



Demolished Houses, Monumentality, and Memory in Roman Culture

This article examines the tradition of punitive house demolition during the Roman Republic, but from a sociocultural rather than institutional-legal perspective. Exploiting recent scholarship on the Roman house, on exemplarity, and on memory sanctions, I argue that narratives of house demolition constitute a form of ethically inflected political discourse, whose purpose is to stigmatize certain social actors as malefactors of a particular sort (“aspiration to kingship” being the central instance). The demolition itself is symbolically resonant, and the resultant stigma is propagated by subsequent monuments—various structures, toponyms, narratives, etc.—that attach to the housesite. These monuments are thought to bear the trace of what went before, hence transmit an account of the alleged malefactor’s deed and disgrace. Far from obliterating the doer of misdeeds, then, the discourse of punitive house demolition fixes him in cultural memory as a negative *exemplum*.

I. INTRODUCTION

The toponym *Argiletum* refers to both a district and a street. The district lay adjacent to the *forum Romanum* to the northeast (roughly between the forum and the *subura*) during the Republic and first century of the Imperial age. The street ran through the heart of this district, leaving the forum along the east side of the *curia* and proceeding northeast into the *subura* roughly along the route of the

This article has been seven years in the making. During that time, portions were presented in numerous venues. I hope it will not seem ungrateful to refrain from listing them: comments in every case helped improve the final product. I owe special thanks to John Bodell and Karl-Joachim Hölkeskamp, who read and rendered much assistance to near-final versions; to Uwe Walter, whose lucid German version of one talk enabled me to reach German audiences more effectively; and to an anonymous referee for *CA*. All translations are my own.

modern Via Cavour.¹ Antiquarian speculation about the origin of the district and its name survives in Varro (*Lat.* 5.157) and in both Servius and Servius Auctus (*in Aen.* 8.345). Varro's text, though vexed, clearly suggests two etymologies for the name *Argiletum*: some authorities, he says, derive it from the murder (?) and burial of a figure named Argus in that place, and others from *argilla*, a type of clay supposedly found in the soil there.² The Servian text briefly notes the clay etymology, then—by way of explaining *Aen.* 8.345–46—offers a longer narrative of one Argus, a guest of Evander, who was killed and interred in that spot. The Auctus text then intervenes with additional etymologies. It begins with an alternative version of the Argus-Evander story, but notes that other authorities refer to a different Argus—a son of Danae—who was killed there. It then turns to the etymology of a related landmark called the *porta Argiletana*: this gate may be so called because one Cassius Argillus built or restored it, or because during the first Punic war a seditious man of this name was killed on the site. Still another etymology for the gate and the district goes as follows: *alii quod Argillus senator post Cannense proelium suaserit a Poenis pacem postulari, ideo in senatu carptum domumque eius dirutam et locum Argiletum appellatum* (“Others say that, because a senator called Argillus urged that the Carthaginians be sued for peace after the battle of Cannae, he was for this reason torn to pieces in the senate and his house was demolished, and the place was called ‘Argiletum’”). The series concludes with a final alternative, narrated at length: the story of an Etruscan *haruspex* who murdered his son, named Argus, in this location.

This series displays many features typical of Roman antiquarian etymological speculation. A toponym may be explained with reference to some physical feature or characteristic of the place, or to a mythical or historical figure with whom the place is linked through narrative. Etymologized as *Argi letum*, this toponym invites narratives involving the violent death of a figure named Argus or the like (Argillus is presumably understood as a diminutive), just as *Capitolium*, etymologized as *caput Oli*, invites narratives that associate the hill with the head of someone named Olus or Aulus.³ Here I focus on the etymology involving

1. Detailed discussion in Tortorici 1991; see 85–89 for relevant texts. The district seems to have contained many *domus*, *insulae*, and shops, as well as the marketplace(s) bearing the names *macellum*, *forum cuppedinis*, and *forum piscatorium* (section IIIb). The whole area was eventually consumed by the Imperial fora. In brief, see Tortorici, *LTUR* 1.125–26 (s.v. *Argiletum*), and 2.77 (s.v. *domus: Cassius Argillus*), also Hülsen, *RE* 2 s.v. *Argiletum*, col. 718.

2. Var. *Lat.* 5.157: *Argiletum* [*argeletum* Mss.] *sunt qui scripserunt ab †argolaseu* [*Argo laeso* Collart; *Argi leto* Canal; *alii alia*] *quod is huc venerit ibique sit sepultus, alii ab argilla quod ibi id genus terrae sit*. On the text see Collart's apparatus criticus *ad loc.*, with testimonia (1954: 146) and commentary (246).

3. For the idea that *argill-* derives from *arg-*, see Isid. *Etym.* 16.1.6: *argilla ab Argis vocata, apud quos primum ex ea vasa confecta sunt*. *-illus* as a diminutive ending is very common in Imperial cognomina, even for non-i-stem forms, but is rare in the Republic. Hence *Argillus* would ring true as a diminutive of *Argus* for Servius' readers, but is unlikely to be correct for the era of the second Punic war (see Kajanto 1965: 31, 126–27, 168–70). For *Argiletum* as a compound word cf. Mart. *Epigr.* 1.117.9, 2.17.3; Prisc. 3.113 Keil. For *Capitolium* see again Serv. Auct. *In Aen.* 8.345, where

the otherwise unattested senator Argillus and his house, quoted above, which seems curiously indirect. In all other accounts given by Varro and Servius/Servius Auctus, the figure named Arg(ill)us dies or is buried on the very site that bears his name. In this case, however, we are told that Argillus was “torn to pieces in the senate” (*in senatu carptum*) for his treasonous motion, his house was demolished, and its site came to bear its proprietor’s name.⁴ Thus the death of “little Argus” is displaced to the *curia*, and a demolished house is introduced to mediate between the place that bears the name and the figure who gives it. Why might a Roman be open to accepting this indirect, mediated aetiology for the toponym, when the alternative aetiologies are more direct, unmediated, and (seemingly) intuitively obvious?

Roman texts contain notices of about a dozen houses demolished in (partial) return for their owners’ misdeeds, ranging from the early Republic to the early Augustan period. Most familiar, perhaps, are the cases of the “aspirants to kingship” of the fifth and fourth centuries BCE, namely Sp. Cassius, Sp. Maelius, and M. Manlius Capitolinus. Starting with Mommsen’s 1871 seminal source-critical study, scholars have pursued two related questions: how the traditions surrounding these figures developed and were transmitted into the texts from which we know them; and what, if anything, these traditions tell us about politics, law, and religion in the early Republic.⁵ Equally familiar is the case of Cicero. The demolition of his Palatine house by Clodius in 58 BCE, and the erection of a sanctuary of the goddess Libertas on the lot, has long engaged scholars as a case study in the political violence and legal wrangling of the late Republic.⁶

the story of the *haruspex* and his son manages to encompass both the *Argi letum* and *caput Oli* etymologies; also Quint. *Inst.* 1.6.31.

4. For *carpo* as “tear to bits,” *TLL* s.v. I.B.1. The weaker sense “vituperate,” though common (*TLL* s.v., II.C.2.a), does not provide the death that is presumably needed to account for *-letum*. On the (treasonous) idea of seeking peace after Cannae, see Livy 22.53, 22.61.13.

5. Mommsen 1871: 240–43, 246–47, 258, 268 evaluates the historicity of these demolitions in terms of the supposed route of each story’s transmission, and the degree of credibility he ascribes to each stage of that transmission. Lintott 1970 tries to tease from these accounts evidence for patterns of political violence in the early Republic (e.g., 19–20), though—like most scholars—he believes these accounts are heavily stamped by late Republican concerns (e.g., 20–22). Martin 1982–94: 1.354–58, Salerno 1990 (esp. 80–98), Mustakallio 1994, and Liou-Gille 1996 (all with further references) seek from these traditions evidence of early religious-legal processes and sanctions, while Smith 2006: 56–62 discusses other kinds of “archaic realities” that may be glimpsed in these tales. The difficulties presented by any such inquiry are well discussed by Pina Polo 2006: 80–87.

Scholars conventionally use the noun phrases *adfectator regni* and *adfectatio regni* to designate these figures and their misdeed. Yet the latter phrase is unattested in classical Latin, and the former occurs only at Quint. *Inst.* 5.13.24. Verbal and participial formations such as *regnum adfectare*, *crimen adfectati regni*, and *spes adfectandi regni* do occur in Livy and later writers, and may suggest an awareness of this particular category of transgression. But the use of the nominalized forms is a modern convention—a kind of hyper-legalizing that leaves the false impression of widely agreed, well-established categories of crime and criminal (e.g., Lovisi 1999: 26–28, 54–56, and Vigourt 2001a on the “crime” of *adfectatio regni*). In this study, I avoid these nominalized Latin forms. The modern phrase *damnatio memoriae* is similarly misleading: see n.9.

6. Full bibliography in sections II–III.

This interest in the development of political and legal institutions, leavened with source criticism, might be termed the “Staatsrecht” approach to Roman house demolition.

In the past 20 years, new scholarly directions have brought to this phenomenon a new kind of attention, which might be called “sociocultural.” First, an upsurge of interest in Roman domestic spaces and activities has illuminated the symbolic dimensions of the Roman house—those respects in which the elite urban *domus* was a representative and monumental structure, the locus where its owner’s social power was constructed and displayed.⁷ Second, scholars have undertaken to study how values, monuments, memory, and social reproduction are interconnected in Roman society—work that may position itself under the rubric of “collective memory” or “exemplarity.”⁸ Third, more particularly, scholars have renewed their attention to the sanctions that could be imposed against a person’s memory—the practices that are conventionally, if misleadingly, termed *damnatio memoriae* in scholarship.⁹ House demolition sits squarely amidst these emerging areas of inquiry, and provides an interesting case study of each. For to be aware that the *domus* is in some respects a monumental structure is also to open the question of how its demolition is implicated in the dynamics of memory, exemplarity, and the maintenance and transmission of social values. And this question is only sharpened by the realization that punitive house demolition, as surviving texts represent it, has similarities to the destruction or removal of statues, the effacement of inscriptions, the banning of certain names, and other such memory sanctions. Moreover, the texts that narrate or refer to the alleged cases of punitive house demolition—the four cases just mentioned, and others too—are numerous and varied, providing a rich basis for investigating the symbolic and ideological dimensions of the phenomenon.¹⁰

7. E.g., Saller 1984: 349–55, 1994: 88–95, Wiseman 1987, Edwards 1993: 150–63, Wallace-Hadrill 1994: 3–61 (and *passim*), Bodel 1997, Eck 1997: 176–90, Rilinger 1997, Papi 1998, Tatum 1999: 159–62, Guilhembet 2001, Hales 2003: 40–60, Von Hesberg 2005, Stein-Hölkeskamp 2005: 116–58.

8. E.g., Hölkeskamp 1996 (= 2004: 169–98), Stemmler 2000, Roller 2004, Walter 2004: 51–70, 131–95; Bücher 2006. Foundational for this approach, though employing different terminology, is Vasaly 1993.

9. The phrase *damnatio memoriae* is a modern coinage, reifying the attested participial phrase *memoria damnata*. As such, it leaves the false impression that the Romans imposed a standardized package of memory sanctions in return for determinate misdeeds. Yet there was no such standardized package of punishments, nor a corresponding category of misdeeds (so Vittinghoff 1936: 66, Flower 2006: xix; cf. n.5 on the phrase *adfectatio regni*). Vittinghoff 1936 (esp. 12–52, 64–74) remains the foundational study of sanctions against memory in the Imperial age. The recent resumption of interest in this topic has produced, besides numerous articles, at least four major studies: Hedrick 2000 (esp. 89–130, on Imperial inscriptions), Varner (ed.) 2000 (on various Imperial media), Varner 2004 (Imperial portraiture), and Flower 2006 (Republican and Imperial memory sanctions in general).

10. It may be helpful to list all cases here: besides Cassius, Maelius, Manlius, and Cicero, I examine the thickly-described cases of Vitruvius Vaccus, M. Fulvius Flaccus, and Vedius Pollio, the thinly-described cases of (L. Appuleius?) Saturninus and L. Cornelius Sulla, and the probably fictitious cases of Argillus, Macellus, and Cupes. Also discussed, though not alleged to have suffered

This paper pursues the sociocultural approach, aiming to explore more deeply the monumental qualities of the demolished house in Roman culture. This paper is not, therefore, a history of demolition from a legal, religious, or political perspective, but rather a study of the *social meanings* ascribed to demolitions by the texts that inform us of them. It examines the kind of monument a demolished house is, the dynamics of memory that are implicated in such a monument, and the social values that are thereby asserted or affirmed. It is a study, in other words, of house demolition as a form of ethical and commemorative *discourse*, one I will argue has a fairly regular structure and definite ideological implications. The texts examined date mostly from the late Republic to high Empire, even as the demolitions of which they speak date from the early Republic to the Augustan age. A few texts, at the point of overlap, present us with contemporary or near-contemporary discourses about the events they represent: notably Cicero on his own house, and Ovid on the demolition of Vedius Pollio's house by Augustus. But when texts speak of demolitions in the distant past, such as those of the three "aspirants to kingship," I assume the associated discourses are those that resonate in these texts' own day with their own intended audiences. I do not assume that such texts necessarily reproduce and transmit discourses of the distant past, let alone accurately convey the actual events of that past.

In asserting that house demolition is a form of discourse, I must clarify what semantic territory the English word "demolition," for current purposes, actually covers. For our Latin and Greek texts use a wide range of words and phrases to describe the fate of these *domus*. In Latin texts, derivatives of the *ru-* stem, with its root sense of "rush (downward)," are common. Livy commonly employs *diruere* ("make to fall apart") when referring to such destruction, while other texts employ *eruere* ("dig out," "overthrow") and the noun *ruina* ("downfall"). Also common are compounds of *verto*: Cicero regularly uses *ev-ertere* ("overturn") to describe the fate of his house and others he deems comparable; elsewhere we find *subvertere* ("topple from the base"). These clusters suggest a physical knocking-down, so that parts of the house that were once high are brought low. However, no specific means or instruments for achieving this end—battering rams? crowbars?—are ever specified. Likewise suggesting physical disordering and displacement are such colorful Latin expressions as *dissipare*, *supericere*, and *strages Penatium*, along with the common Greek verbs *kataskaptein*, *kataballein*, and (perhaps) *diarpazein*. An alternative form of destruction is sometimes signalled by verbs of burning (*cremare*, *ardere*). The occurrence of expressions for "flattening" (*complanare*, *solo aequare*), as well as the use of the term *area*—the *mot propre* for any unbuilt space in the urban fabric—may imply the belief that some of these housesites were completely

punitive demolition, are the houses of P. Valerius Publicola, C. Sempronius Gracchus, M. Livius Drusus, Q. Tullius Cicero, and C. Iulius Caesar.

cleared, leaving no ruins or debris.¹¹ In what follows, then, the English word “demolition” (and its cognates) should not be taken to imply a fixed, consistent, and uniform type of attack on a house’s structure. The diverse underlying vocabulary does not support such a unitary understanding. What this vocabulary does consistently imply is that a *domus* so treated can no longer serve its basic residential, reception, and representational functions. “Demolition” should, therefore, be understood functionally: “the inflicting of sufficient damage (of whatever sort) upon a *domus* as to render it visibly and practically unfit for normal use.”

While the phenomenon of house demolition has received no systematic scholarly study to date, it is frequently mentioned in recent scholarship on houses and memory sanctions, with divergent conclusions about its aims and effects. The most sustained discussion to date is found in John Bodel’s 1997 study of the monumentality of villas. As a preliminary to this study, he examines the monumental qualities of townhouses, including demolished ones. In four dense pages (7–11), he maps out the terrain on which a discussion of the symbolics of demolition may take place. Consider the following assertions: “When the Romans tore down a man’s house, their aim was to erase any memory of his existence” (8); again, “Eradicating the memory of a hated enemy was certainly the intention of P. Clodius in 58 BCE when he demolished Cicero’s house on the Palatine and constructed a shrine of Liberty on the site” (9). Here is one key strand of argumentation: the idea that house demolition at least purports to efface the proprietor altogether, to blot him from the landscape of the city and also of memory. Bodel concedes, however, that “[o]ccasionally the location of a villain’s house, and hence also the memory of his crime, was preserved by a toponym” (8). This concession adverts to one device (we will see that there are others) that commemorates a demolition and the reasons for it, hence counteracts any notional aim to obliterate existence and memory. Here, then, is a second and apparently contrasting strand of argumentation: that demolition is itself a commemorative strategy, or attracts other, supplementary commemorative strategies, that keep an account of the proprietor and his misdeeds in circulation, but in a negative ethical mode—that is, as a negative *exemplum*. Most scholars who have remarked on the possible aims or effects of house demolition have adopted one or the other of these strands, if only implicitly.¹² And some scholars have recently suggested that memory sanctions in general bring both strands together simultaneously—that is, that the gesture at oblivion and the gesture at commemoration necessarily coexist as constituent elements

11. See *TLL* s.v. *area* I, where the essential urbanness of the term emerges; explicit assertions in Var. *Lat.* 5.38: *in urbe loca pura areae*, and Flor. *Dig.* 50.16.211: *locus . . . sine aedificio in urbe area, rure . . . ager appellatur*.

12. Obliteration of the proprietor and his memory: see, e.g., Saller 1984: 354 and 1994: 93. Preservation of memory, but with disgrace: e.g., Mustakallio 1994: 78, Hales 2000: 46, 2003: 49–50.

of all memory sanctions.¹³ One aim of this paper is to sort through these options by exploring more deeply the social meanings associated with demolition: how the house, standing and demolished, functions as a monument, and what implications demolition has for the memory of the proprietor whose misdeeds spurred the demolition. Ultimately I argue in favor of the second strand: demolition works to freight the house's proprietor with negative symbolic meaning, i.e., to constitute him as a negative exemplum. For we will see that a demolished house, obliterated as it is, always attracts a supplement: the space (physical or psychological) that the house leaves vacant is inevitably occupied by other monumental forms that remind readers and viewers of what is no longer there and what this absence means. Regarding the first strand, I strongly doubt that house demolition—even in conjunction with other memory sanctions—could ever have obliterated a proprietor altogether, in the sense of depriving him entirely and permanently of all commemoration. More on this matter in the conclusion (section IV).

The argument unfolds as follows. In section II I examine how the demolished house is related to the single most important monumental form with which it is regularly associated: the standing house that preceded it, the necessary precondition without which the demolished house could never, so to speak, have come into existence. In section III, I examine the demolished house in relation to the variety of monumental forms—temples, toponyms, open spaces, porticoes, and so on—that succeed (or, better, coexist with) it, and consider the dynamics of memory that are thereby activated. Through these analyses I hope to describe the structure and ideological implications of the discourse of house demolition, and to illuminate how its commemorative and evaluative functions come into play in each situation, as each demolished house is related to its erstwhile proprietor and his deeds.

II. THE “MONUMENTAL” HOUSE AND ITS UNMAKING

To approach house demolition as a commemorative discourse, let us begin by reviewing the social and symbolic functions of the elite *domus* of the late Republic and early Empire, considering in particular how it served as a monument to its owner.¹⁴ First, a large house, located near the political arenas of the *forum*

13. Flower 1998: 180 suggests that memory sanctions in general involve “two distinct tendencies . . . namely, the urge to remember the villain . . . and an equal and opposite tendency to forget him”; similarly Hedrick 2000: 92–93. This view is also shared by the authors of the papers on memory sanctions in *Cahiers Glotz* 15 (2004): see Lefebvre 2004: 216 on inscriptions, Hostein 2004: 228 on coins, and Huet 2004: 252, summarizing Varner's work on recarved portraits. Likewise, Bodel 1997 (quoted above) seems implicitly to admit both tendencies.

14. Ownership was, almost certainly, the normal mode of occupancy in this social stratum (Rawson 1976: 87; also Wallace-Hadrill 1994: 103–110). We may sometimes have to reckon with an aristocrat occupying a rented house; or one who remains *in potestate*, meaning that “his” house is

Romanum, endowed with ample reception spaces, and enhanced with prestigious architectural and decorative elements, was a sign that the owner possessed, or wished to be seen as possessing, significant social power. In particular, a large atrium implied that he had numerous clients and friends to attend his morning reception (*salutatio*), conduct business with him, and support his various enterprises. Likewise, large and elaborately appointed colonnades, gardens, and associated reception rooms advertised his capacity to host groups of peers and underlings at evening *convivia*, to preside as host and judge in legal hearings, and to host meetings of priestly colleges or other groups of civic consequence to which he might belong. Such features were of course practical as well as symbolic, provided that the owner really did possess the kind of social network implied by these spaces, and really used the spaces accordingly.¹⁵ Second, certain features symbolized the continuity of his lineage, and the sociopolitical power that his family had exercised over time: the wax masks (*imagines*) of ancestors who had held curule magistracies, looking down from cabinets in the atrium; the family trees (*stemmata*) that were perhaps painted in the *vestibulum* near the entrance; and in some cases the spoils—captured arms, plundered statuary, and the like—installed in the atrium or *vestibulum* by an ancestor who had won a military victory and celebrated a triumph.¹⁶ Moreover, like all Roman houses, the elite *domus* had a religious dimension: it was the abode of the domestic *Lar*, the *Penates*, and the *Genius*. While the roles and functions of these divinities and their domestic cults are represented in diverse and sometimes contradictory ways, they undoubtedly linked the owner and other members of his household with one another (since everyone living under the same roof, free and slave, shared in these cults), as well as with the physical structure of the house (since it was the seat of these divinities and the site of their cult). Thus, through domestic cult practice as well

technically owned by his father; or one whose house is part of his wife's dowry, hence under his control but technically owned by the wife or her father. In what follows, however, I typically use the term "owner" rather than "occupant," and possessive formulations such as "X's house" should be assumed to imply ownership unless an alternative form of occupancy is specified.

15. On the practical and symbolic aspects of domestic reception spaces, see Cic. *Off.* 1.138–39, Vitruv. 6.5.1–2; on the elite *domus* as a stage for marshalling and displaying its owner's social power see, e.g., Q. Cic. *Comm. Pet.* 34–35 and Sen. *Ben.* 6.34.1–2 (discussion below). For scholarly discussion see Saller 1984: 351–53, 1994: 91–93, Carandini 1986: 264, Flower 1996: 185–222 (esp. 217–20), Guilhemet 1996: 187–89, 2001: 216–18, Dickmann 1999: 275–81, Tatum 1999: 159–61; more generally, see works cited in n.7. Still informative is Friedländer 1919: 1.238–40.

16. For masks, *stemmata*, and spoils adorning aristocratic atria in the good old days, see n.30. Bücher 2006: 110–18 discusses the house as a familial monument, and Flower 1996: 185–222 treats ancestral masks in particular. One must not overstress the lineage and familial continuity expressed in the *domus*, however. Aristocratic *domus* frequently changed occupants, at least in the late Republic and early Empire, through purchase, confiscation, and rental, and several texts remark upon perceived incongruities between successive occupants: e.g., Cic. *Off.* 1.139, *Phil.* 2.68–69 (cf. Plut. *Ant.* 21.2, *Caes.* 51.2), 2.103–105; [Cic.] *in Sall.* 14.1; Prop. 1.16.1–10; Plin. *Nat.* 35.7. Cf. Cic. *Att.* 4.5.2, 14.6.1 (villas rather than *domus*). On the turnover in occupancy of senatorial houses in the late Republic, see Rawson 1976: 85–87 and Papi 1998: 46–48; for the early empire, see Eck 1997: 187–90.

as architecture and decoration, the elite *domus* articulated its owner's relationship to his slaves and dependents, family and ancestry, supporters and peers, in ways that underpinned his claims to social power and prestige. It monumentalized him by bearing the imprint of, or providing a template for, the social relations and status claims that defined him as an aristocrat in Roman society and as a particular individual within the aristocratic group.¹⁷

Demolishing an elite *domus*, scholars have assumed, must somehow negate this social functionality and symbolism. Bodel characterizes demolition as “a violent rupture in family continuity, signifying a break with the past and rendering prospects for the future of the line uncertain,” and Saller speaks of the “symbolic destruction of the offender and his family root and branch.”¹⁸ In the following pages, I seek to test these views of the practical and symbolic effects of demolition. By scrutinizing texts that narrate demolitions and the events leading up to them, and examining closely the declared or implied reasons for and symbolic consequences of demolition, I will argue that—at least during the late Republic and early Empire, the periods from which these texts mostly date—house demolition was thought to have one especially important practical effect, along with a rather narrow range of symbolic effects impacting only particular aspects of the monumentality of the elite *domus*.

A. DOMESTIC SPACE AND SOCIAL POWER

Most important, in these texts, is the first “monumental” aspect discussed above: the aristocratic house as the primary locus in which the owner develops, maintains, and displays his social power, and from which he projects that power. Let us begin with Livy's account (4.13–16) of the sedition of Sp. Maelius in 440 BCE. Livy does not allow Maelius' aims to emerge over time, but declares them briskly at the outset: we are told that Maelius was an equestrian, and very wealthy by the standards of his day; he alleviated a grain shortage by purchasing grain abroad with his own money, employing his network of guest-friends and clients; he distributed this grain to hungry plebeians, thereby attaching them to himself as a retinue of supporters; and finally, carried away by his good fortune, he came to hope for “what was not permitted,” namely to make himself king.¹⁹

17. Bodel's study of villas (1997: 11–32) shows that the rural properties of aristocrats could have monumental functions similar to those of urban *domus*. Familial continuity looms much larger in villas, however, as they may constitute a family's ancestral property and appear more likely to be kept over generations (though see previous n. for villas changing hands); also, they are often the site of family tombs, as urban *domus* never are. For other ways in which villas may be regarded as reflections of their owners, see Sen. *Epp.* 12, 55, and 86, with Henderson 2004.

