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Aims and theoretical framework of the thesis

The aim of the thesis is to investigate Roman clans with regard to collective memory, in a way different from classical historiographic methods. In recent decades, the investigation of memory and the methods of mnemohistory have become increasingly popular in the study of history; but the Romans clans as communities possessing a distinct collective memory, and consequently a peculiar identity and view of the past, have not yet become the primary subject of such research. Instead of problems usually discussed by historians, the thesis focuses on particular elements and aspects of the collective memory of clans. I discuss four clans; two of them are of plebeian origin (gens Caecilia and gens Cassia), two of patrician (gens Claudia and gens Fabia).

The theoretical basis of the research is discussed in the Introduction. In my investigation of the Roman clans, the chief term I use is that of ‘collective memory’, coined by Maurice Halbwachs and later taken over by scholars of sociology, history and psychology as well. The terminology suggested by Jan Assmann (‘cultural’ vs. ‘communicative’ memory) is also used in special cases, but it was not always applicable (or applicable only with reservations) to the Roman Republican era.

The sources for investigating the collective memory of clans and the structure of the thesis

Four media are examined which transmit the collective memory of Roman clans. In the first chapter, I discuss the iconography of coins relevant to the study of clan memory, by focusing on the minting activities by members of two plebeian clans, the Caecilii and the Cassii. From the 130s BC onwards, it had gradually become usual to include on coins visual hints at the clan of the moneyer, in addition or even instead of decoration suggesting the whole of Rome. The introduction of balloting and the increased significance of the minor office of tresviri monetales together resulted in coins becoming an important medium of communication with voters. Through implicit hints at or explicit references to distinguished clan members and their deeds on coins, the aristocratic moneyer starting his political career could advertise the name of his gens and how it had contributed to the success of Rome in the past. On the clan-related denarii issued by moneyers of the two above mentioned plebeian gentes, it is easy to discern those symbols which allude to distinguished clan members from the close and distant past, and also the common origin of clan members, and which thus represent the decisive points of reference for the construction of the clan’s collective memory.

While for plebeian clans coins seemed to be an appropriate medium for representing the common past and peculiar identity encoded in the collective memory of the gens, it is my finding that the same cannot be said about the two patrician clans examined in the thesis. Thus, I investigated the collective memory of the Claudii and Fabii through the examination of literary sources and monuments as sites of memory. Literary sources, discussed in the second and third chapter, form the second important medium of clan memory and include pontifical records (fasti consulares, fasti pontificales, fasti triumphales) upon which the Roman historical tradition is based; the annals, also produced by the pontifices, chronologically listing the most important events concerning affairs of the state; and finally the written laws. The most important literary sources of clan memory are, however, the works of the annalistic historians (written in Greek during the 3rd century BC, then in Latin after the Punic Wars) and the later historiographic works which are based on those of the annalists. Since the annalistic works survived only in fragments, the most historiographic sources concerning Republican history are those written in
the 1st century BC (Livy, Dionysius) and later; these, it is true, often cite their sources directly or indirectly. It was also important to keep in mind during the research that the first historians were politicians who retired from public life; consequently, as members of the nobilitas they were actors in forming the contemporary political climate, and they were also members of a particular gens possessing a peculiar collective memory. The best example is that of Fabius Pictor, taking part in the Second Punic War, who incorporated the family traditions of the Fabii into his pioneering historical work written in Greek.

Some scholars working on this period traditionally hold Fabius Pictor responsible for the markedly negative representation of the gens Claudia in the literary sources, contrasted with the conspicuously positive representation of the Fabii. It was also aim of the thesis to refine this hypothesis. The examination of the collective memory of the two patrician gentes led to the conclusion that Fabius Pictor must, indeed, have had some role in constructing a negative picture of the Claudii and exaggerating the role of his own clan; but Fabius Pictor was not the sole actor in this development. The contradiction inherent in the character of Appius Claudius Caecus as a figure arrogant and tyrannical on the one hand, open-minded and innovative reformer on the other, apparently symbolizes some of the contradictions regarding the nobilitas as a social class which was just forming in the era of Appius. His figure also played a key role in the formation of the collective memory of the gens Claudia.

