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Introduction: Research guidelines

Abstract

FINES. Bordering practices and natural features in Livy
Antonio Montesanti, University of Exeter
PhD in Classics and Ancient History
May 2014

The fullest and most comprehensive unpacking of the term finis has yet to be achieved. Studies have narrowly focussed on the idea of border, boundary or frontier, without even entertaining the prospect of interpreting the study from the ancient point of view. This investigation considers the use of the word finis in Livy and attempts to recreate a conception of finis which mirrors as closely as possible that of a Roman of the Republic up to the very Early Empire. Besides the remarkably high usage of the term by Livy, the author’s work is also useful due to its chronological nature, which allows for broad investigation throughout the Republican Period, as well as shedding light on the Early Imperial concept of finis.

The main aim of this dissertation is to provide a collective analysis of diverse cases, which together can help build a complete picture of the detectable features related to the term finis. As well as this, the analysis of the contexts – in which the term finis is used has also cast light on those features of finis – that have remained fixed despite the different historical contexts in which they appear. For example, throughout my study, two fundamental concepts will continue to pop up in front of the reader’s eyes: a) the inapplicability of modern conceptual categories to the idea of finis and b) finis – if translated as border, boundary or frontier – as a concept applicable not to a line, but to a spatial element.

On the basis of Livy’s evidence – drawn from his work Ab Urbe Condita – this study attempts to present a reconstruction of the term through the identification of an entirely new concept. This study is conceived in terms of a crescendo, which begins with the basic definitions attached to finis and evolves, adding an increasing number of evidences until it reaches a climax, whereby the reader can see both those invariable features of finis in Livy’s account and the
evolution of the term as *finis* are applied within different political contexts. Rome – a city that rose on a *finis*, the Tiber River – reinvented or remodelled the concept of *finis*, demonstrating behaviour antithetical to the notion of confining herself behind a ‘single line’. Once identified as a *finis*, the natural features helped the Romans to exert their *imperium*, which was itself an embodiment of the features contained within the concept of *finis*. The establishment of the *fines* provided an ‘imaginary’ subdivision of the territory subjected to the Roman *imperium* in a series of land strips. This is documented by Livy through Rome’s expansionist ‘*finis*-system’, from a single occupation of the Janiculum Hill to the scientific approach and setting of the treaty of Apamea.

Although the *lacunae* in *Ab Urbe Condita* – from 168 B.C. onwards – do not permit a direct connection between the Late Republic and the Early Empire, some elements can be used to evidence an intimate relationship between Livy’s and Augustus’ thinking and terminology. To some extent, this common intent has made possible this attempted reconstruction of the ‘bordering practices’ used in the last 150 years of the Republic, as well as the possible evolution of such practices in the first 150 about years of the Empire.
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Notes to the reader


Crossing references within the same volume or between volume 1 and 2 are indicated by square brackets and in grey colour [ ]. The reference to figures or appendixes is put at the beginning of a sentence i.e. [FIG. 1] / [APPENDIX], while the reference to chapters or section is set at the end of the sentence and will appear in the following format: [1.1.1 = chapter.section.subsection].
“The real voyage of discovery consists not in seeking new landscapes, but in having new eyes”.

(M. Proust, In Search of Lost Time)
Introduction: Research guidelines

“We’re going to be on the frontier for the next three years. Or at the border, on the edge, at the limit, in the margin, on the boundary, perhaps in no-man’s land – maybe at the barrier or on the barricade, or even on the fence … and especially, perhaps, on the frontier (or border, edge, limit, margin, boundary, barrier, barricade or fence) between these various, non-synonymous words or concepts. But even though we’ll be on the frontier for three years, we’ll take things term by term”.¹

Approaching the question

The object of this study is the analysis of the term² finis in Livy’s work Ab Urbe Condita (AUC), in its tangible/material aspect with applications to real-world contexts. Thus, this is an investigation of the practical existence of finis in relation to the real world – the material environment. The main aim of this project is to identify the features of the term finis as found in Livy’s historical reconstruction of Rome’s history from a Late Republican/Early Imperial perspective. In later chapters I will also consider Livy’s link with Augustus and his ‘propagandistic’ literary circle.³ The chronological limits of my study are set within AUC, analysing the period of Republican Rome from her birth to the Third Macedonian War (753-168 B.C.), as viewed through Livy’s perspective of the 1st century BC. I have avoided comparisons with the Imperial Period, as I believe it is incomparable with the Republic due to the substantial changes in ideology of the 1st century A.D. The adopted methodology will avoid the application of modern definitional categories to the ancient terms. On the contrary, my major aim is to attempt a reconstruction of the concept of finis from a Roman point of view: namely Livy’s. The reason behind this investigation is the almost complete absence of a scholarly discussion about finis as a territorial element, which has led to confusing interpretations of the term, due to assumptions made about its meaning and distinct but overlapping ancient and modern definitions. In this

² Bennington (2003:4) stress that “The term 'term', at any rate, means just that: boundary, border or frontier of territory: a term can be a stone or post (traditionally carved with the image of Jupiter Terminus, god of boundaries) marking the limit of possession of a piece of ground”. See also Piccaluga (1974:99-107) on Terminus.
introduction, I aim to set out and clarify the research process through the objects of the study, the main issues linked to the research, and through two main methodological problems: the explanation of terminology used and the general perception of the environmental space at the time of Livy.

Questions and aims of the research

“Nevertheless, for many periods of the republic Livy is our best or only authority”. 4

The overall objective of this study is to provide examples that may help to build or rebuild the definition of finis as it was perceived in Republican Rome as seen through the eyes of a late Republican author, living on the cusp of the Empire. The reasons for analysing the word finis in Livy’s AUC and the bordering practices linked to this term are three-fold: a) Livy presents an extensive usage of the word finis. Livy is the Roman author who uses this term the most in the whole history of Latin literature. The presence of finis has not just a substantial average use throughout the entire length of AUC, but its massive incidence ratio concerns a number of differing contexts and acceptations; b) Livy’s narration allows crucial associations to be made between finis and geographical, topographical and perceptive features from diverse points of view; c) The periodisation and contextualisation of Livy’s work in the particular historical moment in which he lived. Historically, Livy represents a link and a watershed: telling the Republican history and foreshadowing future developments of Rome’s policy.

The main challenge of this investigation is to gain an understanding of the concept of finis and its function through the analysis of the relationship between spatiality and functionality in ‘key places’ linked with Rome’s expansion. In other words, the modern ‘linear concept’ of the boundaries has been overlapped with ‘natural features’. These ‘natural features’ are distinctive, in that they protrude from the landscape, shaping the environmental space. For this reason, humans have considered ‘natural features’ as ‘natural boundaries’, embodying ‘natural
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communities’ (rather than social) that coalesce almost accidentally. Consequently, it became quite common to encounter the description of rivers, mountain ranges or promontories as ‘natural boundaries’. Such places might have represented elements of territorial control and also functioned as a symbolic element at the frontline of Rome’s foreign policy of expansion. Some of the questions posed by Bennington may be useful if adapted to this study: “Are natural boundaries called boundaries by analogy with non-natural ones, once they have been crossed? Are boundaries natural boundaries in the sense of being boundaries of nature, boundaries to nature, lines where nature ends, the transition or transgression point of nature into one of its others (culture, law, tekhne, politics, etc.)? Maybe every frontier also divides nature and culture.”

In addressing some of these, I will examine the extent to which the bordering practices overlap with fines and how they converged into a natural feature. Varro’s main statement in Frontinus – as recorded by Grotius – represents the major hypotheses of this study: the superimposing of ‘natural features’ with the fines and the ‘spatiality’ of the finis versus the common place of its ‘linearity’. The terms Ager Arcifinius, often compared with the Ager Occupatorius do not appear to be exactly equivalent, though some of the writers on the Res Agraria make them so. Ager Arcifinius appears to express the whole of a territory, which had only some natural or arbitrary boundary, and was not defined by measurement (qui nulla mensura continetur). Grotius’ exact words on the finis arcifinius provide a very clear distinction between limes and finis: “Writers, who have treated of the division of land, have described it as of a threefold nature; one kind they name divided and assigned land, which Frontinus the Lawyer calls limited, because it is marked out by artificial boundaries. By land assigned, is meant that which has been appropriated to a whole community, comprising a certain number of families; a hundred for instance; from whence it has derived that name. And those portions are called hundreds. There is another division called arcifinum, which is applied when the land is defended against an enemy by the natural boundaries of rivers or mountains. These lands Aggenus Urbicus calls occupatory, being such as have been occupied either by reason of their

---

5 Bennington 2003:2
6 Bennington 2003:5.
being vacant, or by the power of conquest. In the two first kinds of lands, because their extent and bounds are fixed and determined, though a river should change its course, it occasions no change of territory, and what is added by alluvion will belong to the former occupant. In arcifinious lands, where the bounds are formed by nature, any gradual change in the course of the river makes a change also in the boundaries of territory, and whatever accession is given by the river to one side, it will belong to the possessor of the land on that side. Because the respective nations are supposed originally to have taken possession of those lands, with an intention of making the middle of that river, as a natural boundary, the line of separation between them".  

Livy’s work will be the litmus test to prove the words of Romans jurists and surveyors. Recalling the idea of *pomerium*, *finis* will be identified with a natural feature (river, mountain range, promontory, strait), which allows it to serve as a geographical and political constant within formal agreements and as the building block for a political/territorial subdivision/organisation/grid. Through the synthesis of the data provided by the study cases, *finis* had particular features, listed in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Oppidum</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>Agreement</th>
<th>Passageways</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Table 1 – Synopsis of the main concordances between *fines* and natural features in this thesis.

Through the analysis of several Livian contexts, I will ask different, more direct questions (and propose answers): ‘What was their function? How did they work? Where were they placed? What were their features?’ In this way, I hope

---

to provide new perspectives from the ancient point of view, allowing for a number of previously unexplored propositions and possibilities.

Issues and problems

In the opening sentence of this introduction, Bennington\(^\text{10}\) had already detected the main issue that the concept of ‘land or territorial limit’ – at least in English\(^\text{11}\) – has a broad and interchangeable range of non-synonymous descriptors, in particular nowadays, the word ‘frontier’.\(^\text{12}\) Unclear and superimposable notions of these bordering terms, along with a lack of scientific studies related to them, has created two types of problem for scholars: a) they use interchangeably various concepts within the ‘non-synonymous basket’ and b) none of them seems to have tackled the topic from the ancient perspective. Owing to this, modern categorisations have been applied to the ancient world but they have been unable to explain ancient concepts or notions, which is the main aim of this investigation.\(^\text{13}\) In undertaking this research, I will avoid any sort of label or connection with modern constructs. Mainly by assessing the term *finis*, I will provide concepts rather than a precise translation of the Latin term. To do that, I will borrow Bennington’s terminology, who uses the expression ‘non-synonymous concepts’. However, when I need to provide an undefined translation of one of the terms listed above for the word *finis*, I will use the expression ‘bordering concept’. On the other hand, when I need to detect a geopolitical area such as a *finis* or such potential limit, I will use the expression

---

\(^{10}\) Bennington 2003:1.

\(^{11}\) The problem is also present in other languages as stressed by Berend 2001:26

\(^{12}\) Bennington (2003:4) listed all the related terms: frontier, boundary, edge, limit, border, margin. He invokes Derrida's handy notion of 'non-synonymous substitutions', though we need to recognise that this is also the name of a problem (what determines the substitutions if the terms are not synonymous – i.e. interchangeable *salva veritate* – in Leibniz's definition?). “These words or concepts or terms (frontier, border, etc.) seem to share with others, such as difference, the complication involved in also saying something about what it is to be a concept, a word or a term. In one conception of philosophy at least, it would be our task to establish as precisely as possible the frontiers between these various concepts – and the establishment of precise frontiers between them would be a condition of their conceptuality”. The roots of the problems are evident also in: Crabb (1893:135-40), where a distinction is made: a set of words comprises: border, edge, rim, brim/brink, margin, verge. Another set is so subdivided: border, boundary, frontier, confine, precinct.

\(^{13}\) See Marx about exchange which begins ‘accidentally’ at the frontiers of natural communities. Aristotle’s analysis of exchange in the Politic considers as the term ‘accidental’ as opposed to ‘natural’, which play a vital role in the argument about exchange. In Bennington 2003:263.
‘bordering practice’. Hence, I tried not to decontextualise the word *finis*, since in our minds the terminology is profoundly entrenched within modern conceptions, as the literature review will show. However, I will preserve the original terminology when referencing other studies or authors.

Another issue that has immediately surfaced relates to the fact that the perception of ‘bordering concept’ fluctuates in time and space. Bordering practices have been a contentious subject for centuries, across different languages and schools of thought. Scholars’ generalisation provides a list of terms and so-called ‘non-synonymous words’, whereas the indiscriminate use of ‘frontier’ in many cases assumes a global connotation, which practically conflates all bordering practices and concepts. Comparison of the long list of bordering concepts has provided no appreciable results. Despite the numerous terms such as frontier, border, boundary, edge, limit, margin, liminal, no-man’s land, barrier or barricade, or even fence, there is an overuse of the term frontier (*limes*), which is often still used as an umbrella term for any other listed word.

Furthermore, scholars prefer to focus the bulk of their studies on the (Late) Roman Empire rather than on the Republic. This concentration on the Late Empire has led to a kind of ‘reverse’ process – from the Late Empire backward in time – thus creating a ‘one-way effect’ in which importance has been given only to structural or dividing lines emphasised by walls, roads, dykes, *clausurae* or rivers which were functional to block the advancing ‘*Barbaricum*’. Finally, this study aims to open a breach in the modern view, led by Whittaker’s statement: “It is impossible to find any evidence of a Roman frontier policy in the

---

14 Overall for this terminology, see: Sahlins 1989; Popescu 2011:38.
15 An ‘Ordinary language philosophy’ could be adopted, establishing their ‘grammar’, in Wittgenstein’s sense or invoking Derrida’s handy notion of ‘non-synonymous substitutions’. At the moment, there is an expected need to recognise a common problem. This issue determines the substitutions if the terms which are not synonymous or interchangeable, in Leibniz’s definition. Bennington (2003:3) thinks of Derrida, not only when he makes abundant use of this vocabulary, but because these words or concepts or terms (frontier, border, etc.) seem to share with others the complication involved, regarding whether or not it is to be a concept, a word or a term.
16 Frege famously suggests that if a concept does not have precise boundaries then it is simply not a concept (Bennington 2003:5).
17 Bennington 2003:3.
period of the Republic, despite the strong Roman sense of organised social and political space.”

Methodological definitions and ‘natural’ perception

The terminology comprises four main keywords, which will be used throughout this study:

1. **Term** indicates ‘a word or expression used in relation to a particular subject, often to describe something official or technical’. However, it is necessary to remember also its temporal meaning: ‘The fixed period of time that something lasts for.’ In this way, I ‘lock’ the descriptive definition of ‘term’ to the temporal one, therefore in space and time; 2. **Definition** for which there are two definitions reported in the dictionary: first) a statement that explains the meaning of a word or phrase and second) a description of the features and limits of something. For my purposes, definition is a blend of these two descriptions: practically, going back to its etymology, ‘definition’ is the recognised statement of the meaning or significance of a word, phrase or idiom, which sets its definite, distinct, or clear limits; 3. **Acceptation** – a particular challenge as it is not

---

19 Not casually, they are linked with Roman bordering practices.
20 Early 13c., term “limit in time, set or appointed period,” from Old French terme “limit of time or place” (11c.), from Latin terminus “end, boundary line,” related to termen “boundary, end” (see terminus). Old English had termen “term, end,” from Latin. Sense of “period of time during which something happens” first recorded c.1300, especially of a school or law court session (mid-15c.). The meaning “word or phrase used in a limited or precise sense” is first recorded late 14c., from Medieval Latin use to render Greek horos “boundary,” employed in mathematics and logic.
21 Cambridge dictionaries on line 2011: s. ‘term’.
22 See n. above.
24 Accepta, -ae f. (sc. sors agrini). Agrimensorum vocabulum. Frontin. Grom. 51.16: quo pertica cecidit, eatenus acceptae designantur; Frontin. 45.8. Hyg. Limit. Grom. 113.3 = Dig. 1.0.281.25: sortes dividi debent ... et in forma secari denuo hominum acceptae, ut quo singuli accipere debent in unum coniungantur; Hyg. 199.12: agro limitato accepturorum comparationem faciemus ad modum acceptarum; Hyg. 201.18: acceptas acceperunt; Hyg. 204.5: primum
completely ‘accepted’ or understood in English. The Oxford dictionary only reports its meaning as ‘a particular sense or the generally recognised meaning (common acceptation) of a word or phrase’, which is the usage that I will employ in this paper; d) ‘concept’,\(^{25}\) which contains the simple definition of a principle or idea;\(^{26}\) however, I will be using it to refer to a mixture of abstract objects and the common mental representation of an idea, which will allow us to draw appropriate definitions of the targeted entities.\(^{27}\)

The second point relates to the perception of the environment. Livy’s work (\textit{AUC}) is a literary work, which includes description and use of ‘natural or environmental features’, as distinguished from a flat landscape. This perception is based on three main stages: the abstract literary evidence, authors’ conceptual ideas and visions, and the transliteration into the material environment. Within this process it is important to establish the relationship between the perception, the literary rendering, and the reality. I borrow philosophical, mathematical and geometrical concepts to help explain the main concepts used throughout this research.\(^{[FIG.2]}\) I support the Kantian theory that phenomenal space such as that experienced during visual perception or imagery may be described by Euclidean geometry.\(^{28}\) As articulated by Schlick: “The description of reality with the help of the four-dimensional schema (one of time) is a result of the construction of physical space from psychological spaces (visual and tactile spaces, etc.). These latter are, however, by no means relative. In these regions, the application of Euclidean geometry is more than an

\^{25}\textit{Concipio}, -cēpī, -ceptum, -ere [i. q. falisc. cuncaptum ‘conceptum’, a con et capere. Th.].

\^{26}\textit{OED2}, s. 1.4 Philosophy; ‘concept’.

\^{27}\textit{Murphy} 2002; \textit{Carey} 2009; \textit{Margolis & Laurence} 2007.

\^{28}\textit{Of course Kant’s arguments have been criticised frequently and Euclidean geometry cannot describe and be applied to the space of the physical universe. Cf. Salmon 1975; Sklar 1974.}
Introduction: Research guidelines

I am emphasising this point for a number of reasons. Firstly, it is important to justify, at least geometrically, the difference between line and plane. In the following investigation, I will establish a scientific basis mainly to clarify the concept of a line – but also point and plane – in their primary application to the material environment/reality. In spatial contexts, it is of vital importance to bear in mind a few basic geometric concepts: a ‘point’ is an exact location in space, while a line consists of an infinite set of points and is a subset of a plane. This line is stated to have certain properties which relate it to other lines and points, and both are contained by the plane, which is an infinite set of points forming a connected flat surface extending infinitely far in all directions. Some geometrical assumptions or axioms, which represent the basis of the Euclidean geometry, are also useful for our purpose: a) a straight line segment can be drawn joining any two points or, for any two distinct points, there is a unique line containing them (1st Euclid’s’ axiom); b) through any two points is exactly one line (Unique Line Assumption); c) given a line in a plane, there exists at least one point in the plane that is not on the line (Dimension Assumption); d) there are an infinite number of lines that can contain that one point (consequence of the Euclid’s axiom); e) two or more line segments may have some of the same relationships as lines, such as being parallel, intersecting, or skewed (consequence of Euclid’s axiom). Secondly, in the section on Livy’s representation of the material environment, I insist on the fact that, because “(environmental) spaces apparently necessitate considerable information integration in memory over time, their mental representations have been termed cognitive maps or cognitive spaces”. How the material environment is represented visually will be one of the keys to understanding how different perspectives and different visions can change perceptions of reality.

29 Schlick 1964:296.
32 My reference is to the comparison between the geometrical representation of environmental by Polybius (e.g. 2.14.4-16.5, cf. i.e. Walbank 2002:38) and the spatial vision by Livy, as I will show in this research through several arguments.
Outline of the chapters

Chapter 1 is divided into three main sections. In the Literature review, I analyse European studies on ‘bordering concepts’ throughout the centuries, which is useful for assessing comparisons, outlines and initial questions. My primary objective is to present a series of problems related to the perception of bordering practices in the European context and explore them in my study. In the second section, my aim is to provide a stable and comprehensive definition of *finis*. The meanings, value of *finis*, its appearance, and the features associated with it are completed by the importance and quantitative incidence of the term *finis* in *AUC*, through the raw data. In the third section, my objective is to highlight the main features of the Livian narration and the importance of the term *finis*, contextualised both in *AUC* and in the context within which he lived. I will also emphasise the connection between the Augustan literary circle and the programmed use of *finis*.

Chapter 2 explores Livy’s introduction on the role of the Tiber in Rome’s history. Livy’s key observation that the Tiber was the *finis* between Etruscans and Latins shows both the guidelines and the issues related to its function and highlights the importance of rivers as *fines*. By starting from this point, the chapter analyses the relationship of Rome with her river, highlighting the importance of the Janiculum Hill and the Bridge (*Sublicius*) as connector between the core of the original foundation and the bulwark on the other bank. The rest of the chapter is dedicated to the early expansion of Rome toward the North (Veii) and the importance of rivers in this process. As further evidence of the significance assigned by Livy to rivers, other instances will be used to help us understand how some rivers – linked to *fines* – have a delimitative function in Livy’s geography.

Chapter 3 is grounded in a single passage:33 the foundation of Jupiter Feretrius’ temple. This chapter is crucial, as it puts forward the planning of a subdivision of the surrounding territory. This process went through different stages, which were possibly a *topos* in Rome’s history: a) conquest of territories and Rome’s expansive process; b) choice of a place of command and control (Capitol); and

---

33 Liv. 1.10.6.
c) subdivision of the encompassed/conquered territory. The presence of *fines* in this context is crucial as it works both as a delimiting element and also to demonstrate how Livy, for the first time in his narration, seems to emphasise the importance of a vision from above.

In Chapter 4, I stress the relationship between the *fines* and the *fetials*, during Republican Rome’s expansive process. In the first part, I explain the composition of *fetials’* college, its origins and the main skill it offered: the *ius fetiale*. Furthermore, I also describe the procedure which connected the *fetials* with foreign powers and the territory within the *fines*. The second part shows the *fetials’* connection with the temple of Jupiter Feretris and with the Capitol. The main case studies are recorded, such as the wars against Alba and Veii, which show a procedure for approaching the enemy and declaring war that differs from that of the middle Republic. The third part highlights those differences both in the procedure and in Livy’s narration, which show an adaptation by periods. Further developments in *fetials’* rituals during the Augustan period are also reported, in order to link Livy’s work to them during this time period.

The whole of Chapter 5 is dedicated to the treaty of the Ebro as *finis*. In the analysis of the treaty, the major point I will discuss is the position of Saguntum in relation to the Ebro. Through comparison with Polybius, it has been possible to understand: a) a different perception of the idea of ‘non-synonymous words’ from different cultures (e.g. Greek and Carthaginian); and b) a framework behind the notion or concept of *finis*, which is real and applicable to real contexts. The last point is possibly the most significant for this present study: the *finis* is not a simple line, but is based on spaces on both sides, which granted strategic security to Rome.

The Alps are the key focus of Chapter 6. In one passage, Livy characterises the mountain range as an almost ‘impassable wall’. In this chapter, the contextualisation of this passage allows us to tackle different aspects of the Alps as *finis*: a) the actual extension or ‘thickness’ of a *finis*; b) the importance of a colony (Aquileia) in relation to a *finis*; c) the importance of the *iuga* (passes) (see the importance of the bridge for Tiber); d) the sense of dominance that accompanies the vision from a high vantage point, which might have been
employed by armies looking to conquer Italy; e) the link with the Augustan policy on the Alps (s. the trophy of La Turbie).

The germinal principles planted in the preceding chapters come to fruition in Chapter 7, which is dedicated to the treaty of Apamea. The treaty of the Ebro had created problems for Rome due to a misunderstanding on the Carthaginian side. In the treaty of Apamea, the clauses are clearer and the text of the agreement is detailed such that the construct around the Taurus mountain range (finis) appears clearer. We are facing, therefore, not just a concept of finis based on spaces, but a concept grounded on different layers of space, possibly concentric if compared with the new centralised position of Rome.

The conclusions in Chapter 8 prefigure the assumed developments in AUC and in Livy’s concept of finis. I will propose a hypothesis, which provides signs of continuity in AUC, changes and breaks between the Late Republic and Early Empire. The rise of individuals, the positioning of trophies and Pompey’s improvements in marking territory are the fertile background that led to a general outline of Augustan territorial policy, involving monumentalisation and areas of passage at key points. Stressing the continuity between these and the guidelines present in Livy, this study aims to show: a) a different perspective and approach to the conceptual question, b) the materialisation or visualisation of boundaries and c) continuity throughout the Roman world, analysing the role of the monuments, which worked as landmarks. During the Empire, landmarks took on meaningful shapes related to their function. The entrance in a different context, i.e. passing from an environmental context to a diverse one, through specific points of passage, was seen as a ritual emphasised by specific monuments linked to each other through a homogenous project. Such monuments were embedded in the territorial organisation with specific meanings and significance, linking different areas/zones of the rising Empire.
Chapter 1. Finis. Project and research

1.1 Literature review (History of studies)

1.1.1 Guidelines, problems and challenges

“You may ransack the catalogues of libraries, you may search the indexes of celebrated historical works, you may study the writings of scholars, and you will find the subject almost wholly ignored”.34

The excerpt quoted above underlines the lack of studies concerning ‘ancient frontiers’ at the beginning of the 20th century. In Lord Curzon’s opinion, all works focus on political geography, places or space, but they neglect the concept of ‘frontier’.35 When approaching the question of the number of ‘bordering concepts’ connected to the term finis from an ancient perspective, I found myself in the same position as Lord Curzon. Whereas others have hitherto surveyed various diverse aspects of bordering practices, it is very likely that no one has undertaken such holistic or extensive interrogations of the issue. Few have tried ‘understanding borders from the ancient point of view’ and even fewer have applied this to the concept of finis.36

I will show this by exhibiting how scholars have taken for granted even the broad notions and meanings of the ancient terminology and how their research has often led to a superimposition of modern categories upon the ancient terminology itself.37

The following section will also show how the concept of bordering evolved. In the first part of this section, I emphasised the evolution of the studies based on the ancient sources and perspectives: how they were used and eventually exploited.

34 The sentence was pronounced by G.N. Curzon of Kedleston at the prestigious Romanes Lecture at Oxford University in 1907, which had as subject ‘Frontiers: Curzon 1907:4-5.

35 Although specific studies on the frontiers had still largely been disregarded, Lord Curzon was criticised within academic circles for having ignored any extensive work by European geographers over the previous century. Cf. Whittaker’s 1994:2, overture.

36 The only three monographs on finis are: Sini 1991; Richardson 2011; Cacciari 2007: esp. 277-8.

37 From the middle of the 20th century, just a few studies have focussed purely on the concept of borders, boundaries and frontiers in the ancient world and just two of them are a sort of monographic work. Sordi 1987 and Piccaluga 1974.
Two more points are relevant in this process of assessment: a) the English and French colonial experience, which gave to the studies a real and tangible dimension, and b) the more recent practical approach to the question – just after WWII – resulting from a ‘fresh’ support provided by new archaeological excavations and the introduction of new technologies (GIS, GPS and satellites).\(^{38}\)

The very last part of this section will highlight how the terms *limes* and ‘frontier’\(^{39}\) have taken centre stage in almost every study, to the extent that scholars neglect the fact that a frontier is just a subcategory (or ‘hyercategory’) of the bordering concepts. While several attempts have been made to elucidate the meaning of ‘frontier’, showing the substantial geopolitical value of the concept of *limes*, in many cases more problems have arisen due to the different translations of ‘frontier’ and their superimposition on the acceptation of the word *limes*.\(^{40}\) Researchers have accepted a sort of ‘pre-formed’ (pre-packed) idea of frontier – as if suggesting that the Roman Empire was formed from nothing! Instead, to undertake a uniform study, scholars have preferred to focus (mainly) on the Late Empire, comparing e.g. the Roman frontier (*limes*) and similar patterns identifiable in other cultures or continents.\(^{41}\) Consequently, studies on the frontiers of the Roman Empire ramified into non-homogeneous concepts, monopolised by the frontiers/*limes*.

It also provides a detailed analysis showing that: a) European study is deeply rooted in the Roman tradition; b) the notion of bordering concept has often been superimposed upon material or natural features; c) borders are often considered to be shaped like a single line; and d) the bordering concept is often associated with a broad plethora of terms, the most common of which – in recent years – has been ‘frontier’ (roughly translated from *limes*). I collect and assess raw data on the term *finis* in *AUC* both from a qualitative (meaning, definition, acceptation) and a quantitative point of view, visualising the data in contextual assessments such as

---

39 See esp. Ch. 1 from Anderson 1996.
41 It is interesting to note the distinction made by Bowersock, Lamont Brown and Grabar (1999:542; the unknown author put just the abbreviation of his name: ‘C.W.’): “… in the Roman Empire never meant a military frontier in the modern sense and was probably never used as an official term for boundary.”
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tables and charts [1.4.2; APPENDIX 1] I also underline the significant factors that have led to my choice of Livy as the subject of this study: a) the structure and subdivision of AUC; and b) the period in which Livy lived.[1.5]

These problems can be listed as follows: a) the lack of a homogeneous concept of bordering within the different perspectives and perceptions of European scholars, who have taken for granted the meanings of the bordering concepts and exploited the meaning and the usage of these terms; b) the application of modern definitional categories to the ancient pattern, which has led to an undeniable association between natural features (mountains ranges, rivers, promontories), bordering concepts, and the ‘linear concept’ – the identification of bordering practices with a simple line; and c) the endemic lack of scientific work on terminology and its definition in relation to finis. The difficulties surrounding this last point are caused by the vulnerability of the terminology, due to a largely indeterminate use of different terms, often considered interchangeable; the absence of systematic and scientific investigation of the term finis; and the fact that currently the term ‘frontier’ / limes is the most commonly used term for the borders in the context of Roman Empire.42

1.1.2 Medieval and modern ‘bridges’ to Antiquity

“The concept of natural frontiers is deeply ‘encrusted’ in us all”.43

[FIG 1] The first idea of bordering practice drew on ancient sources and natural features. Between the Low Middle Ages and Renaissance Humanism, blurred concepts of bordering were intertwined with nationalism, geography and religion. Until then, references to bordering practices – which looked back to classical times – had been almost latent or ignored. Following this, Charlemagne brought about innovations within his kingdom and the immediate vicinity, leading to the rise of absolutist states.44 Only the humanists commenced to build ‘cultural myths’, inspired and based on classic authors.

43 Febvre 1922:324.
44 Conscious reference to rivers is clearly established in the treaty of Verdun (843), which defines the middle Frankish kingdom of Lotharingia as that of the Quatre Rivieres. A first attempt at evoking the
Ancient writers were more often interpreted and regularly cited to justify a sort of ‘nationalistic geography’,\textsuperscript{45} in which rivers, mountains, and seas were always stressed as ideological borders.\textsuperscript{46} By virtue of the fact that it was surrounded by sea and limited by the Alps, it is easy to see why Italy was the first ‘subject’ to be explored, becoming a geophysical rather than a political idea.\textsuperscript{47} The Italian historical/geographical definition and the ease, with which her natural limits can be recognised, formed mainly by mountains and sea, gave rise to the idea that the Alpine range was a gift from nature, or divinely dispensed. The idea that, politically speaking, “whole Italy rose from the Alpine passes” (“\textit{Universa Italia surgit a jugis Alpium}”) is present in Riccobaldo Gervasio.\textsuperscript{48} Petrarch, instead, described the Alps as frontiers of certain Italian kingdoms (\textit{certissimos regnorum fines}), working as Italy’s defenders by acting as a barrier.\textsuperscript{49} This ‘Alpine barrier’ (\textit{schermo delle Alpi})\textsuperscript{50} was exalted by Boccaccio as Italy’s natural stronghold capable of halting Hannibal’s advance.\textsuperscript{51} The traditional view of Rome and her frontiers was emphasised by Flavio Biondo’s \textit{De Roma instaurata}, which explicitly equated contemporaneous Italy with Republican Rome. He commenced a process whereby the Roman model of state frontiers was manipulated and adapted by early modern Europe.\textsuperscript{52}

France followed the example of the Italian Renaissance by claiming her own integrity and extent and reinventing the Roman provincial borders of Gaul. This

---

\textsuperscript{45} This long shadow of “Italy’s sentiment and dreams” extended to the 19\textsuperscript{th} century, when Republican Rome frequently provided the inspiration for a supposed own political identity. Cf. Michel (1982:84-91) cites Biondo 1531.
\textsuperscript{46} Willems 1986.
\textsuperscript{47} Liv. 1.1.3.
\textsuperscript{48} Rizzi 2008.
\textsuperscript{49} Rawski 1991:1.160.
\textsuperscript{50} Rawski 1991:2.92; cf. “\textit{Ben provide Natura al nostro stato, / quando de l’Alpi schermo / pose fra noi et la tedesca rabbia}” (Our State was well provided by Nature, / when She put the barrier of the Alps / between us and the German fury). Cf. “\textit{Italia mia, benché ‘l parlar sia indarno}” (My Italy! Yet saying this is a problem) [\textit{Canzoniere} 1281].
\textsuperscript{51} The tensions are excellently discussed by Clarke 1999. Cf. Polyb. 3.39.8 and Livy 34.12.12; the latter criticised by Strabo (8.8.5) for “following the chance route of a general”; Boccaccio, Comm. Dante Alighieri: see Mazzacurati 1987:342-50. In the Italian Renaissance art echoed literature, as evident in a brass relief in which God draws the borders of Italy. St. Peter Cathedral, Baptistery, Rome, Italy.
rendering was applied to natural boundaries, which delimited the 'Hexagone'.

Although the concept of riverine frontiers was deeply embedded in the French psyche in the Middle Ages, De Bello Gallico provided the instructions to legitimise French claims up to the natural frontiers of the Rhine, the upper Rhone, the Alps and the Pyrenees. In the 17th century 'la permanence de César' (Caesar's durability) became the cornerstone of national political geography in the two centuries following. Cardinal Richelieu targeted France's contemporary geopolitical aspirations and ambitions, exploiting Roman historical and geographical authors – like Strabo and Ptolemy – in order to justify their national territorial ambitions. Richelieu linked his idea of natural borders with the ancient classical one, when he spoke of wishing “restituer a la Gaule les limites que la nature lui a fixées” (“to give back those limits that nature established for Gaul”). This is a key concept in the process of interpretation of the frontiers. Richelieu’s theoretical ideal of natural frontiers aimed to extend French strongholds up to or beyond the Rhine and the Alps.

The Roman limes was virtually replaced not as a continuous line, natural or static, but rather as a ‘cordon de noeuds’ (‘cordon of knots’): communication lines and rivers formed an open, unlimited ‘bordering area’ or ‘frontier region’. Grotius and

---

53 The hexagon resembles the geometrical shape of France, following her borders and natural limits.
54 Mazarin argued that the commission's task was to search for “the ancient limits which divided the Gauls from the Spains, and not the historical frontier of the two crowns”, cited by Sahlins 1989:47. Whittaker 2004:183.
55 Caesar was first cited in the 15th century, when Aeneas Sylvius asserted that Alsace was part of Gallia. Sylvius is cited by Sorel 1897; cf. Pounds 1951:152, The Alps are not named by Caesar (BG 1.1) in his opening description of Gaul (BG 1.1), but were clearly intended to define Gaul, as he shows later (BG 3.1 and 7). Nordman 1998:45-6.
56 In 1501 Jakob Wimpfeling, the Alsatian reformer, used the newly discovered Tacitus' Germania to prove that Alsace had always been German; cf. Rives 1999:71. However, Julius Caesar’s statement was virtually airbrushed out of history by the subsequent frontiers created by Augustus and his successors beyond the Rhine; Nordman 1998:474.
58 Note the identity between la Gaule and la France, in Alliès 1980:65.
59 Louis XIV's expansionist policy in the late 17th century was enforced by architect Vauban, who planned and set up some of the greatest fortresses of Europe since Trier and Cologne. Strasbourg (Argentorate) was regarded not as a frontier but as the 'entree en Allemagne'; the bridgehead at Brisach happened to repeat the fortress of Valentinian's Roman frontier in the 4th century AD; Pignerol was held to control Savoy and Montferrat to stop Spain; Alliès 1980:20; Nordman 1998:91-4.
60 Vauban considered a frontier should be constructed entrenching political geography, "in such a way that it closes the enemy's way into our country and facilitates our entry into his", which resonates remarkably with Roman practice. Cf. Luttwak's (1976) theory; Alliès 1980:20; Nordman 1998:91-4. Whittaker 2004:186.
his entourage lent intellectual weight to Richelieu’s claims, deliberately exploiting Roman historians: jurists and agrimensores were cited to defend the thesis of natural, territorial boundaries.\(^{61}\) In 1659, they were invoked by the negotiators of the treaty of the Pyrenees, who wished to reset the boundaries between France and Spain based on the old ones between Gallia (Aquitania and Narbonensis) and Hispania (Terraconensis).\(^{62}\) The failure in assessing them led historians and politicians to quote Tacitus,\(^{63}\) his words echoed in two statements: a) “Rivers are the most natural limits because they serve to defend the frontiers: hence they are called arcifinium by the Doctors. ... These are the boundaries which were always chosen in ancient times to separate states, as the Romans did, who had bounded their empire on the German side by the Rhine, from the Scythians and Moesians by the Danube, and from the Parthians by the Euphrates”\(^{64}\); b) “Ses limites sont marquées par la Nature; nous les atteindrons toutes des quatre points de l’horizon, du coté du Rhin, du coté l’Ocean, du coté des Alpes”\(^{65}\) (“Its boundaries are determined by nature; we will reach all four points of the horizon, as far as the Rhine, the Ocean and the Alps”). The natural frontiers of ancient Gallia were thus no longer a geopolitical ‘représentation’. They rather turned into an instrument of aggression in Napoleon’s hands in the wake of growing nationalism subsequent to ‘la Revolution’.\(^{66}\) His imperialist expansion would have followed Rome’s frontier policy when he exclaimed that the rivers of Europe, “which seem so well created to separate nations, nowhere form the real line of the frontiers”.\(^{67}\) This French conviction demonstrates an evolution in the concept of border, stressing with customary clarity that the two concepts of fixed military ‘front’ and territorial

---

\(^{61}\) The most interesting citation from the agrimensores is Varro’s category of arcifinium borderland; for which see Nordman 1979:81-3, discussed in its original context by Whittaker 1997:20.

\(^{62}\) Despite the Roman texts, the commission was unable to detect territorial and linear borders, the jurisdictional sovereignty of which, on either side, thus remained uncertain for about 200 years afterward. Goudineau 1990:9-12; Nordman 1998:14.

\(^{63}\) Tac. Ann. 1.9: “The Ocean and remote rivers were the boundaries of the Empire”.


\(^{65}\) Danton’s famous speech on the natural frontiers of France (1793) in: Jaurès 1901:972.

\(^{66}\) “Quand un peuple se fixe une frontière naturelle...c’est simplement un limite qu’il établit à l’intensité de son désir d’expansion” in Lapradelle 1928:55-7; Whittaker 1997:280,n. 11.

boundary (*fins*) did not merge until the 19th century. In the ideology of French historiography, the new fixed frontiers were an evolution from a natural barrier line to a *cordon sanitaire*, made more explicit after the Congress of Vienna (1815), which formalised the rise of the nation states.\(^{68}\)

### 1.1.3 The German School

The end of the 16th century is notable for two discoveries, which deeply marked the German school of thought in its debate with its French neighbours: a) the manuscript of Tacitus’ *De Germania* and b) the only known ancient map of the Roman Empire purchased by Conrad Peutinger. While *De Germania* provided the Germans with an effective ‘weapon’ to counter the *De Bello Gallico*, the *Tabula Peutingeriana* showed the total absence of any sort of boundary\(^{69}\) (although a physical line existed in the shape of Hadrian’s Wall).\(^{70}\) *De Germania* confirmed the ancestral distinctiveness of *Der Volk* (The people):\(^{71}\)

*Ipse eorum opinionibus accedo, qui Germaniae populos nullis aliis aliarum nationum conubiis infectos propriam et sinceram et tantum sui similem gentem exstitisse arbitrantur.*\(^{72}\)

For my own part, I agree with those who think that the tribes of Germany are free from all taint of inter-marriages with foreign nations, and that they appear as a distinct, unmixed race, like none but themselves.

Tacitus sparked two consequential and crucial concepts: a) Germans were beginning to be deemed and to identify themselves as a whole, and b) ‘die Grenze’\(^{73}\) limited the population rather than the landscape/territory. Tacitus’ statement also echoed in the anthropological Enlightenment and in the ‘discovery’ of Indo-European languages. While Emmanuel Kant argued that miscegenation produced the degeneration of races,\(^{74}\) the Englishman William Jones traced

---

\(^{68}\) Febvre 1922:39

\(^{69}\) Peutinger was author of ‘*de mirandis Germaniae*’ (1530), but it is difficult to assess the impact of the map on German historical geography.

\(^{70}\) Talbert 2011:171.

\(^{71}\) The translation might be ‘The people’, meaning ‘The ethnic’ of the Germans, but also ‘The Nation’.

\(^{72}\) Tac. Germ. 4.1.

\(^{73}\) This German word can be translated with one of the terms, which implies several acceptations of the ‘bordering concepts’ (border, boundary, frontier). For a better understanding of the term, see Böckler 2006.

\(^{74}\) Lectures held in the University of Könisberg and published in 1789.
German linguistic origins from India. Both theories received enthusiastic support from German geographers, such as Karl Ritter and Heinrich Berghaus, as well as from philologists like Friedrich Schlegel, inventor of the Aryan myth, or Jacob Grimm, who was responsible for the towering thesis of Indo-European Einwanderung and ‘Volk ohne Raum’. They were laying strong foundations for the later theories of Lebensraum (vital space) and expanding borders. The scholars justified them through the Roman Kriegsgeographen (war geographers) such as Strabo, Polybius and, even more strongly, Tacitus:

Germania omnis a Gallis Raetisque et Pannoniis Rheno et Danubio fluminibus, a Sarmatis Dacisque mutuo metu aut montibus separatur.

Germania is separated from the Galli, the Rhæti, and Pannonii, by the rivers Rhine and Danube; mountain ranges, or the fear which each feels for the other, divide it from the Sarmatae and Daci.

The process of change from common customs to a common culture to a common place of the Germanic Stamme (tribe/stock) was a consequent mental transposition. It generated the concept of Volkraum (space of people), a space-population, where Naturgrenzen (natural boundaries) were defined by language and race, not by territory.

The Congress of Vienna (1815) left behind the core of a unified Germany with indistinct boundaries and a sense of growing nationalism, where Prussia became the confederate leader and ‘la terre des géographes’ (land of geographers). Although Carl Ritter’s (1843) work – which compared geographical places to the human body – was limited to Africa and Asia, his Meisterwerk (masterpiece) was hailed as a ‘pioneer of geography of frontiers’. Cultural clashes foreshadowed the Franco-Prussian War, which started where the Roman Empire ceased: on the Rhine frontier. Mommsen stressed that “the value of a natural barrier is not what it was. Great rivers, being great highways, should in all reason be national property,

---

76 The figures cited by Bryce 1914:5-6 and 155 were for India.
77 Ratzel 1882:119-20; see e.g. Hänger 2000.
78 Tac. Germ. 1.
80 Mackinder 1919:26-7; the term ‘terre des géographes’ comes from Korinman 1990:9.
81 Cf. the Roman conception of limbs and body of the empire. Allied native kings were regarded as “limbs and parts of the Empire: “…membra partisque imperii”; cf. Suet. Aug. 18.
82 Whittaker 2004:181.
not national boundaries”.

Underlying this theory was a rejection of the restrictions of traditional perceptions of Roman frontiers. Fustel de Coulanges replied: “A historian like yourself should pretend not to know that it is neither race nor language that makes a nation. History perhaps tells you that Alsace is a German country. ... What about when ancient Gaul held the whole Rhine and when Strasbourg, Saverne and Colmar were Roman towns?” Ritter and Mommsen’s theories echoed in Ratzel’s works. On the one hand, he theorised that the state possessed frontiers resembling the skin of a living organism, which expanded and contracted according to scientific, determined laws. He provided a key concept, embedded in a final postulate: Rome’s evolution from a village to an Empire was unrestrained by rivers or mountains. On the other hand, he affirmed that “rivers unite, and although both sides of the Rhine may once have been occupied by Gallic tribes, the Teutonic people have made it into a German river”. There was no such thing as fixed Naturgrenzen, “since Nature abhors fixed boundary lines and sudden transitions”. An abstract boundary was just always a broad brim (Saum), which became a “border/zone of assimilation”. This acquired awareness of Roman frontiers placed more emphasis on their function than on their strategic location.

This direct attack upon traditional perceptions of frontiers had a profound effect on rivers or mountains.

---

83 Mommsen 1871:30.
84 Mommsen et al. 1871:13. Later speeches on Tacitus’ Germania (Mommsen 1870) and the ‘Uniform Limes’ (Mommsen 1890) are remarkably free from crude, political geography. In this scenario, Bismarck would have put to use the Deutschtum, a German-speaking Empire, which culminated in the Franco-Prussian Wars and France’s loss of Alsace and Lorraine in the treaty of Frankfurt (1871).
85 Ritter’s evolutionism played a key role in the biological theory of frontiers as he was trained in zoology and much influenced by theories of social Darwinism. Although Ritter strongly influenced Ratzel’s first book (1881), influence is more evident in Ratzel’s further work, Politische Geographie (1897).
86 The work is subdivided into two volumes. Other, subsequent titles of Ratzel announced his specific interest in frontiers – e.g. Ratzel 1892 and Ratzel 1896.
87 Ratzel’s work was disliked by the father of American frontier studies, E.J. Turner, although his influential paper (Turner 1920) contains similarities with Ratzel’s views on the impermanence of natural barriers and visions of space, as expressed in Ratzel 1873; Bogue 1998:129. Turner had studied at Johns Hopkins University under Herbert Baxter Adams, the scholar who had brought the German theory of the state as a biological organism into American academic life; Hofstadter 1969:60-1.
88 Ratzel 1882:114; Semple 1911:204.
89 The Barbarians, therefore, did not deserve their reputation as destroyers, as they had ‘assimilated Roman civilisation’ over a long period on the frontiers. By contrast, the weakness of Rome was its multiethnicity, over-extension and loss of political control and communications from the centre. Ratzel 1896:40; Cf. Semple 1911:191,230.
90 Vidal de la Blache 1918:201. If Ratzel was the villain of Fevvre’s attacks, there is no doubt that Vidal de la Blache was the hero.
prevailing European thought and the perception of borders. But, significantly, the
debate has focussed primarily on the concept of frontier/limes and not on finis,
drawing a deep line between the two terms.[1.3.1; 1.3.6]

1.1.4 France and Britain as Empires: awareness through the
practice.

“(The Roman Empire) lights up our own Empire, for example in India, at every turn”.91

The notions of ‘frontier’ in modern and ancient times converged only when some
European nations developed a form of imperialism territorially closer or similar to
the Roman Empire, setting their frontiers in wild territories.92 Nevertheless, Britain
and France wished to compare their Empires and colonial borders exclusively to the
Roman Empire and its frontiers (limites), rather than to the wider concept of
border.93 After all, there were good reasons for Europeans to study Roman
frontiers, as “…half the warfare of the European continent has raged around the
frontier barriers of the Alps and the Pyrenees, the Danube and the Rhine”.94

Despite striking differences, which led to two very different perspectives, Britain and
France would have experienced and shared a common issue – involvement with
and understanding of ‘natural frontiers’. Their lieutenants, governors or writers in
colonial border-areas were responsible for the early practical studies on the topic.95
Connections and analogies can be found in the Romantic-Roman Imperial vision of
the frontiers, representing still a line often superimposed onto environmental or
natural features, with the frontiers considered as a dividing line between the civilised
and the barbarian world. France’s history led to frontiers being clearly based on
natural features and landscape, evidently rooted in the country’s Roman past.

---

91 Francis Haverfield, Professor of Archaeology at Oxford and affectionately known as ‘The Pope of
Roman Britain’, used the inaugural lecture of the Roman Society in 1911. Haverfield 1911:xvii, cited
92 Continuing colonial confirmations of a natural-historical border are evident in both the Indian
Subcontinent and North Africa.
94 Bryce 1914:8; Davies 1932:1932:16-17.
95 Other essays by colonial administrators include Sir Charles Lucas (1912), Lord Cromer (1910).
Even Le Figaro on the occasion of Queen Victoria’s Diamond jubilee (1897) declared that Rome had
been ‘equalled if not surpassed’ by the British Empire. Poliakov 1974 and Korinman 1990.
Chapter 1. Finis. Project and research

Rivers and mountains encapsulated the country into a natural container, representing the material link between the ‘myth’ of natural frontiers and the scientific concepts of *potamologie* and *orologie*. On the contrary, the British historical background based on walls and ditches viewed borders as “a line of trespass rather than a frontier”. Nevertheless, anachronistically British India was compared to the Roman Empire, which appeared to function, at that time, as a model for its legal, administrative and military history. British India might have learned from the “Roman Empire’s frontier policy and experience”, as the northwest frontier of India could compare “point by point with its ancient counterpart and prototype, the frontier system of Rome”. Both Empires, concluded Lord Bryce, had “been favoured in their extension and their maintenance by the frontiers, which nature had provided”.

The question of frontiers soon began to assume a different tone, leaning toward the cultural, symbolic and also sacred value of the Roman *limites*, which encapsulated the Roman Empire within water or mountain boundaries. The ‘natural frontier’ – the classical idea that the bordering practices matched with natural features – began to be thwarted. The British in India and the French in Indo-China had advanced beyond the natural frontiers of the Indus or Mekong, surpassing the Roman achievement. However, military practice highlighted that rivers were untenable as frontier, as was plainly stated by the Duke of Wellington in 1808 when rejecting the river Indus as a northern frontier: “The art of crossing rivers is so well understood and has been so frequently practised… that we cannot hope to defend the Indus as

---

96 Whittaker 2004:182
97 The danger was that Britain, like Rome, would be tempted beyond these limits, comparing the disaster of Varus (*Clades Variana*) in the Teutoburg Forest with the retreat from Kabul in 1843. See Whittaker 2004:185 and Macrory 2002.
98 This association was not just limited to the borders: their size and populations appeared roughly the same; both were controlled by armies of approximately the same size, composed of native and colonial troops. The figures cited by Bryce 1914:5-6 and 155 were for India: area 2 million sq. miles, population 515 million, army 550-400,000 soldiers; for the Roman Empire area 2.5 million sq. miles, population 515 million, army 500,000 soldiers. Not all these figures would be accepted today, but the Native States were, presumably, not included.
99 “I wonder if my heaters appreciate the part that frontiers are playing in the everyday history and policy of the British Empire” (Curzon 1907:8); Davies 1932:115; Curzon 1907:54; Whittaker 1997:2.
100 Bryce 1914:14; a governor of Bengal who believed that the British had “pretty well reached the limit set by nature”, which some thought was the River Indus, others the Himalaya Mountains; Morris 1992:16. Whittaker 2004:184-6.
a barrier. “101 Experience also radically challenged Curzon’s own traditional perceptions. In his opinion: “Augustus selected rivers as frontiers of the Roman Empire, though strategic reasons soon tempted the Romans beyond.”102 According to Whittaker,103 rivers connected rather than separated and, jurisprudentially, the more powerful nation always demanded rights over the far bank.

Broad geographic definitions of territory soon became neither natural nor even real. Scholars were divided over whether or not the mountain ranges were administratively impossible to control or little better than rivers, since “both the entrance and the exit of the passes (must be) in the hands of the defending power”.104 This had been demonstrated in British and French experiences, on the Khyber Pass and the range of Atlas respectively, since they had a dynamic of their own and were not fixed lines.105 The French mission civilatrice in the Maghreb was used by Capitaine Dinaux during his Saharan expedition in 1905,106 when he redrew and replaced the ‘chaine du African limes’ on the mountain range from Aures to Tlemcem.107

French scholars remarked that the chronic Anglo-saxon ‘disease’ in studying Roman North Africa had been to believe that Hadrian’s Wall in Britain and the African fossatum were not only the creation of a single mentality (Hadrian’s), but were constructed with the single strategy of forming a barrier line to keep the barbarians out.108 The modern colonisation period gave rise to the perception of the Roman frontier as a splitting element between cultures: beyond it lay another world, different from the known one.109 Nevertheless, this attitude was not just a British prerogative. The commander of the French expedition in North Africa, Capitaine Dinaux, affirmed by his experience that “beyond (the frontier) lay another world

101 Davies 1932:4, 6.
104 Curzon 1907:14.
105 Febvre 1922:330.
107 Mannert 1842.
109 Kipling’s experience is paradigmatic of that feeling. In 1884, the young journalist was shot by a tribesman on the north Indian frontier, by the Khyber Pass, during the Afghan Wars. His Romantic vision was suddenly broken in a mixture of fear and homesickness, brought on by the presence of the enemy beyond it in the outer darkness waiting to attack and his great distance from a sure and protected home. Whittaker 1997:1-2; Carrington 1970:447.
made of barbarian nomads, uncontrollable and uneconomical”.

This idea was profoundly embedded in the unknown world hidden over the frontier, still a sinister ‘Tartar steppe’ of Buzzatian inspiration. This perception has led many historians to accept the classical Weltanschaung that, by adopting the Roman frontier policy, they, like the Greeks, created a world of ‘barbarians’, which Whittaker considered a false stereotype.

1.1.4.1 The ‘scientific frontier’

During the Second Afghan War of 1890, Britain enforced an extraordinary concept on the Indian northern frontier. Lord Roberts struck upon the idea of a ‘scientific frontier’: a strip of land between the Indus and ‘natural line’ of the Sulaiman Mountains. This attempt to push the borders beyond the British territories in India was compared to Rome’s search for a wider frontier and Hadrian’s “regular system of frontier defence” in Britain and Germany. Britain synthesised in this way her collective memory of territorial frontiers, its historical and geographical features: a land divided into rival kingdoms, with no apparent natural divisions. Paradoxically, between England and Scotland lies that most visible of Roman frontiers, which consists of the walls of Hadrian and Antoninus. Lord Roberts insisted that control of the road from Kabul to Kandahar would bring advantages. Indeed, India’s northwest frontier was not a line but a deep zone: administrative, military and political. This large belt encompassed many native tribes “over which we exercise no jurisdiction and only the minimum control”. The impossibility of

---

12 Hartog 1988:207.  
16 Febvre 1970:525. Francis Bacon advised King James in 1605 to adopt the single title of ‘Great Britain’ for the unified crown, on the analogy that in antiquity the single names Graecia, Hispania, etc. carried an ideological message. Foucher 1986:119.  
17 Although they often follow no obvious natural features, the impressive remains appear designed to exclude untamed Scots, building a powerful theme in British political geography of artificial, closed frontiers that drew a moral line between ‘barbaricum’ and civilisation. For example, Davies (1932:6), writing about British India: “Rome fell because the dykes were not strong enough to hold back the flood of barbarian inroads” a lesson, he argued, for great powers that neglect their frontiers”.  
19 Kirk 1979:43; Curzon 1907:40; Davies 1932:13-6; Whittaker 1997:60.
maintaining a ‘zonal’ rather than a ‘linear’ frontier is evident in the position of several strategic ‘lines’ within that area. In 1893, the ‘Durand Line’ coincided with a sort of unstable and predictably undefined, political frontier. Six years later, in 1899, the administration of the new territory, the northwest Frontier Province, was assigned to Lord Curzon, putting him in charge of the relationship between political agents and environmental features. The new Viceroy of India was credited with the most successful attempt made by any administrator to bring stability to the Indian frontier. Despite Lord Curzon’s praise of the scientific frontier – that ‘unites natural and strategic strength’120 –, Roberts’ line was abandoned because no military strategists could agree on its precise location or on how to cover the logistics of its supply.121 Colonel Sir Thomas Holdich continued to consider the mountain ranges the most convenient border, when he identified the best ‘border/zone’ as lying on the northwest Frontier of the Subcontinent.122 The practical experience of the British – gained in the field in India – provided a more real connection between ancient and present, altering the perceptions of frontiers from ‘linear’ to ‘zonal’.

1.1.5 Beyond the colonial experience. Return to Europe

“The advance on the Rhine was the tradition of our ancestors… a true frontier”123

French and British scholars’ theories were profoundly shaken and also stimulated by lessons learnt from the period through the Franco-Prussian War and the two World Wars, when a powerless France suffered three humiliating invasions by Germany. At the beginning and end of every conflict, the borders of Europe, and those along the Rhine frontier, were redrawn, confirming that it had never represented a fixed ‘frontiere naturelle’. The “natural theory of borders” became therefore a blatantly geopolitical construct and the old theories of the Enlightenment were discarded. In this climate, Ratzel’s principles were set on both sides of the Rhine, and such principles became benchmarks fixed by Karl Haushofer, the main

120 Curzon 1907:48-9.
121 The importance of Roberts’ line is before our eyes still today, as it is the actual border between Afghanistan and Pakistan.
122 Holdich (1916) was in charge to draw the borders between Argentina and Chile along the Andes belt, and issued a military manual in 1918.
historical theorist of Germany’s expansion in WWII. Despite his aggressive attitude, he underlined the *Deutsche Lebensraum* (German vital space), claiming that Germany, unlike Rome, had built its frontiers upon zones or marks, not on boundary lines.  

On the other side of Rhine, Lucien Febvre began the process of revisiting French theories on the subject. Although he abandoned the French tradition and ancient texts, and rejected the determinism of natural conditions, Febvre included several comparisons with Rome. Mountains, rivers, and deserts – “promoted to the dignity of being a natural frontier” – were far from being barriers. Conveniently, expansive nations and politicians considered rivers or mountains as geographical markers in their desire to define space. Rome’s *limites* were now viewed in a different light, becoming: “*symbole de crainte ou de domination*” (“a political instrument of imperialism”), an artificial tool of organisation and a base for conquests, not a limitation. Febvre’s theory dismantled the ancient historians’ idea of natural borders and modern scholars’ notions of ‘strategic’ borders, proving they were historically elusive as scientific frontiers: “Natural borders were only conventions imposed by the strong on the weak, and in antiquity they were zones, never lines. There was (as currently still) need for greater study in antiquity of the concept of frontiers as well as their real outline on the ground.”

However, he was historically obliged to accept the Rhine and the Danube as Rome’s natural frontier and to regard the German and the British *limites* both as territorial boundaries and as military barricades of the Roman Empire, long before the advent of the nation-state. Febvre’s legacy was perpetuated by Albert Sorel.

---


125 Montesquieu’s school.

126 Febvre 1922:325-31; Alliès 1980:70.


129 Despite the negation of his ancestor’s convictions, Febvre’s target was Friedrich Ratzel, whose name appears on the first and last page of Febvre 1922.


131 Whittaker 2004:186.
and his disciple Paul Vidal de la Blache, who exploited the victorious end of WWI as an opportunity to once again reference Roman frontiers and Germans. Again, France was approximated to Gaul in terms of its physical extent, its borders matching those of its forerunner as it shared the same fate. Their main question focused on "how the Roman Empire had fallen to or had survived the barbarian invasion over three centuries".

Practical experience in India led British scholars to question key assumptions about the Roman Empire’s frontiers. Some – for instance – pinpointed the Balkan area as one the most complex in Europe, and likewise a constant cause of preoccupation for the Romans. Others – like those from Davies – verged on the absurd, who declared that “Rome fell because her dykes were not strong enough to hold back the flood of barbarian inroads.” Contradicting himself, he also asserts that the ‘Barbarians’ would have been able to cross the Rhine definitively only in 406 AD, when the frozen river permitted en masse to break through to the Empire.

---

132 Lacoste introduction to Korinman 1990:xiii; cf. Vidal de la Blache 1903:263. The first was the teacher of almost all French diplomats; the second is regarded as the father of French geography. Vidal de la Blache, who was working in the recently founded nursery for French diplomats, the Ecole Libre des Sciences Politiques, under Albert Sorel. Sorel himself was a substantial authority on the frontiers of France, important enough to be cited by Marshal Foch and Georges Clemenceau in the border negotiations of 1919.

133 Just as the theories expressed by Ratzel were manipulated by Hitler and his officials, Vidal de la Blanche was later used by General de Gaulle in the reorganisation of French borders after WWII. Despite keeping a portrait of Arminius beside that of Bismarck in the Arbeitszimmer of the Chancellery, Hitler thought that Arminius had been the commander of the Third Roman Legion; Hitler and Bormann 1988:486.

134 Vidal de la Blache 1903: “On répète volontiers que la France, comme la Gaule, s’est assise à cette place en vertu du développement naturel de ses destinées”.

135 Which is roughly different from Gibbon’s (1776) reasons “why the Roman Empire had fallen”.

136 Holdich 1916:289, 500-6; 1918:9. He claimed a process of peace for the Balkan area, foreshadowing the cause of WWI. The weakness of Holdich’s (1916:165-4) Roman history is evident when he claimed that the Antonine Wall in Scotland had been built in AD 80 by Tacitus (sic!). A contemporary study by Fawcett (1918:92-8) suggested a possible solution in the Balkans might be to deport minority populations/ethnic cleansing, no less. The irony is not lost on us when he suggested some international force should be organised “backed by the sword” in order to allow Serbia to form a united Slav state “with a great future before her”.

137 Davies 1932:6.

138 However, new scholarship seems to show that the idea that barbarians would not dare to cross natural frontiers, such as rivers, except when frozen, is an old topos. Hornstein 1957:154-61.
1.1.6 The modern vision: breaking-up with old theories, new visions

The US school had developed different perspectives, even long before the turning point of the WWI. Ellen Semple – one of Ratzel’s disciples – labelled her theory as “The law of the natural growth of states”, after which frontier zones “removed the sharp edge of cultural antagonism”.  

Focussing his attention on Greek colonisation, Turner altered common perceptions of borders. The frontier was rather a ‘state of mind’ that created the constant tendency to expand – an unstable zone, an open gateway without a closed boundary or juridical limit. Lattimore represents the last evolutionary stage of the traditional view of the role of frontiers. He deconstructed the British experience in India and the frontiers of the Roman Empire: the scientific, rational frontier of Curzon’s was deemed as fantasy. Nevertheless, he conceded that the Romans, like the Greeks (and the Chinese), may have had an ideological view of a limite de civilisation. An imperial boundary, he stated, was not solely concerned with keeping out barbarians, but represented the optimum growth of one particular society. The national borders became a compromise between the range of conquest and the economy of rule. However,
the long and contiguous chain of topics and points of view – which connected past and present – was about to be severed. The necessity in recognising and mapping borders became a political issue, so that international controversies could be avoided or solved. The Treatise on International Borders (1945) concisely and incisively stated: “Boundaries and boundary problems have undergone great changes. (…) Even a century and a half ago the international boundary picture bore little resemblance to that of today. In Asia, there were few treaties or other definite lines, but only fluctuating limits of various kingdoms. (…) European boundary concepts have proliferated until they now extend to nearly all.”