18. Bodel 1997: 11; Saller 1984: 354–55, 1994: 93; similarly Nippel 1988: 85.

19. Livy 4.13.1–4: *Sp. Maelius ex equestri ordine, ut illis temporibus praedives ... frumento ... ex Etruria privata pecunia per hospitem clientiumque ministeria coempto ... largitiones frumenti facere instituit; plebemque hoc munere delenitam quacumque incederet conspectus elatusque supra modum hominis privati secum trahere.... ipse, ut est humanus animus insatiabilis eo quod fortuna spondet, ad altiora et non concessa tendere et ... de regno agitare.*

Thus Livy's reader can view every event in the subsequent narrative with the knowledge that Maelius was aspiring to kingship, and basing his hopes upon his great personal following. At this point, Maelius' house enters the story as one of the principal stages on which this political drama is played out. Minucius, the *praefectus annonae*—the magistrate officially responsible for procuring grain, as Maelius was doing privately—learns that in Maelius' house weapons are being collected, meetings are being held, and plans for a *coup d'état* are being finalized (*tela in domum Maeli conferri, eumque contiones domi habere, ac non dubia regni consilia esse*, 13.9).²⁰ Leading senators then complain that the consuls have allowed grain distributions and gatherings of plebeians to take place in a private citizen's house (*cum undique primores patrum ... consules increparent quod eas largitiones coetusque plebis in privata domo passi essent fieri*, 13.10). To deal with the emergency, Quinctius Cincinnatus is appointed dictator and Servilius Ahala master of the horse. When the dictator summons Maelius, he is amidst his retinue of supporters, and attempts to hide behind them (14.1, 4—though Livy does not specify whether this group is at Maelius' house, in the forum, or elsewhere). In the ensuing confusion Ahala stabs Maelius to death with a dagger. The dictator Cincinnatus then delivers a speech that repeatedly accuses Maelius of attempting to make himself king, and compares him to figures from the past who suffered exemplary punishment for making similar attempts (15.1, 4, 5, 7, 8). The speech concludes with the declaration that full expiation of this awful portent (*pro monstro habendum*, 15.7) requires not only the malefactor's blood, but also that “the roof and walls within which such madness was begotten be utterly destroyed, and his possessions, defiled by being the currency for purchasing kingship, be made public property” (*id ... nec satis esse sanguine eius expiatum, nisi tecta parietesque intra quae tantum amentiae conceptum esset dissiparentur; bonaque contacta pretiis regni mercandi publicarentur*, 15.8).

In Livy's representation, this demolition seems to have one potentially practical effect, along with (perhaps) two symbolic meanings. First, Maelius' house is presented as the logistical base in which the aristocratic owner nurtures his social network and from which he projects his social power out into the civic sphere—familiar functions of aristocratic *domus* in Livy's own day. Indeed, Livy stresses the unity and loyalty of Maelius' social network by referring to them

20. Minucius gets his information, says Livy, from people who frequented both houses on account of Minucius' and Maelius' parallel activities in procuring grain (4.13.8). Perhaps these informants are imagined as *salutatores* of both men, who would be present regularly in the atria of both houses—though to discuss a *coup d'état* among one's *salutatores* is to show a cavalier disregard for secrecy. More commonly, Roman conspiracy narratives involve plotters assembling secretly in the recesses of a ringleader's house, often by night. Such narratives imply reception spaces other than the atrium—e.g., dining rooms or cubicula in the garden/peristyle area of the late Republican/early Imperial *domus*. See, e.g., Cic. *Cat.* 1.8–9; Sal. *Cat.* 20.1 (Catiline holds a meeting *in abditam partem aedium ... omnibus arbitris procul amotis*), cf. 27.3, 40.5; Asc. 83C; Dion. Hal. 5.7.2 (imagining a Greek house); Dio Cass. 37.32.3; for laws banning such gatherings, see Crawford 1996: 694–95. See also Guilhembet 1996: 192, Oakley 1997: 1.525.

with the possessive formulations *Maeliani* (14.1) and *caterva suorum* (14.4). The destruction of the house has the potentially practical effect of disrupting this network and curtailing its sociopolitical power. For demolition sweeps away the atrium, dining rooms, and other spaces in which the would-be *rex* assembled, organized, and indoctrinated his clients and friends, distributed grain, and collected weapons. But Maelius is already dead, hence his social network is already decapitated and he himself is unable to experience the inconvenience of being stripped of his reception spaces. A symbolic dimension is thus brought forward instead: the demolition of the house functions as a metonym for the destruction of its owner, his social network, and that network's political aims. This symbolism, indeed, is explicitly what Livy's Cincinnatus intends: *domum deinde, ut monumento area esset oppressae nefariae spei, dirui extemplo iussit* ("He then ordered the house to be demolished forthwith, so that the open lot might be a reminder of the crushing of a wicked aim," 16.1; more on the monumentality of this open lot in section IIIa). A further symbolic dimension emerges in Cincinnatus' assertion (§15.8, quoted above) that Maelius' roof, walls, and possessions are linked with his "madness" and "defiled" by association with his aims; hence they must be destroyed or confiscated. In this representation, house and contents become an extension of their owner, infused with his character: their hitherto metonymic relationship is strengthened to a synecdochic one, and the house must now be destroyed in order to eliminate the owner completely.²¹ Demolition, then, combined with capital punishment, graphically symbolizes the civic community's judgment that the conspirator and his social network have attacked the community's very fabric, while affirming that the community has put an end to him, his network, and the threat they pose. While other texts that treat Maelius more briefly also present the demolition as a

21. Cincinnatus' use of religious language hammers this point home: Maelius' aim is called a *monstrum*—a disruption in the fabric of nature, hence an indication that the proper relations between gods and mortals (the *pax deorum*) has been disturbed. Expiation—ritual action aimed at mending such a rupture—commonly involves eliminating the *monstrum* or prodigy from the community. In this case, expiation begins with blood sacrifice (*nec satis esse sanguine eius expiatum*) and ends with the confiscation of Maelius' "contaminated" goods (*bonaque contacta*). Under this ritual armature, Maelius and his property become one, to be destroyed as one. For the expiatory sacrifice of creatures reckoned as *monstra* or *prodigia*, see, e.g., Livy 28.27.16, Verg. *Aen.* 8.81–85, Phaed. 3.3.4–11; also MacBain 1982: 127–32 and Rosenberger 1998: 132–34 (hermaphrodite births). Corbeill 2005 discusses the semantics of these terms; see also Engels 2007: 276–78 on the term *monstrum*. On Cincinnatus' language in this passage see Salerno 1990: 83–85 and Fiori 1996: 395–96. Among all the texts that speak of punitive house demolition, this Livian passage is unique, to my knowledge, in even hinting at the idea of pollution (in the word *contacta*, perhaps). In contrast, Connor argues (1985: 90–94) that pollution is central to certain cases of house demolition in Archaic and Classical Greece.

Val. Max. 6.3.1c explains this demolition in terms that echo Livy but without religious overtones: *quantum ergo odii adversus hostes libertatis insitum animis antiqui haberent parietum ac tectorum, in quibus versati fuerant, ruinis testabantur*. Here the implied relationship between inhabitant and house is metonymic, but there is no hint of pollution, prodigy, or expiation.

punishment for his aspiration to kingship,²² only Livy's lengthy and detailed narrative sketches out the symbolic and practical relationships between the aspiration and the punishment.²³

Another Livian conspiracy narrative (6.11–20) provides a similar rationale for the demolition of another would-be king's house—that of M. Manlius Capitolinus, in 384 BCE. The tale begins, according to Livy, with Manlius, the hero of the Gallic siege of 390, growing jealous of his rival Camillus' preeminence and seeking to elevate his own stature by cultivating the *plebs*. First he impugns the senators and proposes debt reform (11.6–9); then he begins to redeem plebeians from debt-bondage (14.3–10). He delivers speeches in his house “in the manner of one addressing a public meeting,” casting reproaches against the senate (*ad hoc domi contionantis in modum sermones pleni criminum in patres*, 14.11): presumably his audience consists of his supporters, namely those plebeians whom he has bound to himself by advocating or personally providing debt relief. He also holds meetings in his house, by night and day, with plebeians and leading advocates for debt relief (*advocata domum plebe cum principibus novandarum rerum interdum noctuque consilia agit*, 18.3). The use of the house as the staging area for such activities obviously recalls Maelius, and Livy even labels Manlius' followers with a possessive designation, *turba Manliana* (16.8), implying the same alarming degree of personal loyalty as Maelius' supporters, who were similarly labeled, had displayed. Indeed, Manlius and others repeatedly invoke Maelius, along with Sp. Cassius, the other prior kingship-aspirant (17.2; 18.4, 9; 19.2; on Cassius see section IIIa), as *exempla* in the current situation. Thus it comes as no surprise when the aspiration to kingship is explicitly attributed to him (*de regno agendi ortum initium*, 18.16). Yet Manlius' seditious aims and tyrannical aspirations are made even more patent—indeed, are overdetermined—by additional details about his house. First, the house is located on the *arx*, the northernmost and highest of the two summits that constitute the Capitoline hill. Therefore the senate can portray the meetings held there as a “secession of the plebs,” recalling previous secessions

22. Var. Lat. 5.157: *aequata Meli domus publice quod regnum occupare voluit is*. Cic. Dom. 101: *Sp. Maeli regnum adpetentis domus est complanata*. Val. Max. 6.3.1c: *eadem ausum* [sc. seeking *dominatio*] *Sp. Maelium consimili exitu* [sc. execution followed by house demolition] *patria multavit*. Quint. Inst. 3.7.20: *post mortem adiecta quibusdam ignominia est, ut Maelio, cuius domus solo aequata*. Vir. Ill. 17.5: [sc. *Cincinnatus*] *dictator dictus Sp. Maelium regnum adfectantem a Servilio Ahala magistro equitum occidi iussit, domum eius solo aequavit*.

23. The only other detailed narrative of Maelius' conspiracy, in Dion. Hal. 12.1.1–12.4.6, gives the house no symbolic weight. In this account Maelius conspires in the Forum—sitting on a tribunal, dispensing advice, convoking assemblies, and driving naysayers out. Thus his conspiracy consists partly in usurping magisterial functions (e.g., 12.1.5–6, 10; 12.2.3). Meanwhile his opponents, including senators and magistrates, are excluded from the civic sphere and must assemble secretly (12.1.4) or by night (12.2.1)—behaving, that is, like stereotypical conspirators (see n.20). Maelius' house enters this account only once, as a potential refuge from his attackers (12.2.8). Dionysius reports its demolition at 12.4.6 as a sanction for seeking νεώτερα πράγματα (12.2.4) or ἡγεμονία (12.2.9), but does not expressly “interpret” the demolition, as Livy does, nor does his account as a whole provide a basis for inferring its practical or symbolic effects.

to other nearby hilltops and mobilizing their seditious overtones. Second, since *arx* is also the generic term for the citadel in any city, it is the location of the fortified house of the stereotypical *tyrannus* (in the Roman sense of “unjust or illegitimate king”) who looms so large in the historical imagination and rhetorical exercises of late Republican and early Imperial Roman aristocrats.²⁴ Given this incrustation of seditious and tyrannical symbolism, we might expect Livy to report that Manlius’ house was demolished following his downfall and execution. In fact Livy makes no explicit statement, but does imply it: he says a law was passed forbidding patricians to live on the Capitoline hill (6.20.13), and observes in this same passage and again subsequently (7.28.4–5) that the temple of Iuno Moneta eventually stood on the site of Manlius’ house (implying that the house was no longer there). Other texts, however, both earlier and later than Livy, explicitly say that Manlius’ house was demolished in the aftermath of his execution, and connect this demolition with the accusation of aspiring to kingship.²⁵ So although Livy himself omits to say that Manlius’ house was demolished in return for his seeking kingship, it is thanks primarily to Livy’s lengthy and literarily elaborated narrative—as also for the Maelian conspiracy—that we have access to the symbolic meanings that could be ascribed to demolition, and understand why the demolition could

24. These ideas are brought together at 6.19.1: *senatus de secessione in domum privatam plebis, forte etiam in arce positam, et imminente mole libertati agitatur*. Here the word *arx* hovers ambiguously between reference to the specific site of Manlius’ house and the generic site of the stereotypical tyrant’s house. Thus the location of the house, in Livy’s representation, both assimilates Manlius to the tyrant and poses an explicit threat to *libertas*. For the tyrant’s house being fortified and elevated (on an *arx*), see, e.g., Sen. *Cont.* 2.5.1, 3, 6–7, 20; also 3.6, 4.7, 9.4.4, 8; Sen. *Thy.* 455–56, 641–45. Discussion of this motif in Tabacco 1985: 42–45, Jaeger 1997: 83–84, and Oakley 1997: 1.552 (*ad loc.*)

The legend of Valerius Publicola likewise involves a house on a hilltop (the Velia) arousing the suspicion that he aspires to kingship. Livy writes, *regnum eum adfectare fama ferebat quia . . . aedificabat in summa Velia: ibi alto atque munito loco arcem inexpugnabilem fieri* (2.7.6; note the invidious use of *arx*). Similarly Cic. *Rep.* 2.53, Dion. Hal. 5.19.1, Val. Max. 4.1.1 (*instar arcis*), Plut. *Popl.* 10.1–3, Flor. 1.3.4 (*specie arcis*), Vir. *Ill.* 15, Serv. in *Aen.* 4.410. Valerius symbolically renounces these implied aspirations by razing the house and rebuilding it at the foot of the hill (Livy 2.7.11–12). The stories of Valerius and Manlius are explicitly linked in Plut. *Mor.* 285F (= *Quaest. Rom.* 91), and implicitly in Livy, who presents Valerius as an anti-Manlius *avant la lettre*. For Livy’s Valerius declares himself so benign that the *plebs* should not fear him even if he lived *in ipsa arce Capitolioque* (2.7.10)—i.e., on the (specific) Capitoline *arx*, the very thing that will later arouse anxieties about Manlius. Moreover, he is credited with promulgating a *lex Valeria* consecrating the person and possessions of any would-be king (Livy 2.8.2, cf. Plut. *Popl.* 12.1). On Valerius’ house see Weinstock 1971: 278–80, Coarelli 1983: 1.79–82, Mustakallio 1994: 28–29.

25. Cic. *Dom.* 101: *M. Manlius . . . regnum adpetisse est iudicatus; ergo eius domum eversam duobus lucis convestitam videtis*. Note that, for Cicero, house demolition follows logically, *ergo*, upon the judgment of having aspired to kingship. However, he apparently places Manlius’ house in the saddle between the two summits of the Capitoline hill, rather than on the *arx* proper: Wiseman, *LTUR* 1.130 (s.v. *asylum*). See also Vir. *Ill.* 24.5–6: *regni adfectati <suspectus> . . . reus factus . . . damnatus et de saxo Tarpeio praecipitatus, domus diruta, bona publicata*; Dio (Zon.) 7.23.10; Dio fr. 26.1. Ov. *Fast.* 6.183–90 notes the demolition and the accusation of aspiring to kingship without connecting them closely. Val. Max. 6.3.1a, like Livy, does not expressly mention demolition but notes the erection of the temple on the housesite.

be thought fitting for the aspirant to kingship in general and for Manlius in particular.²⁶

One may, therefore, wonder whether the symbolics of the demolished *domus* as analyzed above represent a viewpoint idiosyncratic to Livy, one that is not generalizable across Roman culture. Narratives of other instances of house demolition, however, also link aristocratic houses and social power in ways that corroborate the analysis developed so far. Consider the cases of C. Gracchus and his ally M. Fulvius Flaccus. In Appian's account of the Gracchan turmoil of 121 BCE, these two men withdrew to their houses, accompanied by their partisans, the night before their final, violent confrontation with the consul L. Opimius. The next morning they emerged from their houses, having armed their partisans, to seize the Aventine hill.²⁷ While Appian does not elaborate on the houses' role, his very understatement is telling: he assumes any reader would understand that these men's social power derived from the social networks that were nurtured in and projected from their *domus*. Plutarch's account of these events (*C. Gracch.* 14–15) remarks upon the *senatus consultum ultimum* that was passed against the Gracchans, interpreting it as a command to the consul Opimius to “save the city . . . and destroy the tyrants.”²⁸ He goes on to relate, like Appian, that the supporters of Gracchus and Fulvius gathered in their leaders' houses the night before the final confrontation, to protect and go forth with them the next day. He further says that Fulvius' supporters armed themselves that morning with the Gallic spoils that adorned the walls of Fulvius' house—spoils he had collected, as victor, from the battlefield and paraded in his triumph two years earlier.²⁹ This additional detail projects a “back story” that deepens the symbolic links among the house, the ambitious aristocrat, and his social network. This story begins with the aristocrat cultivating a network of friends and dependents, using his house as a logistical base, to the point that he can mobilize this network for electoral support.

26. The only other substantial narrative of Manlius' sedition, at Plut. *Cam.* 36, omits the domestic component visible in Livy. The senate infers that trouble is afoot from the tumult Manlius' supporters raise in the forum (36.3–4), not from any activities in his house. The eventual demolition of the house is noted (36.9). But no thematic or symbolic link is suggested between the demolition, any activities that took place in the house, or Manlius' tyrannical aims in general. The same holds for narratives of Sp. Cassius' sedition: although his house is said to be demolished, no surviving account thematizes the house in relation to its destruction. See section IIIa, however, for the memorial dynamics of subordinate structures on the site.

27. App. *BCiv.* 1.25–26 (112–14): ὁ μὲν Γράκχος καὶ ὁ Φλάκκος . . . ἐς τὰς οἰκίας διέτρεχον, καὶ οἱ συνθέμενοι αὐτοῖς συνήεσαν ἐς αὐτάς . . . ἢ μὲν βουλή Γράκχον καὶ Φλάκκον ἐκ τῶν οἰκῶν . . . ἐκάλουν, οἱ δὲ σὺν ὅπλοις ἐξέθεον ἐπὶ τὸν Ἀβεντῖνον λόφον.

28. Plut. *C. Gracch.* 14.3: [sc. the senators]. . . ἐψηφίσαντο καὶ προσέταξαν Ὀπιμίῳ τῷ ὑπάτῳ σφῆξιν τὴν πόλιν ὅπως δύναιτο καὶ καταλύειν τοὺς τυράννους.

29. Plut. *C. Gracch.* 14.5: [sc. οἱ πολλοὶ] κακίσαντες αὐτοὺς ὡς ἐγκαταλείποντες τὸν ἄνδρα καὶ προδιδόντες ἦγον ἐπὶ τῶν θυρῶν. . . (15.1) ἅμα δὲ ἡμέρᾳ τὸν μὲν Φούλβιον ἐκ τοῦ πότου καθεύδοντα μόλις ἐπεγείραντες ὠπλίζοντο τοῖς περὶ τὴν οἰκίαν αὐτοῦ λαφύροις, ἃ Γαλάτας νενικηκῶς ὅτε ὑπάτευεν εἰλήφει. . . Fulvius (*RE Fulvius* (58)), cos. 125 BCE, triumphed as proconsul over three Gallic peoples in 123.

Rising eventually to the consulship, he is empowered to deploy the *res publica*'s implements of force. With this power he wins a military victory that earns him the greatest honor of all, the triumph. Some of the booty ends up in the house; captured armor and weapons in particular—mounted on the walls of the *vestibulum* and *atrium*, where the morning callers (*salutatores*) congregate—serve as monuments in a double sense. These spoils not only represent the awesome prestige of the ex-consul and *triumphator*, commemorating the victory in which he took them and the triumph in which he displayed them, but they are also, in this location, literally brought “home” to the place where his rise to power began and was continuously nurtured, and as such commemorate the power and success of the social network centered in the house. They say to *salutatores* and other supporters who assemble in the atrium, “This is your doing, as well as mine.”³⁰ In the passage under discussion, the social network still centered on Fulvius’ house arms itself with these very spoils—thereby reactivating Fulvius’ fossilized, monumentalized power as a military commander, while manifesting its own power not, as before, in the form of electoral support, but as violent force.³¹ The aristocratic *domus*, thanks to its interconnected monumental and social functions, is a premier venue for converting one form of symbolic capital into another (the elections and the battlefield are other key venues), and it is precisely this capacity of the *domus* that Plutarch’s account of Fulvius’ last hours spotlights. In a situation where factions based in aristocratic houses engage in civil conflict, and allegations of aspiring to kingship are hurled against the aristocrats at the heads of these factions, it comes as no surprise to hear that Fulvius’ house was demolished following his execution, and his property confiscated. This is related not by Plutarch or Appian, however, in whose accounts the house explicitly features, but rather by Cicero, who briefly notes that Fulvius was killed and suffered house demolition “because he had acted, along with C. Gracchus, contrary to the public good.”³²

30. For displaying spoils in the most visible parts of the *domus*, see Cic. *Phil.* 2.68 (in *vestibulo*); Livy 38.43.10, Verg. *Aen.* 2.504, 7.183–86, *Ov. Tr.* 3.1.34 (all *postes*); Verg. *Aen.* 8.196–97 (*fores*); Plin. *Nat.* 35.7 (*foris et circa limina*); Polyb. 6.39.10 (ἐν τε ταῖς οἰκίαις κατὰ τοὺς ἐπιφανεστάτους τόπους). In general see Wiseman 1987: 394–98; Rawson 1990: 158–61, 166; Polito 1998: 26 (also 127–32 on painted and stucco decorations that depict spoils); and Welch 2006: 110–12 (and *passim* on the Roman “booty aesthetic” of the mid- to late Republic).

31. There are additional symbolic complexities. The reader may find this conversion of social power into armed force troubling, since Fulvius no longer holds *imperium* and so has no secular or religious authority from the *res publica* to command such a force (nor, even if he had *imperium*, would it hold sway inside the *pomerium*). It may also be portentous that these partisans seize the weapons of vanquished foes, and so present themselves as the reembodyment of enemy soldiers who have once already been crushed. For other cases of citizens arming themselves with spoils, see Livy 23.14.3–4; Sil. 10.598–600.

32. Cic. *Dom.* 102: *M. Flaccus quia cum C. Graccho contra salutem rei publicae fecerat ex senatus sententia est interfectus; eius domus eversa et publicata est...* (cf. §114, where Fulvius is described as *qui perniciose rei publicae consilia cepisset*; also Cic. *Cat.* 1.4, where he is killed *propter quasdam seditio-nis suspiciones*). Cf. Val. Max. 6.3.1c, possibly echoing Cicero: *ideoque*

A further detail about C. Gracchus' social network and its domestic context warrants discussion. The younger Seneca reports (*Ben.* 6.34) that Gracchus, and after him M. Livius Drusus (tribune of the plebs in 91 BCE), handled their morning *salutatores* in an innovative way: they divided them into three groups distinguished by status, and received each group in a specific, differentiated manner (6.34.2). Seneca is concerned with the nature of "true" friendship, which he says an aristocrat will not find among callers so treated; indeed he describes it, ominously for Gracchus and Drusus, as "a habit of kings and those pretending to be kings" to set such value on entering the house and touching the threshold, or on waiting closer to the entrance or entering before others—since, once admitted, a caller finds ever more doors within that exclude him from more intimate contact.³³ Thus Seneca presents the overly ambitious aristocrat's social network (his notional "friends") as not only grounded in, but also structurally articulated by, the spaces within his *domus*, and by the doors and thresholds that provide or deny privileged access to those spaces. It is through such social practice in domestic settings that men like Gracchus or Livius gain, or at least seek, power.

Since Gracchus is characterized as a "pretend king" for the way he fosters his social network within his house (Seneca), and is called, along with Fulvius, a "tyrant" (Plutarch) whose supporters gather in and emerge from his house to do violence on the streets of Rome (Plutarch, Appian), we might expect his house to share the fate of Fulvius'. Yet, while Gracchus' property was reportedly confiscated and plundered, no surviving text says that his house was demolished.³⁴ Eck and Flower suggest that C. Gracchus, as a younger son, inherited no house,

M. Flacci et L. Saturnini seditiosissimorum civium corporibus trucidatis penates ab imis fundamentis eruti sunt. More on Fulvius' house in section IIIa.

The Saturninus mentioned at Val. Max. 6.3.1c is presumably L. Appuleius Saturninus (*RE* Appuleius (29)), the tumultuous tribune of BCE 103, 100, and designated for 99. Certain texts mention the size and violent behavior of his retinue (Liv. *Per.* 69, Val. Max. 9.7.3, App. *BCiv.* 1.32 (142–43), Oros. 5.17.3), or assert that he exercised *dominatio* or welcomed being called *rex* (Flor. *Epit.* 2.4.3–4, Oros. 5.17.6). One text alleges a seditious *contio* in his house (Oros. 5.17.6). He was killed in a riot in late 100 (Broughton 1951–86: 3.20–23). Only Val. Max. states that his house was then demolished. While these scattered texts do not allow a detailed symbolic analysis, the elements from which a narrative of aspiring to kingship is often constructed are clearly present in this tradition. On Saturninus and kingship see Salerno 1990: 124–25, Martin 1982–94: 2.132–33; on sanctions against his memory, Flower 2006: 82–83.

33. Sen. *Ben.* 6.34.1–3: *consuetudo ista vetus est regibus regesque simulantibus populum amicorum describere, et proprium superbiae magno aestimare introitum ac tactum sui liminis et pro honore dare ut ostio suo propius adsideas, ut gradum prior intra domum ponas, in qua deinceps multa sunt ostia, quae receptos quoque excludant. apud nos primi omnium C. Gracchus et mox Livius Drusus instituerunt segregare turbam suam et alios in secretum recipere, alios cum pluribus, alios universos. habuerunt itaque isti amicos primos, habuerunt secundos, numquam veros. amicum vocas, cuius disponitur salutatio?* (Cf. n.38; for the thought, also Cic. *Att.* 1.18.1).

34. Confiscation: Plut. *C. Gracch.* 17.6, Oros. 5.12.9. App. *BCiv.* 1.26 (119) writes that the people "plundered" both men's houses (ὁ δὲ δῆμος αὐτῶν τὰς οἰκίας διήρπαξε). διαρπάζω may perhaps be understood to mean "demolish," but only at a stretch. On Gracchus' property see Oakley 1997: 1.566, Salerno 1990: 120–23; also Fiori 1996: 407–10 on the accusations of tyranny against both Gracchi.

and therefore may have lived either in rented accommodation or in a property belonging to his wife Licinia's dowry. A house he occupied but did not own, these scholars imply, may have been exempted from the subsequent confiscation or destruction of his property.³⁵ For other figures too, however—notably Ti. Gracchus, M. Livius Drusus, and C. Iulius Caesar—no post-mortem demolition is attested, although all were murdered amidst accusations of tyranny and despite (in the first two cases) occupying houses that are portrayed as the nerve centers of huge social networks. For current purposes, I would merely observe that demolition is a common, but not universal, element in the discourse of the (over)ambitious aristocrat who derives great, even dangerously excessive, power from the social network he fosters in his house.³⁶

This discourse is most spectacularly evident in Cicero's writings about the demolition of his house. In several speeches following his return from exile in 57 BCE, he describes the events preceding his departure from Rome in 58, and

35. Eck, *LTUR* 2.176; Flower 2006: 77–78. However, see n.48 on Licinia's dotal property and its involvement in Gracchus' fall.