Literary sources relevant for the study of clan memory also include poetic works. Of these, Ovid’s Fasti is given prominence since it can be treated as an important source for both the gens Claudia and the gens Fabia. Since Ovid had Paullus Fabius Maximus as patron and friend, and his third wife came also from the Fabian clan, the poet was probably exceptionally well acquainted with the family traditions of this gens.

The third type of sources is constituted by sites of memory. The fourth and final chapter of the thesis investigates sites of memory related directly or indirectly to the gens Fabia and the gens Claudia. In the thesis I employ the term ‘site of memory’ in a more limited sense than that of lieu de mémoire introduced by Pierre Nora. I refer by this term to physical sites of memory (monumenta): the temples, funerary monuments, family memorials and statues erected by members of Roman clans. Care and, if need be, restoration of these monuments was the duty of family members. The name of the builder was always advertised on an inscription (titulus) which could be expanded in case a later member of the family restored or enlarged the monument. Several examples of that are discussed in the thesis; the most peculiar case is that of the Temple of Bellona built by Appius Claudius in which shields displaying clan members (imago clipeata) were put on display by another clan member more than two hundred years after its original construction. To the same category belong the statues, arches, columns and historical paintings portraying triumphant generals; these were issued with tituli as well. While in case of some monuments (like the statue of a triumphant general; an arch; the funerary site of a family) the commemorative function was explicit, other monuments took part in commemorating the past rather through implicit means. A so called manubiae-temple, whose construction was funded from the spoils taken in a victorious campaign, had religious and commemorative function and the same time, and it is evident that the motivation for a triumphant general to erect a temple for a deity was not exclusively religious in nature. His name was preserved in an inscription on the temple; in many cases, his statue was erected in or close to the building; part of the spoils exhibited in his triumph was also put placed in the temple.

The house of the member of an aristocratic gens was also a site of memory and can be interpreted as a monumentum. Wax masks of the ancestors, except for their usage in the pompa funebris, were kept in a separate part of the house in the atrium, in niches (aedicula) furnished with explanatory tituli. During festivities, the niches were opened and the ancestor masks were adorned with garlands and wreathes. The entrance or the walls of the house of a triumphant general were also often adorned with objects taken from spoils. Family members moving out
usually took newly made copies of the masks of their ancestors to their new home; it was forbidden to remove from the house objects related to triumphs, even if the owner had changed. Therefore, the house was not just to keep memories of the past, but also to put on display important figures of that past and their deeds, kept alive in the collective memory of the family; this way, the house had its function in linking the present to the past.

The collective memory of Roman clans thus manifested itself spatially as well, and it was connected not just with the private sphere of the family, but also to public spaces constructed by the community. The particular images of the past, transmitted by memory communities from generation to generation, could be seen and touched in the city of Rome. Roads, temples and other monuments, carrying the collective memory of individual gentes even through their very names, were spatially related and established kinds of districts. Spaces of memory, moreover, were constituted not only by monuments erected with the explicit aim of commemoration, but also by all kinds of sites to which the collective memory attached an important event of the past. The monuments were linked to stories involving outstanding figures or events of the Republican past and thus advertised, as kinds of “separate histories”, the contributions of different groups to Roman history. These monuments which manifested images of the past constructed by various groups holding political power, made perceptible the relationship between these many-layered “separate histories”.

The fourth type of sources is orality – most probably, this is the oldest kind but by nature also the most difficult to grasp. The deeds and successes carried out by ancestors must have been part of family traditions originally, transmitted orally from generation to generation. We can assume that part of this tradition – that which recorded specific data, offices and triumphs – had early been written down. This is suggested by the tituli of the imagines which document, in writing, the highest offices held by distinguished ancestors and which may have served as models for public statues, funeral sites of a family and other kinds of monuments. Funeral orations based on family traditions included, just like different media transmitting clan memory, the list of titles and deeds of ancestors; these orations were eventually written down for preservation.

Other elements of clan memory which can be discerned in other media as well, also seem to preserve traces of orality. For example, the symbols seen on coins allude to particular stories preserved in written sources, and their pictorial nature helps memorization. The traces of orality can also be discerned in the case of some elements of collective memory related to distinguished ancestors of the Fabii and the Claudii.