The early stage of the bordering practice and demarcation saw rapid precision as it was employed to provide correct, definitive and mainly enduring boundaries to avoid local and international disputes. In the early 1960s, studies on bordering practices were predominantly focused on mapping the demarcation lines which formed the political borders. Developments of new technologies and sophisticated detection devices such as the Global Positioning System (GPS) and its application through Geographic Information Systems (GIS) progressively led to an extreme precision in setting, drawing and delimiting of borders. This method of identifying borders is now universally recognised and politically accepted, with few exceptions, when disputes arise between two states. This process, strictly linked with the mapping of borders, has also led to an overall imaginary stereotype, due to the overlapping of maps with the environmental reality. As a consequence of this, the bordering concepts partially shares the similar and simple definition of a line. This line representing a bordering concept can be traced on maps, can be assumed and,

146 Whittemore Boggs 1945: vi.
147 Whittemore Boggs 1945: vi.
148 Computer hardware development spurred by nuclear weapon research led to general-purpose computer “mapping” applications by the early 1960s. See Fitzgerald 2014.
149 Claussen 2009:257; Sumner 2004; Prakash Sharma 1976. For instance, in order to remain in an historical-archaeological context, a mapping survey in October 1991 showed that the body of the chalcolithic mummy found in the Ötztal (Ötz valley) in the Alps was located 92.56 meters inside Italian territory rather than Austrian. The result was achieved following the geodetic coordinates (46°46′44″N 10°50′23″E / 46.77889°N 10.83972°E) and since 1998 it has been on display at the South Tyrol Museum of Archaeology in Bolzano, Alto Adige, Italy. Information taken from the website of the STMA (= South Tyrol Museum of Archaeology).
150 Boundary is defined as “a line which marks the limits of an area”, whilst a border is considered as “a line separating two countries, administrative divisions, or other areas” (OED 2010).
in some cases, becomes real and effective in transitional areas such as dividing walls and customs houses. The two main consequences of this are: a) from here onward, a bordering concept or practice is now associated with a line, which is intangible and materially “is visible – in exaggerated fashion – only on maps”\textsuperscript{151}; b) the progress made in deconstructing and reconsidering the concept of frontier-as-line was halted, as this concept once again became the status quo.

Lattimore’s influence provided European historians with new instruments of comparison for the reinterpretation of Roman imperial history.\textsuperscript{152} However, the scholars, instead of approaching the problem through a scientific study from the beginning of Rome’s history – as I will do –, explored different areas of study related to the bordering practices. This process led scholars to entertain the Roman perception of bordering practices, without completely grasping their meaning. This cultural attitude has been recognised as overtaking the materialistic sense of the frontier: “Not only a waterway… not only did a palisade isolate the (Barbarians) … but the frontier line was at the same time a line of demarcation between two fundamentally different realms of thought.”\textsuperscript{153} Historical and geographical studies contradicted the old ‘theory’ that Roman expansion was restricted by ‘natural’ or ‘linear boundaries’ such as rivers or walls.\textsuperscript{154} The landscape perspective led to what was called the ‘ludicrous misunderstanding’ that Augustus’ expansionist drive to the Elbe was in defence of the line of the Rhine frontier.\textsuperscript{155}

Social and cultural constructions of historical and political frontiers were removed from the focus of research at this time, despite the significance of borders in the representation of power. The frontier became “a process rather than a fixed

\textsuperscript{151} Van Gennep 1909:15,
\textsuperscript{152} See, for example Williams 1996:670, describing Hun spatial identity – “The system of outer walls was never a permanent or tidy barrier separating mobile herders from sedentary farmers The imposing barricades functioned more like a screen than an envelope, because they allowed for economic and cultural exchange. (on) the edge of two soil zones. The walls clearly served as a visible ideological marker of domesticated space…”
\textsuperscript{153} Alföldi 1952:1; Whittaker 1997:8
\textsuperscript{155} Rice Holmes 1931:2.164-5; Wells 1972:152; Whittaker 1994:3.
geographical region”. More importantly, henceforth the frontier was a source of continual adaptation. Archaeologists shifted the arguments towards symbolism and ideology, due to the evidence gained by intense excavations of hundreds of imperial forts across Europe, Africa and the Near East. Archaeology revolutionised the flow of information, and the focus of interest shifted from where the frontiers were located to what function they served, changing the terms of the debate. They could, in other words, be studied both objectively and subjectively. Theories on borders and boundaries were suddenly put aside to make room for the concept of frontier, supported by the ‘post-processual’ archaeology. Finally, scholars rightly concluded that frontiers were imprecise, and more ‘zonal’ than linear.

The majority of the remains of frontiers and their discoveries were mostly from the period of Late Antiquity and the early Middle Ages, and profound but disparate changes were taking place within this discipline. It was inevitable that similarities and differences were going to form, as scholars undertook parallel but independent studies comparing the works of ancient authors such as Eutropius, Ammianus Marcellinus and Procopius with excavation data and cultural differences across modern state frontiers. Within many of these studies, the written evidence was taken at face value, with the archaeological outcomes confirming in detail the Roman record of defence policy. Most historians began to rely wholly on archaeological analysis and the field of *Limesforschung* became a sort of annual institutional meeting. In spite of these advances, early surveys and archaeological

---

156 It is a quotation of Turner in one of his letters dated to 1920s, cited by Worster 1987:154; cf. See Nichols 1986.
158 Papagno 1987; 64; Alliès 1980:32-3.
159 See i.e. Barth 1969: 10-38; Lightfoot, Kent & Martinez 1995.
161 Recently scholars came to question the traditional concept of frontier: Schneider 1993:51-68; Drinkwater 1996:20-30; Berend 1999:54-72; Abulafia 2002:1-34. See also Pohl 2001:11-8, and Pohl 2001:17-41. Medievalists were the first to appropriate Turner’s approach. As early as the 20th century, Thompson (1913:490-504) applied the frontier thesis to the study of German medieval frontiers; cf. Lewis 1958:475-83. The most remarkable application of a fundamentally ‘Turnerian’ approach in recent studies is Bartlett 1993. For Roman frontiers, see Dyson 1974:277-83. By contrast, historians of Byzantium were slow in responding to this challenge, but the situation is rapidly changing. See Papadopoulos 1975:415-19; Stephenson 2000; Curta 2005a:4.
excavations confirmed that Roman frontiers were not – politically or militarily, – rigid barriers.\textsuperscript{164} the \textit{Grand Strategy of the Roman Empire}\textsuperscript{165} explained this point, giving rise to harsh debates among ancient historians.\textsuperscript{166}

In the late 1980s, a considerable amount of archaeological and field data were available and this, combined with the diversity of chronological and geographical focus within contributors' research papers, opened interdisciplinary and comparative dialogues and new scenarios in the study of frontiers.\textsuperscript{167} An attempt to give a modern reading of the Roman frontier, with excellent results, has been undertaken by Whittaker.\textsuperscript{168} The theorised Roman \textit{limes} illuminating the main points of the argument, which assumed the presence of a ‘limit’ of the Roman Empire and focussed attention on a potential absence of bordering practices in the Early Empire, and a strong presence in the Late Empire. Detailed studies could and still do take this approach much further; at various points in time, barriers broke into pieces, each with its own history of utter destruction. Inevitably, however, the strength of emphasis on the military aspects of the frontier tended to limit the focus of attention to only those details around forts and within them.\textsuperscript{169}

At the present time, publications on frontiers have begun examining the Roman territoriality and its spatiality, often comparing it with the ever-changing European situation – both political and economic – in order to grasp the political evolution of the city.\textsuperscript{170} Different views are held on how to approach and study the ‘non-synonymous words’: e.g., vehement attacks have been made on the idea that the Roman \textit{limes} was a frontier line.\textsuperscript{171} The orthodox perception of Roman frontiers,

\textsuperscript{164} Concept expressed firstly by Webb (1953:31), affirming that a frontier is not “a line to stop at, but an area inviting entrance”, therefore not a boundary. However, the apex of this process was touched with Lattimore in his masterpiece, where the frontier, still an immense barrier, assumed new features, becoming elastic and receptive in its structure, but always ready to repel continuously the invasions.

\textsuperscript{165} Luttwak 1976.


\textsuperscript{167} Curta 2005a:8

\textsuperscript{168} Whittaker 1997.

\textsuperscript{169} E.g. Bülow & Alexandra 1999.

\textsuperscript{170} Note, for example, Austria’s enthusiasm for the European Union as a means of embracing ethnically diverse links; Barker 1998. Italy established ‘Euroregions’ (Eurodioceses or euroregions) as a solution to age-old problems of frontiers in the Tyrol and Istria; Strassoldo 1998.

\textsuperscript{171} E.g., Haubrichs & Schneider 1993; Power & Standen 1999; Pohl, Wood & Reimitz 2001; Abulafia & Berend 2002. Berend (2002:201) argues that “on a conceptual level, even if not in a practical
which influenced early modern European ideology is now in turn being transformed
by the reality of European history. Spatiality and ‘line negationism’ were possibly
inspired by comparisons with the recent developing situation in Europe.\textsuperscript{172} The
collapse of the Iron Curtain forced scholars to redefine borders from a perspective
different to that of ‘military control’. The political changes of the last twenty-five
years – the disaggregation of the Soviet Union and its political aftermath – has
arguably seen a shift from ‘border studies’ to ‘boundary studies’. The Yugoslavian
Wars and their aftermath moved toward ethnic solutions, revealing a repeatedly
demonstrated instability of the Balkan area, as the tragic events in Bosnia and
Kosovo have shown. The debate has moved away from the study of the evolution
and changes of the territorial line to the border, now perceived as a spatial element,
through which socio-spatial differences are communicated. In other words, more
attention has been paid to the space rather than the boundary itself through the
analysis of comparisons between different (overlapping) contexts, such as: political,
environmental, linguistic and especially cultural.\textsuperscript{173}

1.1.7 Conclusions

Just twenty years ago, when Western Europe was discussing the abolition of
economic and political borders, the conference of Saarbrücken opened with ‘the
concept of border’ which, despite being a topical issue, saw several contributors
referring back to Roman history.\textsuperscript{174} The conference represented a watershed, in
which the issue of borders and boundaries was directly addressed, reversing – very
slowly – the process ‘from borders to frontiers’ back to ‘from frontiers to borders’.\textsuperscript{175}
Frontiers and boundaries were now perceived as historically less permanent and
geographically more complex than once thought, without any necessary evolution

\textsuperscript{172} Note, for example, Prescott 1987:45, or Foucher 1986:75, asserting that, unlike the Great Wall of
China, the Roman walls in Britain and Germany were closed frontiers in a system of defence, despite
citing Lattimore.

\textsuperscript{173} Van Houtum 2005:1; Hettlage and Deger 2006.

\textsuperscript{174} Haubrichs & Schneider 1993; Whittaker 2004:191-3.

\textsuperscript{175} Schneider 1993:51-68.
from one to the other. From here, research has been pushed in two directions: a) the simplification of the bordering concept and practice as a ‘delimitation line’ began to be overturned, and b) the identification of borders has been bypassed through the exploration of new perspectives. Scholars have altered their field studies from the concept of line to that of plane, analysing the content (space) of the borders rather than its delimiting container (boundaries).

The Roman *limes* ceased to be a linear frontier; instead of being understood as a fortified system of erected structures, the study of the distribution of forts and other fortified sites along or across natural frontiers focussed instead on the network of roads which they created. Archaeology shows clearly that they were neither restraints to expansion nor defensive barriers, but lines of communication and supply. The break-up of the ‘frontier-as-barrier’ concept, as expressed by Procopius, was now viewed as a literary construct and an element of propaganda. Badie made use of Roman history to legitimise his argument: a multi-ethnic, supra-territorial power must figure somewhere as a solution in the search for new solidarities. Frontiers become less important than acculturation, and the notion of territoriality also fell out of favour. The *limes* turned into a channel of communication and exchange of information between populations living on either side; a deep zone including the supporting provinces and, in some cases, even territories over the frontier. Natural frontiers came under attack: earlier, as natural barriers, they separated one world from another; now they had become vital arteries of cultural dialogue. They, with political frontiers, were key elements in the ‘creation’ – as opposed to ‘separation’ – of ethnic groups. That was the place,

---

177 E.g. Talbert & Brodersen 2004.
178 Much of this work of revision was done by Isaac 1990. See also Miller 1996:162. For the meaning of *limes*, see Isaac 1988:125-47.
179 Curta 2005a:2.
180 Badie 1995.
area or zone, for the construction of cultural identity and the process of political mobilisation.183

This section has provided both the scholarship approach to the study of ancient bordering practice, and a consistent stimulus for reflection – a sort of launch pad for this investigation. I undertook this introductive and retrospective walkthrough in order to understand the disputes and differences linked with the diverse national perspectives, terminologies, acceptations and problems encountered.184

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LANGUAGE TERMS</th>
<th>GERMANY</th>
<th>ITALY</th>
<th>FRANCE</th>
<th>ENGLAND</th>
<th>US</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>hóros (gr.)</td>
<td>Horizont</td>
<td>orizzonte</td>
<td>horizon</td>
<td>Horizon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>péras (gr.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>limes, limen (lat.)</td>
<td>limite</td>
<td>limite</td>
<td>Limit</td>
<td>Limit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>finis, confinium (lat.)</td>
<td>confine</td>
<td>confines</td>
<td>confine</td>
<td>Confine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>terma (gr.)</td>
<td>termine</td>
<td>terme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>terminus (lat.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>borna (lat.)</td>
<td>borne</td>
<td></td>
<td>bound</td>
<td>bound</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>granica (slav.)</td>
<td>Grenze</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macha/Marka (germ./got.)</td>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>marca</td>
<td>marche</td>
<td>Marche</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mörk (germ. = Wald)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>frons (lat.)</td>
<td>Schranke</td>
<td>frontiera</td>
<td>frontière</td>
<td>frontier (1-3)</td>
<td>frontier (1-4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 – Terminology derivated from ancient language as reflected into modern western languages (adapted from Böckler 2007:30).

In particular TABLE 2 shows: a) the translation or adaptation of ancient terms into different languages; b) the list of acceptations and definitions given to the ‘non synonymous words’; c) the low consideration given to the term finis; d) the very specific definition in modern terminology. The assimilation between frontiers/limes and borders has caused several problems, which it is necessary to bear in mind during the course of the study: a) the word frontier/limes is the most commonly used

183 Curta 2005a:2-3. 5. More recently, the pressure exerted by wandering populations upon the limes in the later Roman Empire finds a striking analogy with the European Union facing similar pressures by immigrants from Africa, the Middle East and the Balkans, demonised as the new ‘barbarians’. See King 1998. The same notion is expressed in Rufin 1991.

184 The need to have a clear definition of terminology is not just an English-speaking issue: cf. Böckler 2006:39-44.
term in the hierarchy of the bordering concepts;\textsuperscript{185} b) potential developments in the concept of bordering have been left aside, neglecting the term \textit{finis};\textsuperscript{186} c) authors and scholars have a tendency to equate the frontier with geographical elements and link them to the ‘scientific frontier’ as defensive mechanisms; d) the exploitation of the concept of frontier for political ends; e) the fact that modern studies have focussed their attention mainly on the Roman Empire and not on the Republic;\textsuperscript{187} f) the lack of a comprehensive and overall study of the notion of ‘non-synonymous’ categories according to their original meanings; g) up to the invention of GIS / GPS, the superimposing of natural features with ‘bordering concepts’.

\textbf{1.2 \textit{Finis}, the term}

This section is divided into three main subsections: the first explains the linguistic implication of the word, etymology, translation and features;\textsuperscript{1.2.1} the second part presents the raw data based on a quantitative and qualitative assessment, from which it is possible to draw some conclusions;\textsuperscript{188}[1.2.2] the third part is dedicated to the context in which the word and concept of finis are embedded, the Augustan Era in which Livy lived.[1.2.3]

By providing a general definition of \textit{finis} both from the ancient and modern point of view.\textsuperscript{189} This analysis will facilitate a reconstructive process leading to the last section, in which I will attempt to rebuild the development of the term within the missing books of \textit{AUC}. By cross-referencing the data between the two sections, it will also be possible to present the data in a more graphic format with the exploitation of graphs and charts, allowing me to visualise some major points of the

\textsuperscript{185} The concept of frontier has been taken for granted and assimilated to border and boundary. However, still in late sources the term \textit{finis} is used and in some cases preferred to \textit{limes}. A 5th century manual chose the term \textit{finis} to indicate the frontier road line (cf. Ps.-Boethius, \textit{Grom.Vet. 401.8L: viae militares finem faciunt}) and the Justinian’s decree ordered the restitution of the African \textit{fines} in the 6th century (Cod. Just. 1.17-4). Cf. Bowersock, Lamont Brown and Grabar 1999:543.

\textsuperscript{186} Only a couple of times has a comparison between \textit{limes} and \textit{fines} been made: Bowersock, Lamont Brown and Grabar 1999:543 and Drijvers 2009:20.

\textsuperscript{187} Dyson 1985 is an exception to the chronic lack of assessments and studies on the Republic.

\textsuperscript{188} The data and the results of this assessment need to be compared to and superimposed upon the internal subdivision of \textit{AUC}.

\textsuperscript{189} The guidelines for the methodological research have been provided by Sini 1991:47.
development of the conceptualised use of finis. Through this assessment, I shall highlight the usage of finis and the importance of the visualisation of the surrounding material environment. This methodology is essential to help identify historical evidence of different occurrences of fines offered by Livy, not all of which will be explicit. This is because his topographical references often relate to specific areas, in which fines may be detected through comparisons with other passages.

1.2.1 The linguistic nature and character of finis

Investigating the etymology of the term finis is somewhat of a challenge, as the origins of the word seem to be quite confusing. The oldest etymology of finis derives from Isidore of Seville in the 6th century AD, who connects finis with the word funis (rope). The word finis is also too often and sometimes exclusively associated with land properties and with boundary signs (termini). Probably, ‘its primitive character’ and the evanescent value of the finis justify the intimate connection between finis and terminus (which means both ‘land marker’ and divinity) as Varro and Paulus Diaconus have shown. The late texts put

---


191 Is. Siv. Orig. 15.14.1, links finis with funis: “Fines dicti eo quod agri funiculis sint divisi”. The title of the paragraph is ‘de finibus agrorum’. Probably, Isidorus got the information from the literary tradition of Agrimensores; Fontaine (1959:402, n. 3) and more recently Behrends (1985:88,n. 87) support the notion that Isodore preserved “les restes d’art gromatique”.

192 E.g. Cels. Dig. 41.2.18.2. Schanbaker 2004:428.

193 The taking out of the terminus from the ground was considered sacer (= course), s. Paul. Fest. 505.20-1L. Schanbaker 2004:428.


196 Paul. Fest. 505L: “Termino sacra faciebant, quod in eius tutela fines agrorum esse putabant. Denique Numa Pomplilus statuit, eum, qui terminum exarasset, et ipsum et boves sacros esse” and Plutarchus (Num. 16.1-2: Πρώτων δὲ φοιν καὶ Πιτεως καὶ Τέρμωνος ιερὸν ἱδρύσασθαι, καὶ τὴν μὲν Πίστιν ὅρκον ἀποδεῖξαι Ῥωμαίοις μέγιστον, ὥ χρώμενοιέχρι γύν διατελοῦσιν ὃ δὲ Τέρμων ὅρος ἀν τις εἶ, καὶ τύνιν αὐτῶ δησαία καὶ ιδίᾳ κατὰ τούς τῶν ἀγρῶν περιορισμῶς, γύν μὲν ἔμψυχα, τὸ παλαιόν δὲ ἀναίμακτος ἤ ἡ θυσία, Νομά φιλοσφήσαντος ὡς χρή τὸν ὄριον θέον
emphasis on the regulation of the *finis* between private landowners.\(^{197}\) Although they do not provide the earliest meaning of the word – leaving the origins of *finis* still uncertain – later authors such as Isidore add a physical description and interesting features, crucial to my study:

\[
\text{Finium regundorum actio dicta eo, quod per eam regantur fines utrique, ne dissipentur, dummodo non angustiore quinque pedum loco ea controversia sit.}
\]

The action of *finis* drawing (*fines regundi*) is so called because through it the *finis* of each party may be drawn (*regere*), lest they be blurred, as long as the disagreement does not concern a place narrower than five feet.

Although Isidore lived more than five centuries after Livy, his is not a late construction: at least one feature of *finis* was already present in the law of Twelve Tables.\(^{199}\) According to the surviving text in the Twelve Tables,\(^{200}\) the *finis* between two properties had a ridge width of five feet for each side, which could not be acquired\(^{201}\) and called *arcifinium*.\(^{202}\) As we will see, this last concept is key to the present study, in order to understand the acceptation(s) of *finis* and its use in Livy. However, it is not without controversy. Scholars such as Leonhard have expressed doubt as to whether a *finis* should be considered as a standing line or a strip of land five feet wide.\(^{203}\) Indeed, the issue of whether or not *finis* was a built strip, a cultivable area, or a common area to be ploughed, was already an area of debate.

---

\(^{197}\) The *fines* adjustment suit (*actio finium regundorum*) was an action *in personam* (against an individual) and yet it was also *pro vindicatio rei* (an action concerning the handing over of property). It concerned in particular rural properties, occasionally also large gardens in Rome (*controversia de modo or de loco*). See Frontin. *Contr. Agr.* 1.9.2; Hygin. *Gen. Contr.* 1.126L; Paul. *Dig.* 10.1.1-2; Ulp. *Dig.* 10.1.4.10; Mod. *Dig.* 10.1.7. Cf. Leonhard 1909:2325; Schanbaker 2004:428-9.

\(^{199}\) Isid. *Orig.* 5.25.11.


\(^{200}\) Tab. VII.4. Schanbaker 2004:428.


\(^{202}\) Ager *arcifinius*: land on the periphery of the roman territory, which was occupied informally. It was unsurveyed, with irregular boundaries usually demarcated by natural features. The name may be derived from *arceo* in the sense of ‘warding off’ the enemy, or from *arcus* in the sense of ‘wavy’ or ‘curving’. This land was sometimes identified with *(ager) occupatorius*. Cf. Campbell 2000:499.

among Roman authors.\textsuperscript{204} The ancient definitions of \textit{finis} seem also to be confused among the \textit{agrimensores}: the extremity is a defined line (\textit{extremitas finitima linea est}).\textsuperscript{205} Schulten proposed that \textit{finis} “\textit{non è un concetto materiale, bens\'e matematico, al pari della linea e del punto}” (“is not a concrete concept, but a mathematical one, as well as the line and the point”).\textsuperscript{206} This definition of \textit{finis} as flat line contrasts with both the definition from Isidore of Seville (see above) and that of Hygin, who states that:

\begin{quote}
\textit{de fine si ageretur, quae res intra pedum quinque aut sex latitudinem questionem habet.}
\end{quote}

about the \textit{finis} we can conclude, that whatever happens between five or six feet of width leads to controversies.\textsuperscript{207}

Although Isidore’s connection between \textit{finis} and \textit{funis} is supported among modern linguists,\textsuperscript{208} doubts still remain about the primitive, original and concrete features of \textit{finis}.\textsuperscript{209} Horace considered Silvanus to be the protecting divinity of the \textit{fines}.\textsuperscript{210} As \textit{tutor finium} and \textit{custos} (guardian),\textsuperscript{211} Silvanus had the task of defending the realm of agriculture and domestic life from untamed wilds: he was the overseer of boundaries separating the farm from the woods.\textsuperscript{212} From this perspective, the \textit{finis} needed real or material elements to be identified, such as trees or \textit{termini}, which formed the point of this imaginary line, as Varro stresses in his \textit{concepta verba} of the formula made on the \textit{auguraculum capitolinum}.\textsuperscript{213}[2.2.7; esp. 3.5] There are general features and attributes of the term \textit{finis}, which will be relevant for my investigation. In the next section I consider the more specific features of \textit{finis}.

\begin{footnotes}
\item[204] Leonhard 1909:2326.
\item[205] Frontin. 41.15L; cf. Hygin. 126.9-11.
\item[206] Schulten 1922; see also Cipriano 1983:54.
\item[207] Hygin. 126.4; cf. Front. (39.24) writes about the \textit{Lex Mamilia} referring to \textit{‘fini latitudinem’}. Leonhard 1909:2326.
\item[209] Ernoult & Meillet (1979:236) affirm that: “\textit{Il est difficile de dire ce que finis désignait primitivement, mais le caractère matériel de finis n’est pas douteux}”. See again Bauer 1927:788; Leonhard 1909:2325.
\item[210] Hor. \textit{Epop.} 2.21-2: “\textit{ua munereetur te, Priape, et te ater Silane, tutor finium}”.
\item[211] CIL VI.310, 640; CIL XI.7560; Panciera 1991:no. 246 (Rome); cf. Dorcey 1992:159.
\item[213] Cf. Varro \textit{L.L.} 7.8-9.
\end{footnotes}
I have shown a lack of extensive studies of the term finis, and how it differs from other bordering concepts.[1.3] The primary modern definitions given for finis come from the philological and philosophical field. Leo has proposed an etymological similarity between the term finis and the Italian word ‘border’ (confine), stressing the fact that the Italian word ‘indicates something “that has an end (a limit) in common”.214 Richardson provides a ‘capable notion’ of the term finis as ‘frontier’. He adds to one of the main issues in this research, by saying that this notion has a “wide spectrum of significance, meaning and context”;215 though he does not go on to explore this spectrum. Da Costa,216 like Richardson,217 also seems to connect the term finis to the Roman provincial boundaries, providing a translation for finis (limit) and a contrasting comparison with limes (boundary).218 The general agreement on its common acceptation or translation is ‘border’ and its related terminology ‘boundary, limit, end’.219 Scholars and translators also mainly agree on its meaning of ‘territory’ when used in the plural form.220 But, in my opinion, this translation renders an ineffective idea of the political and geographical space and confuses the reader. Livy has a specific word for ‘territory’, which is ager and which differs from finis. Campbell,221 instead, provides a definition from translation, which is not satisfactory, but adds an interesting feature to finis: “(Plural) land or territory within special limits”. Other acceptations of finis, which it is beneficial to compare with Livy’s usage, are: a) legal remedy,222 b) legal concept,223 c) behaviour,224 sum,225 amount226 or end.227

---

214 Leo 2012: 17 and introduction.
215 Richardson 2011:1.
216 Da Costa 2009.
217 Richardson 2011.
218 Cacciari (2007:277) has shown this striking dichotomy between finis and limes; cf. Da Costa 2009:51.
220 See Bauer 1927. The collective sense of the plural of finis is predominant (Caes. BG v. 46. 4: “ad fines Nerviorum veniet”; BG v. 54. 2: “usque ad fines insecuti”); there is somewhat of a distributive sense in Cic. Phil. 13. 14: “fines imperii”. The singular in the sense of “border” is usually the defined singular (Liv. 7.19.9: “ad finem Tusculanum”; cf. Liv. 38. 15.10 and Cic. Phil. 6.5). For the undefined singular see Bauer 1927:798, s. “sine fine”.
221 Campbell 2000:500.
222 ‘Actio’, in figurative sense: Dig. 47.4.1.2.
223 ‘Culpa lata’, Dig. 50.16.223.
225 Gai. Inst. 4.57.
226 Dig. 50.16.124.
227 ‘Litium, vitae’: Dig. 41.10.5 pr.; 36.1.67.1. Schanbaker 2004:429; Campbell 2000:500.
In order to understand the basic principles and features of the finis, we have to consider that its specific character can be applied to private and public contexts. In other words, the nature of finis might be distinguished as being either land delimited by a natural feature or land measured out. The acceptance of finis linked with interstate law and occurring as a geo-political limit has remained less considered. The main feature of arcifinium is comparable to the concept of postliminium, where the application of finis to interstate law will become one of the main concerns of this study. The two Roman concepts above are key elements when they are used by sovereign states informed Roman diplomatic practice. Yet scholars have preferred to set aside the interstate specification of borders – especially ‘shared borders’ – in treaties. What is important to bear in mind is the existence for the Romans of a zonal area, abutted and belonged to the finis, representing a key element in this process of investigation.

1.2.2 Collecting data

The detailed work of Schafter has served as the basic template for my data collection methodology. By analysing Livy’s translation from Ph. Hollands, Schafter arranges the passages of AUC by subject and, although his work is limited

---

229 ‘Finis provinciae’, ‘finis patriae’: Dig. 1.18.15; 47.18.1.1. Schanbaker 2004:429.
230 Completely ignored by Leonhard 1909.
231 The concept of postliminium created a ‘grey area’ between allied and client states on the one hand, and foreign and hostile powers on the other. Marcus Antistus Labeo (Dig. 49.15.30) – Livy’s contemporary – asserts that slaves should be understood as having returned by postliminium as soon as they escaped from the enemy and “began to be within the borders of our empire” (Si id, quod nostrum hostes ceperunt, eius generis est, ut postliminio redire possit: simul atque ad nos redeundi causa profugit ab hostibus et intra fines imperii nostri esse coepit, postliminio redisse existimandum est). Paulus (Dig. 49.15.19.3) later qualified this view: to be sure, “a person is understood to have returned by postliminium when he enters into our borders, just as a person is lost when he departs our borders”, but “a person should also be understood to have returned by postliminium who comes to an allied or friendly community or an allied or friendly king” (Postliminio redisse videtur, cum in fines nostros intraverit, sicuti amittitur, ubi fines nostros exessit. sed et si in civi tatem sociam amicamve aut ad regem socium vel amicum venerit, statim postliminio redisse videtur, quia ibi primum nomine publico tus es esse incipiat).
232 Ando 2008:505.n.36: e.g., see Liv. 21.2.7 (“Cum hoc Hasdrubale, quia mirae artis in sollicitandis gentibus imperioque suo iungendis fuerat, foedus renouauerat populus Romanus ut finis utriusque imperii esset amnis Hiberus Saguntinisque medii inter imperia duorum populo rum libertas seruaret”) and 34.58.2-3 (describing negotiations between Flamininus and Antiochus, to be contrasted with the conditions imposed after Antiochus’ defeat: 38.38.2-4). For a skeptical position regarding the concept of the border in the debates leading up to the Second Punic War, see Brunt 1990:300.
233 Schafter 1910.
Chapters 1. Finis. Project and research

to only a few instances, he succeeds in categorising several subjects present in Livy. Besides serving as a template for my investigation, Schafter’s work is also useful for other reasons such as: a) common meanings and acceptations of translations found in passages considered in this study; b) analysis of specific categories, applicable to this study; c) provision of interesting elements of analysis, otherwise not considered. The Finnish school also presents an advanced method for data collection, although it is still limited to visual statistics. Kajanto and especially Viljamaa used tables and lists to provide data on the presence of the infinitive in Livy’s Books. The procedure I will follow is similar to Viljamaa’s, e.g. in highlighting the use of the term finis and its derivatives in every Book of AUC. However, his method is limited to collection and collation of data, with little explanation given of the practical uses of such lists. [APPENDIX 1]In order to visualise the data in relation to the historical timeline of events in the Livian narration, I will implement this method, then present the data in graphical forms (charts and diagrams).

[APPENDIX 2]A table shows the primary framework for an analytic assessment of the data. In this summary table, the term finis is connected with its identifiable features, in order to provide methods for evaluation. Without doubt, Livy uses the term fines much more frequently than any other Latin author: the word finis appears 372 times – 157 in singular form and 215 in plural. [FIG 3]Finis appears in AUC in all cases of declension: 53 times as finis (nom., gen., voc. sing.), 96 as finem (acc. sing), 8 as fine (abl. sing.), 120 fines (nom., acc., voc. plur.), 24 finium (gen. plur.); and 71 finibus (dat., abl. plur.).[FIG 4] Moreover, the term appears a further five times (all of them as fines) in the ‘Periochae’ and once in a fragment. But before analysing the term finis as ‘land marker’, it is necessary to draw a particular distinction: in AUC, the term finis has chiefly two main acceptations (A and B). Although conceptually part of the same framework, the two acceptations require a distinction. The first acceptation (A) refers to resolution of a temporal event, such as a speech, a pursuit, a war or a day. The second acceptation (B)

234 See Kajanto 1967; Viljamaa 1983.
237 Fragmentum in cod. palimps. Uaticano servatum.
incorporates the plethora of ‘non-synonymous categories’ in a political, geographical or topographical context. Roughly and summarily this second acceptation might be likened to the translation of boundary, only with different nuances of meaning.\textsuperscript{238} 

*Finis* as defined under category (A) and related to the ‘end of something’ is used by Livy 116 times, always in the singular case. Due to the temporal usage of *finis* in these instances, acceptation (A) has been deemed non-useful for the purpose of this research, which is only concerned with the reconstructive process of identification of the term *finis* as ‘land marker’. In this way, the number of usable instances, defined under category (B), drops to 256, which still leaves a sufficient number of cases to undertake an elaborate and appropriate study. Its translation can be identify with one of the concepts of bordering, but with different shades.[FIG 5, 6]

The second step of the research is to identify and distinguish the acceptation (B) of *finis* under ten different subcategories: (B\textsubscript{1})-(B\textsubscript{10}). This is necessary due to the broad number of contexts within which Livy uses the term *finis* as ‘land marker’, linking it with geography, topography and natural features. In other words, the ten main subcategories (named B\textsubscript{1}-B\textsubscript{10}) relate directly to the idea of ‘plane’ – in the sense of surrounding space – and ‘line’, as limit of the same space. Before continuing, it is worth reminding ourselves of the geometrical notion of *finis* provided by Shulten, where a mathematical concept is juxtaposed with natural features.\textsuperscript{239} These diverse typologies of *fines* (B) have been quantitatively listed as:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FINIS TYPE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>N. of CASES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B\textsubscript{1}</td>
<td>NATURAL / ENVIRONMENTAL / GEOGRAPHICAL FEATURE</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B\textsubscript{2}</td>
<td>DELIMITING SACRED AREAS AS A TEMPLUM</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B\textsubscript{3}</td>
<td>PART OF THE FETIALS’ RITUAL</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{238} Although the verb form appears only once (Vitr. 64.20: “terminavi finitionibus”, “I defined the limits”), the use of the substantive *terminatio* occurs thirteen times in Vitruvius. In five of these it means ‘limits’ (36.24: *finire terminationibus*, cf. 64.20: *terminavi finitionibus*; and 28.8; 67.20; 112.6; 113.21); ‘end’ in 103.13; ‘terminating point’ in 135.21; ‘boundary’ in 203.5, 232.2; ‘departments’ in 12.8; ‘extremities’ 111.2; ‘rules’ or ‘laws’ in 155.16; ‘scope’ in 32.28. Cf. Morgan 1909:174.

\textsuperscript{239} Cf. section 1.3.1.
Table 3 – *Fines* B₁-B₁₀: ‘labels’ and quantitative subdivision. [FIG 7, 8; APPENDIX 2]

However, a given categorisation is not always schematically and strictly applied to one subcategory. In a few cases, the definition of *finis* might fall into more than one category, fluctuating between two or three of them and sharing different labels. In these cases, the exact detection and classification of some *fines* in one category rather than another has been possible through the matching (or mismatching) of different categorisations: the use of singular or plural, the related verbs or the prepositions used. Conversely, sometimes Livy’s descriptions related to *fines* are extremely detailed, allowing for a precise classification. The crucial parallels between the term *finis* and territorial elements provided by Livy might also help us, through his terminology, to understand the expansionistic process of Republican Rome and its territorial expansion in sensitive areas.

### 1.2.3 *Fines* and structure in *AUC*

In this section, I briefly provide an assessment of *AUC*, in order to understand its construction and internal subdivisions. This process is useful for matching these subdivisions within the *AUC* with the observed incidence of the word *finis* throughout the whole text. [FIG 9] Despite the fact that roughly 107 of 142 Books
(75%) of *AUC* have been lost,²⁴⁰ the surviving 35 Books still provide enough material to facilitate a reasonable study.

Livy has been accused of failing to impose a large-scale vision upon his history, contrasting with Polybius’ interpretation of historical developments.²⁴¹ This view argues, in its extreme form, that Livy’s conception of history is a series of unconnected, isolated scenes, which stress unchanging values.²⁴² Attempts to perceive large-scale unity in *AUC* have been based on the simple recurrence of a single historical topic or on elaborate structural symmetry.²⁴³ Although no reader would notice any unifying structure within *AUC*, Lipovksy has shown that every chapter represents a monadic element by itself.²⁴⁴ The chapters seem to be arranged in a ‘crescendo’ of narration, which usually leads to a final event of immense magnitude in Roman history. Lipovsky argues that Book 1 asserts the greatness of Rome and anticipates the themes of the other books.²⁴⁵ Ogilvie has extended this conception (Burck’s view), assigning to every chapter a single skill within them: *libertas* – Book 2; *modestia* – Book 3; *moderatio* – Book 4; *pietas* – Book 5.²⁴⁶ It is reasonably clear that Livy composed his work episode by episode without planning ahead and was controlled by his sources.²⁴⁷ However, Luce’s work shows also that Livy chose particular events for detailed treatment at the start, arguing that such careful ‘architecture’ can only be achieved by planning substantially in advance.²⁴⁸ As Walsh had already reported, *AUC* is divided by decades and pentads.²⁴⁹ Luce, following the results from the book edited by Dorey, proposed a series of major subdivisions.²⁵⁰ He argued that *AUC* could be given

---

²⁴⁰ *AUC* originally comprised 142 ‘books’ (*libri*) which in modern terminology would be considered ‘chapters’. Thirty-five of these – Books 1-10 with the Preface and Books 21-45 – still exist in reasonably complete form. Damage to a manuscript of the 5th century resulted in large gaps (*lacunae*) in Books 41 and 43-45.

²⁴¹ Burck 1934, for the view which he refuted; see Witte 1910:418-9.

²⁴² Lipovsky 1979:1. The reference is to Syme (1963:148) and Walsh (1961:ix); the former speaks of “no instinct for historical structure” and the latter of “his inability to impose upon the historical material an organised design, a sense of control, and an acutely personal vision such as Polybius and Tacitus manifest”.

²⁴³ Lipovsky 1979: pref.

²⁴⁴ Lipovsky 1979.


²⁴⁶ Ogilvie 1965.

²⁴⁷ Luce 1977:xv-xxv.

²⁴⁸ Lipovsky 1979:3.

²⁴⁹ Walsh 1974:8.

uniformity and unity through subdivision by topic. [FIG 10] Books 1-15: Early Rome, with Books 1-5 forming a unit from the Founding to the Gallic Sack (and with yet further subdivisions, composed of Book 1: the Regal Period (Kings’ Age), and Books 2-5: the Early Republic). Books 6-15: The Conquest of Italy, devoted to the period from the Gallic crisis to the outbreak of the Punic wars. Books 16-30: The Punic Wars, with Books 16-20 covering the First Punic War and its aftermath, and Books 21-30 covering the Second Punic War with a meticulous internal structure. Books 31-45: Wars in the East, with Books 31-35 covering the Second Macedonian War, Books 36-40 covering the Wars in Greece and with Antiochus, and Books 41-45 covering the Third Macedonian War. The internal subdivision of any single book, or section, is composed on the basis of a single source. However, it is important to underline that the lack of Books 45 onwards impedes the complete vision of the bordering practices in Livy. This part will be integrated into the research by way of a reconstructive process in the last chapter of this work. This architectural plan has been highlighted in Livy’s emphasis of major scenes responding to a symmetrical architecture so common in Augustan authors. Such precise Livian subdivision, when married with the raw data, has allowed for a visual approach to the magnitude of the terminology on crucial events in Rome’s Republican history.

The communicative function of the text and Livy’s linguistic competence has constituted the basis for several studies, mainly in the last thirty years since the narrative value of Livy’s work has been re-evaluated. From the way AUC has

251 Ogilvie 1965:30; Burck 1934; Briscoe 1966:2.
252 Stadter 1972:294; it was already noted that there is no clear break of subject between Book 10 and 11, see Briscoe 1966:1.
254 Burck 1966:30 ff.
259 Lipovsky 1979:10.
been structured, the reader can hardly recognise different text-types or verbal
features. It is therefore a scholar’s task to render this recognition possible: in the
study of a text, it is not just the linguistic aspects but also the structure and, in the
last thirty years, it has been argued that even the approach to the study of the
narrative must be re-evaluated.\textsuperscript{261} McDonald had already warned scholars: “One of
the urgent needs in Latin studies is a re-examination of Livy’s narrative style and
detail, with reference to particular kinds of context. Especially, studies which deal
with his language are needed, because it seems that in the nearer past relatively
few studies have been devoted to the examination of his language.”\textsuperscript{262} In my
research, I took up this invitation in relation to this single term. Although this
research is centred on the term \textit{finis}, it is also important to consider those words
that originate from the main term. There is a wide range of words containing the root
\textit{fin-is} and they are quantitatively and qualitatively important. \textbf{[FIG 12]}From the main
word \textit{finis}, we have a broad range of derivative terms:\textsuperscript{263} a) simply derivate words
\textit{(finire, v. (60); finitus, adj. (27); finitimus/finitumos*, adj. + desinence –iti(/u)mos
(88))}; b) simply derivate words + preposition \textit{(adfinis, n. (7); confinis, n. (3))}; c)
preposition + simply derivate words \textit{(infinitus, adj. (1); praefinitus, adj. (1))}; d)
preposition + other derivate words \textit{(confinius, n. (2); adfinitas, n. (1))}.\textsuperscript{264} The
quantity provides the worth, which Livy assigns to the derivate word, while the
quality is represented by the grade of linkage with the main term. The reason for
this further underlining is to show how the Livian terminology is not casual, and also
how the incidence of the derivative words in the chapters relates to the events
within them.

\textsuperscript{261} Viljamaa 1983:9.
\textsuperscript{262} McDonald 1957:172, n.52; cf. Viljamaa 1983:11.
\textsuperscript{263} The order is as follows: word types or typology of word (derived term, sort of word: v. = verb; n. =
noun; adj. = adjective [number of cases]).
\textsuperscript{264} For some of the derivate words linked to \textit{finis} (adfinitias, confinis, confiniun) compare: Cacciari
1.3 Livy’s style and narrative: landscape, environment and world

The importance of natural elements (rivers, mountain and/or promontories) is crucial to my research as they are strongly linked to the word *finis*. For this reason, in this section I will assess the nature of this connection in Livy. Key points to bear in mind for this assessment are: a) Livy’s style; b) the representation of the material environment (geography) around Livy at the time of his writing; c) Livy’s idea of landscape; d) Romans’ (Livy’s) perspective on *fines*, which is different from any other non-Roman point of view (e.g. Greek/Polybius); e) the visualisation of the material environment in Livy’s narration. In other words, Livy makes possible the identification of *fines* through his narrative, and these *fines* are often linked to the real and natural elements of the landscape, mainly when historical accounts require this association.

Well-founded criticisms have been aimed at Livy, due to the fact that his work-style is in essence an imitation, developed after the fashions of his time. His epic style used under the influence of the Augustan circle of literary poetry is infused with the style of the Late Republic, tracking back to Cicero’s and Caesar’s rhetoric style and principles.265 Livy took the principles of *exaedificatio* and *exornatio* from Cicero,266 and Walsh even connects the logistic aspects of *AUC* with the Ciceronian-structured style.267 However, Livy’s main concerns, especially in military contexts, were clarification of time and place, such as description of planning, action and outcome,268 whose influence I assign instead to Caesar’s narrative. Like Caesar, Livy’s account provides continuous references, which link the term *finis* to the surrounding landscape. Space as a visual element is often marked by natural features, and *AUC* presents a coherent and continuous representation of reality, in which the reader relates himself to the incessant relationship between Rome’s territorial possession and the outside world. In the first stage of Livian narrative,

---

265 Viljamaa 1983:11.
266 McDonald 1957.
there is a sort of mutual exchange between the natural environment and the City. Then, when the narrative widens alongside Rome’s own expansion, the relationship embraces those sensitive areas, where actions happen. Jaeger has argued this point convincingly: to a certain degree the ancient historian shares the orator’s purpose in referring to the concreteness of the physical world and the facts as they developed. Livy identifies the natural features both on an textual plan and on a real framework, matching places and names when they become politically or militarily important. This process follows three main steps and progressively expands when Rome broadens, interacting with foreign and abutting powers: a) at the beginning, the functional portrayal of the Urbs, then b) the territory of Rome and c) her ‘sphere of influence’ or imperium. In order to explain this interaction between different stages of Rome’s growth, Livy’s narrative produces a schematised topography: natural features – bound to the term finis – impose themselves upon events. Although Livy was a historian and not a geographer, he mainly uses the settings in an abstract way, filling the landscape with significance through the record of events and making them more meaningful for their abstraction. Livy understands the importance of peculiar natural features, using them freely and often in conjunction with finis. Fossae, montes, campi, agri, flumines, mares are just a few examples in which those features serve a function within historical events. In several cases these natural features are ‘locked’ to the term finis, differentiating it from abstract or theoretical notions of the term.

---

269 It has become increasingly clear that modern standards of precision are inappropriate for evaluating Roman geographical writing, which scholars now tend to explain in terms of ancient readers’ expectations and the limits of ancient geographical knowledge and terminology. As a result, attempts to match literary descriptions to places in the objective world have given way, in many cases, to the study of the conventions that guide such writing. Horsfall (1987:199) has observed that “no expectation existed in Augustan Rome that the geographical information contained in a work of literature should be precise”. A particularly useful discussion of the use of conventions in topographical writing can be found in Thomas 1982. When applied to the study of Livy’s Ab Urbe Condita, these developments suggest not that we ignore the objective world, but that we consider Livy’s use of the urban landscape and its monuments.  
271 For the interaction amongst these three strips see Morley 1996.  
This process of abstraction or schematisation, is a continuous system preserved in the Roman rhetorical handbooks. Livy’s narration also seems to have two other systems of connectivity that imprint topographical elements in readers’ minds simultaneously, and his narration becomes universal through the repetition of the same geographical *topoi*. This template is therefore positioned on an extensive framework, which forms the ‘remembered landscape’: blending geography, topography and historiography with memory. In this way, Livy has no need to match place and *fines* together, unless the action is more important than the place. It is, however, necessary for us to make this distinction. On the one hand, Livy associates the term *finis* and the ‘remembered landscape’ with toponyms, which have a correlation in the real world and are often named. In this case, the *locus* is *cognitus* (known) to the writer, putting it into the category of the places he knows or which have been crucial for historical, political or military reasons. On the other hand, we have a different category of passages in *AUC*, in which *fines* belong to imaginary places, visualised through Livy’s mind’s eye. In this second instance, Livy turns into an ideal historian, narrating events through the use of outlined details and not focussing on particulars which cannot be narrated in the absence of an eye witness. Therefore, Livy conveys events as visual imagining in two ways: a) by naming key topographical features in association with *fines*, when they are important, or b) by referring the term *finis* to a general landscape created as an imaginary one, when the climax of the main events overtakes the topographical information. In both cases, we shall bear in mind that geography shapes narrative structure: “Placing a literary phenomenon in its specific space – mapping it” – can thus be a powerful tool of analysis, “bringing to light relations that would otherwise remain hidden”.

---

275 According to Cicero (*Mat.* 2.87), the Greek Simonides, whom the Latin sources credit with having invented the art of memory. See Yates 1966:44.
276 Kinoshita 2006:3.
1.3.1 Diverse perspectives: Polybius and Livy

Another key point of relevance is the fact that the Roman (Livy’s) perspective is very different to that of other cultures, concerning the notion of *finis*. For instance, even comparisons with the Greek world are untenable, due to the difference in contexts and mentalité. I will stress this last point in two ways: a) by contrasting the challenging perception of ‘border, boundary, frontier’ in Livy’s work with that used by Polybius, and b) by underlining the different ways in which they create links between their own notions, the surrounding landscape and the historical events. Livy had a privileged relationship with Polybius’s work, in which Polybius insisted that first-hand or direct observation provides the best evidence.278 According to the historian of Megalopolis, the ideal scholar, when approaching historical events, actually travels to and gains personal experience of warfare and politics. If he cannot experience first-hand the events he reports, at least he knows how a soldier carries out his duties.279 Polybius represents the perfect source for Livy, due to his tendency to shift between his Greek instinct for geographic abstractions and the Roman readers’ interest in itineraries.280

This link between Livy and Polybius has been widely proved and, as the author of Megalopolis, geography is undeniably subjugated to history within his writing: Polybius’ descriptions of Gaul or central Greece, for instance, seem to follow routes into an environmentally-obliged framework. The Polybian description appears to be flat, from the onlooker’s point of view, and does not seem to exploit diverse angulations in representing the reality.281 This last statement leads to another question: how is history – and its veracity – affected when viewed from an alternate perspective? In this study we will see how different the perceptions of bordering concepts in Livy and Polybius really are. Jaeger proposed that Livy’s constructive metaphors are different from those of Polybius, just as his project is different, and

278 Polyb. 12.4.3-4, 24.
281 Clarke 1999.
that they require terminology uniquely adapted to them. In my opinion, even the most basic concepts are different, such as the definition of *finis*. Livy manages to convey, through his precise use of evidence, the Roman sense and the limit of space through visual perspectives, which is evidently different from Polybius.\(^{282}\)

This will be especially evident in the chapters on the Alps,[6.2.3] and the treaties of the Ebro[5.2.1] and Apamea[7.2.2], when we will see how closely Livy made use of Polybius’ chorographic descriptions of *topoi* and travel, since they chimed with Roman horizontal perspectives. It is not just a visual perspective; it is also a mental one, and throughout my study I will show that different populations had different ideas and conceptions of border, depending on their ethnic background (Etruscan, Celtic,\(^{283}\) Carthaginian or even Greek).

### 1.3.2 View and mapping in Augustan Rome

Polybius had the advantage of being a ‘field historian’, as he travelled to and visited those places he describes; his sources deriving from direct contact with the local people. Nicolet has pointed out, however, that since the 1\(^{st}\) century B.C. a different way of seeing and of writing history had begun to develop among Augustus’s contemporaries, Livy (in his last books), Strabo, and Velleius Paterculus.\(^{284}\) For Nicolet, in this period geography begins to influence history as the environment influences human actions. The standards for evidence – received from earlier historians – had placed vision at the top of the hierarchy of the senses (while interviews with witnesses and written accounts based on information that came aurally were considered less reliable).\(^{285}\) This ‘sensoriality’ (or direct approach, as in

---


\(^{283}\) The translation of *finis* in Celtic (North Italian dialect) is present in the Gallo-Latin bilingual inscription from Vercelli. The document deals with borders and the term *antos* is born out by the appellative noun, which actually means “limit, end”. The same form and meaning is attested in ‘*anta*’ – and the derivative PGerm. *antiiaz* – all of them thematic forms ultimately going back to IE *H2ent-“front*” (cf. Pokorny 1959:48-9). The only extant Celtic parallel of *antos* is the accusative singular *atom* (with trivial omission of the nasal; alternative reading *atoš*, allegedly in the accusative plural!) cf. Cf. Meid 1989:13. In this inscription, its meaning is assured by the correspondance between Latin: FINIS CAMPO QVEM DEDIT ACISIVS ARGANTOCAMER FVLS COMMVNEM DEIS ET HOMINIBVS ITA VT LAPIDE[S] IUI STATVTI SVNT, and Celtic: Akisios Arkatokomaterekos tošokote atom/atoš teuoxtonion eu. See Prósper:250-67.


the case of Polybius) of space contained horizontal, linear movement of itineraries over land and sea, where the perception of the material environment was never finalised. On the contrary, Livy – as a non-field historian – had the benefit of consulting different documents and diverse sources as potential visual representations of the landscape, such as sketches, drawings, itineraries and probably maps. Livy’s description often seems to have an awareness of the existence of maps in the same way that he has clear in his mind the natural features of the environmental. Thus, a view of the historical landscape as conceptually coherent usually entails seeing it from outside or above, from the cartographer’s perspective, just as seeing events as part of a coherent pattern entails adopting the objectivity of an omniscient narrator.\textsuperscript{286} And the goal of this vivid representation is to move (\textit{mouere}) the reader or listener emotionally on the field of a hyperreality, capable of depicting vivid key areas (points) in the narrated, and therefore, built landscape.

Livy aimed to achieve \textit{energeia}, vivid representation, or \textit{subieciio sub oculis}, incorporating the information he had gleaned from maps to create a complete picture in the mind’s eye.\textsuperscript{287} Livy recorded what is generally agreed to be the first provincial map drawn in Rome: the map of Sardinia (‘\textit{simulacra picta}’) to commemorate the victories of Tiberius Sempronius Gracchus the Elder over the Carthaginians, displayed in the temple of Mater Matuta in Rome in 174 B.C.\textsuperscript{288} Livy also should have had access to the documents of Gaius Fabius Pictor, which depicted scenes of history.\textsuperscript{289} In the same period, Fabius Pictor is said to have painted the map of Italy on the wall of the temple of Tellus,\textsuperscript{290} while Livy was probably an eyewitness to the first map of the known world displayed in the \textit{porticus}.


\textsuperscript{287} On the potency of images, Feldherr (1998:308) says, “spectacle is such a powerful tool in Livy’s text that in some cases it can substitute for, or even generate, reality”.


\textsuperscript{290} Varro \textit{Re Rus.} 1.2.1.
Vipsania: the map of Agrippa. With no evidence, it can only be argued that Roman maps – up to the Mid-Late Empire – possibly differed slightly from those of modern cartography. In the Tabula Peutingeriana, no line work is shown for any border, even a fortified one like Hadrian’s Wall. However, the fines as place names are evident as termination points of itineraries, as hubs and as bordering zones in some critical areas. Moreover the natural features are well distinct from the itinerary and – although schematically defined – they look to have a distinctive role in the tabula. In his analysis, Talbert reports the presence of ‘fines’, appearing as a “common name or component”. The cartographer opted to omit such features, emphasising distances among places rather than accurate geopolitical features. This is made clear by a rare attempt to add dimensions to descriptions: a feature present also in Livy, who measured the length and breadth of the conquest of Lucius Scipio's campaign against Antiochus in days' marches. When we imagine the ancient perspective for viewing the landscape, we have to bear in mind that the view is mainly flattened, based on a vision at ground level, like the vision that Polybius had. We have to think of a reproduced landscape with no detailed maps, which could be drawn from above or from a high vantage point (without the aid of satellites or airplanes), providing an overall picture of the world. Livy does not often venture into spatial descriptions, but – in several description of landscapes– he delivers a new conceptual platform in his control of the landscape. The vision from a top place (hill, mountain or promontory) starts to become privileged in Livy’s account, as I will show in some cases in which the view from the top performs a major role.

293 The discussion on maps has been pushed towards an idea of road maps based on itineraries. The Tabula would not reflect the late Roman cartography. See Levi & Levi 1967 and Bekker-Nielsen 1988:155-7.
294 Talbert & Brodersen 2004:130.
295 Talbert 2011:99 is convinced that the map is full of indicators which confirm the awareness of boundaries between communities and provinces and the exclusion of them was a conscious choice.
297 We will see in the chapter on Jupiter Feretrius, the Alps and Janiculum, where the dominant perspective is crucial from a strategic point of view.
298 I recorded at least four of them: the position of the Capitol from where a sort of control is exerted through the subdivision of the land around it: Romulus (Liv. 1.10.6) Numa (Liv. 1.18.7); the famous

68
1.3.3 The Roman *imperium*

However, there is another aspect to consider in assessing the Peutinger Map: the concept of *imperium*. The Romans perceived two means of dominion: one based on the real occupation of territory (e.g. military conquest, economic exploitation, colonisation, and provincialisation) and the second grounded in the immanent power of *imperium*.\(^\text{300}\) In a recent study, Mattingly has provided one of the best approaches to the question.\(^\text{301}\) Through a detailed list, Mattingly defines the issues linked with the *imperium Romanorum*. I would stress the qualitative importance of his work, and the suitability of his principles for comprehending Livy’s view. Until the 20\(^{th}\) century, there was a ‘nurtured’ identification of the European Empires with the Roman Empire, whereby *empire* was equated with *imperium*. Politically the two could be argued as being compatible, but historically and archeologically the two definitions did not match. Therefore, the need for a different definition arose. Despite the fact that *imperium* needed to remain quite distinct from the modern term *imperialism* – the first important concept here that we need to bear in mind – the new definition nevertheless took on political-economic connotations, even if they were well distinct from the current idea of Empire.\(^\text{302}\) A proposed solution is the innovative linkage between empire and globalisation, although they are influenced by the current social developments.\(^\text{303}\) Despite the fact that the Roman Empire invites more than other ancient Empires a specific comparison with imperial powers,\(^\text{304}\) Livy’s concept of *imperium* cannot match with any current\(^\text{305}\) or ancient view. As we will see, Livy’s – and probably the Romans’ – different view of the territory in a geo-political sense was incomprehensible to Polybius,[5.4.1;5.5.1] to Hannibal[5.6] and Eumenes in the treaty of Apamea.\(^\text{306}\)[7.5.2] *Fines* and *imperia* scene when Hannibal looked out over the North Italian plain after crossing the Alps (Liv. 21.35.7-10; Cf. Polyb. 3.54.2); the Romans’ first view over the route into central Etruria from *Mons Ciminus* (Liv. 9.37.1-2); Philip’s view from *Mons Haemus* tracing his route to Italy (Liv. 40.21.2).

---

\(^\text{301}\) Mattingly 2010.
\(^\text{302}\) This difference has been stressed by Hobson (1909), in whose footsteps Mattingly (2010) follows.
\(^\text{303}\) Pitts 2008; Witcher 2000.
\(^\text{304}\) Mattingly 2010:11-3, 75-93. See also the position of Edwards & Woolf 2003 and Morley 1996.
\(^\text{305}\) Eich & Eich (2005) move their analysis over a political-military system, similar to the current ‘USA Empire’.
\(^\text{306}\) Polybius’ view is completely different from Livy in the shape and function of the Alps; moreover he is shown to have problems in understanding the Roman treaties. Livy emphasises the difficulty of
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appear in Roman treaties, where subject and allied peoples serve to underline the unequal positions of these agreements, which “Rome adopted to control or to exert influence on far-flung territories”307. The third and last concept to bear in mind is the fact that *fines* and *imperium Romanum* are strongly connected. The *imperium* was an ‘immanent presence’ – sometimes identified as ‘sphere of influence’,308 dominance, hegemony,309 authority and control310 which became ‘visible’ especially in the treaties.[5.1; 5.3, 5.3.1, 5.4.1; 6.3.4; 7.3.1; 7.5.1]

Did Rome's 'invisible' *imperium* extended to ‘the ends of the earth’ (*ultimos terrarum fines*)?311 For some scholars the concept of *imperium* gained currency in the 2nd century B.C. as Rome’s empire grew; but it reached its climax in the age of the dynasts of the 1st century AD.312 Despite the fact that the Livian passage has been deemed an exaggeration, it is important to stress the distinction made a generation after Livy by Seneca. The philosopher distinguishes the extension of the world as different from the extension of ‘Roman authority’. Although Seneca’s conception is different from Livy’s, he reports the situation of a recent past, when termini were set up in key places by Augustus: “Oceanusque tuas ultra se respicit aras / qui finis mundo est, non erat imperii” (The subject Ocean does with wonder see / Beyond his limits, altars rais’d to thee. / And the last borders of the farthest land, / Shall ne’er contract the bounds of thy command).313 For the *Anthologia Latina* (scil. Seneca), the concept of *imperium* has already been affected by a deep dichotomy, whereas in Livy *imperium* and *fines* seem conceptually linked to each other throughout the whole narration.[Finis B9] In light of the Augustan connection between the two terms, another concern within the present study is to investigate to what extent the idea of *imperium* affected the *fines* and their connectivity.

Hannibal and Eumenes II in their understanding of the acceptation of *finis*, using a different terminology (i.e. *terminus* instead then *finis*).
308 Heitland 1909:140.
309 Hoyos (2003:6-7, 12-3) give both definitions.
310 Lavan (2013:176-210, esp. 54, 165, 186-189) denominates ‘sphere of activity’ as the direct control of the provinces, as distinct from ‘sphere of control’ – the latter being stronger, however – ‘venire in in fidem (or in potestatem or dicionem).
313 (?Seneca) *Anth.Lat.* 419.3-4. Translation by E. Gibson from Camden 1695. Cf. Castagna 1996:81, stresses that the Oceanus was the border of Empire and at Seneca’s times it is part of the Rome’s *imperium*.
1.3.4 Livy and Augustus

Livy lived in the Augustan ‘golden age’ of Roman literature, and this fact, along with the character of *AUC*, placed him in a transient stage between two periods: classical and postclassical, republican and imperial.\(^{314}\) The strong relationship between Livy and Augustus has led scholars to their dominant preoccupation: to what extent this liaison between the two might have affected *AUC*.\(^{315}\) Tacitus confirms their friendly relationship\(^{316}\) and Suetonius revealed that Livy focussed the last part of his work on the future Emperor Claudius.\(^{317}\) Scholars have often disapproved of Livian historical method, criticising the composition of *AUC* and his research into the truth “far removed from the Thucydidean sense of history” – but this at least confirms his strong bond with the Augustan system.\(^{318}\) A sort of symbiosis built up between Augustus and Livy, which is pinpointed by Syme as a mutual understanding created “to work upon the upper and middle classes of a regenerated society”.\(^{319}\) Syme considered Livy as “the last of the Republican writers” and – I would say – the first of the Imperial ones,\(^{320}\) who accepted the new rising order.\(^{321}\) Despite the evident connection between Augustus and Livy, other scholars have tried to demonstrate that in some way Livy warned his peer citizens “not to tolerate an unmitigated monarchy” from his very first book,\(^{322}\) while others try to show how critical he was in later books.\(^{323}\) Of the four points, listed by Welsh,\(^{324}\) just two are relevant for our discussion: a) Livy was pro-Pompeian and generous in his praise of Brutus and Cassius,\(^{325}\) therefore pro-Republican; b) the references in *AUC* to Augustus are respectful but not adulatory or apolectic.\(^{326}\) These two points help us to understand: a) how Livy’s lost books (from 46 onwards) may have developed, in connection with the present study, and b) how great the influence

\(^{314}\) Viljamaa 1983:11.
\(^{315}\) Walsh 1974:5. This was also confirmed by the major Dessau’s (1906) work at the beginning of the 20\(^{th}\) century.
\(^{316}\) Tac. *Ann.* 4.34.
\(^{317}\) Suet. *Claud*. 41.1
\(^{318}\) Cochrane 1940:98-9, 103.
\(^{319}\) Syme 1939:317, 468.
\(^{320}\) Klinger 1967:56, notes that Livy’s work has been created on the verge of two Eras.
\(^{322}\) Petersen 1961:440 ff.
\(^{323}\) Mette 1961:278 ff.
\(^{325}\) Tac. *Ann.* 4.34.
\(^{326}\) Mensching 1967:12-4, 25.
exerted directly or indirectly by Augustus or his literary circle would have been on
Livy. In the latter instance, the use of a common understanding, highlighted by a
common terminology might turn out to be crucial, where the terminologies of *Res
Gestae* and *AUC* match.\(^{327}\) Even in Virgil and Ovid several elements recall key
passages in Livy, as Burck has pointed out.\(^{328}\) The sentence often repeated, “*tu
regere imperio populous Romane memento*”,\(^{329}\) echoes the phrase in the Livian
preface, “*iuvabit tamen rerum gestarum memoriae principis terrarum populi*”.\(^{330}\)
Likewise, both of them directly connect their works with the Augustus’ inscription
“*RERUM GESTARUM DIVI AUGUSTI, QUIBUS ORBEM TERRARUM IMPERIO
POPULI ROMANI SUBIECI*”.\(^{331}\) A further confirmation of this link can be found in M’
Acilius’ speech to his troops before the battle of the Thermopylae (191 B.C.).\(^{[7.1.2]}\)
Considered as epochal, Livy connects the *Romanum imperium* with the extension of
the *finis*, reporting the two extremities of such an extension: “*ab Gadibus ad mare
rubrum Oceano finis terminemus, qui orbe terrarium amplexu finit*”.\(^{332}\) This is an
evident Livian *topos*, repeated few other times in his narration.\(^{333}\) The association
‘*Gades-Oceanus*’ (modern Cádiz-Atlantic Ocean) probably reflects directions to be
followed in his work, as the same phrase appears in Augustus’ *Res Gestae*: ‘*[ITEM
GERMANIAM QUÅ INCLUDIT OCEANUS A GADIBUS AD OSTIUM ALBIS
FLUMAN[IS PACAVI]*’.\(^{334}\) Seen also is the presence of the term *finis* in the *Res
Gestae Divi Avgvsti*\(^{335}\) and a very extensive use of the same word in Virgil,\(^{336}\) so it
is reasonable to assume that Livy’s use of *finis* might also have been included
within a programmed Augustan propaganda.\(^{337}\)

\(^{327}\) Burck (1967:97, 106) emphasises the clarity and common sense between Virgil and Horace.
\(^{328}\) Burck 1967:110.
\(^{331}\) *RG* 1.1.
\(^{332}\) Liv. 36.17.13.
\(^{333}\) See from the very early of *AUC*:5.37.2 and 21.43.13.
\(^{334}\) *RG* 5.26.
\(^{335}\) *RG* 5.26; 5.30.
Fasciano 1982:345.
1.3.5 Clarification: Livian historicity and Augustan propaganda

The last section of this chapter casts a light on one main issue that might be detected by the reader: the non-historicity of AUC. One of the key points of this thesis is to open the reader’s eyes to the potential of the term finis in Livy, with the aim of expanding the use of the framework detected in Livy to other ancient authors. After all, Livy offers an extraordinary opportunity, providing within his work the analysis of a 'longitudinal' study through the narration of almost 800 years of history. This is particularly significant in the context of the possible influence of Augustan developments and vision on his use of the term finis. For instance, it will be clarified through this study that Livy seems to follow a specific programme within AUC. As I will show, the concept of finis evolves throughout the centuries and that is evident in the detection of the main features of fines. Livy understands that the earliest Roman society is primitive, its political agreements (pacts, treaties) embedded with magical / sacred elements. However, considering the period in which Livy is writing, in the worst-case scenario his outlook is 800 years removed from the events he is depicting.

