

Privatizing Power in the Late Roman Republic: The Case of L. Licinius Lucullus

Alyson Roy

Abstract: The late Roman Republic witnessed the consolidation of power in the hands of individual aristocrats. Simultaneously, wealthy Roman elites increasingly conveyed social status through domestic spectacle – that is, the decoration, aesthetics, and entertainment functions within their homes and villas. These two developments were explicitly linked. As traditional paths to power became less accessible, Roman elites frequently enhanced their power through alternative means. Domestic spectacle offered potent opportunities both for solidifying electoral support and for forming, and maintaining, political relationships. Using L. Licinius Lucullus (cos. 74 BCE) as a case study, this paper traces how private display and conspicuous consumption became integral to elite identity, offering complementary paths to power that ultimately broadened access to political authority.

Keywords: consumerism; prestige; villas; banquets; cultural capital; conspicuous consumption

In his description of Marcellus' ovation of 211 BCE, the Roman historian Livy identified three important elements of a process that came to define elite Roman prestige in the late Republican period (c.100-44 BCE): the seizure of luxury goods during conquest, the parading of war booty in the city of Rome, and the public display of those spoils within the city.¹ The catalyst for this process was the triumphal parade, a ritual procession granted to a conquering general at the behest of the Senate.² The triumphal parade lauded a general's military achievements and garnered him significant social capital. Its ability to enhance social status made it a foundational element of elite self-representation dating back to at least the fourth century BCE.

The allure of the triumph was undeniable, but by the second century BCE, Roman elites faced a problem: the more they conquered, the more opportunities there were for triumphs, which diluted the cultural capital of any individual parade.³ The influx of Hellenistic booty in the second century BCE in particular saturated the triumphal "market" and yielded a shift in how elite Romans visually conveyed their prestige.⁴ As both ancient and modern writers have noted, Rome's Hellenistic wars introduced a thirst for art among Roman elites and

¹ Livy 25.40.1; 26.21.6-9.

² That Marcellus' parade was not a triumph, but rather the lesser honor of an ovation, is particularly interesting in light of the increasing shift toward domestic spectacle as a source of prestige, in that Marcellus, denied a triumph, held a full, unofficial, triumph on the Alban Mount the day before his ovation and was purportedly the first to decorate his home with some of his plunder (Livy 26.21.6). See also Welch 2006.

³ For more on the expected qualifications for a triumph, see Lundgreen 2014.

⁴ Welch (2006) rooted the development of a "booty" mentality in the second century BCE.

fundamentally changed Roman iconography.⁵ As art and display became a source of prestige, the performance of elite power expanded to include the domestic sphere, where the display of luxury materials became its own form of cultural capital.

The marriage of elite self-expression and domestic display helped privatize triumphal prestige. Commissioning or owning conquest imagery could substitute for the triumph as an expression of social achievement, making wealth an important foundation for the performance of power. This shift provided both a potential solution to the social pressures facing Roman elites in the second and first centuries BCE to achieve political advancement, and yet also created further difficulties.

Once conquest became commodified, elites were no longer restricted by the geographic and class limitations that the triumph once imposed. As expressions of power became rooted in wealth and display, Roman style cultural capital became accessible including to elites outside Italy, for whom office-holding in Rome was not a feasible option for denoting status.⁶ The intense wave of monumental self-expression that spread across the empire in the first centuries BCE and CE stemmed in part from the growing commensuration between prestige and conspicuous consumption.⁷ As such, private display became another integral element of elite identity, offering divergent paths up the *cursus honorum* that ultimately broadened access to political authority.

Conspicuous consumption was not, however, a new or even purely Roman form of self-expression. Many Mediterranean elite cultures revolved around various forms of ostentatious display, from banqueting to funerary rites to community rituals to monumental architecture.⁹ Consequently, connoisseurship – namely, the purposeful consumption and display of luxury objects to convey wealth, aesthetic taste, and cultural knowledge – created a shared language of power.¹⁰ Indeed, the shared nature of this visual language was a critical element of its effectiveness, because it made the products widely legible to elite, as well as non-elite, viewers.¹¹

Once connoisseurship could garner prestige, elite identity increasingly centered on the ability to express social distinction through one's collecting habits and aesthetic tastes. Yet, the commodification of prestige also contributed to the problems Roman elites faced in distinguishing themselves from their peers. Roman political culture became a fraught competitive landscape in the second and first centuries BCE. As many scholars have noted, the constraints of Roman cultural values such as the *mos maiorum* placed significant pressure on elite

⁵ See Welch 2006 on war booty; Hölscher 2018 on Roman visual culture; Evans 2011 and Bounia 2004 on collecting.

⁶ The triumph could only legally take place within the city of Rome and only magistrates with *imperium* qualified. For more on the rituals and qualifications for the triumph, see contributors to Lange and Vervaeke 2014.

⁷ Wallace-Hadrill 2008: 73-143.

⁹ For more on consumerism in the ancient world, see Walsh 2014. Funerary archaeology has also revealed a lot about dining as an elite social behavior. See for example Draycott and Stamatopoulou 2016. Food and other ephemeral luxuries also reflected one's social identity; see Dalby 2000.

¹⁰ For more on the origins of the visual language of power, see Loar et al. 2018, especially the introduction and the chapter by MacDonald.

¹¹ Tronchin (2012: 267) stated: "Patrons and visitors alike needed to be fluent in the same visual language, one that spoke to the multifaceted ideals of Roman elite identity."

males not only to reach the consulship but also to do so in a way that allowed them to surpass the achievements of both their ancestors and their peers.¹³ As such, it encouraged increasingly extreme measures to achieve recognition, since that recognition needed to be public.¹⁴ Private display offered a means of enhancing one's political and social reputation outside of martial achievement, and drew political power further into the domestic sphere.¹⁵ This is not to say that collecting replaced traditional methods of performing political power; rather, it was incorporated into political culture as an additional means of earning, maintaining, and projecting power.

The integration of conspicuous consumption into elite identity is not a new field of inquiry. Two of the most frequently cited case studies are Cicero and Verres, yet it is necessary to look beyond those two case studies to other actors in order to assess how connoisseurship became first a supplement for other expressions of political power, and then ultimately a major source of cultural capital. In particular, I argue that L. Licinius Lucullus (cos. 74 BCE) deserves far greater attention in any study of how prestige-display came in the late Republic to include conspicuous consumption.¹⁶

Lucullus' oft-rebuked luxury indulgences were more than mere extravagance, however; rather, they were a performance of his political power and connections. Lucullus' methods reflect the increasing extension of political boundaries into the home. As Cristina Rosillo-López and others have noted, Roman elites relied on dinner parties for political networking and conversations.¹⁷ Yet, the harsh criticisms leveled at Lucullus, Verres, and others over their lavish tables indicates that these dinner parties frequently became a visual performance as well, through the display of luxury materials, many of which had been plundered.¹⁸ Lucullus and his peers contributed to the development of a display-based elite culture that transcended the traditional elite identity that was tied to office-holding and triumph hunting. By decentralizing military prowess as a requirement for social advancement, this new display-based elite culture further incorporated elites across the empire.