The collective memory of the clan as represented on coins

Although clan-specific symbols on coins – as it has been discussed above – had become usual only in the 130s BC, after passing laws about balloting, the first, not yet truly Roman coin already shows some characteristics which make it interesting with respect to clans. Through the hero as ancestor of the gens Fabia on one side of the coin, and through the she-wolf suckling the twins (symbolizing the political activity of the gens Ogulnia) on the other, the Hercules didrachm of 269 BC represents important elements of both the Fabii and the Ogulnii. Examination of the Hercules didrachm, moreover, provides some insight into the enmity between the Fabii and the Claudii in the era, which is preserved in various media transmitting collective memory.

The symbols on the coins issued by members of the plebeian gens Caecilia and gens Cassia (discussed in separate sub-chapters), while showing many similarities with regard to the representation of clan memory, can be contrasted as well. The coins issued by members of both clans are related to prominent branches of these gentes: the Caecilii Metelli and the Casii Longini.
Through examination of the symbols on these coins alluding to the origin of the clan in question such as the elephant, the Macedonian shield, Vulcan, Ceres, Vesta, the ballot box, and through investigation of related literary sources we can identify some “nodal points” of how these clans remembered their past and constructed their identity. In the case of these clans, the theory of collective memory proposed by Assmann, contrasting two modes of recollection, proved to be applicable. The operation of generational or communicative memory can be seen on coins which show symbols recalling “historical” ancestors of the Caecilii. The victory and triumph of L. Caecilius Metellus in the First Punic War is recalled by the elephant; that of Q. Caecilius Metellus Macedonicus is recalled by the Macedonian shield. In the case of the Cassii, a similar “historical” ancestor is L. Cassius Longinus Ravilla of the second half of the 2nd century BC, who distinguished himself by his legislative activity (alluded to through the ballot box and the letter V) and his stern conduct as judge in the trial of Vestal virgins (alluded to through the head of the goddess). On the other hand, according to the operation of cultural memory as Assmann calls it, the origin and identity of the clans is expressed by references to fixed points of the past. In the case of the Caecilii, the “mythical” ancestor Caeculus, who had given his name to the clan, is recalled through Vulcan; this reference is also closely related to the story of how an otherwise “historical” ancestor, L. Caecilius Metellus had lost his sight. The forefather of the Cassii, on the other hand, is surprisingly not a deity or a hero, but the patrician Spurius Cassius who belongs to the beginning of the Republican era and who, despite his successful political career, had been convicted of striving for becoming king and executed. A separate sub-chapter deals with the adfectatio regni as an exemplum and the demolished houses of wrongdoers as special sites of memory.

The last section of the chapter examines the coins issued by members of the Fabii and the Claudii – the two clans which will be discussed in the major part of the thesis (chapters 2–3). The conclusion of this section is that in contrast to the gens Caecilia and the gens Cassia, coins do not play a major role in the transmission of collective memory of these two prominent patrician clans. Only the plebeian branch of the Claudii, the Claudii Marcelli were using the medium of coins to express their identity and history which is partly in accord with that of the Claudii in general (Sabine origin), but partly distinct from it (Claudius Marcellus). The same can be said of the Fabii: symbols suggesting clan memory are displayed only rarely on coins issued by members of the clan.

At this point it is important to touch on the issue of why precisely these four clans are discussed in the chapter on coins as sources for investigating clan memory. In the Republican era it was the Caecilii Metelli who used symbols recalling the origin of the gens most frequently on coins, thus they were chosen as the starting point for the discussion of coin issues. Members of the gens Cassia also used clan-related symbols frequently on coins, but this was not the sole reason for choosing them. They seemed suitable for the study of clan memory for two additional reasons: like the Caecilii, they were of plebeian origin, thus I had the opportunity to compare the transmission of collective memory of the two plebeian and the two patrician clans through different media; and the Cassii emphasized that they are of “Roman” origin (in contrast to the Praenestine origin of the Caecilii), thus offering an interesting opportunity to compare the cultural memory of two plebeian clans. Although some patrician clans (like the gens Aemilia and the gens Marcia) also advertised their peculiar res gestae on coins in a number of cases, the symbols used by the Cassii and the figure of Spurius Cassius as controversial forefather seemed to provide an interesting case study which could be integrated into the planned structure of the thesis.
The collective memory of the gens Claudia