We will face Livy’s construct from his first usage of finis in the prehistoric period – where the story he tells is useful for understanding the magic / religious value of the term, when an agreement between two ethnics is struck. In other words, Livy might have focused on particular episodes specifically because they functioned to help him achieve his objective. This idea seems especially clear in chapters 2, 3 and 4, which have the particular aim of emphasising the sacred value of the finis. The role of those elements, such as the function of the Temple of Jupiter Feretrius and the fetials’ role, is to send messages – reading between the lines – rather than presenting factual accounts of historical reality. Yet, the evolution of ‘bordering practices’ in Livy runs parallel to the evolution of the fetials’ practices, both changing through time. Moreover, the Livian construct – probably following an Augustan framework – necessarily applies to the story of Rome, which was useful both to the author and to his imperial committent. Livy distributes the main concepts – derivates of, or derivable from, Augustan propaganda – throughout a convincing
historical process. Hence, although Livy states the Augustan guidelines, he also tries to reflect the earlier, historically-situated outlook, showing the different phases of the way that *finis* is defined. Through episodes, laws and debates, Livy’s understanding, use and interpretation of *finis* alters from the earlier period, developing through time and acquiring a broad range of features, where – for instance – the sacred aspect of *finis* slowly fades away, while the legal value takes precedence.

Probably, Livy’s early history is not factually reliable, but the story he presents is clear when considered in the context of the programme he is trying to put forth, and was probably adapted to the Augustan guidelines. Livian account is based on an interconnected series of episodes, linked to create a final plot of his history. We do not need to believe that what Livy tells us about the early history of Rome is true to understand the development of the term *finis* within his work. I will show through this thesis the reasoning behind Livy’s programme, which consists of a developing concept of *finis*, probably following the Augustan propaganda.
Chapter 2. Tiber. The earliest paradigm for finis?

2.1 Aims and challenges

The first attested use of the term finis by Livy within AUC occurs at the beginning of Book 1, in relation to the river Tiber. Beginning with the connection ‘Tiber-finis’, I will use this chapter to analyse this first attestation, both in association with Rome’s river and also with the river Cremera. Through comparison of the contexts in which the label ‘finis’ is applied to these two rivers, I will attempt to elucidate several key features of its usage: a) the relevance of Tiber as finis in a context prior to Rome’s foundation; b) the concept of river and finis (Tiber) for peoples other than the Romans; c) the sacral value of the river, when considered as finis (Tiber / Cremera); and d) the function of rivers, when deemed as fines (Tiber / Cremera). My aim is to reveal consistent patterns and features of finis, providing instances which may lead to a better understanding of the term in relation to geographical features. The main question is: Does a finis represent a ‘limit’ of an occupied area – as political and legal acquisition – or is it rather a linkage between two territories, areas or zones?

I decided to begin this investigation with the analysis of fines as geographical features – like the rivers Tiber and Cremera – for several main reasons: a) the literature recognises geographical features as the main natural territorial markers; b) they are not generic in their identification, as they are linked to names and physical features in the environment that are still discernible in the present day; c) it is, within this context that we find, the first chronological and literary attestation of finis in the AUC; and d) although finis here is related to a pre-Roman context, it is significant for helping to understand the context within which Rome was founded. Methodologically, in order to investigate and detect the common characteristics contributing to the concept of finis, I will provide a detailed analysis of Livy’s passages containing the term finis. The informative context around any single sentence reporting the term finis will likely be helpful to identify those features linked with the fines that might otherwise not be immediately detectable. It is also
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important during this process to bear in mind the double perspective within Livy’s writing: on the one hand, there is the contextualising location (setting), which is responsible for placing both the event and its perception; on the other hand, we have the distant, removed viewpoint of Livy, who looks at the event from the period in which he lives. Most significantly, this assessment will also be useful to help understand Livy’s contextual adaptation of the timeline in \textit{AUC}. In this way, we might note the way the Livian conception modified earlier conceptions of \textit{fines} and the way in which this may have been adopted by Augustus and his political programme.

2.2 Tiber as \textit{finis} between Etruscans and Latins\textsuperscript{339}

In this section, I commence my investigation with the contextualisation and analysis of terms in the Livian passage which correlate the Tiber with a \textit{finis}. This further analysis will assess and develop four key points: a) the \textit{finis} as a place on which it is possible to strike an agreement, like a pact, a treaty or a covenant; b) the modifications of the name of the Tiber as possible hegemonic sign of possession or control over it; c) the sacral value connected with the impassability of the river once established as \textit{finis}; and d) Rome’s privileged position in the surrounding landscape, as the City rose upon a \textit{finis} as determined between two populations: the river Tiber. I will commence by presenting the background situation between Etruscans and Latins preceding or contemporary to Rome’s birth. In this way, my purpose is to test the link between the Etruscan and Latin attitude toward the \textit{finis} and that of Rome. Under these premises, I will show how Livy specifically positioned the \textit{Urbs} in relation to the Tiber, laying claim to and exploiting the river. I will also investigate the functional elements and diverse features of the Tiber, according to Livy’s perception. The impression – mainly in light of key points discussed in later chapters – is that he seems not only to follow a chronological narrative, but also to

\textsuperscript{339} In order to avoid controversy not pertinent to the question, the terms Etruscan, Latin, and Sabine are used in a geographical, not an ethnic sense. For purposes of this discussion, Etruscans are the dominant people of the Etruscan cities in the Orientalising Period (beginning 725 B.C. ca.; for this ‘traditional’ chronology see Carafa 2004:49); Latins, the inhabitants of Latium in that and in the preceding period; Sabines, the neighbours of the Latins on the North and East. Cf. Holland 1949:290, n.1.
place every single episode firmly within its own historical context. It would seem then that the Tiber serves several functions within time and circumstance; my main concern within this chapter, however, will be how Livy outlines different perspectives on the function of the river, contextualising it both from a historical and a functional point of view. These considerations lead to a wealth of questions: Can all the detected features of the Tiber be applied also to the concept of *finis*? Or might the features apply only to *fines*-rivers? Are the features of the Tiber or other named rivers applicable just to the single context in which they appear, or are they also chronologically compatible?

**[FIG 13]** The starting point for this research is provided by a single sentence in Livy’s text, where the word *finis* is strongly connected to the Tiber:

> Pax ita conuenerat ut Etruscis Latinisque fluuius Albula, quem nunc Tiberim vocant, *finis esset.*

Thus, a peace (treaty) was agreed between Etruscans and Latins in order that the river Albula, which now is called Tiber, was the *finis*.

Livy emphasises the importance of two ethnic groups – Etruscans and Latins – involved both in the *pax* (agreement) and indirectly in Rome’s foundation, and his comprehensive historical contextualisation of Rome’s origins also emphasises the crucial role played by the river. The map of Italy reveals the importance of the Tiber at first glance, as its northern course divides Italy longitudinally, before splitting the country in the last part of its stream into almost two perfect halves. However, it is commonly accepted that the Middle Tiber Valley in fact represents a connecting zone and area of contact between four ethnic groups: Etruscans, Latins, Sabines and Faliscans-Capenates.

From a generally protohistoric (Iron Age) period, Livy pinpoints the agreement of the *pax* between Etruscans and Latins as the first preparatory act for the foundation of Rome. In this process, her landscape, river and neighbouring populations played a vital role, as Forsythe confirms: “Rome...laid somewhat farther inland...and the river along which she arose was the largest one of central Italy and formed the

---

340 Liv. 1.3.5.
341 Cifani 2002:220.
342 As evident in Livy’s account, he refers to a period prior to Rome’s foundation.
boundary between Etruria and Latium. Despite the simplicity of Livy’s passage, I shall try to rebuild the process that led Livy to consider the Tiber as a political dividing element between two ethnic groups. Firstly, this key sentence needs to be contextualised in order to clarify why Livy chose to highlight it. After all, this statement is the conclusion of Livy’s account of a much longer historical process. This account, which is a vital testimony for the whole of my investigative process from here onwards, describes three different moments of pre-Roman history. In the first chapter of Book 1, Livy tells of the Trojan exiles’ arrival on Italian soil and their impact on Italic communities, while in the second and third chapters he shifts the focus to the Etruscans and Latins. It is in the two chapters preceding the sentence on the Tiber as finis that the author follows an explanatory scheme vital for the detection of the features of the finis. Livy triggers a process – centring his story on three key passages – which leads to the Tiber as finis.

The first step in this process is the statement of the Etruscans’ greatness, concerning limits to their spatial ‘influence’ in Italy:

...quamquam tanta opibus Etruria erat ut iam non terras solum sed mare etiam per totam Italiam longitudinem ab Alpibus ad fretum Siculum fama nominis sui implesset

... so great was Etruria’s richness/wealth that the renown of her people had been not only the inland parts of Italy but also the coastal districts along the whole length of the land from the Alps to the Straits of Messina.

The Etruscans appear to be the most powerful people in Italy at that time, with an affirmed territorial and marine supremacy over continental Italy, and Livy explains such Etruscan fama with a sentence that is a blend of geographical and political projections. In order to explain the power or extension of their fama, spread along the whole Italian peninsula, Livy explicitly mentions topographical features, explaining that the concept of Italy – probably the Augustan Italy – is embedded between two extremities: the Alps and the Strait of Messina (fretum Siculum).[6.2.6]

The second step in this process is represented by the might of the developing Latins who, at some point, commenced in all likelihood to contest the Etruscan

---

343 Forsythe 2005:80.
344 Liv. 1.3.5.
345 Liv. 1.2.5.
‘hegemony’. We cannot guess whether the confrontation was on a territorial or non-material (i.e. economic, prestigious – see the use of *fama*) basis. Considering the territorial occupations of the two ethnic groups, it is realistic that they were contesting control of the rich land strip that spanned and encompassed both banks of the Tiber. Livy speaks from a Latin perspective, as is made clear by: a) the name used for the Tiber (*Albula*); b) the contrasting historical situation, which led the Latins to “tantum tamen opes creuerant”346 (“an unexpected powerful growth”); and c) possibly by the renewed territorial control south of the Tiber.

The third step – before the *pax* – is the military confrontation between the Etruscan and Latin peoples. The latter’s expansion had been made possible by their union with the mythical exiles from Troy347 and “maxime fusis Etruscis”348 (mainly through the defeat of the Etruscans). The consequence of this clash was an agreement between the main ‘nations’ of central Italy, eventually leading to a definitive *pax* being struck between them. And although Livy prefers to present this *pax* between Etruscans and Latins from a mythical point of view, the use of the term *pax* becomes of vital importance when applied to the river, with the result that it ‘becomes’ a *finis*. The Tiber represents a ‘dividing’ element between two populations or ethnic groups, as defined by classicists as a boundary349 or frontier.350 Even more distinct is the position of the archeologists who define the Tiber as a ‘conventional frontier’.351 Another point of note is the fact that *pax*, in this instance, is being used in a circumstance distinct from its usual meaning of a process of peace or a treaty, providing a very early example – both in a historical and narrative context – of the word *fines* being applied to exceptional circumstances of agreement.352 Mommsen has already stressed the importance of this peaceful

346 Liv. 1.1.5.
347 The loyalty of the two nations who were day by day growing into one.
348 Liv. 1.3.5.
349 Forsythe 2005:80; Mommsen 1873:1.35.
350 Bourdin 2012:1007.
351 See for different positions: Colonna 1986; Bartoloni 1986. For an attempt in seeking the ‘frontier’ at the time of the ‘pax’ between Latins and Etruscans see Cifani 2003.
352 Cassell’s New Latin Dictionary (Simpson 1959) defines *pax* as “a state of peace, opp. to war,” then goes on to give as secondary and transferred meanings, “calm, serenity, quiet”. Thus the primary and secondary senses of Latin *pax* seem to be the same as those of English peace. More important is the etymological connection with the the verb *paciscor*, “to make a bargain or agreement, covenant, contract” (whence English pact). This would seem to imply that in Latin peace
process based on a demarcation line, which resulted in the two ethnic groups sharing ‘this boundary line’ without providing any ‘essential change’. In the short term, the impact of the word pax and the ‘limit’ chosen to demarcate the two populations leads to something immediate in time, in contrast with a process of pacification. In the longer term, the river assumes a meaningful political significance, becoming a conciliatory instrument that might well have aided the development and prosperity of both opponents while simultaneously curbing and delimiting the Etruscan ‘sphere of influence’ southward.

From the Livian perspective, the finis Tiberis fulfils the function of granting a ‘pact’ between two populations, delineating their own spheres of influence. In Livy, the choice of the Tiber could be interpreted as a sort of preliminary manifesto whose main function is to underpin an associative context between treaties and natural features. It seems to be used as a sort of prologue to future agreements between Rome and her opponents, based on the value and function of finis as guarantor of political pacts between ethnic entities. Around this time, a “sense of common advantage and danger consolidated the Latin and Sabine settlements, sharpening the realisation of the ties between them. On the other hand, the Etruscan threat overshadowing them all strengthened their solidarity and encouraged their common aims.” Holland’s statement here is crucial to understanding Rome’s future political developments, her rulers were aware that by striking treaties the finis might also function as an element of reinforcement. In other words, although chronologically distanced from the actual events, Livy contextualises the events and considers the main river of peninsular Italy as a dividing and, at the same time, cohesive line between the two populations due to the pax.

---

is conceived as something resulting from an official interaction and agreement between two individuals or groups. Cf. Salomon 2007:58.

353 Mommsen 1873:1.181.
354 Holland 1949:317; Säflund 1932:164.
2.2.1 Naming and crossing the river

The fact that the Tiber was chosen as finis upon which the Etruscans and Latins struck their pax suggests that the river had not previously served this function. There are two main aspects which I will explore in this section: the change of the name – why was it that the name of the Tiber was so important?\(^{355}\) – and the action of crossing the Tiber, once it was defined as finis. My investigation delves into the ownership, as much as that is possible of a river, by either Etruscans or Latins as signified by the name adopted, and interprets the episode of crossing a ‘finis’ as a sacrilegious action, which could only lead to disaster for the one who performed it. The evidence for these two points comes from a passage in Livy immediately subsequent to the one in which the Tiber is named as finis:

\[\text{Mansit Silviis postea omnibus cognomen, qui Albae regnarunt. \ldots Tiberinus, qui in traiectu Albulae amnis submersus celebre ad posteros nomen flumini dedit.}\] ^{356}  

Later, everyone – who ruled Alba – bore the surname Silvius. … Tiberinus, who was drowned in crossing the Albula, famously gave his name to the river.

Firstly, I will consider and explore the Tiber’s name change, which Livy explicitly states, and then I will examine Livy’s account of Tiberinus’ crossing and subsequent death. The point is ‘chained’ to the concept of sacredness of the fines: when they are crossed without performing any religious ritual and when there is a need to make them ‘safe to cross’. Both of these – the change of name to the divinised Tiberinus and the ‘geopolitical sacredness’ of the river as finis – are also present in other Augustan authors.\(^{357}\)

\(^{355}\) Liv. 1.3.6. In Latin, generally the names of rivers are masculine, although things are not always so straightforward (Cf. Kretschmer 1937). Of the three Latin words for river, only fluuius is masc. at all periods: flumen (originally ‘a flow[ing]’) is always neuter, and amnis (which incidentally disappeared early from ordinary speech and was hence avoided by Caesar, is very rare in later literature such as the Vulgate, and is not continued in Romance) was almost exclusively fem. in pre-classical Latin and not consistently treated as a masculine until the classical period. Probably the gender changed under the influence of fluuius because of the general gender rule. But in the context of the ancient view of rivers as male divinities (see Nissen 1902:1.300), all Italian river-names are masc., from Tiberis and Anio on. This normally applies even to 1st-declension names like Albula and Cremera, even though they are the only masc. a-stems with non-personal reference. The rule generally applies even to foreign river-names, especially those of Gaul and Germany, including many in -a, such as Sequana, Garumna, Isara, and even Mosella (in Ausonius’ poem about the Mosel, the river names Druentia at 479, and Garumna at 483, are fem.), from Langslow 2009:4-5.  

\(^{356}\) Liv. 1.3.8.  

\(^{357}\) Enn. Ann. 54.5; Virg. Geor. 4.369, Aen. 8.72; Liv. 2.10.11.
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2.2.2 Changing the name of the River

The aforementioned passage of Livy lends itself to an interesting linguistic investigation, which can be connected to the Tiber's change of name and to the prohibition of river crossing, once the finis has been established. In the following analysis of both these aspects, it is also important to bear in mind the value Livy gives to the Tiber as finis. Under these premises, I will provide evidence showing that the river's change of name is linked with the hegemony exerted by Latins or Etruscans over the Tiber. I will also reconstruct the etymological process that led to the name Tiber, in order to understand the future relationship between Etruscans, Latins and Romans, and chiefly the way in which the Tiber worked as finis, according to the Late Republican tradition. Indeed, Livy's apparently 'informative' passage on the change of the name is mirrored by Ovid:

\[\text{Albula, quem Tiberim mersus Tiberinus in undis reddidit, hibernis forte tumebat aquis}
\]
\[\text{hic, ubi nunc fora sunt, lintres errare videres, quaque iacent valles, Maxime Circe, tuae.}^{358}\]

Albula, which turned in Tiber from Tiberinus, drowned in its waves, was swollen with winter rain: where now the forums are, you see boats floating, and where the valley of the Circus Maximus lies.

Besides confirming that the episode occurred, Ovid also adds topographical elements, which make the future site of Rome the key point of the passage. [FIG 14] The area is outlined as the long hallway between the Aventine and Palatine hills, now occupied by the Circus Maximus and the area of the fora: the Holitorium and the Boarium, which lay next to the Tiber. The River's name was changed as a consequence of Tiberinus, one of the mythical kings of Alba, drowning in its waters while crossing (in traiectu) it. In both Livy's and Ovid's passages, the most ancient name of the Tiber would have been Albula, which, after the Tiberinus episode, changed to Tiber. However, another name for the river is also known: \(^{359}\) Ovid and

\[^{358}\text{Ovid Fast. 2.389-92.}\]
\[^{359}\text{There is also a fourth and a fifth different name for the river in Servius: Rumon (ad Aen. 8.63; 8.90) and Serra (ad Aen. 8.63).}\]
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Virgil apply a third form to the river, the archaic *Thybris*.\(^{360}\) The former continues in providing topographical elements, linked with the places of future Rome:

\[
ipse solum colui, cuius placidissima laevum radit harenosi Thybridis unda latus.  
hic, ubi nunc Roma est, incaedua Silva virebat, 
tantaque res paucis pascua bubus erat.  
ax mea collis erat, quem volgo nomine nostro nuncupat haec aetas laniculumque vocat.\(^{361}\)
\]

I myself inhabited the ground on the left  
Passed by sandy Thybris’ gentle waves.  
Here, where Rome is now, uncut forest thrived,  
and all this was pasture for scattered cattle. My citadel was the hill the people of this age. Call by my name, dubbing it the Janiculum.

Virgil also mentions the old names, contrasting the Etruscan with the Latin tradition:

\[
tum reges asperque immani corpore Thybris,  
a quo post Itali fluvium cognomine Thybrim diximus;  
amisit verum vetus Albula nomen.\(^{362}\)
\]

then the kings, and savage Thybris, of vast bulk,  
after whom we Italians call our river by the name of Thybris: the ancient Albula has lost her true name.

Ovid, therefore, confirms that *Albula* was the original name of the Tiber. But he also adds that the river took its name from an ‘unspecified’ king, *Thybris*, which represents a different tradition to that of Tiberinus (and even a different name, though they are reminiscent of one another). And yet further complications surrounding this process of changing the name and the chronological order of these changes are introduced by the fact that the various names were used contemporaneously by early Imperial authors – probably following the Augustan programme.\(^{363}\) Fortunately, much of the confusion caused by the above is eradicated by a passage of Varro. Although he remains within a mythical sphere, Varro is more detailed, explicit and linear in tracking the onomastic chronology:

\[
Sed de Tiberis nomine anceps historia. Nam et suum Etruria et Latium suum esse credit, quod fuerunt qui ab Thebri vicino regulo Veientum, dixerint appellatum, primo Thebrim. Sunt qui Tiberim priscum nomen Latinum Albalam vocitatum litteris tradiderint,
\]


But about the name of the Tiber there are two accounts. For Etruria believes it is hers, and so does Latium, because there have been those who said that at first, from Thebris, the nearby chieftain of the Veians, it was called the Thebris. There are also those who in their writings have handed down the story that the Tiber was called Albula as its early Latin name, and that later it was changed on account of Tiberinus king of the Latins, because he died there; for, as they relate, it was his burial-place.

Now, it is possible to reconstruct the onomastic process (the chronological order of the different names), already foreshadowed in Livy: the first name of the river was Thybrim or Thebrim, defined by the name of a Veientine ruler and setting, before it obtained the Latin name Albula and finally Tiber. The adaptation of these three names is key to understanding the process of naming the river. By comparing Varro’s and Livy’s passages, the three names of the Tiber in Varro might be superimposed onto the three different stages of the challenge between the Etruscans and the Latins. Thus, we have first a period of Etruscan dominion (Thybris), then a second moment when the Latins grew in power (Albula) and finally the definitive situation after Tiberinus’ (Tiber) death. As we will see, this situation might be linked with a turn back of the Etruscans over the Latins, through physical possessions on the Latin side. [2.1.5]

If the change of name is linked to the ‘claimed possession’ of a natural finis, the ‘sacrality’ of the finis is given by the act of crossing that finis with any kind of deliberate purpose. Although in a very Late Imperial context, Servius links the ancestral name of Thybris both with the Etruscan King bearing its name and mainly with the fact that the Tiber would have received its name “ἀπὸ τῆς ὑβρεως”, (τῆς ὑβρεως = Thybris) from the arrogance (ὑβρις) of crossing it. Although
representing an impossible grammatical connection between the genitive and nominative and the phonetic, the ὕβρις denotes overconfident pride and lack of humility, often linked to arrogance. Servius reminds us also that the Tiber was “fines super usque Sicanos” (“the upper finis up to the Sicans”), in a still more ancient period whence Etruscan and Latin considered it. The comment of Servius on the Aeneid adds very little to this problem, except for small hints which might confirm the hypothesis of a sacral value to the finis. A sort of ancestral curse is contained in the episode of Tiberinus, who drowned in his attempt to cross the river. Although there might be several reasons for crossing the river, at first glance the Latin King seems to be guilty of crossing an established finis. The evidence of his guilt is not circumstantial and Livy did not write about the episode by chance. The parallel story is told by Servius, who describes Tiberinus as an aboriginal killed by Glaucus, an Etruscan, a Latin or a son of Jupiter who fell in battle near the river. This act of crossing a defined and agreed finis can often have terrible consequences in cases where a ‘struck pact’ has not been respected, having Jupiter as ‘guardian’ of the pact.[3.5.3; 4.3.2]

So who provided the definitive name of the Tiber, ultimately accepted by the ‘Italians’, as Ovid reports? Might a finis have different names, dictated by the population who claimed it? It could be that the change of name was decided by the population who controlled the river and/or its crossings, or that the final name of Tiber was established after the pax was struck. The rising Latins as a self-sufficient ethnic group must have represented enough of a threat to the Etruscans that they were able to push them to a reciprocal pax, and this final change is indicative of that: it would seem that the two peoples reached a compromise, in which the name resembled the original Etruscan Thybris, but linked with the Latin king Tiberinus.

ad Rutulos et Ardeam: unde est “fines super usque Sicanos”: et Albam fluvium ad imaginem fossae Syracusae Thybrin vocaverunt, quasi ὕβρις, ut “effigiem Xanthi Troiamque videtis”, circa Syracusas autem esse fossam Thybrin nomine Theocritus meminit”.  
367 The referenced text and still actual is: Payne 1960.  
369 Serv. ad Aen. 8.72.330.  
370 Ogilvie 1968:45.
2.2.3 Name and geographical possession of a finis

These considerations – drawn both from the evidence provided by the earlier tradition about the agreement on the ‘conceptual line’ and from a reconstruction of the etymological process that resulted in the name Tiber – lead to three more areas of investigation: a) a sort of Etruscan-Latin polarism around the river; b) the process of pacification, based on the river, which had the function of separating territories held by ethnic groups; and c) a kind of cautionary tale for future generations who may plan to reattempt the crossing of the Tiber. Those historical/mythical premises are important for two reasons. Firstly they provide information about a potential dual interface which the river, chosen as a boundary, could possibly have. Secondly, they define an important point of view in the future of Rome’s expansionistic policy, as she would never be restrained in occupying the farthest side of any river.

2.2.4 Etruscan and Latin Tiber

In this section, I will link the name of the river to the evidence of its possession by Etruscans and Latins, through the evidence provided by Livy. The idea that the Romans could control the finis might also be useful to help us comprehend the diverse attitude toward the Tiber when compared with the conceptual ‘line’ shared by the Etruscans and Latins. ‘Possessing’ a finis can provide diverse advantages, the principal of which is the control of passage points on the finis itself. As we can see, the Romans applied different strategies to the Tiber, rivers and natural features in general, considering them a connecting feature between their two sides and capable of joining two different areas.[2.2.8; 6.2.3, 6.2.7]

The first point allows me to determine that, in the Etruscan conception, any river – or at least the Tiber – was always in a state of possession. As the Tiber has been considered as finis, we will focus on its possession in Livy’s passages. The Augustan literary circle seems to have had common directions in considering the Italian geo-onomastic. When reminding us of the mythic origins of Mantua, Virgil
calls the Tiber ‘Thyrrenus Thybris’ and three times as Tuscus amnis, because the provenance is from Etruria. Horace names the Tiber as Tuscus amnis and Tuscus alveus, and when he talks to his friend Gaius Cilnius Mecenas, who had Etruscan origins, he names it ‘paterni fluminis ripae’. To the eyes of the Romans of the Early Empire, the northern bank of the Tiber still nominally belonged to the Etruscans, as it is shown in Pliny’s historical and geographical digression. Horace again explains that the Tiber ‘clashes’ with the northern bank:

\[
\text{Vidimus fluorum Tiberim retortis}
\]
\[
\text{litore Etrusco violenter undis.}
\]

We saw the ‘blonde’ Tiberis waves hurled backwards from the Tuscan shore.

In the brief paragraph on Tiber, Pliny seems to have adopted the Augustan tradition, which differs from the Varronian one because the Albula would be the oldest name of the river: “Tiberis, ante Thybris appellatus et prius Albula” (The Tiber or Tiberis, formerly called Thybris, and previously Albula).
However in a later period, the Latins – due to their growing power ("tantum tamen opes creuerant") – would have imposed their influence up to the southern bank of the Tiber, giving to it their own name: Albula. The etymological root of the Latin name Albula could be linked to the whitish colour of the river and therefore have a crucial meaning in the context of the bordering practices. Indeed, Servius had connected the name of the river with the white colour of the water, as well as the waters of the river Nar. The same root Alb- has been identified in several places across Romanised Europe, especially in the bordering practice areas, and the white colour may have been the main indicator of peripheral areas of the Empire, perhaps already in Livy’s time. Despite criticisms of this theory, it is therefore important to keep in mind the possibility that the colour might have been associated with some of the ‘bordering concepts’.

381 Liv. 1.1.5.
382 The name recalls the colour white, in Latin: albus. It might be due to the fact that the deposits of sulphur (and calcium) in the Tiber basin did actually give the water a whitish colour, and this is what the Romans probably would have connected with the name (Virg. Aen 7. 82.: "oracula Fauni. adit lucosque sub alta consulit Albunea, nemorum quae maxima sacro fonte sonat saeuamque exhalat opaca mephitim"). At Tivoli the water of the Anio is charged, not with sulphur, but with carbonate of lime (Burn 1871:394). The sulphurous springs called Aquae Albulae were used medicinally (Vitr. 8.3; Mart. Ep. 1.12; Statius 1.3.74.) and are connected with the nymph Albunea (Hor. Odes 1.7.12.), who dwelt in the white cascades of the Anio next to the Tibur (Tivoli) (Virg. Aen. 7.83-4; Serv. ad Aen. 8.332). Burn (1871:360-1) speculated that the ancient Aquae Albulae were sulphur-ponds more than five miles from Tivoli on the plain below near Bagni, confirming the tradition (Statius 1.3.74) that the site is so attractive that the river-deities Anienus and Albula bathe in its waters and Tiburnus reclines in the shade of its trees. Tiburnus is mentioned because, like Anienus and Albula, he is a local deity and has a grove of his own. Hallam & Ashby (1914:125; cf. Dunbabin 1933 and Tilly 1934) point out the grove: "The 'luculus' is, of course, the grove where King Latinus went to consult Faunus as described by Virgil (Aen. 7.82: "Lucosque sub alta Consult Albunea"). However, the true site of Virgil’s Albunea was discovered long ago by Bonstetten. It was a wood with a sulphur-spring in it at the Zolforata, 5 km from Lavinium (Pratica), the ancient city of the Laurentes (cf. Probus Georg. 1.1 "itaque etiam oraculum eius (sc. Fauni) in Albunea, Laurentinorum silua, est"; cf. Dunbabin 1933:56).
385 Enn. Ann. 260.5; Virg. Aen. 7.517: "sulpurea Nar albus aqua".
386 The tribe of Albani along the southwestern shore of the Caspian Sea, Alba Longa, the modern Albanians (south of Montenegro), but also with Albion (the ancient name of the British Isles) and Alba = Scotland or the river Albis, the modern Elbe (lat. Albis) in Germany. The confirmation of the colour white is detectable in the slavish languages as in Czech the name is Labe and the first segment of the river is also called ‘Bilé Labe’ (White Elbe). See on the etymology of the Elbe: Krahe 1954:52-3, 101; Laur 1981:118. However, Haupt (1925:16) had already affirmed that Alba cannot be combined with the Latin ‘albus’ (white) and that “the designation Albion is not derived from the chalk-cliffs of Dover, and the old name of the Tiber, Albula, cannot mean White River”. Ogilvie (1965:330-1) following Haupt’s argument, supported the theory that Albula had nothing to do with Latin albus and also that the Alps would derive instead from a pre-Indo-European word, which meant ‘mountain’ or ‘stone’: cf. Eden 1975:108-9 and Bertoldi 1936.
387 To verify, the color red (rubrum) is present in other border areas and on toponyms which are connected with bordering areas: see Saxa Rubra in the war against Veii.
The practice of changing the name of the Tiber might even have affected political or ethnic identity, such as in the case of the Etruscans or Latins, when exerting their authority over this particularly sensitive area of Italy. And the undeniable duality which dominates this sensitive area of Italy and Rome’s origins is traceable in Piccaluga’s book, in reference to another mythical period when Silvanus on the Latin side and Jupiter on the Etruscan side shared the leadership in being the official protectors (divinities) of boundaries (termini). But while archaeology might have provided some confirmation of different stages in the relationship between Etruscans and Latins in the protohistoric age, unfortunately any conclusions drawn are currently limited and often disputed – in spite of the efforts of some scholars to construct a rough picture of them. Taking all this into consideration, the pax that included the Albulia (Tiber) as finis between the two populations might have limited the Etruscan expansion in some way, as the name was later universally recognised as Tiber. Taking the definition of finis, the Tiber is confirmed as finis and not just in the Etruscan-Latin context.

Livy only rarely uses the verb habere (to have) to define the possession of a finis. He normally prefers the verb esse (to be) and those instances where habere is used are limited to the case of Finis A. In using the verb esse, Livy seems almost to neutralise the value of finis by not assigning the possession to anyone, mainly when the finis might be disputed. However, Livy does entertain the possibility that a finis, particularly a river, might belong to someone. In his usual way of delimiting a population or a geopolitical area within two ‘natural features’ working

---


389 At an early stage of its history, Veii reveals a propensity for inhuming people which corresponds with others who penetrated into Latium at the same time, probably by way of the Tiber roads on both sides of the river. Von Duhn (1924:368-9) notes that Faliscan cremation graves are away from the Tiber toward the West, while the strongest inhuming element is in places more accessible from the valley roads. For progress westward of the inhuming rite, see Sundwall 1932:167; Colini 1914:361. The change reaches Veii before the coast (Sundwall 1932:93). Variants of an opposing theory are put forward by Säflund (1938:27) and Pareti (1947:5). They contend that inhumation was the original Italic rite, and that graves of that type are older than cremation tombs on sites where the two are mixed from an early period. Their hypotheses deserve thoughtful consideration, but the question of the physical relation between the two types seems against them. Inhumation graves of the Forum break into cremation pits in such a way as to prove the priority of the latter (Scott 1929:25-6,36). The poor and conservative contents of the graves cannot be dated accurately enough to override such evidence. Cf. Holland 1949:290-1.

390 In the idiom ‘finem habere’. Liv. 33.35.12; 36.35.14; 37.26.10; 40.9.5.
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as limits/outlines, Livy records that a population habuere (had/possessed) the fines, which corresponded with two rivers:

\[ \text{tum Senones, recentissimi advenarum, ab Utente flumine usque ad Aesim fines habuere.} \]

Then the Senones, the latest to come, had their fines from the river Utens all the way to the Aesis.392

Livy seems to place special emphasis on the presence of the Senones as recent arrivals (recentissimi advenarum) in the territory between the rivers Utens (modern Uso) and Aesis393 (modern Esino), and the verb habuere seems to be justified by their occupation, which came with no agreement on the fines.394 I insist on the name because – as Ogilvie pinpointed – the change of name from Thybris/ Thebris to Albula is crucial and “represents the victory of the Etruscan language (Thebris) over the indigenous”.395 However, is it just a victory of the language or a tangible possession, which is reflected in the name?

Tiber was chosen to define a territorial end (finis) with the aim of avoiding future wars. In other words, it was a process which had ancient roots, as Livy pinpoints, where both parties counterbalanced each other through the use of reciprocal power. And this polarity became embedded in Rome’s nature, as demonstrated by the double or possibly triple name given to the Tiber. The dualism between Etruscans and Latins concerning the Tiber is important in order to understand the way the Tiber worked as, or became, that complementary agreed line between two populations. The explanations outlined above for these two different traditions, which would seem to be the most reasonable, would have contributed to the ultimate authority wielded on this geographical area, due to the historical process of conquest, expanding and holding territories. This dichotomy between Latins and

391 Liv. 5.35.3.
392 Husband 1911:386.
393 On the name of the Aesis: Whatmough 1937:189.
394 The Aesis-Utens area is problematic and for this reason might have received a different approach from Livy. The river Aesis was the old ‘frontier’ of peninsular Italy, before it shifted to the Rubicon, which is the river next to the Utens. Probably Sulla shifted the boundary between Cisalpine Gaul and Italy proper from the Aesis River to the Rubicon, which furnished his justification for extending the pomerium, thus satisfying Seneca’s criterion: see Mommsen 1873:122; cf. Sumi 2002:426; Ewins 1955:76. The whole area between the two rivers (Ager Gallicus: see Mason 1992:77, n.11; Sherwin-White 1973:76,n.5) is clearly a sensitive area. On the line Arnus-Aesis as ‘bounday’ of Italy before Sulla: Hardy 1916:65-6. Is that the reason why Livy justifies the possession of the fines?
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Etruscans, which in all likelihood deeply affected the Roman conception of finis, can be seen in the future relationships between Rome and her neighbours: the same Latins and Etruscans from which Rome inherited her historical and political background.

2.2.5 Latins in ‘Etruria’ and Etruscans in ‘Latium’

The next four sections are distributed as follows: in the first, I will assess the position and the possession of the Etruscan settlements aligned on the left bank and the presence of Latin ethnic populations (Faliscans and Capenates) on the right bank of the Tiber.\[2.2.5\] In the second, I will show the distinctiveness of the Capitoline Hill as another settlement similar to Crustumerium (modern Marcigliana, North of Rome), Antemnae (modern Monte Antenne, Rome) and Fidenae (modern Borgata Fidene, Rome), which were probably under the influence of the Etruscans.\[2.2.6\] The third section will show the connection between the left bank, where Rome’s core lay, and the right side: the occupation of the Janiculum.\[2.2.7\] The last will underline how the bridge – or previously any other conjoining means (ferry, Tiberine Island) – may have played a connective, vital part in linking two sides of the river.\[2.2.8\]

[FIG 13] In this section, I will provide an overall picture of the political and topographical situation along the Tiber prior to the foundation of Rome. The strip of land which follows the Tiber and goes from Nomentum (modern Mentana) to Rome is deemed especially sensitive, with the settlements on the left bank, in particular, dotted with fortified settlements occupying steep hills overlooking the course of the Tiber. Nomentum, Crustuminum (or Crustumerium), Antemnae, Fidenae and possibly Caenina (not identified) were – along with Rome – those bulwarks which directly faced the south bank of the Tiber. The strength of their strategic position came mainly from several points: a) the river crossings; b) the control of main communication routes; and c) the control of the junctions with tributaries. These
settlements were considered a critical hub along the two routes which, in their first section, flanked the Tiber and the break caused by the river-crossing itself.\textsuperscript{396}

The towns of Caenina, Antemnae and Crustumumin were under the authority of the Sabines.\textsuperscript{397} and although they were considered Latin cities by foundation,\textsuperscript{398} Livy suggests an alternative tradition. Two of the three strongholds were under the influence of the Etruscans: Crustomerium (modern Marcigliana) and Fidenae (modern Castel Giubileo) and these communities had a ‘blood connection’ with Veii.\textsuperscript{400} Fidenae in particular – which was about five miles north of Rome (in Latin or Sabine territory) – was a city that was always allied with Veii and traditionally considered Etruscan.\textsuperscript{401} The Livian statement is even stronger – he expressly states that “nam Fidenates quoque Etrusci fuerunt” (“the Fidenates were also Etruscans”).\textsuperscript{402} As a third connection between the Veientes and Fidenates, Livy even notices that the Fidenates had only learnt the Latin language from their intercourse with the Roman colonists.\textsuperscript{403} Yet Livy is the only writer who alludes to such extension of the Etruscan power beyond the Tiber, despite the fact that Fidenae frequently appears in alliance with Veii, which is sufficiently accounted for by their relative positions. Nomentum – the more southern city in this war scenario could be used as a stronghold from which the Etruscans could launch their attacks on Rome. Here, the Fidenates are also allied in a sort of federation – with Faliscans and Capenates – led by Veii itself (Veientium Fidenatiumque adiunctis Faliscis ad

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Hintzen-Bohlen 2001:359.
\item Liv. 1.9.6. They were invited by Romulus for the festival of Consualia. On the connection between Consualia and Neptunus Equestris; see Ogilvie 1965:66. Cf. Liv. 1.38.
\item Dionysius of Halicarnassus (1.44, 2.35) expressly assigns to the Aborigines the foundation of Antennae, Caenina, Ficulea, Tellenae, and Tibur.
\item FIDENAE (Φιδηναι, Strab., Ptol., but Φιδήνη in Dion. Hal., Fidenae is used by Virg. Aen. 6.773 and by Tacitus Ann. 4.62; Eth. Fidenās,-ātis; Φιδηναιος, Dionys.) has been deemed an ancient city of Latium and on the Via Salaria, five miles from Rome. There appears no doubt that it was originally and properly a Latin city. Virgil mentions it among the colonies found by the kings of Alba; and in accordance with the same view, Dionysius relates that Fidenae, Crustumumerium, and Nomentum were founded by colonists from Alba led by three brothers, the eldest of whom was the founder of Fidenae (Virg. Aen. 6.773; Dion. Hal. 2.53; Steph.B. sub voce). Still more decisive is it that its name is found in Pliny in the list of the towns that were accustomed to share in the sacrifices on the Alban Mount. (Plin. N.H. 3.5. s. 9.69).
\item Liv. 1.15.1; Strabo 5.2.9. Guidi (2004) has shown the presence of pre- / protohistorical occupational patterns in both sites. See also Carafa 2004:52-3. Archaeological connections between Veii and Crustumumin are detectable in Di Gennaro, Schiappelli & Amoroso 2004:147-55.
\item Camporeale 2005:18.
\item Liv. 1.15.1.
\item Liv. 1.27.9; cf. Liv. 38.34.6; cf. Bayet 1938; Ogilvie 1965:119.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
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Nomentum exercitus fuderit). Therefore, it is clear that several cities on the left bank of the Tiber were linked in some way with Veii. However, once again Livy’s vision appears to be different from that of other authors. Why did Livy need to show that the Fidenates, who were settled on the opposite bank from Veii, were Etruscans?

There is a common belief that the Etruscans had their core nation delimited by defined borders (Tiber and Arno). Some scholars, including Camporeale, have questioned this assumption, however. Briefly, therefore, I will present those cases in which the Tiber did not represent a separating line, concerning ethnicity, culture and language. Despite Livy presenting the Tiber as finis, it should not to be considered as a demarcating or dividing line distinctly separating Etruscans from Latins. On the other side of the Tiber, the situation presented some anomalies in terms of the relationship between populations and territory. Holland here embraces the same thinking as Pliny: the central-Italian tribes or peoples encompassed specific spheres of competence and rivers played a key role in this subdivision. Directly opposite one another, the Faliscans and Capenati inhabited the right bank of the Tiber – in that region which Pliny denominates as ‘Etruria’ – yet they are often presented together in Livy. They occupied the ager Faliscus and, although they belonged geographically and politically to the Etruscan federation, spoke Latin.

---

404 Liv. 4.32.3.
405 Camporeale 2005:18.
406 Plin. N.H. 3.54. The geo-political situation of the Etruria’s borders seems to be the clearest and ‘sharpest’ in the Italian peninsula, as it was enclosed inside two rivers and a sea. Pliny, although a geographer rather than an historian and writing two generations after Livy, uses rivers to shape geo-political entity and not populations or ethnic groups. Etruria and Latium are named, outlined and bordered by rivers.
409 Liv. 5.8.4.8; 5.12.5; 5.13.9; 5.17.6; 5.18.7, 10; 5.19.7; 6.4.4.
410 The ager Faliscus was bordered on the East by the Tiber and it seems that the significant crossing was by Lucus Feroniae at the southern end of the ager Capenas; cf. Frederiksen & Ward Perkins 1957. The northern and southern limits of the ager Faliscus are harder to establish. Northwards, the ager Faliscus extended to the ager Hortanus to the Northeast and the ager Vulcentanus. To the Southwest, the ager Faliscus bordered on the ager Veientanus. The most obvious natural boundary here is formed by the Monti Sabatini and the ridge connecting these with Mons Soracte (Monte Soratte), and this may well have been the original western boundary of the ager Faliscus. (Cf. Plin. N.H. 7.2.19) and Porphyrio (in Hor. Carm. 1.9.1) The border with the ager Capenas must have run somewhere along its southern and southeastern slopes. It is unclear whether the land between Monte Soratte and the Tiber belonged to the ager Capenas or the ager Faliscus: although modern authors tend to assign it to the ager Capenas, the 4th and 3rd century
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After the fall of Veii (390 B.C.), the Faliscans allied with the Tarquinians. Politically, the *ager Faliscus* was probably subsumed into Etruria in a later period and then aggregated into the *ager Veientem*; the Faliscans were ‘federative’ allies of Veii. Livy knew the natural features that characterised the logistic and strategic importance of the *ager Faliscus*. Geographically, it was ‘bordered’ by the Sabatini and Cimini Mountains – which Mommsen considers the earliest boundary of Etruria – respectively on the South- and Northwest. Livy records that, at the end of the 4th century, the slopes of these mountains were densely wooded, forming an impassable forest: the *Silva Cimina*. Throughout the 5th century, the political influence of Veii extended northward, encompassing with the Ciminian slopes the bulwarks of *Sutrium* and *Nepet* (modern Sutri and Nepi), of which Livy recognises their strategic importance, limiting the northern expansion of the *ager Faliscus*. Although he does not use the term *finis*, Livy allows the reader to visualise the function with regard to the Sutrium and Nepet as:

> namque cum ea loca opposita Etruriae et uelut claustra inde porta eque essent, et illis occupandi ea cum quid noui molirentur et Romanis recipendi tuendique cura erat.

fronting Etruria, served as gates and bulwarks on that side, and the Etruscans were anxious to secure them whenever they were meditating hostilities, whilst the Romans were equally anxious to recover and hold them.

Mommsen has already tackled the question of the Faliscans in the Etruscan territory, emphasising the role of Sutrium and Nepet. The Livian comparison with gates and *claustra* is crucial as it brings to mind a comparison between the landscape and the city, imagining or considering them as part of a

---

inscriptions from the area to the east of Monte Soratte are virtually without exception Faliscan, instead of Capenate Latin). cf. De Lucia Brolli, Gallavotti & Aiello 1991. 
412 Liv. 7.17.2,7.
413 Mommsen 1973 1.121, 130.
414 Liv. 4.21.1.
415 Liv. 4.17.11: ‘Faliscorum auxilio venerunt’; cf. 4.18; 4.21.8; 4.23.4; 4.32.3; 5.8.6; 5.11.8
416 Mommsen 1873:1.130.
417 Pollen analyses of samples from the beds of the Lago di Bracciano. The Lago di Monterosi and the Lago di Vico, which indicate that the eastern slopes of the Monti Sabatini were covered by dense oak forests that remained largely undisturbed until the 3rd and 2nd century B.C; cf. Potter 1976:6.
418 Cf. Liv. 9.35.9-37.1, spec. 9.36.1. Cf. also 10.24.5. In the last passage, Etruria is assigned to a member of Fabian family and he opened a route through the Silva Cimina.
419 Liv. 6.9.4.
420 Mommsen 1873:1.30. Morselli 1980; Ceccarelli & Stoddart 2007:
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‘walled’ area. These towns subsequently became Roman colonies in the early 4th century, ceasing to be part of the *ager Faliscus* at an earlier date. The same terminology and visualisation finds some correspondence in the Fetial’s procedure when accessing different areas or zones, where the gate of a city are equated to the *fines*.[4.2.3] In summary, the situation as depicted by Livy appears as follows: the Etruscans of Veii seemed to have control of a federation of sorts, which extended beyond both banks of the Tiber. The definition of *finis* as given to the Tiber by Livy seems, therefore, not to conform to the idea of a dividing line, which dissects two territories in two distinctive parts.

### 2.2.6 The place of Rome

At some point, Livy describes the relationship between the landscape and the position occupied by Rome:

> non sine causa dii hominesque hunc urbi condendae locum clegerunt, saluberrimos colles, flumen opportunum, quo ex mediterraneis locis fruges devehantur, quo maritimi commenatus accipientur, mare vicinum ad commoditates nec expositum nimia propinquitate ad pericula classium exterarum, regionem Italiae mediam, ad incrementum urbis natum unice locum.

Not without good reason did gods and men choose this spot as the site of a City, with its bracing hills, its commodious river, by means of which the produce of inland countries may be brought down and overseas supplies obtained; a sea near enough for all useful purposes, but not so near as to be exposed to danger from foreign fleets; a district in the very centre of Italy — in a word, a position singularly adapted by nature for the expansion of a city.

Ogilvie has pinpointed the importance of this passage, underlining that, once again, the structure of the sentence – which introduces the list of advantages for Rome – is not immediately clear. A combination of needs and decisions was the fertile

---

423 Latin sherds found in Veii do not support the historicity of the war at Romulus’ times (Liv. 1.15.1-5), but they confirm the interchanging relationship between the two banks of the river: cf. Ward-Perrins 1961:22 ff.; Ogilvie 1965:83.
424 Liv. 5.54.4. cf. Ogilvie 1965:748-9. The last phrase in Livy is crucial as he shows the existence of *regiones Italiae* and stresses the importance of being in the middle of them. The statement after, that the Tiber would have been in the centre of Italy, was therefore a given. Ogilvie’s (1965:749) questioning is nonsense as he considers the parenthetic phrase as ‘awkward and artificial’. On the contrary, Livy refers probably to the Augustan regions as he did in the subdivision of the city.
ground of Rome’s development, as Strabo bluntly confirms. The founders built Rome where they did more from necessity than from choice, even though the Roman writers tend to ascribe to the very nature of the site certain advantages that were in fact only acquired by generations of determined effort and exploitation of the location.

The short segment along which Rome rose has been deemed as the main connective junction of peninsular Italy. Here, two routes intersected each other: the north-south route leading northward to Etruscan territory, and the East-West route, important in the transport of salt from the sea to the Sabine herders and other peoples in the interior, its name reflected in the ancient name Via ‘Salaria’ (Salt Road). Rome’s prominent position on the Tiber exercised a position of control over both the naval traffic and any sort of crossing-ford, taking advantage of being the closest stronghold to the sea. The City straddles the Tiber at a point some 24km inland from the Mediterranean Sea and lies on the highest and steepest cliffs for anyone who comes from the sea – a maritime vantage that has been listed by both ancient and modern authorities as being among the first virtues of the location. Besides adding fish to the food supply, ancient authors emphasised the importance of the Tiber. Rome was near enough to the sea for convenience, but not so near to be in danger from foreign fleets. In its lower course, the Tiber was easily navigable for even large ships, which could reach a sort of natural emporium, a marketplace. Even though at the beginning of the 4th century B.C. maritime trade at Rome was still negligible, Livy depicts Camillus reaping the benefits from

---

426 Strabo 5.3.2, 7.
427 Cozzo 1935:135; Pareti 1947:56-7; Nissen 1902:1.317-8; Romanelli 1949:61; Cic. Rep. 2.6-11; Plin. N.H. 3.53-4. Beloch (1926:201-2) exaggerates the importance of the Tiber to Rome, which he says was the natural emporium of the whole district because of its situation on the river.
429 Campbell 2012:77.
431 Bones of fresh water fish were found in Forum graves: cf. Von Duhn 1924:422.
433 For late development of Portus and Emporium at Rome, see Säflund 1932:175, 177; for general lack of interest in seafaring, Jordan 1907:1.1.428; Ashby 1927:16; Frank 1940:1.54. Holland 1949:301; Campbell 2012:77.
the river, receiving merchandise from overseas.\textsuperscript{434} This ancestral marketplace – encompassing the whole district – was probably set in the area of the \textit{Fora Boarium} and \textit{Holitorium}, which is the place where Tiberinus attempted his crossing.\textsuperscript{435} Although no ancient writer suggests that there was a ford at Rome, in this area a river crossing might have been set up, as the mythical tradition would suggest: Hercules himself waded through the river at the future site of Rome with a herd of cattle, clashing with a primitive ‘Roman’ inhabitant, Cacus.\textsuperscript{436} The advantage of Rome was the same as Antemnae, Crustumoinum and Fidenae, which had the control of key points along the Tiber: fords, crossings and connection with tributaries.\textsuperscript{437} Perhaps it is not accidental that Caeninae and Antemnae – with Fidenae – are listed amongst the first villages conquered by Romulus.\textsuperscript{[3.4]} What was it that Rome had that the other towns listed above did not?

Rome’s first concern was to eliminate the installation of similar places. Furthermore, besides being the only ford/bridge in the area, Rome allowed travellers to cross just one river, before approaching the Anio, for those who used to head to Etruria from the South. Rome would have had advantages in controlling the opposite bank, keeping both sides strongly connected. The nature of the banks was already favourable, since they were fairly solid on both sides opposite the island, while the surrounding swamps helped to interconnect the approach to the river.\textsuperscript{438} Livy presents this landscape, creating an association in the reader’s mind between Rome’s hills and the Tiber, when the river used to flood:

\begin{center}
\textit{forte quadam divinitus super ripas Tiberis effusus lenibus stagnis, nec adiri usquam ad iusti cursum poterat amnis.}\textsuperscript{439}
\end{center}

It is something strongly divine that the Tiber used to spread beyond its banks into stagnant pools, as the main channel of the Tiber was not even recognisable when the flood happened.

\textbf{[FIG 14]} So what was the landscape like around a flooding river? In these cases, the Capitoline appeared like a peninsula, stretched out from standing waters merged

\textsuperscript{434} Livy (5.54.4) probably transposed the days of the Gallic disaster to the early imperial Rome, when the docks of the Emporium received daily deliveries from the markets of the world.
\textsuperscript{435} Cf. Ovid \textit{Fasti} 2.389-92.
\textsuperscript{436} Liv. 1.7.4.
\textsuperscript{437} Holland 1949:310.
\textsuperscript{438} Holland 1949:312.
\textsuperscript{439} Liv. 1.4.4.
together. By flooding the area around it, the Tiber *de facto* isolated the Capitoline Hill, which stayed connected with the Quirinal Hill only through a thin, continuous saddle.440 The river and the picture drawn by Livy, of surrounding land flooded, would have given the Palatine and Capitoline the shape of a promontory. Although the situation was uncomfortable for the first settlers, they might have had easy access to the river through these broad bogs. Rome effectively turned into a seasonal peninsula and a comfortable refuge, as no enemy, neither man nor beast, could approach the settlement. In the early period the *Arx* – the northern slope of the Capitoline Hill – was one of the key spots of the *Urbs*. Besides being small enough to be defended with only a few men,441 it also hosted the *auguraculum*,442 a sacred place used to divide and control the space around it, and was used strategically and commercially as an observation post.[2.2.7; esp. 3.1] The importance of having a broad view of the surrounding area,443 and especially the Tiber, is a theme debated in the chapter dedicated to Jupiter Feretrius. For now it is enough to say that the whole area around the *Arx* was readily visible and allowed for the regulation of any movement of people.

[FIG 13, 16] The only obstacle to the 360-degree visual was the Janiculum Hill. Positioned on the western bank, the ridge of Janiculum overlooked the hills on both sides of the Tiber. The first Roman objective, therefore, was to secure the hill on the opposite side within the City’s borders. Rome began a series of wars with Veii,

---

440 The hill (*mons*) was cut by Trajan in creating his forum as the inscription on the base of his column reports: “SENATVS POPVLVSQVE ROMANVS / IMP CAESARI DIVI NERVAE F NERVAE / TRAIANO AVG GERM DACICO PONTIF / MAXIMO TRIB POT XVII IMP VI COS VI P P / AD DECLARANDVM QVANTAE ALTITVDINIS / MONS ET LOCVS TANTIS OPERIBVS SIT EGESTVS (The Senate and people of Rome to the Emperor Caesar Nerva Trajan Augustus, son of Nerva of blessed memory, conqueror in Germany and Dacia, High Priest, vested with the tribunician power 17 times, proclaimed Imperator 6 times, elected consul 6 times, Father of the Nation: as an illustration of the height which this hill and place attained, now removed for such great works as these).

441 Livy (5.48.6) describes the bitter trial of the Roman force besieged on the Capitoline by the Gauls: “*diem de die prospectans ecquod auxilium ab dictatore appareret,*” and the hopelessness they felt because they knew that there was no relieving force if they could not see one.

442 The open space (*templum*) on the *arx*, where the public auspices were taken after the Capitoline hill had become a part of the city. In the centre of this open space was the thatched hut of the observer, which was preserved in its primitive form at least as late as the time of Augustus (Vitr. 2.1.5; Varr. L.L. 7.8; Cic. Off. 3.66-7; Paul. Fest. 18; cf. Plin. N.H. 22.5; Liv. 1.24; Platner & Ashby s. ‘*auguraculum*’; Lugli 1946:37; Paul. Fest. 466-7L, s. ‘*summissiorem*’). The *auguraculum* was on the northeast corner of the *arx*, above the *clivus Argentarius*, probably near the apse of the present church, which coincidentally is called S. Maria in Aracoeli (Jordan 1907:1.1.131).
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which possessed at least the right bank of the Tiber.\textsuperscript{444} These wars can be historiographically divided into two moments: during the Regal Period (753-510 B.C.) and in the Republican Period (510-390 B.C.). I will focus on the war with Veii because the finis used by Livy is related to the rivers Tiber and Cremera, which bordered Veii’s territory. We do not have to think that the Romans “were impressed by the feeling that the Etruscan was a foreigner, while the Latin was their countryman”.\textsuperscript{445} On the contrary, Rome fought against both of them in various ways and also the territory south of Rome presented fines, shared with the Latins. [FIG 13]Livy refers to the Fossa Cluilia as a bordering practice area between the territories of Rome and Alba.\textsuperscript{446} It is almost the same sort of agreement when Rome had to fight Alba: it was agreed that the conflict would be decided by a duel between Horatii and Curiatii, so that the Etruscans could not take advantage of a war between them (“etrusca res quanta circa nos teque maxime sit”).\textsuperscript{447} [4.3.2]

This task was apparently accomplished by Ancus Marcius (640-616 B.C.). Digging a defensive ditch (Fossa Quiritum)\textsuperscript{448} or building walls was a consistent part of his policy of expansion and defence of the whole city, as Livy stresses in different circumstances.\textsuperscript{449} [4.2.2] Amongst these works, Ancus undertook the main extension of the city based on the incorporation of the Janiculus into the City:

\begin{quote}
\textit{ianiculum quoque adiectum, non inopia loci, sed ne quando ea arx hostium esset. id non muniti solum sed etiam ob commoditatem itineris ponte sublicio, tum primum in Tiberi facto, coniungi urbi placuit.}\textsuperscript{450}
\end{quote}

Janiculum was also annexed to the city, not from any lack of room, but lest it might someday become a stronghold of Rome’s enemies. It was decided not only to fortify it, but also to connect it with the City, for greater ease in passing to and fro, by a bridge of piles, the first bridge ever built over the Tiber.

\textsuperscript{444} De Santis 1997.  
\textsuperscript{445} Mommsen 1873:1.131.  
\textsuperscript{446} Liv. 1.23.3: 2.39.5.  
\textsuperscript{447} Liv. 1.23.8.  
\textsuperscript{448} Liv. 1.33.7: “Quiritium quoque fossa, haud parvum munimentum a planioribus aditu locis, Anci regis opus est” (The Quirites’ Ditch also, no small protection on the more level and accessible side of town, was the work of King Ancus). Can this ditch be related to a sort of border line, similar to the Fossa Cluilia for the Latin territory? Cf. Liv. 1.38.6-7.  
\textsuperscript{449} Liv. 1.38.6: “nam et muro lapideo, cuius exordium operis Sabino bello turbatum erat, urbem qua nondum munierat cingere parat” (For he set to work to encircle the hitherto unfortified parts of the City with a stone wall, a task which had been interrupted by the Sabine war).  
\textsuperscript{450} Liv. 1.33.6.
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The occupation of the Janiculum was necessary in order to prevent surprise attacks from the North, i.e from the Veientines. Livy, however, focuses the attention on the connective value of the bridge, the main expedient used to improve the relations between the City and the detached area on the other side of the Tiber. Preceded by a ferry, the use of a bridge was possibly the crucial revolutionary idea that allowed for a joining of the banks lawfully, religiously and practically.\textsuperscript{451} A pontoon bridge, or more probably the ‘Sublicius’,\textsuperscript{452} was supported on piles driven into the bed of the stream.\textsuperscript{453} The existence of a massive stepping stone guarded by the Citadel – the Tiberine Island – was also helpful to build up the bridge, which connected the opposite bank.\textsuperscript{454} The ancient accounts explain artificial improvements to a massive island, right in front of the main city hills (Capitoline and Palatine), illustrating the effect of interfering with nature, through an act of creation.\textsuperscript{455} This place, which probably decided Rome’s destiny was of vital importance for Rome of three factors: a) the consequent command and control of the crossing; b) the first bridge; and c) the island – which could have given an advantage to any invading forces who crossed from it.\textsuperscript{456} As consequence, scholars are in general agreement that Rome

\textsuperscript{451} Holland 1949:311.
\textsuperscript{452} Dionysius of Halicarnassus (3.45.2, 9.68) says it was impossible to cross the Tiber on foot except by a bridge. Platner & Ashby s. ‘Pons Sublicius’ speaks of “slack water below the island where the original ford was situated”. Jordan (1907:1.1.394) and Gilbert (1885:2.178, n. 1) describe the same place as dangerous with rapids. Smith (1877:25) and Nissen (1902:1.317) join the latter in supporting Dionysius of Halicarnassus. Plin. N.H. 36.100; Serv. ad Aen. 8.646; Paul. Fest. 374L. A depiction of the bridge on an Antonine medallion shows the bridge’s supports as vertical clusters, clearly representing bundled wooden piles; cf. Mayerhöfer 1883:26; Taylor 2002:3.
\textsuperscript{453} Holland 1949:312.
\textsuperscript{454} Holland (1961:242-6) identifies a bridge older than the Sublicius, which originally connected Rome, the Island and the Trans Tiberim.
\textsuperscript{455} There are two legends on the ‘creation’ of Tiberine Island: a) In Livy’s account, the island is not considered in this process, as he follows the tradition after which it was created by the corpse of Tarquinius (Liv. 2.5.); b) the Vestal Virgins prepared the mola salsa, a meal served to the priests consisting of cakes of far (a type of wheat) and salt during various festivals. The waste material from the preparation process was thrown from the Pons Sublicius into the Tiber in the form of straw men. Serv. ad Aen. 2.135, 4.57, 10.541; Serv. Eclog. 8.82. See Holland 1961:316-7; Taylor 2002:2.
\textsuperscript{456} Weiss 1936:11.782-4; Almagià 1949:29.590; Cozzo 1935:87-91; Lugli 1938:3.620; Platner & Ashby:1929:536. Holland 1949:310 states that the insula was the best place to set up a cable ferry, if such a thing existed. However, some authors consider that the Romans did not have a major crossing by the Island, disregarding the island until the construction of embankments and the draining of the marsh on the east bank made development desirable: cf. Le Gall 1953a:83; Taylor 2002:2.
offered the first protected and comfortable crossing on the way upstream from the mouth of the Tiber.\textsuperscript{457}

\section*{2.2.7 Connection Capitoline-Tiber-Janiculum}

Since the loca (places) of the Tiber-\textit{finis} has been established by the tradition, I will try to extrapolate from this section some features attributable to the \textit{finis}, as Livy records them. In this section, my research targets one event: the occupation or the possession of Rome beyond the opposite bank of the Tiber as \textit{finis}. Specifically, I will consider a key argument – the connection of a river (Tiber) with specific places (Janiculum and Capitolium Hills) – which helps to define the concept of \textit{finis}. In order to understand how the Tiber-\textit{finis} was considered, I will focus attention on the adjoining of the Janiculum to Rome, which lay on the left bank of the Tiber. The willingness to occupy the Janiculum – and to consider it as part of the city – represents a true revolution in Roman conception about \textit{fines}: both sides of a \textit{finis} are seen as a unity. Although it has not been definitively proven that the Janiculum was inhabited at the time of Ancus, Livy’s narrative reveals the conjoining elements that made this annexation possible. The bridge as a means of connection is a key point both in the Livian account and in the reshaping of the concept of \textit{finis} and is, nevertheless, crucial to my argument.