The Domestic Turn: Situating Prestige within the Domus

Rome's prestige economy has long been a subject of scholarly interest. From the second-century

¹³ For more on the cultural pressures of *mos maiorum*, see Flower 1996 and 2006.

¹⁴ Including, for example, the extrajudicial massacre of conquered peoples, such as that perpetrated by L. Licinius Lucullus (cos. 151) on the town of Cauca in 151 (App. *Ib.* 51-55; 59-60). The intricacies of Roman aristocratic competition and the relationship between military success, political power, and prestige have been explored from numerous angles in recent years. For martial elements, see Rosenstein 1990; Pittenger 2009. For non-martial approaches to public power, see Rosillo-López 2017; Steel and van der Blom 2013.

¹⁵ Tronchin (2012: 280, fn. 28) referred, for example, to the connoisseur as a "domestic triumphator."

¹⁶ For Lucullus, see RE Licinius 104.

¹⁷ Rosillo-López 2022: 39. See also Pina Polo (2023) on how villas became information hubs.

¹⁸ For example: Cic. *Verr.* 2.1.19.49-50; *Verr.* 2.4.26.62-63; *Verr.* 2.1.26.65-67. The sumptuary law limiting dinner party extravagance, and its subsequent repeal, also reflect the increasing frequency of dinner parties, and the luxury goods associated with it, as a source of prestige-display (FRL 68).

“booty mentality” and its influence on domestic display to connoisseurship, the prevailing scholarly theme has been that Roman collecting habits were fueled by aristocratic competition and the influx of foreign luxury goods into Rome via conquest.¹⁹ These two elements, as noted above, at times worked against each other, creating additional pressures on individual Roman elites who wanted to achieve recognition. I do not challenge this theme; rather, I want to build upon this excellent work in a narrower case study to examine how material culture could function as an alternative expression of power, one that could even challenge existing social expectations for elite behavior. The career of L. Licinius Lucullus is often invoked in discussing how domestic display ran afoul of normative elite social behavior. Yet, by examining Lucullus’ career and private life, and particularly the moralizing critiques of his famed retirement, within the context of a display-based elite culture, it becomes clear that Lucullus was one of those at the forefront of a remarkable shift in social practices among Roman elites.

Analysis of the privatization of prestige rests on a few key scholarly questions. First and foremost is the question of how plunder was transferred from public spaces – encapsulated by the ephemeral triumphal parade and the erection of monumental architecture – into the private sphere.²⁰ Thanks to the work of Katherine Welch, it is generally accepted that the political and military realities of the second-century BCE centralized spoliated decoration as a key element in an elite man’s projection of political power.²¹ Intertwined with this issue is the question of the social role that domestic space played in elite Roman life. As Shelley Hales and others have demonstrated, the *domus* played an active role in elite life, projecting status in multifaceted ways.²² The importance of the home as a platform for political power is evident in the numerous references to elite dinner parties sprinkled throughout Cicero’s letters, as well as in the growing size and elaboration of these elite homes in the late Republic.²³

While such questions focus mainly on the social and political aspects of domestic display, one cannot ignore the economic component.²⁴ Rome was a culture of appropriation driven by demand for both the seizure and the production of luxury goods.²⁵ The desire for foreign luxuries in the late Republic and early Empire was unprecedented, and the increasing complexity and eclecticism of domestic space underscores how rapidly the social role of domestic consumption was changing.²⁶ These changes encouraged the conspicuous display of wealth and power,

¹⁹ For the booty mentality, see Welch 2006. For collecting and connoisseurship, see Carey 2003; Bounia 2004; Rutledge 2012. For the role of luxury in connoisseurship, see Wallace-Hadrill 2008; Dalby 2000.

²⁰ As many scholars have noted, there was no hard and fast division between public and private in Roman culture. For more on this, see Wallace-Hadrill 1994 and Hales 2003.

²¹ Welch 2006.

²² Hales 2003; Tronchin (2012: 279) argued that “domestic ensembles” served as a form of autobiography for the collector. Similarly, Guy Métraux argued that houses were “active environments” (1999: 396). See also Hales 2000: 44; Pina Polo 2023; Rosillo-López 2022.

²³ For example: Cic. *De Fat.* Frag. 4; Att. 9.1.3, 13.37.2; Cic. *Ad Am.* 9.20.2, among others. The *domus* of M. Aemilius Scaurus, for example, reportedly could hold 2,000 people (Métraux 1999: 395).

²⁴ Such rapid changes necessitated the movement of artisans and specialists, many of whom came from conquered territories, throughout the empire. Flohr stressed that the demand for art “facilitated the emergence of a substantial supply economy” that provided a living for artistic specialists (2019: 101).

²⁵ Loar et al. 2018.

²⁶ Flohr 2019: 101-103; Tronchin 2012.

particularly in the form of acquiring luxury goods and hosting parties and feasts at which to exhibit one's wealth.²⁷ Such rapid changes also spawned social critique, and much of our evidence for luxury consumption in fact comes from Roman authors lamenting the extravagant prices laid down for luxury objects.²⁸ Pliny the Elder, for example called out individual Romans whom he felt overspent on luxury goods simply to advertise their wealth and taste.²⁹

These critiques indicate that aggressive appropriation was not uncommon.³⁰ Gaius Verres' obsessive focus on collecting, to the point of coercing locals to acquire desired pieces, was an extreme example of the growing elite trend toward collecting and displaying luxury items that referenced those that entered the city via the triumphal parade.³¹ In a similar vein, Plutarch stressed that many of those killed during Sulla's proscriptions died for their property, which included their art:

Only a tiny portion of the dead were killed because they had angered or made an enemy of someone; far more were killed for their property, and even the executioners tended to say that this man was killed by his large house, this one by his garden, that one by his warm springs. Quintus Aurelius, a man who had never played any part in public life, thought that the sympathy he felt for others' misfortunes would be the only effect the troubles would have on him. One day he went to the forum and read the list of proscribed men. Finding his own name there, he said, 'Alas, I am undone! My Alban estate wants to see me dead.'

ἦσαν δὲ οἱ δι' ὀργὴν ἀπολλύμενοι καὶ δι' ἔχθραν οὐδὲν μέρος τῶν διὰ χρήματα σφαττομένων, ἀλλὰ καὶ λέγειν ἐπῆει τοῖς κολάζουσιν ὡς τόνδε μὲν ἀνήρηκεν οἰκία μεγάλη, τόνδε δὲ κῆπος, ἄλλον ὕδατα θερμά. Κόϊντος δὲ Αὐρήλιος, ἀνὴρ ἀπράγμων καὶ τοσοῦτον αὐτῷ μετεῖναι τῶν κακῶν νομίζων ὅσον ἄλλοις συναλγεῖν ἀτυχοῦσιν, εἰς ἀγορὰν ἐλθὼν ἀνεγίνωσκε τοὺς προγεγραμμένους εὐρὼν δὲ ἑαυτόν, "Οἷμοι τάλας," εἶπε, "διώκει με τὸ ἐν Ἀλβανῷ χωρίον." καὶ βραχὺ προελθὼν ὑπὸ τινος ἀπεσφάγη καταδιώξαντος.³²

Verres would himself ultimately fall victim to the extremes of connoisseurship. Marc Antony proscribed Verres and then tracked him down in Massalia (Marseilles) to get his hands on Verres' Corinthian bronzes.³³ Roman literary discourse on luxury consumption emphasized

²⁷ Dalby 2000.