The second chapter deals with the collective memory of the Claudii. The starting point of the discussion is that the contradictory nature of the collective memory of the clan is closely related to the figure of Appius Claudius Caecus, active in the first half of the 3rd century BC. The simultaneously positive and negative light in which this clan had been traditionally represented is well expressed by the idea of *superbia* which characterizes both the clan in general and some of its members. *Superbia* is the expression for both the tyrannical arrogance and the majestic pride which characterize clan members. This is most apparent in the case of Caecus whose activity in construction projects (Via Appia, Aqua Appia) and culture, but also his deeds suggesting tyrannical aspirations and his haughty patrician behaviour are all recalled in extant sources. Caecus is stereotypically represented as an innovative reformer, supporter of the poor on the one hand, but also a staunch defender of patrician prerogatives. The duality of his character can also be grasped in his *cognomen* recalling his blindness: a disability which symbolizes both the *impietas* of a blindfold person acting against the will of the gods, and the *pietas* of the blind man saving the state. The Sabine origin of the *gens* which gives expression to the collective identity of the Claudii also symbolizes the dualities of aliens vs. Romans and keeping away vs. accommodating outsiders – both being important issues of Roman collective memory in general.

The collective memory of the gens Fabia

One of the figures most influential for the construction of the collective memory of the *gens Fabia*, discussed in the third chapter, is Q. Fabius Maximus Verrucosus. The tactics he used successfully against Hannibal, the delaying which was misunderstood and condemned as cowardice, had quickly become an *exemplum*, as the impact and afterlife of the sentential Ennian lines show. The dualities related to *cunctatio*: cowardice vs. recklessness, delaying vs. rushing are the primary factors in the construction of Fabian collective memory. The stories about members of the clan – similarly to the case of the Claudii discussed in the previous chapter – are narrated through a series of binary oppositions (prudence vs. imprudence, old age vs. youth; death vs. survival) which we can thus treat as formative elements of Fabian collective memory. The figure of Fabius Rullianus active during the Samnite Wars, partly modelled on that of Verrucosus, also serves as a nodal point of memory. The recurring emergence of the motif of *concordia* and that of the cavalry (associated with quickness and youth) in Fabian collective memory is closely related to his activities. This nodal point in the collective memory of the clan plays an important role by being related to both the “mythical” and the “historical” past of the *gens*, and thus being the subject of both cultural and communicative memory and serving as a bridge between them. The examination of the story about the origins and ancestry of the Fabii concludes with a finding similar to that in case of the Claudii, namely that elements of the clan memory expressed through binary oppositions and showing traces of orality are closely related to an important issue in Roman cultural memory, that of conflict between two parties which characterizes both the foundation story of the city (Romulus and Remus) and the history of the Republic from its birth (the struggle of patricians and plebeians).
Sites of memory of the gens: the rivalry of the Fabii and the Claudii for the spaces of memory

The final chapter examines sites of memory which are related directly or indirectly to the gens Fabia and the gens Claudia. The monuments built by the two prominent members of these clans active during the Samnite Wars of the late 4th, early 3rd centuries BC, Appius Claudius Caecus and Fabius Rullianus, and also those built by persons and groups related to them, allow insight into how the political climate was changing in the era and how these changes were expressed spatially as well. The political changes went hand in hand with the development of the identity and political culture of the newly formed nobilitas. Rullianus and his allies stepped up against the extensive activity of the innovative Appius Claudius Caecus (well represented by the road and aqueduct he built). This rivalry is expressed in some of the construction projects of the era and can be interpreted – with regard to both the choice of sites and the indented political messages – as a contest for possessing the sites of memory in the public urban space of Rome. The policy maintained by certain groups of the nobilitas and the norms of behaviour expected of leaders can be easily grasped by examining the temples erected to honour divine qualities (Concordia, Salus, Victoria) which appear in this era. Such temples and their relationship to collective memory are discussed in a separate sub-chapter.