Although Livy acknowledges that the Janiculum was encompassed into the City by Ancus, this process was still unfinished at the time of Porsenna’s invasion (509 B.C.). Therefore, I disagree with Ogilvie’s somewhat radical belief that the “incorporation of the hill as a whole” was an exaggeration.\textsuperscript{458} It is merely the case that, at this crucial historical moment, Rome had obtained a permanent link with the Janiculum, but not its complete control. In this context, Livy’s legendary account of the first war against Veii in Romulus’ time can be read as a statement of the Roman

\textsuperscript{457} Besnier (1902) made an often repeated statement that the island is of the same tufa rock as the Capitoline (cf. Platner & Ashby 1929 s. ‘Capitoline Hill’). De Angelis d’Ossat (1944:77) shows a dismaying lack of evidence for this assertion, but gives his opinion that the island existed from prehistoric times and was of cardinal importance in making an early bridge possible (1944:88). The small island shown in old maps at the upper end of the Insula Tiberina was apparently formed by a mass of masonry which fell away from the bank (1944:81). Cf. Holland 1949:312.

\textsuperscript{458} Ogilvie 1965:137.
attitude towards the presence and the function of the Tiber.\textsuperscript{459} Once attacked by the Etruscans, the Romans had an entrepreneurial determination in crossing the river. This determination is also evident in the difference between the Roman and the Veientine military tactics: the latter would devastate and plunder Rome’s territory before returning to their own, without setting up any fort (\textit{...itaque non castris positis, non exspectato hostium exercitu raptam ex agris praedam portantes Veios rediere}).\textsuperscript{460} Livy in this case uses the term \textit{ager} (\textit{agris}) to indicate the Roman territory – a key point for the exploration of the term \textit{finis}. In the first chapter, I underlined that the translation of \textit{finis} (plural) is often combined with the notion of territory.\textsuperscript{[1.4.1]} Through the use of this term, Livy again highlights Roman tactics and strategy: instead of remaining ensconced behind Rome’s river, “the Romans – not finding the enemy in their territory (\textit{agris}) – ready and eager for a decisive struggle, crossed the Tiber” (“\textit{Romanus contra, postquam hostem in agris non invenit, dimicationi ultimae instructus intentusque Tiberim transit}”).\textsuperscript{461} Once again Livy relates those places with Ancus’ expansion, stating the connection between the King and the enlargement of their borders. Ancus’ expansionistic policy allows Livy the opportunity to emphasise this difference between \textit{agri} and \textit{fines}, in the process of Rome’s extension of her dominion.

\begin{quote}
\textit{Nec urbs tantum hoc rege creuit sed etiam ager finesque. Silua Maesia Veientibus adempta usque ad mare imperium prolatum et in ore Tiberis Ostia urbs condita, salinae circa factae, egregieque rebus bello gestis aedis Iovis Feretri amplificata.}\textsuperscript{462}
\end{quote}

And this reign was a period of growth, not only for the City, but also for her lands and \textit{fines}. The Maesian Forest was taken from the Veientes, extending Rome’s dominion clear to the sea; at the Tiber’s mouth the city of Ostia was founded, and salt-works were established near-by; while in recognition of signal success in war the temple of Jupiter Feretrius\textsuperscript{[3.3]} was enlarged.

In the first phrase, Livy reports Rome’s expansion on three different levels: city (\textit{urbs}), territory (\textit{ager}) and \textit{fines}. They are clearly three different layers, which form a sequence from the core to the periphery of the Roman domain. It is undeniable that \textit{ager} and \textit{fines} are distinguishable and clearly not synonymous, representing two different conceptions of space to Roman eyes. Moreover – besides this one aspect – Livy sums up in this key passage some other important aspects: a) the \textit{Silva

\begin{footnotes}
\item[459] Liv. 1.15.1-3.
\item[460] Liv. 1.15.2.
\item[461] Liv. 1.15.2.
\item[462] Liv. 1.33.9.
\end{footnotes}
Maesa was probably part of the *fines*; b) the *fines* might also be connected with the extended (*prolatum*) *imperium*; c) the foundation of the colony of *Ostia Tiberis* might be linked to the control of salt-works; d) the enlargement of the temple of Jupiter Feretrius was due to great victories and deeds, which some authors have linked with the extension of the *fines*.[3.8]

Livy presents other examples, in which *finis* and *ager* are in the same context:

- *Sita in Maesessum finibus est, Bastetanae gentis ager frugifer; argentum etiam incolae fodiunt.*\(^{463}\)
  It is situated in the *fines* of the Maessesses, a Bastetanian tribe. Its land is fruitful; the inhabitants mine silver also.

- *finium is ager Cassandrensium erat, longe fertilissimus omnis orae quam praeteruecti fuerant.*\(^{464}\)
  These *fines* belonged to the territory of Cassandrea and was by far the most fertile of all the coast they had passed.

- *[Fabii], qua Tuscus ager Romano adiacet, sua tuta omnia, infesta hostium vagantes per utrumque finem fecerat.*\(^{465}\)
  but in all that region where the Tuscan territory marches with the Roman the Fabii afforded universal security to their own countrymen and vexation to the enemy, by ranging along the *finis* on both sides.

*Fines* have a precise spatial definition, which is not superimposable upon *ager* and therefore cannot be translated as territory. At the moment, it is important to emphasise this difference. The last passage – on the Fabii – will be discussed later,[2.3.2] while the possibility of different territorial subdivision of the surrounding space will be analysed later.[4.2.3.1]

### 2.2.8 Finis and the bridge

In this section, I emphasise the role of the ‘passageways’ across the *fines*, which turn into a means of connection between two separated areas. The extension of *fines* might also have encompassed Ancus’ expansion on the right bank of the

---

\(^{463}\) Liv. 28.3.3.  
\(^{464}\) Liv. 44.10.12.  
\(^{465}\) Liv. 2.49.9.
Chapter 2. Tiber. The earliest paradigm for finis?

Tiber. Through the ‘natural’ incorporation of the area beyond the Tiber-finis and the setting up of a bridge, Rome created an ‘osmotic area’ (my definition). 466

[FIG 16] Directly in front of the Capitoline lay the Janiculum hill, obscuring the sightline towards Etruria. The establishment of a Janiculan outpost was, therefore, one of the first concerns for early Romans although, in terms of occupation, it was more likely a watch tower than a fortress initially. 467 Ancus added the Janiculum [to the City] (ianiculum quoque adiectum) for strategic purposes: to avoid the hill becoming a stronghold for the enemy [the Etruscans] (sed ne quando ea arx hostium esset) and not because of lack of space in Rome (non inopia loci). However, bringing the Janiculum within Rome’s fines was a two-stage process. Firstly, the King crowned the Janiculum with walls and later he decided “also to connect it with the City, for greater ease in passing to and fro, by a bridge of piles, the first bridge ever built over the Tiber” (“sed etiam ob commoditatem itineris ponte sublicio, tum primum in Tiberi facto, coniungi urbi placuit”). 468 This was not the establishment of an entity independent and separate from Rome; this new area was a part of the City herself.

The early ford heading to the right bank conveyed the existing synergic system toward the Janiculum. Historical reminiscences told the Romans that that side (ripa) belonged to the Etruscans of Veii. But the Tiber had never been considered a

466 OSMOSIS: 1. Biology & Chemistry: A process by which molecules of a solvent tend to pass through a semipermeable membrane from a less concentrated solution into a more concentrated one. And especially acceptation 2. The process of gradual or unconscious assimilation of ideas, knowledge, etc. (OED2 2010). Although the Oxford Dictionary definition gives both ideas, biologically and socially, of an ‘osmotic process’, I just report the passage of a romance writer, who provides a more colourful idea of an ‘osmotic area’ by applying the biological aspects to the visual-narrative style [see ch. 1 on Livy’s style]: “The Tendency of a solvent to pass through a “semipermeable” (which he defines as: “allowing some substances to pass; permeable (open to passage) to smaller molecules but not to larger ones, as a membrane in osmosis”) membrane, as the wall of a living cell, into a solution of a higher concentration, so as to equalise concentrations on both sides of the membranes (‘membrane’ being fine skin, parchment—a thin pliable sheet)”. A further definition of “osmosis” is given as: “The diffusion of fluids through a membrane or porous partition: an apparently effortless absorption of ideas—feelings—attitudes—etc.; as if by biological osmosis”. (Freedman 2002:76-7). The ‘osmotic process’ might provide the idea of growing space and assimilation of Rome, performed already with Caenina, Antemnae and Crustuminum, following the embodiment of the surrounding territory through connective means such as roads, sea routes, and mainly bridges, mountain passes and tunnels.

467 Taylor 2002:1
468 Liv. 1.33.6.
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‘whole Etruscan river’ in Roman memory,\textsuperscript{469} and they now proceeded to override the schematic subdivision made in the protohistoric period through the annexation of Janiculum, by constructing across this finis – the Tiber – the first bridge as a substantial stepping stone in Ancus’ expansionistic policy. A sight-system of flag signals now linked the Janiculum to the Arx,\textsuperscript{470} which was still standing as a vestigial remnant of military past in the Late Republic.\textsuperscript{471} Ancus’ construction of a wooden bridge over the Tiber – and his conquest of the salt-beds (Salinae) – allowed Rome to become the new hub along the salt road.\textsuperscript{472} In this early period of Rome’s history, the river might have had the ancestral function of finis, inheriting both the situation and the concept from the Etrusco-Latin agreement. Here, across the Tiber, was situated the Lucus Albionarum where sacrifices of white oxen were offered, confirming that the name Albula does indeed share some connection with the colour of the river itself.\textsuperscript{473} North and south banks had shrines of Anna Perenna (Amnis Perennis?)\textsuperscript{474} and Dea Dia\textsuperscript{475} set up, both of which could be reached by boat on the occasion of their festivals. For this reason, Purcell stresses the liminal, religious and legal nature of the site along the river.\textsuperscript{476} In Rome, the Tiber had the strongest ideological meaning in dividing the Urbs from the ‘litus Tuscus’ (Etruscan bank),\textsuperscript{477} a strip of land belonging to Veii and running from the Faliscan / Capenate

\textsuperscript{469} I.e. Stat. Silvae 1.2.190.
\textsuperscript{470} Livy (4.18.6) describes a dictator with the army at Antemnae as he watches for the battle signal to be raised from the Roman Arx after the auspices. The signal in this case was apparently a flag, but Livy (4.27.12) and Caesar (B.C. 3.65.2) show that the ancients also used smoke signals. Other instances of long-distance communication are Dion. Hal. 3.6.3, 7.11, 5.41. Visibility was important when travel was so slow. Ancient towns were placed so that they could be approached by unseen enemies only at night. The long range of the eye in the neighbourhood of Rome has been important in history. The Alban Hills are visible from Caere, or even from Tarquinii on a very clear day, and they remain in sight for travellers on the coast road; cf. Von Duhn 1924:391. Antemnae was an early acquisition of the Romans and its height could be used for camp or signal station. It may have been called turrigerae (Virg. Aen. 7.631) not from turrets of a wall which it probably never had, but from a known tradition of a signal tower. It was useful to have a relay between Rome and Fidenae which was screened from the arx by the Pincian Hill (Dennis 1883:1.53). Holland 1949:309, n. 115.
\textsuperscript{472} Ogilvie 1965:140-1, who connects the control of the salinae with Via Salaria and the jurney to the Sabine hinterland; cf. Richardson 1992, s. ‘Salinae’; Taylor 2002:2.
\textsuperscript{474} Egelhaaf-Gaiser 2007:212-4.
\textsuperscript{476} Purcell 1996:187.
\textsuperscript{477} Serv. ad Aen. 11.598; cf. Irollo 2004:139.
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territory to the mouth of the Tiber.\textsuperscript{478} The festival of Dea Dia was also called Tuscanicae, with a reference to the Etruscan side of the bank.\textsuperscript{479} How far, both spatially and chronologically, that zone spread is demonstrated by the name ‘ripa Veientana’,\textsuperscript{480} which clung to the Roman right bank for centuries after the great rival had fallen and the Roman territory had passed beyond its walls.\textsuperscript{481}

The ‘alien’ or peregrinus territory of Etruria,\textsuperscript{[alienus:4.3.2; peregrinus:4.2.3]} as it was in the Roman conception, began directly on the other side of the river, and the river bank in both directions was the setting for important rituals that concerned the boundaries of space and time. A further confirmation of the nature of the Tiber as a finis is given by an essential step: the development of a limited concept of planning, detectable among the Romans in the distinction between public and private land or between sacred and other land. For instance, in order to protect public rights, the commissioners for water and for the banks of the Tiber had power to exercise such delimitation (terminatio), and erected cippi to mark the boundary.\textsuperscript{482} In this context, both the bridge and the river served a dual role; first as ‘divider’ and later as ‘joiner’. The Pontiffs – besides being tasked with looking after the Sublicius Bridge – used to perform sacred functions on both bridgeheads.\textsuperscript{483} And it would seem that bridges on both sides of the island were necessary for many centuries, as the ancient name of ‘Inter duos pontes’\textsuperscript{484} implies.

As previously mentioned, however, at the time of Porsenna’s invasion (510/9 B.C.), the process of fortifying the Janiculum had still not been completed, as it could not check the Clusinian army. But Livy still underlines the defensive nature of the Tiber, confirming it as a natural barrier capable of repelling a siege and mostly as Rome’s

\textsuperscript{478} This is in general the line on which raiding parties used to bring their attacks: Tarquinians and Faliscans appear at the Roman Salinae to which only Veii had had access (Liv. 7.17.6). Caeretans are involved in another raid there (Liv. 7.19.8).
\textsuperscript{479} Prudent. Perist. 2.77. During the feast dedicated to the Dea Dia (end of May), several banquet took place. Lit torches touched the pots (tuscanicae) of food, now profanated and made proper for human use, by carrying it to the Arval Brothers. Woodard 2006:230.
\textsuperscript{480} The name is still used on imperial cippi (CIL 6.31547, 31548 b). See Jordan 1907:622, 651-2. Cf. Hor. Odes 1.2.14: “litore Etrusco”.
\textsuperscript{481} Holland 1949:309.
\textsuperscript{482} Robinson 1992:22.
\textsuperscript{483} Var. L.L. 5.83
\textsuperscript{484} Lanciani 1897:18. For the name, see Platner & Ashby 1929 s. ‘Insula Tiberina’. Cf. Holland 1949:311.
defender, and the defensive function of the Tiber is definitively confirmed by its comparison with the city walls. On the appearance of the enemy, the Romans:

\begin{quote}
_{pro se quisque in urbem ex agris demigrant, urbem ipsam saepiunt praesidiis. alia muris, alia Tiberi obiecto videbantur tuta._}
\end{quote}

decided to gather themselves, withdrawing from their fields into the City. The weakest points were protected by military posts, elsewhere by the walls and somewhere else by the barrier of the Tiber.

This equation between a natural feature, such as a water stream, and an artificial construction such as the city walls, might represent an important step in identifying some features of finis, which seems in this example to be more important as a defensive tool than as a ‘marking line’. We have already seen this consequent ‘crescendo’ of supposed layers in Livy’s historical representation of urbs, ager, fines, related to Ancus’ expansion (\textit{nec urbs tantum hoc rege crevit, sed etiam ager finesque [urbs => ager => fines]}). In this case – when Rome had to defend herself, the order of the layers is inverted (\textit{in urbem ex agris demigrant / urbem ipsam / alia muris, alia Tiberi}) and the term finis is omitted: territory => urbs => walls/Tiber. The Roman conception of the surrounding space/territory prefigures as a concentric view of the world, subdivided by imaginary strips. Moreover, Livy renders the bridge as a vital element through which two parts can be joined or split, united or separated, connected or divided. In common with Juvenal, he depicts the heroic deeds of Horatius Cocles, Mucius Scaevola and Clelia, confirming the function of the Tiber in a sort of historical \textit{topos} common to all three episodes.

Romans’ fears were realised when Porsenna conquered the Janiculum, but most of all when he tried to take the city by passing over the bridge. The wooden piled ‘sublicium’ set up between two river sides served as a ‘corridor’ for the enemy (\textit{pons sublicius iter paene hostibus dedit}) and what the Romans feared most came to pass: Posenna had occupied the Janiculum and exploited it as a fortress to attack Rome on the opposite side. The Romans, meanwhile, were experiencing for the first time all possible functions of a bridge: not least that it could be defended by just a few people, in this case led by Horatius Cocles, “\textit{qui positus forte in statione pontis,}

\begin{flushright}
486 Liv. 2.10.1.
487 Liv. 1.33.9
488 Liv. 2.10.2
\end{flushright}
cum captum repentina impetu Ianiculum\(^{489}\) ("who chanced to be on guard at the bridge when Janiculum was captured"). Horatius Cocles was the sole, last defence of the bridge in the face of Porsenna’s advancing army, and he succeeded brilliantly in holding it.\(^{490}\)

Livy gives a series of clues in this passage that resume the previous observations: the Janiculum is part of the City and has a privileged link with the other two monumental hills, Palatine and Capitoline (Palatio Capitolioque quam in Ianiculo fore). Pons Sublicius was broken apart (interrumpant) with swords, fire and any other means available (ferro, igni, quacumque vi possint), and came crashing down when the Etruscans, stunned by a standoff with only three men, attempted to charge the defenders – to the delight and cheers of the Romans, who were consequently saved (iam impetu conabantur detrudere virum, cum simul fragor rupti pontis, simul clamor Romanorum). Cocles’ prayer addressed to the river, when he is about to dive into it, also reminds the reader of another reason the Romans had to defend these fines: its Latin name (Tiberinus) represents the sum of the importance given to the water stream, ‘Tiberine pater’. According to Cicero,\(^{491}\) the name Tiberus or ‘Tiberinus’ was certainly ancient, since it appeared in the augural prayer and referred to the sacred value of the river.\(^{492}\)
Once Porsenna’s invasion was checked, the reconquest or recapture of the Janiculum seemed once again to be Rome’s primary objective. While the Urbs was still under siege by the Etruscans of Clusium (modern Chiusi), Gaius Mucius – later Scaevola – encapsulated his purpose in two words pronounced before the Senate. He wanted to enter the enemy camp (intrare, si possim, castra hostium uolo) and assassinate King Porsenna, after having crossed the Tiber (“patres, …transire Tiberim …”). Juvenal’s mythical account still considers the Tiber as the finis of Rome’s imperium, although it renders the Livian account more explicit – albeit in a context that seems more epic and legendary (see e.g. the name Tiberinus for Tiber):

prodita laxabant portarum claustra tyrannis
exulibus iuvenes ipsius consulis et quos
magnum aliquid dubia pro libertate decreter,
quod miraretur cum Coclite Mucius et quae
imperii fines Tiberinum virgo natavit.495

Conspired to betray the barrier of the gates
to banished tyrants, the sons of the consul himself
instead to attempt some deed for the doubtful liberty,
as those we can admire of Mutius, with Cocles and
the virgin who swam the Tiber, the fines of our Empire.

The terms porta and claustra recall the Livian description of Sutrium and Nepet,496[2.2.5] the deeds of ‘Republican heroes’ like Mucius and Cocles and Cloelia (virgo) are the same as in Livy, and the name of the Tiber (= Tiberinus) recalls Cocles’ prayer to the river. Livy’s imperial view here is traceable in Juvenal’s poem, where the terminology of the two authors is the same, confirming the key role of Livy as ‘bridge’ between the Republic and the Empire.

493 Liv. 2.12.1-13.5; Dion. Hal. 5.27-30.
494 Liv. 2.12.5. When he failed to kill Porsenna, he voluntarily set his right hand on fire. Two more passages provide connections with similar border stories. After having impressed Porsenna with his steadfastness, Mucius was released and informed the Etruscan king that 300 young men were ready to perform this same action, in trying to kill Porsenna. The number of 300 seems to be a topos in mythography and history. The most famous Spartan army (s. Hdt. 7.205.1-2) has a precedent in the ‘Battle of Champions’ between Sparta and Argo. The same number is cited by Mucius Scaevola facing Porsenna, when he says that 300 young Romans were ready to imitate his act against the Etruscan king. After his return to the city, Mucius got the surname of Scaevola and was rewarded with a plot of land North of the river, the Mucia Prata (Mucian Meadows). Cf. Liv. 2.13 with Dion. Hal. 5.35 and Paul. Fest. 144L; Aur. Vict. Vir.III. 12.
495 Juvenal Sat. 3.8.261-5.
496 Ceccarelli & Stoddart 2007.
By considering the data at face-value, scholars might still conclude that “the Tiber marked the boundary between Etruria (the Etruscan heartland) to the North, and Latium, a region dominated by Rome”, however, since from that moment onward the Janiculum remained in Rome’s hands and the adjoining part on the right bank was finally exploited like the right side on the insediamental point of view. Forsythe seems to have grasped correctly the sense of the *finis*: “The Romans were thus the northernmost inhabitants of Latium and… encompassing the northern bank of the Tiber, became also the southernmost settlers of Etruria”. Richardson has commented on the episode from an Imperial perspective: he deems the Tiber as ‘boundary of imperium’ and considers it the ‘limit of Rome’s territory’. He compares the period in which the Tiber was the boundary of Rome with the time of Juvenal, when Rhine, Danube and Euphrates marked the boundaries of Rome. This tradition remained unaltered through the eyes of the Romans until the Middle/Late Empire, when it was considered also an ‘opus inex<supe>rabile’, in a moment of the Empire when the rivers assumed a particular connotation of serving a practical, defensive function. During the time of the Roman Empire, the district of *Transtiberim* (modern Trastevere, Rome) where, according to newspaper reports, the port facilities of ancient Rome along the Tiber have recently been discovered, was intensively occupied. Procopius states that the Romans constructed so many houses in Trastevere that the Tiber appeared to be in the middle of the city, instead of marking the boundary with hostile Etruscan territory as it had done in the earliest stages of Roman history.

Rome revolutionised the bordering practices on a practical level, by crossing the river and occupying the opposite side. For the Romans, the river – and therefore the *finis* – represented more than just a simple ‘dividing line’, marking two potential territories. The Tiber was not even merely a ‘demarcation line’, which may be equated to any of the bordering concepts, and during Rome’s early days her river
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498 Carafa 2004:56.
500 Richardson 2008:176.
502 So already in Augustan period: Catalli, Fabiani, Mazzoni & Pacchiarotti 2009.
was more important as a barrier than as a means of communication. The dividing power of the river is apparent not only from geographical probability, but from the evidence of archaeology. The Romans contextualised their position and possibly modified the previous view of it, overturning the Latin and Etruscan trend of considering the river a dividing line. In this sense, the apparently weak position of Rome in the centre of that context forced the Romans to exploit the river in the other ways I have described.

2.3 The River Cremera

In 477 B.C., Rome faced a disaster in which 300 members of the most powerful gens of Rome, the Fabii, perished when they were ambushed by the Veientines. Indirectly, Livy states that the river Cremera, a tributary of the Tiber, was the *finem* between Etruscans and Romans. In this section, I will report the case of the Cremera as *finis* in order to confirm and emphasise some of the features of the Tiber already detected. Even the smallest streams had a focal role in relationships, subdivisions and strategies amongst the different ethnic groups, and the River Cremera as a natural feature was used to mark the zone of the *finis* between Etruscans (Veientes) and Romans. Although Livy does not explicitly state that the River Cremera was the *finis* between Etruscans and Romans, his definition of *finis* extends to this northern tributary of the Tiber: the stream Cremera.

In this context, it is my aim to consider the Cremera as a key case showing how the concepts of *finis* – applied to the Tiber and the Cremera – are superimposable. The Roman notion of *finis* was applied not just to the most significant features, such as large rivers or mountain ranges, but to any other feature that could perform that role. The Veientine Wars – also defined as ‘border ballads’ – were a series of
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504 Holland 1949:287.
506 Liv. 2.49.9-10. Cornell (1995:310) confirms that the Cremera was the border of the *ager Veientinus*. I slightly agree with the fact that the river was the boundary, but probably not of the *ager Veientinus*. It was most probably the boundary of the strip of land which bordered the river and which I call *fines*.
507 Holland 1949:317.
skirmishes or battles for the salt fields (*Salinae*) and the *Septem Pagi*, for Antemnae and Fidenae and against those Latin towns that gave aid or shelter to the enemy. After the Regal Period, the chronology of the wars between Veii and Rome – which “…shared an uneasy border along the Tiber”\textsuperscript{508} – has been historically subdivided into three main conflicts: a) a ten-year war (485-476 B.C.) where the Fabii carried out their cross-border raids and which, after the family’s annihilation, led to a forty-year truce in 474 B.C.; b) the second war, focussing mainly on the left line of the Tiber, during which Rome seized the strategic Veientine stronghold of Fidenae on the Latin side of the Tiber, leading to a twenty-year truce (438-426 B.C.); c) a lengthy ten-year siege (405 to 396 B.C.) launched by the Romans to capture Veii.\textsuperscript{509}

### 2.3.1 Fidenae and Veii

In this area – though it was no less *ager peregrinus* than Etruria from the viewpoint of infant Rome\textsuperscript{[4.2.3]} – so many cities survive, at least in name, that it is hard to find room for all of them on the map.\textsuperscript{510} Romulus had already obtained some advantages after the first fight against the Veientines,\textsuperscript{511} an initial expansion that seems to have encompassed the area of the *Septem Pagi*.\textsuperscript{512} Their names suggest a group of villages in good Italic fashion, along with the ‘district’ of *Silva Maesia*,\textsuperscript{513} northwest of the Tiber and oriented toward the sea, as the territories won were associated with the salt works.\textsuperscript{514} But he gave these same territories back to the Veientines in exchange for a century-long truce.\textsuperscript{515} Besides the *Septem Pagi* on the right bank of the Tiber, there was also a list of cities, which overlooked the Tiber from the left bank. Caenina, Antemnae, Fidenae, Eretum, Crustumerium and Nomentum are all crowded into a space about one quarter the size of the Etruscan

\textsuperscript{508} Dunstan 2011:56.  
\textsuperscript{509} Cf. Dunstan 2011:56; Kohn 2013:180.  
\textsuperscript{510} Nissen 1902:2.560, 563.  
\textsuperscript{511} Dion. Hal. 2.55.5; 5.31.4, 36.4, 65.3; Plut. *Rom*. 25.  
\textsuperscript{512} Within the limits of Tyrrenian Sea, Tiber and Janiculum, we know the names of few of them: the unallocated (not located) Artena, which is of dubious connection and is mentioned only by Livy (4.61.11) to clear up confusion with a Volscian town (he says it was destroyed by Roman kings and was in the territory of Caere; s. also Ashby 1927:228); Fregenae, which has no history before the Roman colony, and Careiae and Lorium, which are known only from imperial sources. Cf. Holland 1949:297.  
\textsuperscript{513} Livy (1.33.9) mentions this place as one of the conquests of Ancus Martius.  
\textsuperscript{515} Plut. *Rom*. 25.5; Liv. 1.15. This pact was carved on a stone, cf. Dion. Hal. 2.55.6.
territory under discussion and appear in Livy’s account often as allies and used sometimes as bridgeheads by the Veientines.

The key point was Fidenae – Veii’s tête du pont\textsuperscript{516} – and the area surrounding it, lying between the tributaries of Tiber: Anio and Cremera. The network of roads between Veii and Rome put Fidenae in a very desirable position, emphasised by its relationship with both rivers. At the river crossing nearby Fidenae, the Via Flaminia, Tiberina and Salaria from the South intersected the Etruscan road coming from the North.\textsuperscript{517} In this process and the episode of the Fabii, roads had a crucial function.\textsuperscript{518} The first road from Etruria to the South used the Cremera approach to the Tiber, which it crossed at Fidenae, not at Rome.\textsuperscript{519} Unlike Fidenae and Rome, Veii had no view of the approaches to the crossing by those roads, leading to the Tiber.\textsuperscript{520} For this reason, the position of Fidenae has been considered a sort of extension of Veii south of the Tiber. [FIG 15] The isolated height of the ancient citadel of Fidenae could forewarn the Veientines by signal if people were approaching by water or by land from any direction.\textsuperscript{521} The height of Fidenae, directly opposite the opening of the Cremera valley (which flows in the Tiber), was essential to Veii’s communications. High, wooded ridges flanked both sides of the Cremera, which flows in a deep furrow. Nevertheless, in summer the Cremera flowed healthily from its generous springs, making its banks still steeper. Fidenae, despite its colonisation, had soon discovered, either through inclination or force majeure, that its interests lay not so much with the inhabitants of Latium\textsuperscript{522} as with the southern Etruscans: probably, Fidenae was a rival of Rome when it came to

\textsuperscript{516}Mommsen 1873:1.131.
\textsuperscript{517}Ogilvie 1965:140 connects appropriately the salinae – held by Veii – with the Via Salaria. Rome aspired to keep the control of the salt-beds and the commerce of it: Cf. Meiggs 1960:16 ff. and Alfoeldi 1962. Excavations in the last four years are confirming that the earliest colony of Ostia – founded by Ancus – extended on both banks of the Tiber, as already speculated by Coarelli 1988:127-29.
\textsuperscript{518}Val. Max. 2.4.5. As Richter (1882:425) argues in connection with the legend of the Fabii that the topographical background of such stories reflects actual conditions, even when the events are far from historical. The fierce and almost unbroken enmity between Rome and Veii in the legends supports the hypothesis that Veii was the patron of a rival trade route. Far from frequenting Rome’ marketplace, Veii spared no effort to thwart the competition which reduced her own profits. The road between them was better barred against hostile visits than opened for convenient access.
\textsuperscript{519}Holland 1949:299.
\textsuperscript{520}Dunstan 2011:56.
\textsuperscript{521}Holland 1949:306.
\textsuperscript{522}For the large number of graves, see Sundwall 1932:81; Giglioli 1930:67-8. The objects in the earliest graves reflect a simple scale of living in the peasant style of the Italic. Cf. Pareti 1947:13.
crossing the river. The Livian narrative points to this peculiar topographical spot from a military/strategic point of view. The position of Fidenae is based on the fact that it is a fortress that would be extremely hard to overcome; it prominently dominates the left bank of the Tiber, thus covering the ‘right’ ("...inde ad laevam versi quia dextra Tiberis arcebat") from the top of a steep hill, which would have come under the Etruscan sphere of control.

Together with the Veientines on the other side of the Tiber, the Fidenates had predominant control both of the ferry and the traffic along the valley, by water or by land. Toward Rome, the view from Fidenae was entirely open for only about two miles, where it was interrupted by the hill of Antemnae. Thus Fidenae, for its connection with Veii and its proximity, represented a constant cause of concern for Rome. Not unnaturally, drawn once again into the sphere of Etruscan influence, Fidenae renewed its hostility towards Rome, and not without success if we are to attach any credence to the story of the Fabian gens being massacred at the Cremera. Livy puts the wars with Veii – where Fidenae was also involved – in several different periods, but situated in the same location and with the same military tactics. Wars between Rome against Fidenae and Veii were fought, in first instance, with Romulus, Tullus Hostilius, and in the Early Republic by the dictator Mamercus Aemilius with the support of L. Quintus Cincinnatus. Richter affirms that an ‘undeveloped’ Rome became a more important hub soon after the fall of Veii, which was already possible as soon as Fidenae fell (435 B.C.).

2.3.2 The Episode of the Fabii

There are several reasons to consider this Livian episode as crucial in the process of identification of the Livian term finis. Mainly, I consider it extremely important to
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524 Liv. 1.14.5.
526 Cf. Liv. 4. 33-34.
527 Liv. 2.48-49; Dion. Hal. 9. 15-16 (475 B.C.); cf. Salmon 1953:126.
528 Liv. 1.14-5; Dion. Hal. 2.53; Plut. Rom. 23.25.
529 Liv. 1.27.11. Dion. Hal. 2.72, 3.6.
530 Liv. 4.17.12.
531 Richter 1882:433-438; contra Quilici & Quilici Gigli 1986:391, who support the tradition of Dion. Hal. 5.59-60, after whom Rome conquered Fidenae in 498 B.C.
understand the construction and structuralisation of the *finis* on the Etruscan frontline between the 5th and 4th century B.C. This section has several main aims: a) highlighting some features related to *finis* in Livy’s account; b) understanding the relationship between the word *finis*, the river Cremera and the toponym Saxa Rubra; c) the reason why this small stream had such importance as *finis* between the territories of Rome and Veii; d) the claims of the Fabii over a *finis*; and most importantly, e) the link between the definitive occupation of the Janiculum and Rome’s expansion to the North. As we saw in the previous section, the conception of Tiber as *finis* had been already rendered obsolete by the Romans when they occupied the Janiculum. Rome needed to find another *finis*, pushed very close to the city of Veii: the Cremera.

Some scholars speculate that the reason for the campaign of the Fabii against Veii was a personal, rather than a public one. The prologue to the whole episode is when Q. Fabius was killed during a battle against the Veintines in 480 B.C. The strongest blood ties amongst the family’s members and the chance to extend their possession to the North made Q. Fabius’ death “…an event that could reasonably have given cause for familial involvement”. In this raid, the Etruscans once again came close to Rome and possibly reoccupied the Janiculum, as Meiklejohn hypothesises. Thus, Rome was directly entangled in the frontline war against Veii. When the threat materialised, the Fabian *gens* planned a counterstrike. The mighty family of the Fabii volunteered its service in order to continue the Veientine war single-handedly, as the *Urbs* was occupied with other surrounding enemies, such as Volsci and Aequi in the South and in the East.

Diverse hypotheses have been published about the interests of the Fabii in that territory. Kubitschek suggested that the land of the Fabii and their clients was located near Veii, south of the Cremera. I found an interesting comparison with Mucius’ tale. After Porsenna’s repulsion from its siege of Rome, as Mucius was
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532 Smith 2006:290-1.
533 Liv. 2.46.5 shows the mourning of M. Fabius on Q. Fabius’ corpse in the battlefield.
535 Meiklejohn 1938:172, although his chronology looks inaccurate, dating this attack to 478 B.C. and not cumulating it with the Roman victory of 480 B.C.
536 Liv. 2.49.2.
537 Kubitschek 1882.
being rewarded with territories in the *Transtiberim*, the Fabii wanted a prominent role in the war, aiming for similar territorial rewards. Lily Ross Taylor further explains that “Veientane (sic) attacks on the property of the *gens* would explain the special interest of the Fabii in prosecuting the war”.\(^{538}\) Cornell’s emphatic statement referring to “the fact that the Fabia tribe was situated on the borders of the *Ager Veientanus*”\(^{539}\) has, on the other hand, been deemed too strong.\(^{540}\) This theory does not imply that all of the Fabian clan lived in this area, but simply that some of them or the whole family had their personal and financial commitment in that area with the intention of expanding.\(^{541}\) From a mythic point of view, the involvement of the Fabii might be comparable with personal connections.\(^{542}\) For example, the Horatii brothers, who famously fought the Curiati,\(^{543}\) might have lived near Alba.\(^{544}\) Despite Becker’s theory,\(^{545}\) we can find more appropriate examples to help define the involvement of rich Roman families in ‘border’ or frontier wars’. In the 6th and the 5th centuries B.C., the patricians used to improve their standing through the military help they gave to the Republic, claiming back the bordering areas in which they had fought.\(^{546}\) The Fabii, as one of the main aristocratic groups, and with its gentilicial structure and clients,\(^{547}\) would have been at the front of the line.\(^{548}\)
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\(^{538}\) Ross Taylor 1960:40-1. See also Ruggiero 1984:277; Nissen 1902:564. Alföldi (1965:312) however, does not believe that the Romans were not settled on the right bank of the Tiber by this date.\(^{539}\) Cornell 1995:311.\(^{540}\) Becker & Terrenato 2006:64.\(^{541}\) Becker & Terrenato 2006:65.\(^{542}\) Smith 2006:292.\(^{543}\) Dion. Hal. 3.13.28.\(^{544}\) Taylor 1960:43; Ruggiero 1984:278-9; Kubntschek 1882:12. This is the theory from Becker & Terrenato 2006:65.\(^{545}\) Becker & Terrenato 2006:65, n. 242.\(^{546}\) Rome enacted a policy of territorial inclusion, admitting to the citizenship the old Claudian family and granting land lying beyond the Anio, even though it was a non-pacified territory; see Liv. 2.16.2. Capogrossi Colognesi (1980:31-7) has speculated on the combination between *gentes* and private possession of land, assuming that the land possessed by the gentes was assigned by the leaders of the gentes to the heads of individual families; cf. Roselaar 2010:23.\(^{547}\) The number of *clientes* who supported the gens Fabia is recorded as 4,000 (Dion. Hal. 9.15.3) or 5,000 (Paul. Fest. 450-1L, s. ‘*Scelerata porta*’); cf. Smith 2006:292.\(^{548}\) The Claudii, as we noted, set themselves in the occupied land of Sabine along the Anio by their *clientes* (Suet. *Tib*. 1), while the Valerii *gens* was involved, and this has also been recorded in an inscription recalling a Publius Valerius and his *s(u)odales*: see Stibbe, Colonna, De Simone & Versnel 1980; also Ampolo 1988:209.
Thus, the Senate accepted the offer and the Fabii, 306 in all (excepting one half-grown boy left at home) left the Urbs, passing through a city gate:

\[ \text{infelici via, dextro iano portae Carmentalis profecti ad Cremeram flumen perveniunt. is opportunus visus locus communiendo praesidio.}^{549} \]

setting out by the Unlucky Way, the right arch of the Porta Carmentalis, they came to the river Cremera, a position which seemed favourable for the erection of a fort.

The tradition on this point is quite puzzling. The Porta Carmentalis was south of the Capitol;\(^{550}\) one passed through it from the Forum Boarium to the Forum Holitorium.\(^{551}\) Close by was the fanum\(^{552}\) and an altar of the goddess Carmenta.\(^{553}\) According to Livy, as a consequence of the total defeat of the Fabii at Cremera, the Porta was cursed and named Scelerata and the day entered history as a dies ater.\(^{554}\) This explanation for the cursing of the gate was already being challenged in antiquity.\(^{555}\) However, Festus instead suggests that it was the Senate’s acceptance of the offer of the Fabii in the temple of Janus, just outside the gate, that was the ill-omened event from which the Scelerata took its name.\(^{556}\) Although Ogilvie may be right in believing that it was simply an invention of later times and the ‘gate’ did play its role in the elimination-rite as disentangled from the story.\(^{557}\) Livy is also reflected in at least three of Ovid’s lines, which seem to be almost the same.\(^{558}\)

\[ \text{Carmentis portae dextra est uia proxima iano:} \]
\[ \text{ire per hanc noli, quisquis es: omen habet.} \]
\[ \text{illa fama refert Fabios exisse trecentos.} \]

\(^{549}\) Liv. 2.49.8; cf. Ovid Fasti 1.201: “Carmentis portae dextra est via proxima iano”.
\(^{550}\) CARMENTALIS / CARMENTAE PORTA. Double gate in the Servian Wall named for a nearby shrine of Carmenta (Serv, ad Aen. 8.337) at the foot of the Capitoline where the Vicus Lugarius departed the city (Livy 27.37.11-14, 35.21.6). The Porta is identified with the remains of a city gate dating to the 4th c. B.C. found just northwest of the temples of Fortuna et Mater Matuta (Coarelli 1988:394; Ruggiero 1984:25 fig. 4).
\(^{551}\) The Fabii are passing through Pons Sublicius, therefore. The position of Porta Carmentalis, at the southwest corner of the Capitoline Hill, opens up the possibility that they did not make for the Sublician Bridge, but a primitive bridge over the Insula Tiberina. Cf. Dion. Hal. 10.14.2; see Holland 1961:242 ff. Festus (285L) speaks not of an unlucky gate or path but of an ill-starred meeting of the senate in ‘aede iani’. There are many instances of superstitions connected with passing through doorways. Cf. Ogilvie 1965:364; Holleman 1976:210.
\(^{552}\) Solin. 1.13.
\(^{553}\) Dion. Hal. 1.32; cf. Serv. Ad Aen. 8.337.
\(^{554}\) Paul. Fest. 335L.
\(^{556}\) Paul. Fest. 285L: “religioni est quibusdam porta Carmentali egredi; et in aede iani, quae est extra eam, senatum haberit; quod ea egressi sex et trecenti Fabii apud Cremeram omnes interfecit sunt, cum in aede iani senatus consultum factum esset, uti proficiscerentur.”
\(^{557}\) Ogilvie 1965:364.
\(^{558}\) They are quoted by Frazer 1929:322,n. 2.
Chapter 2. Tiber. The earliest paradigm for finis?

porta vacat culpa, sed tamen omen habet,
ut celeri passu Cremeram tigere rapacem
(turbidus hibernis ille fluebat aquis),
castra loco ponunt, dextraeis ensibus ipsi
Tyrhenenum valido Marte per agmen eunt. 559

The nearest way is the right arch of Carmentis Gate
Let no one go that way: it is unlucky.
Tradition says that the three hundred Fabii went out:
The gate is free of blame, but is still unlucky.
When they had quickly reached the rushing Cremera,
(It was flowing darkly with winter rain)
They pitched their camp there, and with naked swords
Broke the Etruscan ranks with their valour.

For centuries, editors have recognised that Ovid’s narrative corresponds very closely with Livy and is filled with so many of the same details that it seems nothing more than Livy in verse.560 Livy’s narrative, by contrast, offers easily the best background for assessing Ovid’s.561 “Carmentis portae dextro est via proxima iano” might seem a very strange sentence with no comparison in Ovid, who did not write these words. It means “the nearest way is through the right arch of the Gate of Carmentis”. But nearest to what? At first glance, the answer is ‘to the Cremera’. However, topographers have shown that considering the Carmentalis Gate as the nearest to the Cremera is absurd.562 Although Ovid does not adopt Livy’s preferred date for those circumstances,563 his close reading suggests that it is not so much

---

559 Ovid Fasti 2.200-5.
560 Liv. 2.48-50 = Ovid. Fast. 2.195-242. On Ovid’s debt to Livy, see Schenkl 1860:401-2, Sofer 1906. But the writers have gone too far; Ovid obtained material from Livy, but there are many others to whom he was indebted, especially Verrius; cf. Winther 1885. Winther’s view that Verrius is the only source of Ovid’s information is, of course, quite untenable, as Ehwald (1886:172) and Wissowa (1904:271) show, whose remarks on the Porta Carmentalis are probably preserved by Paul. Fest. (285L).
562 “Hoc dicimus, Livii Ovidiique consensu standum esse,” says Vahlen (1893:2), and he proceeds to instruct the ordinary reader in the correct translation – “If you (i.e. Ovid’s reader) find that your shortest way (when your destination, whatever it is, lies outside the city) is through the right arch of the Gate of Carmentis, avoid that route; it is unlucky”. See Alton 1918:14.
563 A way out of the difficulty is suggested by Ogilvie’s (1965:17) demonstration that Livy’s account of the battles at the Cremera draws on two sources which date the ambushing of the Fabii to different parts of the year 477 BC. What Ogilvie showed was that while Livy (6.1.11) explicitly dates the Cremera to 18 July and his actual narrative of the battle (2.49-50) is substantially as consistent with that date as with a winter one, he must nevertheless have used in 51.1-3 another source in which the preferred date of the battle will have been in about February. And the Etruscan advance into Latium after the Cremera “precipitates a corn shortage” (51.2) “because the Romans were prevented from harvesting their crops. [which] would have been harvested well before 18 July”. If Ovid draws so many of his details of the Cremera from Livy, why does he not adopt Livy’s preferred date? The debt to Livy is obvious enough and has been often documented, see: Sofer 1906; Richard 1988a:531 and more recently Fraschetti 1998 and Smith 2006:293.
the Carmentalis as the Janus through which the Fabii passed. Ogilvie\textsuperscript{564} rightly spends more than a page on the topographical and textual oddities implied in this tradition. On the contrary, I prefer to focus on the following piece:

\begin{verbatim}
Idibus agrestis fumant altaria Fauni
hic ubi discretas insula rumpit aquas.
haec fuit illa dies in qua Veientibus armis
ter centum Fabii ter cecidere duo.\textsuperscript{565}
\end{verbatim}

The altars of rustic Faunus smoke, on the Ides.
There, where the island breaks Tiber's waters.
This was the day when three hundred and six
Of the Fabii fell to Veientine weapons.

Etruscans, Latins and Romans seem to have had a privileged relationship with the rivers as delimitative feature between their territories.\textsuperscript{566} Rome, however, had no intention of stopping short of the 'natural feature', as the Etruscans or the Latins had previously agreed. It was not the \textit{finis} itself that changed, e.g. the use of a river or a promontory rather than a wall or a road; instead, as previously argued, it was the conception of the \textit{finis} itself that was changed. The 'protruding' extension over the river up to the Janiculum Hill (\textit{praesidio in Janiculum locatum})\textsuperscript{567} is confirmation of the Roman attitude, and this trend is confirmed by the Fabii's sureness in facing the

\textsuperscript{564} Ogilvie 1965:363-4.
\textsuperscript{565} Ovid Fasti 2.193-6.
\textsuperscript{566} The river Anio may have played the role of \textit{finis} – although Livy does not explicitly assign such a definition to the river – and later claimed by the Romans in the territorial subdivision with the Sabines (see Plin. \textit{N.H.} 3.54). Repeated skirmishes occurred along the Anio between Sabines and Romans and in many cases the core of the battle is localised upon its banks (Livy 1.36.1; 1.37.1; 2.26.1, 2.64.2; cf. Sall. \textit{Jug.} 90.2; Tac. \textit{Ann.} 3.39.1; Ogilvie 1965:302). Livy (1.37.1) narrates a key episode about the bridge over the Anio, when it was used in for the same strategic purposes as the Tiber: "\textit{hac parte copiarum aucta iterum cum Sabinis conflagitur. sed praeterquam quod viribus creverat Romanus exercitus, ex occulto etiam additur dolus, missis qui magnam vim lignorum, in Anienis ripa iacentem, ardentem in flumen conicerent; ventoque iuvante accensa ligna et pleraque rati bus inpacta sublicisque cum haerent, pontem incendunt}". (When this arm of the service had been enlarged, a second battle was fought with the Sabines. And in this, besides being increased in strength, the Roman army was further helped by a stratagem, for men were secretly dispatched to light a great quantity of firewood lying on the bank of the Anio, and throw it into the river. A favouring wind set the wood in a blaze, and the greater part of it lodged against the boats and piles, where it stuck fast and set the bridge on fire). Traditionally a pile bridge carried the \textit{Via Salaria} over the Anio in the days of the kings, and the network of streams and ponds among which the Sabines are said to have lived before their descent upon the valley, provided ample opportunity for practice in such construction; cf. Ashby 1906:3.4, n.1.
\textsuperscript{567} Liv. 2.11.1.
enemy, although with a specific strategy in mind.\textsuperscript{568} Once the family set up their fortified camp, the Fabii commenced with their plan of action:

\begin{quote}
\textit{et donec nihil aliud quam in populationibus res fuit, non ad praesidium modo tutandum Fabii satis erant, sed tota regione qua Tuscus ager Romano adiacet, sua tuta omnia, infesta hostium vagantes per utrumque finem fecere. intervallum deinde haud magnum populationibus fuit, dum et Veientes accito ex Etruria exercitu praesidium Cremerae oppugnant, et Romanae legiones ab L. Aemilio console adductae cominus cum Etruscis dimicant acie. quamquam vix dirigendi aciem spatium Veientibus fuit; adeo inter primam trepidationem, dum post signa ordines introeunt subsidiaque locant, inverta subito ab latere Romana equitum ala non pugnae modo incipiendae sed consistendi ademit locum. ita fusi retro ad Saxa Rubra—ibi castra habebant—pacem supplices petunt; cuius impetratae ab insita animis levitate ante deductum Cremera Romanum praesidium paenituit.}
\end{quote}

And so long as nothing more than plundering was afoot the Fabii were not only an adequate garrison for the fort, but in all that region where the Tuscan territory marches with the Roman they afforded universal security to their own countrymen and vexation to the enemy, by ranging along the \textit{finis} on both sides. Then came a brief interruption to these depredations, while the men of Veii, having called in an army from Etruria, attacked the post on the Cremera, and the Roman legions, led thither by Lucius Aemilius the consul, engaged them in a pitched battle; though in truth the Veientes had scarcely time to draw up a battle-line, for at the first alarm, while the ranks were falling in behind the standards and the reserves were being posted, a division of Roman cavalry made a sudden charge on their flank and deprived them of the power not only of attacking first, but even of standing their ground. And so they were driven back upon Saxa Rubra, where they had their camp, and sued for peace. It was granted, but their instinctive fickleness caused them to weary of the pact before the Roman garrison was withdrawn from the Cremera.

The Fabian strategy was working well: they established a stronghold, after assessing the best place (\textit{opportunos visus locus}) to set up their base or assembly point (\textit{praesidio}) on the river Cremera. Dionysius of Halicarnassus is even more precise about the nature of the camp, which is described as a real fortress, the strongest of ‘bulwarks’ due to its position.\textsuperscript{570} From that stronghold, they could attack and weaken the Veientines and easily return to their refuge. There, they remained well-protected from the Etruscan attacks, to the extent that the Veientines were compelled to call an army in to aid them. Livy provides us with enough elements to add more features to the concept of \textit{finis}. It begins to configure itself as a ‘system’ of features apt to define or choose that specific natural feature as \textit{finis}. Nominally, the \textit{finis} crosses strategic routes; when coupled with a ford or a bridge (used by the Fabii to pass to and fro easily), it connects two territories divided by a river. Both

\textsuperscript{568} Livy narrates it from 2.48 to 2.50.
\textsuperscript{569} Liv. 2.49.9-12.
\textsuperscript{570} Dion. Hal. 9.15.6. On this stronghold or keep see: Richard 1989a:67-68; Richard 1989b; Fraschetti 1980.
sides of the *finis* belong to none, but the Fabii claim the control of the farthest bank – in terms of a linear division, this would be considered the side belonging to the enemy. The natural strategic features of that area (Saxa Rubra) are even reinforced by the Fabii through the construction of a fort. And even though the *finis* can be crossed, the danger comes from breaking the ‘sacredness’ which the *finis* is believed to have.

The Fabii held out for nearly two years, plundering the hinterland of the Etruscan territory. Well away from the line of the Cremera, they were lured into an ambush and the campaign ended in a tragic annihilation, following their presumptuous attempt. The consensus of ancient evidence is that this ambush took place on 18 July, a date which nearly a century later would also become the cursed *dies Alliensis*. This ‘strange’ coincidence, which sees the defeats at rivers Cremera and Allia, leads one to look for similarities between the two events. Bellen refers to the fact that the Romans remembered the day of the defeat at the Allia, known as the *dies Alliensis*. The *fasti Amiternini* also refer to 18 July as the *DIES ALLIENSIS*. In the *fasti Antiaties* we also find the same day, referred to here as the *DIES ALLIA*[E ET] *FAB*[IORVM]. The Allia River is the stream at which the Romans faced defeat at the hands of the Gauls in 390 B.C. The suggestion, then, is that these two defeats from the distant past took place on the same day of the month.

It is a calendric analogy that connects the two worst defeats of the early Republic, and is a form of analogy that was not uncommon in antiquity. Certainly, the degree of factual reminiscence is remarkable considering the brevity of the passage, including the fatal omen attached to the right arch of the gate through which the Fabii marched out of Rome. The general consensus of scholars that such legends are pure invention and were probably imitating Greek literature can

571 The hazardous move along this line was dearly paid for with the extermination of almost the entire family, but for the survival of the one male child, who ensured the continuation of the family line. Cf. Holleman 1976:210. The familiar parallels are respectively: Livy *AUC* : Ovid *Fasti* = 2.49.8 : 2.201-4; 2.49.4: 2.199-200 (reading *exercitus* with Bentley); 2.50.11 2.239-42. In the first of these parallels Ovid and Livy are making the same point and the objections of Elter 1910 are unfounded.


575 According to Herodotus (7.166), the battles of Himera and Salamis (480 B.C.) were fought on the same day; according to Aelianus (2.25), Alexander was born, won the battle at Issos, and died on a Thargelion 6; Ov. *Fasti* 6.563-568 mentions two defeats on June 11; see also Grafton & Swerdlow 1988:14-42; Ungern-Sternberg 2000:210.
scarcely be questioned. However, if this perspective is given credence, we would have confirmation that the Tiber was considered finally as an utterly Roman river and, on the contrary, its tributaries might have worked as ‘fines’ of the Roman territory.

In the light of these facts, the early Livian passages highlight two main points and also even more conclusions about the functionality of finis:

A) From the theoretical point of view, the finis would be a magical boundary which it is forbidden to cross. In this historical period, the importance of the fines, as Livy defines them, is related to and made clear to be for strategic purposes. Livy characterises rivers with a political, warlike, enchanted sense of boundary, as seen through the episodes of Tiberinus and the Fabii. Then, the more Roman authority was extended through continuous warfare, as well as the bordering practices developed. In the mythical era, this conception was still blended into a sort of sacral mysticism with flashes of inductive geo-topographical elements but, in times closer to the author, they lose a consistent part of their legendary aura as we shall see.[3.5.3; 4.2.3; 6.2.3; 7.1.4] The function of the fetials might have been decisive as ‘boundary breakers’ and in Livy there is no clue of their intervention before their expedition.

B) From a practical aspect, the Tiber should have been the main spine of a systemic developed ‘idea of regional topography’, which at the same time joined and split the better-watered hill landscape of the western Mediterranean. The Tiber was a sort of ideal line for Etruscans and Latins; for the Romans, this segment had become wider and even broader until assuming the shape of a ‘zonal’ and not ‘linear’ element, on which some points became crucial (fords, bridges, islands). In this system, the minor rivers (e.g. Anio, Cremera and Allia) might have worked as advancing fines, as shown in the analogies between them. Rome modified the

---

576 Gell. NA 1721.12 says that the Cremera was three years after Salamis and does not mention the Thermopylae as synchronised to Cremera; see Ogilvie 1965:365 and esp. Forsythe 2005:196-7. However, Livy (7.15.19) reports the story of 307 prisoners massacred by the Etruscans in 353 B.C. Cf. Plut. Par. Min. 4 = Mor. 306E. Cf. Oakley 1998:173 and Smith 2006:293.
conception of Tiber as ‘*fluvius dirimens*,’\(^{577}\) as it had probably been considered since the protohistoric period, by turning its basin into the most aggregative zone within the peninsular Italy. Rome created one of the most important Mediterranean ‘micro-regions’\(^{578}\) situated between two mighty macro-regions which in fact split, as the Tiber did, peninsular Italy into two trunks.\(^{579}\)

C) The *finis* provides an easy crossing to a different area and involves an important hub, which can be a roadway intersection and a river crossing.\(^{580}\) Despite the tactical failure of the Fabii, strategically the plan was to break the enemy’s communication with a small but vital outpost, and it left the way open for an attack on the outpost thus isolated. It is also probable that this was intended to be the prelude to an assault on Fidenae itself, as Meiklejohn rightly argues. Holland, instead, has broadened this view.\(^{581}\) He gives major import to the Cremera basin, considering it a dividing valley capable of creating devious ways by which journeys could be accomplished through the difficult country, isolating the most southern city of Etruria.\(^{582}\) Although contact with Caere, Vulci, and especially Tarquinii had been operating since the earliest times, such regional difficulties would likely have played an important role in their relationships.\(^{583}\)

D) The association between Tiber and Cremera as *fines* can possibly also be seen in Ovid. He compares both the turbulence of the Tiber (‘*hibernis fortetumebat aquis*’\(^{584}\)) and that of the Cremera (‘*turbidus hibernis ille fluebat aquis*’\(^{585}\)), using almost the same words, which already anticipate the dreadful events that would turn the potential for greatness into tragedy.\(^{586}\) The use of almost exactly the same

---


\(^{578}\) Patterson & Millett 1998; Cascino 2008.

\(^{579}\) Horden & Purcell 2000:420-1.

\(^{580}\) See the archeological presence of a bridge on the Cremera: Messineo 1991:155.

\(^{581}\) Meiklejohn 1938:172.

\(^{582}\) Anziani (1913:231) makes a good case for Caere’s connection with the Tiber above Rome on the road which passed through Veii and along the Cremera (234). From Tarquinii he traces an old road through Blera, north of Bracciano. The best connections with Caere are in Fraschetti 1980.

\(^{583}\) Giglioli 1930:340; Sundwall 1932:84-5; Pallottino 1939:120 (important material in the Villa Giulia Museum in Rome is still unpublished); Holland 1949:291.

\(^{584}\) Ovid *Fasti* 390.

\(^{585}\) Ovid *Fasti* 206.

phrasing would seem to indicate a similar ‘competence’ of the rivers. Both of them had the same dangerous ‘structure’ based on their waters, which did not allow an easy crossing, and in Livy they share the same definition of *fines*.\(^{587}\)

E) The ‘double face’ of a *finis*. This is possibly the most important point, which needs to be stressed. The members of the family were able to patrol both sides (*per utrumque*) of the *finem*, which was overrun by enemies.\(^{588}\) This idea is reinforced by the term *utrumque*, although this choice of word is strange, as it suggests that there were two borders instead of one. Practically speaking, any water stream would of course limit a city’s area of control, but the impression is that they had two faces mirroring the same line, almost not touching each other, in the same way that Janus is depicted.

F) On the Veientine side, emphasis has been placed on the importance of the left bank of the Cremera. This side was a tiny strip between the Cremera and the tufa hills, along which ran a road, and which could be converted when necessary into a fortified pass.\(^{589}\) Referred to in Livy’s time as Saxa Rubra, the adjectival use of the colour red opens up to several comparisons in *AUC*. The place was important to the Late Republic / Early Empire authors,\(^{590}\) even more for the presence of Livia’s villa.\(^{591}\) Both modern and ancient authors agree that Saxa Rubra was a fortified place which presented strategic advantages.\(^{592}\)

G) As was well understood by Harries,\(^{593}\) a major point in the Cremera narrative was the way the gods can intervene to avert the worst consequences of human

---

\(^{587}\) There is the emphatic *rapacem* (*Ovid* *Fasti* 205) associating the river with the Fabii in two ways. In the sense of "swiftly dashing along with destructive potential", it matches the speed of the Fabii’s advance *celeri passu* (in the same line) and prepares for the simile of the destructive torrens in 219-22; while in the grim sense which associates *rapax* with death, the adjective anticipates the appalling slaughter of a whole gens on the river-bank; Harries 1991:154-5.

\(^{588}\) Liv. 2.49.9-10.

\(^{589}\) Holland 1949:305.

\(^{590}\) *Cic. Phil*. 2.31; *Tac. Hist*. 50.3.79.

\(^{591}\) Forte 2007.

\(^{592}\) The fact that Veii had a camp there means that it was a fortified place and in connection with Fidenae: cf. Ogilvie 1965:364; Ashby & Fell 145-7; Phillip 1921:3.307-8; Messineo & Agneni 2007.

\(^{593}\) Harries 1991:155, 160 and esp. 166.
recklessness and folly.\textsuperscript{594} The episode of the Fabii teaches us that the \textit{fines} – once established as such – are limits, which have to be respected. In this sense, this episode might recall, and in some way be linked, both with the passage of Tiberinus in crossing the Albula and with Rome’s insatiable desire to occupy the opposite bank.\textsuperscript{595}

\section*{2.4 Conclusions}

Detected common features between Tiber and Cremera reveal them to be very similar in the way they were conceived as \textit{fines}. This similitude is comprehensible particularly in the action of crossing the rivers: the Fabian family’s crossing of the Cremera led them to fall victim to the same destiny as Tiberinus. In this way, Rome’s use of the \textit{fetials} priests might assume an interesting perspective: their function might be related to the way they break this sort of curse or neutralise the negative effect of entering into an enemy’s \textit{finis}.\textsuperscript{[4.2.3]} In this way, Rome would have felt herself free to cross any established \textit{finis}. What do the rivers Tiber and Cremera have in common, then? The impression is that their identification as \textit{finis} gave them the same features, as applied to any water stream.

By stressing the importance of the name of the river, I have attempted to show an earlier vision attributable to the Iron Age, when a \textit{finis} might be disputed and possessed. Some Etruscan and Latin influence on this reminiscence can be recognised in Rome’s attitude toward the \textit{fines}. Her continuing willingness to expand beyond the conventional lines paid continuous dividends, allowing her to: a) occupy the area opposite to Rome’s occupation; b) hold a bulwark in this area; and

\textsuperscript{594} Ovid stress that the gods saved the Fabii from total extinction (237-8), so there is confidence they would do the same for the twins (399-400), whose eventual rescue by the she-wolf is quasimiraculous (414).

\textsuperscript{595} Smith (1895:204) stresses that most of the names themselves are considered strangers to their surroundings; cf. Schwegler 1873:1.343,n.2. Historical details are, in fact, limited to brief notices attached to the names of three kings. Aventinus was buried on the Mons Aventinus: hence its name. As a contemporary of Livy, Ovid connects in his Fasti the future significance of Romulus (cf. 386) confirmed by the precedent established in 389-90: as the drowning of the hero Tiberinus in the Albula gave a new name to the river, so Amulius’ servants attempt to drown Romulus in the very part of the Tiber where the city named after him will rise (391-4). Here again it is Livy’s version (1.4) which is the obvious source of virtually all Ovid’s narrative detail from the overflowing of the Tiber to the Ruminal fig-tree, where Romulean etymologies are naturally in evidence.
c) make the finis work as connector instead of divider. The presence of utrumque related to finem in the ‘Episode of the Fabii’ seems to recall the features of a finis: the Roman sources established the presence of two strips of land running along the finis.[1.4.1] Livy seems to show how the general idea of finis evolved with time and population, from its beginnings as a simple dividing line, to a joining area between two different zones. This mirrors precisely the situation faced by Rome, as she was not content to stop at her own bank, but tried instead to occupy and politically merge with the population on the opposite bank.

In the next chapter, we will observe the way the Romans – in their earliest tradition – would have defined the fines in the surrounding space and what function was served by the highest position of the Capitoline Hill and Rome’s ancient templum of Jupiter Feretrius. On the other hand, Chapter 4 will clarify the sacrality of the fines and how the Romans dealt with the legitimacy of their crossing through the use of the fetial priests.
Chapter 3. The foundation of the *templum* of Jupiter Feretrius

3.1 Introduction and aims

The foundation of the *templum* of Jupiter Feretrius is the final act, the apex of a crucial episode of Rome’s earliest history. The historical background for the foundation of the temple contains some elements which might be linked with the re-organisation of Rome’s first conquered territory. The first step in the process leading to the foundation of the *templum* is characterised by Romulus’ victory over Caeninae, while the second step of the process is the triumphal procession up to the Capitoline Hill. In order to understand the signs related to the bordering practices and the meaningful place of the *arx* as focal point of the triumphal procession, we will focus on the following narrative:

*inde exercitu victore reducto, ipse, cum factis vir magnificus tum factorum ostentator haud minor, spolia ducis hostium caesi suspensa fabricate ad id apte ferculo gerens in Capitolium escendit ibique ea cum ad quercum pastoribus sacram deposuisset, simul cum dono designavit templo Iovis finis cognomenque addidit deo.*

He then led his victorious army back, and being not more splendid in his deeds than willing to display them, he arranged the spoils of the enemy’s dead commander upon frame, suitably fashioned for the purpose, and, carrying it himself, mounted the Capitol. Having there deposited his burden, by an oak which the shepherds held sacred, at the same time as he made his offering he marked out the *finis* of a temple to Jupiter, and bestowed a title upon him.

A first step will be to extrapolate the semantic episodes and all possible indications related to bordering procedure. Contextualising the Livian account, it is my aim to demonstrate how his description of the foundation of the temple of Jupiter Feretrius is relevant to further understanding his idea of *finis*, as subdivisional element for the surrounding space. The practices detected in this episode represent one of the oldest and more interesting attestations in

---

596 Liv. 1.9 and 1.10 (cf. Livy 3.2). Ogilvie (1965:71) also put it on top of the climax of the following process: the story of the Sabine women, the battle against the Caeninenses, the dedication, the trophy procession and the construction of the temple.