36. On Ti. Gracchus as potential tyrant/*rex* see Martin 1982–94: 2.123–31, 343–47, Fiori 1996: 407–10, and Flower 2006: 74 and n.25; on his house see Guilhembet, *LTUR* 5.253, with further references.

Livius Drusus (*RE Livius* (18)): many texts remark on his wealth, generosity, ambition, and large retinue (Vell. Pat. 2.14.1–2, Sen. *Brev.* 6.34.1–2, Flor. *Epit.* 2.5, *Vir. Ill.* 66). As tribune in 91 BCE he cultivated the plebs by promulgating an agrarian law, and proposed enfranchising the Italians; Diod. Sic. 37.11 reports an oath of loyalty that the Italians are supposed to have sworn to him (discussion by Herrmann 1968: 55–58). His house is thematized as a powerful social center: in addition to Sen. *Ben.* 6.34 (discussed above), Vell. Pat. 2.14.3 and Plut. *Mor.* 800F report that he built this house on the Palatine, requiring it to be so constructed that everything he did would be visible to all. One point of this story, with its emphasis on his desire for high visibility in a domestic setting, is to characterize him as ambitious to attract many *salutatores* and build a large retinue. His Italian supporters are later said to gather there (Val. Max. 3.1.2, Plut. *Cat. Min.* 2; cf. Liv. *per.* 71 for the Italians' "meetings and conspiracies"). All of this might seem to mark him as an aspirant to kingship, courting execution and house demolition. However, he also cultivated the higher orders, proposing to draft equestrians into the senate and then to return control of the *quaestiones* to this reconstituted senate. In the end, he was slain by an unknown assailant for uncertain reasons, (suitably enough) in or near the *atrium* of his house, amidst his retinue (esp. *Rhet. Her.* 4.31, Liv. *per.* 71, Vell. Pat. 2.14.1–2, App. *BCiv.* 1.36 (164), *Vir. Ill.* 66). No text asserts that his house was demolished. Indeed, scholars universally interpret Vell. Pat. 2.14.3 as meaning that the house continued to stand, passing 28 years later into Cicero's hands (*cum aedificaret domum in Palatio, in eo loco ubi est quae quondam Ciceronis, mox Censorini fuit, nunc Statilii Sisennae est. . .*). The clear distinction drawn here between the house of Livius and that of Cicero-Censorinus-Sisenna presumably reflects Vell. Pat.'s knowledge of the Clodian demolition and subsequent rebuilding (2.45.3).

Caesar: accusations that he aspired to become *rex/tyrannus* swirled near the end of his life and after his death: Fiori 1996: 451–61 offers detailed discussion, with sources and bibliography; also Weinstock 1971: 270–76, 318–41. However, his property was not confiscated following his death, nor is a demolition reported. His murderers' decision not to pursue vendettas at least partly accounts for the non-confiscation; as for the non-demolition, from 63–44 BCE Caesar's official residence as *pontifex maximus* was the *domus publica* (Suet. *Iul.* 46), which was provided at public expense. Being state owned, this property was presumably not a candidate for punitive demolition regardless how any particular occupant used it. In the event, it was duly occupied by the next *pontifex maximus*, M. Aemilius Lepidus (Dio 54.27.3). Nevertheless, one prodigy relating to Caesar's assassination is his wife Calpurnia's dream that the house fell down (Dio 44.17.1–2) or that its pediment—perhaps

his house's role in those events. As he describes it in *De Domo Sua* (53–55), his house was the center of resistance by the “good men” (*boni*) against the tumultuous tribune Clodius; indeed, it was “packed” with such men. Yet, because of threats issued by friends of the consuls Gabinius and Piso, who were collaborating with Clodius, these *boni* were filled with the dread of being proscribed, and thus was Cicero's support eventually stripped away.³⁷ In *In Pisonem* he boasts that, in the face of Piso's attacks, not only his house, but the entire Palatine, was “packed” by the Senate, the equestrians, the citizenry in general, and municipal Italians as well. He implies that his throng of supporters had grown so large that his own atrium could not accommodate them, so they spilled out into the surrounding neighborhood.³⁸ When his support collapsed, however, he fled the city and his house was plundered and burned (*Dom.* 60–62; *Pis.* 26).

As he describes these events in *De Domo Sua*, Cicero weighs two possible motivations for this plundering and destruction. Were the consuls greedy for his furniture, silver, doors, columns, and so on? Perhaps not, since Clodius had granted them entire provinces to plunder as a bribe for their cooperation (§60)—in comparison to which the fittings of Cicero's house were an insignificant prize. A more likely motivation, in his view, is sheer hatred, as when “we” (apparently Romans), following particularly nasty wars, demolish enemy cities out of hatred rather than greed, “since a bit of war seems still to cling to the houses and buildings” (§61). The simile's conclusion is lost in a lacuna, leaving the character of the intended parallel between the destruction of houses and cities somewhat unclear.³⁹ However, the idea that the owners' hostility clings to the walls, hence that the buildings are extensions of their owners, is precisely the argument Livy's

a regal symbol—fell off (*Obs.* 67, *Suet. Iul.* 81, *Plut. Caes.* 63.9). Thus the metonymic link between the fate of the house and its occupant is still observable, in a modified way. On the *domus publica* see Weinstock 1971: 276–81 (for the pediment); Carettoni 1978–80: 346–55 (archaeology); Scott, *LTUR* 2.165–66 (s.v. *domus publica*); Papi, *LTUR* 2.169–70 (s.v. *domus regis sacrorum*); Guilhembet 2001: 219–21.

37. *Dom.* 55: *cum [sc. consules] . . . me terrerent minis, mihi caedem et dimicationem denuntiarent, meam domum refertam viris bonis per amicos suos compleverent proscriptionis metu, me frequentia nudarent virorum bonorum, me praesidio spoliarent senatus . . . ne tum quidem vis erat?*

38. *Pis.* 11: *erat non solum domus mea, sed totum Palatium senatu, equitibus Romanis, civitate omni, Italia cuncta refertum.* . . . (cf. *Att.* 2.22.3, predating his exile, where Cicero describes the throngs at his house and the power they confer). For throngs of *salutatores* filling up the streets around the house of a great man, cf. *Sen. Ben.* 6.34.4—an expansion of Seneca's remarks on the reception practices of Gracchus and Livius Drusus (see n.33). It is striking, if only coincidental, that Cicero's pre-demolition Palatine house was probably Livius' own (*Vell. Pat.* 2.14.3; Papi, *LTUR* 2.132, 202–203; see n.36 on Livius). Hence Seneca's generic description of massed *salutatores* notionally involves the selfsame house and streets as Cicero's concrete description of the same.

39. *Dom.* 61: *ut hostium urbes . . . quibuscum acerbum bellum internecivumque suscepimus, non praeda adducti sed odio solemus excindere, . . . cum horum etiam tectis et sedibus residere aliquod bellum semper videtur****. On the lacuna and possible supplements, see Nisbet 1939: 128; cf. §143 where the idea is briefly resumed. The symbolics of city destruction are beyond this paper's scope, but note that Cicero elsewhere presents the monumental dynamics of city destruction as comparable to those of house demolition: *Leg. Agr.* 1.5, 2.51 sees the demolition of Carthage as having a symbolic, memorial function (cf. *Fam.* 4.5.4), while at *Leg. Agr.* 2.87–90 and *Off.* 1.35

Cincinnatus offers for demolishing Maelius' house, as discussed above (Liv. 4.15.8, cf. Val. Max. 6.3.1c). It is also strongly affirmed elsewhere in *De Domo Sua*, as Cicero repeatedly assimilates his person to the structure of his house. At §63, immediately after describing how the house was burnt, he declares that the firebrands were thrown "at me alone"—though he had personally left Rome some hours earlier. At §131 he declares, even more vividly, that Clodius "placed his statue of Licence (rather than Liberty) in the blood and, one might almost say, the bones of a citizen well-deserving of the commonwealth." And at §137, he says that Clodius placed his monument "in the guts of the man who saved the city."⁴⁰ This persistent synecdoche, whereby the house is figured as part of its owner's body, lends credibility to Cicero's second suggested motivation for the Clodian plundering and destruction of his house.

Elsewhere in the speech, however, Cicero's arguments reveal that Clodius had a further, perhaps weightier, aim in attacking his house: the desire to assimilate him to the kingship-aspirants and related figures. Cicero's analysis of the demolitions suffered by these figures in §§101–102—a discussion crucial to our understanding of how the discourse works, and therefore often cited in this paper—is in fact framed as a systematic comparison between their experience of demolition and his own. He explicitly acknowledges that his experience is similar to theirs, and he uses forms of the same verb, *evertere* (literally, "overturn"), to refer to those demolitions as well as his own.⁴¹ The crucial difference, he asserts, is that those figures aimed to destroy the *res publica*, while he himself saved it. His self-presentation as "savior" refers to his suppression of the Catilinarian conspiracy, and counters Clodius' longstanding accusation that he had behaved like a tyrant or *rex* in ordering the summary execution of certain conspirators

pragmatic functions are foremost. Connor 1985: 96–99 compares the symbolics of city destruction and house demolition in Greek contexts.

40. *Dom.* 63: *in me uno consulares faces iactae manibus tribuniciis . . . adhaeserunt.* §131: *tu in civis optime de re publica meriti cruore ac paene ossibus simulacrum non libertatis publicae sed licentiae collocasti* (here *paene* apologizes for the vividness of the figure). §137: *in visceribus eius qui urbem suis laboribus ac periculis conservasset monumentum deletae rei publicae conlocaris.* Berg 1997: 137–40 offers excellent observations on the "owner is his house" synecdoche in this speech.

41. Explicit statement at *Dom.* 101: *quam igitur maiores nostri sceleratis ac nefariis civibus maximam poenam constitui posse arbitrati sunt, eandem ego subibo ac sustinebo, ut apud posteros nostros non extinctor coniurationis et sceleris sed auctor et dux fuisse videar?* Cicero uses the participle *eversa* (in various cases) to refer to the demolitions of Cassius', Vaccus', Manlius Capitolinus', and Fulvius Flaccus' houses in §§101–102, and to refer to his own house in §§101, 147.

The first joint appearance of Cassius, Maelius, and Manlius in surviving texts is here in *Dom.* (they appear later as an exclusive threesome in Cicero at *Rep.* 2.49, *Phil.* 2.87, 114, and often in later authors). Vigour 2001a: 281 suggests that Cicero was indeed the first to link these three together as kingship-aspirants, precisely for the sake of the argument in *Dom.* 101–102 (also Pina Polo 2006: 87 and Chassignet 2001: 87–89; cf. Mommsen 1871: 269–71, who sees the threesome as an earlier, annalistic creation). But since Cicero here replies to Clodius' accusation of behaving like a tyrant, Clodius may already have propounded a list of such figures, including these three, to support this accusation.

without allowing them their rights of trial and appeal. According to this representation, Cicero subjected fellow-citizens to arbitrary corporal punishment as if they were slaves, and so, in the stereotypical manner of the tyrant, usurped master-like power over them.⁴² The demolition of his house, with its overtones of defeating and eliminating a would-be tyrant or *rex*, was to cohere symbolically with, and thereby underpin, this accusation; the erection of a sanctuary of Libertas on the site, which Clodius subsequently engineered, further symbolized the “freeing” of the civic community from this master-figure’s oppression, and monumentalized Clodius as “liberator.”⁴³ Now, the specific form of Cicero’s allegedly tyrannical behavior—the deployment of illegal force as consul—differs from that ascribed to Maelius, Manlius, Gracchus, and Fulvius, who cultivated large, loyal, and seditious personal followings. We have seen that house demolition has a particular symbolic relevance to the latter type behavior, as the house’s condition is metonymically that of the owner and his social network. Demolition thus seems less symbolically apt in Cicero’s case, as Clodius has presented it.⁴⁴ Nevertheless, Cicero himself supplements this symbolic deficit by boasting (as noted above) of the vast social network rooted in his house; moreover, he acknowledges, indeed insists, that demolition inflicted a blow upon himself and his network that was, if not fatal, pragmatically effective and symbolically powerful. At *Dom.* 101 he paints a vivid and pathetic picture of his house “overturned and built up” by Clodius (i.e., it was demolished and the sanctuary of Libertas was built on the site), and “placed before the eyes of the citizen body, so that the lamentations of good men might never subside.”⁴⁵ In this representation, the *boni*—the people

42. These accusations begin soon after Cicero’s consulship ends (e.g., *Sull.* 21–22, 26–27, 48, dating to mid-62, and *Att.* 1.16.10, dating to mid-61). In *Dom.* Cicero notes the tyrant/*rex* accusation at §§75–76 and 94, then confronts it at greater length in §§101–102, as just discussed. Scholarly discussion of Cicero as tyrant/*rex* by Allen 1944: 5–9, Tatum 1999: 158 and n.45, 165–66, Pina Polo 2006: 96–97, Clark 2007: 209–12, and especially Nippel 1988: 114–19; also Roller 2001: 213–64 on the master-slave metaphor in Roman political discourse.

43. In section IIIa, I discuss the symbolics of Clodius’ actions in detail. In Greek contexts, the demolition of houses (also of cities and walls) only occasionally symbolizes “liberation” from literal or metaphorical tyranny, or responds to “treason” that takes the form of elevating a tyrant: Connor 1985: 96–99 (esp. sources T2, T11); Schmitz 2004: 362–66, 370–71. In the Roman discourse of demolition, however, this symbolism is regular.

44. Fiori 1996: 445–50 likewise contends, on different grounds, that Clodius ascribes to Cicero a “non-canonical” form of kingship-aspiration; see Vigour 2001b: 334–35 for imposing clientele as a key characteristic of the would-be tyrant or king.

45. *Dom.* 101: . . . *in ea* [sc. *urbe*] *possim intueri domum meam eversam non ab inimico meo sed ab hoste communi, et ab eodem exstructam* [Mss.; *eodem* <*aedem*> *exstructam* Lambinus] *et positam in oculis civitatis, ne umquam conquiescere possit fletus bonorum?* Lambinus’ supplement smooths the sense, is palaeographically tidy, and is accepted by most editors (though not in Watts’ Loeb). I think it cannot be correct, however. While Cicero often refers to temples and houses as *aedes*, nowhere else in this speech does he dignify Clodius’ building with this term—understandably, since he seeks to persuade the *pontifices* that it was not legitimately consecrated. Rather, he calls this building a *monumentum*, i.e., to his own oppression or Clodius’ transgressions (§§51, 100(2x), 112, 116, 137, 146: see section IIIa), or alternatively says that Clodius “placed” (*collocare, ponere*) Libertas in his house (108, 110(2x), 131, 132), or that Libertas “drove” (*pellere, expellere*) him from

who used to “pack” his house, constituting the social network from which he derived his power—were not, upon their defeat, destroyed along with the house, but were displaced, and are now imagined to be elsewhere in the city, looking up tearfully at Clodius’ constructions on the site of their champion’s house. This is why he insists to the *pontifices*, the principal audience for this speech, that the sanctuary of Libertas must be deconsecrated (or rather, acknowledged as never having been properly consecrated) and removed so that his house can be restored on its original site. Only then, he says—in a lengthy concluding assimilation of self to house (§§143–47, cf. 100)—will his own personal restoration be true and complete.⁴⁶

The texts discussed so far—primarily from Livy and Cicero, with scraps from other authors—are the only ones I know that give information, explicit or implicit, about the practical and symbolic aims and consequences of demolishing an aristocratic *domus*. Central to the discourse of demolition, clearly, is the first of the two “monumental” aspects described above: namely, the idea that the house is the venue in which its owner cultivates a large and loyal clientele, and that the house also stands metonymically for the owner, his clientele, and their political aims. Demolition may result from the civic community’s judgment that a particular aristocrat/clientele combination has become dangerous to the political order (“aspiring to kingship”). Demolition’s practical and symbolic consequences thus consist of stripping the aristocrat and his clientele of the spaces in which they marshalled their strength, and of metonymically representing their joint destruction. Occasionally we also catch sight of an even tighter symbolic connection between owner and house, one synecdochic rather than metonymic: the idea that the physical structure of the house is an extension of its owner, or is infused with his character. On this view, demolition is required if the owner and his dangerous qualities are to be eliminated entirely.

his house (108, 111). In *Leg.* 2.42 he refers to Clodius’ building as *templum Licentiae*, where any legitimacy conferred by the term *templum* is promptly undercut by the derogatory designation for the goddess (quoted n.59; cf. Nisbet 1939: 207 on these terms). The mss. reading in §101 can be retained without great difficulty, as the closely parallel construction in §147 shows: *domo per scelus erepta, per latrocinium occupata, per religionis vim scelevatius etiam aedificata quam eversa*. Here Cicero speaks of his “house more criminally built than overturned” without additional specification of what, exactly, is built in its place.

46. The case of Sulla *dictator*’s house in Rome, reportedly demolished in 87 BCE following his departure for Asia and Marius’ return to the city, resembles Cicero’s case in some aspects. To my knowledge, no text describing the events of 87 imputes to Sulla an aspiration to kingship. However, he was declared a public enemy and hence was effectively exiled. At App. *BCiv.* 1.73 (340), the account of proscriptions and confiscations under Cinna includes the assertion that Sulla’s house was demolished; at *BCiv.* 1.77 (351) Sulla complains of these wrongs in a letter to the senate (cf. *Mith.* 54 (204), along with Plut. *Sull.* 22 for his villas being destroyed in addition; on the symbolics of this destruction see Thein 2002: 94–95). If Sulla really lost his only townhouse, then upon his bloody return to Rome in 82 he purchased, rented, or (most likely) confiscated a house suited to his needs. For Plut. *Cat. Min.* 3 and Val. Max. 3.1.2 speak of the large numbers of *salutatores* he received during his dictatorship (implying that he occupied a suitable house), and of the heads of the proscribed being set up in his atrium.

B. FAMILY, LINEAGE, AND DOMESTIC CULT

What, then, of the second cluster of monumental features described above—the *imagines*, *stemma*, and spoils, as well as the sites, objects, and practices of domestic cult within the aristocratic *domus*? Some scholars regard these features as symbolizing the integrity, continuity, and enduring sociopolitical power of the owner's family and familial line; they are patently swept away along with everything else when a *domus* is destroyed. Could an assault on the owner's kin and lineage as a whole be intended or implied by the destruction of these monuments?

To approach this question, let us begin by considering any other indications that the malefactor's family is, or is not, caught up in his downfall. In some cases we find explicit statements that broader assaults on the family are unacceptable. Dionysius of Halicarnassus (8.80) says that Sp. Cassius' sons were exempted from sharing their father's fate, and asserts the general principle that sons are not implicated in or punished for their fathers' crimes. To be sure, the very assertion of this norm betrays the expectation or fear that the family and its property will indeed be swept up in the malefactor's fall, and Dionysius mentions one particular instance: the sanctions against the children of Sulla's victims. Still, he argues that these unjust penalties were eventually reversed, and their perpetrators were held in contempt and duly punished by the gods. The case of Fulvius Flaccus is similar. Several texts note that his sons were killed along with him, one of them as he attempted to mediate between the partisans of his father and those of the consul Opimius. Two texts explicitly state that the consul committed an outrageous transgression in killing the latter youth, since he was not responsible for his father's acts—thus the norm is asserted, by way of acknowledging its violation.⁴⁷ In the case of C. Gracchus' wife Licinia, a text by the jurist Mucius Scaevola (preserved in the Digest of Justinian) indicates that she lost the property that constituted her dowry during the tumult following her husband's death. Apparently Opimius' partisans, while they did not murder her, did not hesitate to seize her dotal property, which Gracchus presumably administered. They should not have done so, says Scaevola: he declares that her dotal property must be restored, "because the sedition was Gracchus' fault," i.e., not hers.⁴⁸ The case of Manlius Capitolinus is different: several texts note that

47. On Fulvius' son see Vell. Pat. 2.7.2, Plut. *C. Gracch.* 16.1–3, 17.5–6; also App. *BCiv.* 1.26 (115–16, 120); Oros. 5.12.6, 9. Cic. *Cat.* 1.4 mentions the sons' deaths as an exemplum of (apparently warranted) consular severity. By contrast, the Archaic and Classical Greek practice of house demolition strikes more overtly at the malefactor's entire *oikos*: other current family members are sometimes explicitly included, and we hear also of bans on future burials and the digging up of existing graves (Connor 1985: 86, 93–96, Schmitz 2004: 362–66, 372–73). In some cases, however, the view can be found that children are not responsible for parents' crimes. Thus Connor identifies a tension in Greek thinking between ideas of collective responsibility, represented by the concept of pollution, and individual responsibility.

48. Dig. 24.3.66.pr.: *ea sententia Publii Mucii est: nam is in Licinnia Gracchi uxore statuit, quod res dotales in ea seditione, qua Gracchus occisus erat, perissent, ait, quia Gracchi culpa ea*

the *praenomen* “Marcus” was banned to future Manlii. Livy calls this a “familial stigma” (*gentilicia altera* [sc. *nota*], 6.20.14), a formulation that presupposes the family’s continuity, and indeed seems designed to protect its integrity by removing from circulation one sign that points to the disgraced member. Thus, in whatever other ways he may be commemorated, his nomenclature at least cannot be reproduced within the family.⁴⁹ Cicero, meanwhile, says that his wife Terentia, children Tullia and Marcus, and brother Quintus all experienced great danger and suffering during his exile. Yet none of these family members fled Rome in this period, nor did they incur official sanctions. Indeed Quintus, after returning from his *propraetorship* in Asia, agitated publicly and tirelessly for his brother’s return.⁵⁰ On the whole, then, these texts acknowledge that a malefactor’s family may be threatened by, and even caught up in, the punishment he suffers, and they note concrete instances. Yet they also normatively assert the contrary, and note countervailing practices that work to restore or at least avenge the family and its property if they are violated in this way.⁵¹ Thus the punitive demolition of an aristocratic *domus* does not, or *should* not, entail or accompany a wider practical assault on the owner’s family.

Could such a demolition nevertheless entail at least a *symbolic* assault on the owner’s family, in the sense of an attack on the symbols (*stemmata, imagines*, etc.) of his familial continuity and power? Details of the specific process(es) of demolition are hard to come by, beyond Cicero’s assertion that his house was looted and burned.⁵² But even if we imagine—without any textual support—

seditio facta esset, Licinniae praestari oportere. Discussion by Flower 2006: 76–78, with further references.

49. See generally Flower 2006: 49, Hedrick 2000: 103–105, and Vittinghoff 1936: 42–43. See also Flower 1998: 172–73 on the particular case of the son of Piso, the conspirator of 20 CE, being asked to change his *praenomen* (which he shared with his father), in the expectation that he would not be like him (*Senatus Consultum de Pisone Patre* lines 93–100, Tac. *Ann.* 3.17; Eck-Caballos-Fernandez 1996: 213–15 for further discussion and parallels). Flower 1998: 177–82 plausibly suggests that the memorial interests of the family of the condemned may diverge from those of the community at large, with the former seeking to eliminate monuments of his disgrace and the latter seeking to preserve them (i.e., to make the figure a negative *exemplum*); see section IIIb.

50. On the lives of Cicero’s family in Rome during his exile see Stein, *RE* 7A s.v. Tullius (31), cols. 1292–93; Kelly 2006: 123, 134–40; Treggiari 2007: 56–70. Tullia, now married, presumably lived with her husband, while Terentia initially sought refuge with the Vestals; we hear nothing of subsequent arrangements (Treggiari 2007: 60–61). Perhaps she and Marcus *filius* eventually occupied a *domus*, whether borrowed or rented, since Cicero says that the Roman people escorted him “home” the day he returned from exile (*a porta in Capitolium atque inde domum*, *Dom.* 76: what counts as *domum* under these circumstances?). Note that, while Cicero apparently did not lose all his property, the losses extended well beyond his Palatine house. On the damage to his villas at Tusculum and Formiae, see *Dom.* 62, *Red. Sen.* 18, *Att.* 4.2.5, 7, with Bodet 1997: 9. In general on the economics of exile, Kelly 2006: 137–41.

51. This is not to minimize the financial consequences of demolition and confiscation for the immediate family. Property of significant value simply disappears, and is not transmitted to the heirs, whose own social aspirations must suffer at least some degree of infringement as a result.

52. *Dom.* 60–62, *Pis.* 26. App. *BCiv.* 1.26 (119) alleges looting of Fulvius Flaccus’ house (prior to the demolition alleged only by Cic. *Dom.* 102). In no other case, however, do our texts offer specific information about the process of demolition.

that such looting was a regular feature of demolition, that the looters intentionally targeted the owner's ancestral monuments (e.g., the cabinets containing the owner's *imagines*, if he had any), and that the fragments of these monuments perhaps burned up in an ensuing conflagration, nevertheless the scope of such an attack would have been sharply limited by the actual or expected survival and impunity of his kin. For his close agnate male relatives (brothers, father, sons) must normally have had similar ancestral monuments in their own houses, provided they lived separately. In the case of Sp. Cassius, some accounts say that his father was his judge and executioner (n.74). Roman readers of these accounts would have assumed that father and son were living in separate houses, and would probably have further imagined (had the question even crossed their minds) that the same *stemma* and collection of *imagines* existed in each house. Thus the destruction of one Cassian *domus* would presumably leave at least one additional set of familial monuments intact.⁵³ The case of the Cicero brothers is similar. They too must have kept similar ancestral monuments in their houses—not wax masks representing ancestors who held office in Rome, since they were “new men,” but conceivably other types of ancestral portraiture and *stemmata*.⁵⁴ If the destruction of such ancestral monuments in Marcus' house were thought to constitute a symbolic attack on his family, the force of this attack must have been considerably blunted by the existence of a similar set of monuments in Quintus' house. This *domus*, which was apparently unmolested during the period of Marcus' exile, was also immediately adjacent to Marcus' house and presumably (like all aristocratic houses) stood open for anyone to visit.⁵⁵ I am not persuaded, then, that the authors of the texts that speak of house demolition, and/or their intended audiences, could have regarded the accompanying destruction of ancestral monuments as a damaging symbolic

53. We cannot know whether Roman aristocrats of the early fifth century BCE employed the same means of familial advertisement (*imagines*, *stemmata*, displays of spoils) that are well-attested in later periods. Such practices may be best understood as arising during the consolidation of the patricio-plebeian nobility, with its ethos of competition in the service of the *res publica*, in the latter part of the fourth century. Dionysius' readers, however, would likely have assumed that aristocrats of the early Republic employed the same strategies of self-advertisement familiar to them in their own day.