²⁸ See Wallace-Hadrill 2008: 315-355.

²⁹ Examples: C. Gracchus purchased two silver dolphin figurines for 5,000 sesterces (Pliny *HN* 33.147). L. Crassus purchased a pair of chased silver goblets by the artist Mentor for 100,000 sesterces (*HN* 33.147) and purchased other vessels for 6,000 sesterces per pound (*HN* 33.147). The heirs of L. Crassus sold bronze dinner couches (*HN* 34.8), suggesting that he had likely purchased some at an earlier date. P. Lentulus Spinther owned onyx wine jars, though it is unclear if he purchased or looted them (*HN* 36.12). Varro owned a marble group of winged Cupids playing with a lioness by Arcesilaus (*HN* 36.4). Caesar purchased a pearl for Servilia (Suet. *Caes.* 50.2). See also Rutledge 2012: 57-8.

³⁰ Miles 2008: 105-151.

³¹ See fn. 17. For more on Verres and Cicero's prosecution of him, see Miles 2008: 105-151.

³² Plut. *Sulla* 31.5-6, translated by Robin Waterfield. Sallust also noted that some proscriptions targeted people for their wealth (*Hist.* 1.55(48) 9-11, 14-15).

³³ Pliny *HN* 34.6. Verres purportedly refused to hand over his bronzes, so Antony had one of his agents send Verres some poison in Antony's most expensive myrrhine cup. Verres drank the poison and then smashed the cup

the symbolic association with conquest inherent in these displays, underscoring that owning objects that evoked or mimicked triumphal plunder held greater social capital than ordinary prestige goods.³⁴

The popularity and utility of luxury goods drove elite Romans both to purchase and sometimes also loot Hellenistic art and luxury goods to decorate their homes. Although, after Cicero's vehement attacks on Verres' acquisitory excesses, overt interest in acquiring authentic Greek statues became problematic and connoisseurship shifted to other modes of expression.³⁵ Verres' collecting interests served as a cautionary tale rather than a successful advertisement of how art could be deployed to augment a political reputation. Unlike Verres or Cicero, who focused on collecting specific objects, Lucullus demonstrated how domestic display more broadly – from the design of one's house and gardens to the objects housed therein – could safely evoke one's status. Despite the moralizing attacks against Lucullus' behavior, he demonstrated the remarkable potential of domestic life as a source of not only social, but also political capital.

Today Lucullus Dines with Lucullus: The Career and Collection of L. Licinius Lucullus

Due in part to the rhetorical evidence from Cicero, scholars have argued that in the decades after Verres' downfall, Roman elites shifted their focus from the appropriation of Greek statuary to other forms of conspicuous consumption.³⁶ L. Licinius Lucullus and his contemporary, Q. Hortensius, have served as the main examples of this shift.³⁷ Yet, the contemporary accusations that Lucullus was more a connoisseur of pleasure and a gastronome obscure the fact that through his homes, Lucullus was crafting a subtle and ongoing performance of his triumph, marrying military and political prestige with domestic cultural capital. To illustrate this, we must examine his career and the accusations leveled against him against the backdrop of the dramatic changes – and the fear they invoked – to elite social practices in the first century BCE.

L. Licinius Lucullus was an *optimates* from a distinguished Roman family. His grandfather was consul in 151, and his father reached the praetorship. Through his mother, he was related to the powerful Metelli, including the pontifex maximus Q. Caecilius Metellus Pius, and through his own two marriages, he deepened his aristocratic connections.³⁸ Through his brother Marcus

(Pliny *HN* 34.6). Petronius' *Satyricon*, while a much later example, mocks the obsession with collecting luxury goods by having his nouveau-riche characters collect whatever they can. Petronius himself collected bowls and drinking cups and fell victim to Nero's desire for one of his myrrhine bowls; he met the same fate as Verres and likewise destroyed the bowl to spite Nero (Pliny *HN* 37.20).

³⁴ Velleius Paterculus and Pliny the Elder noted the relationship between public display, private collecting, and the triumph. Velleius Paterculus noted the triumphal connotations of importing marble for use in private homes (1.11.5), while Pliny the Elder associated new fashions with particular triumphs (ex: *HN* 34.8.14).

³⁵ Miles 2008: 218-19. Miles argued that the private collecting of antique statues waned in the decades after Verres' trial and did not become popular again until the late first century CE.

³⁶ Miles 2008: 218-226.

³⁷ We have reproving descriptions of the private collections of L. Lucullus (Varro, *Rust.* 1.2.10; Pliny *HN* 34.36; Plut. *Luc.* 39.2), Q. Hortensius (Pliny *HN* 35.130, 34.48), and M. Terentius Varro (Pliny *HN* 36.41), for example.

³⁸ Although his marriage to Clodia, the youngest of the daughters of Ap. Claudius Pulcher, brought unwanted notoriety and led to divorce (Plut. *Luc.* 34.1; 28.1). On the identification of Clodia, see McDermott 1970.

Terentius Varro Lucullus' adoption, Lucius Lucullus was also related to the family of M. Terentius Varro.³⁹ Lucullus' initial career followed traditional paths. He began a successful military career during the Social War and quickly linked his career to that of L. Cornelius Sulla, to whom he was also connected via marriage.⁴⁰ This proved a fruitful relationship for Lucullus, whose loyalty as the only officer to support Lucullus' march on Rome in 88 BCE led him as proquaestor to head diplomatic missions on Sulla's behalf, collect resources, and mint money.⁴¹ Perhaps most famously, as consul in 74, Lucullus marched through Cappadocia to invade Armenia, which was against accepted procedure since he left his province, where he achieved a significant victory at Tigranocerta that soured opinions on him back at home.⁴² Hoping to build off that victory, Lucullus returned to Rome in 66 to request a triumph.

Like most elites of his generation, Lucullus was expected to achieve distinction through his military career, particularly if he hoped to advance politically. Upon returning home, he found his request for a triumph and his organization of Asia blocked by political enemies, and, ultimately, his career stalled in the 60s just as his rival Pompey was ascendant.⁴³ At this point, Roman sources dismissed Lucullus as a man who turned to self-indulgence, abandoning his duties and career.⁴⁴ Modern historiography until recent years, with the notable exception of Arthur Keaveney, followed this rhetorical critique. As Ernst Badian stated in his *OCD* entry for Lucullus: "He now concentrated on living in refined luxury, but lapsed into insanity before his death.... [He] lacked the easy demagoguery that was needed for success in both war and politics in his day."⁴⁵ This dismissive summation encapsulates the prevailing attitude toward Lucullus' later career among his detractors.