597 Liv. 1.10.5.

598 Liv. 1.10.1 ff.
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reference to early Roman history. The multiple connections to the bordering practices related to Rome’s first war, victory and conquest identified across the entire episode show a distinctive connection between the newly conquered territory and the ‘visual control’ exerted from the Capitoline Hill.\textsuperscript{599} Bordering procedures, both explicit and implicit, will be investigated: on the one hand, I will examine the most evident cases in the Livian account, where specific terms clearly related to bordering (\textit{fines, regiones}) are used; on the other hand, when faced with less evident examples (e.g. objects related to the \textit{fines}, such as stones, trees or items), ancient parallel sources and secondary literature will offer constructive comparison for detecting the \textit{fines} and their connective structure.

Concepts such as \textit{fines, regiones} and/or signs – like stones or trees – would confirm the presence of detectable bordering practice and can be related to a symbolic celebration of the victory. Besides confirming Romulus’ victorious zenith, they represent the reorganisation and the subdivision of the expanded Roman territory, from its early stages as a small town, to her first conquest. Following the chronological order established by Livy, I shall briefly emphasise the presence of Jupiter as already having existed on the top of the Capitoline Hill symbolically. For instance, the presence of the oak tree might link the cult of Jupiter with the place where it was initially held sacred by the local shepherds, and where it was used as a significant landmark after the victory of the triumphal procession. Furthermore, an overall description of the Romulean triumph will be given, in order to highlight the importance of this gesture. In the core of this chapter, I analyse the importance of the temple’s foundation formula, which Livy ascribes to Romulus. Livy’s sacred invocation and description contains precise terminology, which appears to recall the primordial process of expansion and subsequently the new territorial redefinition.

The ‘etymological note’, which begins the next section, is a short assessment of the meanings attributed by the ancient authors and some modern scholars to the epithet ‘Feretrius’. Several clues will be useful to trace the different

connections between the god and the implicit bordering practices, and I then analyse the historical background, which led to the foundation of the temple. For example, Rome’s first conquest involves an indirect bordering procedure; the territorial incorporation is equivalent to the foundation of the temple and the celebration of victory. The second section of this chapter is dedicated to the objects contained in the temple and to the peculiar relationship with the fetial priests.[4.3.1] Paragraph five will consider the arx as the main location of the temple; indirectly this venue will be linked with the sacred herb used by the fetials and with the presence of the auguraculum (observation point) on top of the Capitoline Hill.\textsuperscript{600} Identification between the Romulean temple and the auguraculum will be proposed, as both these elements enabled an augur to create dividing lines in space. We will then assess the problem of the lapis silex, preserved in the temple. Through the secondary literature, I will investigate the relationship between the templum and the surrounding space and then the symbolic value of the sacred objects, focusing the attention on the stone(s) preserved in the temple. I will also try to compare the special relationship between the sky and the larger stone, reflecting the link between the belief of the templum caelestis and terrestris,[3.4; 3.5] and the possibility that such a stone could have been used as a marker-stone, perhaps as starting fulcrum for the terminatio. The final section will provide an overview of the phases of rebuilding: the first by Ancus Marcius and the second by Augustus. In addition to the evidence of bordering elements present in the templum and the political magnitude of the temple itself, we will consider the special link between Livy and Augustus.

\textsuperscript{600} AUGURACULUM. Spot located on the Arx (in arce) from which the augurs observed the flight of birds. An anecdote concerning the destruction of a house on the Caelian that interfered with the augurs’ lines of sight indicates that the Auguraculum stood above the Sacra Via, overlooking the Forum Romanum. Cic. Off. 3.66; Liv. 1.18.6; Val. Max. 8.2.1; Varro L.L. 7.8. Coarelli (1981:181; 1983:106), using Plutarch (Num. 7.2-3), which states that the Auguraculum was visible from the Comitium, convincingly identifies the Auguraculum with the remains of walls from various periods in the SE corner of the Aracoeli garden. These walls were part of a terrace wall and thus formed a rectangular platform which functioned as an observation point.
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3.2 Etymological note

The epithet Feretrius was already debated amongst the ancient authors, with the result that various and confusing explanations were given. Jupiter Feretrius has been considered a case of ‘assimilation’ between the names of the god (Jupiter) and Feretrius, and the festival in honour of Jupiter Feretrius was held on the 15th of October, when the Capitoline games were celebrated. Despite Ogilvie’s argument against Livian etymological negationism, Livy makes his chosen etymology for Feretrius clear, believing it to derive from feretrum, a type of litter or bier for carrying the trophies in the procession to the Capitoline Hill. This etymology can be confirmed through an extensive use of different parts of (i.e. the conjugation of) the verb *fero* (to carry, to bring): e.g. *ferculo*, *Feretri*, *ferent*, *laturos*. However, Plutarch lists three possible meanings, deriving from: a) *pheretron*, a support on which the trophy dedicated to the god was carried, in line with Dionysius’ and Livy’s explanation; b) *ferire* (to strike, to smite), in the sense of striking a victim or in making or concluding a treaty (*foedus ferire*); c) *feri*, the command to strike an enemy in battle. Propertius favours the last definition when he says, “*causa Feretri / omine quod certo dux ferit ense ducem*”. Festus provides us with a similar interpretation of the name. He connects the name with the verb *ferire* (to smite), “which is said...”

604 Ogilvie 1965:70 follows Ernoult & Meillet 1951:402 and Walde & Hofmann 1954:1.481, after whom the title would derive from the Greek loan-word φέρετρον.
605 Sil. 5.168: quis opima volenti Dona Jovi portet feretro suspense cruento; Sil. 17.630: jamque rogum quassasque faces feretrumque parabant. Also Ov. Met. 3.508, 14.747 (feretro); Virg. Aen. 6.222, 11.64; Val. Fl. 5.11; Sil. 10.567; Grat. Cyneg. 488; Inscr. Orell. 4370 al.; Varr. L.L. 5.
608 Liv. 1.10.5; Prop. 4.10.46; Paul. Fest. 92L; Dion. Hal. 2.34; Plut. Marc. 8, Rom. 16; Bettenworth 2002:122, n. 3.
609 In his elegy Propertius (4.10.45-6) is an aetiological elegy 'explaining' the name of the temple of Jupiter Feretrius: *Nunc lovis incipiam causas aperiere Feretri armaque de ducibus trina recepta tribus*. The circular pattern of the temple Feretrius manifest itself: *nunc spolia in templo tria condita: causa Feretri, omine quod certo dux ferit ense ducem; seu quia vieta suis umeris haec arma ferebant, hinc Feretri dieta est ara superba lovis*. Cf. Domaszewski 1895:120; Wissowa 1909:6.2209; Robson 1973:235; Welch 2005:134.
to bring peace” (“quod pacem ferre putaretur”) and also the flint stone, which is
struck at the conclusion of the pact (qui foedus ferirent). The connection with
ferire results from foedus ferire, the technical phrase used by the Romans for
entering into a treaty, since a sacrifice was offered as confirmation of the
pact. The last two definitions include Jupiter’s function as wielder of the
thunderbolt. It will be useful to keep in mind that the etymological root of the
term ‘feretrius’ is embodied within the verb fero – the definition of which is
bringing or carrying something from one point to another. The verb fero might
consequently reflect both the literal cult trophy procession in which spoils were
brought to the temple, and a metaphorical emphasis on the conduct of an
external political entity into another one through the conquest. Dionysius of
Halicarnassus, Livy’s contemporary, confirmed the acceptation of the term,
regarding it as equivalent to ὑπερφερέτης and equating Feretrius with
τροπαιοῦχος, σκυλοφόρος, and, therefore, connected with feretrum, the frame
on which the spolia (spoils) opima were fixed. Any doubt seems to dissolve if
we look at the Greek translation of the Res Gestae (AEDES IN CAPITOLIO
IOVIS FERETRI = ΝΑΟΥΣ ΕΝ ΚΑΠΙΤΩΛΙΩ ΔΙΟΣ ΤΡΟΠΑΙΟΦΟΡΟΥ): Feretrius would confirm its translation as Triumphator or ‘Trophy Carrier’
(Τροπαιοφόρος).

610 Paul. Fest. 81L, s. ‘Feretrius’; Liv. 30.43.9. For a short discussion about all the meanings
611 Liv. 1.24.8-9: “Diespiter, populum Romanum sic ferito ut ego hunc porcum hic hodie
feriam”.
612 Cf. the further discussion on Serv. ad Aen. 12.206.
614 Ogilive (1965:70) well notes that the Romans did not set up any trophy on the battlefield until
121 B.C. (c.f. Florus 1.37.6: ‘mos inusitatus’) and that was a Greek habit. The spolia were
clearly analogous to τροπαια, which were dedicated to Ζεὺς Τροπαιος (Gorgias, Epitaphios fr.
6 Diels) and were collocated on a wooden stump (trunk) so that they should not last for ever (cf.
Diod. 13.24.5).
615 RG 19.5.
616 The statement of Cassius Dio (54.8.3) that Augustus dedicated in 20 B.C. on the Capitol a
temple of Mars Ultor ‘opposite’ to the temple of Jupiter Feretrius (κατὰ τὸ τοῦ Διός Φερετρίου ζῆλωμα), refers only to the use of the new temple, not to its
shape, for it was round. However, even though Augustus rebuilt the temple of Jupiter Feretrius,
the unique position of this cult was weakened by the temple of Mars Ultor: the translation of
Cassius Dio’s passage could also be ‘as rival’ (ζῆλωμα) of Jupiter Feretrius. In Parker’s
(1879:1.12) opinion, the temple of Mars Ultor would have been built imitating that of Jupiter
Feretrius, being built next to it. However, the coincidences of connections between the two
temples are not limited to a structural similarity: the visual evidence that Mars Ultor was to
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3.4 The story behind the temple

Livy narrates the revenge sought by three Sabine cities, Caeninae, Antemnae and Crustuminum, following the abduction of some Sabine women, an act that had caused the greatest offence. Caeninenses Crustuminique et Antemnates erant ad quos eius iniuriae pars pertinebat. lente agere his Tatius Sabinique visi sunt: ipsi inter se tres populi communiter bellum parant. ne Crustumini quidem atque Antemnates pro ardore iraque Caeninensium satis se impigre movent; ita per se ipsum nomen Caeninum in agrum Romanum impetum facit. sed effuse vastantibus fit obvius cum exercitu Romulus levique certamine docet vanam sine viribus iram esse. exercitum fundit fugatque, fusum persequitur: regem in proelio obtruncat et spoliat; duce hostium occiso urbem primo impetu capt.

The men of Caenina, Crustumium, and Antemnae, were those who had had a share in the wrong. It seemed to them that Tatius and the Sabines were procrastinating, and without waiting for them these three tribes arranged for a joint campaign. But even the Crustuminians and Antemnates moved too slowly to satisfy the burning anger of the Caeninenses, and accordingly that nation invaded alone the Roman territory. But while they were dispersed and engaged in pillage, Romulus appeared with his troops and taught them, by an easy victory, how ineffectual is anger without strength. Their army he broke and routed, and pursued it as it fled; their king he killed in battle and despoiled; their city, once their leader was slain, he captured at the first assault.

Only the inhabitants of Caenina (Caeninaenses) took action, with impatience and anger (pro ardore iraque), invading Roman territory (in agrum Romanum impetum facit). The subsequent battle saw the Romans emerge victorious, and Romulus did not limit himself to victory on the field. He chased the fleeing enemy’s army and, having caught the opposing king, slew him (exercitum fundit fugatque, fusum persequitur: regem in proelio obtruncat). Livy does not give as much detail in his account as is found in Plutarch’s narration above, but assume the position of Jupiter Feretrius is indicated by the fact that Augustus had the scene of Romulus dedicating spolia opima engraved on the door of the temple of Mars Ultor (Ovid, Fasti 5.559-66). In 1913 a painting of Romulus shouldering the spoils of Acron was found on the Via dell’Abbondanza in Pompeii. (Edwards, Gadd & Hammond, et al. 1989:177, fig. 2). Also, in the forum of Pompeii was found an elogium to Romulus (CIL 1:283). In the temple of Mars Ultor were deposited the Roman standards which Crassus had lost to the Parthians and which Augustus had recovered through peaceful negotiations. See Springer 1954:27-28, 31-32.

assume the position of Jupiter Feretrius is indicated by the fact that Augustus had the scene of Romulus dedicating spolia opima engraved on the door of the temple of Mars Ultor (Ovid, Fasti 5.559-66). In 1913 a painting of Romulus shouldering the spoils of Acron was found on the Via dell’Abbondanza in Pompeii. (Edwards, Gadd & Hammond, et al. 1989:177, fig. 2). Also, in the forum of Pompeii was found an elogium to Romulus (CIL 1:283). In the temple of Mars Ultor were deposited the Roman standards which Crassus had lost to the Parthians and which Augustus had recovered through peaceful negotiations. See Springer 1954:27-28, 31-32.
otherwise the distinction between the two authors’ accounts may not appear to be extremely marked. On the one hand, Livy seems to focus on a sort of symbolism, choosing to condense his account and centre the attention of the audience on specific keywords. On the other hand, Plutarch gives many more exhaustive details when telling the story, which leads to the setting up of the first temple of Rome. But a closer analysis reveals deeper differences. In Plutarch’s version, the Romulean victory invokes substantially different details. The two kings, Acron from Caeninae and Romulus, had agreed on a pact before the fight: they would challenge and fight each other, while their armies would remain quiet under arms (ἀλλήλους προύκαλούπτο μάχεσθαι, τῶν στρατευμάτων ἐν τοῖς ὀπλοῖς ἀτρεμοῦντων).

Initially, this procedure recalls not just the duel between Horatii and Curiatii, but chiefly the pact struck by the fetials before the combat between Rome and Alba. Plutarch’s passage provides both diverse information and a political/territorial message, hardly detectable in Livy. Livy seems to take for granted or disregard the importance of Plutarch’s sources, which is most evident in the last of Romulus’ semiotic invocations to Jupiter. More importantly, in Livy and Plutarch the single parts of the fights are inverted. In Livy, Romulus triumphs over the Caeninaenses and then he slays their king (exercitum fundit fugatque, […] regem in proelio obtruncat), while in Plutarch’s narrative, first he kills the king in one-to-one combat, and then he chases the opposing army (αὐτὸν τε καταβάλλει κρατῆσας, καὶ τρέπεται τὸ στράτευμα μάχες γενομένης αἱρεῖ δὲ καὶ τὴν πόλιν). This is not a simple victory; we are facing a different concept of conquest, with the population being moved from their previous residence to Rome. This is made clear in Plutarch’s later lines: after defeating Acron, Romulus captured the Caeninenses, not harming them, but on the contrary, ordering them to tear down their dwellings and accompany him to Rome, where, he promised that they would be citizens with equal rights (οὐ

---

620 Florus 1.1.11: Spolia insuper opima de rege Agrone Feretrio Iovi manibus suis rex reportavit.
621 Plut. Rom. 16.4.
622 Plut. Rom. 17.1.
The occupation of the enemy territories and cities is confirmed by a third version of the story, given by Dionysius. Here Romulus defeats two allied cities together, Caeninae and Antemnae. Then, in celebrating his triumph, he summoned the inhabitants of the two cities to Rome, promising a merciful solution: Roman colonists would have to be sent to the two cities and their inhabitants invited to migrate to Rome (which 3000 of them immediately did). Livy is keen to make clear that a political distinctiveness existed between the cities of Caeninae and Rome. They both had an inhabited centre and their territories were distinct from one another, as Livy states: on their own account, men of Caeninae (*ita per se ipsum nomen Caeninum*) made an attack (*impetum facit*) upon Roman territory (*in agrum Romanum*). Yet this distinction between territories was undoubtedly removed when Romulus decided to grant Roman citizenship to the inhabitants of the defeated cities (according to Plutarch and Dionysius).

Clearer and more evident elements relevant to the existence of ‘*fines*’ between Caeninae and Rome have been provided by Propertius’ elegy, probably one of the most important passages on the temple of Jupiter Feretrius.

Now I begin to reveal the origins of Feretrian Jupiter and the triple trophies won from three chieftains. I climb a steep path, but the glory of it gives me strength: I never delight in wreathes plucked on easy slopes.

---

624 Dion. Hal. 2.35; Liv. 1.11.2.
625 Liv. 1.1.3.
626 Prop. 4.10:1-48 *Templum Jovi Feretri.*
In Propertius, different elements recalling the existence of bordering practices have also been emphasised by Welch. In his article, the scholar primarily points out the importance of the ‘spolia optima’ preserved in the temple of Jupiter. In his analysis he also briefly deconstructs Propertius’ passage, emphasising different scenarios, which are both part of the narration and serve also as distinctive delimitation of reciprocal sovereignty. In Propertius’ poetry, Acron, descendant of Hercules, the chieftain from Caenina, when leaving his Citadel (Acron Herculeus Caenina ductor ab arce), was once a cause of fear along Rome’s borders (Roma, tuis quondam finibus horror erat). The latter passage is reminiscent of the Livian in agrum Romanum impetum facit but with an explicit reference to the borders (finibus) rather than to territory (agrum): Caeninae and its king Acron were responsible for the limiting, curbing, and inducing of fear on the Roman borders. Acron represents a real danger for the integrity of Rome as he was attempting to assault the gates of Rome (tempore quo portas ...petentem). Romulus fought within sight of his own arx, in defence of his own hollowed towers (cauae turres), which Acron boldly attacked, leaving the arx of Caenina (hunc uidet ante cauas librantem spicula turres Romulus et uotis occupat tante rates). The gates and towers are elementally linked with the city’s wall, the last bulwark against the conquest of

---

627 Prop. 4.10:1-16.
628 Welch 2005.
629 Cf. the poetic fragment in Terent. Maur. 2632-3: opima adposui senex Amori arma Feretrio.
630 Prop. 4.10.9-10. Three more references seems to refer to boundary lines in Propertius. At 4.10.31: At Veii the situation is the reverse of that at Caeninae: Tolumnius is on the offensive in sight of his own arx, above the gateway to which Cossus advances for the parley (forte super portae dux Veiens astitt arcem). Cf. Richmond 1916:112. Propertius (4.10.23-4) attests that before the war against Veii there was no sound of war over the Tiber, the furthest conquered city was Nomentum and three iugers from Cora (necdum ultra Tiberim bellis sonus, ultima praeda Nomentum et capitae iugera terna Corae). While at Prop. 4.10.23-40, Claudius threw Viridomarus and his army back when they crossed the Rhine (Claudius a Rheno traiectos arcuit hostis). Cf. also Bettenworth 2002:125, n.18.
631 Prop. 4.10.7.
the city. But they are also the element of distinction between the city and the surrounding territory (ager), forming a structural boundary, a type of ring around the city, of a similar shape to the ager around the city walls. Thus we may affirm through the comparison of the Livian and Propertian passages that the arx is considered the last rampart in defence of the City. The arx was positioned inside the city and possibly surrounded by walls; beyond the walls we find the ager and over the ager, the fines.[3.3.3; 4.2.3] Once Rome conquered her first territory, may we consider the fact that, in joining the two (or three) political and territorial entities, the fines of Rome were also modified?

### 3.5 Romulus’ triumph and the foundation of the temple

The Livian passage concerning the victory over Caenina and its king Acron reaches, almost visually, the highest point of the narration through two main distinctive parts: the triumphal procession and, more importantly, the words that Romulus addresses to Jupiter, which I will examine below.

#### 3.5.1 Dedicatio

In this section, my main aim is to show how the reference to Romulus setting up the templum is not just related to an augural practice, but could also refer to a real, effective subdivision of the surrounding territory just conquered by Rome. For our purposes, the apex of the Livian narrative is reached in Romulus’ concise words, spoken at the moment of the dedication. Once Romulus marked off the limits of a sacred precinct and bestowed the epithet of Feretrius to Jupiter (designavit templum Iovis fines cognomenque addidit deo), in a sacral language\(^{633}\) he announced:

---

\(^{633}\) Ogilvie 1965:72.
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“Iuppiter Feretri” inquit, “haec tibi victor Romulus rex regia arma fero, templumque his regionibus quas modo animo metatus sum dedico, sedem opimis spoliis quae regibus ducibusque hostium caesis me auctorem sequentes posteri ferent”.

“Jupiter Feretrius, he said, to thee, I, the victorious Romulus king bring (fero) these royal weapons, and I dedicate this templum, whose boundaries I have just measured off with my mind’s intention, as the seat of these supreme spoils (spolia opima), which coming descendants will bring from the slayed enemy leaders and kings following my example”.

They represent the meaningful characteristics of the templum, which Romulus was about to set up as the direct outcome of a vow he made before the battle with Acron. In case of victory, he vowed to dedicate a templum to Jupiter. Livy follows this origin story of the building, which was the first templum to be consecrated in Rome (Haec templi est origo quod primum omnium Romae sacratum est). Thus the earliest Roman Jupiter had his oldest cult in the most ancient temple in Rome on the northern/north-western summit of the Capitoline Hill. However, despite his ancestral worship and its connection with the ancient priesthood of the fetiales, Feretrius never rose to the greatest heights. His cult and his temple were quite distinct from his more famous ‘Etruscan’ successor, Jupiter Optimus Maximus, who supplanted the Feretrius and shared with Luno and Minerva the great temple on the southern peak, destined to become supreme. The arx was already sacred – before Romulus set up the templum – as Livy establishes that the oak was already worshipped by shepherds. Thus the delimitation of this sacred enclosure on the sacred ground of the Capitoline Hill may be deemed as the first possible evidence of a boundary practice. Primarily, I shall consider the evidence of the terms used within the Romulean bordering practices (fines and regiones) and the theoretical concepts connected to them. Secondly, following Livy and Varro, I

634 Liv. 1.10.6.
635 Aicher 2004:1.61.
636 Schnusenberg (2010:188) gives to the temple of Jupiter Feretrius the definition of templum-theatrum.
637 More references are present also in: Liv. 1.33; Prop. 4.1.0.15: Iuppiter, haec hodie tibi uitctima corruet Acron.
640 Dumézil 1974:147-8, 184, for the nature of this divinity and of a possible pre-Capitoline ‘triad’.
shall explore which kind of ritual Romulus is undertaking, focussing on the fact
that it is related to the *templum*. Finally, I will analyse the Livian semiology;
those symbols used in his account and how they relate to bordering practice
and the fetial ritual.

Such a cryptic passage is open to different interpretations about the terms *finis*
and *regiones*, as they could be ascribed to de-limiting, spatial and structural
elements.642 According to Livy’s narrative,643 Romulus decided (*designavit*)644
the boundaries of the *templum* of Jupiter (*templo lovis finis*) Feretrius while
saying: “Jupiter Feretrius, I, the victorious king Romulus, […] dedicate the
*templum* here by these *regiones*, which I am measuring off in my mind”.645 At
first glance, the entire sentence seems to be quite obscure,646 as it is not made
explicit what kind of regions he is talking about. Was Livy referring to a real
subdivision of the newly conquered areas/territory, or was Romulus performing
a theoretical subdivision of the sky? Scholars themselves seem confused about
the application and relation of both the term *finis* and *regio* to so simple a
structure as a *templum*.647 Nevertheless, it is also undeniable in Livy’s text that
the evident use of these terms is related to bordering practices — the question
is, what exactly is it bordering? Romulus, then, in his dedication speech, defined
the inner boundaries and the outer limit (*finis*) of the *templum*. By drawing these
lines, he established and divided the space into those regions he had in his
mind’s eye (*his regionibus quas modo animo metatus sum dedico*),648 through
the appropriate words and probably also employing the proper gestures. Varro,

642 Linderski (1986:2286) found the passage unusual, citing Regell (1878) and Magdelain
(1962), showing that Valeton (1889; 1890) interpreted Livy’s passage as a reference to the
*partes caeli* rather than *pars templi*.
643 Liv. 1.10.5-6
644 One meaning of the verb *designare* is “to point out” and this interpretation is strengthened by
the use of the demonstrative “these regions”. Cf. Gargola 1995:35.
645 Operating in conjunction with a colonial pontiff, the magistrate who dedicated the temple at
Salona announced publicly before reading out the words of the law: “I will give and dedicate by
these rules and by these regimes, which I will say here publicly today”. ILS 112: … *his legibus
hisque regionibus dabo dedicaboque, quas his hocdie palam dixero* … See also CIL III.1933:
… *olis legib(us) ollisque regionibus dabo dedicaboque, qua hic hocdie palam dixero* …; CIL
646 Linderski (1986:2287) considers the formula ‘tralatician’. Cf. the *leges vici Furfensis, area
Narbonensis and Sanotinae*, ILS 4906.112.4907.
647 In the translations there is a dichotomy between *fines* and *regiones*. Cf. Linderski
(1986:2287) does not make a distinction, stating that the augurs “delimit and separate different
*loca* by drawing the *fines* or *regiones*”.
648 Liv. 4.20.5.
as Frothingham points out, provides perhaps a more convincing explanation of what *modo animo metatus* means.\(^{649}\) The boundaries were determined not merely by sight (*conspicione*), but also by memory or mental vision (*cortumione*), determining the regions of the *templum* itself which, temporary and immaterial, was not marked out.\(^{650}\) *Fines* are related to the foundation of the same *templum*, where, in this case, they represent the 'limits' of the physical *templum* (*terrestris*).[3.4; 3.5]

*Regiones*, on the other hand, is a word used by Romulus when he actually applies a sub-division to the temple. The term *regiones* does not refer to the lines of the foundation of the temple; otherwise Livy would have once again used the term *fines*. In the context of augury, it should be noted that the word *regiones* means, primarily, the lines that both subdivide a space and separate it from the external world and, secondarily, the parts of a space that these dividing lines create.\(^{651}\) Acting as an augur, Romulus seems to perform the ritual of creating a *templum*, not in the sense of a structure (*aedes*), but instead following some ancestral augural procedure.\(^{652}\) Successively, magistrates seeking to use a *templum* to create within it an *aedes* or altar also identified the lines that were to define the place in their mind, by words and by gestures, as Romulus did.\(^{653}\)

Livy and Cicero’s narratives can be compared, where the latter provides a more definitive explanation of this question. It represents the best comparison with the Livian passage, displaying the use of similar related bordering terms. Cicero compares himself to Pompey,\(^{654}\) possibly reporting the same words as found in Livy and adding some more. Cicero is even more explicit, both in terminology and in connecting concepts, explaining that:

---


\(^{651}\) Gargola 2004:130.


\(^{653}\) Gargola 1995:36.

\(^{654}\) See Dyck 2008:204. Cicero refers to himself probably to his consulship in 63 B.C.
...unoque tempore in hac re publica duos civis exstitisse quorum alter finis vestri imperi non terrae sed caeli regionibus terminaret, alter huius imperi domicilium sedisque servaret.655

...in Rome there were, at the same time, two citizens (Pompey and Cicero himself), one of whom limited the finis of your (Roman) empire only by the regions of heaven, not by those of the earth, while the other preserved the abode and home of that same empire.

Cicero uses different terms in the same sentence – terms which can be found in Livy as well. By comparing the two authors’ sentences, considerations can be drawn: some from the terminological richness of Cicero’s passage and some others by mutual integration with Livy’s passage. Cicero explains that there are two kinds of bordering practice related to the subdivision of the ‘empire’: the boundary (finis) of the Empire (vestri imperi), which can be on the earth (terra) and in the sky (caelus), and which, in both instances, can be bordered (terminaret) by the regions (regionibus). Considering Cicero, the Livian regiones might fit with the regions of the sky, which reflect the regions on the earth. It becomes evident that Cicero used augural terminology in order to compare the special relationship between heaven and earth: the augural interpretation of signs is strictly linked to the demarcation of religious space through boundaries. This ‘operating mode’ has been considered as a way to categorise space both within the city and between Rome itself and the outside world.656 Through comparison of the two passages above, it is possible to surmise that Livy also considered the fact that Romulus applied this process of subdivision to regions of the conquered territories.657 In this way, the Livian account might be considered a manifesto of Rome’s future foreign policy toward conquered cities and states.658 Those might be the areas in which, in his mind, Romulus had already divided his planned Empire. In this sense, might Romulus’ acting as an

655 Cic. In Cat. 3.26.6-7. See Dyck 2008:204. To be bounded by heaven has been a hyperbolic description of human achievement since Odysseus claimed that his fame went up to heaven (Od. 9.20, imitated by Virg. Aen. 1.379). Regio alone or regio caeli is often used a regions of the sky; Cf. similarly Cic. In Cat. 4.21.8-9: “Pompeius, cuius res gestae atque virtutes isdem quibus solis cursus regionibus ac terminis continentur”.
657 Cf. Att. Nav. Div. 1.17.31: Multis annis post Romulum Prisco regnante Tarquinio quis veterum scriptorum non loquitur quae sit ab Atto Navio per lituum regionum [i.e. urbis Romae] facta descriptio.
658 Cf. Liv. 1.18.7: Inde ubi, prospectu in urbes agrosque capto, deos precatus regiones ab oriente ad occasum determinavit (dextras ad meridiem partes, laevas ad septentrionem esse dixit), signum contra, quoad longissime conspectum oculi ferebant, animo finivit.
augur assume a meaningful significance, in dividing probably not just the sky, but also the territory? The temple of Jupiter Feretrius without doubt gives credence to interpretations of its final meaning; might it be a sort of symbolic act in order to bring or carry the conquered city into Rome herself?

3.5.2 The ritual of the templum

Romulus’ ritual in creating the temple resembles another ritual, which involved magistrates, priests, and private citizens creating new spaces in and around the City or changing the status of old ones. The ritual delimitation of the fines and the designation of the regiones, which set the external boundaries and the internal divisions of a templum, was only part of a larger process. Livy must have considered the templum, a place marked off by the augurs, as a sacred enclosure or a sanctuary. In the course of its constitution, the ausplicants acted in a formal procedure in order to set up a temporary or definitive field of vision, which was called templum. The definition of its limits with appropriate phrases and gestures involved three basic actions: a) the indication of the limits through a defining gesture (for example, in ‘blessing’ a locus inauguratus); b) the establishment of permanent markers, which organised the internal spaces and whose materiality was sacralised through the special character of a lex or the performance of further rites; c) the verbal identification of the space at the moment of creation, by reciting the rules that would govern its use and set its purpose, through a formulac legum dictio. Following these three main steps in creating the templum, we can detect two main sources about the procedure for creating tempa. Livy himself provides specific elements, related to the procedure, while Varro focuses mostly on the formula. Through the joining of

---

659 Catalano (1978:463-70 and 1960:305-6) stresses that centuriae were not temples, as the creation of orthogonal axes was, of itself, not sufficient to create a templum, and that some spaces organised by orthogonal axes were, in fact, never tempa. Gargola 2004:132.


661 Canon (1905) in his note to Liv. 1.18: “In taking auspices, the augur or magistrate marked out a rectangular space by noting certain objects, trees or what not, within which the desired signs were to appear, and tracing a corresponding area mentally in the sky. The spot where he took his station, the ‘auguraculum’, was also a small rectangular space; each of these was called a ‘templum.’ All important magisterial acts were preceded by auspices, and the word ‘templum’ was extended to denote the position occupied by the magistrate, such as the senate-house, the platform from which the Assembly was addressed.
elements present in both their accounts, we will also be able to seek and detect those ‘permanent markers’ established in the procedure. By reporting both of them, I intend to clarify and highlight some evident aspects linked with bordering practices which can be applied to the temple of Jupiter Feretrius.

3.5.3 Livy and the creation of the templum

Livy\(^\text{662}\) seems to repeat the Romulean experience in setting up the temple of Jupiter Feretrius when he renders more precisely the inauguration of Numa Pompilius. The account specifies that the future second king of Rome sat on the arx, ‘on the stone’, facing South (\textit{in arcem in lapide ad meridiem versus consedit}). In this case, the augur, standing to the King’s left (\textit{augur ad laevam eius}), commenced the procedure:

A) He looked out over the city and the fields (\textit{inde ubi prospectu in urbem agrumque}), and, taking his curved staff or \textit{lituus} in his right hand (\ldots\textit{dextra manu baculum sine nodo aduncum tenens, quem lituum appellarunt\ldots}), established and marked (\textit{determinavit}) the regions (\textit{regiones}), thus separating the areas to be searched for signs.\(^\text{663}\) Livy seems to describe only a single division of the templum into a left and a right (vertical subdivision), even though we know that the pomerium itself crossed the templum, dividing it into an upper and a lower sky register (horizontal subdivision).\(^\text{664}\)

B) The augur fixed upon an object opposite him as a corresponding landmark (\textit{signum contra}), as far into the distance as he could see (\textit{quoad longissime conspectum oculi ferebant}), and delimited it according to the plan in his mind’s eye (\textit{animo finivit}).\(^\text{665}\)

\(^\text{662}\) Liv. 1.18.6-10.
\(^\text{663}\) The quadrants are mostly four, a line from East to West, calling ‘right’ the part to the South and ‘left’ the part to the North: ‘\ldots\textit{capto deos precatus regions ab oriente ad occasum determinavit, dextras ad meridiem partes, laevas ad septentrionem\ldots}’. Gargola 1995:35.
\(^\text{665}\) Liv. 1.13.6-10, esp. 7-8. Gargola 2004:130. The following ‘\textit{tum lituo in laevam manum translato dextra in caput Numae imposita}’ recalls the Etruscan tomb of Tarquinil.
C) The third step, called the *lex dicta*, governed the use of the imaginary and temporary *templum*, analogous to the way in which, in earlier times, the *dedicatio* governed a temple.666

In Livy’s view, the creation of the *templum* presents features clearly relating the presence of Jupiter to the boundaries. Borders are connected with the cult of Jupiter, when the augur asks the god to send definite signs (*signa certa*) within the field of vision and “within these *fines* which I have made” (“*Iuppiter pater, … inter eos fines, quos feci*”). The ideological connection between *templa* and the areas of a political community has already been identified by Scheid, whereas three different plans of the social-religious-political living are so identified and banded together: the ancient territory of Rome (*ager Romanus antiquus*), the city itself (*urbs*) and the temple (*templum*).667

### 3.5.4 Varro and the creation of the *templum*

Comparing Livy with Varro, I shall demonstrate that the *templa* were not just created as immaterial within the field of vision, but also as a real, material ‘framework’ on the ground. Norden668 undertook the difficult task of rebuilding the entire corrupted text of the augural verbal formula preserved by Varro:

> In terris dictum templum locus augurii aut auspicii causa quibusdam conceptis verbis finitus. Concipitur verbis non isdem usque quaque; in Arce sic:
>
> On the earth, templum is the name given to a place set aside and limited by certain words for the auguries or the auspices. The words of the ceremony are not the same everywhere; on the Citadel, they are:
>
> *Templa tescaque me ita sunto, quoad ego ea rite lingua nuncupavero*
>
> Temples and wild lands be mine in this manner, up to where I have named them with my tongue in proper fashion.
>
> *Olla vera arbos quirquir est, quam me sentio dixisse, templum tescumque me esto in sinistrum.*

---

666 Gargola 1995:35. Cf. Reid 1912:46: “Festus (146L). by explaining the temporary enclosure known as a *templum minus* and probably following the Augustan antiquarian Verrius Flaccus, noted that it was “defined by fixed words”.


668 Norden 1939:3-106, 281-286. See also Weinstock 1932; Blumenthal 1934; Giordânich 1934:579-587; Ribezzo 1934:201, n. 1; Pighi 1941; Latte 1948; Pisani 1955; Pisani 1956; Peruzzi 1976.
Of whatever kind that truthful tree is, which I consider that I have mentioned, temple and wild land be mine to that point on the left.

**Olla vera arbos quirquir est, quam me sentio dixisse, templum tescumque me esto in dextrum.**

Of whatever kind that truthful tree is, which I consider that I have mentioned, temple and wild land be mine to that point on the right.

**Inter ea conregione conspicione cortumione, utique ea rite dixisse me sensi.**

Between these points, temples and wild lands be mine for direction, for viewing, and for interpreting, and just as I have felt assured that I have mentioned them in proper fashion.

**In hoc templo faciundo arbores constitui fines apparebit et intra eas regiones qua oculi conspiciant, id est tueamur, a quo templum dictum...**

In making this temple, it is evident that the trees are set as boundaries, and that within them the regions are set where the eyes are to view, it is to be fenced, from which is called templum...

Varro provides the most complete overview, but his terminology is uncertain; moreover, he lists three categories of *templum*, which varied greatly in form and function. Varro characterised the *templum in caelo* as *ab natura* (by nature) a field of vision, defined against the sky, in which the ausplicant searched for divine signs, such as lightning. Such *templum* were temporary spaces defined in the imagination for the purposes of *auspicatio*. However, the same word *templum* also signifies a permanent enclosure on the ground, corresponding to what is called *templum inauguratum* or *templum terrestre*. Varro’s *templum in terra* was probably defined on the land by an ausplicant looking down over the surrounding countryside from a high place when searching for signs. Structures established on the ground to serve as places from which observers would create these *templum* may have shared the category of *templum in terra* with the visual fields that were created from them. This distinction between a terrestrial and aerial *templum* confirms what Varro says: the *templum* was limited and bounded by augury. Some scholars, such as Frothingham,
consider *templa* as bounded spaces, separated from the external world for some public or augural end.\(^{673}\)

In Livy’s and Varro’s passages, I considered those terms and sentences that demonstrate that the *templum* was not just an immaterial object, such as an augural ‘frame’, but also a real, concrete structure, which reflects the celestial subdivision.\(^{674}\) As Ogilvie points out, the directions given by Livy in the construction of the *templum* are incompatible with those usually specified for the *templum in caelo*,\(^ {675}\) which might mean a different use of the *templum* and a practical use in dividing land regions. On the contrary, other scholars show that the temple in the heavens is a rectangle, where “the sign depended on its spatial relationship to these defined points. These celestial rectangles had a series of equivalents – they continue – on earth to which the same term was applied”.\(^ {676}\) However, Varro himself makes clear that the *templum in terra* is distinct and was not a mere mirror-image of the *templum in caelo*.\(^ {677}\) For example, centuriated spaces possessed an analogous organisation and were created by the surveyors, or the officials, following this augural procedure.\(^ {678}\) Livy himself states that the whole city of Rome\(^ {679}\) and some of her monuments were dedicated as *templa*.\(^ {680}\) [FIG 24] The *templum* was, therefore, real and the best example which has survived is the augural late-republican *templum* at

\(^{673}\) Many, and probably most, *templa* were clearly and firmly bounded by the actions of the person who created them, even privately. Cicero, for example, depicted Attus Navius as only setting the internal divisions of his *templum*, where the vineyard itself provided the boundaries, not the augur (Cic. *Div.* 1.17.31). For the all above points, see Linderski 1986:2266, 2287, n. 561. Gargola 2004:131.

\(^{674}\) According to Paul. Fest. 146L, the *templum* was “defined and closed in such a way that it was open on a side only, with its corners solidly fixed on the ground”: cf. Scheid 2003:60.

\(^{675}\) Ogilvie 1965:92.


\(^{677}\) Varro *LL* 7.7.; *Serv. ad Aen.* 1.92, 6.191, 7.187. Cf. Regell 1881:618-20, still did not know the augural stones from Bantia.

\(^{678}\) Gargola 2004:132.

\(^{679}\) Liv. 1.18.8: *Accitus, sicut Romulus augurato urbe condenda regnum adeptus est, de se quoque deos consuli iussit.* The legend of the famous Etruscan diviner, Olenus Calenus, as related by Dion. Hal. 4.69-71. He also shows the eastern orientation in the laying out of the city of Rome, and, in general, in the orientation of the terrestrial *templum*, because when the diviner traces on the ground the image of the *templum* of Rome with a circular outline which two lines at right angles bisect into four equal parts, he starts tracing these lines at the East end toward which he faces. Frothingham 1917:200.

\(^{680}\) Varro *LL*. 8.6-13: “quaquia intuiti erant oculi, a tuendo primo templum dictum quocirca caelum qua attuimur dictum templum;” the rostra, some basilicas, the curia, were all *templa*. Frothingham 1917:195 has shown that for this class of *templa* almost any form could be used, and that they can be roughly classified under circles, triangles, and rectangles.
Bantia (modern Banzi). At the present time, it is the best-known replication of the \textit{templum} and the divisions created from it for the auspices: a clearly defined rectangular space divided into four quarters by East/West and North/South lines using stone markers to aid in the construction of an ausplicant’s field of vision and to assist in the interpretation of the signs observed there. These orthogonal axes were traced on a stone providing the fixed directions \textit{fines} and \textit{regiones} on a quadrangular frame and were found in a type of \textit{loci inaugurati}: a \textit{stella}, or \textit{decussis}, the sign of two crossing lines, which was placed on the entrances to all inaugurated places or in the middle of \textit{templa}, acting as an internal division with the words \textit{antica} and \textit{postica} inscribed on it. Through comparison of Livy’s and Varro’s passages, we obtain some data: a) the \textit{locus}, the place where the ritual was undertaken: the \textit{arx} and specifically the \textit{auguraculum}; b) the importance of trees in setting up the \textit{templum terrestris}: the connection with the sacred oak, mentioned by Livy; c) the presence of a stone inside the temple of Jupiter Feretrius: the Livian reference to a stone on the \textit{arx}; d) the relationship between the objects contained in the temple on the \textit{arx}: their relation with fetial priests; e) the relationship between the \textit{arx}, the tree (oak), the stone, the \textit{templum}, the fetials and the cult of Jupiter Feretrius, which are in turn connected with bordering practices. Linderski may have

\textsuperscript{681} The dimensions of this platform on the Capitoline Hill compare favorably with the small size of the terrestrial templum at Cosa and Bantia. Using Varro’s description (L.L. 7.8) of the \textit{auguraculum} as a consecrated space marked on the ground: \textit{templum in terris} and comparative evidence from Cosa and Bantia, it is thought that the Auguraculum was a square or rectangular area marked by boundary stones, or cippi. Torelli 1966; Linderski 1986; Beck 1994:100-10; Carandini 2000b:256.

\textsuperscript{682} See Torelli 1966; Gargola 2004:129.


\textsuperscript{684} For the \textit{stella}, which bore the description \textit{augustus} on itself, see Paul. Fest. 470L and 476L: “\textit{stellam significare ait Ateius Capito laetum et prosperum. auctoritatem secutus P. Servili auguris [stellam], quae ex lamella aerea adsimilis stellae locis inauguratis infigatur}”; Dolabella p. 224.1-3 C: “quaer per aedes publicas in ingressus antique fecerunt crucem, ANTICA. et POSTICA? quia aruspices secundum anispicium in duabus partibus orbe terrarum diuiserunt: una parte ab oriente in occidentem, alia a meridiano in septentrionem”. For the parts of a temple, see Paul. Fest. 244-245L: “\textit{posticum ostium dicitur in postericre parte aedium, ceterum antiqui etiam vicinum habitantem ad posteriorem partem aedium sic appeturarunt. denique et quae ante nos sunt antica, et quae post nos sunt postica dicuntur, et dexteram anticam, sinistrum posticam dicimus, sic etiam ea caeli pars, quae sole inlustratur ad meridiem, antica nominatur, quae ad septentronem. postica; rursurnque dividuntur in duas partes. orientem atque occidentem}”. Linderski 1986:2289, n. 568. Prosdocimi 1991:37-43. argues that there was no similarity between the surveyors’ \textit{stella} and the \textit{stella} placed on inaugurated places, since the former had the shape of a cross, while the latter, he suggests, was rectangular, with the corners forming points that were star-like. But see Dolabella above. Cf. Scheid 2003:60; Gargola 2004:131.
identified the solution to the issues surrounding Livy’s passage: “The mention of fines, within which Jupiter was asked to exhibit unmistakable signs, points back to the operation of the establishment of the field of vision, and the tense of feci indicates that it had already been concluded. It is interesting to note that in the preceding narrative Livy did not use the term finis.685 (…) We have to look for another word that would correspond to fines and connote the concept of boundaries. It is not difficult to find it: regiones. When the augur regiones ab oriente ad occasum determinavit, he drew the boundary lines or fines.”686

3.6 The auguraculum and the arx

The templum terrestris was a clearly defined rectangular enclosure on the ground, a locus inaugurates. It served as a place where the public officiant would perform important functions687 and also as a location for altars, temples (aedes) and shrines.688 This locus inauguratus, also known as auguraculum,689 was an ‘open space’ (templum), where the public auspices were taken. In the centre of this open space was the thatched hut of the observer, which was preserved in its primitive form at least as late as the time of Augustus. The auguraculum was laid out on the highest point of the arx, which was the highest area of the Capitolium as well, suitable for the augurs, because their view of the surrounding territory was not interrupted by other elements, such as buildings or higher hills.690 The Janiculum was the only ‘mountain’, which impeded the view to the North[2.2.8] and no tall monuments could be built around or on the top of

---

685 Which is not true as he used the first time in relation with the Tiber: Liv. 1.3.5.
687 See Liv. 1.18 and the ‘creation’ of Numa as king of Rome.
689 Vitr. 2.1.5; Varro L.L. 7.7; Cic. Off. 3.66; Paul. Fest. 18L; cf. Plin. N.H. 22.5; Liv. I.24. The auguraculum was on the northeast corner of the arx, above the clivus Argentariorum, probably near the apse of the present church of S. Maria in Aracoeli Cf. Jord. 1.2.102-106; Hülsen 1912:199; dap 2.12.149-153; 148.
690 E.g. Paul. Fest. 466-8L: Summisiorem aliis aedem Honoris et Virtutis C. Marius fecit, ne, si forte offeceret auspiciis publicis, augures eam demoliri cogerent. (Marius’ temple of Honos and Virtus was lower than other temples so that it would not be an obstruction to the taking of the public auspices, and so that the augurs might not order its demolition”). For other example of augurs keeping free from obstructions the prospectus from the temple, see Cic. Off. 3.66; cf. Val. Max. 8.2.1. Cf. Carney 1962; Linderski 1986:2158; McDonnell 2006:275.
the Capitoline Hill. Politically, the arx was therefore a unique point of control both through a ‘visual domination’ and as a religious hub.

From this vantage point, the augurs, standing on the arx (in arce sic), looked around over the city and the territories (agri), as Livy’s description confirms. The arx and the templum of Jupiter Feretrius were both associated with the fetial priests, because they took their instruments from there: the lapis silex and the verbena. With this statement and a convincing argument, Coirier has shown that the sagmina was taken not from the Capitolium in general but from the auguraculum, which Festus says to be so called by the ancients, which we now call an arx, the place from where the public augurs take the auspices (appellabant antiqui, quam nos arcim dicimus, quod ibi augures publice auspiciarentur). Having seen the connection between the fetial priests, the sagmina and the arx, could it be that the same templum of Jupiter Feretrius was considered as the earliest auguraculum, and used by Romulus

---

691 Paul. Fest. 466-8L on Marius’ buildings.
692 Varro L.L. 7.8.
695 Paul. Fest.17L.
696 As confirmed by Liv. 1.10.5 the temple was on the Capitoline Hill (Jordan 1907:1,2.47-8). Parker (1879:249-50) tried to demonstrate that the construction of the walls of all the earliest buildings of Rome, recorded by Livy, is the same, “as this bears the truth of his history. In connection with the fortification on the Palatine hill there is the foundation of a temple of the same early character which was excavated by the Italian government in 1871-2 at the west end of the arx of Romulus (Roma Quadrata). There is a long flight of steps up to this temple from the direction of the Circus Maximus, and the whole of the wall is of the same early construction as the walls of the fortifications, and as the aerarium and the tabularium on the Capitoline Hill. This temple can hardly be any other than that of Jupiter Feretrius. The walls are of tufa, of the same rude early character of construction as the other walls, known as walls of Romulus, and the stones are of the same size. A grand staircase or a flight of steps, descended from it in the direction of the Circus Maximus; the line from it would now pass just in front of the church of S. Anastasia and straight to the Carceres of the Circus. This temple is stated to have been built in the Capitoline Hill, that is, in the Capitoline Hill of Romulus, before the union with the Sabines. The hill of Saturn, now called the Capitoline Hill, was added to the Roman city at a subsequent period, as stated by Livy; at that now stands the point at which the Aqua Argentina, the only drinking water on the palatine hill, fell into the stream that ran between the two fortresses, and had formed the Lacus Curtius. We have also the notice of another wall: the one which enclosed the hill of Saturn and the Palatine” (Dion. Hal. 2.66). Differently, Carandini (2011:79-81) defines the temple as a dwelling. In his eminent opinion, opposite to its entrance would have been set up a shrine and a holy oak. The Italian archaeologist placed the sacred area within the modern Promoteca Capitolina, where have been discovered votive finds from the first half of the 8th century B.C.
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– as perhaps suggested in Livy’s narrative – to subdivide into regiones the city and the surrounding countryside697

3.7 Trees and stones

Natural features were part of the process of creating the templum. For instance, as Varro notes, the boundaries of the templum were determined by large trees.698 This leads both to the Livian reference to the oak tree699 and to the second step in determining the favourable and unfavourable quarters of the field. In the templum, the purpose of auspicio was to use the trees or the cippi (stones) to guide the creation of the defining regions.700 Varro himself clearly explained that the augur firstly established the outer limits or fines of the templum using trees, and through them ausplicants went on to set the lines or regions (conregiones in the formula itself) via a glance and the ritual, which subdivided the field.701 On the contrary, Livy explicitly mentions the presence of a stone, upon which Numa sat during the creation of the ‘open templum’.702 The templum of Romulus was not a majestic one, such as those later created by the Etruscan kings. At the end of the procedure, the templum terrestre or minora were finally fenced either with planks and linen cloth or with stakes and spears.703 In other spaces, sturdier elements would have been required.704 Burn describes this first templum-theatrum of the founder of Rome as a ‘diminutive

---

698 Frothingham 1917:195.
701 When Bantia became a municipium after the Social War, an auguraculum was built to take the auspices in the Roman manner, and stone markers or cippi were installed to assist in the construction of the templum. See Gargola 1995:36.
702 Liv. 1.18.6: ... deductus in arcem in lapide ad meridiem versus consedit.
703 Paul. Fest. 146L.; Servius (Ad Aen. 4.200) reports that the same or similar enclosure was marked by hastae. The purpose of such precincts is uncertain: cf. Valeton 1892:374. Although the templus minus served to mark a place after the performance of the liberatio and the effatio (liberation and pronouncing designated; cf. Scheid 2003:60), but before a permanent enclosure or the walls of an aedes could be built. Linderski (1986:2274-79) suggests that one use for those templum was for taking auspices in military encampments. Gargola 1995:38.
704 The legates noted in their verbal description places where the parties were to erect boundary markers; since those legates were not magistrates and the points in question were on foreign soil, they probably could not have performed the operation themselves. Cf. Gargola 1995:36.
which seems to have been a simple wooden structure, along with other public buildings, perhaps with a demarcation of stones of tufa. This hypothetical reconstruction is similar to the wooden frame hut built by the augurs in the setting up of any early templum, which encompasses the original meaning of the name. To be considered sacred, the templum had to be consecrated. As many temples (aedes) were built within templa, gradually over time this term was applied directly to them and eventually acquired the current meaning of a religious building.

3.7.1 The sacred oak

Livy points out the symbolic presence on the Capitoline Hill of an ancient oak, which was sacred to the shepherds (quercum pastoribus sacram). The recognition of a divine spirit in an individual tree can be traced to the cult of Jupiter on the Capitol, which may originally have been the spirit of that sacred oak. In other words, this tree identified the immanent numen and a probable cult of Jupiter. The oak was thought to be sacred because it was the tree most often struck by lightning, the sign of Jupiter. After his victory, Romulus used the sacred oak, modelling it into the shape of a log, on which the weapons and armours of Acron (spolia opima) were hung. In this way, he built the first trophy and dedicated it to the father of the gods. The sacred oak is not just an isolated, standing sign, containing the intrinsic meaning or metaphor of bringing or merging one city into Rome with the protection of Jupiter. This tree might also represent a key element in the subdivision of the space: could its

---

705 Burn 1871:24.
708 Cf. Scheid 2003:61: “A templum in the ancient Roman sense of the term was neither a building nor a sacred place”.
709 Bailey 1932:44.
710 Its contextualisation recalls the sacro-idyllic scenes of the roman fresco from the same period as Livy. See Cook 1904:364; Springer 1954:28; Schnusenberg 2010:188.
711 Eliade 1958:79.
712 Romulus' action itself in dedicating the spolia opima was repeated by C. Marcellus, who ‘froze’ the moment of the dedication on one of his coins; CIL X 809. Cf. Aust 1890:673; Cook 1904:364 ff.; Wissowa 1909:6.2210.
modification into a trophy symbolise the possibility that Romulus,\textsuperscript{713} and the Romans, could modify the structural, environmental, natural positioning of the boundaries?

3.7.2 The \textit{silex}

In this section, I shall try to show that the stone (\textit{lapis silex}) preserved in the \textit{templum} of Jupiter Feretrius was a stone of bigger dimensions than previously thought.\cite{21,22} Moreover, it is my intention to try to indicate that this stone was the starting point for the creation of the earliest bordering practice in Rome. Both Livy and Varro stress that the augurs sought to determine Jupiter’s will through the observation of signs, and although there is no evidence for his statement, Wissowa\textsuperscript{714} assumed that the \textit{arx} was a ‘\textit{Kultstätte}’ of Jupiter. In the \textit{sacellum} of the \textit{templum} of Jupiter Feretrius, unlike other cults, there is no mention of any cult statue of the god, but there is the sign of Jupiter, a stone preserved in it.\textsuperscript{715}

The oak and the \textit{sagmina / verbena}, through the use of the fetials, were not the only items which might have been indirectly related to some bordering practice or with Jupiter Feretrius.\textsuperscript{716} Early Roman religion seems to connect the material world with the power manifested in the sky/universe, which was thought to be in the form of impersonal spirits (\textit{numina}), dwelling in springs, rivers, mountains, groves, trees or stones.\textsuperscript{717} Consequently, the early Romans thought of Jupiter, not as a personal deity living in the sky like Zeus, but rather as the heaven itself, so they could think of him as immanent in some natural element (e.g. eagle, oak, thunder).\textsuperscript{718} The pervasive immanence of the deity himself was

\textsuperscript{713} Cf. Plut. \textit{Rom.} 16; “Romulus, that he might pay his vow in a manner well-pleasing to Jupiter. cut down an enormous oak which was growing in the camp, trimmed it to the shape of a trophy, and fastened about it all the weapons of Acron in order due”. Cook 1904:364.
\textsuperscript{714} Wissowa 1912:104.
\textsuperscript{715} Paul. Fest. 81L, s. ‘\textit{Feretrius}’.
\textsuperscript{716} The strong relationship between fetials and Jupiter Feretrius has been emphasised by Wissowa 1909:6.2210.
\textsuperscript{717} Scullard 1935:391.
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represented in stones, such as the *lapis silex*\(^{719}\) in the shrine of Jupiter Feretrius or, as it happened, the *lapis manalis*. The *silex*, which would have been a hard stone capable of being struck to produce sparks, is also associated with the god in Virgil,\(^{720}\) being an object of cult in an earlier stage. This special association is also clear in Jupiter’s punishment of those guilty of perjury, by striking them down with a thunderbolt.\(^{721}\) For example, a line of Virgil states that Jupiter *Fulgur*\(^{722}\) or *Fulgurator*\(^{723}\) was summoned to ratify the treaties (*qui foedera fulmine sancit*),\(^{724}\) Despite Reid’s scepticism, Tyrrel believed the stone to be an immanent thunderbolt on the earth, a symbol of Jupiter.\(^{725}\) Jupiter was summoned in the fetial and augural ceremony and regarded as witness of oaths and treaties, or sender of signs. One particular representation of Jupiter joined together the two ceremonies. The connection between *Iuppiter Fulgur*\(^{726}\) or *Flagius* and *Iuppiter Feretrius* was represented by the *lapis silex* (flint stone), both because that stone was preserved in his *templum* and because it was able to produce sparks, which reminded people of the thunderbolt.\(^{727}\) As Frothingham notes,\(^{728}\) in the ancient Italian universe, the augural divination happened in two ways, observing the birds, as in the Italic and Roman custom, or the observation of thunder and lightning, which is Etruscan.\(^{729}\) Both these

---

\(^{719}\) Bailey 1932:7.


\(^{721}\) Eliade 1958:79.


\(^{723}\) Epigraphically, the italic context presents a wide range of documents about the cult of *Iuppiter Flazzus o Flagius*.

\(^{724}\) Serv. *ad Aen.* 12.200: “audiat haec genitor, qui foedera fulmine sancit” confirmat. *Iuppiter confirmat, sancta esse facit, quia cum fiunt foedera, si coruscatio fuerit, confirmantur.* Cf. *Hom. Il.* 15.117: εἷς πέρ μοι καὶ μοῖρα Δίως πληγέντι κεραυνῷ κείσθαι ὅμοι νεκύεσσι μεθ’ αἵματι καὶ κονίσιν (even though it be my fate to be smitten with the bolt of Zeus, and to lie low in blood and dust amid the dead).


\(^{726}\) The cult is similar to *Iuppiter Flazzus o Flagius* present in some italic inscriptions: Vetter 1953:nr. 92 (Capua); nr. 108 (Cuma) [= Pocetti 1979:nr. 132] e *CIL* X 1571 (Pozzuoli).


\(^{728}\) Frothingham 1917:187.

\(^{729}\) Cf. Pliny (2.142) explains the belief in the lucky left by this southern orientation: *Laeva prospera existuntur quoniam laeva parte mundi ortus est. In sexdecim partes caelum in eo spectu divisere Tusci. Prima est a septentriobus ad eaquinocitalem exortum, secunda ad meridiem, tertia ad aequinoctialem occasum, quarta optinet quod reliquum est ab occasu ad*
cases must be studied in connection with a consecrated and determined area called *templum*, within which the phenomena are noted.

Like the invocation in war-declarations, this ritual also considered Jupiter, not as a personal deity living in the sky like Zeus, but rather as immanent in the flint stone, indeed *luppiter Lapis*.

Jupiter Feretrius’ worship and representation remained aniconic and appeared to be the only hypostasis of an otherwise anthropomorphic Roman god that was simultaneously worshipped in non-human form. In other words, not having a proper cult statue, Jupiter Feretrius’ *numen* (divinity) was represented by his cultural symbol: a stone of immense sacredness encompassed in his temple. Festus informs us that the fetials held only a sceptre and a stone, which were ‘used’ in the *templum* (*ex cuius templo sumebant sceptrum per quod iurarent et lapidem silicem*).

The superimposition of the *lapis silex* and the *sceptrum* has caused some scholars to consider the *lapis silex* as a superstitious relic from the Stone Age, like a small stone axe (celt) or a sacrificial knife of immemorial past, which was proper to use on the occasion, but was not otherwise sacrosanct. Both the stone and the sceptre were symbolically the peculiar marks of Jupiter and were used by the fetials for their solemn ceremonies.

---

731 Fowler 1911:129-30; Bailey 1932:15. On similarities about the oath on a stone or on multiple stones: see Campbell 1953:13.
733 Scullard (1935:391) considers both stones as boundary stones.
735 Carandini 2011:94.
736 In this context, Cook (1904:365) concludes that the *lapis silex* of Jupiter Feretrius was the symbol of the sky-god, just as the stone axe in the palace of Minos was the weapon and symbol of Zeus. Cf. Springer 1954:27.
737 Cf. Serv. *ad Aen.* 12.206: *Axidiat haec genitor civi foedera fulmine sanct*, where he says: *Ut autem sceptrum adhibeatur ad foedera haec ratio est quia maiores semper simulacrum lovis adhibebant: quod cum taediosum esset — inventum est ut sceptrum tenentes quasi imaginem
the *silex* had the same significance as the *sagmina*. Like the *verbena*, it represented the native land, brought from abroad. The ritualistic and sacred procedure of carrying instruments from the Capitoline Hill reinforced their diplomatic immunities, by granting them a sort of protective aura (*per quod iuvarent*). In this way, the fetials, when carrying the *verbena* with them, in some way transposed the spreading *imperium* to the real word. The act of moving toward the enemy’s bordering areas and then crossing them with the spear-ritual might mean that they “took possession of the hostile land”, breaching the boundary of the enemy’s *fines*. In his opinion, Reid stated that the function of *sagmina* and *lapis* was to keep the fetials in touch with their own country, when they made their demands or concluded their treaties.

### 3.7.3 *Juppiter Lapis* (Jupiter Stone)

In the section to follow I will attempt to demonstrate that: a) the cult of ‘Jupiter Stone’ and the stone which personified him (*lapis silex*) was not just present in the *templum* of Jupiter Feretrius; b) the stone ‘*lapis silex*’, adopted for striking oaths, pacts or treaties was conflated with the stone representing ‘*Juppiter Lapis*’. In other words, I will show that the two stones have been confused in the procedure of swearing oaths and consider the hypothesis that inside the *templum* was preserved an original stone of larger dimensions than the one used to swear on.

*simulacri redderent Iovis. Sceptrum enim ipsius est proprium.* (The reason why the sceptre is used when a treaty has to be made is this. Our forefathers on all such occasions were wont to produce an image of Jupiter. This was difficult, especially when the treaty was made with a distant tribe. A way out of the difficulty was for them to hold a sceptre and so copy as it were the image of Jupiter; for the sceptre is peculiar to himself). Cf. Cook 1904:365; Ogilive 1965:70.

738 Reid 1912:48. The notion of the sceptre, which also appears in Paul. Fest. 92L, is apparently a distortion of the idea that the *verbena* was a *caduceus*.

739 Even if the phrase ‘*lapis Capitolinus*’, which Augustine (*C.D.* 2.29) places side by side with *Vestalis focus*, does refer to the temple of Jupiter Feretrius, which is doubtful, the writer is no real authority on such a matter. Reid 1912:50.