54. The Cicero brothers make much of their *novitas*: e.g., Cic. *Verr.* 2.4.80–81, 2.5.180–82; *Leg. Agr.* 2.1–2; Q. Cic. *Comm. Pet.* 2. Their mother Helvia, whom Plutarch calls “well born” (γεγονέναι καλῶς, Cic. 1.1), is connected by Gelzer (1969: 1) with a pair of Helvii who reached the praetorship in 198 and 197 BCE (*RE Helvius* (1), (4)). Since maternal as well as paternal ancestors were admitted into displays of *imagines*, at least during the late Republic, then these Helvii might have provided the Ciceros with *imagines*, if there was a relation. Yet these Helvii are never mentioned in the Ciceronian corpus, and were clearly not of interest to the brothers. Marcus and Quintus may, however, have kept portrait busts of their father and paternal grandfather, who are described as leading men of Arpinum. On *imagines* and *novitas* see Flower 1996: 61–65; also Dugan 2005: 93–96 and *passim* on the kind of “ancestry” a *novus homo* can fashion for himself.

55. In late 57 BCE, however, shortly after Marcus' return, Quintus' house was burned by Clodius' gangs: on the house see Papi, *LTUR* 2.204; on his rental arrangements following its destruction, see Cic. *Q. Fr.* 2.3.7.

attack, any more than a practical assault, on the malefactor's broader family or lineage.

Similar considerations hold regarding the sites and practices of domestic cult. Ancient texts occasionally describe the demolition of a house as the destruction of the owner's household gods, his *Lares (familiares)* and (*di*) *Penates*. While much about the conceptualization and worship of these divinities remains unclear, it is fairly certain that they were conceived as tutelary divinities for the *paterfamilias* and those who lived under his roof. The *Lares* seem to be connected with dead ancestors, and the *Genius*, with whom the *Lares* often share a shrine, is generally regarded as a guardian spirit of the *paterfamilias* himself. The *Penates* are typically a heterogenous assemblage of sacralized objects and divine images, some of which may be passed down from previous generations, and others selected by individuals currently living within the household. Thus Roman household cult seems to involve both synchronic, individualizing elements that are especially pertinent to particular members of the current household, and diachronic, inherited elements that look back to previous generations, with which rites distinctive to the trans-generational descent group are presumably associated.⁵⁶ Now, the destruction of shrines, objects, and images associated with domestic cult, amidst the punitive demolition of a malefactor's *domus*, might be thought to constitute a symbolic attack on the household and descent group with which this cult is associated, just as the destruction of ancestral monuments might be regarded as such an attack. But exactly the same considerations apply in this case as in that one. The survival of agnate kin living in other households, whose own domestic cult practice could be expected to share some images, objects, and rites with the malefactor's, means that the elements common to the descent group as a whole continue under other roofs (e.g., in the *domus* of Cassius' father and of Q. Cicero, notwithstanding the demolitions suffered by Cassius himself and Marcus). Only individualizing, household-specific elements of domestic cult practice are interrupted or eliminated by the destruction of a particular *domus*.

A number of texts do mention domestic divinities in the context of punitive house demolition. Yet these texts articulate a quite different symbolic connection between a *domus* and its divinities: the names of these gods are used synecdochically to indicate the house of which they are a part, but with heightened sentimentality, pathos, or drama. This usage seems to leverage their conception

56. On these matters see Bodel 2008 (esp. 248–49, 255–64), a major new synthesis and analysis of what can be known about Roman domestic cult. Cicero, in *De Legibus*, speaks of rites that are distinctive to any given lineage, that should be practiced and maintained across generations: *Leg.* 2.19, 22, 27, 47 (with Dyck 2004 *ad locc.*) Such practices need not be localized exclusively in the *domus*, however. Cicero may also be thinking of family tombs and necropoleis outside the city walls, and the funerary and other commemorative rites performed in such tombs.

In addition to Bodel 2008, see also Dubourdieu 1989, Orr 1978, and Fröhlich 1991: 27–48 on the location and character of the household cult(s) and shrines; Wachsmuth 1980: 46–53 considers the relationship between domestic and state religion.

as tutelary divinities who, however well-disposed to the master and his household, cannot in the end protect this house or its inhabitants.⁵⁷ In Livy's pathetic description (1.29.4–6) of the residents of Alba Longa leaving their city, which the Romans will demolish, the viewpoint of the evacuees is represented as follows: "each one grabbing what he could, they went out, leaving behind their *Lar* and *Penates* and the houses in which they were born and raised. . . and the sounds of lamentation were heard. . . ." Cicero achieves a similar effect in *De Domo Sua* (108–109), while meeting a rhetorical need distinctive to this speech. Were the immortal gods, he asks, greedy for my house? "That lovely Liberty of yours drove out my *di Penates* and *familiares Lares*, so she could settle herself, so to speak, on captured soil? What is more holy, more fortified by every sort of numinous awe, than the *domus* of every individual citizen? Here are his altars, his hearth, his *di Penates*; here are located his rites, ceremonies, and observances; here for all men is a refuge so inviolate that it is sacrilege for anyone to be torn away from it."⁵⁸ The paradoxical outrage, he concludes, is that Clodius evicted Cicero's household gods, thus violating true *religio*, to establish false *religio* via the fraudulent sanctuary of *Libertas* (109). Here Cicero, like Livy, harnesses the affective power of the *Lares* and *Penates* to produce a pathetic and moving description of his own suffering. But he also enmeshes these gods in a context that foregrounds or activates their specifically religious associations. This emphasis engages the responsibilities of the *pontifices*, the addressees of this speech, as they must determine whether the consecration of Cicero's housesite to *Libertas* was legitimate; the household gods themselves, in Cicero's representation, tell the *pontifices* that the correct answer is "no."⁵⁹

Valerius Maximus also exploits the heightened affect conveyed by the names of the household gods. Let us examine the rhetoric of 6.3.1c, where Valerius writes, *quantum ergo odii adversus hostes libertatis insitum animis antiqui haberent parietum ac tectorum, in quibus versati fuerant, ruinis testabantur. ideoque et M. Flacci et L. Saturnini seditiosissimorum civium corporibus trucidatis Penates ab imis fundamentis eruti sunt*. In the first sentence, Valerius asserts a general principle about house demolition in anodyne language: enemies of freedom suffer the downfall of the roofs and walls that sheltered them. The second sentence contains

57. On household gods and affect, see especially Dubourdieu 1989: 52–54, 101–111; also Saller 1984: 350, 354; Treggiari 2002: 104–106; Orr 1978: 1562–70.

58. For the house as refuge—where one should expect to find personal safety—see, e.g., Dion. Hal. 12.2.7 (Maelius); [Sen.] *Oct.* 887, *Sen. Marc.* 16.4, *App. BCiv.* 1.36 (164) (all Livius Drusus); *Cic. N.D.* 3.80 (Scipio Aemilianus); *Cic. Cat.* 1.9–10, 2.1, 4.2, *Sull.* 53 (all Cicero), and the legal texts examined by Treggiari 2002: 88–91, 101–102 (with helpful discussion). Nevertheless, the Roman house is no temple and is technically "profane," as Wachsmuth 1980: 37–46 shows: it is not a *locus sacer* or *religiosus*, and is *sanctus* only in a non-technical sense.

59. See also *Dom.* 143, with Berg 1997: 139–41. These same rhetorical moves (a contrast between "true" and "false" religion, along with pathos) occur at *Cic. Leg.* 2.42: *cum perditorum civium scelere discessu meo religionum iura polluta sunt, vexati nostri Lares familiares, in eorum sedibus exaedificatum templum Licentiae, pulsus a delubris is qui illa servarat* (with Dyck 2004: 365).

a specific instance, expressed with greater emotional intensity: “the household gods of these utterly treasonous citizens were ripped up from their deepest foundations.” The heightening of affect here is visible in the articulation of who is destroyed (“enemies of freedom” become “utterly treasonous citizens”), what is destroyed (*Penates*, rather than structural elements) and in the thoroughness and violence of the destruction (“ripped up from the deepest foundations,” rather than simple “downfall”). A little earlier, at 6.3.1b, Valerius similarly describes the punishments imposed on Sp. Cassius: *senatus . . . populusque Romanus non contentus capitali eum supplicio adficere interempto domum superiecit, ut Penatium quoque strage puniretur*. Here again, the expression *strages Penatium* (“the wreckage of his household gods”) marks an escalation of the intensity of collective rage against the conspirator—a punishment above and beyond the “mere” capital punishment with which the *populus Romanus* might, Valerius leads us to think, have been content.

Thus I find no grounds for thinking that the punitive demolition of a malefactor’s house constitutes a broader attack, practical or symbolic, on his kin or descent group as a whole—at least, not insofar as such a demolition destroys the owner’s ancestral monuments and domestic cult objects and practices. Indeed, the destruction of domestic *Lares* and *Penates* carries quite different associations, as we have just seen. To mention their fate is to augment pathos and affect in the current rhetorical situation; in Cicero’s case, they are also adduced as vectors of an authentic, “natural” form of *religio*, in contrast to Clodius’ fraudulent sanctuary of *Libertas*.⁶⁰

A text from the younger Seneca also warrants discussion here, for it too has been taken to imply that punitive house demolition constitutes an attack on a malefactor’s family and familial line.⁶¹ Near the end of book one of *De Ira*, Seneca contrasts the unruliness of anger (*ira*) with the control that characterizes reason (*ratio*). He writes, “If need requires, *ratio* quietly and calmly tears out entire houses (*domus*) from the roots, and families that are noxious to the commonwealth it destroys along with wives and children; it knocks down their very dwellings (*tecta*) and levels them to the ground, and eradicates names that are hostile to *libertas*.” This idea reappears early in book three, where Seneca lists some evil consequences of a mob’s irrational anger; one of these is “entire *domus* burned with their entire families.”⁶² In linking “hostility to *libertas*” with house demolition, Seneca seems to be drawing on the traditional

60. A religious dimension can also enter the process of demolition when (/if) there is a consecration of malefactor and/or property (see Salerno 1990: 11–19), since that which is consecrated passes into the power of a god. However, this dimension is imparted only by the performative utterance *sacer esto*, and is not inherent to the Roman house as such.

61. Saller 1984: 354–55, 1994: 93: “Here there is an explicit connection between the physical destruction of a *domus* and the destruction of a man and his family, root and branch.”

62. Sen. *Ira* 1.19.2: *sed si opus est, [sc. ratio] silens quietaque totas domus funditus tollit et familias rei publicae pestilentes cum coniugibus ac liberis perdit, tecta ipsa diruit et solo exaequat et inimica libertati nomina exstirpat*. Sen. *Ira* 3.2.4: *totae cum stirpe omni crematae domus*.

discourse of the kingship-aspirants and related malefactors. Yet his assertion that entire families, including wives and children, are annihilated at the same time is difficult to understand within that discourse, as the discussion in the past few pages shows. For no specific case squares with Seneca's generalization, and moreover, the normative generalizations about malefactors' families are, as we have seen, exactly the opposite of Seneca's assertion here—i.e., we hear the general principle that family members should not be caught up in the malefactor's downfall, particular cases to the contrary notwithstanding. Perhaps Seneca is thinking here of the carnage of the civil wars and the associated proscriptions, when multiple members of a single family were indeed sometimes killed together. The Ciceros themselves provide an excellent example, as the proscription of December 43 BCE encompassed Marcus, his son Marcus, brother Quintus, and the latter's son Quintus as well. Only the younger Marcus escaped. Earlier, Sulla's wife and children barely escaped Marius' proscriptions in 87 BCE. After Actium, Marcus Antonius, his son Antyllus, Cleopatra, and her son Caesarion either committed suicide or were executed (though Antony's other children were raised in Rome by Octavia). Imperial instances may also be at hand, such as the execution of Sejanus' young children following their father's downfall in 31 CE.⁶³ Seneca may even have non-Roman practices or instances in mind, since the second passage (*Ira* 3.2.4) actually claims to be exemplifying the destructiveness of anger among Greeks and barbarians, not Romans (§§3.2.1, 6). At any rate, I suspect that several different elements contribute to Seneca's descriptions of the cruel pitilessness of *ratio* and the unbridled madness of *ira*: the discourse of the aspirants to kingship, to be sure, but not only this. Since these descriptions employ the timeless rhetoric of the gnomic statement, Seneca need not bind himself to the patterns of any single discourse, nor follow any particular instance: he can simply combine the most lurid elements of each, so as to create the most vivid possible picture of the damage that *ira* and *ratio* can do.

III. RE-MEMBERING THE DEMOLISHED HOUSE

In examining scholarly debates about memory, sanctions against memory, and forgetting, it is helpful to distinguish two different registers in which these concepts can be deployed. First, there is "remembering" and "forgetting" as individual psychological states—i.e., an individual's success or failure in calling to mind some object, person, or event that he or she once personally experienced. Second, there is what might be called *cultural* remembering and forgetting. Cultural remembering is to freight some object, person, or event with symbolic meaning, and (thereby) to place it in communicative circulation among people

63. Proscription of the four Tullii: App. *BCiv.* 4.19 (73). Sulla's wife and children: App. *BCiv.* 1.73 (340), 77 (351). Deaths in Antony's family: e.g., Plut. *Ant.* 76.4–5, 81.1–82.1, 86–87. Execution of Sejanus' children: Tac. *Ann.* 6 (5).9.

for whom the symbolic meaning is culturally resonant. If an object, person, or event is not so freighted with symbolic meaning, it does not—indeed cannot—enter communicative circulation for lack of cultural resonance. Cultural forgetting may be defined as the stripping of symbolic meaning from a person, object, or event, as if to remove it from communicative circulation. As social practices involving communication within groups of people, cultural remembering and forgetting have nothing to do with an individual’s ability to remember (i.e., call to mind) his or her personal experience of some event or person. For an individual can always call to mind, from personal experience, innumerable persons and events that the culture in which that individual participates has either never “remembered” in the first place (i.e., failed to load with symbolic meaning) or, more actively, “forgotten” (i.e., stripped of symbolic meaning that they once carried). Conversely, a culture can “remember” persons or events that many individuals who participate in that culture did not personally experience, hence cannot call to mind. Indeed, events or persons “remembered” over centuries are remembered only in this symbolic, cultural sense, and not (after the deaths of the last people who experienced them) in the individual psychological sense.⁶⁴

In this section, I examine a variety of objects that, according to our texts, are associated with demolished houses: toponyms, statues, temples, narratives, porticoes, and the like. By relating such objects to particular demolished houses in specific, symbolically resonant ways, our texts represent these objects as taking on a monumental function—the function of causing Romans who hear or read the narratives, encounter the structures or objects, learn the toponym, and so on, to discover the demolition, the reasons for it, the deeds of the proprietor, and the judgments passed upon him by contemporaries and posterity. The standing house as a culturally resonant symbolic object, as discussed in the previous section, is thus effaced and supplanted—or rather, perhaps, the house’s absence is *supplemented*—by one or more new symbolic objects that nevertheless bear a relationship to, and hence contain the trace of, the house that went before. Throughout this discussion, we will be concerned for the most part with memory and forgetting in the cultural sense, and only occasionally in the individual, psychological sense.

A. DEMOLISHED HOUSES AND THEIR MONUMENTS

We begin again with Sp. Maelius’ house. As noted above, Cincinnatus (in Livy’s account) presents demolition as an appropriate symbol of the destruction of the would-be tyrant and his social network. He also declares that the open lot resulting from the demolition will serve as a reminder of Maelius’ misdeed (*domum deinde, ut monumento area esset oppressae nefariae spei, dirui extemplo iussit*, 4.16.1). But how, we may ask, can this be? If such a lot is to serve as

64. I am indebted to Flaig 1999: 39–43 (with further references) for this articulation of cultural memory and its relationship to individual memory.

a monument to its former owner, how is it distinguishable from a lot that was merely never built—at least, once the individuals who personally experienced these events, and can call them to mind, have died out? Livy’s simple explanation follows: “it was called *Aequimaelium*” (*id Aequimaelium appellatum est*). Livy does not explain exactly how this toponym functions as a monument, but other reports of Maelius’ sedition provide helpful etymologies. The second element, we learn, contains the malefactor’s name in the form *maeli-* or *meli-*, while the first element is the word *aequus*. Now, Varro interprets this first element as meaning “flat,” referring to the leveling of the house via punitive demolition: *Aequimelium, quod a<e>quata Meli domus publice, quod regnum occupare voluit is* (*Lat.* 5.157). Dionysius of Halicarnassus offers the same explanation, translating the Latin word *aequus* with the Greek *isopedon* for the benefit of Latinless readers.⁶⁵ Alternatively, *aequus* can be interpreted as meaning “right,” i.e., that Maelius suffered a fitting and just punishment for his crime. So Cicero interprets it in *De Domo Sua* 101: *Sp. Maeli regnum adpetentis domus est complanata, et, quia illud aequum accidisse populus Romanus Maelio iudicavit, nomine ipso Aequimaeli iustitia poenae comprobata est*. Valerius Maximus explains the toponym similarly in his paraphrase of Cicero, though he omits the etymologically obvious *aequus* and allows the synonym *iustitia* (also found in Cicero) to stand in its place: *eadem ausum Sp. Maelium consimili exitu* [sc. to that of Sp. Cassius] *patria multavit. area vero domus eius, quo iustitia supplicii notior ad posterios perveniret, Aequimeli appellationem traxit* (6.3.1c). Under either interpretation of its first element, the toponym contains *in nuce* the whole story of Maelius’ sedition and the resulting house demolition. The name loads the open lot with symbolic meanings that allow it to enter into communicative circulation and cultural memory as the site of a former malefactor’s house. The toponym functions monumentally by causing the open lot to bear the trace of its purportedly built past, supplementing the absence of the house and its owner with (what is taken to be) an implied narrative about his deeds and fate. Thus this open lot is distinguished from one that was simply never built. The toponym’s monumental function is especially accentuated in Cicero and Valerius Maximus, as quoted above. For Cicero emphasizes its moral content, namely the justness of the punishment in the eyes of contemporaries (*nomine ipso Aequimaeli iustitia poenae comprobata est*). And Valerius emphasizes the

65. Dion. Hal. 12.4.6: οὗτος ὁ τόπος ... καλούμενος ὑπὸ Ῥωμαίων Αἰκυμήλιον· ὡς ἂν ἡμεῖς εἶπομεν ἰσόπεδον Μήλιον. αἶκον γὰρ ὑπὸ Ῥωμαίων τὸ μηδεμίαν ἔχον ἐξοχὴν καλεῖται. τόπον οὖν τινὰ Αἰκίον Μήλιον ἐξ ἀρχῆς κληθέντα, ὕστερον συμφθαρέντων ἀλλήλοισι κατὰ τὴν μίαν ἐκφορὰν τῶν ὀνομάτων Αἰκυμήλιον ἐκάλεσαν. Likewise *Vir. Ill.* 17.5: [sc. Cincinnatus] *dictator dictus Sp. Maelium regnum adfectantem ... occidi iussit; domum eius solo aequavit; unde locus Aequimelium dicitur*. Quint. *Inst.* 3.7.20 probably implies the same etymology: *et post mortem adiecta quibusdam ignominia est, ut Maelio, cuius domus solo aequata...* For while the toponym is not directly mentioned, it lurks in the background (hinted at by *Maelio* and *aequata*) as the actual mechanism by which demolition imposes disgrace. Note that this etymology commits these authors to the view that Maelius’ house was completely leveled to the ground or removed (immediately following his murder?), so as to create the etymologically necessary “flat” place—a rare case where it is reasonably clear what our authors imagine happened to the house, and how the site looked afterwards.

transmission of this information to future generations: the lot was given its name “so that the rightness of the punishment might get through the more clearly to posterity.” The toponym stands alongside—indeed, inside—Valerius’ and Cicero’s narratives as a guarantee that their own accounts and moral interpretation of the Maelius exemplum are correct.⁶⁶

Nor is this toponym the only monument to Maelius’ sedition. The annalistic tradition reports that the cognomen *Ahala* of the *gens Servilia* derives from the Latin word *ala*, “armpit,” where the Servilius who committed the murder concealed his weapon. Similarly, Greek writers associate the *nomen* of the *praefectus annonae* Minucius, who alerted the senate to the plot, with the Greek nouns *mênutês/mênuma*, “informer/information,” and Minucius was supposedly honored for his service with a column and statue.⁶⁷ These onomastic and plastic monuments work to create, and are invested in perpetuating, cultural memory of Maelius’ sedition. For they can only enhance the familial glory of the Minucii and Servilii if the narrative that defines Maelius as an aspirant to kingship, and describes the roles of a Minucius and a Servilius in suppressing his aims, remains in communicative circulation. These families, without doubt, have a stake in making sure Maelius is not “forgotten.”⁶⁸

Another toponym, with a similar monumental function, is mentioned by Cicero in *De Domo Sua*. Cicero says (§101), “In the meadows of Vaccus was Marcus Vaccus’ house, which was confiscated and demolished so his misdeed might be stigmatized by the recollection and name of the place.”⁶⁹ Presumably these “meadows,” like the Aequimaelum, were an unbuilt open space in Cicero’s day, and were known to his audience by that name. While Cicero does not specify the misdeed so recalled, Livy provides further detail. At 8.19.4 we hear that Vitruvius Vaccus was a prominent man from Fundi who was also visible in Rome. “He had a dwelling on the Palatine, [a place] that was called the meadows of Vaccus, once the building had been demolished and the ground confiscated.”⁷⁰ In 330 BCE he led a revolt of Priverni and Fundani; upon its suppression the next year,

66. On the name, location, and function of the Aequimaelum, see Cic. *Div.* 2.39.1; Coarelli 1983: 1.285–86; Forsythe 1994: 305–307; Pisani Sartorio, *LTUR* 1.20–21 (s.v. *Aequimaelum*).

67. *Ahala* from *ala*: Dion. Hal. 12.4.5, citing Cincius Alimentus and Calpurnius Piso. Servilius is often named as Maelius’ murderer: Cic. *Cat.* 1.3, *Sen.* 56; Livy 4.14.6–7, Quint. *Inst.* 5.13.24, *Vir. Ill.* 17.5. Minucius from *μηνυσι*: Dion. Hal. 12.4.6, Zon. 7.20; cf. Liv. *Per.* 4 (*Minucius index*). Minucius’ column and statue: Plin. *Nat.* 18.15, 34.21; Livy 4.16.2. Further discussion of all these matters by Wiseman 1996: 64–67, Forsythe 1994: 304–307, and Lintott 1970: 14–16.

68. On these memory dynamics see Ogilvie 1965: 550, Flower 2006: 48, and more generally Pina Polo 2006: 75–76. Cf. n.134.

69. Cic. *Dom.* 101: *in Vacci pratis domus fuit M. Vacci, quae publicata est et eversa ut illius facinus memoria et nomine loci notaretur*. The somewhat difficult phrase *memoria et nomine loci* may be better understood as *hendiadys*, “by the recollected name of the place.” One appreciates the clarity of Baiter’s conjecture *illius facinoris memoria nomine loci*, but the transmitted text can hardly mean anything different.

70. Livy 8.19.4: *Vitruvius Vaccus, vir non domi solum sed etiam Romae clarus; aedes fuere in Palatio eius, quae Vacci prata diruto aedificio publicatoque solo appellata*. On the odd grammar of *quae . . . appellata*, see Oakley 1997: 2.608.

he was captured, brought to Rome, and executed following the consul's triumph. Livy then reports (8.20.8–9) that “the senate . . . decreed that his house, which was on the Palatine, be demolished, and his goods consecrated to Semo Sancus; and, from the bronze that was realized from those [goods], bronze discs were made and placed in the temple of Sancus, opposite the temple of Quirinus.”⁷¹ Note that Livy remarks twice within the space of a few sentences that Vaccus' house was on the Palatine; the toponym *prata Vacci*, expressly named in the first passage and assumed to be familiar to his readers, must also lie behind the second mention of the location. Thus Livy stresses that the story of Vaccus' revolt, its suppression, and the demolition of his house provides the aetiology for the toponym, and implies—just as Cicero does—that the toponym (together with the open lot) in turn calls all of this to mind.⁷² Thus the open lot has a monumental function, thanks to its toponym, just as the Aequimaesium does. Unlike Maelius, however, Vaccus is not alleged to be aspiring to kingship. While a prominent non-citizen with a substantial house in Rome might well receive callers there, Vaccus' transgression was to incite the allies to revolt, rather than to advance his own political ambitions (of which, as a *peregrinus*, he presumably had none). Thus the demolition of this *domus* lacks the symbolic resonance of a case where the *domus* is used by an (over)ambitious Roman aristocrat to build a threatening clientele.

The narratives surrounding Sp. Cassius, chronologically the first of the three canonical kingship-aspirants, exhibit the same impulse to load an object with symbolic meaning and render it “monumental” by relating it to a supposedly demolished house. In this case, however, the object is not a toponym, but a temple.⁷³ The most detailed narratives of Cassius' sedition are in Livy (2.41) and Dionysius of Halicarnassus (8.77–80). These texts say that Cassius, as consul for the third time in 486 BCE, promulgated a law to distribute land to the Latini and perhaps Hernici, as well as to Roman citizens. He was accused of seeking, through this *largitio* and other “popular” measures, to attach the allies to himself and, presumably with their support, to establish himself as *rex/tyrannus* in Rome. The tradition then offers two *dénouements*: either he was arraigned by

71. Livy 8.20.8: *aedes eius quae essent in Palatio diruendas, bona Semoni Sanco censuerunt consecranda. quodque aeris ex eis redactum est, ex eo aenei orbes facti positi in sacello Sancus adversus aedem Quirini.*

72. The *orbes* in the temple of Semo Sancus also serve as monuments to Vaccus' misdeeds, as their aetiology in Livy 8.20.8 suggests. Perhaps they were inscribed with his name, as the dedications to Ceres following Cassius' execution supposedly were (see below). On the possible logic of this consecration see Salerno 1990: 98–102. Nothing is known about Vaccus, his house, or its site beyond what Livy and Cicero say; though see Gundel, *RE* 9A s.v. M. Vitruvius Vaccus, cols. 426–27, for a summary.