Ancient Roman writers such as Plutarch and Cicero read Lucullus' retirement as a lapse into narcissistic self-indulgence. Scholarship has often situated the moral judgements on luxury within the context of Roman anxiety over Hellenistic cultural influence.⁴⁶ Plutarch, on the other hand, attributed Lucullus' extravagance not to his famed Hellenism, but rather more broadly to the decadence of the East, to which Lucullus' military exploits had introduced him.⁴⁷ Similarly,

³⁹ Marcus reached the consulship in 73 and as governor of Macedonia earned a triumph in 71 (MRR II 109; RE Licinius 109; Strabo 7.6.1; Plin. *HN* 4.92; 34.38). Lucius preceded his brother to the consulship, reaching it in 74 BCE. See also Pina Polo and Díaz Fernández 2019: 274-5. Lucius served as quaestor in 87 (Pina Polo and Díaz Fernández 2019: 274-75), and as praetor in Africa in 77 (Díaz Fernández 2015: 408-409; Brennan 2000: 544-545).

⁴⁰ Sulla's wife Caecilia was Lucullus' cousin (her father was L. Caecilius Metellus Dalmaticus).

⁴¹ Thonemann (2004) persuasively argued to date Lucullus' quaestorship in 87 BCE, based on the inscriptions honoring Lucullus' proquaestorship, which date to 96 (*IG* 9.2.38, 12.1.48; see also Pina Polo and Díaz Fernández 2019: 167). For Lucullus being the only officer (quaestor) to support Sulla, see Sumner 1973: 178.

⁴² The actions and career of his brother-in-law, P. Clodius Pulcher, further undermined Lucullus' reputation. For more on the vagaries of Lucullus' career, see Keaveney 1992.

⁴³ *Triumph ex Ponto de rege Mithridate et ex Armenia de rege Tigrane*. MRR II.169, Itgenshorst no. 256, Rich no. 256.

⁴⁴ Keaveney (1992: 143-165) sought to redress the general assumption that Lucullus was no longer active in public life upon his retirement and proposed that Lucullus' investment in his villas was more a reflection of aesthetic interests than decadence.

⁴⁵ *OCD* "Lucullus."

⁴⁶ See for example Gruen 1992.

⁴⁷ Tröster 2008: 27.

Cicero nicknamed Lucullus and his peers “Tritons of the fish-ponds,” or *piscinarii* (fish-fanciers), drawing attention to his Eastern influences.⁴⁸ While much of the extant evidence about Lucullus’ career is, thanks to Plutarch, cast in the light of a slow slide into decadence, reading between the lines of Plutarch’s narrative suggests that Lucullus’ actions, particularly in retirement, were not so much a rejection of duty and a turn toward excessive self-indulgence, but rather the transfer of his political interests from public activity to domestic spectacle.⁴⁹

Plutarch associated the purported shift in Lucullus’ character from admirable phil-Hellene to indulgent Eastern profligate to Lucullus’ return from the Mithridatic Wars, implying that the forced leisure of waiting three years for the Senate to vote him a triumph played a significant role in his behavior.⁵⁰ Yet, underneath the accusations that Lucullus abandoned his political duties when he chose luxury and retirement over an active political life, it is clear that Plutarch read Lucullus’ descent into barbarism as connected, at least in part, to his conquest of Tigranocerta.⁵¹ We can see threads of this influence throughout Lucullus’ post-retirement behavior that indicate the impact of his experiences in the East, but this was about more than simply embracing Hellenistic-Persian styles, particularly considering the dubious reception such influences had.

Like many of his wealthy contemporaries, Lucullus owned multiple homes, some of which he paid for out of the spoils from his Armenian campaign.⁵² We know, for example, that he purchased a hilltop villa at Cape Misenum from Sulla’s daughter Cornelia, but that he also owned at least three other villas, including the famous villa on the Pincian hill just outside Rome and his villa near Tusculum.⁵³ Plutarch explicitly linked Lucullus’ extravagant architectural designs to the East. Plutarch described the chambers and galleries of Lucullus’ villa which overlooked the sea, built from his Armenian spoils, and decorated lavishly with porticoes, paths, paintings, sculptures, curiosities, and much more.⁵⁴ Of Lucullus’ famous fishponds, Plutarch proclaimed that when the stoic Tubero saw them, he dubbed Lucullus “Xerxes in a toga,” due to the visual connection between Lucullus’ canal and the isthmus cut by Xerxes.⁵⁵ Part of Plutarch’s critique of Lucullus’ extravagance connected back to the accusations leveled against Lucullus by his mutinying soldiers. By claiming that Lucullus spent all the wealth he garnered from his eastern

⁴⁸ Miles 2008: 221.

⁴⁹ Keaveney, for example, broke down several of the more fanciful slights against Lucullus, such as that he dined like a satrap, which Keaveney suggested referred to Lucullus’ penchant for covering his couches in purple (1992: 145).

⁵⁰ Plut. *Luc.* 38.

⁵¹ Plut. *Luc.* 29.6. Plutarch repeatedly references the various spoils and luxuries that Lucullus encountered both on his travels through the East, such as in Alexandra (*Luc.* 2), and particularly as he pursued Mithridates and Tigranes. The implied shift in behavior after Lucullus’ Armenian campaign is further underscored by Lucullus’ reported frugality while on campaign, which led to some of his soldiers mutinying because they felt they were not receiving enough spoils (Plut. *Luc.* 35).

⁵² Plut. *Luc.* 39. For example, when he garnered six thousand prisoners and substantial spoils when he captured Mytilene; he likely sold these ‘assets,’ because we know he donated some money to the aerarium, as expected (Plut. *Luc.* 3.3-4.3; see also Keaveney 1992: 30-31).

⁵³ For references to Lucullus’ villas, see Plut. *Luc.* 39; Vell. Pat. 2.33; Tac. *Ann.* 12.1.

⁵⁴ Plut. *Luc.* 39-41.

⁵⁵ Plut. *Luc.* 39.3.

campaigns on constructing and decorating his various villas, Plutarch implies that none was left for Lucullus' soldiers in the wake of his triumph.⁵⁶

Plutarch's description of Lucullus' villa in Naples reflected the complicated relationship that Graeco-Roman elites had with luxury, and especially the somewhat performative distaste that many contemporary writers expressed for excessive indulgence. Indeed, Cicero used Lucullus as an example to caution moderation:

One must be careful, too, not to go beyond proper bounds in expense and display, especially if one is building for oneself. For much mischief is done in this way, if only in the example set. For many people imitate zealously the foibles of the great, particularly in this direction: for example, who copies the virtues of Lucius Lucullus, excellent man that he was? But how many there are who have copied the magnificence of his villas! Some limit should surely be set to this tendency and it should be reduced at least to a standard of moderation; and by that same standard of moderation the comforts and wants of life generally should be regulated.