The contest for possession of the sites and spaces of memory continued during the Punic Wars. This is suggested by the Temple of Honos, most probably built by Fabius Maximus Verrucosus, to which the Temple of Virtus was attached by Claudius Marcellus, thus claiming back, as it were, the territory from the Fabii. Examination of this temple includes a discussion of the meaning that terms of value like Honos and Virtus (and also Mens) had in the political climate brought upon by the nobilitas. This new climate is signalled not only by the sites chosen for the new temples, but also the calendar dates of the related cults. The thesis follows the development of sites of memory related to the two clans up to the first century BC. These sites of memory articulate the complex, intertwined layers of memory, and express the peculiar identity and past of the clans in question, but also of the collective (especially political) memory of the nobilitas.

Conclusions

The collective memory of the memory communities examined in the thesis is expressed through motifs, elements and symbols which are easily isolated on the one hand, but also interrelated with each other in various ways. Such interrelations were observed on coins and also in the stories about clan members narrated in literary sources. Some elements (like the motifs of Concordia and cavalry, both related to the Fabii) represent the clan-related motif of memory spatially as well (see the Temple of Concordia or the route of the transvectio equitum). The elements of collective memory discussed in the thesis constitute a framework of memory by the help of which the collective identity and the peculiar view of the past of a given gens can be grasped.

The stories which connect the past of the group with its origins serve as temporal and spatial reference points for the collective memory of the clans examined. In these stories we usually encounter the clan’s motherland and forefather (mythical or historical, although the distinction is not valid from a mnemonic point of view), and also the period of foundation together with the main issues related to it. These stories, connected with the period before Rome’s foundation, then with Romulus, the end of monarchy and the establishment of republic, investigate some basic issues of how the Romans had viewed their past. Such issue is that of aliens vs. Romans, the accommodation of outsiders (see the Sabine origins of the Claudii and how they had become Romans, or the Praenestine origins of the Caecilii); that of the twins Romulus and Remus and
the sole possession of power (Fabii), that of the Republican figures who had striven for kingship and their punishment (Cassii). It was my finding that the common name of the clan, the *nomen gentile* itself or a frequently used *cognomen* can express the common origins of the given clan.

Distinguished members of the clan and their deeds are also reference points for collective memory. These persons are also termed “nodal points of collective memory” in the thesis, since some of their characteristics or their activities are strong factors in developing the framework of the clan’s collective memory. This strong effect appears visually as well on coins through symbols alluding to historical ancestors who serve as nodal points. In the case of literary sources we can also feel the strong impact of elements related to memorably ancestors in how members of the clan are represented in the early Republic. Through the systematic examination of motifs it turned out in some cases that the meaning of symbols related to a notable ancestor gained new layers of significance when frameworks of reference have changed, mirroring the experiences and knowledge of the later era. The crystallization points of clan memory can be discerned on those coins which represent the recent and the distant past through symbols referring to ancestors of the moneyer. In some cases, a similar phenomenon was found with relation to clan memory expressed by monuments.

It seems to be a special characteristic of literary sources that the motifs discussed above are arranged as binary oppositions and refer to a notable ancestor in this way. It must be stressed, however, that the most important features of the collective memory of the clans examined – i.e. the *superbia* of the Claudii, derived for the most part from the figure of Caecus, and the *cunctatio* of Fabius Maximus Verrucosus – themselves signal contradictory characteristics and modes of action. *Superbia* expresses both the tyrannical arrogance of a god-forsaken person and the pride of a person who looks at the situation from above, as it were; a self-confidence derived from the fact that one can see more of the “landscape” from above. *Cunctatio* implies the prudence implied by delaying, avoiding direct confrontation and “sitting on the fence”, but it can also be interpreted as the cowardice of someone incapable of decision. Such dichotomies can be twined with many further characteristics and elements; for example, the negative meaning of *superbia* can imply abuse of power or tyrannical behaviour, but also *impietas*, a negligence of the gods in religious terms. The dilemma of *cunctatio* – prudence or cowardice – also carries a wide range of associations: the oppositions of prudence/imprudence, recklessness/cowardice, youth/old age, quickness/slowness, *pietas/impietas* or even cavalry/infantry warfare. The investigation of episodes concerning the Claudii and the Fabii brings out the variety of how these elements and motifs can be linked with each other.