73. Cassius is not discussed in section IIa, because no surviving account links his house with his conspiratorial activity in a way that symbolically justifies demolition. In Livy, the conspiracy develops entirely in the civic sphere, as Cassius and his principal opponent—his consular colleague Verginius—hold *contiones* (2.41.5–7). Only in Dion. Hal.'s account does a reference to “secret plans” (ἀπόρρητα βουλευτήρια, 8.78.3) possibly allow one to think of a house as the locus of plotting (cf. n.20), though no house is mentioned here.

the quaestors on a charge of *perduellio*, tried before the *populus*, convicted, and executed (which is deemed more likely), or his father conducted a domestic inquiry and put him to death himself (deemed less likely).⁷⁴ In either case, according to Livy and Dionysius, his house was demolished and his *peculium*—the property he controlled but did not own, since his father still lived—was dedicated to Ceres in the form of an inscribed statue. A temple to Tellus was also eventually erected on part of the site. Pliny the Elder further mentions that a statue of Cassius was later removed from before the temple of Tellus (*Nat.* 34.30).⁷⁵

For scholars pursuing the “Staatsrecht” approach, large historical problems attend every aspect of the Cassius narrative: the specific provisions and aims of his purported agrarian law, and the degree to which their representation is colored by post-Gracchan or post-Sullan concerns; the religious and legal character of the process(es)—*perduellio* or *patria potestas*—by which he was condemned and executed; and the nature of his connection to Ceres, whose temple Cassius himself had dedicated in 493 BCE, and to Tellus. These and related matters have received extensive scholarly discussion.⁷⁶ Here, for my own sociocultural analysis, I am interested in just one specific matter: how the texts that speak of Cassius link him and his house to subsequent objects and structures, which are thus made to function monumentally. Consider the temple of Tellus. Florus reports (*Epit.* 1.14) that it was vowed by P. Sempronius Sophus, consul in 268 BCE, after an earthquake occurred during a battle between Romans and Picentes. Tellus is a reasonable goddess to appease under such circumstances, and Frontinus declares—without mentioning the vow—that Sempronius did restore his frightened soldiers’ spirits and win the battle (*Str.* 1.12.3). We infer, then, that about 220 years intervened between the demolition of Cassius’ house and the erection of the temple.⁷⁷ Among the texts that assert the coincidence of temple and housesite, however, only one expressly indicates a time interval: Dionysius of Halicarnassus says that the lot still lay open in his day, apart from the temple that was built “in later times” on

74. Livy 2.41.5–6 and Dion. Hal. 8.78.3 explicitly link the threat of *regnum*/τυραννίς with Cassius’ courting of the Latins and Hernici. The two versions of the legal process are weighed by Livy 2.41.10–12 and Dion. Hal. 8.77–79; both declare the civic one more probable. Val. Max. 5.8.2 and Plin. *Nat.* 34.15 mention only the domestic process, while Cic. *Rep.* 2.60 and Florus 1.17 seemingly amalgamate the two.

75. Demolition, dedication of *peculium*, inscription: Livy 2.41.10–11, Dion. Hal. 8.79.3. Also reporting the dedication of the *peculium* are Val. Max. 5.8.2, Plin. *Nat.* 34.15; for the demolition see also Val. Max. 6.3.1b, Cic. *Dom.* 101. Cassius is widely cited as a would-be king or tyrant: in addition to the texts just cited, see Plin. *Nat.* 34.30, Diod. Sic. 11.37.7, Dio Cass. 5.19, Cic. *Lael.* 36, *Phil.* 2.87, 114. At Livy 4.15.4 he is adduced as an exemplum justifying the punishment of Maelius.

76. Just in the past generation, see Flower 2006: 47–48, Smith 2006: 49–52, Fiori 1996: 375–92, Liou-Gille 1996: 170–78, Forsythe 1994: 296–301, Salerno 1990: 83–85, De Cazanove 1989, Panitschek 1989: 234–37, Martin 1982–94: 1.344–49, Lintott 1970: 18–22.

77. On this temple see Ziolkowski 1992: 155–62, Coarelli, *LTUR* 5.24–25 (s.v. *Tellus, Aedes*). There is no information about its dedication. One presumes it followed within a few years of the vow.

part of it.⁷⁸ Other texts allow for a different impression. Both Livy and Cicero mention the temple or its erection immediately after mentioning the demolition of the house; thus they not only reveal a close conceptual connection between temple and demolished house, but they also make it possible—whatever they themselves may have thought—for their audience to infer that the temple was erected shortly after the demolition.⁷⁹ Valerius Maximus, who uses both Cicero and Livy as sources, seeks to forge a stronger connection between house and temple. He places his discussion of demolished houses under the chapter heading *De Severitate* (6.3), a chapter in which he promises to relate instances of notably strict or uncompromising revenge or punishment (6.3.pr.). Regarding Cassius, Valerius says that “the mastery [Cassius] lusted after” (*concupita dominatio*) was rewarded by the senate and people with capital punishment and house demolition; they also erected the temple of Tellus on the site.⁸⁰ Thus all three actions—execution, demolition, and temple dedication—are credited to the same collective entity, the senate and people: three related, evidently *contemporaneous* ripostes by the collective in return for a transgression against itself. Valerius continues, *itaque quod prius domicilium impotentis viri fuerat, nunc religiosae severitatis monumentum est* (“So, what was once the abode of an out-of-control man is now a *monumentum* of pious strictness,” 6.3.1b). Here Valerius contrasts Cassius’ “uncontrolled” character, apparently manifested in and symbolized by his house (once again, a house implicitly takes on its owner’s characteristics), with the scrupulously exact observance of a goddess’ cult, which is manifested in and symbolized by the temple. Thus Valerius makes the temple into the vector of the very quality that is this chapter’s theme—*severitas*—as it intervenes in the story of Cassius, punishing, correcting, and superseding the latter’s *impotentia*.⁸¹ So Valerius not only represents the temple as being erected soon after the demolition by the same parties responsible for Cassius’ punishment—strengthening the looser impression of contemporaneity that he finds in his sources, Livy and Cicero—but he also presents the temple as *a response to* that demolished house—that the temple takes its own meaning as a “monument of pious strictness” (*religiosae severitatis monumentum*) precisely from its contrast with the lack of self-control

78. Dion. Hal. 8.79.3: μετὰ τὸν θάνατον τοῦ Κασσίου ἢ τε οἰκία κατεσκάφη, καὶ μέχρι τοῦδε ἀνεῖται ὁ τόπος αὐτῆς αἰθριος ἔξω τοῦ νεῶ τῆς Γῆς, ὃν ὑστέροις ἢ πόλις κατεσκευάζε χρόνοις ἐν μέρει τινὶ αὐτῆς.

79. Livy 2.41.11: *invenio apud quosdam . . . dirutas publice aedes. ea est area ante Telluris aedem.* Cic. *Dom.* 101: *Sp. Cassi domus ob eandem causam <est> eversa atque in eo loco aedis posita Telluris.*

80. Val. Max. 6.3.1b: *senatus enim populusque Romanus non contentus capitali eum supplicio adficere interempto domum superiecit, ut penatium quoque strage puniretur; in solo autem aedem Telluris fecit.*

81. My interpretation here is broad: I see Val. Max. as contrasting the “unrestrained” character of Cassius with the “scrupulous exactitude” of cult practice *in general*. On this view, any temple whatsoever would serve his ends. If a connection between Tellus *in particular* and Cassius is intended, I do not see it.

(*impotentia*) of that house's owner. All three authors, then, are pre-armed with the belief that a temple stands on the site of a demolished house, and allow their readers to assume a chronological coincidence. But Valerius, in addition, works hard to articulate a symbolically satisfying relationship between house and temple. In his hands, the temple commemorates the ethical judgment implied in the demolition of Cassius' house, and in this way bears the trace of the house that formerly stood on the same site.⁸²

A further monument to Cassius warrants brief discussion in this context. Pliny says (*Nat.* 34.30, citing the historian Piso) that, until 159 BCE, a self-dedicated statue of Cassius, the aspirant to kingship, stood before the temple of Tellus. The censors of 159, however, cleared from the forum and environs statues that were not erected by authority of the senate or people. They removed Cassius' statue and even went so far as to melt it down—"no doubt in this matter too [sc. of statues], those excellent men were taking measures against the quest for power."⁸³ This alleged statue entails grave historical and art historical difficulties, and Pliny's (/Piso's) account undoubtedly contains several conflation or misunderstandings.⁸⁴ But here I am interested simply in how Pliny (or Piso) represents its removal, and particularly in the inference about the censors' aims. Pliny seems to imagine that the censors interpreted the statue as Cassius' own monument to his royal ambitions, and this (Pliny infers) is why they took the extra step to melt it down following its removal. On this understanding, the destruction of the statue—itsself standing before the temple of Tellus, hence on the site of the demolished house—is patently a doublet for the demolition of the house itself, a replay or reiteration of the earlier penalty. In both cases, an object regarded as a monument to the would-be *rex* has been destroyed, hence removed from communicative circulation. Yet each monument's absence is supplemented by new monumental forms—a temple and narrative replaces the house, a narrative records the demise of the statue—that bears the trace of the earlier monument. The result is patently not cultural oblivion, where no information about Cassius ever again circulates. On the contrary, by conveying the community's disapproval

82. Some scholars also implicitly accept this "monumental" logic. While no scholar to my knowledge rejects Florus' assertion that the temple was vowed by P. Sempronius Sophus in 268, some nevertheless seek, like the ancient sources, to connect Cassius himself with Tellus: e.g., Forsythe 1994: 296 and De Cazanove 1989: 106–109. In contrast, Ziolkowski 1992: 155 sees that Florus' testimony leaves no need for a connection between Tellus and Cassius, and remarks that the story of Cassius' fall "managed to stamp itself on the temple built 200 years later." Were Florus' testimony lost, however, the accounts of Livy, Cicero, and Valerius would probably lead scholars to conclude that the temple was dedicated in the 480s BCE, soon after and in response to Cassius' fall.

83. Plin. *Nat.* 34.15: *L. Piso prodidit M. Aemilio C. Popilio iterum cos. a censoribus P. Cornelio Scipione M. Popilio statuas circa forum eorum, qui magistratum gesserant, sublatis omnis praeter eas, quae populi aut senatus sententia statutae essent, eam vero, quam apud aedem Telluris statuisset sibi Sp. Cassius, qui regnum adfectaverat, etiam conflata a censoribus. nimirum in ea quoque re ambitionem providebant illi viri.*

84. On the problems with this statue and Pliny's account of it, see Pina Polo 2006: 86–87, Sehlmeier 1999: 79–81, Forsythe 1994: 297–98, De Cazanove 1989: 107.

of Cassius' aims and symbolizing his defeat, the new monuments place him into communicative circulation as a negative exemplum.

A more complex dynamic of substitution, supplementation, and trace-preservation is visible in the narratives of M. Manlius Capitolinus' house. As noted in section IIa, the main tradition holds that the site of this house, on the *arx*, was eventually occupied by the temple of Iuno Moneta. Livy says (7.28.4–6) that the dictator L. Furius Camillus vowed this temple in 345 BCE during a battle against the Aurunci; it was dedicated the following year.⁸⁵ He further says it was intended for the *area*, or open lot, of Manlius' house; thus he seems to imagine that the site had remained unbuilt since the demolition.⁸⁶ Scholars generally seek to explain this temple's foundation in relation to its dedicator and the circumstances of the vow. It is suggested, for example, that this Iuno was specifically associated with the Aurunci, and that Camillus' vowing of the temple in battle therefore involves an *evocatio* or "calling out" of the goddess, echoing the famed *evocatio* of Iuno carried out during the siege of Veii by his more famous older namesake M. Furius Camillus (possibly the dedicator's father or grandfather).⁸⁷ While some such explanation must be correct—the younger Camillus assuredly had a reason, under those circumstances, for vowing a temple to this particular divinity—our surviving texts do not overtly interest themselves in this matter, but are instead preoccupied with the coincidence of temple and housesite. Livy notes this coincidence not only in book seven, as noted above, but also in book six (6.20.13), where he invokes it to demonstrate that Manlius' house stood on the *arx* (i.e., since the temple still stands on the *arx*, and the house preceded it on the same site, then the house too stood on the *arx*). And since Manlius lived on the *arx*, Livy continues, patricians were banned thereafter from living anywhere on the Capitoline hill. The ban itself thus functions, inter alia, as a stigma (*nota*) imposed upon Manlius, hence as another monument to his misdeed.⁸⁸ Valerius Maximus, in a passage paraphrasing Livy, likewise cites the coincidence of demolished house and temple as evidence that the ban on patrician residences was a response to Manlius' conspiracy.⁸⁹ Plutarch, perhaps missing the logic of this argument,

85. The coincidence of temple and housesite is asserted by Livy 6.20.13, 7.28.4–6, Val. Max. 6.3.1a, Plut. *Cam.* 36.9, Ov. *Fasti* 6.183–85; cf. n. 25 for Cicero's alternative (?) localization. Discussion of these topographical matters by Oakley 1997: 1.566–67, Ziolkowski 1992: 71–73, Wiseman 1979: 39–40, Giannelli, *LTUR* 3.123–25 (s.v. *Iuno Moneta, Aedes*), cf. Ziolkowski 1993: 210–11.

86. Livy 7.28.5: *locus in arce destinatus quae area aedium M. Manli Capitolini fuerat*. On the term *area* see n.11.

87. This is Coarelli's suggestion (reported by Giannelli 1980–81: 36 n.129). Ziolkowski 1993: 218 notes the family tradition (cf. Livy 5.21.3); further discussion at Ogilvie 1965: 673–75, Andreussi, *LTUR* 3.125–26 (s.v. *Iuno Regina*).

88. Livy 6.20.13: *adiectae mortuo notae sunt: publica una, quod, cum domus eius fuisset ubi nunc aedes atque officina Monetae est, latum ad populum est ne quis patricius in arce aut Capitolio habitaret*.

89. Val Max. 6.3.1a: *huius supplicio aeternae memoriae nota inserta est: propter illum enim lege sanciri placuit ne quis patricius in arce aut Capitolio habitaret, quia domum eo loci habuerat, ubi nunc aedem Monetae videmus*.

mentions these same three elements—demolition of the house, foundation of the temple, and ban on patrician residences—as three *contemporaneous* events directly following Manlius’ execution, tacitly backdating the temple’s foundation by 40 years relative to Livy.⁹⁰ And in Ovid’s hands, the temple becomes a monument to both parties. In an aetiology at *Fasti* 6.183–90, he connects the temple not only with the Camillus who vowed it (184), but also with the house that had previously stood on the site, as well as with that house’s owner Manlius (185)—who did both good deeds (185–88) and bad ones (189–90).⁹¹ However, by mentioning “Camillus” without further specification, just before turning to Manlius, Ovid makes it possible for his reader to think (and could he himself have thought?) that the Camillus who vowed the temple is the one most closely associated with Manlius: the famous elder one, whom Manlius regarded as his rival and who, in some versions of the story, plays a role in Manlius’ downfall.⁹² Such an understanding is also congruent with Plutarch’s implicit dating of the dedication to the immediate aftermath of Manlius’ fall.

This connection finds additional corroboration in a second passage of Valerius Maximus (1.8.3), which narrates the elder Camillus’ *evocatio* of Iuno from Veii. Valerius calls this goddess Iuno Moneta, and says that her temple was established on the Aventine. Other texts (Livy 5.21.3, 5.23.7; Dion. Hal. 13.3) assign the epithet “Regina” to this originally Veian Iuno on the Aventine, an identification that scholars accept.⁹³ If Valerius gives the wrong epithet, his error evinces the possibility of confusion or assimilation between these aspects of Iuno. Indeed, the survival of a dedicatory inscription to “Iuno Moneta Regina” (*CIL* VI 362 = *ILS* 3108, from Rome but undated and lacking precise provenance) may constitute positive evidence that these two aspects of the goddess could be assimilated. And if indeed the Iuno on the Aventine, who was universally associated with the elder Camillus, could herself be known as Moneta, then the readily imaginable confusion or conflation between her and the Iuno Moneta on the *arx* makes it all the more possible to bring the elder Camillus into the story of this latter temple’s foundation. Livy, in fact, is alone among surviving authors in stating explicitly that the temple on the *arx* was dedicated by a different, younger Camillus nearly half a

90. Plut. *Cam.* 36.9: οἱ δὲ Ῥωμαῖοι τὴν οἰκίαν αὐτοῦ κατασκάψαντες ἱερὸν ἰδρύσαντο θεᾶς ἣν Μονῆταν καλοῦσι, καὶ τὸ λοιπὸν ἐψηφίσαντο μηδένα τῶν πατρικίων ἐπὶ τῆς ἄκρας κατοικεῖν.

91. Ov. *Fasti* 6. 183–90: *arce quoque in summa Iunoni templa Monetæ / ex voto memorant facta, Camille, tuo. / ante domus Manli fuerat, qui Gallica quondam / a Capitolino reppulit arma Iove. / quam bene, di magni, pugna cecidisset in illa / defensor solii, Iuppiter alte, tui! / vixit, ut occideret damnatus crimine regni: / hunc illi titulum longa senecta dabat.* On the memory dynamics of this passage in context, see Pasco-Pranger 2006: 261–67.

92. Livy 6.11.3–4 and Plut. *Cam.* 36.2 both say that Manlius’ plotting arose from his envy of Camillus’ greater renown and fortune; both also make Camillus a consular tribune in the year Manlius is condemned (Livy 6.18.1, Plut. *Cam.* 36.5). Thereafter Livy gives Camillus no role whatsoever in the saga (perplexingly, as Kraus 1994: 148–49 notes), while Plutarch gives him a crucial role—the decision to transfer Manlius’ trial to the Peteline grove, thereby securing his condemnation (*Cam.* 36.6). Zon. 7.23 (or Dio) goes so far as to make Camillus dictator to deal with the Manlian *seditio*.

93. E.g., Ziolkowski 1992: 76–77, Andreussi, *LTUR* 3.125–26. There is no sign of textual corruption at this locus in Valerius Maximus.

century after the Aventine temple, and some 40 years after the death of Manlius. In no other pertinent text is there any hindrance to believing (and in at least Ovid and Plutarch, there is some encouragement for believing) that the temple on the *arx* was dedicated soon after Manlius' fall by the elder Camillus.⁹⁴ The availability of this belief, I suggest, further supports the argument I advanced earlier regarding Cassius, his statue, and the temple of Tellus. For in Manlius' case too, at least some authors (though not Livy) strive to connect the temple and divinity with the demolished house allegedly on the same site, hence with the house's owner and his deeds—to bring the two structures into a harmonious, symbolically satisfying, culturally resonant relationship within a unified temporal and ethical framework. This “harmonization” causes the temple/divinity to supplement the absence and perpetuate the trace of the house and its owner, but with modified symbolic meaning. Specifically, we might say that Manlius' house, regarded as a sign, has had a line drawn through it—in semiotic terms, placed *sous rature*. This “line” (the temple, imagined as dedicated by the elder Camillus) does not efface the underlying sign: it merely modifies it, announcing it as necessary yet unacceptable in the current symbolic order. As a symbol of the power and ambitions of the aristocrat and his social network, the house is a sign of (unacceptable) tyranny, yet the story of the conspiracy's extinction is necessary to give meaning to the subsequent temple, in which the trace of the house and owner therefore persists.

Ancient speculation about the meaning of the epithet “Moneta” provides a further example of this impulse to “harmonize.” Surviving ancient etymologies, explicit or implied, connect this epithet to a cluster of words denoting remembering, advising, and warning. Livius Andronicus and Hyginus both use Moneta to render *Mnêmosunê*, the Greek goddess of remembering who is also the mother of the Muses.⁹⁵ Cicero, in *De Divinatione*, twice (1.101, 2.69) refers to a tradition whereby Iuno demanded the expiatory sacrifice of a pregnant sow following an earthquake, and hence was called Moneta—from *moneo*, in the sense of “advise” or “warn.”⁹⁶ The *Suda* (s.v. *Monêta*) speaks of Iuno's advice to the Romans amidst a financial crisis during the Pyrrhic war, glossing her Latin name with the Greek word *sumboulos*, “adviser.” And Isidore, offering an etymology of *moneta* in the sense of “coinage”—a function associated with Iuno's temple on the *arx*—sees minting as guarantee of metallic content and weight, hence a “warning” against

94. Indeed, if this explicit testimony of Livy (7.28.4) were lost, scholars too would probably conclude, from Plutarch and Ovid, that the elder Camillus dedicated the temple on the *arx* following the demolition of Manlius' house in the mid-380s. Val. Max. 1.8.3 would then be interpreted as a mere slip, confusing the two different temples of Iuno associated with this same Camillus. For further observations on the possible conflation of Iunones and Camilli see Horsfall 1980/81: 310, Meadows and Williams 2001: 31–32.

95. Liv. Andr. fr. 21 Blänsdorf: *nam diva Monetas filia docuit* (cf. Hom. *Od.* 8.488). Hyg. *Fab.* pr. 27: *ex Iove et Moneta, Musae*.

96. The second passage (*Div.* 2.69) clearly implies the etymology of Moneta from *moneo*: *quod idem dici de Moneta potest: a qua praeterquam de sue plena quid umquam moniti sumus?*

the possibility of fraud.⁹⁷ Most interesting for current purposes, however, are some anonymous scholia to Lucan 1.380, glossing the word *monetae*. In the *Commenta Bernensia*, the scholiast says that Iuno was given the epithet Moneta following the Gallic sack, because she incited the Romans to defend the Capitol. This story, of course, implicitly involves Manlius. A second set of scholia is more explicit: Iuno Moneta is so called because she warned (*monuit*) Manlius, by means of the geese, about the advent of the Gauls, and he repelled them.⁹⁸ Through this explanation, the temple on the *arx* enters into an immediate relationship with the owner of the house on whose site it was thought to stand: the aspect of Iuno housed there is explained by and commemorates the “Manlius and the Geese” episode. These scholiasts’ explanations entail many historical problems, not least in the circular supposition that Iuno was already present on the *arx* to provide the warning, even as this warning is adduced as the aetiology of this very temple/cult. Predictably, scholarly discussion of this and other historical problems, and in general on the origins and etymology of the epithet Moneta, is extensive. For current purposes, I would simply observe that these scholiasts’ explanations display the same impulse to link names and structures with demolished houses that we observed in other texts discussing this temple’s dedication, as well as in texts discussing Maelius and Cassius.⁹⁹ Romans were disposed to freight a structure or name (here a cult epithet) with symbolic meanings derived from a demolished house deemed to underlie the structure—to derive an explanation or aetiology for the name or structure from that house and its owner, and so to perpetuate the trace of the former structure in a new symbolic, monumental form. In Manlius’ case, however,

97. Isid. *Etym.* 16.18.8: *moneta appellata est quia monet ne qua fraus in metallo vel in pondere fiat.*

98. *Comm. Bern.* (ed. Usener, 1869), ad Lucan 1.380: *Moneta Iuno dicta est. cum enim Senones a Capitolio removisset, Moneta dicta est, quod movisset ut Capitolium tuerentur.* Cavajoni 1979: 59 (ad Lucan 1.380): *Moneta autem est dicta Iuno eo quod monuit nocte per anserem Romanos de adventu Gallorum, ne Capitolium introirent. . . . tunc Mallius, custos Capitolii, Gallos detrusit clangore anseris excitatus, quem privatus quidam dono Iunoni dederat* (cf. Serv. in *Aen.* 8.652). Meadows and Williams 2001: 32 n.30, apparently unaware of this second scholion, express surprise that no ancient text connects Moneta with the goose-warning.

99. For starting points, see Meadows and Williams 2001: 31 n.25, Ziolkowski 1993 (both with copious bibliography), Blanc, Brachet, and de Lamberterie 2003: 328–29, and—for a survey of scholarly positions up to about 1980—Dury-Moyaers and Renard 1981: 165–67. Meadows and Williams 2001 is a stimulating, if conjectural, attempt to organize the founding legends, etymologies, and later associations of Iuno Moneta and her temple (including the mint and the presence of the *libri lintei*) within a coherent “monumental” frame.

As with Cassius (n.82), so with Manlius there are scholars who implicitly embrace the “monumental” logic of the Lucan scholiasts. Zehnacker 1973: 52 declares the “goose warning” explanation of the epithet Moneta as “l’explication classique,” while Blanc, Brachet, and de Lamberterie 2003: 328 say “la justification [sc. for understanding “Moneta” as “warner”] serait une allusion à l’épisode des oies du Capitole, consacrées à Junon, et qui ont sauvé Rome de l’attaque gauloise.” But since no two ancient explanations of Iuno Moneta’s “warning” are the same, there is no evidentiary basis for giving the “goose warning” explanation such priority. Rather, these scholars’ assertions appear to be their own inferences, as they (like the scholiasts) look for a plausible reason to connect the epithet to Manlius.

the two efforts to harmonize the story of the temple with the story of Manlius produce conflicting moral commentaries. The “goose warning” explanation of the epithet *Moneta* implies that the temple commemorates Manlius’ heroism, and so inserts Manlius into communicative circulation as a positive exemplum; while the linkage of the dedication with Manlius’ rival Camillus, in a timeframe shortly after Manlius’ execution, points rather to Manlius’ disgrace as an aspirant to kingship, and so constructs him (like Maelius and Cassius) as a negative exemplum. In both cases, however, the supervention of the subsequent structure and name upon the site of the demolished house, and their imprintation with elements of its symbolic meaning, entails a modification of the character of the cultural remembering of Manlius, but not at all a cultural forgetting of him.

Cicero’s house affords a still richer, more complex instance of a demolition followed by new structures on the same site. In this case, the meaning of both the demolition itself and of the house’s relationship to subsequent structures is ferociously contested. In section IIa, we saw that Clodius and other opponents of Cicero branded him a “tyrant” and “master” in the years preceding his exile. This representation was based upon Cicero’s having executed certain Catilinarian conspirators who were Roman citizens without trial or appeal, and thus—in behavior stereotypical of a “tyrant”—imposing arbitrary corporal punishment upon fellow-citizens as if they were slaves. By demolishing Cicero’s house, Clodius sought to assimilate Cicero to the early Republican aspirants to kingship/tyranny and related malefactors. And by consecrating the housesite and constructing a sanctuary of *Libertas* there, Clodius stressed that the formerly “enslaved” Roman community had now regained its “freedom,” thanks to the tyrannical “master’s” exit—while also, no doubt, aiming to obstruct with religious scruples any later attempt by Cicero to reclaim his property and rebuild his house. Moreover, according to Cicero, Clodius incorporated this sanctuary into a larger set of structures through which he sought to monumentalize himself as “liberator.” He removed or remodeled the portico of Catulus (see below), which was adjacent to Cicero’s house, creating an enlarged portico that incorporated the sanctuary of *Libertas* and the portion of Cicero’s lot containing it; he also inscribed his own name on the complex.¹⁰⁰ Furthermore, this complex was connected to, and apparently functioned as an extension of, Clodius’ own house, which adjoined both Cicero’s house and Catulus’ portico.¹⁰¹ In light of this reconstruction of Clodius’ symbolic aims, let us consider

100. This description of Clodius’ complex is pieced together from Cic. *Dom.* 51, 100, 102, 116, 121, 137. For discussion see Nisbet 1939: 206–209, Tamm 1963: 37–43, Picard 1965, Papi, *LTUR* 3.188–89 (s.v. *Libertas*), Berg 1997: 129–34, Tatum 1999: 163–66.