*Cavendum autem est, praesertim si ipse aedifices, ne extra modum sumptu et magnificentia prodeas; quo in genere multum mali etiam in exemplo est. Studiose enim plerique praesertim in hanc partem facta principum imitantur, ut L. Luculli, summi viri, virtutem quis? at quam multi villarum magnificentiam imitati! quarum quidem certe est adhibendus modus ad mediocritatemque revocandus. Eademque mediocritas ad omnem usum cultumque vitae transferenda est.*⁵⁷

Considering the rhetoric deployed against Lucullus, it is important to consider what value such lavish indulgence might have offered Lucullus, beyond simply an opportunity to pander to his vanity, as his detractors might have claimed.

When situated within the social and political context of the 60s BCE, Lucullus' actions suggest a shift toward wealth and connoisseurship as an expression of power instead of exclusive focus on political ambition. We can see evidence for this shift in the work of contemporary writers, both those explicitly critiquing Lucullus, such as Plutarch, and those such as Sallust, who criticized those of senatorial rank in broader strokes. Sallust hinted at the obstacles that men of illustrious families faced in distinguishing themselves politically from their peers. He argued that attempting to achieve glory in battle was pointless, because the Senate would always demand more.⁵⁸ Power, he proclaimed, could be achieved with spoils.⁵⁹ Indeed, Wolfgang Blösel argued that from the second century BCE, the *plebs urbana* was increasingly disinterested in a general's military exploits unless he produced significant booty, because they were no longer conscripted into the army.⁶⁰ Wealth, therefore, and especially wealth garnered through territorial conquest, produced both the social and the actual capital

⁵⁶ Similarly, Plutarch has Lucullus demur on extending dinner invitations to his social equals at times, preferring, it seems, to entertain Greeks (Plut. Luc. 41).

⁵⁷ Cic. *De Off.* 1.140, translated by Walter Miller.

⁵⁸ Sall. *Hist.* 2.98(82).5-6.

⁵⁹ Sall. *Hist.* 3.48(34).6.

⁶⁰ Blösel 2016: 79.

required for one's reputation; and, by implication, plunder increasingly provided aesthetic value that could enhance the experience of the guest at an elite Roman's home.⁶¹ It is unsurprising, therefore, that to Sallust, elite Romans only had one desire, and that was to conquer and despoil in order to augment their wealth.⁶²

Sallust, of course, along with numerous other writers, embraced a worldview that condemned *luxus*. Roman literature is, consequently, rife with exegesis on the moral implications of *luxus*. Such critiques reflect an attempt to curb what was seen as an alarming trend toward privatizing power.⁶³ As Shelley Hales argued:

The house sucked in public achievements of the entire *gentes* but scattered out aspects of the family's life into Rome. The truly successful families of Rome were those who had got this balance and whose houses were simply the center of a nexus of communications that linked house to outside – life and death, public and private were all played out equally within and without the house.⁶⁴

Lucullus used his homes as conduits to link his personal achievements – especially his conquest and triumph – to his political and social power.⁶⁵ Thus when Lucullus' butler asked whether he needed to use his spoliated tableware when he was dining alone, Lucullus' response reflected this nexus of power: "today Lucullus dines with Lucullus."⁶⁶ His plundered tableware was a critical element of his power performance, and thus he deemed it necessary even when he was not entertaining guests.

The moralists' fixation on Lucullus' dining habits is indicative of the critical discourse on luxury. As Emanuela Zanda noted, luxury was understood metaphorically as an illness or disease, one that came from the outside, as luxury goods themselves did, and could corrupt the "body of society."⁶⁷ In that context, Lucullus' gastronomic interests, which have enduring fame even today, were doubly reflective of Lucullus's excesses. He was corrupted by his embrace of foreign luxuries, but his dining interests also made him dangerous, as they could spread corruption to others. This concern underscores how much social power Roman elites had within

⁶¹ Hans Beck argued that the rise in *ambitus* and *cursus* legislation reflected "a complex negotiation of the aristocracy's most basic ethos as a ruling elite: a negotiation that clustered around the question of the elite's most fundamental assets, and its defining traits as a status group, including the notion of the accumulation, and actual use, of symbolic and of actual capital in the pursuit of its most basic goals" (2016: 150).

⁶² Sallust indirectly tied his critique to Lucullus by writing it in Mithridates' voice and having Mithridates lament that the Romans sought to conquer him for his wealth. Sall. *Hist.* 3.48(35).27-28; Mithridates' comment: 4.69(67).5.

⁶³ As Catharine Edwards (1993) suggested, morality and moral critique were themselves expressions of power that sought to curb political ambition.

⁶⁴ Hales 2000: 53.

⁶⁵ Rosillo-López (2022) argued that face-to-face conversations were critical to Roman political networking, and that dinner parties facilitated those conversations. Lucullus' home, therefore, allowed him to continue his normal political networking.

⁶⁶ Plut. *Luc.* 41.3.

⁶⁷ Zanda 2011: 18.

their homes, enough to create genuine concern over the future of the *res publica*.⁶⁸

Such criticisms reflected contemporary concerns over the role that conspicuous consumption was coming to play in not just reflecting but creating power in Rome. Status had always been something that needed to be (re)performed and (re)acknowledged by others, and as domestic spectacle in its myriad forms became a dominant prestige-marker, it is unsurprising that elites such as Lucullus continued to perform their status even in the face of moral judgment.⁶⁹ From the late second century BCE, wealth became increasingly important in Roman politics and society, but there were also increasing attempts to curb conspicuous consumption in order to protect the political and social status quo. The well-known second-century BCE sumptuary laws reveal legal attempts to limit the privatization of power, particularly with respect to banqueting.⁷⁰ These laws were, as Emanuela Zanda articulated, “weapons of self-defence used by the Roman ruling class” to protect traditional paths to power.⁷¹ Part of the fear of private power stemmed from the fact that it was, essentially, economically wasteful because it benefited only the individual.⁷²

Seen in this light, Lucullus’ villas were less examples of extreme consumption and more a form of political behavior that was becoming increasingly common. In fact, even as Cicero criticized Lucullus’ extravagance, he also acknowledged that many imitated Lucullus’ style.⁷³ Some have argued that the second century BCE witnessed the beginning of a trend toward the “de-militarization of [the] Roman nobility” as wealth became a more important source of “growth potential” for generating political power.⁷⁴ Though, it should be noted that not everyone has agreed with Blösel’s argument for a general demilitarization of the nobility. François Cadiou, for example, persuasively argued that the demilitarization argument is a modern historiographical construct. Nevertheless, Cadiou recognized that changes in the late Republic created multiple competitive paths for advancement among the nobility.⁷⁵ Therefore, we should understand the increasing privatization of power not as a replacement of the traditional paths for social advancement, but rather one way in which the Roman nobility

⁶⁸ There is a hint of this concern in Cicero’s letter to Papirius Paetus in August 46, when he notes that he was critiqued for inviting Hirtius to dinner (*Ad Am.* 9.20.2), and in the potential impact of social criticism leveled at dinner parties (*Att.* 9.1.3).

