sup> Pfeilschifter 2006.

<sup>59</sup> Cornell 1995, 377-385; Hölkeskamp 2011, 199-203.

<sup>60</sup> Linke 2011, 51-58.

colonial enterprises in the fifth century and Capua, and the devastating rebuke delivered by Fabius Maximus Verrucosus to Spurius Carvilius' proposal of incorporating the Latin colonies into the *res publica* to offset the losses suffered at Cannae.<sup>61</sup> Introducing intermediate levels of administration would not only have clashed with the primacy of the city of Rome and its institutions, it would also have introduced visible hierarchies in the rural districts that had the potential to interfere with the freedom of the individual citizen by claiming authority over them.<sup>62</sup> The importance and prevalence of latent tensions between the state and the autonomous structures of the Roman family in form of the absolute authority of the *pater familias* are superbly captured by the prominent and intensely memorized the youthful years of T. Manlius Torquatus.<sup>63</sup>

Consequently, the *fora et conciliabula* featured official positions for conducting administrative, judicial, and religious tasks, but their position was extremely weak since their authority did not rely on any official grant of temporary powers by the *populus* but solely on the local community, whose members could in theory ignore any instructions given. Due to this lack of legal authority, local officials will have derived a lot of their practical power from the personal authority of the office holders, which were in all likelihood recruited from local elites. Assuming these responsibilities will, on the one hand, have advanced one's standing and influence in the community, and on the other hand, allowed to engage in the wider elite networks of the Republic.<sup>64</sup> It might even be hypothesized that the discharge of such local assignments was a necessary prerequisite for ambitious individuals and families if they aspired to gain access to the political arena. After all, the Roman elite was characterized by a stable inner circle, the nobility, but it also featured a steady influx of new families. These *homines novi* must have somehow made their way into the inner circle of the Roman elite and some of them will certainly have originated from powerful families settled in the *ager Romanus*. We know that a large part of these owed their rise to marriages and alliances with already influential families, but the question remains how these contacts were established in the first place.<sup>65</sup> Engaging in local governance and managing the regular requests by the central authorities in Rome might have provided the necessary opportunities and contacts to build up connections next to outstanding military service and the lobbying of support in private elite networks.

#### 4. Conclusion

Local governance formed a crucial component in the organization and control of Roman Italy. However, it is necessary to acknowledge the deliberate limitations that the Roman center placed on the administrative structures of its rural districts and to contextualize these

---

<sup>61</sup> Liv. 23.22.4-9.

<sup>62</sup> This power was limited to *consules* and *praetores*, who will have spent practically no time in the rural areas. The case of Sp. Postumius Albinus and Q. Marcius Philippus in 186 is a rare exception caused by the hysteria over the Bacchanalia scandal, Liv. 39.3-19, Val. Max. 6.7.3. Cf. Pfeilschifter 2006, 135.

<sup>63</sup> The youth had threatened a *tribunus plebis*, despite the fact that the latter had taken action against the extraordinarily harsh treatment of the young Manlius by his father. Cic. *off.* 3.112, Liv. 7.5, Val. Max. 5.4.3, Sen. *benef.* 3.37.4, Vir. ill. 28.1-2. Linke 2014, 82-86

<sup>64</sup> Pfeilschifter 2007 has succinctly shown this for the allied troops.

<sup>65</sup> The rise of Italian elites has been widely acknowledged, see for example Beck 2015, 61-7 and Terrenato 2019, *passim*. However, we are less well informed about the ways in which Roman elites living in the *ager Romanus* might have advanced into the nobility. Cf. Beck 2005, 188-191 on M'. Curius Dentatus.

with the wider civic ideals and concepts of the *res publica*. Viewed from this perspective, it has been demonstrated that most of the urban centers in or near the *tribus* were of no importance in political terms, due to their lack of full Roman citizenship. Those settlements that had achieved the full franchise either decayed due to their proximity to Rome or they were turned into *praefecturae*, which resulted in the oversight if not control of their local civic structures.