101. The topographical location of this complex of properties, which Cicero describes with such tantalizing imprecision in *Dom.* and elsewhere, has received much scholarly discussion. Based on Cicero’s descriptions, Allen 1939 suggested a location on the north slope of the Palatine south of the *atrium Vestae*, while Tamm 1963: 37–43 proposed the heights farther west on the north side, the site of the future *domus Tiberiana*. Subsequent scholars have generally gravitated toward the former view. Archaeological arguments have also been adduced for both locations: Carandini’s excavations

the view, advanced by some scholars, that Clodius sought to eradicate the memory of Cicero by demolishing Cicero's house and constructing his own monumental architectural complex on its site.¹⁰² In what sense of "memory" could such an assertion make sense? Certainly not in the individual, psychological sense: the hundreds of thousands, perhaps millions, of inhabitants of the Roman world who had personally encountered or had some knowledge of Cicero obviously did not lose the ability to call these experiences or knowledge to mind, simply because Clodius had demolished his house. Rather, these scholars must be thinking of (what I here call) symbolic, cultural memory—the idea that effacing a symbol strips it of cultural resonance and removes it from communicative circulation. Clodius' actions, however, seem at odds even with this sense of "forgetting." For the sanctuary of Libertas that Clodius erected upon the site of Cicero's house gains its cultural resonance precisely through its relationship to Cicero's purportedly tyrannical, master-like deeds. This information must under no circumstances fall out of communicative circulation (cultural "forgetting") if Clodius is to gain and retain the glory as "liberator" to which he lays claim in and through this very dedication. Indeed, Clodius' aim in dedicating this sanctuary must have been to assure that his interpretation of Cicero's actions remained culturally current. Again, we might say that Clodius has placed Cicero's house *sous rature*, where the nature of this semiotic process is not to efface or obliterate the underlying sign but to modify it—to mark it as simultaneously necessary and inadequate to the current symbolic order. Being necessary to Clodius' self-positioning as "liberator," Cicero is commemorated in a negative ethical mode; thus he and his house persist as traces in Clodius' sanctuary.¹⁰³

Cicero concurs that the demolished house and Clodius' subsequent constructions function monumentally and commemorate both men. Yet he describes these monumental functions quite differently. In *Dom.* 110–111 Cicero discusses the source and symbolism of the statue of Libertas that Clodius erected in the sanctuary. This statue, he says, is nothing but the funerary portrait of a prostitute from Tanagra, stolen from her tomb and shipped to Rome by Clodius' brother Appius Claudius (§111). This statue, Cicero says, Clodius had the effrontery to pass off as "Libertas," when he had in fact banished true *libertas* entirely from the city (§110). For Clodius had kept his colleagues, who were "endowed with the greatest powers," from being "free" (*liberos*), had shut off access to the temple of Castor,

during the 1980s led him to locate these properties on the north slope, though farther east than Allen had suggested (e.g., Carandini 1986: 263–68), while Krause's excavations during the 1990s under the *domus Tiberiana* brought to light foundations he identifies with Clodius' sanctuary of Libertas (Krause 2001)—which would bring Cicero's house, and the whole complex of neighboring properties, with it. Carandini's team has apparently accepted Krause's localization: Papi 1999: 209–10.

102. Bodel 1997: 9 and Hales 2003: 42 say that Clodius aimed to obliterate the memory of Cicero; conversely, Tatum 1999: 165 takes for granted that Clodius' subsequent constructions work to commemorate both men.

103. My thinking here is indebted to Fowler 2000, esp. 204–205.

ordered his attendants to trample a distinguished (but unidentified) ex-consul, had driven Cicero from the city without due process using a “tyrant-like law directed at a single person” (*privilegiis tyrannicis inrogatis*), shut Pompey up in his house, and beset the forum with armed men. Moreover, Clodius set up his “Libertas” in a house “that was itself a sign of your bloody despotism and of the wretched slavery of the Roman people” (*quae domus erat ipsa indicium crudelissimi tui dominatus et miserrimae populi Romani servitutis*)—i.e., Cicero’s house functions, in its demolished state, as a monument evincing Clodius’ “despotism.” Ironically, Cicero concludes, Clodius’ Libertas drove out the very man who had “kept the commonwealth from falling into the power of slaves”—apparently referring to the status of certain supporters of Clodius (cf. §§89, 92, *Sest.* 47). In this passage, then, Cicero provides a counter-mapping of the master-slave metaphor to compete with the one supplied by Clodius, described above. Here, Cicero represents the Roman people and magistrates as “enslaved” under the tyranny of Clodius, who stands as the “master” figure in this metaphor; his “tyrannical,” illegal expulsion of Cicero and demolition of his house are merely the most lurid proofs of that master-like behavior. Clodius’ attempts to associate his own behavior with “Liberty” are thus dismissed as a bitter irony.¹⁰⁴

Many further passages from this speech could be adduced to illustrate the monumental operations that Cicero ascribes to his demolished house and Clodius’ subsequent structures—whether discussing the symbolic meanings and moral judgments with which Clodius’ buildings freight Cicero and his house, or conversely, the meanings that Clodius’ buildings may come to carry in relation to the earlier building. I quote and discuss just one additional passage (§§100–101) that illustrates these operations particularly vividly.¹⁰⁵ To show the density of monumental language here, I have italicized phrases describing objects that freight Cicero, his house, Clodius, or Clodius’ buildings with symbolic meaning and thus activate cultural remembrance. I have also set in boldface words relating to seeing, and underlined phrases in which an evaluation is stated or implied:

(§100) nam si vos me in meis aedibus conlocatis . . . **video** me plane ac sentio restitutum; sin mea domus non modo mihi non redditur, sed etiam *monumentum praebebat inimico doloris mei, sceleris sui, publicae calamitatis, quis erit qui hunc reditum potius quam poenam sempiternam putet?* **in conspectu** prope totius urbis domus est mea, pontifices; in qua si manet illud non *monumentum* [urbis] sed *sepulcrum inimico nomine inscriptum, demigrandum potius aliquo est quam habitandum* in ea urbe in qua

104. Alternatively, Libertas can be recoded as her vicious opposite, *Licentia* (since the statue does, after all, depict a prostitute) and is then regarded as a perfectly appropriate goddess for Clodius to honor with a dedication: Cic. *Dom.* 132 (cf. 47), *Leg.* 2.42 (quoted n.59). See Berg 1997: 137–40 on Cicero reinterpreting Clodius’ monuments; Clark 2007: 211–13 on these men’s competing deployments of the term *libertas*, and Milnor 2005: 72–76 for the symbolics of the feminine gender of Libertas and her Ciceronian recodings.

105. Besides §§100–101 and 110–11 (just discussed), cf. §§103, 137, 146.

tropaea de me et de re publica videam constituta. (§101) an ego tantam aut animi durtiam habere aut oculorum impudentiam possim ut, cuius urbis servatorem me esse senatus omnium adsensu totiens iudicarit, in ea possim **intueri** domum meam eversam, non ab inimico meo sed ab hoste communi, et ab eodem exstructam et positam in **oculis** civitatis, ne umquam conquiescere possit fletus bonorum?

Cic. *Dom.* 100–101

(§100) For if you establish me in my house . . . **I see** and feel myself fully restored; but if my house, far from being given back to me, actually *provides my enemy with a memorial of my pain, of his own villainy, and of the disaster to the state*, who will there be who regards this as a restoration rather than perpetual punishment? My house, pontiffs, is **under the gaze** of practically the whole city. If this *memorial*—no: this *tomb, inscribed with my enemy's name*, remains here, **I would have to emigrate to some other place rather than dwell** in a city in which **I see trophies set up for victories over myself and the commonwealth**. (§101) Could I possibly have such thick skin, or **eyes** so insensitive to propriety, that in a city where the senate by universal consensus has so often declared me its savior, I could **look upon** my house, demolished by my opponent—no: by our collective enemy, and built up by him and **planted in full view** of the citizens, so that the lamentations of good men might never fall silent?

Who sees, and what is seen? Currently visible, says Cicero, is his own house, in the sight of the whole city: *in conspectu prope totius urbis domus est mea*. Cicero must harden himself to gaze upon it, in its current demolished state: *an ego tantam aut animi durtiam habere aut oculorum impudentiam possim ut . . . possim intueri domum meam eversam. . . ?* Also visible are Clodius' constructions on the site, again seen by Cicero himself (*tropaea . . . videam constituta*) and by the citizenry ([sc. *domum*] *exstructam et positam in oculis civitatis*).¹⁰⁶ What

106. On the text of this last phrase, see n.45. Elsewhere too Cicero stresses the high visibility of his house: *in Palatio atque in pulcherrimo urbis loco* (§103); *in Palatio pulcherrimo prospectu* (§116, of Clodius' constructions on his and Fulvius' housesites); *in urbis clarissimo loco* (§132); *urbis enim celeberrimae et maximae partes adversum illud non monumentum sed vulnus patriae contuentur* (§146). Yet Cicero's words at §100–101—affirming the visibility of his house, while acknowledging that he sees it “overturned” (*possim intueri domum meam eversam*) leave it far from clear what, exactly, could be seen aside from Clodius' constructions. Berg 1997: 134 interprets Cicero's words to mean that Clodius left at least part of the burned-out hulk standing, and that this ruin remained to be seen behind or around the portico and sanctuary he constructed. In a less literalist vein, Walter 2004: 170–72 and Milnor 2005: 68 suggest that Cicero's assertions of his house's visibility supplement, even substitute for, the absence of a material domestic structure. Thus, for the benefit of the Pontifices, he discursively (re)constructs his house on, around, and in place of the sanctuary of Libertas, as part of his argument that they should allow him to reconstruct it materially. On this interpretation, Cicero's words are no guide whatsoever to what, if anything, still remained visible from the original structure of the house.

It is attractive to imagine Cicero pointing out the site and its structures as he speaks these words, thus inviting his audience to join their tears and outrage to that of the *boni* whose reactions he describes. Vasaly 1993 shows how, in other speeches, Cicero actively incorporates the monumental

do this (demolished) house and the subsequent constructions signify, and how should these signs be evaluated? Here Cicero seems to acknowledge Clodius' aims, while imposing significations and evaluations of his own. In its demolished state, he admits, the house itself "provides my enemy with a *monumentum* of my pain" (as Clodius must have intended), though he quickly adds, "[as well as of] his own villainy, and of the disaster to the state." If the house remains in this condition, Cicero insists, his "restoration" will be nothing but "perpetual punishment": i.e., having returned to Rome, he will have to look upon the site without end (cf. §146). Regarding the structures currently on the site (*in qua*), Cicero offers several "monumental" interpretations. Emending his earlier usage, he says that these structures constitute "not a *monumentum* but a tomb (*sepulcrum*) inscribed with my enemy's name (*inimico nomine*)."¹⁰⁷ Alternatively, they are a battlefield monument commemorating a military victory by Clodius over Cicero and the whole commonwealth (*tropaea de me et de re publica*). This image implies that Clodius is not merely Cicero's personal adversary, but an external enemy waging war on the commonwealth—as he subsequently makes explicit (*non ab inimico meo sed ab hoste communi*). To look upon such monuments, he repeats, is unbearable, and he would have to leave the city (*demigrandum potius aliquo est*) if they remain. At the end of this selection he turns from his own viewing and judgments to those of a wider group: he declares that the *boni* will never cease weeping as they view his "overturned house" and the structures built therein. The *boni*, he explained earlier, are the supporters who filled his atrium before he fled the city (*Dom.* 53–55; n.37). He implies that they interpret the demolition of the house—where they marshalled their political power, and where their interests were given voice and definition—as a monument to their collective defeat, no less than to their champion's personal

and moral topography of Rome's center (e.g., 37–38 on *Scaur.*, 40–87 on *Cat.* 1, 3). It seems impossible to determine, however, where *Dom.* was delivered. In principle, a small interior venue (such as the *regia*, the "office" of the *pontifex maximus*) should suffice for the 19 *pontifices* and other priests listed as present in *Har. Resp.* 12, in addition to the adversaries Cicero and Clodius and some secretarial staff. Yet Cicero alleges a great crowd present for his speech (*maxima frequentia amplissimorum ac sapientissimorum civium adstante*, *Har. Resp.* 12), which may—if not grossly exaggerated—point to an open-air venue in the forum, such as the *comitium*. His housesite on the northern heights of the Palatine (if it was there: n.101) would indeed be visible from the *comitium* or any other outdoor arena toward the west end of the forum. But every link in this chain of inference is highly speculative.

107. I omit the unconstruable *urbis*, bracketed by Ernesti and several modern editors; for other conjectures see the apparatus to Maslowski's Teubner edition. Without *urbis* (and with no other supplement) I interpret Cicero as revising his usage of *monumentum* in the previous sentence, sharpening its focus with the more specific *sepulcrum*. For a parallel "correction" cf. §146: *illud non monumentum sed vulnus patriae* (see Nisbet 1939: 195 for further parallels, and 207 on the usage of *monumentum* in *Dom.*). The "tomb" metaphor, *sepulcrum inimico nomine inscriptum*, seems to refer to the inscription of Clodius' name on his new constructions (cf. §51). Cicero and/or the *res publica* stand as the deceased in this metaphor, so Clodius, the *inimicus*, is imagined in the role of dedicator—a travesty, of course, since dedicating a tomb is usually the role of a pious friend or family member of whom the deceased "deserved well" (*bene merenti*).

defeat. Everyone agrees, then, that the structures visible or not visible on the site of Cicero's demolished house serve as monuments to both Cicero and Clodius. These structures symbolize these men's divergent sociopolitical positionalities, symbolically replicate the political struggle between them, and place all such symbols into communicative circulation. The debate, as represented in and through *De Domo Sua*, concerns which of the two alternative symbol-systems that have been attached to these structures—the Clodian interpretation or the Ciceronian one—will triumph politically.

In this same text Cicero informs the *pontifices* (and his readers) that his house was adjacent to the site of Fulvius Flaccus' house, demolished after his death in 121 BCE (section IIa). This site, Cicero reveals incidentally, offers an even more complex topographical palimpsest than his own house. Some twenty years after its demolition, according to Cicero, Q. Catulus, who shared with C. Marius the victory over the Cimbric in the battle of Vercellae in 101 BCE, erected a portico on the site and filled it with Cimbric spoils, "so that the entire memory of one who had taken measures ruinous to the commonwealth [sc. Fulvius] might be utterly removed from the eyes and minds of men" (*Dom.* 114). We may note, at the outset, that Cicero seems to be speaking of what I have been calling "cultural" rather than individual memory, since Catulus' concern (as Cicero presents it) is with a well-known topographical locus that functions as a sign of Fulvius' disgrace. Why did Catulus wish to obliterate this sign, to take it out of circulation? Because, Cicero explains, Catulus' brother was married to Fulvius' daughter.¹⁰⁸ Catulus was thus seeking to bandage a gaping wound in the honor of his sister-in-law's family, while also broadcasting his own military glory through the new construction and the spoils it contained. Cicero attributes this aim to Catulus (whether Catulus actually had such an aim is unknowable) in order to characterize him as *pious*, as one who has scrupulous regard for his obligations to family and community. A pious man would want, if possible, to remove symbols of a "wicked" relative who besmirches the honor of the family and injures the community—to take those signs out of circulation, and so (with luck) bring about cultural forgetting.¹⁰⁹ The portico (says Cicero) is Catulus' attempt to do just this. Yet Catulus can only

108. Cic. *Dom.* 102: *M. Flaccus quia cum C. Graccho contra salutem rei publicae fecerat ex senatus sententia est interfectus; eius domus eversa et publicata est; in qua porticum post aliquanto Q. Catulus de manubiis Cimbricis fecit* (cf. Val. Max. 6.3.1c); §114: *tu, Q. Catule, M. Fulvi domum, cum is fratris tui socer fuisset, monumentum tuarum manubiarum esse voluisti, ut eius qui perniciose rei publicae consilia cepisset omnis memoria funditus ex oculis hominum ac mentibus tolleretur*. On Fulvius' house see Papi, *LTUR* 2.105.

109. See n.49 on the memorial interests of family members. Note that it is *the housesite itself* that Catulus (according to Cicero) wished to efface: that is, Catulus himself allegedly believed that this site bore the trace of the (now demolished) house and its owner, conveying a negative evaluation of him—the very argument I seek to make in this paper. For according to Cicero/Catulus, stigma attaches to the owner by virtue of his house being in a visibly demolished state. Far from removing him altogether from communicative circulation, the demolition loads him with new symbolic meanings that convert him into a negative exemplum, and so inspires an attempt at remedial action by a relative. For further symbolic dimensions of the *porticus Catuli* see Bücher 2006: 116–18.

be acknowledged and praised for his *pietas* by means of a narrative or other monument commemorating the occasion(s) on which he displayed it. This entails doing just what Cicero does here: presenting the construction of the *porticus Catuli* as an attempt to efface Fulvius' disgrace. Thus Fulvius is reinserted into communicative circulation as a malefactor, undoing the very thing Catulus' pious undertaking supposedly aimed to bring about. Indeed, if Catulus thought his portico would supplant Fulvius' demolished house, Cicero's narrative of the whole affair converts that portico into simply another *supplement*—yet another sign that bears the trace of the demolished house and its disgraced owner, another level to the monumental palimpsest. For in Cicero's narrative, Fulvius' house as an index of its owner's social power was succeeded by the demolished house as an index of his disgrace, which was in turn succeeded by the *porticus Catuli* as an index not only of Catulus' military glory, but of his piety toward his sister-in-law. In the immediate rhetorical situation, this new level of the palimpsest serves to align Catulus with Cicero on the side of *pietas*, concern for the welfare of the *res publica*, and opposition to tumultuous and wicked citizens. Likewise, Fulvius is aligned with Clodius, the current "wicked citizen" who attacks and victimizes men such as Cicero and Catulus.

Indeed, Catulus is no less a victim of Clodius than Cicero himself. For Cicero remarks that Clodius' grandiose building project engrossed not only Cicero's property, but also the site of Fulvius' house/Catulus' portico; Clodius either demolished or remodeled Catulus' portico to incorporate it into his own, larger portico, which was also somehow connected with the sanctuary of Libertas he had erected on Cicero's housesite.¹¹⁰ This new, Clodian layer of the palimpsest provides Cicero considerable rhetorical scope. In the continuation of the passage discussed above (*Dom.* 114), Cicero apostrophizes the dead Catulus, comparing Clodius' new buildings with the *porticus Catuli* that they displaced. Could you ever have imagined, he asks, that your own monument would be overthrown by a rogue tribune, in defiance of the senate and the judgment of the *boni*, yet with the assistance of the consuls themselves? No, Cicero answers, you could never have imagined such a thing unless the state itself were overthrown.¹¹¹ The succession of these structures represents *in nuce* the travesty whereby a man out to destroy the *res publica* eclipses the kind of men who, in former times,

110. On Clodius' construction on the site of the *porticus Catuli* (Cicero speaks of an *ambulatio* at *Dom.* 116, 121, and a *porticus* at *Dom.* 103, *Att.* 4.2.5, which may or may not be the same thing), see the diverse views of Carandini 1986: 265–68; Papi, *LTUR* 4.119 (s.v. *porticus Catuli*); *id.*, *LTUR* 2.85–86 (s.v. *domus: P. Clodius Pulcher*); and Krause 2001: 186–91; also the scholarship cited n.100.

111. *Dom.* 114: *hoc si quis tibi aedificanti illam porticum diceret, fore tempus cum is tribunus plebis, qui auctoritatem senatus, iudicium bonorum omnium neglexisset, tuum monumentum consulibus non modo inspectantibus verum adiuvantibus disturbaret, everteret, idque cum eius civis qui rem publicam ex senatus auctoritate consul defendisset domo coniungeret, nonne responderes id nisi eversa civitate accidere non posse?* For the outrage to the heroic victor that this demolition/rebuilding entails, see also §§102 (*clarissimi viri mortui monumenta debebat*), 137; *Har. Resp.* 33, 58.

gloriously defended and preserved it—men like Catulus and of course Cicero. Cicero can also juxtapose Clodius' remodeling project with the still earlier layer, the (demolished) house of Fulvius. In §102, Cicero remarks that the demolition he himself suffered enabled Clodius to annex Cicero's lot to the adjacent lot of Fulvius and, thereby, to assimilate Cicero to Fulvius—to make it appear as if the two were being punished in the same way for similar misdeeds. But this is outrageous, says Cicero, since the senate imposed the punishment of demolition on Fulvius, while Clodius first crushed the senate and then unilaterally imposed this punishment on a man who had been judged the state's protector.¹¹² On the adjacent sites of Cicero's and Fulvius' houses, then, we can observe a remarkable sequence of structures erected, demolished, and displaced by other structures. None of these transitions, at least in Cicero's hands, effaces or supplants any of the symbolic meanings associated with what went before; no symbol is ever removed from circulation altogether (as far as we can see). Rather, each new level bears traces of all preceding levels, so that all the various pasts represented by demolished earlier structures are available for ethical comparison with each new present as it successively emerges.¹¹³

I conclude this discussion of monuments that bear the trace of demolished houses and their owners by examining the (chronologically) last case of demolition represented in surviving texts as a memory sanction. This is the case of Vedius Pollio, the wealthy equestrian and associate of the emperor Augustus renowned in the early Empire for his cruelty and *luxuria*. Cassius Dio provides a death notice (54.23.1–6, 15 BCE), remarking that Vedius had “offered up nothing worthy of remembrance” insofar as he was low-born and did no brilliant deeds. Nevertheless, he “had become widely renowned/infamous for his wealth and cruelty, so that it warrants mentioning in a history.”¹¹⁴ To exemplify these characteristics Dio

112. *Dom. 102: hanc vero, pontifices, labem turpitudinis et inconstantiae poterit populi Romani dignitas sustinere, vivo senatu, vobis principibus publici consili, ut domus M. Tulli Ciceronis cum domo Fulvi Flacci ad memoriam poenae publice constitutae coniuncta esse videatur? ... ista autem fax ac furia patriae ... meam domum cum Flacci domo coniungebat, ut, qua poena senatus adfecerat eversorem civitatis, eadem iste oppresso senatu adficeret eum quem patres conscripti custodem patriae iudicassent.* Cf. §101 for a similar expression of outrage at his assimilation, through demolition, to the three early kingship-aspirants (discussion in section IIa).

113. Nor does it end there. The speech *De Domo Sua* was successful: the *pontifices* deconsecrated the sanctuary of Libertas, while the senate approved the demolition of Clodius' buildings and provided funds to rebuild Cicero's house and the *porticus Catuli*. *Cic. Att.* 4.2 and 4.3.2 relate this story, with further twists. Though no speech survives in which Cicero interprets this latest layer, we can readily imagine how he might now have thrown back at Clodius all the tropes linking house demolition (this time publicly sanctioned!) with tyrannical behavior.

114. Dio Cass. 54.23.1: *κάν τῷ αὐτῷ τούτῳ ἔτει Οὐγγίδιος Πολίων ἀπέθανεν, ἀνὴρ ἄλλως μὲν οὐδὲν μνήμης ἄξιον παρασχόμενος (καὶ γὰρ ἐξ ἀπελευθέρων ἐγεγόνει καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἱππεῦσιν ἐξητάζετο καὶ λαμπρὸν οὐδὲν εἰργάσατο), ἐπὶ δὲ δὴ τῷ πλούτῳ τῇ τε ὀμότητι ὀνομαστότατος γενόμενος, ὥστε καὶ ἐς ἱστορίας λόγον ἐσελθεῖν.* Note the specific realms within which, according to Dio, one can be *μνήμης ἄξιος*: social status of oneself and one's ancestors, and the performance of noteworthy deeds. *Onomastotos* presumably carries a negative connotation here, to contrast to (implicitly positive) *mnêmê*: at any rate Tacitus (*Ann.* 1.10) makes *luxus Vedii Pollionis* an item

narrates the lurid story, also found in other authors, of Vedius threatening to throw to the lampreys in his fishponds a slave who had broken a crystal drinking vessel. Augustus, who was present at this dinner party, saved the slave and punished Vedius in turn by ordering all of his crystal to be broken.¹¹⁵ Nevertheless, Dio continues, Vedius left much of his estate to Augustus, requesting that a grand public structure be built (presumably from the proceeds). Augustus did so: he razed Vedius' house in Rome, built a grand portico on the site, and then inscribed it with his wife Livia's name, not Vedius', "so that Pollio might have nothing in the city to be remembered by."¹¹⁶ The dynamics of memory described and performed in this passage are complex. Dio overtly agrees with Augustus that Vedius was, at least in principle, unworthy of commemoration (§23.1: οὐδὲν μνήμης ἄξιον; §23.6: ὅπως μὴδὲν μνημόσυνον . . . ἔχη); yet, if this judgment precludes Vedius from commemoration via a built monument in the urban landscape—hence Augustus demolishes his house and omits his name from the subsequent structure—it does not exclude him from the written monument that is narrative historiography. On the contrary, Dio insists that his "infamous" luxury and cruelty demand inclusion (§23.1). Yet in the very act of describing Vedius' cruelty and extravagance, thus illuminating Augustus' attempt to deprive Vedius of a built monument, Dio (re)connects the new structure, the *porticus Liviae*, with the demolished house preceding it and with the name of Vedius, and so makes this portico available to his readers as precisely the built monument that, according to Dio, Augustus tried to deny. As with the palimpsest of Clodius' constructions, the trace of the demolished house and its owner clings like a contagion to all subsequent symbols connected with the site.¹¹⁷

for which Augustus could be reproached (see also the next n.) On Vedius see still Syme's (1961) classic essay.

115. Other versions in Sen. *Ira* 3.40, *Clem.* 1.18.2, *Plin. Nat.* 9.77. This tale exemplifies not only Pollio's cruelty, but also his wealth and *luxuria*, since he could purport that his crystal was so valuable (or that he valued it so highly) that the cupbearer himself, who must have been attractive and expensive, was of insignificant value in comparison and therefore could be conspicuously squandered. On the economics of display and exchange in this story, see Roller 2001: 168–71, Stein-Hölkeskamp 2005: 156.