⁶⁹ Martin Jehne stated that “In Republican Rome, the standard tension [of status dissonances] was conceptualized as a conflict of wealth and *dignitas*... status has to be acknowledged by others again and again, and for that, it has to be demonstrated, proven, performed, confirmed, and so on” (2016: 190-91).

⁷⁰ The second-century sumptuary laws include the *lex Orchia* of 182, which limited the number of guests that could attend a private banquet; the *lex Fannia* of 161 limited how much an individual could spend on a party and banned specific foods deemed too luxurious; the *lex Didia* of 143 extended that limitation to all of Italy and instituted punishments for violation, which reflected the growing social power of rural villas; and lastly the *lex Antia* of 71 banned serving magistrates from attending private banquets. See Hollander 2016: 22. Zanda (2011: 18) surmised that houses were not subject to sumptuary laws, unlike the banquets held within, because they had public and private functions.

⁷¹ Zanda 2011: 70.

⁷² Zanda 2011: 11.

⁷³ Cic. *De Off.* 1.140.

⁷⁴ Blösel 2016: 81 and Hollander 2016: 25, respectively.

⁷⁵ Cadiou 2018: 405.

sought to exercise power in tandem with the *cursus honorum*.⁷⁶

Therefore, Lucullus' villa design was not merely an attempt to monumentalize his wealth; rather, his villas conveyed his personal achievements and created a communal space that mirrored political spaces and, therefore, reified his political power.⁷⁸ The gardens of his Pincian Hill villa, begun in 60 BCE, for example, emulated Persian garden styles and thus subtly advertised his martial exploits over Tigranes. In doing so, his gardens and villa continually (re)performed his triumph and visually consumed the fruits of that conquest, including Eastern aesthetic styles. His gardens likely offered a visual counterpoint to Pompey's theater complex, whose gardens, as Ann Kuttner has demonstrated, visually narrated the scope of Pompey's military triumphs.⁷⁹ Indeed, from its location on the Pincian Hill, Lucullus' villa had a commanding view of the Campus Martius, and could likely, therefore, see Pompey's theater complex.⁸⁰ Considering the rivalry between the two men and the role of Pompey's supporters in delaying Lucullus' triumph, the location and design of Lucullus' gardens were particularly evocative in crafting a narrative of Lucullus' accomplishments.⁸¹

While contemporary sources stated that Lucullus' villa design was too ostentatious and, by implication, was too *avant garde* for current tastes, their arguments are reflective more of the anxieties over Roman values than of reality.⁸² Eastern – both Hellenistic and Persian – architectural and aesthetic styles were becoming increasingly popular in elite rural spaces. While Varro snubbed many of these architectural spaces as overly ostentatious and detrimental to Roman values, including the Hellenistic fashion for having an anteroom (*procoetion*), exercise room (*palaestra*), dressing room (*apodyterion*), colonnade (*peristylon*), aviary (*ornithon*), pergola (*peripteros*), or fruit room (*oporothea*), his contemporary Vitruvius in fact insisted that such elements, particularly the peristyle, were essential to any effective domestic space.⁸³

Furthermore, Lucullus' villas were set in a wider architectural context in which they communicated in both form and function with other Roman villas. Luxurious houses and villas became increasingly common along the Bay of Naples from the late second century BCE, for example, and their incorporation of elements of public architecture, such as colonnades and *palaestra*, demonstrated that villas functioned as extensions of the social and political landscape of the city. Roman townhouses were rooted in the urban landscape and served as both physical and social reference points in daily life, including influencing public perceptions of political

⁷⁶ Indeed, Plutarch stressed that Lucullus continued to play a role in traditional politics, including going to the forum to show support for friends (*Luc.* 42.5-6).

⁷⁸ Vitruvius, for example, stressed that elite homes needed architectural elements such as peristyles, libraries, picture galleries, and basilicas to mirror public buildings since some public business, such as lawsuits or hearings, could and did occur in private homes (*De Arch.* 6.5.2).

⁷⁹ Kuttner 1999. Pompey's gardens had plants, broadly speaking, from each of the regions he conquered and also had myrtle and laurel to reflect his triumphal achievements. See also Davies 2017: 215-244.

⁸⁰ See Davies 2017: 218 for a map with the location of both the Horti Luculli and Pompey's theater.

⁸¹ As Beck argued, "A house's decoration, its architecture, and its location were all geared to the public proclamation of fame, and, in turn, reflected the social status of its owner. In addition, the act of daily living was a way not only to display distinction before the public eye, but also to engage in aristocratic competition" (2009: 368).

⁸² Cicero, for example, had seven or eight villas of his own.

⁸³ Rothe 2018: 45. See Varro *De Agr.* 2.2.2-3; Vitruvius *De Arch.* 6.5.2

leaders.⁸⁴ The Italian villas of these aristocrats, however, are often seen as outside the political and monumental landscape. Yet, while many aristocratic villas were situated in rural landscapes, they were an extension of the monumental topography of Rome and its empire.⁸⁵ Indeed, these spaces brought the empire to Rome just as triumphs did. They were decorated with the fruits of conquest, but they also appropriated fashions and techniques from conquered regions.

By incorporating Eastern pleasure gardens into Roman architectural spaces, moreover, Roman architects effectively subordinated the East to Rome. As Mantha Zarmakoupi argued, “In the framed gardens of the peristyle, the foreign pleasures of the East were under Roman moral control.”⁸⁶ Since most Roman aristocrats had multiple villas, such spaces offered them the opportunity both to perform their status and to establish political bonds with local communities that could advance their own careers or the careers of those they supported.⁸⁷

The most alarming social function of villas according to Roman moralists was the private banquet. As mentioned previously, as both second-century BCE sumptuary laws and changing social practices attest, spectacle, including banqueting and hosting, had become the main form of “prestige-making,” and were a valuable source of social power.⁸⁸ Lucullus is, of course, famous for the banquets he hosted, including one where guests not only dined on rare birds, but they also enjoyed birdsong from Lucullus’ private aviary.⁸⁹ The social importance of banqueting for Lucullus is evident in the fact that he named each of the dining rooms in his Pincian Hill villa, and each had a fixed budget for any dining that took place there. In the most expensive of his dining rooms, Lucullus reportedly paid the equivalent of fifty thousand drachmas for a banquet that Pompey goaded him into hosting.⁹⁰ That he did so due to Pompey is particularly revealing, since Pompey was, essentially, responsible for diminishing the value of Lucullus’ triumph by using his supporters to block the vote for three years, taking credit for completing the conquest of Mithridates, and preventing the ratification of Lucullus’ *acta*. Pompey, was, therefore, a focal point for Lucullus’ extravagance in order to out-perform him socially, since Pompey, as a new man, in theory had to work harder to achieve the same recognition.

Reevaluating the extant sources on Lucullus’s relationship with Pompey hints that Lucullus’ behavior was not a rejection of political life, as Plutarch claimed, but rather an extension of that

⁸⁴ Beck 2009: 366, see also Hölkeskamp 2004: 121.

⁸⁵ Larmour and Spencer (2007: 12) applied this concept of architectural metonym to triumphal architecture, but I argue that villas such as Lucullus’, paid for through spoils, should also be considered metonymical examples.