This picture of the *tribus* makes sense when we consider the autonomous structures of the Roman *familia* and the discourse of our Roman sources on the ideal relationship between the citizen and the state, which clearly favors a 'small government'-model and a minimum of interference with the everyday affairs of the *cives Romani*. The subsidiary organization of the *ager Romanus* guaranteed and further entrenched this ideal of independent citizens who organized their own affairs at a very low degree of administrative intensity and were only beholden to the few elected magistrates of the *populus Romanus*. Paradoxically, the shallow institutional penetration of the Roman territory in turn guaranteed the primacy and authority of the *urbs* and its central political institutions, which were also the safeguard of the status quo in the rural districts. The desire to maintain and defend this delicate equilibrium between a weak state with a strong executive and a citizen body accustomed to a wide scope of individual autonomy allowed for the mobilization of overwhelming resources in times of crisis and the eschewal of any elaborate bureaucracy. In this sense, the *res publica Romana* indeed constituted a grassroots empire.

MARIAN HELM  
HELM@UNI-MUNSTER.DE  
WESTFÄLISCHE WILHELMS-UNIVERSITÄT MÜNSTER

## Bibliography

- Armstrong 2016 = Armstrong, Jeremy: War and Society in Early Rome. From Warlords to Generals, Cambridge 2016.
- Armstrong/Fronza 2019 = Armstrong, Jeremy / Fronza, Michael (eds.): Romans at War. Soldiers, Citizens, and Society in the Roman Republic, London – New York 2019.
- Beck 2005 = Beck, Hans: Karriere und Hierarchie. Die römische Aristokratie und die Anfänge des cursus honorum in der mittleren Republik, Berlin 2005.
- Beck 2015 = Beck, Hans: Beyond 'foreign clientelae' and 'foreign clans': some remarks on the intermarriage between Roman and Italian elites, in: Jehne, Martin / Pina Polo, Francisco (eds.): Foreign "clientelae" in the Roman Empire. A reconsideration, Stuttgart 2015, 57-72.
- Beck 2016 = Beck, Hans: Wealth, power, and class coherence: the ambitus legislation of the 180s B.C., in: Beck, Hans / Jehne, Martin / Serrati, John (eds.): Money and Power in the Roman Republic, (Collection Latomus Volume 355) Brussels 2016, 131-152.
- Boos 2011 = Boos, Marion: Heiligtümer römischer Bürgerkolonien. Archäologische Untersuchungen zur sakralen Ausstattung republikanischer coloniae civium Romanorum, (Internationale Archäologie 119), Rahden/Westf. 2011.
- Bourdin 2012 = Bourdin, Stéphane: Les peuples de l'Italie préromaine identités, territoires et relations inter-ethniques en Italie centrale et septentrionale (VIIIe-Ier s. av. J.-C.), Rome 2012.