116. Dio Cass. 54.23.5–6: τοιοῦτος οὖν δὴ τις ὁ Πωλίων ὃν ἐτελεύτησεν ἄλλοις τε πολλοῖς πολλὰ καὶ τῷ Αὐγούστῳ . . . καταλιπών, τῷ τε δῆμῳ περικαλλὲς ἔργον οἰκοδομηθῆναι κελεύσας. ὁ οὖν Αὐγούστος τὴν οἰκίαν αὐτοῦ ἐς ἔδαφος προφάσει τῆς ἐκείνου κατασκευῆς, ὅπως μὴδὲν μνημόσυνον ἐν τῇ πόλει ἔχη, καταβαλὼν περιστῶν ὠκοδομήσατο, καὶ οὐ τὸ ὄνομα τὸ τοῦ Πωλίωνος ἀλλὰ τὸ τῆς Λιουίας ἐπέγραψεν.

117. As Flaig 1999: 40–43 notes, a person or event can be culturally forgotten within one discursive realm (i.e., symbols of that person or event that were formerly meaningful cease to be so, whether by being taken out of circulation or by being altered), while in another discursive realm cultural memory of the same person or event may persist and be cultivated. In contemporary Germany, for instance, no public monuments or commemorative practices relating to the Nazi era persist (on which see, e.g., Connerton 1989: 41–43), yet the persons and events of that period are assiduously studied by scholars, teachers, and students within the educational system. Regarding Vedius, Dio articulates criteria for historiographical commemoration that differ from what he presents as Augustus' criteria for commemoration via built structures; hence different patterns of cultural remembering and forgetting are visible in different discursive realms.

Ovid also, in the sixth book of his *Fasti*, presents the *porticus Liviae* as a structure that calls Vedius' house to mind. Ovid gives June 11 as the founding day of a shrine of Concordia (*aedes Concordiae*), dedicated by Livia. Ovid devotes but a single couplet (6.637–38) to Concordia before shifting his attention to Vedius' house, which he introduces with the remark (639–40) that it stood on the site of the *porticus Liviae*. The apparent conceptual leap from the *aedes Concordiae* to the *porticus Liviae* is generally taken to imply that these structures were integral, hence logically part of the same sequence of thought.¹¹⁸ At any rate, the sequence of thought *aedes Concordiae* – *porticus Liviae* leads Ovid quickly on to Vedius' house: “But learn, you ages to come: where the *porticus Liviae* now is, there used to be a vast house. . . . This was levelled to the ground, not under any accusation of tyranny, but because it was deemed harmful due to its own *luxuria*” (6.639–44).¹¹⁹ Here, the exhortation to future generations to “learn” that the house preceded the portico places the current and former structures into a relationship, and so presents the portico as bearing (or perhaps causes it to bear) the trace of Vedius' demolished house. The cultural significance of that relationship, presumably, is found in the reasons for the demolition given in the following lines. Ovid explicitly denies that aspiring to kingship was the reason, perhaps supposing that his readers would assume this was the cause unless he expressly rules it out (an assumption that, incidentally, confirms the conceptual centrality of aspiring to kingship within the discourse of house demolition).¹²⁰ Rather, he says, the problem was with the *luxuria*—extravagance or excessive indulgence—that it was taken to embody. He continues (645–48), “Caesar endured the overturning of so massive a structure and, heir though he was, lost so much of his own wealth. This is how a censorship is carried out; this is how *exempla* are manufactured: when the judge himself does what he urges others to do.”¹²¹ In this representation, Augustus demonstrated himself immune to the enticements

118. The square structure shown in the center of the *porticus Liviae* in the *Forma Urbis* fragments is often interpreted as representing the *aedes Concordiae*, though this remains only a conjecture. For the temple of Concordia and its politics see Flory 1984; also Newlands 2002: 228–31, 244–48 (with further references) for the politics of passing over this topic quickly. For the *porticus Liviae*, Panella, *LTUR* 4.127–29 (s.v.) offers general discussion, and Zanker 1987: 475–83 examines its architecture and urbanism.

119. Ov. *Fasti* 6.637–44: *te quoque magnifica, Concordia, dedicat aede / Livia, quam caro praestitit ipsa viro. / disce tamen, veniens aetas: ubi Livia nunc est / porticus, immensae tecta fuere domus; / urbis opus domus una fuit spatiumque tenebat / quo brevius muris oppida multa tenent. / haec aequata solo est, nullo sub crimine regni, / sed quia luxuria visa nocere sua.*

120. The phrase *aequata solo* (643) may glance specifically at Maelius and the “flattening” etymologies for the *Aequimaelium* (n.65). At any rate, the phrase suggests a systematic levelling or removal of the house to make room for the new construction: another rare insight into the actual process of demolition, or what an author imagines that process to be.

121. Ov. *Fasti* 6.645–48: *sustinuit tantas operum subvertere moles / totque suas heres perdere Caesar opes: / sic agitur censura et sic exempla parantur; / cum iudex, alios quod monet, ipse facit.* With most modern editors (and see Newlands 2002: 233–34 for a compelling argument) I accept the reading *iudex* against the variant *vindex* in line 648.

of personal extravagance (*privata luxuria*) in which Vedius, on the evidence of his vast and richly appointed house, had indulged. For he conspicuously destroyed this valuable property that now belonged to him and whose destruction therefore cost him dearly. Indeed, Ovid characterizes this action as an exemplary imposition of a censorial stigma upon the deceased Vedius—exemplary because, in destroying the house, Augustus not only stigmatized *luxuria* in Vedius but conspicuously abjured it himself.¹²²

Yet there is more to the *porticus Liviae* than simply the absence of Vedius' house. Other texts that discuss the portico's uses, along with the fragments of the *Forma Urbis* showing its plan and scale, corroborate Dio's claim that it was a grandiose yet entirely civic structure, open for all to enjoy. As such, it may be interpreted as the turning outward of *luxuria* into the civic sphere, hence the vindication of the private vice exemplified in Vedius' house as a public virtue when deployed to adorn the city and enhance its civic life. Thus the portico and house stand in a pointed, dialogical relationship to one another; each structure comes into its distinctively Augustan meaning precisely through its contrast with its counterpart. The older model of *privata luxuria*, unacceptable to the new order, is visibly and pointedly replaced by a new model of civic *luxuria* (or *magnificentia*) that is acceptable.¹²³ *Luxuria* is the symbolic trace of Vedius and his house that is present also in the portico, endowing it (so our texts hint) with its essential monumental function and moral point.¹²⁴

B. FROM OPEN LOT TO DEMOLISHED HOUSE

An unbuilt or partially built space within an otherwise densely built urban fabric may strike a viewer as noteworthy. Dionysius of Halicarnassus, surveying the Augustan cityscape, finds the Aequimaesium particularly striking: "The senate voted to level [Maelius'] house to the ground. Even down to my own day, this place, alone amidst the numerous surrounding houses, was simply left empty."¹²⁵ This representation corroborates the aim that Livy, Dionysius' con-

122. On the politics and morals of "luxurious" buildings, Edwards 1993: 137–72 is still a good starting point.

123. On this point Zanker 1987: 481 aptly, if anachronistically, adduces Cicero's dictum *odit populus Romanus privatam luxuriam, publicam magnificentiam diligit* (*Mur.* 76); see also Steinhölkenskamp 2005: 42–43.

124. Scholars reasonably suggest that the *luxuria* associated with Vedius, Maecenas, and certain other contemporary figures came to appear at odds with the conspicuous moderation that emerged as a hallmark of the Augustan regime—moderation exemplified in Augustus' own personal style, his moral legislation, and so on: see Syme 1961: 28–29, Flory 1984: 324–30, Zanker 1987: 481, Edwards 1993: 164–68, Newlands 2002: 233–42, and Pasco-Pranger 2006: 272–75. Note also that Ovid's interpretation of the portico, focusing on Augustus as "censor," strikingly omits Livia, whose name it actually bears. Milnor 2005: 60–64 discusses Livia's significance as official dedicator of the shrine and portico, and Barchiesi 2006: 96–107 analyzes Ovid's representation of her in this context.

125. Dion. Hal. 12.4.6: ἡ βουλή . . . ἐψηφίσατο . . . τὴν οἰκίαν ἕως ἐδάφους κατασκαφῆναι. οὗτος ὁ τόπος ἔτι καὶ εἰς ἐμὲ ἦν ἐν πολλαῖς ταῖς πέριξ οἰκίαις μόνος ἀνεμιμένος ἔρημος, καλούμενος ὑπὸ Ῥωμαίων Αἰκυμήλιον.

temporary, attributes to the dictator Cincinnatus: that the open lot resulting from the demolition should commemorate the crushing of the wicked aim (*ut monumento area esset oppressae nefariae spei*, 4.16.1). For only in the context of a built-up neighborhood could the open lot (*area*) be recognizable as such, and so be capable of serving this commemorative function.¹²⁶ Dionysius is similarly struck by the site of Sp. Cassius' house: "His house was demolished, and to this day its site remains open, apart from the temple of Tellus, which in later times the city built on part of it."¹²⁷ The Palatine neighborhood around Cicero's house was also densely built up, as Cicero's descriptions of the surrounding properties makes clear. Thus it seems possible that his and Fulvius' housesites, once the structures there had been demolished by Clodius, were indeed conspicuous as gaps or ruins in an otherwise densely packed hillside of domestic façades. And Cicero's assertion that Catulus, about 43 years earlier, had himself decided to build on Fulvius' housesite in order to blot out the memory of Fulvius' disgrace (*Dom.* 114) requires us to imagine—as discussed above—that the housesite itself was a conspicuous sign of that disgrace, a sign that a pious family member would naturally want to obliterate and remove from circulation by building something there: *anything* to make the lot less conspicuous, less "monumental" in this undesirable way. Finally, regarding the *porticus Liviae*, the *Forma Urbis* fragments that include this large open space on the Oppian hill show a densely built urban fabric enclosing it. As Zanker (1987: 480–81) has noted, visitors entering the portico from the surrounding maze of dark, narrow streets must have been pleasurably struck by its openness and airiness. Indeed, the lot is fundamentally no less open for the construction of *quadriporticus* around it, which merely adds a façade and elegant frame.

Here the Jakobsonian idea of linguistic or semiotic "markedness" may be useful. A plot of land upon which a building stands is "marked" in contrast to the "unmarked" character of an unbuilt plot of land, in the sense that the built lot is informationally more dense and focused, and conceptually more complex, than the unbuilt one. The open lot, meanwhile, potentially opposes itself to its marked counterpart in two different ways: in a general sense of being simply open and potentially available (or indeed unavailable) for building; or, more narrowly, in the specific sense of *lacking a building*. The urban context, I suggest, causes the unmarked term to oppose itself to the marked term in this narrower, more specific sense. In the densely built urban context, as the examples just discussed suggest, the open lot is perceived not simply as unbuilt, but—more specifically—as *lacking* a building of the sort that the surrounding urban fabric would lead one to expect.

126. Cic. *Div.* 2.39 mentions the Aequimaesium as a marketplace, and so seems to confirm its open, unbuilt character in the late Republic.

127. Dion. Hal. 8.79.3: μετὰ τὸν θάνατον τοῦ Κασσίου ἢ τε οἰκία κατεσκάφη, καὶ μέχρι τοῦδε ἀνεῖται ὁ τόπος αὐτῆς αἰθριος ἔξω τοῦ νεῦ τῆς Γῆς, ὃν ὑστέροις ἢ πόλις κατεσκευάζε χρόνοις ἐν μέρει τινὶ αὐτῆς.

This interpretation of the open lot, as opposed to its possible interpretation as (merely) open land, confers upon it a degree of informational density and focus, though presumably less than a built lot has. For to ponder the lack of a building is necessarily to ponder specifically what building could be expected there, or may have stood there in the past.¹²⁸

If indeed the sheer openness of an unbuilt or partially built area within a densely built urban core can be taken to suggest an absent building, the presence of a toponym only enhances this effect. We have already seen (section IIIa) how the toponym *Aequimaelium* is interpreted as containing *in nuce* the entire tale of the disgrace and demolition that Maelius experienced. The toponym *prata Vacci* is not so forthcoming in and of itself, though a similar story of misdeed, punishment, and house demolition is nevertheless linked to this open space via the name of Vaccus. These toponyms are thus made to function as supplements—as monumental features that occupy the conceptual space of the house and bear its trace. In this regard we must also note a quasi-toponymic form that occurs in a number of the cases examined in this paper—the word *area* modified (explicitly or implicitly) by a personal name in adjectival or genitive form. *Area*, as we have seen, is the *mot propre* for an unbuilt area in an urban fabric (n.11), and its urban context seems to raise automatically the question whether a structure once stood there, or may eventually be built, or both. As such, the word *area* indicates not simply an unbuilt space, but the (specific) lack-of-a-building, as discussed above. And to modify this word with a personal name—or indeed to supply any toponym that could be thought to contain a personal name—would suggest to a Roman that the open lot is or once was privately owned, which in turn points to a *domus* as the building that is lacking.¹²⁹

With this in mind, let us consider a fragment of Varro's *Antiquitates rerum humanarum*, preserved in Donatus' commentary on the *Eunuchus* of Terence. Varro (as reported by Donatus) writes, "Numerius Equitius Cupes and Manius Macellus rendered many places unsafe by their egregious banditry. After being driven into exile, their possessions were confiscated and the houses where they lived were demolished; and from the proceeds the stairs of the temple of the

128. In thinking about markedness I have found Waugh 1982 especially helpful, along with the syntheses of Battistella 1990: 1–22 and 1996: 9–25. For reflections on markedness in relation to structuralist anthropological theory and poststructuralist philosophy, see Agamben 2005[2000]: 101–104.

129. For the quasi-toponymic formulations with *area* involving sites of demolished houses, see Liv. 4.16.1: *domum deinde* [sc. *Maeli*], *ut monumento area esset oppressae nefariae spei, dirui extemplo iussit*; Val. Max. 6.3.1c: *area vero domus eius* [sc. *Maeli*] . . . *Aequimeli appellationem traxit*; *Id.* 6.3.1c: *ceterum Flacciana area . . . a Q. Catulo Cimbricis spoliis adornata est*; Liv. 7.28.5: *locus* [sc. *templi Iunonis*] *in arce destinatus, quae area aedium M. Manli Capitolini fuerat*; Cic. *Fam.* 14.2.3: *quod de domo scribis, hoc est de area, ego vero tum denique mihi videbor restitutus si illa nobis erit restituta* (cf. *Att.* 4.1.7, 4.2.3, 4.3.2–3); Liv. 2.41.11: *dirutas publice aedes* [sc. *Cassi*]; *ea est area ante Telluris aedem*. For the inherent "buildability" of an *area* in other contexts, see, e.g., Cic. *Rep.* 2.21, Sen. *Ben.* 7.31.5, Plin. *Ep.* 10.71, Paul. *Dig.* 20.1.29.2.

Penates were built. Where they used to live was the place where foodstuffs that had been brought into the city were put on sale. Therefore the *Macellum* was named for one of them, and the *forum Cuppedinis* was named for the other.”¹³⁰ This Varronian information seems to stand behind two passages from Festus that offer these same aetiologies, though in Festus the aetiology for the *Macellum* adds the unexpectedly precise information that the censors Aemilius and Fulvius (i.e., 179 BCE) established this market on Macellus’ housesite.¹³¹ And Varro himself offers the same story about Macellus a second time, at *De Lingua Latina* 5.146–47, along with some alternative etymologies for both the *Macellum* (e.g., derivation from the Greek word *makellon*) and the *forum Cupedinis* (e.g., from *cupiditas*, “eager desire” or “greed”). These brigands are prosopographically unlikely to have existed under such names: Cup(p)es is completely unattested as a cognomen, and Macellus is attested but once or twice. Indeed, scholars have long surmised that these figures were retrojected from the names of the marketplaces to provide (fictive) aetiologies, and that the “correct” etymologies of these toponyms are to be found among Varro’s other alternatives, or elsewhere altogether. Likewise—for this point returns us to the beginning—the figure of (Cassius) Argillus, whose purportedly demolished house made way for the Argiletum, is regarded as an invention, back-formed from the *Argi letum* interpretation of the toponym to “account” for it; here too, scholars prefer other explanations offered by the Servian text.¹³²

The Romans were, of course, aware that various causal sequences might leave a given trace in the present, hence that one cannot necessarily hunt down the “correct” origin when starting simply with traces visible in the present (a

130. Var. *Ant. rer. hum.* fr. 9 Mirsch = fr. 40 Semi, *apud* Don. in *Ter. Eun.* 256: *Numerius Equitius Cupes et Manius [Manius Reitzenstein, Romanus C, Romanus BV, alii alia] Macellus singulari latrocinio multa loca habuerunt infesta. his in exilium actis bona publicata sunt, aedes ubi habitabant dirutae eque ea pecunia scalae deum penatum aedificatae sunt. ubi habitabant locus, ubi venirent ea quae vescendi causa in urbem erant allata. itaque ab altero Macellum, ab altero forum Cuppedinis appellatum.* Here I give Wessner’s Teubner text of Donatus.

131. Paul. Fest. p. 42L: *cuppes et cupedia antiqui lautiores cibos nominabant; inde et macellum forum cupedinis appellabant. cupedia autem a cupiditate sunt dicta, vel sicut Varro vult, quod ibi fuerit Cupedinis equitis domus, qui fuerat ob latrocinium damnatus.* Id. p. 112L: *Macellum dictum a Macello quodam, qui exercebat in urbe latrocinium; quo damnato censores Aemilius et Fulvius statuerunt ut in domo eius obsonia venderentur.* Cf. Plut. *Quaest. Rom.* 54 (= *Mor.* 277D-E), offering the “bandit” aetiology for *Macellum* along with one from the Greek *mageiros*. For archaeological discussion of these marketplaces, and for the relevance of the censors of 179 BCE (who substantially reconfigured this part of the forum), see Coarelli 1983: 2.151–55, De Ruyt 1983: 251–52, Tortorici 1991: 37–47.

132. For Macellus see Münzer, *RE* 14 s.v. *Macellus*, col. 133; Kajanto 1965: 244 cites two epigraphically attested instances of the name, and regards it as a diminutive of *Macer*. For *Cupes*, see Münzer, *RE* 6 s.v. *Equitius* (4), col. 323: “Dass sein Name nur zur Erklärung dieser unverständlichen Bezeichnung [sc. *Forum Cupedinis*] erfunden ist, kann kaum zweifelhaft sein.” De Sanctis 1907: 2.12–13 also pronounces *Macellus* and *Argillus* unhistorical. For the unlikelihood of a cognomen with the *-illus* diminutive in the 3rd century BCE, see n.3. De Ruyt 1983: 225–35, 243–45 and Collart 1954: 238–40 further discuss these historical and etymological matters.

worthwhile point for all historians to remember).¹³³ This, indeed, is why numerous alternatives are proposed for these toponyms. Yet the demolished house was *among* the causes that, following the rules of its own discourse, might leave a certain toponymic or other monumental trace. In this discourse, as we have repeatedly seen, narratives about figures who transgress against the collective in a certain range of ways, and whose houses are demolished in return, are connected to open or partially open spaces within the urban fabric. This connection between narratives and spaces manifests the (now familiar) assumption that a demolished house, its final occupant, and the reason for its demolition are inevitably somehow commemorated on the former housesite—that some trace always persists in subsequent structures or names associated with that site. These habitual patterns of thought invite Romans, and indeed seem to impose a normative pressure on them, to strive to make each particular case realize and manifest these patterns—to seek out or construct any links, explanations, or elements that might be “missing” from a particular case, in order to bring that case into line with the broader discursive pattern. We have already noted this productive impulse in those texts that strive to make the temple of Iuno Moneta into a monument to Manlius Capitolinus, or to locate a trace of Sp. Cassius in the temple of Tellus. In the cases of Macellus, Argillus, and Cupes, this impulse goes even further, producing what are likely to be entirely spurious malefactors whose names are retrojected from extant toponyms, and whose transgressions and houses are manufactured in accordance with the discursive pattern. These inventions aim to facilitate a narrative of punishment, demolition, and toponymic commemoration, and thus to provide one culturally resonant accounting for a toponym attached to an open lot in the urban fabric (but only one: for the Romans knew that other explanations were possible).¹³⁴ The discourse of house demolition, not an actual demolition, probably stands at the origin of these aetiological narratives, and can be seen to impact other narratives within this group as well.¹³⁵

133. Fowler 2000: 201 offers reflections on this point.

134. Some scholars have even suggested that the legend of Sp. Maelius is a highly elaborated aetiological retrojection from the toponym *Aequimaelium*: Martin 1982–94: 1.349–51, Flower 2006: 48. However, its high degree of elaboration, compared to the sparseness of the narratives involving Cupes, Macellus, and Argillus; the lack of alternative ancient etymologies, for which there are many in the other cases; its implication with the stories of other, unquestionably historical families; and the fact that the *nomen* Maelius is otherwise attested (albeit rarely), does not suggest to me the same dynamic. Cf. nn.67, 68.

135. Nor is the phenomenon strictly limited to open or subsequently built lots. Paul. Fest. p. 117L explains a toponym as follows: *Mancina tifata appellabantur quod Mancinus habuit insignem domum quae publicata est eo interfecto*. Elsewhere this text informs us (p. 503L) that *tifata* means *iliceta*, oak grove—perhaps a loan word from another Italic language. Thus the toponym labels an oak grove that purportedly grew on the site of one Mancinus’ house after he was killed. This aetiology projects Mancinus as a malefactor (otherwise the confiscation of the house makes no sense), and seems to imply eventual demolition (to make way for the grove). Mancinus being a cognomen of the *gens Hostilia*, we can look for an historical candidate. The imprudent cavalry commander of 217 BCE who was killed in a Numidian ambush (Liv. 22.15.4–10; *RE* Hostilius (19))

IV. CONCLUSION

Some common or general features of the discourse of house demolition emerge from the analyses conducted in sections II and III above. In section II we saw that the Roman aristocratic *domus* functions practically as the site in which the owner marshals his social network and nurtures its power (hence his own). Symbolically it functions as a monument both to himself and to his social network, and occasionally even as an extension of his person. The constitutive elements of the discourse of house demolition are an attack on the practical function (destruction of the house hamstringing the social network nurtured there) and the negation of this particular symbolic function (destruction of the house symbolizes the defeat of its owner, his social network, and their collective aims). Hence this discourse is only activated in relation to malefactors. Would-be *reges* who plot revolution among their supporters in their houses seem to be the “best examples” of candidates for demolition—that is, when demolition is mentioned, Romans seem to think of kingship-aspirants first and foremost—but this discourse does not encompass all such figures. It can encompass other kinds of malefactors as well, perhaps when their misdeeds are deemed to have similarly grave consequences for the community. Yet these figures are less central and resonant within the discourse precisely because the symbolic relation between transgression and demolition is less clear, or fits less well, in these cases. Not essential to this discourse, I argued, are ideas about the house as a symbol of its owner’s family and lineage, or about the religious sanctity of the house: only the malefactor and his social network, not his ancestors, descendants, or familial divinities, are practically and symbolically caught up in punitive house demolition.

In section III, meanwhile, I sought to illustrate the dynamics of the “cultural” memory by which Romans of the late Republic and early Empire linked various toponyms, temples, statues, porticos, and so on, to demolished houses that allegedly had formerly stood on these sites. The examples discussed suggest that, in general, Romans of this period expected the structure or object in question to serve as a monument to the house and its owner, and to bear within it traces of the misdeed that occasioned the demolition. Moreover, they expected this monumental relationship to function *dialogically*, with the object or structure both taking its *raison d’être* from the story of the demolition, and also providing a

gives no indication of being a malefactor. Alternatively, the consul of 137 BCE and author of the repudiated peace with Numantia (*RE* Hostilius (18)) suffered public disgrace and even a kind of capital punishment in being stripped of citizenship and surrendered to the Numantines; however, having given himself over voluntarily and being rejected by the Numantines, he returned to Rome and recovered his citizenship and status (Rosenstein 1990: 148–50). Lacking a good fit, we may again suspect that the discourse of house demolition promoted a “harmonization” of details about an historical Mancinus, or indeed may stand at the origin of the entire aetiology. See also Hülsen 1911 with the comments of Palombi, *LTUR* 5.74 (s.v. *tifata Mancina*). Apparently similar is Paul. Fest. p. 43L: *Curia tifata a Curio dicta est, qui eo loco domum habuerat*. In this case, however, *Vir. Ill.* 33 ascribes an honorific interpretation to the toponym.

moral commentary or judgment upon the owner and his deeds. This expectation of dialogical monumentality can incite authors to manufacture or modify details or connections, so as to make subsequent structures respond to and comment on the alleged misdeeds of the demolished house's owner—as we saw (e.g.) in the efforts to connect Iuno Moneta to Manlius Capitolinus, or in the explanation for the melting of Cassius' purported statue at the temple of Tellus. Romans might also have divergent understandings regarding how exactly a subsequent structure commemorates a demolished house, its owner, and his deeds, and in particular regarding what judgment the former pass on the latter. Thus Cicero and Clodius offer starkly opposed interpretations of Clodius' sanctuary of Libertas, its relation to Cicero's demolished house, and the relative moral valence of these two structures, even as both men manipulate the same set of culturally resonant symbols within the same discourse. And it is always the case that the differing rhetorical needs of different contexts can provoke authors to represent a particular case in divergent ways. Thus, when Cassius Dio asserts that Vedius Pollio did nothing worth commemorating, he contends that Augustus' aim in erecting the *porticus Liviae* was to remove all monuments to the man. But when Ovid wants to illustrate Augustus' "censorial" activities, he connects the portico explicitly with Vedius, so that the succession of these structures will bring to mind this emperor's agenda of moral improvement.¹³⁶

Is it possible that house demolition, with or without other sanctions against memory, did impose cultural oblivion on certain malefactors, removing them utterly and permanently from communicative circulation? If so, we will never know, since *ex hypothesi* no monument adverting to such a figure can have survived to us. Yet the foregoing analysis of the discourse of house demolition makes this result, in my view, extremely unlikely. First, we have seen that the alleged housesite attracts other sorts of monuments that commemorate the disgraced owner as such. Second, there are strong incentives for those who had a hand in crushing such a malefactor to commemorate their own glorious role, thus keeping the story of the transgression in circulation: the Ahalae and Minucii in relation to Maelius, Clodius in regard to Cicero, Augustus in regard to Vedius Pollio, and (in a slightly different vein) Q. Lutatius Catulus in regard to Fulvius Flaccus. And third, the opportunity to account for open lots and their associated toponyms in terms of demolished houses and their owners is apparently so attractive that it generates the completely spurious instances of

136. This "dialogical" characteristic of the Roman discourse of house demolition contrasts sharply with the Greek discourse. Connor's 1985 catalogue of Greek demolitions notes only one case, T11 (p. 83, and 85 n.19, = Plut. *Tim.* 22.1–3), in which it is reported what (if anything) followed on the site of the demolition. In this case Timoleon restores Syracusan democracy, demolishes the tyrants' houses, and builds law-courts on the site. This replacement of the quintessentially "lawless" figure of the tyrant with the quintessential site of the exercise of law bestows upon this sequence of structures the kind of symbolic resonance that the Roman discourse of house demolition regularly assumes. Yet this is the only example of a Roman-style moral palimpsest among Connor's Greek examples.