⁸⁶ Zarmakoupi cites Foucault’s discussion of discipline in this argument (2018: 89).

⁸⁷ Howe 2018: 110.

⁸⁸ Beck 2016: 131-2. As Beck noted, the *lex Orchia*’s attempt to impose limits on banqueting “points to the performative realm of public life at Rome” and suggests that social power was shifting into the *domus* (2016: 135). There had long been expectations that elites would open their homes to others for dinner parties as part of their regular performance of social power (for example Cic. *Ad Frat. Frag.* 4; Plaut. *Stich.* 588-90; Plaut. *Pseud.* 876-77; Ter. *And.* 452-455; Cic. *Verr.* 2.26.65-66; Val. Max. 2.6).

⁸⁹ Varro *Rust.* 3.4.3. Adding to the public-facing elements of his villa, Lucullus also had libraries that he kept open to the public (Plut. *Luc.* 42.104).

⁹⁰ Plut. *Luc.* 40.1; cf. 41.3-6.

political life.⁹¹ Lucullus, like many men of his generation, faced a difficult political context. His *dignitas* had taken a few hits, from criminal accusations against family members to his soldiers' mutiny.⁹² And Lucullus, like so many others, found himself overshadowed by the ambitions of Sulla and Pompey. While some, such as Lucullus' brother-in-law P. Clodius, turned to extreme political behavior to achieve their goals, Lucullus instead drew on the still mostly untapped potential of privatized power to display his status. The heightened moralizing censure from Lucullus' detractors highlights that many were aware that power was beginning to shift. Not only was power increasingly concentrated in the hands of a few individual political powerhouses such as Sulla, Pompey, and Caesar, but social capital, display, and conspicuous consumption played an increasingly vital role in political and social prestige.

Conclusion

Lucullus's embrace of privatized power put him at the forefront of a critical shift in elite power. Wealth, connoisseurship, and social cachet were, from the late first century BCE, equally, if not more important than office-holding. With the influx of luxury goods coming into Rome via conquest from the second century BCE, many Roman elites adapted their social behavior to incorporate domestic space into the wider socio-political landscape. Domestic space, consequently, became an even more significant backdrop for political power than it had been previously within Rome. And while not a direct consequence of this process, wealth was also becoming an increasingly significant expression of social status. In the late first BCE and first century CE, domestic spectacle – that is, using the home as a platform for conveying social power – diffused throughout the empire. Elites from diverse cultural backgrounds used conspicuous consumption and euergetism to develop both social and political prestige.

Domestic spectacle offered potent opportunities both for solidifying electoral support and for forming political relationships that could allow someone like Lucullus to maintain influence outside political traditional roles. Indeed, the banquet's power to garner social capital was so widely accepted that dinner parties became a fundamental element of social behavior, as is evinced in everything from the archaeological record to Pliny the Younger's letters to Martial's poetry, in which fictional guests worry about not being invited to dinner parties.⁹³ Thus, while Lucullus remained a fixture in contemporary discourses on the evils of luxury, his actions were, by the first century CE, so central to elite identity that domestic spectacle became a recurring

⁹¹ Plutarch charged that Lucullus let the Roman people down by turning away from public life (*Luc.* 38).

⁹² For example, his brother was prosecuted for actions during the First Mithridatic War (Pina Polo and Díaz Fernández 2019: 324), while his father had been prosecuted for his actions as praetor during the slave revolt in Sicily (Brennan 2000: 478-9).

⁹³ See Rosillo-López 2022: 83-126 and Pina Polo 2023. We see examples of informal, domestic political networking in Pliny's letter to Avitus (Ep. 2.6), or his letter to Apollinarius (Ep. 2.9), in which he included going to dinner parties as a way of garnering political support for his friend, who was running for office. Similarly, Martial, himself a product of social mobility in the provinces, frequently used the dinner party as a motif, often to highlight inequities between social classes or the relationship between patron and client (ex: 2.11, 2.18, 3.7, 3.12, 3.38, 3.60, 3.63, 4.64, 4.66, 8.23, 10.47). For more on elite dining in the empire, see: Dunbabin 2003; Wen 2022; Gold and Donahue 2005; Luley 2014.

motif in the literature and remains evident in the magnificent townhouses and villas excavated across the empire.

Despite the lingering negativity toward Lucullus' actions, he demonstrated the power that domestic space had to produce cultural capital. In doing so, Lucullus and his contemporaries engaged in a wider movement in which elite identity centralized around conspicuous consumption. The relationship between elite identity and conspicuous consumption is well-studied, but it is important to remember that for Romans, this process was rooted in controversial reinterpretations of the triumph, plunder, and domestic architectural design that challenged engrained social expectations regarding normative elite behavior. Their eventual success, however, transformed elite identity into something that could be shared regardless of geographic location or political position. Thanks to Lucullus and his ilk, to be Roman, one merely had to consume.

ALYSON ROY
UNIVERSITY OF IDAHO

Abbreviations

FRL = Manuwald, F. (ed). *Fragmentary Republican Latin: Oratory Part I*. Loeb Classical Library.

IG = 1903. *Inscriptiones Graecae*. Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin. De Gruyter.

Itgenshorst = Itgenshorst, T. 2005. *Total Illa Pompa. Der Triumph in der römischen Republik*. Hypomnemata 161. Göttingen.

MRR = Broughton, T. 1951-1952. *The Magistrates of the Roman Republic*. American Philological Association.

OCD = Hornblower, S. and A. Spawforth. 1996. *Oxford Classical Dictionary*. Third Edition. Oxford.

RE = Pauly, A. and G. Wissowa, and W. Kroll, *Real-Encyclopädie d. klassischen Altertumswissenschaft* (1893–)

Rich = Rich, J. 2014. "The Triumph in the Roman Republic: Frequency, Fluctuation and Policy." In C. Lange and F. Vervaet (eds.), *The Roman Republican triumph: beyond the spectacle*. Roma: Edizioni Quasar.