The elements of collective memory expressed through binary opposition are perhaps traces of the oral tradition which predates literacy. These oppositions help in memorizing stories and events, while the interlinked associations facilitate recalling different versions of a given story or narrative element. We can find obvious examples for the narration of important stories through oppositions in case of legends defining the Romans’ view of their past. Such is the story of Romulus and Remus, the motif of Romans vs. Sabines (and aliens in general), or the rivalry of patricians and plebeians. This characteristic of clan memory, just like the relationship between stories about origins and the foundation, can point out that the peculiar view of the past of a given clan gives expression to an important, often contradictory issue of the Roman past. The oppositions express not only confrontation, but also the potential of creating unity. The middle between the cowardice and recklessness of the Fabii is, for example, the courage which characterizes the *gens*. The remarkable and interesting story elements thus suggest that they call attention to a shift from a middle towards one extreme: the deficiency or hypertrophy of a given characteristic, in addition to making a figure or situation interesting, basically expresses the same.

The *gentes* examined in the thesis were members of the leading class of the *nobilitas*. The behavioral norms expected of leading political figures are thus naturally important constitutive
factors and reference points of clan memory. The value categories related to Roman politician holding office are expressed in clan memory through a variety of forms. The military values (like fortitudo or virtus) which were of paramount importance in Rome, waging continuous wars from its foundation, are represented in the media of collective memory in various ways. Part of the symbols found on coins (like the elephant or the Macedonian shield) recall the triumph or the excellent military performance of a given famous ancestor, just like the manubiae temples erected by victorious generals (some of them quite explicitly, like the Temples of Bellona and Victoria).

Literary sources represent even the military virtues of the clans examined through binary oppositions. Tradition has it that the Claudii are less than capable as military leaders, but excellent as politicians “fighting” in a civic landscape; however, the information that some Claudii had been excellent military leaders was also preserved in tradition. The courage of the Fabii is represented through the opposition of cowardice vs. recklessness: it was because of recklessness that nearly the whole clan perished at Cremera, many young Fabii rushed themselves, their family and indirectly the state into danger because of the same characteristic. The dualities of both superbia and cunctatio represent those values which the Romans used to express and interpret the behavioral patterns of their leaders. The deficiency or hypertrophy of severity (severitas), moderation (moderatio) and discipline (disciplina) can usually be discerned in contrasting elements related to the nodal points of clan memory. Superbia can be interpreted as an excess of severity; the characteristics associated with cunctatio (recklessness vs. cowardice) can be seen as stemming from the lack of moderation. The right behaviour prescribed by the gods, including respect for the order of the state and the family, is also expressed through the duality of pietas/impietas in the collective memory of the Claudii and the Fabii. One conspicuous example is the blindness of Appius Claudius which, also expressed through the cognomen Caecus, symbolizes both the piety and impiety of Appius. Caecus was punished with blindness because he turned the cult of Hercules into a state cult, but as a blind and wise old man, now seeing the right path, he saved the state during the war against Pyrrhus. The blinding of Lucius Caecilius, interpreted as a nodal point in the memory of the gens Caecilia, seems to express similar concerns.

The spatial sites of memory and buildings representing collective memory carry the above discussed characteristics of clan memory, but we can draw other lessons as well from their investigation. Public building projects, which are discussed in the thesis from the Samnite Wars onwards, offer insight into the rivalries between factions of the emerging class of the nobilitas. The systematic planning of building projects related to Caecus, Fabius Rullianus and their allies indicates that already towards the end of the 4th century BC, leading aristocrats had deliberately used public urban space to advertise their policy. In addition to such political messages, monuments also carried the clan memory of their builder.

The elements in the collective memory of the clans examined thus constitute stories, transmitted through a variety of media, which outline the peculiar identity and view of the past of the given clan as memory community. The clans discussed in the thesis were members of the nobilitas, the leading political class of the Roman state which was able to construct and dominate the spaces and media of memory. The clans’ peculiar view of the past thus reflects important and basic issues of the Roman past. The era of the Samnite Wars and of the emergence of the nobilitas might also be the era in which the view of the past that was fixed in literary form one generation later had also been developed. This view of the past – just like the duality of Caecus’ figure and the primary motif of the collective memory of the Fabii – mediates the contradictions and main political issues of this era for posterity which tries to grasp its meaning.
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