- Bradley 2020 = Bradley, Guy: Early Rome to 290 BC. The Beginnings of the City and the Rise of the Republic, Edinburgh 2020.
- Bradley/Farney 2018 = Bradley, Guy / Farney, Gary (eds.): The Peoples of Ancient Italy, Boston – Berlin 2018.
- Brunt 1998 = Brunt, Peter: Italian Manpower 225 BC – AD 14, Oxford 1971 [Repr. 1998].
- Bruun 2000 = Bruun, Christer: „What every man in the street used to know”. M. Furius Camillus, Italic legends and Roman historiography, in: Bruun, Christer (ed.): The Roman Middle Republic. Politics, religion and historiography, c. 400-133 B.C. Papers from a conference at the Institutum Romanum Finlandiae, Sept. 11-12, 1998. (Acta Instituti Romani Finlandiae 23), Rome 2000, 41-68.
- Cooley 2016 = Cooley, Alison (ed.): A Companion to Roman Italy, Malden MA - Oxford 2016.
- Cornell 1995 = Cornell, Tim: The Beginnings of Rome. Italy and Rome from the Bronze Age to the Punic Wars (c. 1000-264 B.C.), London – New York 1995.
- De Haas 2011 = de Haas, Tymon: Fields, Farms and Colonists. Intensive Field Survey and Early Roman Colonization in the Pontine Region, Central Italy, 2 Volumes, Groningen 2011.
- Develin 1985 = Develin, Robert: The practice of politics at Rome 366-167 B.C., Brussels 1985.
- Di Giuseppe 2012 = Cascino, Roberta / Di Giuseppe, Helga / Patterson, Helen (eds.): Veii: the historical topography of the ancient city: a restudy of John Ward-Perkins's survey, London 2012.
- Eckstein 2006 = Eckstein, Arthur M.: Mediterranean anarchy, interstate war, and the rise of Rome, Berkeley 2006.
- Eich/Eich 2005 = Eich, Armin / Eich, Peter: War and State-Building in Roman Republican Times, in: Scripta Classica Israelica 24 (2005), 1-33.
- Elster 2003 = Elster, Marianne: Die Gesetze der mittleren römischen Republik. Text und Kommentar, Darmstadt 2003.
- Farney 2019 = Farney, Gary: Forum Novum and the Limits of Roman Colonization in Italy, in: De Giorgi, Andrea (ed.): Cosa and the Colonial Landscape of Republican Italy (Third and Second Centuries BCE), Ann Arbor 2019, 159-181.
- Farney/Maschi 2018 = Farney, Gary / Maschi, Giulia: The Sabines, in: Bradley/Farney 2018, 543-558.
- Forsythe 2005 = Forsythe, Gary: A critical history of early Rome. From prehistory to the First Punic War, Berkeley 2005.
- Frederiksen 1984 = Frederiksen, Martin: Campania, edited by Nicholas Purcell, London 1984.
- Fronda 2010 = Fronda, Michael: Between Rome and Carthage. Southern Italy during the Second Punic War, Cambridge 2010.
- Gaffney/Patterson/Roberts 2001 = Gaffney, Vince / Patterson, Helen / Roberts, Paul: Forum Novum – Vescovio: studying urbanism in the Tiber Valley, in: JRA 14 (2001), 59-79.
- Gaffney/Patterson/Roberts 2004 = Gaffney, Vince / Patterson, Helen / Roberts, Paul: Forum Novum (Vescovio): a new study of the town and the bishopric, in: Patterson, Helen (ed.): Bridging the Tiber: approaches to regional archaeology in the Middle Tiber, (Archaeological Monograph of the British School at Rome 13) London 2004, 237-251.

- Gallo 2018 = Gallo, Annarosa: Prefetti del pretore e prefetture. L'organizzazione dell'agro romano in Italia (IV-I sec. a.C.), (Documenti e Studi 68), Bari 2018.
- Galsterer 1976 = Galsterer, Hartmut: Herrschaft und Verwaltung im republikanischen Italien. Die Beziehungen Roms zu den italischen Gemeinden vom Latinerfrieden 338 v. Chr. bis zum Bundesgenossenkrieg 91 v. Chr., (Münchener Beiträge zur Papyrusforschung und antiken Rechtsgeschichte 68) Munich 1976.
- Gargola 2017 = Gargola, Daniel: The Shape of the Roman Order. The Republic and its Spaces, Chapel Hill 2017.
- Grossmann 2009 = Grossmann, Lukas: Roms Samnitenkriege. Historische und historiographische Untersuchungen zu den Jahren 327-290 v. Chr., Düsseldorf 2009.
- Hackl 1972 = Hackl, Ursula: Das Ende der römischen Tribusgründungen 241 v. Chr., in: Chiron 2 (1972), 135-170.
- Hantos 1983 = Hantos, Theodora: Das römische Bundesgenossensystem in Italien, (Vestigia 34) Munich 1983.
- Hantos 2003 = Hantos, Theodora: Über die Entstehung der Herrschaft am Beispiel der Praefecti socium im römisch-republikanischen Heer, in: Hantos, Theodora (ed.): Laurea internationalis: Festschrift für Jochen Bleicken zum 75. Geburtstag, Stuttgart 2003, 313-330.
- Hartmann 2010 = Hartmann, Andreas: Zwischen Relikt und Reliquie. Objektbezogene Erinnerungspraktiken in antiken Gesellschaften, (Studien zur Alten Geschichte 11) Berlin 2010.
- Häussler 2013 = Häussler, Ralph: Becoming Roman? Diverging Identities and Experiences in Ancient Northwest Italy, Walnut Creek 2013.
- Heineberg 2017 = Heineberg, Heinz: Stadtgeographie, Paderborn 2017<sup>5</sup>.
- Helm 2019 = Helm, Marian: Poor man's war – rich man's fight: military integration in Republican Rome, in: Armstrong/Fronza 2019, 99-115.
- Helm 2022 = Helm, Marian: Kampf um Mittelitalien. Roms ungerader Weg zur Großmacht, Stuttgart 2022.
- Hermon 2001 = Hermon, Ella: Habiter et partager les terres avant les Gracques, Paris 2001.
- Hopkins 2016 = Hopkins, John: The Genesis of Roman Architecture. New Haven – London 2016.
- Hölkeskamp 2011 = Hölkeskamp, Karl-Joachim: Die Entstehung der Nobilität. Studien zur sozialen und politischen Geschichte der Römischen Republik im 4. Jh. v. Chr., Stuttgart 2011<sup>2</sup>.
- Humbert 1978 = Humbert, Michel: Municipium et civitas sine suffragio. L'organisation de la conquête jusqu'à la guerre sociale, (Collection de L'École française de Rome 36) Rome 1978.
- Humm 2006 = Humm, Michel: Tribus et citoyenneté: extension de la citoyenneté romaine et expansion territoriale, in: Jehne/Pfeilschifter 2006, 39-64.