Argillus, Macellus, and Cupes. In sum, I suspect that our surviving texts allege *more* cases of punitive house demolition than ever actually occurred, not fewer.

An additional common feature of this discourse, not stressed in the paper so far, may now be brought out as well. In every example of demolition examined here, one can observe that property or space held privately in the domestic sphere is, in one way or another, claimed by the community and placed in the civic sphere for public use. Many texts examined above explicitly state that the penalty of demolition was imposed *publice* (by authority of the commonwealth), or that the possessions of the malefactor were *publicata* (“confiscated,” i.e., seized by the commonwealth) concomitant with the demolition. Thus the idea that the community claims the malefactor’s property for itself, on its own authority, seems to be ideologically important within this discourse, and is a regular if not invariable feature of it. The uses reportedly made of the sites of demolished houses also underscore this dynamic. Whether the lot is left entirely unbuilt (Aequimaelium, Prata Vacci, and—for a while—the housesites of Fulvius Flaccus, Sp. Cassius, and perhaps Manlius Capitolinus), or a portico is constructed there (the *porticus Catuli* on Fulvius’ housesite; the *porticus Liviae* on Vedius’), or a temple is erected on part of it (Libertas on Cicero’s housesite; also Iuno Moneta and Tellus, eventually, on the sites of Manlius’ and Cassius’ houses), in all cases the domestic structure is represented as being opened to communal, civic use. This “domestic to civic” dynamic seems particularly appropriate in cases of aspiring to kingship: for the attempt by an individual to claim the entire civic sphere for himself, and to bring it under his personal control, receives an apt symbolic *quid pro quo* when the community seizes that individual’s house and possessions for its collective use instead. When transgressions other than aspiring to kingship are said to be punished by demolition, perhaps it is because they, too, are thought to strike at the commonwealth as a whole (as in Vitruvius Vaccus’ betrayal of his Roman allies, Vedius Pollio’s “harmful luxury,” Cassius Argillus’ proposal to make peace with Hannibal, or Macellus’ and Cupes’ *latrocinium*), and so can be assimilated to the central instance despite being symbolically less resonant. From this perspective, the discourse of house demolition appears to be a way of thinking and talking about the correct demarcation of the boundaries between the civic and the domestic spheres; of showing, on the ground, places where individual claims that push too far are pushed back by communal claims.¹³⁷

Looking at the discourse of house demolition as a way of negotiating the boundaries between public and private, or civic and domestic, may also illuminate why there are no examples postdating Vedius Pollio—why figures from the Imperial age are not also encompassed by this discourse. Desiring or attempting

137. Many scholars have remarked upon this dynamic of rendering “public” the property of certain kinds of malefactors: see especially Salerno 1990: 11–22, 91–94, 99, with further references. Regarding house demolition in particular, Hans Beck has recently argued, in a lecture entitled “The domus of Valerius Publicola and the Fall of the Roman Republic,” that by means of a collectively sanctioned demolition the *res publica* restores the “social equilibrium” that an elite malefactor has disturbed by his political ambitions.

to overthrow the settled arrangements of government, which may be characterized as “aspiring to kingship” in relation to the Republican system, under the Imperial system takes the form of conspiring against the sitting emperor or his regime, and is sometimes, though not always, designated *maiestas* (sc. *(im)minuta, laesa*, etc.). If house demolition was understood to be a practically and symbolically appropriate punishment by which an outraged Republican community could take vengeance upon someone who so threatened it, with formerly domestic space being laid open to communal access and other civic uses, then simple confiscation was a more suitable form of vengeance for an outraged emperor, since an intact property was easier for him to exploit. For from the Augustan age on, a share of the property of those convicted of *maiestas* or other serious crimes—the *bona damnatorum*—passed into the emperor’s hands. He could then liquidate such property through sale or auction, or (more likely) keep it for himself, eventually to bestow it upon a supporter or favorite as a gift. Insofar as the emperor was the quintessentially “public” figure in the Imperial age, then, it is through confiscation and redistribution of property, rather than demolition, that this new “public” pushed back, practically and symbolically, against (what it deemed) excessive or illegitimate “private” claims, thus punishing its enemies and rewarding its friends.¹³⁸ Indeed, Ovid’s remark about Augustus’ handling of Vedius Pollio’s house—that the emperor had destroyed his own wealth in demolishing it (*Fasti* 6.645–46)—already suggests that the symbolic meanings of house demolition were losing their cultural resonance with the emergence of the new dispensation. With preservation rather than destruction of a malefactor’s property already appearing more apt, the case of Vedius, as interpreted by Ovid, provides a tidy closure to the chronological series.¹³⁹

Johns Hopkins University
mroller@jhu.edu

138. For the *bona damnatorum* and the imperial fiscus (and more generally on the emperor’s redistribution of aristocratic wealth), see Millar 1977: 163–74, Roller 2001: 193–210. For the “public” sphere shrinking, in the early empire, to where it encompasses only the emperor—leaving everyone else, even sitting magistrates, as *privati*—see *TLL* s.v., II.A.1.b, and Milnor 2005: 16–27.

139. The discourse of house demolition does not itself vanish, of course, even if no further punitive demolitions are alleged: for my reconstruction of the discourse in this paper is heavily indebted to its representations in Imperial-era texts. Traces of the discourse may, however, appear in relation to two punitive cases from the first century CE. First, the *Senatus Consultum de Pisone Patre* (20 CE), listing the penalties to be inflicted on Piso’s family and property, specifies the demolition of portions of his house that connect to the *porta fontinalis* (lines 105–108). This is not a full-scale demolition, and may merely rectify an unauthorized impingement on the Servian wall (Eck-Caballos-Fernandez 1996: 207–11, Bodel 1999: 58–60). But the sanction may still have caused a Roman reader to recall the tradition of kingship-aspirants. Also Martial, in *Spect.* 2, seems to reprise elements of this discourse in describing how the Flavians opened the grounds of the Neronian *Domus Aurea* for public use and enjoyment (above all, by constructing the Flavian amphitheater there). He writes (2.11–12), *reddita Roma sibi est et sunt te praeside, Caesar; / deliciae populi quae fuerant domini*. Thus, the poet suggests, the people reclaim (with Titus’ help) what Nero—here called *dominus*; in line 3 called *rex*—had seized for himself (Coleman 2006 *ad loc.*; cf. Milnor 2005: 300–303).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Agamben, G. 2005 [2000]. *The Time That Remains: A Commentary on the Letter to the Romans*. Trans. P. Dailey. Stanford.
- Allen, Walter. 1939. "The Location of Cicero's House on the Palatine Hill." *CJ* 35: 134–43.
- . 1944. "Cicero's House and *Libertas*." *TAPA* 75: 1–9.
- Barchiesi, A. 2006. "Women on Top: Livia and Andromache." In R. Gibson et al., eds., *The Art of Love: Bimillennial Essays on Ovid's Ars Amatoria and Remedia Amoris*, 96–120. Oxford.
- Battistella, E. 1990. *Markedness: The Evaluative Superstructure of Language*. Buffalo.
- . 1996. *The Logic of Markedness*. Oxford.
- Berg, B. 1997. "Cicero's Palatine Home and Clodius' Shrine of Liberty: Alternative Emblems of the Republic in Cicero's *De domo sua*." In C. Deroux, ed. *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History VIII*, 122–43. Brussels.
- Blanc, A., J.-P. Brachet, and C. de Lamberterie. 2003. "Chronique d'étymologie latine, no. 1 (*CEL* 2003)." *Revue de Philologie* 77: 313–40.
- Bodel, J. 1997. "Monumental Villas and Villa Monuments." *JRA* 10: 5–35.
- . 1999. "Punishing Piso." *AJP* 120: 43–63.
- . 2008. "Cicero's Minerva, *Penates*, and the Mother of the *Lares*: An Outline of Roman Domestic Religion." In J. Bodel and S. Olyan, eds., *Household and Family Religion in Antiquity*, 248–75. Malden.
- Broughton, T. R. S. 1951–86. *Magistrates of the Roman Republic*. 3 vols. New York and Atlanta.
- Bücher, F. 2006. *Verargumentierte Geschichte. Exempla Romana im politischen Diskurs der spätrömischen Republik*. Stuttgart.
- Carandini, A. 1986. "Domus e insulae sulla pendice settentrionale del Palatino." *Bull-Comm* 91: 263–78.
- Carettoni, G. 1978–80. "La domus virginum vestalium e la domus publica del periodo repubblicano." *RendPontAcc* 51–52: 325–55.
- Cavajoni, G. 1979. *Supplementum adnotationum super Lucanum, I: Libri I – V*. Milan.
- Chassignet, M. 2001. "La 'construction' des aspirants à la tyrannie: Sp. Cassius, Sp. Maelius et Manlius Capitolinus." In Coudry and Späth, 2001, 83–96.
- Clark, A. 2007. *Divine Qualities: Cult and Community in Republican Rome*. Oxford.
- Coarelli, F. 1983. *Il Foro Romano*. 2 vols. Rome.
- Coleman, K. 2006. *M. Valerii Martialis Liber Spectaculorum*. Oxford.
- Collart, J. 1954. *Varron: De Lingua Latina, Livre V*. Paris.
- Connerton, P. 1989. *How Societies Remember*. Cambridge.
- Connor, W. R. 1985. "The Razing of the House in Greek Society." *TAPA* 115: 79–102.
- Corbeill, A. 2005. "*O singulare prodigium!* Ciceronian Invective as Religious Expiation." *Prudentia* 37: 240–254.
- Coudry, M., and T. Späth, eds. 2001. *L'invention des grands hommes de la Rome antique. Die Konstruktion der großen Männer Altroms*. Paris.
- Crawford, M., ed. 1996. *Roman Statutes*. 2 vols. London.
- De Cazanove, O. 1989. "Spurius Cassius, Cérès, et Tellus." *REL* 67: 93–116.
- De Ruyt, C. 1983. *Macellum. Marché alimentaire des Romains*. Louvain.
- De Sanctis, G. 1907. *Storia dei Romani*. 4 vols. Turin.

- Dickmann, J.-A. 1999. *Domus frequentata. Anspruchsvolles Wohnen im pompejanischen Stadthaus*. Munich.
- Dubourdieu, A. 1989. *Les origines et le développement du culte des Pénates à Rome*. Rome.
- Dugan, J. 2005. *Making a New Man: Ciceronian Self-Fashioning in the Rhetorical Works*. Oxford.
- Dury-Moyaers, G., and M. Renard. 1981. "Aperçu critique de travaux relatifs au culte de Junon." *ANRW* 2.17.1: 142–202.
- Dyck, A. R. 2004. *A Commentary on Cicero, De Legibus*. Ann Arbor.
- Eck, W. 1997. "Cum dignitate otium: Senatorial domus in Imperial Rome." *SCI* 16: 162–90.
- Eck, W., A. Caballos, and F. Fernández, eds. 1996. *Das senatus consultum de Cn. Pisone patre*. Munich.
- Edwards, C. 1993. *The Politics of Immorality in Ancient Rome*. Cambridge.
- Engels, D. 2007. *Das römische Vorzeichenswesen (753–27 v. Chr.)*. Stuttgart.
- Fiori, R. 1996. *Homo sacer. Dinamica politico-costituzionale di una sanzione giuridico-religiosa*. Naples.
- Flaig, E. 1999. "Soziale Bedingungen des kulturellen Vergessens." In G. Didi-Huberman, ed., *Die Ordnung des Materials*, 33–100. Berlin.
- Flory, M. B. 1984. "Sic exempla parantur: Livia's Shrine to Concordia and the Porticus Liviae." *Historia* 33: 309–30.
- Flower, H. 1996. *Ancestor Masks and Aristocratic Power in Roman Culture*. Oxford.
- . 1998. "Rethinking *Damnatio Memoriae*: The Case of Cn. Calpurnius Piso Pater in AD 20." *CA* 17: 155–87.
- . 2006. *The Art of Forgetting: Disgrace and Oblivion in Roman Political Culture*. Chapel Hill.
- Forsythe, G. 1994. *The Historian L. Calpurnius Piso Frugi and the Roman Annalistic Tradition*. Lanham.
- Fowler, D. 2000. "The Ruin of Time: Monuments and Survival at Rome." In D. Fowler, *Roman Constructions: Readings in Postmodern Latin*, 193–217. Oxford.
- Friedländer, L. 1919. *Darstellungen aus der Sittengeschichte Roms, vol. I*. Leipzig.
- Fröhlich, T. 1991. *Lararien- und Fassadenbilder in den Vesuvstädten*. Mainz.
- Gelzer, M. 1969. *Cicero: Ein biographischer Versuch*. Wiesbaden.
- Giannelli, G. 1980–81. "Il tempio di Giunone Moneta e la casa di Marco Manlio Capitolino." *BullComm* 87: 7–36.
- Guilhembet, J.-P. 1996. "Les résidences urbaines des sénateurs romains des Gracques à Auguste: La maison dans la ville (1)." *L'information historique* 58: 185–97.
- . 2001. "Les résidences aristocratiques de Rome du milieu du Ier siècle avant n. è. à la fin des Antonins." *Pallas* 55: 215–41.
- Hales, S. 2000. "At Home with Cicero." *G&R* 47: 44–55.
- . 2003. *The Roman House and Social Identity*. Cambridge.
- Hedrick, C. W. 2000. *History and Silence: Purge and Rehabilitation of Memory in Late Antiquity*. Austin.
- Henderson, J. 2004. *Morals and Villas in Seneca's Letters: Places to Dwell*. Cambridge.
- Herrmann, P. 1968. *Der römische Kaisereid*. Göttingen.
- Hölkeskamp, K.-J. 1996. "Exempla und Mos Maiorum: Überlegungen zum kollektiven Gedächtnis der Nobilität." In H.-J. Gehrke and A. Möller, eds., *Vergangen-*

- heit und Lebenswelt: Soziale Kommunikation, Traditionsbildung, und historisches Bewußtsein*, 301–38. Tübingen.
- . 2004. *Senatus Populusque Romanus. Die politische Kultur der Republik — Dimensionen und Deutungen*. Stuttgart.
- Horsfall, N. 1980/81. “From History to Legend: Manlius and the Geese.” *CJ* 76: 298–311.
- Hostein, A. 2004. “Monnaie et *damnatio memoriae*: problèmes méthodologiques (I^{er} – IV^e siècles après J.-C.).” *Cahiers Glotz* 15: 219–36.
- Huet, V. 2004. “Images et *damnatio memoriae*.” *Cahiers Glotz* 15: 237–53.
- Hülßen, C. 1911. “Tifata Curia.” *Hermes* 46: 305–308.
- Jaeger, M. 1997. *Livy’s Written Rome*. Ann Arbor.
- Kajanto, I. 1965. *The Latin Cognomina*. Helsinki.
- Kelly, G. 2006. *A History of Exile in the Roman Republic*. Cambridge.
- Kraus, C. 1994. *Livy Ab Urbe Condita Book VI*. Cambridge.
- Krause, C. 2001. “In conspectu totius urbis (Cic. *dom.* 100): Il tempio della Libertà e il quartiere alto del Palatino.” *Eutopia* n.s. 1: 169–201.
- Lefebvre, S. 2004. “Les cités face à *damnatio memoriae*: Les martelages dans l’espace urbain.” *Cahiers Glotz* 15: 191–217.
- Lintott, A. W. 1970. “The Tradition of Violence in the Annals of the Early Roman Republic.” *Historia* 19: 12–29.
- Liou-Gille, B. 1996. “La sanction des *leges sacratae* et l’*adfectatio regni*.” *PP* 51: 161–97.
- Lovisi, C. 1999. *Contribution à l’étude de la peine de mort sous la république romaine (509–149 av. J.-C.)*. Paris.
- MacBain, B. 1982. *Prodigy and Expiation: A Study in Religion and Politics in Republican Rome*. Brussels.
- Martin, P. 1982–94. *L’idée de royauté à Rome*. 2 vols. Clermont-Ferrand.
- Meadows, A., and J. Williams. 2001. “Moneta and the Monuments: Coinage and Politics in Republican Rome.” *JRS* 91: 27–49.
- Millar, F. 1977. *The Emperor in the Roman World*. London.
- Milnor, K. 2005. *Gender, Domesticity, and the Age of Augustus: Inventing Private Life*. Oxford.
- Mommsen, T. 1871. “Sp. Cassius, M. Manlius, Sp. Maelius, die drei Demagogen der älteren republikanischen Zeit.” *Hermes* 5: 228–71 (reprinted in *Römische Forschungen* 2.153–220).
- Mustakallio, K. 1994. *Death and Disgrace: Capital Penalties with Post Mortem Sanctions in Early Roman Historiography*. Helsinki.
- Newlands, C. 2002. “Contesting Time and Space: *Fasti* 6.637–48.” In G. Herbert-Brown, ed., *Ovid’s Fasti: Historical Readings at its Bimillennium*, 225–50. Oxford.
- Nippel, W. 1988. *Aufbruch und ‘Polizei’ in der römischen Republik*. Stuttgart.
- Nisbet, R. G., ed. 1939. *M. Tulli Ciceronis De Domo Sua ad pontifices oratio*. Oxford.
- Oakley, S. P. 1997. *A Commentary on Livy, Books VI–X*. 4 vols. Oxford.
- Ogilvie, R. M. 1965. *A Commentary on Livy, Books 1–5*. Oxford.
- Orr, D. G. 1978. “Roman Domestic Religion: The Evidence of the Household Shrines.” *ANRW* 2.16.2: 1557–91.
- Panitschek, P. 1989. “Sp. Cassius, Sp. Maelius, M. Manlius als Exempla Maiorum.” *Philologus* 133: 231–45.

- Papi, E. 1998. "'Domus est quae nulli villarum mearum cedit' (Cic. *Fam.* 6,18,5). Osservazione sulle residenze del Palatino alla metà del I secolo a.C." In M. Cima and E. La Rocca, eds., *Horti Romani*, 45–70. Rome.
- . 1999. "La topografia del quartiere tra la fine del III secolo a.C. e il 64 d.C." *BollArch* 59–60: 260–66.
- Pasco-Pranger, M. 2006. *Founding the Year: Ovid's Fasti and the Poetics of the Roman Calendar*. Leiden.
- Picard, G. 1965. "L'*aedes Libertatis* de Clodius au Palatin." *REL* 43: 229–37.
- Pina Polo, F. 2006. "The Tyrant Must Die: Preventive Tyrannicide in Roman Political Thought." In F. Marco Simón et al., eds., *Repúblicas y ciudadanos: Modelos de participación cívica en el mundo antiguo*, 71–101. Barcelona.
- Polito, E. 1998. *Fulgentibus Armis: Introduzione allo studio dei fregi d'armi antichi*. Rome.
- Rawson, E. 1976. "The Ciceronian Aristocracy and its Properties." In M. I. Finley, ed., *Studies in Roman Property*, 85–102. Cambridge. Reprinted in E. Rawson, *Roman Culture and Society*, 204–222. Oxford.
- . 1990. "The Antiquarian Tradition: Spoils and Representations of Foreign Armour." In W. Eder, ed., *Staat und Staatlichkeit in der frühen römischen Republik*, 157–73. Stuttgart.
- Rilinger, R. 1997. "*Domus* und *Res Publica*. Die politisch-soziale Bedeutung des aristokratischen 'Hauses' in der späten römischen Republik." In A. Winterling, ed., *Zwischen "Haus" und "Staat": Antike Höfe im Vergleich*, 73–90. Munich.
- Roller, M. B. 2001. *Constructing Autocracy: Aristocrats and Emperors in Julio-Claudian Rome*. Princeton.
- . 2004. "Exemplarity in Ancient Roman Culture: The Cases of Horatius Cocles and Cloelia." *CP* 99: 1–56.
- Rosenberger, V. 1998. *Gezähmte Götter. Das Prodigenwesen der römischen Republik*. Stuttgart.
- Rosenstein, N. 1990. *Imperatores Victi: Military Defeat and Aristocratic Competition in the Middle and Late Republic*. Berkeley.
- Salerno, F. 1990. *Dalla "consecratio" alla "publicatio bonorum"*. Naples.
- Saller, R. 1984. "*Familia, Domus*, and the Roman Conception of the Family." *Phoenix* 38: 336–55.
- . 1994. *Patriarchy, Property and Death in the Roman Family*. Cambridge.
- Schmitz, W. 2004. *Nachbarschaft und Dorfgemeinschaft im archaischen und klassischen Griechenland*. Berlin.
- Sehlmeyer, M. 1999. *Stadtrömische Ehrenstatuen der republikanischen Zeit*. Stuttgart.
- Smith, C. 2006. "*Adfectatio regni* in the Roman Republic." In S. Lewis, ed., *Ancient Tyranny*, 49–64. Edinburgh.
- Stein-Hölkeskamp, E. 2005. *Das römische Gastmahl. Eine Kulturgeschichte*. Munich.
- Stemmler, M. 2000. "Auctoritas Exempli: Zur Wechselwirkung von kanonisierten Vergangenheitsbildern und gesellschaftlicher Gegenwart in der spätrepublikanischen Rhetorik." In B. Linke and M. Stemmler, eds., *Mos Maiorum: Untersuchungen zu den Formen der Identitätsstiftung und Stabilisierung in der römischen Republik*, 141–205. Stuttgart.
- Syme, R. 1961. "Who was Vedius Pollio?" *JRS* 51: 23–30 (reprinted in *Roman Papers* 2.518–29).

- Tabacco, R. 1985. "Il tiranno nelle declamazioni di scuola in lingua latina." *Memorie dell'Accademia delle Scienze di Torino, Classe di scienze morali, storiche e filologiche* 9: 1–141.
- Tamm, B. 1963. *Auditorium and Palatium. A Study of Assembly-Rooms in Roman Palaces during the First Century B.C. and the First Century A.D.* Stockholm.
- Tatum, W. J. 1999. *The Patrician Tribune: P. Clodius Pulcher*. Chapel Hill.
- Thein, A. 2002. *Sulla's Public Image and the Politics of Civic Renewal*. Diss. University of Pennsylvania.
- Tortorici, E. 1991. *Argiletum: Commercio, speculazione, edilizia e lotta politica dall'analisi topografica di un quartiere di Roma di età repubblicana*. Rome.
- Treggiari, S. 1999. "The Upper-Class House as Symbol and Focus of Emotion in Cicero." *JRA* 12: 33–56.
- . 2002. *Roman Social History*. London.
- . 2007. *Terentia, Tullia, and Publilia: The Women of Cicero's Family*. London.
- Varner, E. R., ed. 2000. *From Caligula to Constantine: Tyranny and Transformation in Roman Portraiture*. Atlanta.
- Varner, E. R. 2004. *Mutilation and Transformation: Damnatio Memoriae and Roman Imperial Portraiture*. Leiden.
- Vasaly, A. 1993. *Representations: Images of the World in Ciceronian Oratory*. Berkeley.
- Vigourt, A. 2001a. "L'intention criminelle et son châtement: Les condamnations des aspirants à la tyrannie." In Coudry and Späth, 2001, 271–87.
- . 2001b. "Les *adfectores* [sic] regni et les normes sociales." In Coudry and Späth, 2001, 333–40.
- Vittinghoff, F. 1936. *Der Staatsfeind in der römischen Kaiserzeit: Untersuchungen zur "damnatio memoriae"*. Berlin.
- Von Hesberg, H. 2005. "Die Häuser der Senatoren in Rom: Gesellschaftliche und politische Funktion." In W. Eck and M. Heil, eds., *Senatores Populi Romani: Realitäten und mediale Präsentation einer Führungsschicht*, 19–52. Stuttgart.
- Wachsmuth, D. 1980. "Aspekte des antiken mediterranen Hauskults." *Numen* 27: 34–75.
- Wallace-Hadrill, A. 1994. *Houses and Society in Pompeii and Herculaneum*. Princeton.
- Walter, U. 2004. *Memoria und Res Publica. Zur Geschichtskultur im republikanischen Rom*. Frankfurt am Main.
- Waugh, L. 1982. "Marked and Unmarked: A Choice between Unequals in Semiotic Structure." *Semiotica* 38: 299–318.
- Weinstock, S. 1971. *Divus Julius*. Oxford.
- Welch, K. 2006. "Domi Militariaeque: Roman Domestic Aesthetics and War Booty in the Republic." In S. Dillon and K. Welch, eds., *Representations of War in Ancient Rome*, 91–161. Cambridge.
- Wiseman, T. P. 1979. "Topography and Rhetoric: The Trial of Manlius." *Historia* 28: 32–50.
- . 1987. "*Conspicui Postes Tectaque Digna Deo*: The Public Image of Aristocratic and Imperial Houses in the Late Republic and Early Empire." In *L'Urbs: Espace urbain et histoire (Ier siècle av. J.-C. -IIIe siècle ap. J.-C.)*, 393–413. Rome.
- . 1996. "The Minucii and their Monument." In J. Linderski, ed., *Imperium sine fine: T. Robert S. Broughton and the Roman Republic*, 57–74. Stuttgart.
- Zanker, P. 1987. "Drei Stadtbilder aus dem augusteischen Rom." In *L'Urbs: Espace urbain et histoire (Ier siècle av. J.-C. -IIIe siècle ap. J.-C.)*, 475–89. Rome.

- Zehnacker, H. 1973. *Moneta. Recherches sur l'organisation et l'art des émissions monétaires de la république romaine (289–31 av. J.-C.)*. 2 vols. Rome.
- Ziolkowski, A. 1992. *The Temples of Mid-Republican Rome and their Historical and Topographical Context*. Rome.
- . 1993. "Between Geese and the Auguraculum: The Origin of the Cult of Juno on the Arx." *CP* 88: 206–19.