Bibliography

- Beck, H. 2009. "From Poplicola to Augustus: Senatorial Houses in Roman Political Culture." *Phoenix* 63.3-4: 361-384.
- , 2016. "Money, Power, and Class Coherence: The *ambitus* Laws of the 180s B.C." In Beck, H. et al. *Money and Power in the Roman Republic*. Editions Latomus.
- Blösel, W. 2016. "Provincial Commands and Money in the Last Decades of the Roman Republic." In Beck, H. et al. *Money and Power in the Roman Republic*. Editions Latomus.
- Bounia, A. 2004. *The nature of classical collecting: Collectors and Collections, 100 BCE-100 CE*. Routledge.
- Brennan, C. 2000. *The Praetorship in the Roman Republic*. Oxford.
- Cadiou, F. 2018. *L'armée imaginaire: les soldats prolétaires dans les légions romaines au dernier siècle de la République*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- Carey, S. 2003. *Pliny's Catalogue of Culture: Art and Empire in the Natural History*. Oxford.
- Dalby, A. 2000. *Empire of Pleasures: luxury and indulgence in the Roman world*. Routledge.
- Davies, P. 2017. *Architecture and politics in Republican Rome*. Cambridge.
- Díaz Fernández, A. 2015. *Provincia et imperium: el mando provincial en la República romana (227-44 a.C.)*. Editorial Universidad de Sevilla.
- Draycott, C. and M. Stamatopoulou. 2016. *Dining and death: interdisciplinary perspectives on the 'Funerary Banquet' in ancient art, burial and belief*. Leuven: Peeters.
- Dunbabin, K. 2003. *The Roman Banquet: images of conviviality*. Cambridge.
- Edwards, C. 1993. *The Politics of immorality in ancient Rome*. Cambridge.
- Evans, R. 2011. "Learning to be Decadent: Roman Identity and the Luxuries of Others." *ASCS 32 Proceedings*: 1-7.
- Flohr, M. 2019. "Artisans and Markets: The Economics of Roman Domestic Decoration." *AJA* 123.1: 101-125.
- Flower, H. 1996. *Ancestor masks and aristocratic power in Roman culture*. Clarendon Press.
- , 2006. *The Art of Forgetting: disgrace and oblivion in Roman political culture*. University of North Carolina Press.

- Gold, B. and J. Donahue. 2005. *Roman dining: a special issue of American Journal of Philology*. The Johns Hopkins Press.
- Gruen, E. 1992. *Culture and National Identity in Republican Rome*. Cornell University Press.
- Hales, S. 2000. "At Home with Cicero." *Greece & Rome* 47.1: 44-55.
- , 2003. *The Roman house and social identity*. Cambridge.
- Hölkeskamp, K. 2004. "Under Roman roofs: Family, house, and household." In H. Flower, *The Cambridge Companion to the Roman Republic*. Cambridge.
- Hollander, D. 2016. "Lawyers, Gangs and Money: Portfolios of Power in the Late Republic." In Beck, H. et al. *Money and Power in the Roman Republic*. Editions Latomus.
- Hölscher, T. 2018. *Visual power in ancient Greece and Rome: between Art and Social Reality*. University of California Press.
- Howe, T. N. 2018. "The Social Status of the Villas of Stabiae." In A. Marzano and G. Métraux (eds.), *The Roman Villa in the Mediterranean Basin: Late Republic to Late Antiquity*. Cambridge.
- Itgenshorst, T. 2005. *Total Illa Pompa. Der Triumph in der römischen Republik*. Hypomnemata 161. Göttingen.
- Jehne, M. 2016. "The Economics of Status in the Late Republic." In Beck, H. et al. *Money and Power in the Roman Republic*. Editions Latomus.
- Kuttner, A. 1999. "Culture and History at Pompey's Museum." *TAPA* 129: 343-373.
- Lange, C. and F. Vervaet (eds.). 2014. *The Roman Republican triumph: beyond the spectacle*. Roma: Edizioni Quasar.
- Larmour, D. and D. Spencer (eds). 2007. *The Sites of Rome: Time, Space, Memory*. Oxford.
- Loar, M. et al. 2018. *Rome, Empire of Plunder: The Dynamics of Cultural Appropriation*. Cambridge.
- Luley, B. 2014. "Colonialism, Dining, and Changing Strategies of Power: The Example of Iron Age and Roman Mediterranean France at Lattara (ca 150 BC-AD 50)." *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory* 21.4: 750-780.
- Lundgreen, C. 2014. "Rules for Obtaining a Triumph – the *ius triumphandi* once more." In C. Lange and F. Vervaet (eds.), *The Roman Republican triumph: beyond the spectacle*. Roma: Edizioni Quasar.
- McDermott, W. 1970. "The Sisters of P. Clodius." *Phoenix* 24.1: 39-47.

- Métraux, G. 1999. "Ancient Housing: 'Oikos' and 'Domus' in Greece and Rome." *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 58.3: 392-405.
- Miles, M. 2008. *Art as plunder: the ancient origins of debate about cultural property*. Cambridge.
- Pina Polo, F. and A. Díaz Fernández. 2019. *The quaestorship in the Roman Republic*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Pina Polo, F. 2023. "Ocelli Italiae: Senatorial villae as Information Hubs." In M. García Morcillo and C. Rosillo-López (eds.), *The Real Estate Market in the Roman World*. Routledge.
- Pittenger, M. 2009. *Contested Triumphs: Politics, Pageantry, and Performance in Livy's Republican Rome*. University of California Press.
- Rich, J. 2014. "The Triumph in the Roman Republic: Frequency, Fluctuation and Policy." In C. Lange and F. Vervaet (eds.), *The Roman Republican triumph: beyond the spectacle*. Roma: Edizioni Quasar.
- Rosenstein, N. 1990. *Imperatores Victi: Military Defeat and Aristocratic Competition in the Middle and Late Republic*. University of California Press.
- Rosillo-López, C. 2017. *Public Opinion and Politics in the Late Roman Republic*. Cambridge.
- , 2022. *Political Conversations in Late Republican Rome*. Oxford.
- Rothe, U. 2018. "The Roman Villa: Definitions and Variations." In A. Marzano and G. Métraux (eds.), *The Roman Villa in the Mediterranean Basin: Late Republic to Late Antiquity*. Cambridge.
- Rutledge, S. 2012. *Ancient Rome as a Museum: Power, Identity, and the Culture of Collecting*. Oxford.
- Steel, C. and H. van der Blom (eds.). 2013. *Community and Communication: Oratory and Politics in Republican Rome*. Oxford.
- Sumner, G. 1973. *The Orators in Cicero's Brutus: Prosopography and Chronology*. University of Toronto Press.
- Thonemann, P. 2004. "The Date of Lucullus' Quaestorship." *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 149: 80-82.
- Tronchin, F. 2012. "Introduction: Collecting the Eclectic in Roman Houses." *Arethusa* 45.3: 261-282.

- Tröster, M. 2008. *Themes, character, and politics in Plutarch's Life of Lucullus: the construction of a Roman aristocrat*. Stuttgart: F. Steiner.
- Wallace-Hadrill, A. 2008. *Rome's Cultural Revolution*. Cambridge.
- Walsh, J. 2014. *Consumerism in the Ancient World: Imports and Identity Construction*. Routledge.
- Welch, K. 2006. "Domi Militiaeque: Roman Domestic Aesthetics and War Booty in the Republic." In S. Dillon and K. Welch (eds.), *Representations of War in Ancient Rome*. Cambridge.
- Wen, S. 2022. *Communal Dining in the Roman West: Private Munificence Towards Cities and Associations in the First Three Centuries AD*. Leiden: Brill.
- Woolf, G. 1998. *Becoming Roman: The Origins of Provincial Civilization in Gaul*. Cambridge.
- Zanda, E. 2011. *Fighting hydra-like luxury: sumptuary regulation in the Roman Republic*. Bloomsbury.
- Zarmakoupi, M. 2014. *Designing for Luxury on the Bay of Naples: Villas and Landscapes (c.100 BCE-79 CE)*. Oxford.