740 Liv. 1.10.7

741 Parallels are easy to find. We may, for instance, compare the consecration of a piece of foreign ground as Roman soil when a consul wanted to nominate a dictator. Also it was once a custom at Rome, in a dispute about land, that a clod from the estate should be produced in court, so that the dispute was in theory conducted in *re praesenti*. Reid 1912:50-1.
From this stone, the father of the gods also took his special title of *Juppiter Lapis* ⁷⁴² and – as in Aust’s opinion – he was immanent in the stone itself. ⁷⁴³ As we have seen, Festus considered that the cognomen ‘Feretrius’ would derive from *ferendo*, of which the *silex* in the *templum* is evidence, and, therefore, Jupiter Feretrius would be equivalent to *Juppiter Lapis*. It is said that the fetials took the *lapis silex* with them during their official journeys and used it to ratify their treaties. ⁷⁴⁴ In his comment to Virgil, Servius presents a further development of the mythical *rapport* between the stone and the god, when he says that the victim sacrificed by the fetials in concluding peace was struck with a *lapis silex*, because they believed it to be *antiqui Iovis signum*. ⁷⁴⁵ After all, we know that the fetials had the task of declaring war or ratifying peace.[4.2; 4.4]

On this stone, the Romans would have taken their most solemn oaths, using the expression ‘*Per Jovem Lapidem jurare*’. ⁷⁴⁶ Indeed, the *templum* was built after a vow had been sworn. Unfortunately, a passage of Polybius ⁷⁴⁷ seems to have created a misunderstanding about this theme. In his famous account about the fetials’ treaties between Rome and Carthage, Polybius affirms that the Romans swore an oath in their earliest agreement by the name of ‘Jupiter Stone’ and the ancient custom (*Δια λίθων κατά τι παλαιών ἔθος*). However, in the case of the third treaty, made at the time of the war with Pyrrhus, they swore by Zeus, Ares and Enyalus (probably Quirinus). ⁷⁴⁸ This passage is confusing and is hard to interpret. But it specifically links Jupiter (Feretrius), Mars and (Janus) Quirinus and suggests that, in the earliest period of the city’s history, these three gods may have been the recipients of the victory spoils, later to be monopolised by

---

⁷⁴³ Aust 1890:674; for similar and chronologically closest views see Roscher 1937:1.676; Springer 1954:31.
⁷⁴⁴ Fowler 1932:130.
⁷⁴⁵ Serv. ad Aen. 8.641: *nam cum ante gladiis configeretur, a fetailibus inventum ut silice feriretur ea causa, quod antiqui Iovis signum lapidem silicem putaverunt esse*.
⁷⁴⁶ E.g. Liv. 1.24.8; 9.5.3; 30.43.9; Paul. Fest. 81L, s. ‘Feretrius’; Cic. Fam. 7.12; Gel. 1.21; Polyb. 3.26, for more sources: s. Paribeni 1922:173. On the idiomatic expression: *foedus ferire* = “*ein Bündnis/Opfer schlachten*” and the importance of slaying the porker as moment of joining between different groups of human beings, politically organised, from the time of the most ancestral hunting communities” (“*Bünde*”) cf. Merkelbach 1978:761-4.
⁷⁴⁷ Polyb. 3.25.6.
⁷⁴⁸ That Quirinus was at any rate in some aspects a war-god is clear from Macrob. 1.9.16; Plut. Rom. 29; Dion. Hal. 2.48 (=’Ἐνυδαλιὸς’). Cf. Cook 1904:371; Butler 1919:62-3.
Chapter 3. The foundation of the templum of Jupiter Feretrius

The problems arise when Polybius goes on to explain ‘Δίκα λιθον’ he who swears the oaths takes a stone in his hand and prays: “If I abide by this oath may he bless me; but if I do otherwise in thought or act, may all others be kept safe each in his own country, under his own laws, in enjoyment of his own goods, household gods, and tombs – may I alone be cast out, even as this stone is now”. This passage has been related to another passage in Livy, on the grounds of the similarity of the transaction. At the end of the Second Punic War (200 B.C.), the fetials were ordered to proceed to Africa to make peace, but the precise duties of their office had so fallen into obscurity that they were obliged to ask the Senate for information. The Senate gave them the order to carry a silex with them. Yet, as Reid correctly notes, it seems rather ludicrous that the fetials carried with them the representation of the divinity and left the templum empty of his visible presence. The casting of the stone, therefore, was the final act of the oath, which was taken not only by representatives of the state, the fetials, to solemnise a treaty, but also by ordinary people to make an oath binding. Polybius recorded words of the oath in connection with treaties, which coincide with the oath taken when Sulla forced Cinna to pledge his allegiance. Cinna went up to the Capitol, took a stone in his hand, and invoked curses on his own head if he did not preserve his loyalty to Sulla, praying, in that case, that he would be ejected from the city (ἐκπεσεῖτα τῆς πόλεως), even as the stone passed from his hand, and so he cast it on the ground. Livy depicts Hannibal, just before the battle of the Ticinus, as sacrificing a lamb with a silex and calling on “luppiter and the other gods” to punish him if he

---

750 Cf. Paul. Fest. 115L: The procedure for those who wished to swear, in later times, was to hold a stone in hand, saying: “If I knowingly swear false, then may Dispiter cast me from my possessions without harm to city and citadel, even as I cast this stone from my hand”. (“Lapidem tenebant iuraturi per Iovem, haec verba dicentes: “si sciens fallo, tum me Dispiter (i.e. Diespiter) salva urbe arceque bonis eiciat, ut ego hunc lapidem”.
751 Liv. 30.43.9: “Senatus consultum factum est in haec verba: ut privos lapides silices privasque verbenas secum ferrent: ut, ubi praetor Romanus eis imperaret ut foedus feriret, illi praetorem sagmina posserent”.
752 Which Reid (1912:48) considers as a senatorial blunder.
753 Reid 1912:49.
754 Paul. Fest. 102L s. ‘lapidem silicem’.
breaks his promise to his allies. Livy cannot have thought that this use of the *silex* was peculiarly Roman. As Strachan Davidson (*Passages from Polybius*) remarks, Polybius has certainly confused two quite different formalities in which the *silex* played a part: the fetial and the oath ceremonial, in which the phrase *Iovem lapidem iurare* was employed, but for which there is otherwise no evidence of a connection. Polybius wrote δια λίθον as a rendering of *Iovem lapidem iurare*, because he believed the Romans possessed a divinity with such a name. This shadowy god has usually been identified with Jupiter Feretrius. But this identification depends on the story, shown above to be very insecurely founded, that the *silex*, used by the fetials, was taken from his *templum*. In conclusion, the *lapis silex* might have three different connotations: a) as the *signum Iovis*: the aniconic image or sign of Jupiter; b) as an execration tool: the stone thrown after the oath; or c) as a sacrificial tool: the object by which the victims were killed.

In the following section, I intend to demonstrate that the *templum* of Jupiter Feretrius already contained a stone, which had the symbolic power of determining the boundaries. This seems to be in contrast with the *lapis silex*, which was carried by the fetials, was therefore moveable and which might also be identified with the *sceptrum*. I am also assuming, from Festus' statement, that the fetials took the sceptre from the *templum* in which they used to swear oaths (ex cuius templo sumebant sceptrum per quod iurarent). Following the interpretation given by Rudorff and the proof given in the previous paragraph about the presence of a stone on the *arx* on which the *templum* was built, we can understand the *lapis silex* or Jupiter Lapis as being the god who watches

---

756 Liv. 21.45. Commentators have generally connected the expression with what precedes and have supposed that *Iovem lapidem iurare* was an ordinary legal expression like *communi dividundo*, but in that case we should find it somewhere in legal literature, where it does not occur.

757 The phrases *vetustissimo ritu* in Apul. *Deo Socr.* 5, and *sanctissimum ius iurandum* in Gell. 1.21.4, point the same way. Even in Cic. *Fam.* 7.12.2, the form may not be connected with ordinary life. The letter is a jesting one addressed to Trebatius the lawyer who has become an Epicurean. Cicero asks how he can use certain legal phrases, which he interprets as conflicting with Epicurean principles. “Quo modo autem tibi placebit *Iovem lapidem iurare*, cum scias *Iovem iratum esse nemini posse? Quid fiet porro populo Ulubrano, si tu statueris poliuteωσθαι non oportere?”

758 Reid 1912:52.


760 Blume, Lachmann & Rudolf 1852:2.242.
over boundary stones (*termini silicei*), a type of double *Terminus*. Its representation was not only aniconic, but also immovable as shown in the oldest Jupiter. According to the s.c. ‘Vegoia Prophecy’, Jupiter is the guardian that pours down many and varied woes on those who remove their neighbour’s landmarks.\(^{761}\) *Terminus* and the *termini* were exempted from *exauguratio* – the shifting of the boundary stones – and worshipped under the open sky, as the Terminus needed a direct contact with the sky. The reference to the damaged roof in Atticus could be misleading due to the fact that the *aedes* of Jupiter Feretrius also had a hole in the ceiling for this special relationship with the sky.\(^{762}\) The flint (*silex*) was probably a meteoric stone, which Pliny describes as much in demand for the practice of magic.\(^{763}\) “In the beginning”, continues Springer,\(^{764}\) “there was probably only one such stone,\(^{765}\) but as Roman aggression expanded, the number of flint stones increased”.\(^{766}\) “The sacred stone would have formed the centre of the cult here, and would have been placed in the new temple”.\(^{767}\) In this divine form, he was thus truly indistinguishable from the thousands of actual boundary stones inside and

---

\(^{761}\) “Scias mare ex aethera remotum. Cum autem Iuppiter terram Aetruriae sibi undicauit, constituit iussitque metiri campos signarique agros. Sciens hominum auaritiam vel terrenum cupidinem, terminis omnia scita esse uoluit. Quos quandoque quis ob auaritiam prope nouissimi octaui saeculi data sibi homines male dolo violabunt contingentque atque mouebunt. Sed qui conterit atque mouerit, possessionem promovendo suam, alterius minuendo, ob hoc scelus damnabitur a diis. Si serui faciant, dominio mutabuntur in deterius. Sed si conscientia dominica fiet, caelerius domus extirpabitur, gensque eius omnis interi...”. (You should know that the sea is separated from the earth. When Jupiter claimed the land of Etruria for himself, he decided and commanded the fields to be surveyed and the lands marked out. Knowing the covetousness of man and his worldly greed, he wanted the boundaries of everything to be marked by boundary stones. Those which at any time anyone has placed because of the greed of this eighth – almost the latest – saeculum, arrogating to themselves licence, men with wrongful deceit will violate, touch and move. But if anyone touches or moves a boundary stone, extending his own possessions or diminishing those of someone else, for this crime he will be condemned by the gods. If slaves shall do this, they shall be moved to a lower status by their owner. But if this is done with the knowledge of the master, the household will be immediately uprooted, and the whole of his family will perish. The people responsible will be afflicted by the worst diseases and wounds and their limbs will be weakened. Then even the land will be shaken by storms or whirlwinds and many landslips. The crops will be frequently laid low and cut down by rain and hail, they will perish in the heat of the summer, they will be killed off by blight. There will be civil strife amongst the people. Know that these things happen, when such crimes are committed: Therefore do not be either a deceitful or treacherous. Place restraint in your heart). Cf. Blume, Lachmann & Rudolf 1852:350-1.

\(^{762}\) Nep. Att. 20.3.


\(^{764}\) Springer 1954:30.

\(^{765}\) Paul. Fest. 81L, s. ‘Feretrius’; Polyb. 3.25.6-9.

\(^{766}\) Liv. 30.43.9 uses the plural, *lapides silices*.

\(^{767}\) Kirsopp Lake 1936:73.
outside the city. It was this indistinctiveness which gave every boundary stone in the landscape a strongly divine aura as a potential ‘cult statue’ of the god.\footnote{68} Since the \textit{termini} were the commonest sacred stones, they would be the first analogy suggested by an unidentified stone, so that this explanation would come readily to the Roman mind.\footnote{69} For this reason, it has also been thought that, instead of a small flint stone, a big rock might have been the symbol within the \textit{templum}, perhaps with the function of an altar (\textit{hinc Feretri dictast ara superba lovis}).\footnote{70} The stone, considered as the first boundary marker to be laid out with the \textit{pomerium}, was worked as an instrument of division and organisation of the conquered territory when Romulus dedicated to Jupiter the “\textit{templum} within those regions which I have now marked out in my mind, as a receptacle for the grand spoils”. In other words, the aniconic appearance of Jupiter Stone served very practical ends.

\section*{3.8 Rebuilding the \textit{templum}}

Jupiter Feretrius, the ‘political Jupiter’\footnote{71} who preceded the cult of the greater Optimus Maximus, already had his oldest cult at Rome on the Capitoline. The \textit{templum}\footnote{72} of Jupiter Feretrius might also have been the first temple (\textit{aedes}) to be dedicated and built on the most important hill of the city, in order to commemorate the conquest of the \textit{spolia opima} and to serve as a repository for them.\footnote{73} These spoils were said to have been won and placed in this temple twice afterwards\footnote{74} — in 437\footnote{75} or 422\footnote{76} B.C. when A. Cornelius Cossus slew Lars Tolumnius, the King of Veii,\footnote{77} and in 221 B.C. when Claudius Marcellus

\footnotesize

\begin{itemize}
\item \footnote{68}{Lipka 2009:89.}
\item \footnote{69}{Kirsopp Lake 1936:73.}
\item \footnote{70}{Propert. 4.10.48.}
\item \footnote{71}{Carter 1908:181.}
\item \footnote{72}{\textit{Templum}: Liv. 1.10; Paul. Fest. 92; νυξ; Dion. Hal. 2.34; Cass. Dio. 54.8.3.}
\item \footnote{73}{Liv. 10.5.6; 4.20.3; Plut. Rom. 16; Dion. Hal. 2.34; Val. Max. 3.2.3; Flor. 1.1.11; Serv. \textit{ad Aen.} 6.859; CIL I 2283, Elog. 22 = 10.809.}
\item \footnote{74}{Cf. McPherson 2010:21.}
\item \footnote{75}{Liv. 4.20.5-11. About the question of the date of Cossus’ victory see: Springer 1954:29.}
\item \footnote{76}{Liv. 4.32.4.}
\item \footnote{77}{Liv. 4.20.3; Cf. Dion. Hal. 12.5.3; Val. Max. 3.2.4; Prop. 4.10.23; Ampel. 21; Serv. \textit{ad Aen.} 6.855; Aur. Vict. \textit{Vir. Ill.} 25. Springer 1954:29.}
\end{itemize}
killed Viridomarus, the Insubrian king.\footnote{Livy. Ep. 20; Serv. ad Aen. 6.859; Prop. 4.10.45; Plut. Marc. 8, Rom. 16; Liv. Per. 20; Prop. 4.10.39-40; Plut. Marc. 8.3; Ampel. 21. Springer 1954:30; Versnel 1970:307; Welch 2005:134.} A denarius\footnote{Babelon 1885:1.351-2, Claudia 11; Grueber 1970:1.567, 4206-8; Cohen 1995:t. XII Claudia 4 (= Mommsen M.W.S. 648 N. 303).} struck by P. Cornelius Lentulus Marcellinus\footnote{Münzer 1900:7.1390-1.} in 45/44 B.C., represents Marcellus, the conqueror of Viridomarus and Syracuse, standing on the high stylobate of a rectangular temple with the \textit{spolia opima} in his hand.\footnote{Virgil (Aen. 6.859) asserts that Marcellus “\textit{tertiaque arma patri suspendet capta Quirino}”. It looks strange that he dedicated the armours to Quirinus as we know that, according to Plutarch (Marc. 8) and Propertius (4.10), he dedicated the \textit{spolia opima} to Jupiter Feretrius. The commentary of Servius explains the matter: “\textit{Numae hunc locum accipere, qui praecipit prima spolia opima Ioui Feretrio debere suspendi, quod iam Romulus fecerat; secunda Marti, quod Cossus fecit; tertia Quirino, quod fecit Marcellus}”. The triad Jupiter, Mars, Quirinus suits the context in the \textit{lex Numae} admirably well: Serv. ad. Aen. 8. 663, “\textit{salios qui sunt in tutela Iouis Martis Quirini}”; Liv. 8.9, “\textit{Iane, Jupiter, Mars, pater Quirine}”; Liv. 5.52: “\textit{Mars Gradue, tuque Quirine pater}”. Cf. Versnel 1970:308; Butler 1919:61. Cf. Jordan 1873:206, n. 1. For the relationship between Livy and Augustus see Dessau 1906: \textit{passim}.} In this late republican depiction, the columns support an entablature with plain pediment and it appears to be tiny in structure, reflecting the small fifteen feet length (\textit{ἐλάττουντας ἢ πέντε ποδών καὶ δέκατάς μείζους πλευρᾶς ἔχον}).\footnote{Dion. Hal. 2.34. Springer 1954:31.}

Livy’s mention of \textit{fines} as limits, foundations or boundaries of the temple implies an extraordinary importance if compared with Dionysius’ description, who probably visited the temple in person, providing an additional element related with bordering. Dionysius writes, almost certainly after Augustus’ restoration, dated in 42 (or 31) B.C.,\footnote{Augustus’ restoration of the temple of Jupiter Feretrius is dated in 42 B.C. by Atticus’ death. However, Platner & Ashby (1929:293) seems to have convincingly dated forward the restoration of the temple to around 31 B.C.} that at that time “indeed it is possible to observe the ancient trace of it” (“\textit{ἐτὶ γὰρ αὐτοῦ σῳζεται τὸ ἀρχαῖον ἱχνος}”). This phrase opens to different interpretations: a) that the dimensions of the restored temple were the same as those of the original,\footnote{Gilbert 1885:3.399} b) that the second was larger and enclosed the earlier,\footnote{Jordan 1907:1.2.47.} or c) that the lines of the earlier were simply marked on the floor of the latter. However, it is also possible that the traces of the oldest ‘\textit{templum}’ could be still identified at the time Dionysius was writing. The meaning of ἱχνος is specifically ‘footprint’, ‘track’ or ‘trace’,\footnote{Liddell & Scott 1883:717.} something
imprinted on the soil, which is clearly a reminder of the *fines* traced by Romulus at the moment of its foundation. The ‘signs’ of the old temple were considered sacred if they were still present and well visible within the structure. The first Roman *templum* of Jupiter Feretrius underwent many changes throughout the ages\(^{787}\) and the two main restorations were both reported by Livy. The larger, newer temple, visible in the Augustan period, might have been built by Ancus Marcius, who enlarged the temple (*aedis Iovis Feretri amplificata*) in recognition of his success against Politorium, one of the Latin cities.\(^{788}\) The use of the words *aedis* and *amplificata* indicates Livy’s belief that an actual temple structure had been built sometime before the second half of the 7th century B.C. Probably, the development of the cult of Jupiter Feretrius followed the usual pattern of other Roman cults: a) the assigning of an area sacred to the *numen*, b) the building of a *sacellum*, which Festus defines vaguely as “a place sacred to the gods without a roof”,\(^{789}\) and c) the building of an *aedes*.\(^{790}\)

Although there is no direct quotation that could be used to link an expansion of the *fines* with the temple of Jupiter Feretrius, some authors\(^{791}\) have hypothesised that this enlargement is directly connected with Rome’s great territorial expansion, conducted (*egregieque rebus bello gestis*)\(^{792}\) by Ancus, and that this increase would be connected with the renewal and expansion of the temple. [FIG 22] Springer is convinced that Ancus Marcius’ ‘temple’ was undoubtedly a *sacellum* or an area walled in with stone,\(^{793}\) and Marcellinus’ coin of 44 B.C. undoubtedly represents the structure before Augustus’ renewal, the second restoration of the temple. On Atticus’ suggestion (*ut Attici admonitu*), the *aedes* had fallen into disrepair (*ex quo accidit… constituta vetustate*\(^{794}\) *atque incuria detecta prolaberetur*) and had even lost its roof, before Augustus restored it (*Caesar eam reficiendam curaret*), probably in 32 B.C.\(^{795}\)

---

\(^{787}\) Schnusenberg 2010:188.
\(^{790}\) Springer 1954:29.
\(^{791}\) Ogilvie 1965:126.
\(^{792}\) Liv. 1.33.8.
\(^{793}\) Springer 1954:29.
\(^{794}\) Cf. Liv. 4.20.7 on this passage: ‘*quam vetustate dilapsam*’.
\(^{795}\) Although the date is uncertain, it happened before the death of Atticus, which occurred in this year. Nep. Att. 20.3. Cf. Mon. Anc. 4.5. Wissowa 1909:6.2210. Cf. McPherson 2010:23 agreed
was probably more concerned about his deeds as founder or restorer of all temples\textsuperscript{796} (\textit{templorum omnium conditorem aut restitutorem}); either that or he replaced the temple because the right of depositing spoils, regarded as \textit{spolia opima}, was then granted.\textsuperscript{797} Augustan restoration was not just a simple and formal act; it was the demonstration both of his intention to be likened to Romulus\textsuperscript{798} and most probably also of the relationship between (his) \textit{imperium} and the \textit{fines}.

Livy shows us another crucial point, which is apparently not so important. He witnesses that Augustus himself read (\textit{se ipsum}) the writings (\textit{scriptum}) on the linen cuirass (\textit{in thorace linteo}). This cuirass was the object of an argument between Livy and Augustus because of an inscription held on the cuirass of King Tolumnius of Veii,\textsuperscript{799} of which Virgil was probably aware.\textsuperscript{800} This passage becomes more important if we think of the image on the cuirass as being of Augustus’ statue of \textit{Prima Porta}, where Augustus is depicted as \textit{triumphator} and \textit{restitutor} of Roman standards lost at Carrahe.\textsuperscript{801} In fact, Drusus was the

\textsuperscript{796} Nepos in his biography of Atticus (Nep. \textit{Att.} 20.3.) gives the reason for the temple of Jupiter Feretrius being among the first to be rebuilt. The temple was among the first twelve to be rebuilt by Augustus (\textit{RG} 19) Altogether Augustus restored eighty-two temples, and he adds that not one which needed repair was neglected (\textit{RG} 20). Springer 1954:31.


\textsuperscript{798} So Flower 2000:48: “the renaissance of Romulus’ image was a marked phenomenon of the late republic that was part of the family propaganda of the Julii”. Cf. McPherson 2010:23. The \textit{elogium} (\textit{CIL} 1.12:189) was inscribed on a plaque attached to the base of Romulus’ statue, placed in the central niche of the exedra built against the southern wall of the forum of Augustus. It reads as follows: “ROMULUS MARTIS / FILIUS URBEM ROMAM /CONDIDIT ET REGNAVIT ANNOS / DUOEOQUADRAAGINTA ISQUE / PRIMUS DUX DUCE HOSTIUM /ACRONE REGE CAENINENSIVM / INTERFECTO SPOLIA OPIMA / IOVI FERETRIO /CONSECRAVIT / RECEPTUSQUE IN DEORUM / NUMERUM QUIRINUS /APPELLATUS /EST”. Cf. Degrassi 1937:70, nr. 86. Ogilvie 1965:70 ff. (on Liv. 1.10); Platner & Ashby 1929:293, s. \textit{Iuppiter Feretrius}. Propertius 4.10 is witness that the subject of Romulus and the \textit{spolia opima} was in the air in the decade after Virgil’s death. At line 17, the elegist styles “\textit{Romulus Urbis virtutis que parens}’ That Augustus is to be seen as the renewer of both the city and her \textit{virtus} Virgil makes clear in the lines that follow in \textit{Aeneid} 6. Cf. Putnam 1985:238-9.


\textsuperscript{800} Liv. 4.20.3 ff. Cf. DeWitt 1928. On the honour deserved by L. Crassus to have slain the Bastarnae’s chief, Deldo see: Tarpin 2003.

last Roman to have the ambition of depositing the *trophaeum* in the temple,\textsuperscript{802} but, upon Drusus’ death, Augustus returned to Rome and on the Capitol\textsuperscript{803} “carried the laurel, contrary to custom, into the temple of Jupiter Feretrius”.\textsuperscript{804} De Magistris considers a renewed interest for the Romulean *templum* as an erudite reconstruction in the Augustan Age, when the theoretical studies of the gromatics found a practical application, not just in the planning of cities, colonies and fields for the cultivations, but also for the new imperial reorganisation. This reconstruction would have been a rediscovery of the most ancient rituals, rather than an invention or falsification of the tradition *ex nihilo*.\textsuperscript{805}

### 3.9 Conclusions

The presence of the terms *finis* and *regiones* in Livy’s text confirms their importance in connection with the highest peak of the archaic Rome, as ways to determine the subdivision of the territory. This is demonstrated in the conquest of neighbouring cities, which led to the annexation both of the territory and the population. The triumphal procession to the top of the Capitoline Hill might have had the significance of a ritualistic act by “carrying the conquered territory to the head of Rome: the *Caput-oleum*”. From here it was possible to overlook the surrounding areas, even the newly conquered ones. By establishing the *templum*, Romulus made that place more sacred than it was before. The subdivision – or reorganisation – of the conquered areas is a reflection of the *templum caelestis* in the sky, which was set up on a stone. As demonstrated in *Bantia* and *Misa* (modern Marzabotto), this stone provided the main alignment for the guidelines on which the *regiones* were defined. The role of the temple of Jupiter Feretrius became key to the future political relationships of Rome with abutting States. Indeed, the link between the temple and the *fines* look difficult

\textsuperscript{802} For Drusus’ *spolia opima*, see now Rich and 1999, who independently reached some of the same conclusions proposed by Flower 2000:58.
\textsuperscript{803} RG 4. Springer 1954:30.
\textsuperscript{805} De Magistris 2007:179-194.
to comprehend but undeniable. ‘Romulus’ ritual’ was accomplished by the fetials priests through carrying pieces of Rome’s most sacred point into enemy territory. This ritual would have allowed for the encompassment of the neighbouring territories following the rules of the fas, without breaking any divine law. This chapter therefore has been propaedeutic for comprehending the future role of the fetials and the importance of highest points as visual and practical control of the territory as we will see in the next chapter. And as a final note, Augustus gave particular emphasis to this temple, which would appear to confirm the propagandistic directives absorbed by Livy, who seems to support a direct connection between the temple and the fines imperii.
Chapter 4. The fetial priests

By declaring war through their Fetiales and legally doing injustices and by always taking and seizing the property of others they have gained possession of the entire world for themselves. 806

4.1 Aims and challenges

Livy shows us a plethora of different bordering practices in his account and the fetials are linked to some of these practices. Modern authors have primarily focused on fetials’ religion, warfare and law and only a few researchers have offered a partial investigation of the significance of their rituals related to the aspect of bordering practices. This chapter attempts to reflect an alternative perspective by trying to bring to light the privileged relationship the fetials had with *fines*. I shall investigate and analyse, throughout the Livian text, what sort of bordering practices are associated with the fetials’ ritual. In some cases it will be an easy matter, when passages or the context of the text show a direct correspondence between the words *fetiales* and *fines*. In other cases, it will be more difficult to show this association, because of the absence of clear and connective facts to combine the strands of the two elements of study. My aim will be to highlight the importance of the fetials’ function when directly involved in Rome’s expansive process, where potential bordering practices can be detected. In order to undertake a complete study of the diverse aspects regarding borders and fetials, I shall investigate those features which comprise the framework of the fetials’ practice, in order to draw from them ideas and conclusions about bordering practices. The following chapter has been divided into three main sections.[4.1, 4.2, 4.3] The first introductory section provides a background and its objective is to set out and identify the fetials and the bordering practices linked with their name, origin and chiefly their main institution: the *ius fetiale*. In the second section, which covers the Regal Period and the Early Republic, my aim will be to collect Livy’s clues about bordering

806 Lact., *Inst.* 6.9.3-4 = Rep. 3.20 Z.
807 For an overall clarification of the word *ritus*: Roloff 1954.
practices, which, while less explicit and not so evident, seem to be linked with Rome’s early expansionism. The third section considers the period from the beginning of the 3rd century B.C., when changes in the nature of the fetial procedure limited their practice to fictional formalities and conclusions of treaties. A short note is also provided about their diminishing presence from the sources and their brief but incisive reappearance under Augustus. My hypothesis hinges on the notion that Roman expansionism might be linked with an extension of fines, and that the fetials may have made this expansion possible by having a direct, religious influence on the fines.

4.1.1 Livy and the fetials: raw data

In Livy’s account, the fetials are mentioned 40 times in 24 different contexts. To these 40 extant instances of the name fetialis, we also need to add the implied references to the rerum repetitio, which almost certainly involved the fetials. Although they are not explicitly declared when proclaiming the res repetenda, their presence is to be considered in at least another six cases, related to six different contexts. Aside from the explicit or implicit mention of fetials, in Livy’s account there is no reference or mention of them between the 10th and 30th book. From the 4th to the 10th book, Rome encompassed, acquired and assimilated several territories through the intervention of the fetials, as Livy reports: Alba, the Prisci Latini (Ancient Latin Communities), Veii, the Hernici, Tibur (modern Tivoli), the Faliscans, Palaepolis (modern Naples) and the Samnites. The last reference to the fetials in Livy’s first ten books is at the beginning of the war against the Faliscans in 293 B.C. However, the most striking difference is in the overall use of the fetials during

---

808 Liv. 1.23.7; 3.25.6-8; 4.58.7-8; 6.10.6; 7.12.6; 8.19.2-3.
809 Oakley 2008:312.
810 Liv. 1.24.3-6
811 Liv. 1.32.5-14
812 Liv. 4.30.13-14; 4.58.1
813 Liv. 7.6.7
814 Liv. 7.9.2
815 Liv. 7.16.2 and 10.45.7
816 Liv. 7.32.1; 8.39.13-4; 9.5.1-4; 9.8.6; 9.9.3; 9.10.2; 9.10.7-10; 9.11.8-11; 9.45.5-8; 10.12.2
817 Liv. 10.45.7.
the Samnite Wars and in books 8, 9 and 10, and their total disappearance from
the 21\textsuperscript{st} to the 30\textsuperscript{th} book. Taking into consideration the loss of books 11 to 20,
Livy seems to neglect any reference to them from the 21\textsuperscript{st} until the 30\textsuperscript{th} book. In
the 30\textsuperscript{th} book, Livy\textsuperscript{818} again briefly mentions the fetial ritual of striking treaties,
when the fetials were summoned to conclude the peace with Carthage in 201
B.C. at the end of the Second Punic War.\textsuperscript{819} The most obvious justification
given for this fetial absence might be that, during this time span, the fetials were
not utilised by Rome, until the Second Punic War. However, the fetials’
disappearance from Livy’s account may also be linked to the massive
rediscovery of the fetial procedure, which from the 3\textsuperscript{rd} century became largely
an advisory capacity.

4.2 Fetials and fines

4.2.1 Composition and function of the fetials’ college

We are informed by Livy that the college of the fetials\textsuperscript{820} in the Augustan period
consisted of 20 members.\textsuperscript{821} As was the case with other priestly colleges,\textsuperscript{822}
they were possibly patricians, chosen by co-optation\textsuperscript{823} from the best families in
Rome and their service lasted a lifetime.\textsuperscript{824} The primary function of the fetials
was to safeguard the public faith (\textit{fides publica})\textsuperscript{825} of the Roman people.\textsuperscript{826} This

\begin{footnotes}
\textsuperscript{818} Liv. 30.43.9.
\textsuperscript{819} Liv. 30.43.9.
\textsuperscript{820} Liv. 36.3.7.
\textsuperscript{821} Varro Ap. Non. 529.21
\textsuperscript{822} With the \textit{pontefices, augures, XVviri s.f., septemviri epulones}, the \textit{fetiales} was one of the
greatest Roman institutions (Cic. \textit{Leg.} 2.21). The desirability of this method is suggested by
Varro also lists as examples the \textit{Pontifices, Curiones, Flamines, Salii, Luperci, Fratres
Arvales, Sodales Titii, and Fetiales}. See Kirsopp Michels 1953:56.
\textsuperscript{823} Wissowa 1912:417.
\textsuperscript{824} Dion. Hal. 2.72.
\textsuperscript{825} On \textit{fides}, see Bayet 1976:141-42. On the relationship between \textit{fides, foedus,} and \textit{fetiales},
see Boyancé 1962:332-33; on the connections between Jupiter with Roma and Fides, see
\textsuperscript{826} Varro L.L. 5.15: ‘\textit{Fidei publicae inter pepulas preaeerant’}, links to this sentence the
ethimology of the word \textit{fetal} with \textit{fides}. Ancient grammarians connected it with \textit{foedus}. (Paul.
Fest. 84L and especially Serv. \textit{ad Aen.} 1.62: quod hostia foede necaretur, see also: 4.242,
10.14.) or \textit{fides, or ferire} (Serv. \textit{ad Aen.} 8.641, Paul. Fest. 81L; Plut., \textit{Q.R.} 27); cf. Rose
\end{footnotes}
meant that, at least during the Regal Period and the Early Republic, their main prerogative was to indicate when, and if, an enemy had given any sort of offence against Rome. On the other hand, they had to enquire into complaints against individual Romans by States with which the Romans had a treaty and to hand them over if they found them guilty. They also had to judge offences against ambassadors, ensure that treaties were observed, and eventually confirm, or not, the validity of any treaties instigated by commanders. The fetials were empowered through the *ius fetiale* to oversee with special responsibility Rome’s foreign affairs. More specifically, they were charged with overseeing the declaration of war through the *ius belli* (war law). The long procedure to wage a just war (*bellum iustum*), drifting between religious beliefs and legal terms, should have secured the victory for Rome. The fetials were responsible for ensuring that the Romans did not begin an unjust war, and a war could not begin without their authorisation. Fetials’ tasks also included: framing terms for the establishment of peace, administering oaths that bound the Roman state, and serving on diplomatic missions. Amongst the latter assignments, the most crucial one was the demand for reparations (*rerum repetitio*) from foreign states. Livy records that in early Rome there were only two fetials. One of these was assigned the role of the *pater patratus*, who was the official spokesman (also called *orator*), and the only one authorised to take action. In the Mid-Late Republic their number was increased to four, with the

---

1913:237-9. Modern scholars favour a derivation from the root *dhe* (cf. *fas*, *fari*, *δειμκτησ*), while Lange (1876:1.323) makes it derive from the ancient substantive *fetis*, which with *fateri*, *fari* and *fas*, belongs to the same family of the Oscan *fatium*.


828 The questions related to war should be sacralised, making it hard to discern a legal institution from these aspects of Roman religion and (almost) magical belief. See generally: Dumézil 1974; Fowler 1911; Rose 1948; Watson 1992. C. Phillipson (1911:115-6) seems the first to have broken this thin line which separated the religious sphere from the legal jurisdiction, affirming that: “The imputation that the fetials belonged entirely to a religious sphere is not really valid. In the first place… a religious connection does not necessarily militate against… juridical significance, and in the second place, the college officials were not exclusively a religious body. After all, according to Dionysius of Halicarnassus, the seventh part of the Sacred Laws of Rome was devoted to the college of fetials, while Cicero (*Off. 1.11.36*) was not being erroneous when he referred to the fetial procedure as being a part of the “human laws. drawn up in the fetial code”.

829 Rehak & Younger 2006:118

830 Liv. 9.5.4.

831 Harris 1979:169-71; Matthaei 1908; Bederman 2001:57-8; Warrior 2006:43.

832 The name of *pater patratus*, perhaps the same as the *pater familias*, is the only one who was able to contract within the family. Universalising the principle beyond the domain of the family,
same functions (*fetiales legatos res repetitum mittebant quattruor, quos oratores vocabant*).\(^{833}\) In 22 B.C., Augustus vainly attempted to integrate them into the college of the *Augustales*.\(^{834}\)

### 4.2.2 Origins\(^{835}\)

Ancient writers agree that the fetial priests and their rites were instituted by Rome’s early kings, but they make contradictory claims about the details. Numa, for instance, is the first who was said to have instituted the fetial tradition. To him are ascribed two important religious acts located in the Campus Martius: a sacrifice to Mars to confirm the *concordia* between the Romans and Sabines,\(^{836}\) and his establishment of the fetial law.\(^{837}\) However, it is common opinion amongst scholars that the college or at least the ritual existed in some communities in central Italy.\(^{838}\) Livy tells us that the Alban people also had some sort of sacerdotal college, probably fetial, led also by a *pater patratus*.\(^{839}\) This has led many scholars to conclude that the fetial institution was, therefore, a wider Latin phenomenon.\(^{840}\)

the Romans created an artificial ‘*pater*’ who was to act for and in the name of the state as a whole. See Samter 1909:6.2261. The meanings given to *pater patratus* might be several. It should be meant ‘one who is made a father’; (Latte 1934:66 ff.; but see Plutarch *Q.R.* 62.) ‘father of the fatherhood’ might be another possible. See Ogilvie 1965:111.

\(^{833}\) Varro *Ap. Non.* 848 L.; cf. Plin. *N.H.* 22.5. This has been presumed on the basis of the information given by Livy (1.24.5.) saying: “*ut privos (= singulos) lapides silices privasque verbenas secum ferrent* (any of them brings with them…). Wissowa 1912:417; Ogilvie 1965:132.

\(^{834}\) Tac. *Ann.* 3.64.

\(^{835}\) The most complete ancient account of the evolution of this ceremony can be found in Serv. 9.52; cf. Liv. 1.32.5-14 with Ogilvie’s note (1965:127-29); Gel. 16.4.1 (quoting L. Cincius); Ov. *Fast.* 6.205-8; Paul. Fest. 30L. On the Fetial college in general, Marquardt 1885:3-41; Wissowa 1912:550-54; Samter 1909:6.2259-65; Beard, North, and Price 1998:1.26-7, 112-2, 132-4. Rawson 1973 expresses some doubts about the story as Servius tells it.


\(^{838}\) See Mendenhall 1954:27, n. 6.

\(^{839}\) Bederman 2001:195-6. Frey & Frey (1999:42) have speculated on the fact that the fetial law might date back to a period when the Latin communities were still separate, and concerned with maintaining peace amongst their own autonomous city-states.
presence of fetials amongst the Latins\textsuperscript{841} might also confirm their provenance from Alba\textsuperscript{842} or Ardea.\textsuperscript{843} An inscription further indicates that they might have had their roots in Laurentum.\textsuperscript{844} This hypothesis may be further supported by a later inscription from Pompeii at the time of Emperor Claudius, which was carved by the Roman Sp. Turranius “\textit{prefectus jure dicundo}” who acted “as \textit{pater patratus populi Laurentis foederis ex libris Sibyll percutiendi cum populus Romanus}” for Lavinium.\textsuperscript{845}[\textit{cf. 7.1.4}] Laurentum and Lavinium\textsuperscript{846} were blended into one entity, uniting into a single city, and their history demonstrates elements of early bordering practices, resulting in the accounts of the demi-mythological history of early Rome. Livy narrates that some Sabine kinsmen settled in Rome with their co-ruler Titus Tatius, mistreated the ambassadors sent by the Latins of Laurentum and then, when the Laurentians sought reparation under the law of nations, Titus drew down their punishment upon himself. He was killed by a mob from the population of Laurentum while sacrificing.\textsuperscript{847} The tradition set the site of Titus’ death at the sixth milestone on the road to Laurentum (Via Laurentina) and originally between the territories of the Romans and Lavinians. Livy\textsuperscript{848} also records that the treaty with Lavinium was renewed annually\textsuperscript{849} and that it became the site where the Terminalia was celebrated.\textsuperscript{850} The festival was held annually on the 23\textsuperscript{rd} of February (the end of the old Roman year) in the old calendar of the ‘Religion of Numa’, as the Romans called it, and was dedicated to the their tutelary divinity: \textit{Terminus}.\textsuperscript{851}

\textsuperscript{841} Liv. 1.32.11.
\textsuperscript{842} Liv. 1.24.4.
\textsuperscript{843} Dion. Hal. 2.72; Serv. \textit{ad Aen.} 10.14.
\textsuperscript{846} The citizens of Lavinium were known under the empire as Laureentes Lavinate, and the place itself at a late period as ‘Laurolavinium’. The ‘laurolavinates’ were a sacerdotal college in the Imperial period. Cf. Derks 1998.
\textsuperscript{847} Liv. 1.14; Paul. Fest. 496L; Dion. Hal. 2.52; Plut. \textit{Quest. Rom.} 24; Ovid. \textit{Fast.} 2.682.
\textsuperscript{849} ILS 5004 - CIL 10.797.
\textsuperscript{850} Wissowa 1912:136; Fowler 1899:324.
\textsuperscript{851} Varr. \textit{L. L.} 6.3.
The presence of the fetials, and perhaps their provenance, seems to be attested in central-southern Italy amongst the Faliscans, the Samnites or more specifically the Aequicoli. Ascribing the institution of the fetiales to Ancus Marcius, Livy claims that the ritual would have been undertaken by the Aequicoli, probably a sub-tribe of the Aequi, although the former outlived the Aequi after the group itself had disappeared. Perhaps they were a branch of the Oscans, but they were to have been the source of such widespread latine rite as the ius fetiale. The attribution to the Aequicoli, as Ogilvie rightly points out, is no more than a late aetiological invention inspired by the false etymology aequum colere, superseding the older traditions. However, a Julio-Claudian inscription records that Ferter Resius was the first Roman to introduce the fetial cult, confirming the origin of the cult from the Aequicoli.

Another tradition concerning the fetials, recorded by Livy and Cicero, suggests that the law on such procedure might have been promulgated in the time of Tullus Hostilius. According to Cicero, Numa’s successor Tullus Hostilius “established the rule by which wars should be declared, and, having

---

853 The institution seems not, however, to have extended as far as the Samnites: Livy’s report of Samnite fetials sent on an abortive peace mission in 322 occurs in a late annalistic fiction presenting the Caudine Forks disaster as divine punishment for Roman intransigence. See Liv. 8.39.14; Oakley 1997-2005:2, 757-760. The parallel narratives of A Sam. 4.1 and Cass. Dio fr. 36.8 in Zonar. 7.26.10 do not mention Samnite fetials.
854 Liv. 1.32.5.
855 Dion. Hal. 2.72.
856 Plin. N.H. 3.106; Liber coloniarum 225.
857 Ogilvie 1965:139.
858 Ogilvie 1965:129-30; Aur. Vict., Vir. Ill. 5.4; Serv. ad Aen. 7.695; fragmentum de prenominibus I (see Briscoe 1998:795); Inscr. It. 13.3.66 = H.I.R.P. 447. Livy (1.32.5) and Dionysius of Halicarnassus (2.72.2) report the attribution to the Acquicoli without mentioning Ferter Resius. See Hülsen 1909:597-8.’ Ampolo 1972 argues that Fertcr Resius’ name may derive from an official title. On the name Acquirol/Acquiculi see Oakley 1997-2005:4.177-178. On these Servian passages and their relation to Livy see also Zack 2001:39-41
859 CIL I² p. 202 XLI = VI 1302; cf. Val. Max. Epit. de Praen. 1. In the western corner of the Palatine Hill, next to the Church of S. Anastasia were discovered an altar (so called Ara Calvini) or ARA DEI IGNOTI (shrine of unknown gods) and four inscribed columns were found dating to the period. Column A: (now missing): “Marspiter,” or “Father Mars” in Archaic Latin. Column B: “Remurreine” which possibly means “In Memory of Remus”. Column C: “anabestas” possibly a goddess named Anabesta, or else related to the Greek anabasio (“to go up”) and interpreted as a reference to Remus’ scaling of the Roman walls. Column D: Ferter Resius / rex Aequicola / is preimus / ius fetiale paravit / inde p(opulus) R(omanus) disciplineam excepit. (Ferter Resius, / Aequicolean (= Aequian) king, / he first / introduced the ius fetiale, / from him the Roman people / learned the discipline [of making treaties]).
Chapter 4. The fetial priests

devised it most justly, gave it fetial religious sanction". The ancient sources also refer to Ancus Marcius as another king who would have taken the tradition from Ardea. The authors of the Augustan period, in their old-fashioned reconstructions, emphasise the descendants of M. Marcius, the first plebeian rex sacrorum. Ogilvie compares the gens Marcia, starting with the first consul in the fasti of 357 B.C., C. Marcius Rutilius. This family name is strongly linked with Ancus Marcius, who is associated in a demi-mythological phase with the foundation of Ostia. In this case we would have a king who was responsible for the most important extension of Rome’s domain, which included the occupation of Politorium, Tellenae, Ficana and Medullia. And in this way, the addition of the Aventine to the City and the settlement ad Murcias can be associated with the accompanying fossa Quiritum – a significant and manmade construction that could possibly have functioned as a landscape marker, which, from Ogilvie’s point of view, is still an ‘etymological speculation’. The incorporation of the Janiculum followed the construction of the Pons Sublicius, which represents a link between Rome and her expansive process on the opposite bank. The connection would have been purely ‘nominal’ and linked to his name: Ancus Marcius would have been the father of the fetial formula for declaring war, playing on the analogy of the name Marcius = Martius. Might we, then, equate Ancus Marcius’ expansive process and the enlargement of Roman territory with an augmentation of Rome’s fines, as Ogilvie presumes?

862 Liv. 1.32; Aur. Vict. Vir. Ill. 5.4; Serv. ad Aen. 10.14.
863 Dion. Hal. 2.72.2 (= Cn. Gellius fr. 16, Peter, Chassignet).
864 Liv. 27.6.16.
865 Liv. 1.33.9; Ogilvie 1965:126.
866 Liv. 1.33.1, 2, 4.
867 Liv. 1.33.5.
868 Ogilvie 1965:126.
869 Liv. 1.33.6.
870 Ogilvie 1965:126.
4.2.3 The ius fetiale

Originally, when Rome was at war with neighbouring peoples, the fetial priests performed both the ritual and diplomacy in the steps leading up to the actual declaration of war, seeking reparation and calling upon the gods to witness that the Roman cause was just. And Livy provides the most complete account of the fetial procedure (formula and practice) for declaring war. This process, known as *ius fetiale*, was an institution with legal or quasi-legal institutions and, as suggested earlier, a common ritual procedure for all the primitive communities of Latium. Livy uses the name of Prisci Latini to relate both the fact that they initiated the fetial procedure of declaring war (*ius fetiale*) and that the phenomenon originated with Ancus Marcius, who was at war with them (*populi Priscorum Latinorum homines Prisci Latini*).

The *ius fetiale* developed as an institution to provide legitimacy for Roman declarations of war. In such a case, the original procedure contained three stages and involved three journeys: the *denunciatio*, the *testatio*, and the *indictio*. With the last step of the *ius fetiale*, the final journey – the *indictio* – hostilities commenced. The Roman State’s conduct and legitimacy in international affairs, however, meant that the fetial procedures had to change. For our purposes, the *ius fetiale* is probably the most important act, because it relates the fetials’ actions most directly with bordering practices, as the *fines* are twice explicitly called upon and singled out in their ritual. Through the procedure of the *ius fetiale*, I shall indicate this privileged relationship.

872 Signs of anachronism in Livy’s account of the fetial formulae have been detected. These elements have led to the conclusion that the formulae might be archaising reconstructions. See the section 4.4.1 on the change of formula and or procedure.
873 Ogilvie 1965:127.
875 Liv. 1.24.6; Oakley 2008:313.
876 Bederman 2001:234.
4.2.3.1 Denunciatio (rerum repetitio)

Livy explains the whole procedure in a relatively clear manner, despite some chronological problems between the phases of the process. When Rome had a grievance against a foreign state, nation, or people, the first step was to make a demand for satisfaction, called *rerum repetitio* or *denunciatio*. Following a decision of the Senate, the head of the college of fetials (*pater patratus*) and the other three members of the delegation (*fetiales pro praetores*) were sent out to the borders of the offending nation (*ad fines eorum venit*). Through the pronunciation of the formula, the *pater patratus* demanded restitution (*ad res repetundas*) for the wrongs done to Rome. The fetials acted as official ambassadors (*legatos*) in a foreign territory and seem to have actually ventured into the enemy’s territory to deliver their concerns. Livy clearly states that the fetials pronounce the formula just before they reach the *fines*, which is called out to Jupiter (“audi, Iuppiter…” “audite, fines”…”audiat fas”).

The name of Jupiter is sacredly evoked and his presence is required as witness (*testem*). In my opinion, the evocation of Jupiter here is important, as it placed a divine value on the *fines*. Watson’s thesis is that the fetial asked the gods to be the judges (“ego vos testor”), not the witnesses, of the *fides publicae*

---

877 Livy seems to have confused the temporal gap between the second (*testatio*) and the third step (*indictio belli*) or rather his main source for Fetiales, Licinius Macer (or the 2nd century authority who drafted the newly phrased formula). Cf. Sumi 2005:210.

878 It is important to indicate that the fetial procedure for declaring war was not used “against a body of people not regularly organised as a State, in the proper sense of the term”, so Phillipson 1911:344. Justinian’s Digest specifically noted that a declaration of war need not be made against pirates or brigands. *Digest of Justinian* 892 (Mommsen, Krueger & Watson 1985 = [49.15.24; Ulp. Instr. 1].

879 For the use of this phrase in the classical sources, see Liv. 3.25, 4.30, 7.6, 8.22, 9.45, 38.45; Val. Max. 2.2: Macrobius *Sat.* 1.16. In later periods, the term *clarigatio* was also used for such a demand for reparation. See Serv. *ad Aen.* 9.53 and 10.14. For more usages and distinctions between *rerum repetitio* and *clarigatio*, see Phillipson 1911:329-30. See Wissowa 1912:553. On the declaration of war cf. Beseler 1932:292.


881 Liv. 1.32.6.

882 The phrase is old and technical, occurring first in Enn. *Ann.* 273 V; see Mommsen 1899, 3.1047 n.2; Ogilvie 1965:131.

883 Liv. 1.32.6-14; cf. Serv. *ad Aen.* 9.52. See Rich 1976. In early times the chief source of complaint would have been e.g. the theft of cattle or property stolen by another political/social entity. Bederman 2001:77, 231-2

884 Liv. 1.32.6.

885 Liv. 1.32.7.
of Rome. What the *pater patratus* says, in this specific formula is: “I call you (the gods, Jupiter and Janus Quirinus) to witness that this nation (naming it) is unjust, and does not act according to the law”:

“*audi, Iuppiter, et tu, Jane Quirine, diique omnes caelestes vosque, terrestres, vosque, inferni, audite: ego vos testor populum illum*” — *quicumque est, nominat— inlustum esse neque ius persolvere*.

“Hear, Jupiter, and thou, Janus Quirinus, and hear all heavenly gods, and ye, gods of earth, and ye of the lower world; I call you to witness that this people” —naming whatever people it is —“is unjust, and does not make just reparation”.

For Watson, the distinction is important, as the gods never served as sureties that Rome would be successful in wars. For my objective, instead, the *fines* are an active, ‘living’ part of the process: firstly, they are identified with Jupiter, hence they take on divine features, becoming personified; secondly, they are present, real or immanent, in space; and finally, the borders might not have been witnesses but judges of wrong actions — if improperly crossed, they would have created troubles for the Romans. It is also important to note that the close association between Jupiter and *fines* is also present in the so-called Vegoia prophecy.

The physicality of the fetials’ journey — and perhaps of the borders? — is confirmed in later passages. Livy offers different ‘layers’ of interaction between the fetials and the enemy’s territory, offering different topographical circles surrounding the core of the structure of any political identity. Although Livy admits that there are few changes in the form, wording and the oath (*paucis verbis carminis concipiendique iuris iurandi mutatis peragit*), he marks the landscape and the political structure of the city as lying in the centre of a concentric pattern of rings. [FIG 19] The fetials repeat this (*haec*) ritual sentence

---

886 See Bederman 2001:240, n. 207.
887 Liv. 1.32.9: not to be confused with the oath formula. The prayer of the fetials, indeed, changes the order to “*Iuppiter et tu Jane Quirine, diique omnes*”. Ryberg 1931:150, n.20.
889 In the prophecy the Etruscan Nymph warns his people that the boundaries should not be moved, as their shifting would bring about the destruction of the Etruscan nation. The Latin fragment of an Etruscan prophecy which is supposed to have been delivered by Vegoia to Arruns Veltumnus. Vegoia was an Etruscan ‘nymph’ to whom a part of the Etruscan revelation was attributed. Cf. Blume, Lachmann & Rudolf 1852:350-1; Heurgon 1959.
five times in key positions, which represent the passageways between these circles: a) before the fines (*ad fines eorum venit*); b) in crossing the fines (*cum finis superscandit*); c) the first stranger met (*quicumque ei primus vir obvius*); d) passing through the city gate (*portam ingrediens*); and finally, e) entering the marketplace (*forum ingressus*). In some way, the five different levels of territorial diversity, and the consequent five repetitions of the formula, recall the five kinds of territory described by Varro. In one of his sources, Varro directly links the fetials’ ritual of the spear throwing with ‘*hostile agrum*’ (enemy’s territory), as we shall see in the section dedicated to the spear-hurling ceremony.

The distinction between Roman and hostile territory formed part of a sacred topography determined by augural law and developed, like the ritual of the *fetiales*, in an early stage of Rome’s expansion:

> Ut nostii augures publici disserunt, agrorum sunt genera quinque: Romanus, Gabinus, peregrinus, hostieus, incertus.

According to our *augures publici*, wrote Varro, there are five kinds of land: Roman, Gabine, peregrine, hostile, and indeterminate.

This mapping within augural law was paralleled in pontifical law by a distinction between Roman and provincial *solum* (soil). Varro neglects any distinctive mark or sign amongst the different *agri*. Livy, on the other hand, provides five geo-political distinctions, within three enclosed and determined spaces: a) the area before the fines, where the fetials used to stop before crossing them, b) the area in between the fines and the city wall, c) the *forum* – and two distinctive passageways, crossing points or linear marks, d) the fines and e) the city gate, which seems to visually and perhaps materially separate the five concentric areas. If the fetials used to invoke the *fines* before and during their crossing, to

---

890 Widemann (1986:479) is wrong in affirming that they repeated the sentence only four times: “This consisted of (a) an embassy in which a legatus invokes Jupiter as a witness that the Romans’ demands are justified; this oath is recited four times, at the enemy community’s fines, to the first man the envoy meets, at the city gate, and in the forum”.
891 Liv. 1.32.8.
892 Varro L.L. 5.3.3.
893 Calenus in Varro = *Logistorici* fr. 2 Semi. For clarifications of the words *ritus* and *cerimonia*: see Wagenvoort 1937.
894 Varro L.L. 5.3.3.
895 Ando 2003:236.
what extent can we consequentially consider real and material the term *finis*, comparing it mainly with the evident physicality of the city walls?

[FIG 23] A solution to the question might be linked to the frescos found in some graves in the cemetery of Esquiline, which feature representations of the Q. FABIVS (Maximus Rullianus).\(^{896}\) For their style and precision in details, the scenes divided by registers have been attributed to Fabius Pictor, a member of the same family. Although the frescos do not depict a map of Rullianus’ campaigns, they report the narration in four detectable bands, where defining elements like city walls recall both the visual Livian framework and the definition of narrative space.[1.5.1]

### 4.2.3.2 Testatio

After 30 days,\(^{897}\) the fetials returned to the enemy’s *finis*. Here, the *pater patratus* remonstrated with the defaulting nation, delivering a solemn *testatio deorum* (second step), calling the gods (Jupiter and Janus Quirinus) to bear witness or act as judges for the injustice that had been done, and legitimating their cause.\(^{898}\) If satisfaction was not obtained, meaning that the demands were rejected and no restitution (*rerum repetitio*) was forthcoming, the fetials convened.\(^{899}\) Then the officiant asked each senator in turn whether he favoured war, until a majority was reached.\(^{900}\) In this span of time, the Senate then met and decided upon war, and its decision was ratified by the People.\(^{901}\) The

\(^{897}\) The 30 days are the time interval prescribed, which finds a strict parallel in the civil procedure *legis actio per conditionem*. (Dion. Hal. 2.72.) In this procedure, a plaintiff gave 30 days’ notice before going to a magistrate *ad iudicem capiendum*, having their common roots far back in Roman legal history. See Ogilvie 1965:127; Briscoe 1973:77.  
\(^{898}\) Saulnier 1980; Bederman 2006:19.  
\(^{899}\) Harris 1979:167; Bellamy 2006:19.  
\(^{900}\) Whether a quorum of senators was required for the vote to be valid is not known. Cf. Sumi 2005:210.  
\(^{901}\) However, according to Livy (6.22.4 and 8.22.8) the war seems to have been declared before the Senate referred the matter to the People, therefore leaving the people to choose the provinces of the consuls. On the contrary, the evidence draws the conclusion that war could be declared only by a vote of the People (S. e.g. Liv. 6.30.15; 31.6.3-8; Polyb. 6.14.10) and there was a lack of carelessness in Livy or his sources. Oakley 2008:314. As for the provinces of the consuls, these would be chosen by the senate, and the people would again ratify the decision; cf. Liv. 31.5.7.
priests, therefore, declared the other party, nation or population as *iniustus* in the eyes of the gods and announced that measures would be taken by Rome.\(^{902}\)

### 4.2.3.3 *Indictio Belli* (The Ritual of spear throwing)

The third stage was called *indictio belli*. The rite had to be performed at the enemy’s *fines*, when on the 33rd day\(^ {903}\) an officiant was sent to hurl an iron-shod\(^ {904}\) or fire-hardened spear (*hastam ferratam aut sanguineam praeustam*)\(^ {905}\) into or toward the enemy’s territory (*ad fines eorum ferret*). The spear stuck in their *fines* signalled that war had begun (*hasta in eorum fines missa indicabatur iam pugnae principium*)\(^ {906}\) and that the land was hostile, witnessed by no less than three men of military age (*non minus tribus puberibus praesentibus*).\(^ {907}\) Ogilve considers the spear to have ‘magical’ significance.\(^ {908}\) The ritual act and symbolism of the throwing would be useful to nullify the enemy’s power and to

---

\(^{902}\) Now, the ritual of declaring war (the incantations and spear-throwing) lent itself to a literal Roman vision of *iustum*. For *bellum iustum*: Nonius’ main citation (850L) may be translated as follows: ‘Varro in *De uita populi Romani* book 2: Thus they undertook wars both late and with great care, because they thought that they should wage no war unless it was righteous; before they declared war on those by whom they knew that injuries had been committed, they used to send four fetial ambassadors to seek restitution, whom they called orators. The same in book 3: ‘If any State’s ambassadors were violated, they decided that those who had done this, if were noble, should be handed over, and that about these matters twenty fetials should enquiry, judge, decide and determine’. The fragments cited in this passage are 75, 93 Riposati = 386, 419 Salvador. Another fragment from book 2 deals with the fetials’ use of grasses (n. 10, above). See Oakley 2008:313; Rich 2011b:191.

\(^{903}\) Liv. 1.32.9. Serv. *ad Aen.* 9.52.

\(^{904}\) Iron because of its magnetic properties, was from the earliest times regarded as a mighty source of magic. At Rome, it was taboo for the *fratres arvales*, while the vestals used it for cutting up salt. Cf. Varro *ap. Non.* 330L.

\(^{905}\) On the terms ‘sanguinea’ and ‘praestus’ and this particular passage of Livy see: J.B.M. 1889. Its use in the ceremony is to attract all the hostile potency of the enemy and so immobilise it. *Sanguineam* is recondite. As early as Dio Cassius (71.33.3) it was being glossed as *αἰματώδες* and though the correct solution was propounded in 1599 by Turnebus (*Adversaria* 8.23.), Dio’s interpretation was generally accepted. *Sanguineus* is the adjective derived from the name of a species of cornel, familiar in romance languages (fr. Cornouiller sanguine). *Sanguinum* is listed by Macrobius (*Sat.* 3.20.3) among *arbores infelices* (infertile), and Pliny (*N.H.* 16.74, 176) speaks of *sanguinei frutices* and *virgae sanguineae*. Cornel is frequently used as a wood for spears (*Virg. Aen.* 3.23 et saep.) but for a magical spear the infertile species was employed because its effect was to render infertile and barren the enemies schemes. See Ogilvie 1965:135.


\(^{907}\) Ogilvie 1965:127.
establish that the war was ‘just’ before the gods. Bederman, on the contrary, links the fetials’ gesture to a sense of legal restraint, a purely symbolic action in advising, formally, the Senate and People of Republican Rome on whether a conflict would be *iustum piumque*. Varro, in his lost treatise Calenus, also speaks of the ritual of spear throwing, but he does so in the context of military commanders who performed this rite when preparing an area to pitch camp. This ritual had an essential correlative in the Romans’ symbolic seizure of some piece of an enemy’s land on which to place their camp and take the auspices:

Varro in Caleno ita ait duces cum primum hostilem agrum introituri errant, omnis causa prius hastam in eum agrum mittebant, ut castris locum caperent.

Varro in his Calenus says that generals, when about to enter an enemy’s territory, out of religious scruple (for the taking of auspices) would first have thrown a spear into that land, in order to seize a place for a camp.

This passage is important because, as shown by Rawson, the spear-casting is either ritual or symbolic, but it took place ‘on the frontier’ and “symbolised choosing a camp-site”. In both cases, *fetiales* and *duces* share the fact that this ritual has been perceived as a fictional act. The conveyed message is one for seizure of the land (*castris locum caperent*) into which the spear had been cast. Servius defines this land as ‘disputed’ (*terram hostium contestabatur*), and perhaps this is the reason why the fetials use invocation before crossing the *fines*.

---

914 The action of the *dux* would be made *omnis causa*, to have positive influxes: Ernout & Meillet 1979:461, s. ‘omen’; Benveniste 1969:477 ff.; Zack 2001:48 ff. However, Dumézil 1956:74-5, n.1, considers the *emittere hastam* as a taking possession of, as “‘fondation’ mystique du champ où l’armée romaine s’avancera ensuite, protégée par les dieux”, where the gesture of the *dux* and *fetials* would be the slightly the same. Bayet 1935:25, n.3 and n.7 connects this practice to the magical sphere and the castra would be “image religieuse de la ville”, set up “au milieu des forces invisibles qui la gardent”. Cf. also Blaive 1993. Romulus also hurled a spear from the Aventine Hill to the Cermalus, which rooted and bloomed there: cf. Ovid. *Met.* 15.560-564; Plut. *Rom.* 20.6; Serv. *ad Aen.* 3.46. Cf. Carandini 2006:418 ff.; Turelli 2008:534.
4.3 Rome’s earliest wars and the fetials

Livy’s narrative may sometimes be considered incomprehensible. However, a close reading of the whole context may offer a model to untangle such complexity. In the following section, I aim to demonstrate how Rome’s acquisition of foreign entities, specifically cities in the earlier period, was possible through the fetial procedure. In three different episodes, elements of the fetial ritual are present in Rome’s mechanisms of territorial acquisition: a) the victory and the conquest of the city of Caenina by Romulus, b) the incorporation of Alba into Rome’s territory and c) the conquest of Veii. Although in the first one (a) the fetials are not materially present, I shall show that their embryonic idea is extant and linked with Rome’s first temple of Jupiter Feretrius. That will be possible due to an analysis of the formula of fetials’ nomination, described as part of the duel of the Horatii and Curiatii. In the second episode (b), which took place in the same military context between Rome and Alba, I shall stress the fact that Rome gained the enemy’s territory, embodying and probably marking its fines, through a pact struck by the fetials. The third episode (c) is the war against Veii, when Livy explicitly cites the fetials and their approach to the Veientine finis. The story of the war against Veii also bears similarities to the ends of the previous two (a and b), with the annexation of the Etruscan city to Rome’s territory915.

4.3.1 Creation of the fetials and Jupiter Feretrius

Livy916 describes the process leading to the ritual treaty between Alba and Rome. The fetials are commissioned to bind the two cities to honour the outcome of the duel between Horatii and Curiatii, and the process is composed of two distinct parts: a) the procedure, which charges the fetials with their responsibilities and instruments; b) the spoken formula of the standard oath,

915 Dunstan 2011:56.
916 Liv. 1.24.3-6.
pact or treaty (*foedus*), struck by the fetial between Alba and Rome and successively sealed through a sacrifice.\(^{917}\)

The first parts of the ceremony emphasise the hierarchical transfer of authority from the king, Tullus Hostilius, to his individual executor, one of the *fetiales*. The ceremony begins with an elaborate dialogue, in which one fetial priest first asks the king for authority to strike the treaty. Once granted, the fetial, known as *verbenarius*,\(^{918}\) asks the king (later a magistrate): “Do you ask me, with the *pater patratus*, to make a treaty with the Alban people?” (“*iubesne me cum patre patrato populi Albani foedus facere*?”).\(^{919}\) This is followed by a demand for the king to pick up a clump of grass, considered sacred in that area and used in the ritual of creating the *pater patratus*. Then, the king gives permission to tear off the grass\(^{920}\) with the formula “have it (the grass) pure” (“*puram [sc. herbam] tollito*”).\(^{921}\)

The herb – *sagmina* or *verbena* – mentioned in conducting the fetial’s procedure, is specifically said to have been taken from the *arx* or Citadel, not from the Capitoline Hill in general (*Herbae id genus ex arce sumptum fetialibus dari solet*).\(^{922}\) *Verbena* or *sagmina*\(^{923}\) is the name of the plant or grass, which should have been plucked from the ground of *Capitolium* with earth attached to its roots, as other ancient authors report.\(^{924}\) Pliny’s use of the word *verbena*
shows that it had become a general term for a herb of lustral value. The most convincing view (represented rather rarely in the modern literature of this subject) is that these herbs stood for the soil of Rome, which the fetials symbolically carried with them. This seems to be clearly indicated by the importance attached to the taking up of the earth at the root along with the plant (Certe utroque nomine idem significatur, hoc est gramen ex arce cum sua terra evolsum).  

The meaning given to the sagmina has been related to the verb sancire (to strike, to conclude), which makes the herb “inviolable en la mettant sous la protection des dieux, en appelant sur le violenteur éventuel le châtiment divin”. Wagenvoort, in his study on the verbena, concludes that the soil of the Arx protected the fetials against harm from foreign influences when outside their native land, carrying a piece of their own country with them wherever they went.