- Jehne 2006 = Jehne, Martin: Römer, Latiner und Bundesgenossen im Krieg. Zu Formen und Ausmaß der Integration in der republikanischen Armee, in: Jehne / Pfeilschifter 2006, 243-267.
- Jehne/Pfeilschifter 2006 = Jehne, Martin / Pfeilschifter, Rene (eds.): Herrschaft ohne Integration? Rom und Italien in republikanischer Zeit, (Studien zur Alten Geschichte 4) Frankfurt a.M. 2006.
- Johnston/Mogetta 2020 = Johnston, Andrew / Mogetta, Marcello: Debating Early Republican Urbanism in Latium Vetus: The Town Planning of Gabii, between Archaeology and History, in: JRS 110 (2020), 1-31.
- Kolb 2002 = Kolb, Frank: Rom. Die Geschichte der Stadt in der Antike, Munich 2002<sup>2</sup>.
- Linke 2010 = Linke, Bernhard: Zwischen Republik und Monarchie. Roms langer Weg zum republikanischen Gleichgewicht, in: Linke, Bernhard / Meier, Mischa / Strothmann, Meret (eds.): Zwischen Monarchie und Republik. Gesellschaftliche Stabilisierungsleistungen und politische Transformationspotentiale in den antiken Stadtstaaten, (Historia Einzelschriften 217) Stuttgart 2010, 117-142.
- Linke 2011 = Linke, Bernhard: Die unfassbare Republik: Idealstaatsvorstellungen der Römer, in: Niggemann, Ulrich / Ruffing, Kai (eds.): Antike als Modell in Nordamerika? Konstruktion und Verargumentierung, 1763-1809, Munich 2011 (HZ Beih. 55), 37-64.
- Linke 2014 = Linke, Bernhard: Die Väter und der Staat. Die Grundlagen der aggressiven Subsidiarität in der römischen Gesellschaft, in: Lundgreen, Christoph (ed.): Staatlichkeit in Rom? Diskurse und Praxis (in) der römischen Republik, (Staatsdiskurse 28) Stuttgart 2014, 65-90.
- Menozzi/Acconzia 2018 = Oliva Menozzi, Oliva / Acconcia, Valeria: The Vestini, in: Bradley/Farney 2018, 519-542.
- Moltesen/Brandt 1994 = Moltesen, Mette / Brandt, Rasmus: Excavation at La Giostra. A Mid-Republican Fortress outside Rome, Rome 1994.
- Mouritsen 2007 = Mouritsen, Henrik: The *civitas sine suffragio*: Ancient Concepts and Modern Ideology, in: Historia 56 (2007), 141-158.
- Mouritsen 2017 = Mouritsen, Henrik: Politics in the Roman Republic, Cambridge 2017.
- Nicolet 1976 = Nicolet, Claude: Tributum. Recherches sur la fiscalité directe à l'époque républicaine, Bonn 1976.
- Oakley 1997 = Oakley, Stephen: A Commentary on Livy, Books VI-X. Volume I: Introduction and book VI, Oxford 1997.
- Oakley 1998 = Oakley, Stephen: A commentary on Livy, Books VI - X. Volume II: Books VII-VIII, Oxford 1998. Pearson 2021 = Pearson, Elizabeth: Exploring the Mid-Republican Origins of Roman Military Administration. With Stylus and Spear, London – New York 2021.
- Pfeilschifter 2006 = Pfeilschifter, Rene: How is the Empire? Roms Wissen um Italien im dritten und zweiten Jahrhundert v. Chr., in: Jehne/Pfeilschifter 2006, 111-137.
- Pfeilschifter 2007 = Pfeilschifter, Rene: The Allies in the Republican Army and the Romanization of Italy, in: Roth, Roman / Keller, Johannes (eds.): Roman by Integration. Dimensions of Group Identity in Material Culture and Text, (JRA Suppl. 66) Portsmouth 2007, 27-42.