Afterward, the verbenarius asked to become himself envoy and the personification of his people, saying:

“Rex, facisne me tu regium nuntium populi Romani Quiritium”  
“King, make me royal messenger of the Roman Quirite people”

The king approves and the verbenarius appoints the pater patratus, touching the head and hair of another fetal (in this case his name is Sp. Fusius) with the

---

926 Benveniste 1969:190; Ernoult & Meillet 1951:587,589. Sagmina is a “’vieux terme rituel’ (...) sans doute apparenté à sacer, sancto; ‘rendre sacré ou inviolable’”. The passage of Pliny (N.H. 22.5) is the most complete and the most coherent: “auctores imperii Romani conditoresque immensum quiddam et hinc sumpsere, quoniam non aliunde sagmina in remediis publicis fuere et in sacris legationibusque uerbenae”. See Paul. Fest. 424-6L: SAGMINA vocantur verbenae, id est herbae purae, quia ex loco sancto arcebantur a consule praetoreve, legatis proficiscentibus ad foedus faciendum bellumque indicendum.  
927 On the rapport between sagmina and arx cf. Fest: herbae purae (...) ex loco sancto; Liv. 1.24.5 (cf. 30.43.9): ex arce graminis herbam puram; herbae id genus ex arce sumptum; Plin. N.H. 22.5: gramen ex arce cum sua terra evolsum; Serv. ad Aen. 12.120: proprie est herba sacra (...) sumpta de loco sacro Capitola. Guillaume-Coirier 1992:366: five an interesting and fitting definition of the locus sacrus Capitoli: “Arx ne doit pas être compris ici dans le sens de «citadelle», lieu de garnison et de refuge; de l'ensemble ce nom désigne vraisemblablement une partie res treinte, plus précisément «un petit quadrilatère, peut-être un carré» limité par des arbres où agissent les argures, sens attesté tout au long du 1er siècle av. J.-C.: in arce augurium augures acturi (Cic. Off. 3.66)”.  
929 Wiedemann 1987:480, 487.
sacred sagmina.\textsuperscript{930} Correspondingly, the gesture of touching the pater patratus with the sagmina literally places him in contact with a piece of living earth that has been ritually transferred from the highest, most sacred, and militarily most powerful point in the city.\textsuperscript{931} The pater patratus is the fetial who actually performed the sacrifice, proclaimed the treaties and was also enabled to act and speak, taking responsibilities without deception before the Roman People (\textit{quod sine fraude mea populique Romani Quiritium fiat, facio}).\textsuperscript{932} Afterwards, the verbenarius appointed three more fellows (comitesque meos) and was thus ready for the last step of the process: the agreement of the treaty (foedus). The officiating fetials visited the foreign territory, where the pater patratus, in the presence of the general and part of his army, swore a pact through an oath.\textsuperscript{933} The fetials took with them on their official journeys a set of instruments. Along with the sagmina, the verbenarius brought also a flint stone (lapis silex) to perform the final sacrifice,\textsuperscript{934} a rod or sceptre\textsuperscript{935} to swear the oath, and vessels (vasa), in which the plant and the silex were contained.\textsuperscript{936} The \textit{lapis silex}\textsuperscript{937} and the rod (sceptre), symbolising their diplomatic power and inviolability,\textsuperscript{938} were

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{930} Before starting on their mission, by touching a member of their group, to designate him as \textit{pater patratus} (Liv. 1.24.6). However it is also reported (Marcian. \textit{Dig.} I.1.8.1) that wearing the sagmina was a sign of their ambassadorial character. Cf. Fay 1910:27. A foreigner provenience from some eastern influx could be considered for the plants. They are vaguely reminiscent of the objects used in Syrian treaty rituals a millennium before. The suggestion is that the fetials believed that their life-giving force protected them as they traversed enemy territory. See Mendenhall 1954:33; Held 1970. This is actually implied in Justinian’s Digest: Marcian \textit{Digest.} 1.8.8.1, Rules 1: “\textit{Sunt autem sagrinma quaedam herbae,quas legati populi Romani ferre soleut. ne quis eos violaret, sicut legati Graecrum forum ea quae vocantur kerykia}”. Ogilvie (1965:111) states that this explanation would be a dangerous assimilation of Roman to Greek ritual. See also Latte 1960:121. For an alternative theory on the \textit{verbena}, see Wiedemann:485-86; Reid 1912:47-9; Bederman 2001 235.

\textsuperscript{931} See n. 113.

\textsuperscript{932} Liv. 1.24.5. Dion. Hal. 2.72.6.


\textsuperscript{934} Fowler (1911:129) considers that this ‘magic’ stone was probably what Celts believed to have been a thunderbolt. Bederman (2001:234), more concretely, credits that the flint stone was probably a vestige of a pre-Iron Age form of animal sacrifice (cf. Serv. \textit{ad Aen.} 1.448). See also Paul. Fest. 81L; cf. Varro \textit{Rust.} 2.4.9; Serv. \textit{ad Aen.} 1.62, 8.641, 12.206; cf. Polyb. 3.25.6-9. cf. Wissowa 1912:30, 477 n. 7, 478 n. 1; Fowler 1911:130; De Francisci 1952:55 n. 144 et 145; 102; 318-320; Braun 1959:94, n.176. Rich (2011b:193) affirms that the use of flint cannot be a Stone Age throwback, as scholars have often supposed. Rose (1922:127 = 1913:237) is convinced, that it was a flint knife, and whatever it was, the \textit{lapis silex} of the Fetiales and the proverb \textit{inter sacrum et saxum prove as much.}

\textsuperscript{935} On the ‘magic’ staff see: De Waele 1927.

\textsuperscript{936} Liv. 1.24-5. See also Mendenhall 1954:26-27; Watson 1993; Ogilvie 1965:111.

\textsuperscript{937} Cf. On the \textit{lapis silex}, Reid 1912:49-51.

\textsuperscript{938} Livy refers to the rod as the sceptre of Jupiter Feretrius, guarantor of treaties and oaths. See Liv. 1.2.1 and Liv. 30.13. Bederman 2001:195.
\end{footnotesize}
Chapter 4. The fetial priests

held in the temple of Jupiter Feretrius and both used to ratify treaties.\textsuperscript{939} As we have seen, the practical procedure in charging the fetials and the instruments they used is directly linked with the temple of Jupiter Feretrius, the first \textit{templum} of Rome.\textsuperscript{940}[3.7.2] At the moment, for our purposes, there are two elements of note: a) the strong link between the \textit{templum} and the \textit{fetiales}; and b) the context for and the reason why the temple was set up. As we saw, three of the sacred tools used by the \textit{fetiales} (\textit{verbenia}, flintstone and rod) originate from the Capitolium, in the case of the former, and directly from the templum, in the case of the latter two.\textsuperscript{941}

The association with fetials is also etymologically strengthened, although it remains still conjectural.\textsuperscript{942} Despite Reid’s excessive criticism,\textsuperscript{943} Weiss considered the possibility that their name might be associated with Jupiter Feretrius.\textsuperscript{944} The most acceptable meaning of Feretrius is linked with \textit{ferire} (‘\textit{foedus ferire}’ or ‘icere’) because, in striking the piglet with the flint (\textit{silex iungebant foedera porca foede, hoc est lapidibus occisa or foede et crudeliter occisa}),\textsuperscript{945} the fetials invoked and imagined an intimate connection between Jupiter Feretrius and the stone.\textsuperscript{946} The \textit{ovatio} at the end of the triumphal procession was also used to swear oaths through the slaying of a small pig with the same stone.\textsuperscript{947} In my opinion, the fetials might be linked to the expansive process of Rome as a sort of ‘guardian of the \textit{fines}’, who personally ensured that the expansion was properly undertaken. Were they perhaps also enabled to enact and manipulate, legally and religiously, the \textit{fines}? Could a connection

\textsuperscript{940} Liv. 1.10.7
\textsuperscript{941} Rich 2011b:189.
\textsuperscript{942} See Ogilvie 1965:110; Rüpke 1990:103; Sgarbi 1992.
\textsuperscript{943} Reid 1912:49.
\textsuperscript{944} Liv. 1.10.6; Weiss 1883:5.
\textsuperscript{945} Explanations in \textit{Serv. ad Aen.} 1.62: \textit{foedus autem dictum vel a fetialibus, id est sacerdotibus per quos fiunt foedera, vel a porca foede, hoc est lapidibus occisa}. Cfr. anche Paul. Fest. 74L, s. ‘\textit{foedus}’. However, this etymology has been challenged already in ancient times after which \textit{foedus} would derive from \textit{fides}: Cic. \textit{apud Serv. ad Aen.} 8.641: Cicero \textit{foedera a fide putat dicta}. Cf. also Liv. 5.51.10; Varro \textit{L.L.} 5.86 = Enn. 32, p. 7 Vahlen; cf. Boyancé 1962. The etymology seems to be confirmed by the Indo-European stem *\textit{bhheidh}/*\textit{bhoides}- of the two terms: s. Benveniste 1969:85-88.
\textsuperscript{946} Aust 1890:674; Fowler 1899:230; Kirssopp Lake 1936:72.
\textsuperscript{947} On such rites, see Weiss 1898:1100-1; Prayon 1998, cols. 496-497; Stoclet 718-9, n. 146.
then have existed between the expansion of the fines of the temple and the fines of Rome’s territory?

4.3.2 The duel between Horatii and Curiatii and the treaty with Alba

[FIG 13] The second episode linked with the expansion of Rome – one of the most important territorial augmentations in the early period – is connected with the fetial procedure of concluding treaties. A different tradition concerning the inception of Roman procedure for demanding restitution can be traced in a number of writers. In this version, the procedure is associated with Tullus Hostilius’ upcoming war against Alba. Livy refers to the skirmish between the two cities on their fines. This Livian passage is crucial for two reasons: firstly, because Livy records the presence of the procedure for declaring war, which is reminiscent, as we shall see, of the Late Republican procedure followed by the legati; secondly, because he mentions neither the involvement of the fetials in such a procedure, nor the word fines, as in the case of raids in enemy territory. Livy states that Roman and Alban country folk were raiding each other’s lands (ut agrestes Romani ex Albano agro, Albani ex Romano praedas in vicem agerent) at the time that Gaius Cluilius was ruling Alba. Ambassadors from each side were sent at the same time to seek restitution (imperitabat tum C. Cluilius Albae. utrimque legati fere sub idem tempus ad res repetendas missi). Both Alba and Rome were ready for a fratricide war and the former

948 Liv. 1.22.3.
949 Diodorus (8.25), Livy (1.22.3), and Dionysius of Halicarnassus (3.2-3) all give similar accounts of the origin of the war.
950 Described later in Livy 1.32.
951 The passage continues (Liv. 1.22.4-7): Tullus had instructed his to do nothing before carrying out their instructions; he was well aware that the Alban ruler would refuse; in this way, Tullus held, war could be declared righteously. The Albans conducted their business in a more leisurely lashion. Received by Tullus with warm and charming hospitality, they took part agreeably in the king’s banquet. Meanwhile, the Romans had both sought restitution first and, when the Alban ruler refused, declared war for the thirtieth day. They reported this to Tullus. Then Tullus gave the ambassadors the opportunity to state what they had come to ask for. Ignorant of everything, they first spent time apologising: they were, they said, reluctant to say anything which would displease Tullus, but were constrained by their orders: they had come to seek restitution; if it was not granted, their instructions were to declare war. At this Tullus replied: ‘Report to your king that the Roman king calls on the gods as witnesses, so that,
made the first move, invading the Roman territory (agro). At this point, Livy inserts in his account one of the distinctive elements which characterises his narrative landscape, affirming that the Albans set up their camp only five miles from the City and surrounded it with a moat; this was called for several centuries the ‘Cluilian Dyke’ from the name of the Alban general (castra ab urbe haud plus quinque milia passuum locant; fossa circumdant; fossa Cluilia ab nomine ducis per aliquot saecula appellata est).\textsuperscript{952} Now, the Latins and the Romans decided, after several invasions of each other’s territories, to come to an agreement. Wisely, Alba and Rome came to an agreement by way of a treaty or pact, so that the Etruscans could not take advantage of a war between them (etrusca res quanta circa nos teque maxime sit).\textsuperscript{953} Livy reports the presence of the fetials only in conjunction with the conclusion of the treaty with Alba in the reign of Tullus.\textsuperscript{954} In this piece of Livian narrative, the fetials and their procedure may be considered catalysts of the pre-agreement pact between Alba and Rome. In this agreement, each city would have chosen a set of triplets to challenge the opposite ones and the outcome of the fight would have had to have been accepted by both parties. The entire formula would have been sealed through a final sacrifice performed by the fetials.

In line with the findings of Feldherr,\textsuperscript{955} the fetiales were involved in Rome’s process of expansion, ending with Rome’s assimilation of Alba’s territory. Livy describes two very separate accounts, which both feature descriptions of the fight itself approaching its decisive and bloodiest moment, and which both culminate in a fetial animal sacrifice.\textsuperscript{956} It was a military event, but in Livy’s explicit statement it was ‘not a battle’, as it resembled a sacrifice,\textsuperscript{957} and the

\textsuperscript{952} Liv. 1.23.2-3.
\textsuperscript{953} Liv. 1.23.8.
\textsuperscript{954} Liv. 1.24.4-9.
\textsuperscript{955} Feldherr 1998.
\textsuperscript{956} In the depiction of the scene the executor of the sacrifice, the pater patratus, and the victim were differentiated by their costume and adornments, but joined in the red colour frequently worn by priests, providing a visual link with the blood of the victim. Thus Fowler 1911:176-7, notes that religious officials who took no part in sacrifice, such as the Vestal Virgins, did not wear red. Beard (2007:72-5) emphasise both the red colour in Romulus for his triumph over Caeninenses and the one of Iuppiter Capitolinus.
\textsuperscript{957} Liv. 1.25.11: nec illud proelium fuit.
triplets also possessed the characteristics of the sacrificial victims. Although Feldherr focuses on the spectacular nature of the sacrifice, identifying and juxtaposing it with the fight between the triplets, he reaches the interesting conclusion that the enlargement of Rome’s territory was strictly linked with the fetial practice, which would allow this expansive process.

We have now analysed the first part of the procedure of creating the fetials. As outlined by Livy, the treaty rite involved three main steps: a gathering of herbs, the sacrifice of a small pig with the lapis silex and the uttering of a sacred oath. Once this was done, the Roman fetials proceeded to meet the Alban counterpart (“iubesne me rex / cum patre patrato / populi Albani / foedus ferire”) and, after the recitation of the terms of the treaty, they announced that the people of Rome would not be the first to break these terms. Between the speech of the Alban dictator, Mettius Fufetius, and the beginning of the duel, there is a detailed description of the sacrifice, which confirms the treaty between Romans and Albans. The materialisation of the oath was achieved through the slaying of a piglet with the holy silex. At the same time, the pater patratus recited the terms, appealing to Iuppiter, Quirinus (and in Polybius also Mars as witnesses) to punish the Romans if they should ever breach their promise (si prior defexit publico consilio dolo malo): “…and strike the Roman People, Godfather, (tum tu ille Diespiter populum Romanum sic ferito) the more in that thou hast greater power and might (tantoque magis ferito quanto magis potes

---

958 And when Horatius speaks of “giving” (dedi, dabo) the Albans either to the souls of his brothers or for the victory of the Romans, he is using the language of a sacrificial offering. Like that of the pater patratus, their designation of the Horatii as champions takes place through the intervention of the king (Liv. 1.24.2: cum trigeminis reges agunt ut pro sua quisque patria ferro dimicent).

959 Liv. 1.24.3-6; see Wissowa 1912:550-51.

960 The language of request and command (repeated archaic imperatives, posco, iubeo) punctuates the king’s empowerment of the pater patratus. The sentence has a marked alliteration which suggests the rhythm of ancient carmina (Ogilvie 1965:111.) Feldherr (1998:136) states clearly that the Livian formula is far from being a mere antiquarian version; the account of the Fetial sacrifice sketches a set of relationships among its various participants that anticipates the tensions that will arise later in the episode.

961 Liv. 1.24.3-9.

962 Polybius (3.25) continues by quoting only the oath by Iuppiter Lapis, and leaves us to assume that those by Mars and Quirinus were made separately. No other references to the right of the fetials include the three deities. Livy (1.24.7) mentions Jupiter only; in 1.32.10 he prescribes the prayer, “Iuppiter, et tu Jane Quirine,” continuing with “dii caelestes omnes”. Cf. Ryberg 1931:152 and Samter 1909:6.2261-2.
pollesque), as I this pig strike” (ut ego hunc porcum hic hodie feriam).\footnote{Varro Res Rust. 2.4.9; Paul. Fest. 234a 31L; Serv. ad Aen. 8.641; Suet. Claud. 25; cf. also Liv. 21.45.8 where the treaty with Carthage is described. Livy does not choose to describe the recitation of the oath itself, on the grounds of its length (1.24.8). This is somewhat surprising if his motive for including the ritual is purely antiquarian. Rather, the omission suggests that the significance of the ritual for Livy lies in the processes of authorisation and sacrifice that he does describe. Cf. Samter 1909:2262; Bailey 1932:15; Feldherr 1998:137.} At this point the foedus was struck,\footnote{Paul. Fest. 234a 31L; Serv. ad Aen. 8.641; Suet. Claud. 25; cf. also Liv. 21.45.8 where the treaty with Carthage is described. Livy does not choose to describe the recitation of the oath itself, on the grounds of its length (1.24.8). This is somewhat surprising if his motive for including the ritual is purely antiquarian. Rather, the omission suggests that the significance of the ritual for Livy lies in the processes of authorisation and sacrifice that he does describe. Cf. Samter 1909:2262; Bailey 1932:15; Feldherr 1998:137.} or feritus (from ferire),\footnote{Paul. Fest. 92L.} or percussus (from percutere).\footnote{Cf. CIL X 797.} In another version, the oath ended with a different formula, “si sciens fallo, tum me Diespiter salva urbe arceque bonis eiciat, ut ego hunc lapidem”, dropping the stone at the final words.\footnote{Paul. Fest. 115.4; Polyb. 1.25.8-9, cf. Polyb. 3.25.} The oath by luppiter Lapis was the most solemn possible.\footnote{Gell. 1.21.4.} In this version, the fetiales used a flint stone to sacrifice the oath-victim, again invoking a curse, this time on the Roman people if they were false to the oath.\footnote{Liv. 1.24.8-9.} In Wissowa’s opinion this tradition would have been specifically Roman or Latin,\footnote{Wissowa 1912:477.} but it seems likely to be a more widespread Italic ritual, (\?Aequicoli) as the striking oath scene is also depicted on some Oscan coins.\footnote{Friedländer 1850:81 ff. nr. 9-12; 86-7,ns. 18-9; 11,nr. 9; 16 n.2.} In the case of this oath, the stone reappears again both as god (luppiter Lapis) and as an instrument (lapis silex). The Roman aureus of 16 B.C. depicts two fetials striking the piglet and concluding the pact. From Livy’s account,\footnote{Liv. 1.24.9} we would expect that only one of the fetials would strike the piglet, beating it from the top to the bottom. However, the depiction shows clearly the flint stone positioned in the top middle of the altar and the two fetiales (?pater patratus and verbenarius) standing and holding the piglet on opposite sides of the altar;\footnote{This coin commemorates the archaic treaty between Gabii and Rome, sealed as treaty of peace. Grueber 1970:55-56, pl. 71, II; Mattingly & Sydenham 1923:cvi; Babelon 1885:2.535. Cf. Ryberg 1955:39, n.10. Rehak 2001:196 (Fig. 6), n.68.} the flint stone is fixed in the shrine and...
they split the pig in two halves. Might this practice have significance and bear a similarity to the dividing / bordering practice in the way it was performed?

Through the victory of Horatius, Rome conquered the Alban territory, expanding her imperium. As Feldherr has shown, in a magnificent piece of his work, the sacrifice of the pig represents the culmination of the unification of the power of the Roman with the Alban people,974 as Livy states: “Both sides turned their attention to burying their dead champions, but with very different feelings, the one rejoicing in wider dominion, the other deprived of their liberty and under alien rule”.975 The connection made by Livy concerning the extension of the imperium is clear for all to see (quippe imperio alteri aucti, alteri dicionis alienae facti). Thus, although there is no explicit reference to imperium, only to fines,976 in the fetial ritual, the ceremony enacts the transmission of imperium, and it is precisely the imperium of the Roman king over the Albans that the ceremony of the execution is designed to establish.[2.2.8; 3.5.1; 3.6; 3.7; 4.4.4; 5.3; 5.6; 6.3.4; 7.5.1] But like the victim’s at the fetial sacrifice, Mettius’s death serves as a warning of what might happen to any other potential traitor.977

Feldherr establishes a sacrificial paradigm behind the narrative,978 and also anchors Livy’s text to a central socio-religious institution that became a particular focus of interest in the Augustan era precisely for its intrinsic, practical connections to the issues of unification and alienation.979 He uses the same

---

975 Liv. 1.25.13.
976 The relationship between imperium and ‘borders’ is present in the 1st century AD writers: Termini imperii: Seneca Dial. 10.4.5; Q nat.1.pr.9; Plin. N.H. 6.120;7.117; Tac. Germ. 29.3, Ann. 1.11. Fines imperii: Seneca Dial.12.10.3; Plin. N.H.; Plin. Pan. 54.4, Ep. 8.6.6; Tac. Hist. 4.48; Juv. 8.265.
977 This episode shares a number of elements with the description of Mettius’s execution, as well as with the scene of the Samnite initiation. Again the spectators, like the Albans in book 1, are secretly surrounded by loyal troops, into which group they must be reincorporated, during their commander’s speech (Liv. 28.29.10). The imagery of health and healing, which provides the link between Tullus’s description of Mettius as insanabilis and the historian’s references to the salubre effect of his text, there appears even more prominently. For the Augustan resonances of this episode, see Syme 1959:107-8.
979 The link between imperium and sacrifice emerges again in Appian’s (B.C. 5.46) account of the reconciliation of Octavian and the mutineers at Perusia. The situation is strikingly similar to...
terminology as Livy, linking the fetials to Rome’s expansive process. The sacrifice equates to the spear-throwing ritual and both sanction a potential augmentation of territory with a sort of assimilation of the ‘other’ (alteri). Thus, becoming all Roman territory, the former already owned and the brand new ‘gained’, the fines between the two territories disappeared. Livy, however, ends his narration with the visualisation of new, artificial landmarks: the tombs of the dead fighters. He pictures the placing of the monuments on the site of the battle: “The tombs stand on the spots where each fell; those of the Romans close together, in the direction of Alba; the three Alban tombs, at intervals, in the direction of Rome”. (sepulcra exstant, quo quisque loco cecidit, duo Romana uno loco propius Albam, tria Albana Romam versus, sed distantia locis, ut et pugnatum est).980 Solodow suggests that there are likely no reasons for believing that the tombs would be closer to Alba or Rome.981 The following questions might therefore be posed: a) Through an enlargement or extension of the Roman territory, were the fines also modified when the two city-states were joined? b) Could the fetials, through their special nature and connection with the fines, be involved in Rome’s process of conquest, related to the alteration of fines? c) Although Livy neglects to mention the exact position of the five tombs and never cites the word fines, might we consider those landscape marks as a manifestation of the ancient bordering practice?982

4.3.3 The war against Veii

The ius fetiale was deployed in most, if not all, of Rome’s wars in the 5th, 4th and early 3rd centuries, as it could be observed in renditions almost identical to her
wars against Veii and the Samnites. The Republic is said to have fought three wars with Veii, and these conflicts, particularly the Third Veientine War, represent the most concrete connection between *fines*, *fetiales* and Rome’s expansionism. Communities reported by Livy as receiving missions to seek restitution in the early Republic include Veii, which was bound to Rome only by an armistice that, in any case, is said to have expired. The first and second wars are similar, and Livy’s narration evidently places them as the final two episodes (437-435 and 427-425 B.C.) culminating in the capture of Fidenae. In these instances, Roman foreign policy seems to adhere to the fetial law.

The war against the Fidenates broke out because of the murder of four Roman ambassadors (*legati*) at Fidenae (dated by Livy to 438 B.C.). They are said to have been sent to protest at its defiance of Rome and to have been killed on the orders of the Veientine king, and his refusal to give the satisfaction demanded by the fetials led ultimately to the outbreak of war. The war with Veii presents the fetial procedure in connection with diplomatic practices and war in a way that is no longer symbolic (as e.g. for the *Prisci Latini*). To begin with, it will be useful to remember the ‘episode of the Fabii’. This time, the Romans required the presence of the fetials for the war. Their crossing of the River Cremera, demonstrating a reckless lack of respect for international law and, more specifically, the *finis* marked by the river, would seem to have been fatal. From that moment, Rome was more careful in its war procedure, independent actions were no longer allowed, and the fetial process was always conducted initially and repeated when necessary. Rome sent her *fetiales* for the first time in 427 B.C. in order to seek reparation (*res repetendas*), but they were ignored by the Veientines. In a successive passage the fetials were finally considered and met by Veii’s ambassadors, who wished to speak with the Roman Senate. In 407 B.C., Livy tells us, on the expiry of the truce agreed after the previous war (but without any offence by Veii having been stated),

---

986 Dion. Hal. 2.53.2; cf., e.g., Liv. 8.22.7; 9. 45. 6; Bickerman 1945:146.
987 Livy narrates it from 2.48 to 2.50.
988 Liv. 4.30.13-14
989 Liv. 4.58.1.
“restitution began to be sought through legati and fetiales”. The move was postponed at the Veientines’ request because of their internal discord, but the following year, when they replied arrogantly to legati seeking restitution, the assembly carried a ruling for war to be declared.\textsuperscript{990} The data so drawn are: a) a confirmation of a real physical process, which conducted the fetials to the enemy’s borders; b) the procedure described by Livy concerning the entrance of the fetials in different areas is well defined by natural (river) or human features (gate, marketplace); c) the \textit{finis} (interpreted in this case as a definitive bordering concept) is a place where two delegations meet each other, similar to the point where Rome and Alba’s fighters duelled. These meeting points may have been within the \textit{fines}, where the fetials had a kind of ‘special’ access; d) from a wider perspective, is the fact that, at the end of the war with Veii – which started in 407 B.C. with this episode of the fetials – Rome had not just won a war, but extended to the Veientine territory, which became \textit{ager Romanus}, a permanent part of the Roman land in 396 B.C.\textsuperscript{991} This was the end of a long process, which was started by Romulus with Caenina, followed by the ‘peaceful’ acquisition of Alba and culminated in the depopulation and envelopment of Veii into the Roman domain.

4.4 Evolution of the fetial ritual

This section aims to investigate the substantial change in fetial procedure which occurred in the 3\textsuperscript{rd} century B.C. I will explain in depth the modifications to the procedure, which will be briefly analysed throughout, to locate the main connections between fetials and \textit{fines}. The most important focus of research will be on the analysis of the spear-throwing ceremony, related to questions of the continuous territory as the sea seems to have been a problem for the Roman attitude. Comparisons between the two previous sections and the one following will also be crucial for this purpose.

\textsuperscript{990} Liv. 4.58.1-8, 60.9. Livy also gives bare reports of war declarations against Labici in 411 B.C. (4.45.7) and the Volserinienses and Sapinates in 392 B.C. (5.31.5). Rich 2011b:219.

\textsuperscript{991} Cornell 1995:310.
4.4.1 Change of procedure

Scholars have struggled to understand the difference between the ritual of ius fetiale and that of striking oaths: two different procedures, which Livy distinguishes clearly. While the procedure for concluding treaties seems to have been affected in a minor way by this change, three main innovations seem to have occurred in performing declarations of war: the spear-throwing ceremony, the change or substitution of the fetiales with legati and a general revision of the written formula. Harris states that there was no practical reason to preserve the old formulae after 281 B.C., the date at which they probably went out of use, affirming, moreover, that “the Livian version is betrayed by certain anachronisms”. This is clear proof that the two elements, practical ritual and oral formula, have been conflated. Because of this, the argument appears to be quite confused regarding when these changes happened. In Freys’ opinion, for example, this ‘new’ procedure was introduced at the start of the Second Punic War, yet by this time the old ius fetiale was considered obsolete.

Different reasons have been provided to justify such a change in procedure. One suggestion is that, as Rome’s domain expanded in the regal period, the fetial ritual for demanding restitution may have been employed only in respect of Latin communities and any other of Rome’s neighbours who possessed

992 For a general discussion about the changes in the Fetial ritual procedure, Rich 1976:56-60, 104-7.
993 D. Musti (1970:76) does not consider the Livian distinction so clear. Instead he notes a rather bad attempt at blending the two rituals.
994 Cf. Liv. 30.43.9 and the treaty with Carthage.
995 Harris 1979:168. The problem of transmission is often evaded (e.g. Catalano 1965:1, 37 n. 76). Latte argued (1960:5, n. 1; 37-8, 121, n. 2) that ‘modernisation’ of language might be not a matter, and there has been mistaken criticism that ‘audiat fas’ is an impossible phrase for the early period, since fas is always a predicate until Livy and Fraenkel (1957:289 n. 1) accepted this argument; cf. Fraenkel (1960:426), for a severe judgement on the authenticity of the fetial formulae; but it rests in large part on the arbitrary exclusion of Accius Trag. 585R (‘ibi fas, ibi cunctam antiquam castitudinem’). However the phrase ‘puro pioque duello quaerendas censeo, itaque consentio consciscoque’ (Liv. 1.32.12) is highly suspect. The question of the authenticity of the foedus-making formula in Liv. 1.24 is separate, as is the question of the secular prayer, since in those cases there were reasons to preserve the old wording. There was every reason to refurbish the war-declaring procedure at Livy’s time (Cass. Dio 1.4.4-5). Ogilvie (1965:129), however, argues that it was put into its present form in the second century.
996 Frey & Frey 1999:42.
fetials. Some scholars are not convinced, however, that the enlargement of Rome’s domain could have been responsible for such a sudden diminishing of the fetials’ significance. And if this were the case, her ‘non-Italic’ enemies would no longer have been able to share in the fetial institution. In fact, the ius fetiale was used in diplomatic relationships with Palaepolis, showing that the fetials were also sent to a Greek community that, as far as we know, did not share the same ritual. The suggestion that Rome’s growth made their procedure unintelligible just because they had dominion over culturally distant peoples seems incomprehensible.

It is generally held, however, that the overall procedure of fetials’ declaration of war was modified when Rome became involved in overseas hostilities, an idea which seems more plausible. It is also possible that the whole procedure became increasingly difficult to apply, and no longer practical, as Rome’s imperium continued to extend outside the narrow circle of surrounding cities, communities and states. Under fetial law, the Senate was obliged to send emissaries with Rome’s demands to enemy states and wait 33 days for a response. Yet, because of the distances involved in travel between Rome and the potential enemy, the journey for the fetiales often took longer than 30 days. So perhaps we should ask whether the question of an eventual inapplicability of the ritual was due to the issue of distance, or the fact that expanding fines no longer abutted enemies’ territories. Probably to the Romans’ eye, the ‘immanent’ idea of imperium clashed with the physical presence within the territory.

999 Matthaei 1907:182, 201.  
1000 Liv. 8.22.8. in 327 AD.  
1001 Warrior 2006:59.  
1002 See Besta 1946:9, 15; Ogilvie 1965:110-12, 127-36. This theory can properly be attributed to F. W. Walbank (1949); see also Walbank 1937:192; 1941:87; Bederman 2001:237.  
1003 Bellamy 2006:19.  
4.4.1.1 The ritual of spear throwing

Aside from changes to the formulae and the fetials’ new status of legati, another significant development concerns the spear-casting ceremony. The most evident aspect of this changing practice, for my investigation, is the drastic revolution in the spear-throwing ceremony, which originally took place into the enemy’s fines. As Livy overlooks and ignores an episode which is key to our investigation, I require the use of a different source – Servius.\(^{1005}\) As soon as the Romans subjugated the Samnites, the experience of their first transmarine war forced Rome to adapt the ritual, since it was impossible “to find a place where they could perform through the fetials this ritual of declaring war” (“nec invenirent locum, ubi hunc sollemnitatem per fetiales indicendi belli celebrarent”).\(^{1006}\) In 281 B.C., during the war against Pyrrhus, the ritual was modified, most likely because his domains were across the Adriatic. Having captured a Pyrrhic mercenary, the Romans forced the prisoner of war to buy a plot of land adjacent to the temple of Bellona near the Circus Flaminius.\(^{1007}\) The purchased area, lying on the southern Campus Martius and outside the pomerium, was marked off as “quasi in hostili loco” (“as if in hostile or enemy territory”). The ritual stretched to ‘foreign soil’ into which the spear was cast, satisfying the ius fetiale as a means of declaring war.\(^{1008}\) From this point on, that

---

1005 Serv. ad Aen. 9.52: PRINCIPIUM PUGNAE hoc de Romana sollemnitate tractum est. Cum enim volebant bellum indicere, pater patratus, hoc est princeps fetialium, proficiscetur ad hostium fines, et praefatus quaedam sollemnia, clara oce dicebat se bellum indicere propter certas causas, aut quia socios laeserant, aut quia nec abrepta animalia, ec obnoxios redderent. Et haec clarigatio dicebat a claritate vocis. Post quam clarigationem hasta in eorum fines indicabatur iam pugnae principium. [Schol. Dan.] Post tertium autem et tricesimum diem quam res repetissent ab hostibus, fetiales hastam mittebant. Denique cum Pyrrhi temporibus adversum transmarinum ostem bellum Romani gesturi essent nec invenirent locum, ubi hunc sollemnitatem per fetiales indicendi belli celebrarent, dederunt operam, ut unus de Pyrrhi militibus caperetur, quem fecerunt in circo Flaminio locum mere, ut quasi in hostili loco ius belli indicendi implerent. Denique in eo loco ante aedem Bellonae consecrata st columna. Varro in Caleno ita ait duces cum primum hostilem agrum introituri erant, ominis causa prius astam in eum agrum mittebant, ut castris locum caperent. Ergo bene hoc poeta de more Romano tractum urno upote duci dedit. Sed in hac consuetudine fetialis, qui bellum indicebat, antequam hastam iaceret, tiam terram hostium contestabatur: unde guidam volunt Aenean scientem quod bellum gesturus esset, sicut a sibylla cognoverat, ubi ad Italiae partem debitam venit, primum adorasse terram, ut geniumque loci rimamque deorum Tellurem.

1006 Serv. ad Aen. 9.53.
1007 For Ando (2003:236) the piece of land purchased would have been in the Circus Flaminius and not next to it.
1008 Serv. ad Aen. 9.52; Ovid, Fasti 6.203-8; Suet. Claud. 25. 5; Paul. Fest. 30L, s. Vellona; Plac. P. 14.2.
plot, which belonged to the Epirote mercenary, became the definitive area where the later altered ritual would be executed. From 281 B.C., the fetials would stand by the temple of Bellona and hurl the spear into the consecrated soil around a small column (*columna bellica*)\textsuperscript{1009} intended to represent, from that time forward, the enemy territory.\textsuperscript{1010} Bederman assumes that the Romans performed this clever legal fiction, as if they symbolically threw the spear across the sea, because they wished to begin offensive operations immediately against the Epirote king.\textsuperscript{1011} It was a practical, legalistic solution to avoid the fetials having to leave Rome and to declare war in the shortest time possible. The Romans, after all, were able to accommodate their ‘metaphysical geography’ and legal/religious pressure through legalised ‘diversions’, as Ando effectively identifies.\textsuperscript{1012}

This conceptual procedural revolution described by Servius affects our inquiry if we compare his account with the Livian one. In fact, as we have seen, Livy says that the spear had to be hurled into enemy territory, within their borders (*hastam in fines eorum*).\textsuperscript{1013} Rome figuratively moved the enemy’s territory within the city herself and marked the *fines* of the plot.\textsuperscript{1014} By forcing a captured soldier to purchase a piece of land, thus turning it into ‘hostile land’, Rome abstracts “the category ‘enemy territory’ from multiple particulars”.\textsuperscript{1015} But, as Wiedemann has pungently noted, there are three things about Servius’ story that make it fictitious, an “aetiological myth intended to explain a particular ritual”.\textsuperscript{1016} The first is that the story implies war had already broken out; otherwise it would have been impossible for Rome to capture an enemy soldier. The second problem was that Roman law prohibited a non-citizen, much less an enemy, from owning real property.\textsuperscript{1017} To have allowed the Epirote prisoner to have made this

\textsuperscript{1009} Serv. *ad Aen.* 9.52. The story of the forced sale of land at the Circus Flaminius was repeated in Ovid *Fasti* 333-35. A briefer version of the story is given in the glossary at Placidus (Lindsay, Glars. Lan 4.55). Samter 1909:6.2264; Bailey 1932:156-7; Fowler 1911:434. See also Latte 1960:122, n.3. De Francisci 1952.


\textsuperscript{1011} Bederman 2001:237-8.

\textsuperscript{1012} Ando 2003:235.

\textsuperscript{1013} Liv. 1.32.24.

\textsuperscript{1014} Wiedemann 1986:481.

\textsuperscript{1015} Ando 2011:61-2.

\textsuperscript{1016} Wiedemann 1986:481.

\textsuperscript{1017} Wiedemann 1986:481, n.13.
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transaction, he would have had to have been manumitted, and then given Roman citizenship. All of this would have meant that the property he bought would not have been invested with enemy character. The third problem with Servius’ account is that, technically speaking, Rome did not declare war against Pyrrhus. The Romans opened hostilities against Tarentum, for whom Pyrrhus was hired as a mercenary commander with his troops. Why did the Romans, therefore, need to perform the spear-throwing ritual and proceed with a formal declaration if they had been already attacked by Pyrrhus? The easiest answer is that they had not previously performed the ritual against Tarentum. Throwing a spear into the Tarentine territory should, therefore, have been a straightforward choice.

4.4.1.2 The formula

It has also been assumed that the formula for the fetials ritual outlined by Livy may have undergone a period of disuse at the end of the Republic although, in any event, it was current again from the time of Augustus. Ando argues that in his (hypothetical) antiquarian reconstruction, the fetials’ ritual originated in a period when Rome fought wars of purely local significance. Since the nature of the rerum repetitio had changed in the early 3rd century, the ceremony cannot have been invented along the lines of later practice. The fetial college was probably subjected to a revival of antiquarian tradition, to which Livy’s formula belongs. At that time, the Romans were looking to preserve the purity of...
their ancestral religion in the face of the contamination of foreign cults. However, the presence of the ritual in early poets’ and playwrights’ fragments of Early Latin period might bring the date back to the second half of the 3rd century B.C., and similarities between these texts and the Livian narrative could confirm this hypothesis. A slightly different, more modern form of the formula, has been provided by Cincius, a younger contemporary of Varro and Cicero. L. Cincius applies the formula to the people of the Hermunduri, a formidable German tribe who in the last decades of 1st century B.C. migrated from Suebia to Elbe.

4.4.1.3 The legati

In this process of ceremonial ‘secularisation’ at the time of the Mid-Republic, the fetials were still consulted on ritual matters, but their diplomatic tasks on war-making were assigned to senatorial legati. These ambassadors, who were empowered directly by the Senate or magistrates, conducted negotiations with

---

1025 Plautus Amph. 204-17 seems to have adapted the Roman form of declaring war. Originally the Fetiales attended to this function, but it was taken over fairly early by legati. The men for this purpose were chosen from the senators (viros primorum principes, 204; eos legat, 205; legati, 215), and made the demand for restitution (206-10). Only after this had been refused (213, 214) did they declare war. A comparison shows further similarities in what are evidently set formulae: cf. 213 ‘superbe increpant’ (Plaut. Amph. 213) with ‘superbe responsum reddunt’ (Liv. 1.32.3).
1026 Libro tertio de re military quoted by Aulus Gellius 16.4.1.
1027 Hermunduri (or ‘Hermunduli’) is a German people with whom the Romans first had dealings in the later years of Augustus (Cass. Dio 55.10.2; Vell. Pat. 2.106.2), but were not hostile to Rome until the mid-2nd century A.D. Even if Cincius wrote as late as Augustus’ reign, he is unlikely to have used the Hermunduri as his sample enemy. For other views see Rüpke 1990:1051.
1028 In his account, Cincius omitted Quiritum, used fecere instead of fecerunt and added – que to populus as the normal asyndeton s.p.q.r. More important is the omission of the clauses (quod populi Priscorum Latinorum hominesque Prisci Latini adversus populum Romanum Quiiritium fecerunt, deliquerunt, quod populus Romanus Quiiritium bellum cum Priscis Latinis iussit esse senatusque populi Romani Quiiritium censuit, consensit, conscivit, ut bellum cum Priscis Latinis fieret; Liv. 1.32.13) either on political grounds (the legality of the senate declaring war without consulting the people and vice versa had been a source of dispute since the Jugurline Wars or because he suspected its Latinity, as well attested (Prisci Latini) in the same passage. Ogilvie 1968:135-6. 5; Widermann 1986:479.
foreign powers.\textsuperscript{1029} Livy records the presence of the *pater patratus*, but he contextualises the fetials, referring to them (or to any other fetials) with the diplomatic term *legatus*.\textsuperscript{1030} The presence of just one *legatus* is explicable through Varro, whose usage could be considered less anachronistic than Livy’s. Varro in the *De vita populi Romani* uses all three terms (*fetials, legati, oratores*) of the emissaries sent to seek restitution, although he is explicit that fetials were (in the past) sent out for this purpose.\textsuperscript{1031} Varro would not be influenced by the subsequent developments in the 3\textsuperscript{rd} and 2\textsuperscript{nd} centuries concerning declarations of war, where the ultimatum was delivered not by a *fetialis* but by a senatorial *legatus*.\textsuperscript{1032} Even in the Mid-Late Republic, the fetial procedure was only applied in special cases, and the *legati* were empowered to proceed under the same circumstances without further consultation. Harris again identifies 281/0 B.C. as the most likely date within which both the war declarations were simplified and the fetials’ tasks were transferred to senatorial *legati*.\textsuperscript{1033} In this later case, the reason for giving the fetials’ diplomatic skills to the *legati* might be explained in the same way as the modification of the practical procedure: distances to overseas enemies or, more simply, the increasing remoteness of Rome’s enemies.\textsuperscript{1034} This might be a simplification, but it is useful to draw our attention to the fact that the territories no longer abutted each other. Over time, the war-declarations were delegated to the *legati*,\textsuperscript{1035} leaving less control over war-decisions available to the Senate and People. The relevant *legatus ‘res repetivit’* also allowed that a state of war became immediate if satisfaction was not given. Yet it seems that the option of striking treaties remained with the fetials.\textsuperscript{1036}

\textsuperscript{1029} Ogilvie 1965:128; Warrior 2006:59.
\textsuperscript{1030} So in Liv. 1.32.6; 4.58.1; 9.5.4; 9.10.10; 9.11.11; 36.3.7-10; 38.42.7.
\textsuperscript{1031} Varro *L.L.* 5.86. Rich 2011b:213.
\textsuperscript{1032} Ogilvie 1965:130.
\textsuperscript{1033} Harris 1979:166.
\textsuperscript{1034} McDonald & Walbank 1937:194, n. 41; Ogilvie 1965:127, 131; Harris 1979:167.
\textsuperscript{1035} Cf. Mommsen 1899:2:689.
\textsuperscript{1036} Cf. Varro *L.L.* 5.86.
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4.4.2 Octavian as fetial

The link between Augustus, Livy and the fetials has been theoretically demonstrated by Syme.\textsuperscript{1037} In associating the spear ceremony with Livy, it is now my intention to report the Livian tendencies which appear in the Augustean period.\textsuperscript{1038} Through the use of secondary sources and a comparison with the previous section,\textsuperscript{[04.02]} I will examine the link between the spear-hurling and the notion of transmarine war, \textit{imperium} and \textit{fines}, remarking on the fetial’s role as covered by Octavian. Varro\textsuperscript{1039} explicitly states that “through them even now a treaty is made”, implying that fetials still made treaties when he was writing, namely around 45 B.C. Livy was a contemporary of Varro’s and the confirmation of a still-living fetial presence might be seen in three alliance treaties struck between Rome and Greek cities between 46 and 39 B.C. While the treaties with the Lycian League (46 B.C.) and with Cnidus (45 B.C.) do not expressly mention the fetials,\textsuperscript{1040} their presence seems unquestionable in the senatorial decree concerning a treaty with Aphrodisias (39 B.C.).\textsuperscript{1041} If the translation and the date are correct, Octavian was involved in this treaty, by exhibiting at that time an interest in the ceremonial activities of the fetial college. The spear-throwing ceremony seemed to have disappeared from the sources after 281 B.C., until Octavian chose to resurrect it in a celebrative and more theoretical incarnation. Reynolds’ arguments lend some support to the hypothesis of Wiedemann (1986) and Rüpke (1990) that the fetial ceremony for declaring war, or at least elements of it, was an invented archaising tendency by

\begin{itemize}
  \item Syme 1959:56.
  \item Wiedemann (1986), who argues that the original function of the priesthood was to maintain and enforce treaties, and that the more flamboyant ceremony in which they declared war by hurling a spear into foreign territory (see Liv. 1.32.5-14) was very much an Augustan construct.
  \item Varro \textit{L.L.} 5.86.
  \item The documents seem to follow a specific almost identical procedure. In each of them two Romans and two ambassadors from the other party are named. Mitchell 2005:lines 74-80; Blümel 1992:no. 33. The Romans included might have been fetials (\textit{pater patratus} and \textit{verbenanus}) as they performed the swearing of the treaty by sacrifice. Rawson 1973:168,n.70 (= 1991:92, n.71); Broughton 1987:61,n. 38; Mitchell 2005:240-1, As Mitchell notes, the Roman officiants of the Lycia treaty, L. Billienus and L. Fabricius Licinus, were undistinguished.
  \item Reynolds (1982:39, 89-90, no. 8, line 85) has argued that the \textit{themisthres} mentioned in a decree of the senate concerning the people of Aphrodisias (probably dating to 39 B.C.) must be a Greek rendering of fetials. She further suggests that the consuls mentioned in the document were exhorted by the fetials to perform a ceremony that ritually validated the treaty between Rome and Aphrodisias. The ceremony in question is the one described by Livy (1.24.4-9). Rich 2011b:194-5.
\end{itemize}
Octavian, for the purposes of declaring war in his final confrontation against Cleopatra and Mark Anthony. Regardless, he used three ways to ensure the Romans of a victorious war: firstly he publicised Antonius’ will, secondly he swore an oath of allegiance with the Italian municipia, the Senate and the People of Rome, and most importantly, he revived the fetial procedure, performing the outdated ritual of spear-casting. In October 32 B.C., Octavian involved members of the senate, outfitted for war in military cloaks, meeting them at the Temple of Bellona. Here, he set himself in fetial character and staged the ceremony in the Campus Martius, perhaps even throwing the traditional spear to the columna bellica himself. The historian Dio, our only source at this juncture, does not actually state whether Octavian hurled a spear or not. But Sumi rightly identifies this ceremony as a revival as part of a larger religious project, which continued into the Principate of Augustus. In my opinion, Octavian’s ceremony was not just a symbolic gesture to impress the people of Rome, as Rehak and Younger suggest. The ceremony as a whole contained other purposes, deserving its importance, as Sumi states, since it could serve, for example, to mask the reality of the already ongoing civil wars that Octavian claimed to have concluded in 36 B.C. However, we cannot agree with the same scholar when he affirms that Octavian was not another member of the fetial college, since it is expressly attested in the Res Gestae. Neither can we limit the ritual of spear throwing to merely sanctioning Octavian’s status as eventual leader and supreme general in leading his troops into battle, as Rüpke remarks. Octavian seems rather to repeat that ‘act of possession’ which was performed by Alexander the Great in

---

1042 The will was unlawfully taken from the Temple of Vesta, damning contents at a meeting of the senate and then in an oath before the Roman people (Cass. Dio 50.3.4).
1048 We know very little about the activity of the fetial college in the imperial period; see Hoffman-Lewis 1955:138-39; Scheid 1978:640.
1049 RG 7: “FETIALIS FUI...”
throwing a spear into Asian soil, claiming its conquest at the beginning of his campaign.\(^\text{1050}\)

Octavian was not interested in some sort of treaty or agreement, as he overlooked and neglected the previous passages of the *ius fetia le* ritual on purpose. The declaration of war was straightforwardly against Cleopatra.\(^\text{1051}\) After all, we do not have evidence that any member of the college was actually sent to Alexandria to claim *rerum repetitio*, as tradition demanded. Performing this ritual, he represented the coming campaign against Antonius and Cleopatra as against a foreign state, the last unconquered or uncontrolled state of the Mediterranean basin. Octavian claimed, amongst other purposes and defending the interest of Rome and the whole of Italy, the possession of Egypt for himself.\(^\text{1052}\) The presence of this fetial ceremony, the spear-throwing rite, might therefore have put Octavian into a different and extra-legal status at this time. If so, it could have provided a public and ritual-based legitimation of his position\(^\text{1053}\) and also of something that he desired almost as a personal

---

\(^\text{1050}\) The ritual of spear throwing was also associated with Alexander, who performed a similar ritual upon his arrival in Asia (Wiedemann 1986:483). Justin 11.5.10; cf. Diod. 17.17.2; Zahrt 1996: Alexander proclaimed the Asian soil as ‘spear-won land’. Cf. Rehak & Younger 2006:119. This was an appropriate evocation for Octavian since he was also embarking on a campaign in the East. It further removed the present campaign from the sphere of civil war and placed it firmly in that of foreign war and especially world conquest—another confrontation between the forces of the West against the East. In other words, the spear throwing simply confirmed the basic meaning and purpose of the ceremony as a whole. This procedure was already known in the epic poems: Protesilaus or Achilles would have been the example for Alexander at the commencement of the War of Troy, while in the Aeneid, Turnus starts the battle, throwing one single javelin to the enemies. Virg., *Aen.* 9.52s.: *(…)* *et iaculum attorquens emittit in auras,* *principium pugnae.* Turelli 2008:526. The same procedure is also present in the Nordic sagas as Eyrbyggia Saga during the feud between Snorre gode and Steinthor about the end of the 10th century in Iceland: see York Powell 1890.

\(^\text{1051}\) Rüpke (1990:105-7) makes this claim, following the words of Wiedemann 1986, who has argued that the rite of spear throwing in particular was the element of the ceremony that Octavian reinvented.

\(^\text{1052}\) See e.g. Kleiner 2005:133.

\(^\text{1053}\) One other point of interest in this ceremony, which has been neglected in other discussions, deserves our attention. The columns: bellica, a small column located in front of the Temple of Bellona, was an important feature of the city's topography and figured in the Fetial ceremony (*Ov. Fast.* 6.205-S). Platner & Ashby 1929:131. According to Festus (30L: *Columella quae bellica vocubur, super quam hastam iacebant, cum bellum indicebatur*), the spear was hurled over this column before landing in the area of the Circus Flaminius, which had been designated enemy territory. If the column was already in existence when Octavian performed the Fetial ceremony in 32 B.C., it is hard to believe that the history surrounding this ceremony, as Servius relates it, would have been unknown. In other words, the existence of the columna bellica in 32 B.C. would be evidence for the existence of the tradition surrounding the Fetial ceremony, including the rite of throwing a spear into enemy territory. Thus, this rite could not have been a wholly invented archaism on the part of Octavian.
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possession. In some way, the statement given by Augustus in his Res Gestae confirms the conception of a new conquest, when a new state was conquered or encompassed in Rome’s domains. Augustus himself states that he:

\[
\text{OMNIUM PROVINCIARUM POPULI ROMANI, QUIBUS FINITIMAE FUERUNT GENTES QUAE NON PARERENT IMPERIO NOSTRO, FINES AUXI.}
\]

Extended the fines of all the provinces which were bordered by races not yet subject to our empire.

The paradox is that Augustus did not include Egypt in this sort of extension of provincial borders; he actually initiated a brand new conquest, as confirmed in the next paragraphs of his Res Gestae: "I added Egypt to the ‘Empire’ of the Roman people" (‘ÆGYPTUM IMPERIO POPULI ROMANI ADIECI’). Following the newest tradition looking to Augustus, the spear- hurling ceremony was once more a formal/symbolic act, performed in Rome and not on the real fines after the ancient tradition.

4.4.3 Function through history: war declarers or treaty makers

This following short digression aims to clarify the features of the fetials’ treaty activity from the second half of the 3rd century B.C. and the overseas territorial acquisitions for Rome. This section shows the interaction of the fetials with Rome’s enemies and demonstrates the evolution of their role. As shown in the next three chapters, from this point in Roman history, the function of the fetials was exclusively related to treaties and agreements. Often, the clauses of such

---

1055 RG 26.
1056 RG 27.
1057 There are only two attested instances of the Fetial ceremony from the Imperial period: the one under Claudius and that of Marcus Aurelius in 178 AD, prior to his campaign on the northern frontier. Under the Principate, the emperor Claudius, a scrupulous observer of the Roman religious traditions, concluded some important treaties with foreign kings. In the role of pater patratus, the antiquarian emperor Claudius sacrificed a sow in the Roman Forum following the ancient discipline (Suet. Claud. 25.5.). It seems that the fact that he also enclosed the Aventine within the pomerium could be linked with an overall control of the Emperor over the borders (fines) (Aul. Gell. 13.14.7; Suet. Claud. 25.12) Ando 2003:237; Rehak & Younger 2006:119. Then, probably the last attestation of a use of the fetiales as war declarers came in 178 AD, when Marcus Aurelius used them in the war against the Scythians (Cass. Dio 71.33.3.). Samter 1909:6.2264.
Chapter 4. The fetial priests

treaties included the bordering practices from a figurative, real and material point of view.[7.3] Since this procedural reinvention, however, the functions of the fetials seem to have changed or, more specifically, became more limited. The tasks and main features of *ius fetiale*, particularly those regarding the declaration of war, were curbed and, as we have seen, restricted to a ceremonial fiction. Such new procedures are only known to have been applied on a few highly important occasions – to declare war against Carthage (probably in 264 B.C.) certainly in 238 and 218 B.C., against Philip V, and in the attack on Perseus. The procedure was also used against Antiochus III in 191 B.C. and war-declaration carried out against the Aetolians. After 171 B.C., the fetial procedure for declaring war seems not to have been recorded, disappearing entirely from historical sources until its reappearance with Augustus.

This situation was noted by Polybius, who records only an ephemeral trace of the original procedure that survived in his days (βραχυ τι ىخوئي), implying that the fetials played little or no role in declaring war in the mid-second century. On the contrary, the new Roman process of transmarine expansion put her in contact with new international laws and the fetials likely maintained...

---

1058 Cic. Off. 1.36; Liv. 9.9.3; Arnob. 2.67; CIL I2 :202, XLI. Dion. Hal. 2.73, Cic. Leg. 2.21.
1059 The five treaties that Polybius claims are authentic were signed in 509, 348, 279 or 278, 241, and 226 B.C., while the one he states to have been false was allegedly signed in 306 B.C. The treaties of 509 and 348 B.C. are virtually identical. Carthage was negotiating with Rome as a stronger power and therefore dictated most of the terms. Cf. Serrati 2011.
1060 On the fetials in the war declaration to Perseus, see: Walbank 1941:85-7 and spec. 91; Rich 2011b:225.
1061 Liv. 36.3.7-12.
1062 Matters came to a head in early 172 B.C., when the Senate was addressed by a Macedonian representative and by king Eumenes of Pergamum, who attacked Perseus. Late in 172 B.C. a Roman embassy led by Q. Marcius Philippus toured Greece in order to strengthen the Roman position there. During their stay the embassy held a meeting with Perseus at his request, at which it was agreed that Perseus should send a further embassy to Rome. It was at that point that the Senate decided to declare war, but the implementation of the decision was postponed until the consuls of 171 B.C. entered office. This Macedonian embassy was received by the Senate during the consular year 171 B.C., but achieved nothing and the war then went ahead. The assembly had already voted for war before this final embassy was given audience. As reported by Livy, the motion put to the assembly listed Roman grievances and provided for war to begin against Perseus 'unless he should have given satisfaction about those matters' (nisi de eis re us satisfecisset). S.I. Oost (1954:147-9) failed, in spite of some good observations, to show that fetial procedure was used against Jugurtha. Harris 1979:167; Bellamy 2006:19; Bederman 2001:195-6.
1063 Polyb. 13.3.7.
only their key role as treaty-makers. After all, by this time Rome probably understood that she was able to obtain evident benefits by actually averting wars and concluding advantageous treaties.\footnote{1065} The treaties struck by fetials certainly might have brought potential benefits, but those treaties seem to have been struck not in a ‘regime of equity’, where both parties had the same rights, but rather in Rome’s position of military supremacy over the enemy: it would have occurred either after the victory over an enemy or through a formal procedure of war declaration. In this case, the demands of rerum repetitio were normally made in the expectation that the requests would be refused. Rome requested either the surrender of key territory, or the payment of a huge amount, or a sort of protectorate (deditio).\footnote{1066} Two instances of its use are known with certainty to have occurred in the latter half of the third century. A fragment from Naevius’ epic on the First Punic War, which reports the ritual of taking the sagmina, should be viewed with reference to the peace treaty of 241 B.C.\footnote{1067} At the end of this war, Rome obtained material advantages by imposing her rules on Carthage, commanding the abandonment and the Roman annexation of Sicily and the islands between Sicily and Italy. In the latter case, Rome shortly after put forward an official res repetendum to Carthage. Learning of the Roman intentions, the Carthaginians, now free of their difficulties in Africa, resisted these claims on the grounds that Sardinia was theirs and

\footnote{1065} Rüpke’s view that the fetials only gained responsibility for treaties at that point is unfounded. See Rüpke 1990:111-6. Sceptical is Rawson (1973:167-171 = Rawson 1991:91-2) who finds that the fetials played no role in treaty-making or other ritual activities before the revival in the late 2nd century B.C.

\footnote{1066} According to Livy (10.12. 1-3), the Samnites were demanded to leave Lucania, Rome having just made an alliance with the Lucanians in order to provoke war; but the source cannot be relied on to have reported the rerum repetitio correctly or in full. The demands made to Tarentum in 281 B.C. are given in App. Samn. 7.2 (cf. 7.3); Zonar. 8.2 included the surrender of political leaders. This latter kind of demand may have been common (cf. Plaut. Amph. 207). The demand of 218 B.C. (Polyb. 3.20.6-10, which is to be preferred to Liv. 21.18.2) was to surrender Hannibal. In 200 Rome demanded that Philip V should not make war on any Greek state or intervene in the Ptolemaic possessions, and that he should submit to arbitration against Attalus and Rhodes (Polyb. 16.34.3). Rome had decided on war and had not the slightest expectation that these demands would be met.
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prepared an expedition against the island. However, in 238 or 237 B.C., severe internal economic difficulties compelled Carthage to avert war with Rome by accepting her demands. Perhaps unexpectedly, Carthage agreed to surrender, transferring Sardinia and Corsica to the Roman orbit of influence and paying in reparation 1,200 extra talents. So far, we have seen only one instance in which a State has conceded to the res repetitae. For this reason, the jurisdiction of the fetial priests in terms of the striking of treaties was probably extended and improved for the purposes of reducing the amount of time taken.

The treaties cited above might represent evidence of an extension of Roman dominion applied to non-abutting territories, facilitated by the presence of the fetials. The treaties, after all, did not need to be stipulated in a brief span of time and the procedure could take longer. The fetials who presided over the ratification ceremony would convey the written text back to Rome, after which the Senate and People of Rome would ratify it again. Although I agree with the point made by Meyer that the creation of Roman treaties was a complex procedure established in the Republic, I cannot agree with his subsequent claim that treaties “differ in their leges, but all are made the same way”. Livy, for instance, records the earliest treaty between Rome and Alba Longa, which does not resemble any later treaty. The fact that early treaties contained the original idea of foedus, a perpetual peace and union, made sense when supervised by a fetial institution. They were guarantors of peace at the outset and also served

1068 Polyb. 1.88.9.
1069 The exact date is controversial and does not concern us here. One tradition, represented by Dio Cassius (Zonar. 8.18) and Sinnius Capito (ap. Paul. Fest. 322L. s. “Sardi uenales”), attributed it to Ti. Gracchus, the consul of 238 B.C. But there may be some confusion between this Gracchus and his grandson who operated in Sardinia in 177 B.C. (cf. Täubler 1921:20, 32-4) and the Livian tradition (Eutrop. 3.2) puts the annexation under the consuls for 237 B.C. Polybius (3.10.1) dates the affair after the conclusion of the Mercenary War, which lasted three years and four months (1.88.9); but whether this should be calculated from autumn, 241 B.C., to the end of 238 B.C. (De Sanctis 1907:3.1396, n. 30) or from the beginning of 240 B.C. to the early summer of 237 B.C. (Meyer 1902:383.n.2) is uncertain. Polybius may therefore have dated the Sardinian incident late in 238 (Meltzer 1879:2.387) or early in 237 B.C.
1071 Ando 2011:41.
1072 C. Saulnier (1980:186-191) and Wiedemann (1986:486-488) have also maintained that the fetial preliminaries of war were used only for States with which Rome had treaties.
1073 See Liv. 9.5. See also Saulnier 1980:181-83; Bederman 2001:195.
1074 Meyer 2004:95.
as a neutral arbitrator in cases of dispute over whether one party had breached its duties as in the later cases of the Ebro and Apamea. Livy has attested that the fetials were despatched to Africa in 201 B.C. to conclude the peace with Carthage through a treaty which ended the Second Punic War.  

The Polybian version of the same treaty seems to present particular problems, however, because he was misled into comparing the last treaty with the previous two. In Polybius’ mind, the first treaty was sworn by ‘Jupiter Stone’, according to an ancient custom, and the later treaties by Mars and Quirinus. However, he confuses the fetial sacrifice of the piglet hit by a flint (silex) with an entirely separate oath to Jovem Lapidem. It may be, therefore, that in the middle of the 2nd century the exact formulae were not common knowledge and they had to be resurrected by a later generation. The existence of two different formulae in Livy, one for the oaths/treaties (1.24) and the other for war declaration (1.32), may point to an overlapping of the two formulae. However, the fetials’ new function would not have changed substantially. They might have been the instruments of Roman territorial acquisitions made through the new ritual formula of the spear-hurling or the striking of treaties.