- Richardson 2012 = Richardson, James: *The Fabii and the Gauls: studies in historical thought and historiography in Republican Rome*, Stuttgart 2012.
- Rieger 2007 = Rieger, Michael: *Tribus und Stadt: Die Entstehung der römischen Wahlbezirke im urbanen und mediterranen Kontext (ca. 750 – 450 v. Chr.)*, Göttingen 2007.
- Rosenstein 2012 = Rosenstein, Nathan: *Integration and Armies in the Middle Republic*, in: Roselaar 2012, 85-104.
- Rosenstein 2016 = Rosenstein, Nathan: *Tributum*, in: Armstrong, Jeremy (ed.): *Circum Mare: Themes in Ancient Warfare*, Leiden – Boston 2016, 80-98.
- Roselaar 2009 = Roselaar, Saskia: *Assidui or proletarii? Property in Roman Citizen Colonies and the vacatio militiae*, in: *Mnemosyne* 62 (2009), 609-623
- Roselaar 2010 = Roselaar, Saskia: *Public Land in the Roman Republic*, Oxford 2010.
- Roselaar 2012 = Roselaar, Saskia (ed.): *Processes of integration and identity formation in the Roman Republic*, Leiden 2012.
- Roselaar 2019 = Roselaar, Saskia: *Italy's economic revolution: integration and economy in Republican Italy*, Oxford 2019.
- Schultz 2006 = Schultz, Celia: *Juno Sospita and Roman insecurity in the Social War*, in: Harvey, Paul / Schultz, Celia (eds.): *Religion in Republican Italy*, Cambridge 2006, 207-227.
- Sisani 2011 = Sisani, Simone: *In pagis forisque et conciliabulis: le strutture amministrative dei distretti rurali in Italia tra la Media Repubblica e l'età municipale*, Rome 2011.
- Tan 2019 = Tan, James: *The dilectus-tributum system and the settlement of fourth century Italy*, in: Armstrong/Fronza 2019, 52-75.
- Taylor 2013 = Taylor, Lily Ross: *The Voting Districts of the Roman Republic. The 35 Urban and Rural Tribes*, repr. of the 1960 edition with updated material by Jerzy Linderski, Ann Arbor 2013.
- Terrenato 2019 = Terrenato, Nicola: *The Early Roman Expansion into Italy. Elite Negotiation and Family Agendas*, Cambridge 2019.
- Toynbee 1965 = Toynbee, Arnold: *Hannibal's Legacy*, 2 vols., London 1965.
- Ungern-Sternberg 2006 = Ungern-Sternberg, Jürgen von: *Die Wahrnehmung des 'Ständekampfes' in der römischen Geschichtsschreibung*, in: Ders. (ed.): *Römische Studien: Geschichtsbewusstsein - Zeitalter der Gracchen - Krise der Republik*, Munich 2006, 170-180.
- Walter 2000 = Walter, Uwe: *Marcus Furius Camillus – die schattenhafte Lichtgestalt*, in: Hölkeskamp, Karl-Joachim / Stein-Hölkeskamp, Elke (eds.): *Von Romulus zu Augustus. Große Gestalten der römischen Republik*, Munich 2000, 58-68.
- Walter 2017 = Walter, Uwe: *Politische Ordnung in der römischen Republik*, (Enzyklopädie der griechisch-römischen Antike 6) Berlin – Boston 2017.