---

1075 Wiedemann 1987:488.
1076 Liv. 30.43.9. Livy’s wording implies that multiple flints were taken rather than the single stone from the temple of Jupiter Feretrius, perhaps a procedural change for the overseas journey. See for the connective link between fetials and the treaties with Cartage in Livy: Schwarte 1972; Rich 2011b:195.
1077 Sydenham 1952: nos. 69, 527, 619.
1078 Polyb. 3.25.6-9 cf. Liv. 3.25.6 with Walbank’s (1937) note: 279 B.C.
1079 A single instance has been cited of the association of Jupiter, Mars, and Quirinus in the rite of the fetiales. Serv. ad Aen. 8.663. Cf. Ryberg 1931:152; Gjerstad 1967:264.
1080 Paul. Fest. 102L. ‘Jupiter Stone’ prayed that if he perjured himself he might be cast out like the stone and then threw the stone away. Polybius, then, shows no knowledge of the fetials and reports treaty rituals quite different from theirs. However, at least in respect of the ‘Jupiter Stone’ oath, he appears to be in error: this is well attested elsewhere as an especially solemn oath, but always as taken by individual Romans, and it seems inappropriate for a treaty, since it binds only the swearer, not the Roman people. So Reid 1912:50-2; Ogilvie 1965:110; Vahtera 2000:256-7; Rich 2011b:194. See Cic. Pam. 7.12.2; Plut. Sull. 10.7; Òell. NA 1.21.4; Paul. Fest. 102L; Apul. Deo Soc. 5. See also now Richardson 2010.
1081 Another set of scholars have adopted a different viewpoint as to the role of the fetials in Roman treaty-making in the period between 250 and 100 B.C. They concede that, while the political influence of the college of fetials may have been on the wane, they have observed the extraordinary resilience of private law contract forms in the ratification ceremony presided over by the fetials; cf. Watson 1993:31-3. Their conclusion was that, while an enforcement mechanism based on the sacerdotal power of the fetials was in desuetude, a new form of obligation [based on contract] was being developed. Cf. Bederman 2001:195-6.
4.4.4 Wars in the Balkans

As we have seen, the fetials 1082 carried out a form of their war-declaring procedure on a number of occasions during the wars of the late 4th and early 3rd centuries. However, the rerum repetitio evolved into an exchange between embassies of proposals and counterproposals. 1083 We have very little evidence on treaty formalities in the 2nd century, but we may assume that the fetials continued to be used to solemnise treaties authorised by the Senate and People, either at Rome or overseas as required. 1084 Livy’s notices, however, may be incomplete, both for the Regal Period / Early Republic 1085 and in the Mid-Late Republic, as indeed the procedure was probably used more often than Livy tells us. 1086

---

1083 Cf., e.g., the protracted negotiations and exchange of numerous missions between Rome and Antiochus III, from the summer of 196 to the late summer of 193 B.C., examined by Holleaux (1913:1) and Bickerman (1932:47). The last Roman embassy left Antiochus’ court without delivering any ultimatum (as in Liv. 35.22.2).
1084 Dahlheim (1968:177) places undue weight on our sources’ silence. There is no reason to suppose the arrangements made in 201 B.C. to enable the fetials to travel overseas were not repeated. Similar provision for taking sagmina was presumably made in 136 B.C. to enable the surrender of Mancinus to be enacted in Spain.
1085 Known cases: Liv. 8.22.8 (Palaeopolis in 327 B.C.), 9.45.5-8 (the Aequi in 304 B.C.), 10.12.1-3 (the Samnites in 298 B.C.), 10.45.6-8 (the Faliscans in 293 B.C.); on all these occasions, but as far as we know never again, the fetials were sent ad res repetendas before the formal war-decision. Cf. also Dion. Hal. 15.7-10 with Liv. 8.23.3-10.
1086 The case of Tarentum in 282/1 B.C. was probably a crucial one. L. Postumius Megellus may possibly have been sent in 282 B.C. ad res repetendas (cf. Val. Max. 2.2.5, Zonar. 8.2), but he seems not to have been empowered to declare war. On the other hand the consul of 281 B.C. who began the war, L. Aemilius Barbula, was provided with a conditional declaration of war (A Samn. 7.3, Zonar. 8.2). It looks as if the essential changes in the procedure had now been made, and given the remoteness of Tarentum from Rome, it may have been precisely in 281 B.C. that the change occurred. This hypothesis accords remarkably well with the information of Serv. ad Aen. 9.52, according to which it was during, or probably at the start of, the war against Pyrrhus that the fetials began the custom of casting their spear not into the actual territory of the enemy, but into a piece of quasi-hostile territory in the Circus Flaminius district (Ovid Fast. 6.205-9). Latte (1960:122 n. 3), followed by Dahlheim (1968:175), objected that this story lacks legal logic. The complaint is that the commentator supposes that the Romans made a prisoner-of-war from Pyrrhus’ army purchase a piece of land in Rome so that they could use it to declare war against Pyrrhus. The quibble is irrelevant, since religious Romans may well have continued to feel the need for a magical spear-throwing against Pyrrhus even after the war had begun. E. Rawson’s (1973:167) arguments against the authenticity of the fetials’ spear-throwing in Rome are scarcely relevant. Thus the first two parts of the fetial war-declaring procedure, as it is described by Livy, were replaced for practical reasons by the delivery of a conditional war-declaration by means of a legatus. The third part, the spear-throwing, would naturally be cherished by the fetiales and others as the most dramatic piece of magic in the whole programme; therefore it was not abolished, but adapted to the new circumstances, and this was
The decision to begin a conflict with, and the consequent declaration of war on Philip of Macedon, is one instance where the change in procedure is most evident. One of the main arguments in the discussion surrounding this is the possibility that Rome’s primary concern was to begin the war when it suited her. Livy stresses the fact that Aurelius Cotta, in his defence of allies, did not cross their fines (finibus sociorum non excessisse), in strict conformity with fetial rules. Livy’s passage on the consular decision of starting the war, in my opinion, broadens the horizons of a limited and restricted focus on the fetials, who were also deeply involved in the commencement of the procedure for waging war. In 200 B.C., before the motion to declare war on Philip, the consuls were charged to address prayers to the Roman people and their Latin allies. The consuls consulted the senate as to the policy to be pursued and the allocation of provinces (secundum rem divinam precationemque ut de re publica deque provinciis senatum consulerent). Moreover – and more importantly – the Senate ordered the consuls to sacrifice and offer prayers to the gods, so that done almost as soon as possible, in 280 B.C. How long the fetiales kept up this tradition we cannot know. Their attested later function in war-declarations is limited to giving procedural advice to magistrates (Liv. 31.8.3, 36.3.7-12). It is fairly clear that in 264 B.C. the new procedure of conditional war-declaration was used against Hiero and Carthage: see Diod. 23.1.4. C. Cichorius (1922:26-7) suggested that Naevius’ line ‘scopas atque verbenas sagmina sumpserunt’ (Pun. 2* 27 Warmimzton) referred to the declaration of war in 264 B.C., but much more probably it refers to treaty-making, either with Hiero or indeed with Carthage (cf. Schwarte 1972:206-23). A mistaken notion has spread that the change did not take place until after the end of the First Punic War (cf. Dahlheim 1968:175). This seems to have resulted from Walbank’s (1949:16) convincing demonstration that the ‘new’ procedure was used against Carthage in 238 B.C. (see Polyb. 1.88.10-12, 3.10.3), as it was on some later occasions (see below). But though he discussed the change in procedure, Walbank for some reason neglected the earlier evidence. However, when he later came to comment on Polyb. 1.11.11, he granted that ’probably the revised procedure was employed’. Later uses of the revised fetial procedure are as follows: 218 B.C.: Polyb. 3.20.6, 21.8, 33.1.4, Liv. 21.18.1-14 (without the phrase ‘ad res repetendas’). 200 B.C.: Polyb. 16.34.3-7, Liv. 31.18.1-4; 172-1 B.C.: Liv. 42.25.1.2 reports on the embassy sent to Perseus ‘ad res repetendas. renuntiandamque amicitiam’: since Nissen (1863:246-7) has sometimes been regarded as a spurious notice (1949:18). Cf. Bredehorn 1968:196-200: it is significant that after the war-decision at Rome there remained a final, though merely nominal, possibility that Perseus would meet Rome’s demands (Liv. 42.30.11-31, 36.6). There seems to be no good evidence that the neo-fetial procedure was used to declare war against Queen Teuta in 230 B.C.: cf. Polyb. 2.8.8. Harris 1979:166.

1087 Liv. 30.42.5. The invention may be modeled after the actions of Roman envoys in Greece in 172 B.C. (Liv. 42.37.1). See Bickerman 1945:143.

1088 Liv. 31.5.

1089 Liv. 31.5.4. “May the will and purpose of the senate and people of Rome as regards the commonwealth and the entrance upon a new war have a prosperous and happy issue both for the Roman people and for the Latin allies!” (“quod senatus populusque Romanus de re publica deque ineundo novo bello in animo haberet, ea res uti populo Romano sociisque ac nomini Latino bene ac feliciter eveniret”).
they, through the haruspices, could give their approval through the victim’s entrails, portending an extension of *finium*, victory and a triumph (*prolationem finium victoriamque et triumphum portendi*). The last passage is key for our purposes. The favour of the gods manifested in the sacrifice would bring three benefits, which are connected to each other in a way that I have already explained previously:[4.2.2] triumph, victory and *prolationem finium*. The latter is the most important aspect, as it takes priority in the Livian account. After all, the importance of the first position is stressed by the fact that Livy does not use a logically connective argument, otherwise the chronological sequence would have been: victory, *prolationem finium* and triumph. My choice not to translate the Latin is due to the fact that, while ‘*prolationem*’ presents no difficulty, meaning extension, augmentation, expansion or enlargement, *finium*, on the other hand, has no definitive translation. While Warrior and Sage have translated it as ‘territory’, Rev. Canon preferred the ‘dominion of Rome’. The term *fines* is used in the same context just a few lines before by Livy, when he clearly states that the Athenians were alarmed, and warned Rome that Phillip was approaching their borders or territory (*quae regem appropinquare finibus suis nuntiaret*). A further passage, while on the one hand confirming that the fetials were relegated simply to the role of consultant, on the other hand helps us to comprehend the relationship between fetials, declaration of war and borders/territory. In this passage, Consul Sulpicius requires suggestions or ‘orders’ from the fetials, as he seems undecided about the act of *belli indictio*, which now is regarded as purely formal. Philip had ignored the earlier unofficial ultimatum delivered to Nicanor at Athens and the full procedure would only

1090 Liv. 31.5.7. Warrior 2006:58.
1091 Sage 1953.
1092 Canon 1905, *ad loc*..
1093 Liv. 31.5.6.
1094 Liv. 31.8.3. The fetials were consulted by the consul on whether they would direct that the declaration of war against King Philip be delivered to him in person, or whether it was sufficient to announce it at the first fortified post in his ‘territory’. The fetials replied that in whichever way he acted he would act correctly (*consultique fetiales ab consule Sulpicio, bellum quod indicetur regi Philippo, utrum ipsi utique nuntiari iuberent, an satis esset in finibus regni quod proximum praesidium esset, eo nuntiari. fetiales decreverunt, utrum eorum fecisset, recte facturum*).
1095 Polyb. 16.27.
serve to give him time to prepare for the war. After the People assembly had voted for war in 200 B.C., Sulpicius consulted the fetials, who seem to have had a simpler role here as consultants. The appointed consul asked them whether the war declaration should be delivered to Philip in person or whether it was sufficient to be handed over at the first fortified site within his ‘finibus regni’. The fetials replied that either way would be correct. Consultation with the fetials about the delivery of the actual declaration of war left the consul in a position to choose freely. Livy knew that, because diplomatic démarches before the break with Philip had already filed a protest with him in 203 B.C., then a warning had been given to his envoys by the senate in 201 B.C., if the king was looking for war, he could have it whenever he wished. Sulpicius tried to exploit the situation by failing to convey in his question a formal declaration of war to Philip himself, and by not giving him a chance to satisfy the conditions. The impression is that the Romans started to understand that the overseas fetials’ procedure would have taken too long to be accomplished, giving the enemy the chance to ready itself for war.

In 191 B.C., two more questions were addressed to the fetials. The first one is exactly the same as had already been put in 200 B.C. about the War with Philip, but this time in respect of Antiochus. The second was whether a separate war declaration had to be delivered to the Aetolians as well. The fetials themselves confessed their irrelevance in the procedure to international affairs, giving the consul the same response given in 191 B.C. with regard to Antiochus III and remarking as they had nine years previously: that it made no difference whether the declaration was delivered to him (Antiochus) in person or

---

1096 The fetials did not commit themselves, perhaps because they did not either to sanction or to condemn the senate’s action in sending out ambassadors without the authority of the people or maybe they were split on the issue. Briscoe 1973:77.
1097 Liv. 31.8.3.
1099 Liv. 30.26.4 and 42.10. The envoys sent to Philip ad res repetendas in 203 B.C. (ibid. 26.3) are those of Greek cities attacked by the king. Bickerman 1945:138.
1100 Liv. 31.8.3; 36.3.7. 9. Errington 1989:257-61; Ferrary 1995:423, n. 46. Warrior (2006:50-1) unnecessarily supposes that a separate embassy was sent direct to Macedonia to present a rerum repetitio. See also Rich 1976:82-7; 107-9, 226; Rich 2011b:189.
1101 Liv. 31.8.3-4, 36.36.7-8.
to a military post. Might we then assume that this implies the war-declaration had to be delivered over the enemy’s borders? Perhaps we can try to understand the process of declaring war and the fact that the borders could have played a crucial role in the procedure. Rich draws an interesting hypothesis: the embassy’s meetings with Nicanor and Philip should be explained in terms not of the supposed fetial requirements for *rerum repetitio* and *indictio belli*, as many scholars have sought to do, but of the particular circumstances of their Aegean journey. We can go even further with this affirmation, considering the necessity of delivering the war declaration within the enemy’s borders. The Senate’s consultation with the fetials in 200 and 191 B.C. concerns the delivery of announcements to the enemy, rather than the spear rite. Thus the war declaration seems to maintain a link to the ancestral formula, as it shares the same function as the ancient spear-throwing act. In shifting the ritual of war from the enemy bordering areas to Rome – a ritual that may even have continued to be practised at Rome before some wars in the 3rd and 2nd centuries BC. – the important thing was that the act of crossing the bordering areas to declare war would have been more understandable to an enemy.

1102 Liv. 36.10.7-10: *Consul deinde M’. Acilius ex senatus consulto ad collegium fetialium rettulit, ipsine utique regi Antiocho indiceretur bellum, an satis esset ad praesidium aliquod eius nuntiari, et num Aetolis quoque separatim indici iubenter bellum, et num prius societas et amicitia eis renuntianda esset quam bellum indicendum. fetiales responderunt iam ante sese, cum de Philippo consulerentur, decrevisse nihil referre, ipsi coram and ad praesidium nuntiaretur; amicitiam renuntiatam videri, cum legatis totiens repetentibus res nec reddi nec satisfieri aequum consuissent* (The consul Acilius, in compliance with a resolution of the senate, submitted two questions to the College of Fetials. One was whether the declaration of war had to be made to Antiochus personally, or whether it would be sufficient to announce it at one of his frontier garrisons. The other was whether a separate declaration of war must be made to the Aetolians and whether in that case the league of amity and alliance must first be denounced. The Fetials replied that they had already on a previous occasion, when they were consulted in the case of Philip, decided that it was a matter of indifference whether the declaration were made personally or in one of his garrison towns. As to the league of amity, they held that it was obviously denounced, seeing that after the frequent demands put forward by our ambassadors the king had neither surrendered the towns nor given any satisfaction).


1104 McDonald & Walbank (1937:195-7) are not so explicit but highlight a mistake in the procedure.


1106 The term *bellum indicere* was used with such flexibility that it is conceivable that some wars were ‘declared’ both by an announcement to the enemy and by the performance of the spear rite at Rome: cf. Rich 1976:105-7.
Chapter 5. The finis of Ebro (Hiberus)

5.1 Introduction to the Treaties of the Ebro and Apamea

The Hiberus (modern Ebro) is a river flowing through the Iberian Peninsula that was chosen by the Carthaginians and Romans as a natural feature to define a basic agreement between them. A treaty was struck in the second half of the 3rd century B.C., known as the ‘Treaty of Ebro’ or ‘Hasdrubal’s treaty’, after the Carthaginian general who signed it. The main clause states that the river Ebro was chosen as finis – and should not be crossed with ‘a view to making war’ (ἐπὶ πολέμου). Yet the key controversy within the treaty comes from the apparent alliance between Rome and Saguntum, which lay well beyond the line of the River Ebro from the Roman perspective. Hannibal’s attack on Saguntum would be considered by the Romans as casus belli, although most non-Roman perspectives (ancient and modern) find it hard to understand the reasoning behind this.

Reading through Livy’s stories, one comes across numerous references to rivers and mountains, and although in a few cases Livy refers to them as fines, they are also cited when they are used in bordering practices and especially in interstate treaties. Two of them in particular – the Treaties of Ebro and Apamea, which are considered the closest parallel – represent respectively the casus belli and a treaty concluding a war. More specifically, in his detailed depiction of events, Livy emphasises the political value of reporting the key role the natural features played in Rome’s conflicts both with the Carthaginian and the Seleucid Empire. I will demonstrate by comparing the two treaties that

---

1107 Polyb. 2.13; 2.22; 3.15; 3.21; 3.27; 3.29; 3.30. Cf. Reid 1913:177.
1109 The comparisons between the two treaties must be taken with caution, because they were struck in two different contexts, as remarked on in the main text. Indeed, cf. the two passages of Livy in which he describes negotiations between Flamininus and Antiochus (34.58.2-3) and which contrast with the conditions imposed after Antiochus’s defeat (38.38.2-4).
Rome created a political system – a sort of ‘geo-political grid’ (my definition) – based on a series of territorial strips around herself in volatile areas.[7.5]

Indeed, the Romans’ negotiations have features in common even if they refer to two different moments before and after a conflict. The phenomenon of exerting a sort of command over the allies (Marseille and Pergamum) has been described using the modern expression ‘sphere of influence’.1110 Livy uses the term *imperium*, which is specifically intended to refer to a sort of extension of Rome’s power toward the Carthaginian possession in Spain and the Seleucid Empire in Asia, which radiated through the allotment of those territories to Massilia and Pergamum, respectively.1111

5.1.1 Aims and basis

The significance of the connection between the treaty and the river comes from their relationship with the concept of ‘*finis*’. The main aim of this chapter is the analysis of the concept of *finis* as ‘geopolitical feature’, as his account seems to provide new elements or features that could be appended to the definition of *finis*. The chapter is mainly based on two perspectives outside that of the Roman: the Greek and the Carthaginian. Polybius' and Hannibal's views of the ‘geopolitical features’ represent two prominent, similar conceptions; they roughly contrast Livy, helping to highlight the differences. The stages of my argument are based on diverse areas of investigation, which include: a) a basic background to the treaty; b) the reasons why the treaty was struck and the River Ebro was chosen; c) terms and clauses of the treaty; d) the involvement of other nations; e) an analysis of the Livian text and comparison with Polybius; f) the diplomatic connections between the treaty and the Second Punic War; g) the question of Saguntum; and h) the geographical issues linked with the positioning of the Ebro and Saguntum.

1111 Polyb. 18.47.2, 50.8-9; Liv. 33.34.4, 39.7. In each case the Romans took the view that if the other party advanced beyond a certain point it would constitute a direct threat to themselves. However, while Hasdrubal was prepared to undertake not to cross the Ebro, Antiochus was not willing to keep out of Europe. Rich 2011a:23.
5.1.2 Premises

Livy outlines the terms of the Ebro treaty in two main passages: A) just before and B) just after the Second Punic War:

A) In the first instance, Livy tells us of the events leading up to the Second Punic War. As background to the war, Livy states the conditions of the treaty, contextualising and highlighting the figure of Hasdrubal:

...quia mirae artis in sollicitandis gentibus imperio que suo iungendis fuerat, foedus renovaverat populus Romanus, ut finis utriusque imperii esset amnis Hiberus Saguntinis que mediis inter imperia duorum populorum libertas servaretur.¹¹¹²

...who showed marvellous skills in tempting the native tribes to join his empire, the Roman People had renewed their covenant, with the stipulation that neither side should extend its dominion beyond the Ebro, while the Saguntines, situated between the empires of the two peoples, should be preserved in independence.

B) Livy also records the same treaty in the context of the Spanish campaigns to pacify the Iberian Peninsula after the Second Punic War (197-85 B.C.). Iberians and Romans had alternating fortunes in the war: the proconsul Sempronius Tuditanus was killed and the praetor Minucius Thermus took revenge on the Hispanic chieftain Budar. In 185 B.C., the Senate sent Marcus Porcius Cato as consul with a significantly larger force to take command of the situation. The theatre of events was the Phocean colony of Emporion (modern Ampurias), where both the enemy and Cato set up their camps. The area chosen for the fort was a flat, plain ‘key zone’ between the Pyrenees and the Ebro. Cato’s camp was under siege due to overwhelming, continuous attacks by the Iberians. So Cato started a march against the enemy camp, after reassuring his remaining Celtiberian allies of their protection. Before the attack, the consul’s speech to his troops pointed out the key role of the river Ebro, highlighting its importance and the treaty which included it:

“...patres nostri, cum in Hispania Carthaginiensium et imperatores et exercitus essent, ipsi nullum in ea militem haberent, tamen addi hoc in foedere voluerunt, ut imperii sui Hiberus fluvius esset finis; nunc cum duo praetores, cum consul, cum tres exercitus Romani Hispaniam obtineant, Carthaginiensium decem iam prope annis nemo in his provinciis sit, imperium nobis citra Hiberum amissum est”.¹¹¹³

¹¹¹² Liv. 21.2.7.
¹¹¹³ Liv. 34.13.7-08.
“Our fathers, at a time when the Carthaginians had in Spain both commanders and armies, and had themselves neither commander nor soldiers there, nevertheless insisted on its being an article of treaty, that the river Ebro should be the boundary of their empire. Now, when two praetors of the Romans, when a consul, and three armies are employed in Spain, and, for near ten years past, no Carthaginian has been in either of its provinces, yet we have lost that empire on the hither side of the Ebro.”

The main points to be drawn from both passages are: a1) Livy points out the Carthaginian expansion in the Iberian Peninsula, when Hasdrubal invited the Hiberian peoples to join the Carthaginian Empire (*imperio que suo iungendis*); a2) Livy specifies that the treaty was renewed (*foedus renovaverat populus Romanus*) – which shows that there was an older treaty before the famous Ebro treaty; a3) Livy provides the basic terms of the treaty in which “neither side should extend its dominion beyond the Ebro” (“*ut finis utriusque imperii esset amnis Hiberus*”); and a4) “the Saguntines, situated between the Carthaginian and Roman *imperia*, should be preserved in independence” (“*Saguntinis que mediis inter imperia duorum populorum libertas servaretur*”); b1) Livy one more time links the River with the notion of *imperium* – which is crucial for our discussion – and this concept is even stronger in the second passage (B), when Livy admits that his kinsmen “had not a single soldier” (“*ipsi nullum in ea militem haberent*”), a detail that emphasises one of the features of *imperium*; b2) the concept of the Ebro having two sides (*citra*) is again stated by Livy as a main feature of the *finis*;[2.7; 2.3.E] b3) once again Livy draws attention to the main clause of the treaty (*tamen addi hoc in foedere voluerunt*), that the River Ebro was the bordering area for both their dominions (“*imperii sui Hiberus fluvius esset finis*”).

5.2 The Ebro treaty

The importance of analysing the Ebro as superimposed to a bordering concept is linked with investigations in three main areas. a) The question of Saguntum: a1) the position and the value of Saguntum from the Roman’s warlike perspective; a2) the Carthaginian and Polybian perspective on

---

1114 Cf. Liv. 24.6.7, where the river Himera is the divider between Carthaginians’ and Syracuse’s *imperia*. 
Saguntum. b) The specification of finis, real or nominal (Carthaginian occupation vs. Roman ‘imperium’): b1) the practical value of the river as a material barrier; b2) the theoretical value of the river Ebro as an element which also shapes the concept of imperium. c) The choice of limits, especially in treaties, and how they work: c1) their specific position (just after the Pyrenees from the Roman point of view or just before the Pyrenees from Hiberian/Punic point of view); c2) why the Romans gave preference to the river Ebro rather than the mountain belt of the Pyrenees as finis. The answers to these questions will not follow this order, but rather will be answered throughout the whole chapter.

5.2.1 Polybius and Livy

Several scholars have tried to address the controversies surrounding the Ebro treaty, using Polybius rather than Livy as a starting point.\textsuperscript{1115} If we were to consider only Livy’s angle, the treaty would appear linear, logical and easy to understand. Moreover, Livy provides complete and detailed explanations, which scholars consider to have been taken from Polybius and are expressed by Roman speakers in the rhetorical debates. Thus, Polybius is necessarily considered to be the first and most complete source. He purports to be an expert in international treaties, given the importance that he places on them (despite the fact that he is careless in reporting details) and, moreover, he is closer to the events and is thus assumed to be more reliable than Livy. Unfortunately, Polybius makes some statements which are problematic. His evidence does not to match with that of Livy and – in several instances – he is even imprecise or inaccurate: for instance, he neglects or ignores the contextual place and date in which the treaty was concluded.\textsuperscript{1116}

\textsuperscript{1115} See e.g. Carcopino (1953a; 1960); Scullard 1935:194; Oertel 1932:225.
\textsuperscript{1116} Reid 1913:177.
5.2.2 When and why did Rome strike the treaty

One example of the problems with Polybius’ narrative comes very early in his account when he stresses that, before the agreement was made, the Roman government had neglected affairs in Spain. In the same passage, he states that Rome awoke after it had ‘gone to sleep’ and so it began to “run on an opposite tack”.\footnote{Polyb. 2.13. Cf. Reid 1913:177.} A passage of Cassius Dio seems to contradict Polybius’ statement, however. According to the imperial author, in 231 B.C. a commission was sent from Rome to Spain to inquire into the situation in the peninsula,\footnote{Cass. Dio fragm. 48a; Dio’s version seems to have followed the annalists too; but his epitomiser Zonaras 8.21 preserves only the clause about Saguntum. Cf. also Liv. Per. 20; Oros. 4.12.} although, due to the lateness of Cassius Dio and its uniqueness, this passage has been considered improbable by Reid.\footnote{Reid 1913:177.} At that time, the Carthaginian domain apparently did not extend so far: the real extension of the Punic provinces in Spain did not go beyond the old \textit{de facto} boundary of Mastia / Sexi (modern Almuñécar).\footnote{Sumner 1968:220.} In 229 B.C., Hamilcar Barca died and his son-in-law, Hasdrubal, took his place, following a Punic “…peaceful expansion rather than conquest”.\footnote{Diod. Sic. 21.1; cf. Liv. 21.2.} Hasdrubal’s successes were due more to a brilliant talent for diplomacy than to feats of arms and this ‘silent’ policy was probably not a cause for concern to the Romans, who paid little attention to this ‘silent’ expansion.\footnote{Polyb. 2.36.} Polybius and Livy agree on the Carthaginian chief’s expertise; Livy stresses Hasdrubal’s incredible skills (\textit{mirae artis}) in convincing (\textit{sollicitandis}) the Hiberian people to join the Carthaginian Empire (\textit{imperio que suo iungendis}).\footnote{Liv. 21.2.7.} This point in fact underlines a possible admiration toward him, presenting him as an excellent man and reliable in striking the treaty. If we attempt to reconstruct Polybius’ version of the events, Rome’s envoys dealt directly with Hasdrubal and not with Carthage herself, presumably entering the treaty – or at least an arrangement – and meeting him at his new capital, Carthago Nova in
226/5 B.C. Historians tend to assign the date of 226 B.C. or early 225 B.C. to the treaty merely because Polybius relates it to the Gallic threat, and not because he clearly states a date. The outcome of this situation, as Polybius reports it, was a treaty between the Romans and Hasdrubal, which affected the relations of the Romans and Carthaginians in Spain.

Polybius states a crucial clause for understanding the nature of the treaty: the Carthaginians should not undertake to cross the Ebro 'with arms'. Apparently this was the only clause that forbade the Carthaginians to cross the river in arms and thus limited their military position to the region south of the Ebro. On the other hand, the treaty might have excluded the Carthaginians from commercial activity to the same extent as it did military and political activity in Italy. After all, 'with a view to making war' presumes that the Carthaginians could have access to their mercantile interests on the north side of the river. The principle of moving armed forces with warlike intentions was probably applied to both parties – as reported also by Appian, who probably followed Polybius. Despite the fact that it is clear none of the contracting

---

1124 Reid 1913:177; Sumner 1968:228.
1128 Polyb. 11.30.3. Cary 1919:74.
1129 The unilateral character of the agreement is clearly explained by Bickerman 1952:18-9; cf. Hoffmann 1957:12-3 (citing Bender 1956), Hoffmann 1957:32-3; Badian 1958:500 n. 2, 293. Others were misled by the concept of a treaty and argue that the Romans must have undertaken a corresponding obligation, thus following the annalistic tradition against Polybius: most recently Heichelheim 1955:213-5; Walbank 1979:169 and comm. on 2.13.7; Dorey 1960:3-5; Cassola 1968:247-8. See Sumner 1968:219-20, n. 41.
1130 In Appian (App. Hisp. 6-7; cf. Hann. 2), the small coastal towns of Spain (led by Saguntum) explicitly warn the Roman Senate of the growth of Punic power, and this is the origin of the Ebro treaty. The problem is that in these passages Appian also has the Ebro River flowing through central Spain into the Atlantic (whereas the real Ebro flows through northern Spain into the Mediterranean); he has Hasdrubal having pushed his domains as far as the Ebro (when he had just gotten to the New Carthage region hundreds of km to the South); he has Saguntum located north of the Ebro, and specifically near Emporium (when it is far south of the river and 300 km/200 mi south of Emporium); he has Saguntum as a Greek city, when it was not; he has Saguntum as the leader in this Greek effort to protect themselves, when the subsequent treaty did not formally protect Saguntum; he has the Ebro treaty sworn sometimes with Hasdrubal (Hisp. 7) but sometimes with his predecessor Hamilcar (Hann. 2: untrue); he has the Ebro treaty ratified by the Carthaginian Senate (when, as Polyb. 2.21 and Liv. 21.2 show, one of the issues in 218 was that the Carthaginian Senate had never ratified it); later he has Hannibal crossing the Ebro to attack Saguntum; and finally, he has Hannibal, having destroyed Saguntum, founding New Carthage on the site (Hisp. 12; Hann. 3). When so much here is so wrong, it is
Chapter 5. The finis of Ebro (Hiberus)

parties were permitted to interfere in the governmental area of the other, some scholars are still convinced about the one-sidedness of the Carthaginian obligations. Erdkamp claims that the result was a half-hearted understanding (not a real treaty) between two disinterested parties. Reid rejected Mommsen’s hypothesis that Rome ‘interdicted’ Hasdrubal to cross the Ebro. The key point for this study is Polybius’ indifference to the implicit abandonment by the Romans of all Spain to the south of the Ebro as they had no interest there.

This treaty allowed Carthage to obtain the freedom to extend, without offence, her dominance over a very wide territory in which she had not yet acquired influence. Hasdrubal did not mind since, after all, his troops were still far from this river and he was now free to deal with the recently subdued Spanish tribes. Once again, Polybius’ knowledge about the circumstances surrounding the agreement is imprecise. While he presents surprising and puzzling aspects of the Hasdrubal agreement, mostly when compared to Livy’s text, he neglects another key aspect which is crucial. Livy presents the agreement with Hasdrubal as a formal renewal (foedus renouauerat) of an unspecified treaty before 241 B.C. with the clause regarding Saguntum. On the Roman side, the decisive factors were to limit both the Punic expansion and Rome’s interests

dangerous method to pick out one bit of information from the middle of everything that is false—namely, the Greek pleas — and then claim it is the key to Roman-Carthaginian relations. Cf. Bender 1997:94-5, n. 17: “Besonders aufschlussreich”; Eckstein 2012a:224.

Polyb. 3.27.3. Bringmann 2001:370 with n.7. Erdkamp 2009:505 Reid 1913:177. Salmon 1960:134. Reid 1913:178. Liv. 21.2.7. Liv. 11.2; cf. 34.3. The hypothesis that the treaty is not the same of Lutatius of 241 B.C. had been expressed already by Cary 1919. However, Sumner (1968:219-20, n. 41) considers spurious the statement that the agreement was a renewal of the treaty, grounding his theory on Täubler’s phrase (1935:95) “erneuert konnte dieser Vertrag nicht mit Hasdrubal, sondern nur mit dem karthagischen Senate werden”. It is indeed refuted by Livy himself (21.19.3): “in Lutati foedere diserte additum esset ita id ratum fore si populus censuisset, in Hasdrubalis foedere nec exceptum tale quiicumque fuerit”, where he follows Polyb. 3.29.2-3: “πρῶτον μὲν ὅτι τὰς πρὸς Ἀσδρούβαν γενομένας ὁμολογίας οὐκ ἀθετητέον, καθάπερ οἱ Καρχηδόνιοι λέγειν ἐθάρρουν: οὐ γὰρ προσέκειτο, καθάπερ ἐπὶ τοῦ Λυτατίου, "κυρίας εἶναι ταύτας, ἐὰν καὶ τῷ δῆμῳ δόξῃ τῶν Ῥωμαίων:" Αὐτοτελῶς ἐποιήσατο τὸν Ἀσδρούβας, ἐν αὕτη ἦν, “τὸν Ἴβηρα ποταμὸν μὴ δια” However, the statement could not be made in this form if the Hasdrubal agreement contained a provision for ratification by the Populus Romanus. Since Rome was undertaking nothing, there was no reason for the Roman people to ratify it.
along with that of her allies. The relationship with the allies is a key point in the treaty: both parties had to leave unmolested each other’s allies and they could not forbid any contact with allies old or new.\(^{1139}\) The Romans underestimated and delayed their intervention in Spain because of Hasdrubal’s cautious and peaceful policy of expansion and the prospect of a great Gallic war in North Italy, two factors which can be considered as the main reasons Rome struck the treaty.

The first assumption made by many scholars regarding the reason for the Ebro treaty is that Rome concluded the treaty in order to prevent Carthaginian troops from joining the Gallic attack on Italy.\(^{1140}\) In his chapters on the Gallic invasion of 225 B.C., Polybius broadens his vision toward a global history. He connects the treaty with the affairs of Italy, Spain and Greece and amazingly foreshadows the interdependence of Mediterranean matters. Polybius imposed this linkage as part of a conceptual framework that stressed the growing interconnectedness, starting either in 225 B.C. or 217 B.C., between previously separate Mediterranean regions. Polybius terms this particular historical situation as \textit{symplokê}.\(^{1141}\) He asserts that it constitutes, along with the growth of Roman power, the major development of his age. Rome’s anxieties about a looming Gallic invasion led to Rome’s policy toward the Carthaginians in Spain,
probably pushing Rome herself to conclude a treaty with Hasdrubal.\textsuperscript{1142} He makes this connection between the treaty and the imminent Gallic invasion twice: the first mention appears in Polybius’ section on the Gauls and their invasion of 225 B.C.,\textsuperscript{1143} while the second reference is made forcefully earlier in the same book, confirming that ‘Romans’ hands were tied because of the Gauls. Polybius implies that, once the treaty was concluded, the invasion took place in 225 B.C.; thus the treaty has usually been dated to 226 or early 225 B.C.\textsuperscript{1144}

A second theory states that the final aim of their negotiation would have been the determination of a certain river-line as the boundary for Punic military advance. Against the contention of Unger\textsuperscript{1145} – that the Roman conquest of the whole of Italy would need to have been completed before Rome could presume to put Italy out of bounds – Rome cited the treaty as an attempt to confine Carthaginian dominion to the south of the Ebro. After having recounted the Illyrian War, Polybius explains the Spanish context for the treaty. In 231 B.C., Rome had already sent an embassy to Hamilcar, the commander of the Carthaginian territories in Spain, demanding that he avow his intentions.\textsuperscript{1146} In winter 229/8 B.C., Hasdrubal succeeded Hamilcar in his position, making great progress in strengthening the Carthaginian position, not least by founding

\textsuperscript{1142} See Polyb. 2.13.3-7 (cf. with 2.22): “The Romans, seeing that Hasdrubal was in a fair way to create a larger and more formidable empire than Carthage formerly possessed, resolved to begin to occupy themselves with Spanish affairs. Finding that they had hitherto been asleep and had allowed Carthage to build up a powerful dominion, they tried, as far as possible, to make up for lost time. For the present they did not venture to impose orders on Carthage, or to go to war with her, because the threat of a Celtic invasion was hanging over them, the attack being indeed expected from day to day. They decided, then, to mollify and conciliate Hasdrubal in the first place, and then to attack the Celts and decide the issue by arms, for they thought that as long as they had these Celts threatening their frontier, not only would they never be master of Italy, but they would not even be safe in Rome itself. Accordingly, after having sent envoys to Hasdrubal and made a treaty, in which no mention was made of the rest of Spain, but the Carthaginians engaged not to cross the Ebro in arms, they at once entered on the struggle against the Italian Celts”. Cf. Erdkamp 2009:495-6; 503-4.

\textsuperscript{1143} Polyb. 2.22.

\textsuperscript{1144} Polyb. 2.13. Other sources for the treaty: Schmitt 1969: no. 503; Scardigli 1911:249-53. The treaty was negotiated and sworn sometime between 228 and the spring of 225 B.C.; the date is uncertain, although Polybius indicates it was before the Transalpine Gauls crossed the Alps in 225 B.C. to join the Po Valley tribes (Polyb. 2.22-3). For Walbank (1957:168, 196), the treaty was concluded in summer 228/spring 225 B.C., but we simply conjecture on it: see e.g. Rich 1996a:23, who suggests instead the date of 228 B.C.). Cf. Rich 2011a:2

\textsuperscript{1145} Unger 1878:203.

\textsuperscript{1146} Cass. Dio Cassius (Zonar. 8.18-21).
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Carthago Nova. Polybius confirms that Rome dealt directly with him, and her involvement in Spain’s affairs came when they became fully aware of the emerging Punic threat in Spain.\textsuperscript{1147} For the purpose of my work, I agree with Frank, who believed that at this time Rome was needlessly afraid, that the real danger came later, in Hannibal’s strategy.\textsuperscript{1148} Were the Romans in 226 B.C. already able to assume that the Carthaginians would not make common cause with the Gauls? In limiting Carthage’s power to the Ebro, they were reacting to what they rightly conceived to be a genuine threat.\textsuperscript{1149}

Although some authors have readily dismissed this theory, since this is not what Polybius says, there is a reasonable plausibility in the assumption that the Romans were already considering the possibility of a Carthaginian invasion of Italy by the northern route.\textsuperscript{1150} We have to bear in mind the clauses of the agreement, which was established as the northern limit to Punic military activity in Spain at the Ebro River, with the Carthaginians forbidden to cross the river Ebro for war.\textsuperscript{1151} Mainly, the ‘line’ of the River Ebro accomplished her primary purpose of preventing Carthaginian aid to the Gauls.\textsuperscript{1152} However, recently Erdkamp has argued against this last statement, as “the Ebro treaty does not make sense, if it was merely intended to avoid hostilities with the Barcids while the Gallic invasion hung over their heads”.\textsuperscript{1153} In some way, the Roman strategy achieved its proper aim. Fixing an agreed demarcation line would have disappointed the Barcids, as Bender remarks.\textsuperscript{1154} Hoyos also notices that the Ebro treaty solved little,\textsuperscript{1155} but if Hasdrubal had been left alone and free to act

\textsuperscript{1147} Polybius (2.2-12 and 2.13.2-3) shows the lack of Roman attention to the Carthaginians’ previous expansion in Spain that seems to Polybius to be surprising. Nor does Polybius attribute the Ebro treaty solely to events in Italy; Hasdrubal’s successes in Spain itself, and especially the founding of New Carthage as a permanent capital, are crucial events that lead the Senate to act (Liv. 2.13.1-2.). Thus we need not accept that Polybius, in eager pursuit of symploky, imposed a simplistic connection between events in Italy and the Ebro treaty.

\textsuperscript{1148} Frank 1928.

\textsuperscript{1149} Altheim (1935:50-51) and Nap (1935:54-5) seem to be correct in assuming that the Romans believed that the time was ripe for checking the Carthaginian advance. Kramer 1948:15-6 n. 54

\textsuperscript{1150} Thus, Rich 1996a:22 and Bender 1997:89.

\textsuperscript{1151} Polyb. 2.13 and 2.22.9-11.

\textsuperscript{1152} Kramer 1948:18.

\textsuperscript{1153} Erdkamp 2009:504

\textsuperscript{1154} Bender 1997:89.

\textsuperscript{1155} Bender 1997:89: The Romans “besanftigen den karthagischen Feldherrn nicht, wie Polybius sich ausdrückt, sondern bedrangten ihn”; similar, Hoyos 2003:81.
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in the Iberian Peninsula, the Romans would not have had any control over the developing improvements made by the Carthaginians.\footnote{1156}

Whether Polybius' information is a personal assumption or a statement of fact is impossible to confirm. Nevertheless, it is quite clear that, as soon as the pacification of Northern Italy and particularly the stabilisation of the Po region were assured, the Romans intervened again in Spain. Another plausible explanation comes from Errington, who argued instead that the Romans were not interested at all in the Barcids or in Spain and that Polybius surely meant that Rome wanted to avoid any sort of confrontation on two fronts, with Carthage and Gauls at the same time.\footnote{1157}

5.3 Finis and imperium

The true novelty in this agreement is shown in the shift from sea to land rivalry. The previous document between Carthage and Rome of 348 B.C. put limits on navigation, while the second regulated the advance by land in terms that sound suspiciously like appeasement.\footnote{1158} Van Nostrand considers the relationships between Rome and Carthage to have produced massive changes in Rome's military history and chiefly affected her foreign policy.\footnote{1159} The main problems with the treaty are linked to Rome's non-occupation of a single area in Spain and to her alliance with Saguntum – as Livy remarks. Livy has been almost ignored by scholars, however, because there is no answer to the following question: How is it possible that Rome claimed the possession or control of the left bank of the Ebro if her empire did not even reach the North of Italy at that time?

\footnote{1156} The Romans no doubt knew about Hamilcar's expansion. Not only did they keep trading with Spanish ports as well as north African, they were allied with Massilia, which had its own wide-ranging trading network. Even if their embassy to Hamilcar had taken place, it would have been the only recorded official contact between the two powers after 237 and before 225 B.C. Cf. Hoyos 2003:61.
\footnote{1158} DeWitt 1940:612.
\footnote{1159} Van Nostrand 1918:4.
The treaty was made with reference to land which was non-Roman. Rome was negotiating a treaty intended to define the northern limit of Carthaginian expansion, yet this was long before a single one of her soldier’s occupied a square inch of Spanish territory, as Livy has Cato say. The Ebro River was not near Roman territory; not even near the territory of her ally Massilia. The treaty, therefore, was an extension of Rome’s authority beyond any limit of authority she had achieved before that time. A possible answer might lie in the conception of ‘imperium’, which translators and scholars keep translating as ‘empire’. Modern authors have avoided using the original term imperium and prefer instead to forge a more modern expression, ‘sphere of influence’, which involves all the sides of the relationships amongst Carthaginians, Iberians, Romans and Massiliotes. [FIG 26] To simplify, the fact that the treaty set up three ‘spheres of influence’ north of the Ebro is beside the point to be made here – namely, that the treaty did insist upon the right of Rome to interfere with the plans of a foreign state when those plans were displeasing to her. The ‘imperium’, instead, is a sort of propagation of her political power, possibly without any direct material control of the area.

The algebraic equation of the final geo-political agreement is as follows: on the one hand, the Romans agreed to recognise all Spain south of the River Ebro as a Carthaginian ‘sphere of influence’ and, on the other hand, they conveyed the impression of having effectively put a limit on Carthaginian expansion. The treaty left the Carthaginians free to consolidate or extend their power in Spain, leaving the Romans sufficiently assured of preventing the

---

1160 Cary 1919:75.
1161 Looking at the fanciful notion about the ‘two empires’, Reid (1913:187) connected this conception with the bold development of the idea of “Poeni foedifragi” (Cic. Off. 1, 38). He speculated on the fact that Livy here followed a very late writer, probably Cato’s Origines, where the Carthaginians were regarded as inveterate treaty-breakers. He noted that they violated treaty obligations for the sixth time when they brought on the Second Punic war (Nonius:100).
1162 On this concept: See infra Kramer (1948:3, n.9) and Frank’s (1917:125, n.38) and Badian (1958:76-9) for the previous positions. For a more recent approach: Barceló 1988; Wagner 1989; Brunt 1990:300 (170).
1164 Based on the classical example of equation; $x : y = w : z \sim \text{Carthage} : [\text{Africa + Spain}] = \text{Rome} : [\text{Gaul (Massilia) + Spain}]$.
1165 Täubler 1921:68.
Barcids from completing the conquest of Spain north of the Ebro. Rome seemed to be aware of the danger she could face, as she was guarding against not just a short-term risk of Carthaginian participation in the imminent Gallic invasion, but the longer-term dangers which might arise if Carthaginian expansion were allowed to continue northwards without being checked – which is what happened. Contrary to Täubner, it was also a way for the Romans to curb the Carthaginian ‘sphere of influence’ without getting involved directly in war operations far from them. It might almost be said that the Romans were seeking to appease the Carthaginians: Polybius confirms this theory: that the Romans ‘stroked and soothed’ Hasdrubal. As they were not eager to back up their diplomacy with arms, the most they could achieve was this treaty, which in effect granted the Carthaginians an absolutely free hand in virtually all the Iberian peninsula. In return, the Carthaginians gave nothing except a promise – which could be repudiated whenever it suited their interests to do so – not to go still further North. In this way, the Ebro River would have been intended to define Carthaginian and Roman ‘spheres of influence’ or, as I would say, ‘imperia’.

### 5.3.1 Massilia

In the signature of the treaty, the silent involvement of Massilia – the long-standing and loyal ally of Rome – seems evident. The connection of the Phocean colony with the Ebro treaty is important when considering: a) the clause within Polybius’ account “not to cross the Ebro for war”; and b) Massilia as an extension of the Roman influence. A formal alliance between Massilia and Rome could have been concluded in the years before the Second Punic War,
as some scholars suppose, but – in view of the silence of our sources on such a development – it is perhaps more likely that it was concluded even earlier.\textsuperscript{1173}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{Fig28}
\caption{Between 226 and 221 B.C., Hasdrubal advanced his influence toward the banks of the Ebro, but revealed no interest in military expansion over the river – a theory put forward by Bender,\textsuperscript{1174} who launches a strong attack on the Polybian connection between the treaty and the Gallic invasion and who also regards the looting Gauls as prompting an attack.\textsuperscript{1175} Furthermore, it is important to bear in mind that in 231 B.C. Hamilcar Barca consolidated his territorial conquests, founding the outpost-cities of Carthago Nova (modern Cartagena) and Arka Leuke (\textit{?} modern Alicante) at strategic locations.\textsuperscript{1176} Those Punic developments would possibly have taken over the area of the Phocean/Massilian colonies near the mouth of the River Sucro (modern Júcar). Although no ancient source mentions their involvements in the treaty and in the preliminaries of the war, modern scholars have speculated that Massilia – alarmed by the Carthaginian expansion towards her ‘sphere of influence’\textsuperscript{1177} –

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{1173} For the early contacts: Justin 43.5; Diodorus Siculus 14.93.4; Appian \textit{Ital.} 8. Massilian naval assistance in 217 B.C.: Polyb. 3.95.6-7; Liv. 22.19.5; Sosylus, \textit{FGH} 176 F 1. The formal alliance (in existence by 196: Syl. 591 = \textit{Inscr. v. Lampsakos} 4.
\item \textsuperscript{1174} Bender 1997:96-7.
\item \textsuperscript{1175} In several recent articles, scholars have taken to arguing that the account of Roman relations with the Gallic peoples of the Po Valley in the 230s and 220s B.C. given by Polybius in Book 2 of his Histories is fundamentally false (Rich 1996a:23; Bender 1997:91-4; Twyman 1997; Rosenberger 2003; Erdkamp 2008:139; Erdkamp 2009:507-8 and chiefly: Eckstein 2012b:206). Polybius was essentially a conduit for false Roman propaganda deriving from the Roman writer Fabius Pictor. In this new vision, therefore, the Romans did not spend the late 230s and early 220s paralysed by great anxiety about a Gallic invasion of central Italy, but instead pursued an active policy toward the outside world; if they engaged in preparations for war, it was war against Carthage; when a Gallic invasion of central Italy actually came, in 225, it came as a surprise. The Ebro treaty between Rome and Hasdrubal in Spain, which Polybius says was concluded by Rome because of the looming Gallic threat and which set a northern limit to Carthaginian military operations at the Ebro River, was in fact not struck in the context of a prolonged Gallic crisis, and perhaps the treaty had nothing to do with the Gauls at all.
\item \textsuperscript{1176} Diod. 25.10.3; Liv. 24.41.3-4. Livy reports the place of Castrum Album which recalls Akra Leuce (the site described by Diodorus). It would have had the function of guarding from its top the Punic holdings. It does not suggest that a Greek colony or trading-station already stood there. Cf. Hoyos 2003:64.
\item \textsuperscript{1177} True, Massilia in Gaul had founded three very small colonies on Spain’s east coast, but Strabo the geographer, who tells us so, also implies that they lay between Cape de la Nao and the river Sucro, today’s Júcar. That zone lay well North of any district Hamilcar can have reached. Strabo (3.4.6) mentions the three Massiliot ‘little towns’ (μηλχένα) in the present tense (‘εστίν), which itself rules out Acra Leuce, a ‘very large city’ and a Punic one from Hamilcar’s day, being one of them. He cites them ‘not far from’ the Sucro river (modern Júcar) and names one: \textit{Hemeroscopeion}, the Roman \textit{Dianium}, which apparently was at modern Denia by Cape de la Nao, 36 miles/60 kilometres south of the Sucro (Rouillard 1982:427). Stephanus lists an
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
expressed her concern, pushing the Romans to send an embassy for an agreement. In Polybius’ picture, Massilia would have prodded Rome’s interest, ‘wakening the Senate’ from its apathy by exploiting the impending Gallic invasion and pointing to the danger of a coalition with Hasdrubal. In the Ebro treaty, Rome’s signature counted, although it was undoubtedly a multi-lateral document like that of 509-8 B.C. The grounds of a strong tri-lateral agreement and the fact that Massilia was undoubtedly a signatory of the treaty seem evident from the following: a) the treaty of 348 B.C. shows Carthaginian control extending only as far as Cape Palos; b) the Ebro treaty saved Massilia at least two of her trading posts in Spain, Emporia and Rhode; c) Massilia offered material assistance lent by the Phocean colony to Saguntum during the siege and her navy drove the Carthaginians out of the sea, thus forcing Hannibal to rely on the uncertain land route across the Alps.

This diplomatic move allowed the Massaliots to protect the strip along the coast as far as Cape de la Nao, which included the routes to Spain and a ‘chain’ of small colonies. The involvement of Massilia and her colonies might conceivably have served for Rome as a _cordon sanitaire_ against the Punic

Alonis (s.) as a ‘Massiliot city’, and other evidence places this near Alicante (Mela 2.93; Itin. Rav. 304), but it does not count very obviously as one of Strabo’s three. If all three were near to or south of Cape de la Nao, Strabo’s phrase loses all meaning; why not describe them instead as ‘not far from’ the cape? cf. Hoyos 2003:226, n.12. Frank 1917:70. On Massilian relations with Rome see e.g. Kramer 1948; Badian 1958:47-48; Dahlheim 1968:138-41; Ebel 1976:5-25. Polyb. 3.22-24. DeWitt 1940:608. Frank 1917:70. DeWitt 1940:612. From the regions to the north of the Ebro, we have similarly significant contemporary silver coins of the Greek polis Emporiae (Hill 1931:18-9, pl. I, 23, 24). The style of these issues of Emporiae points, in my opinion, clearly to a later date than Hill suggested, as they have the well-known standing horse of Carthage on their rev. This political symbol, of the standing horse in a region which is not very suitable for horsebreeding, makes it evident that Emporiae to the north of the Ebro had a treaty with Carthage comparable to that between Saguntum and Rome. The Romans were obviously in full agreement with the general provisions of the Ebro treaty when they concluded their alliance with Saguntum after 226 B.C. See Heichelheim 1955:214-5. Wilcken 1906. However, cf. Liv. 22.19-20; Polyb. 3.95. Besides Emporion and Rhodes, backward she saved also: Agathe Tyche (Agde), Rhodanousia (Espeyran?) and Heracleia at the mouth of Rhone (Plin. _N.H._ 3.5.3). Cf. Tréziny 2002; Garcia-Verdin 2002:420.
menace from Spain, as indeed Strabo specifically remarks. Rome did not really care about losing sight of developments in Spain. By signing the treaty, Hasdrubal had recognised Rome as a power able to arbitrate in Spain and Massilia was satisfied. The agreement fully gratified Roman and Massilian intentions: the area south of the Cape de la Nao remained free of Carthaginian military penetration and the Ebro was the point beyond which no vengeful Barcid could go with an army without serving a long-term notice for advancing upon Rome.

5.4 Threat to Saguntum and the Roman embassies

This framework would also explain why Rome’s alliance with Saguntum south of the Ebro was not considered by any of the ancients as an infringement of the Ebro treaty, as it is sometimes held today. The Saguntian alliance seems apparently to be part of the Massilians’ general policy. Frank’s interpretation – that Massilia was involved in the treaty – also considers the fact that the definition of ‘spheres of influence’ between Rome and Carthage makes no sense, because Massilia was in direct contact with the Punic dominions in Spain. For the Romans, the treaty did not serve simply to draw a line which should not be crossed. Rather, it served to monitor the Carthaginian intentions. The last assumption became a reality when Hannibal opened his vigorous campaigns in 221 B.C. The Massilian colonies grew apprehensive and the Saguntines appealed repeatedly to Rome. Massilia was Rome’s partner in her Spanish policy and her link, to some extent, with Saguntum is provided by coin types chosen for the first Saguntine issue, which imitated a contemporary coin type of Massilia. The Carthaginian question became a live issue on the

---

1186 Strabo 4.1.5.
1188 Frank 1917:70.
1189 Frank 1917:71 ff.
1190 Polyb. 3.15.1.
1191 The head of a young river god on the contemporary Massiliote silver obols is imitated and modified on the obv., the wheel of the same issues of this city on the rev. of the earliest Saguntine coin (Hill 1931:112, 116; pl. XXI, 7 on a still unique coin. For examples of related
agenda of the consuls of 220 B.C., before Hannibal’s attack on the Spanish city,¹¹⁹² and the Romans dispatched an embassy to meet Hannibal in his winter quarters at New Carthage. According to Polybius, Rome warned him to refrain from attacking Saguntum, which was under Roman protection, and he was also asked to respect Hasdrubal’s obligation that the Carthaginians would not cross the Ebro in arms.¹¹⁹³ After receiving a noncommittal answer from Hannibal, the embassy went on to Carthage.¹¹⁹⁴

According to Polybius, when the Roman embassy presented the Senate’s ultimatum at Carthage in March 218 B.C.,¹¹⁹⁵ the Carthaginians declined to discuss the agreement made with Hasdrubal and repeatedly defended their refusal.¹¹⁹⁶ The position adopted by the Carthaginians undoubtedly implies that the Roman embassy had brought the agreement into the dispute. For Livy, the Carthaginian defence of their position is based on the fact that the Carthaginian Senate had not ratified that treaty. They brought as an example Lutatius’ treaty of 241 B.C., which Rome had claimed invalid at the time as it had not been ratified by the Roman Senate.¹¹⁹⁷ After their response, Rome’s envoys effectively declared war on Carthage, meaning that the Romans claimed Hannibal had violated the agreement. But, since at that time Hannibal had not yet crossed the Ebro, the “clear breach of the treaty” would have just been Hannibal’s attack on Saguntum.¹¹⁹⁸ In Polybius’ account of the proceedings, the ambassadors would have hinged the case upon Hannibal’s treatment of Saguntum and its indication of his generally aggressive behaviour.¹¹⁹⁹ Polybius then records what later Romans conceived would have been the ambassadors’

¹¹⁹³ The treaty, we are told, “passed over the rest of Spain in silence, but the Carthaginians engaged not to cross the river called the Iber to make war” (Polyb. 2.13.7). Reid 1913:182.
¹¹⁹⁵ About the discussion on the chronology of the outbreak of war, see Sumner 1966.
¹¹⁹⁷ Liv. 21.18.
¹¹⁹⁸ Rich 2011a:5.
¹¹⁹⁹ Polyb. 3.29.
reply if they had not preferred silent indignation. First of all, they would have insisted on the validity of the Ebro treaty, drawing attention to the clause that “the Carthaginians shall not cross the Ebro in arms”, and secondly they would have rejected the Carthaginian interpretation of the free status of Saguntum under the treaty of 241 B.C. It is possible that the reference to Hannibal’s crossing of the Ebro should be dismissed as a last reflection of a certain type of Roman apologia about the opening of the war, a possibility to which Polybius was open. That Polybius himself seems a little uncomfortable with this chronology might be suggested by his remark that the news of Hannibal’s crossing of the Ebro arrived at Rome “more quickly than expected” (θαττον ἃ προστεδόκων). However, from both Polybius’ and Livy’s narrative, it appears that Hannibal did not cross the Ebro until June 218 B.C., well after the Roman ultimatum had been presented and rejected. Hannibal would not have departed from New Carthage until he learnt what had transpired on the embassy’s visit to Carthage in early spring: the unsatisfactory course of the final negotiations with Rome. Yet this starkly contrasts with the Livian emphasis on the speed of Roman reaction to the fall of Saguntum. This difficulty has spawned much scholarly controversy and even Hannibal’s crossing of the

---

1200 The Romans were demanding some proof of Carthaginian good intentions, some demonstration that they did not harbour the ultimate aim of going beyond the Ebro and heading for Italy. All that the Carthaginians had to do to prove that Roman qualms were groundless was to keep their hands off Saguntum. For if the Carthaginians were to leave this capital of the Edetani, strategically placed along their lines of communication, independent, then their ulterior peaceful good intentions could be taken for granted. Cf. Salmon 1960:136.

1201 The reference to crossing the Ebro would obviously receive greater prominence in later views of what might have been said. But the fact that during the actual meeting at Carthage the Saguntine question bulked so large was not altogether to Rome’s disadvantage, since, whatever precisely was said at the time, later Roman annalists could claim with some justice that war had been declared by Rome for the sake of her wronged ally. See: Scullard 1952:212.

1202 Polyb. 3.40.2.

1203 Sumner 1966:14-15; cf. Pol. 3.15.5; 30.3; 4.28.1, where he places Saguntum north of the Ebro, a fact he knew to be incorrect, cf. Polyb. 3.14.9; 3.97.6; 3.98.6-7.

1204 Polyb. 3.40.2.

1205 His remark at 3.40.1 that these events happened while Hannibal was crossing the Pyrenees may be safely assumed to refer to the events recounted in 3.40, including the Gallic revolt. Cf. Sumner 1966:13-14. Eckstein 1983:265-6 and n. 30.

1206 Polyb. 3.34.6-35.2.

1207 An event equivalent to the arrival of the envoys back in Rome and placed by Polybius in late winter/early spring 218 B.C. Cf. Polyb. 3.34.6-7; 3.35.1.

1208 Liv. 3.20.6.

1209 For older views see De Sanctis 1907:3.1.429-30. Kolbe (1934:11-16) argued that the Ebro treaty included a clause guaranteeing safety to each side’s allies and so extended protection to Saguntum, whose connection with Rome he dates before the treaty. However, if there had been
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Ebro has been put in doubt as grounds for the Roman ultimatum, as all reference to it should have been eliminated from Polybius’ account, which instead turns upon the question of Saguntum. Another suggestion is that “the bare fact that the Carthaginians did not mention the treaty with Hasdrubal” is all that can be accepted as reliable in Polybius’ account.

A solution to this difficulty has been sought in the hypothesis that the embassy should be dated to June 218 B.C., allowing Hannibal to have actually crossed the Ebro at the time of the ultimatum; for some scholars, this chronology is impossible, however. The declaration of war is usually placed in late March or April (i.e. at the earliest date after the entry of the new consuls into office and the beginning of the campaigning season) because, according to Polybius, Rome was committed to war on behalf of Saguntum. The Roman embassy, which was doubtless sent off to Carthage without delay, could not denounce any fresh breach of the Ebro treaty, since this, although in their belief imminent, had not yet in fact occurred. However, it may indeed have been happening about this very time. Sixty years ago, this ancient tradition was strongly challenged, first by Hoffmann and then by Scullard, partly on chronological grounds. Hoffmann argued that it could not have been the fall of Saguntum (news of which had already arrived in Rome during the winter of 219/218 B.C.) which provoked the Roman ‘war embassy’ to Carthage. The

a provision in the treaty so much to Rome’s advantage, we would surely have heard of it, and in any case Polybius’ language implies that it was the ban on crossing the Ebro which was contravened; see further Bickerman 1936; Walbank 1979: comm. on 1.171.

The view that his attack on Saguntum was the crucial factor in the development of Roman policy was only advanced later by writers who sought to justify Rome’s conduct and her neglect of her ally Saguntum during 219 B.C. Hoffmann (1951:76-77) uses Polybius’ chronological coordination at 3.40.2 – the return of the ‘war embassy’ from Carthage, the news that Hannibal had crossed the Ebro, and the Roman preparations for immediate war – as evidence that war was, in fact, only declared in Julian June).


Hoffmann (1951:69-71 = 1957:15, n. 15) accepted by Walbank (1957 comm. on 3.20.6; cf. Liv. 21.1) and Heuss (1964:83, 549). Scullard (1952:209-11), proposes a modification: at the time of the ultimatum Hannibal had left New Carthage with his army, but had not yet crossed the Ebro; the Romans were concerned about a foreseeable imminent breach of the Ebro agreement. Vallejo (1952) discusses the two views critically but without definite conclusion.

Apart from the difficulty of constructing a reasonable chronology on this basis, the views of Hoffmann (1957) and Scullard (1952) founded on the fact that Hannibal knew of the Roman ultimatum before he departed from New Carthage (Polyb. 3.34.7-9).

Hoffmann 1951.

Scullard 1952.

Hoffmann 1951; Rich 2011a:11.
Romans continued to do nothing until they heard that Hannibal had crossed the Ebro. Rome decided on war (June, 218 B.C.) after Hannibal’s subsequent violation of the Ebro treaty by his crossing with a large army (end of May, 218 B.C.). In this way, the Roman ultimatum was delivered only after Hannibal had violated the treaty by actually crossing the Ebro (news of which arrived in Rome in June), causing the diplomatic crisis. Denouncing Hannibal, Rome would refer to his past crimes (Saguntum) as well as his latest one (the Ebro crossing). Thus his attack on Saguntum first gained importance when linked with the Ebro incident, i.e. when Roman politicians saw in it his first step against Rome.

If the return from Carthage and the news of Hannibal’s crossing tally, we might therefore think that the news came with the ambassadors themselves. The siege of Saguntum would have been just the forewarning; indeed, when the envoys came back they found Rome in a state of active concern “invenerunt satis constante fama iam Hiberum Poenos tramisisse” (“as they discovered by persistent rumour that the Phoenicians had already crossed the Ebro”). However, the synchronism of the return of the ‘war embassy’ to Rome with the arrival there of news that Hannibal had crossed the Ebro has been deemed as suspect. Indeed, in order to accept such synchronism, Scullard – following Livy – points out the apparent senatorial indifference, both to the plight of Saguntum throughout 219 B.C., and also to the apparently very late departure of the consuls to their provinciae in 218 B.C. In that spring, the question of the consular provinciae and even of the raising of troops was simply left in abeyance for two or three months after the entry of the consuls into office. Polybius’ tradition – in which the senatorial ‘war embassy’ returns to Rome about the time the news arrives that Hannibal has crossed the Ebro – records that the consuls had already departed and is clearly not the same tradition as

1218 Hoffmann 1951:77.
1219 Hoffmann 1951:77-78.
1220 Scullard 1952:213.
1221 Liv. 21.20.9.
1222 Sumner 1966:13
1223 Scullard 1952:210-212; Eckstein 1983:255.
1224 Cf. Liv. 3.40.3
1225 Sumner 1966:13, n. 40
that of Livy.\footnote{\textit{Liv. 21.26.1-3}; cf. \textit{21.20.9} Cf. \textit{Weissenborn & Müller 1888:67}, on \textit{Liv. 26.3}; \textit{Eckstein 1983:269} and \textit{n. 40}.} Livy’s account of the peregrinations of the senatorial ‘war embassy’, in which the ambassadors travel through northern Spain and Transalpine Gaul after leaving Carthage\footnote{\textit{Liv. 21.19.6-20.9}; cf. \textit{De Sanctis 1907:3.2, 182}.} before returning to Rome when it is rumoured that Hannibal has crossed the Ebro,\footnote{\textit{Liv. 20.9}} appears to be more linear and understandable. It seems remarkably close to Polybius’ synchronism\footnote{\textit{Polyb. 3.40.2}.} – except that in Livy’s account, the consuls for 218 B.C. have already finished levying their troops, and have departed from Rome for their provinces, before the return of the envoys.\footnote{\textit{That, in turn – as is noted by \textit{Weissenborn & Müller 1888:67} on \textit{Liv. 21.26.3} – seems quite similar to the Polybian tradition that both consuls for 218 departed few months later; cf. \textit{Pol. 3.41.2; 5.1.3-4}. In fact, the appearance of both these traditions together at \textit{Liv. 21.20.9} may indicate that the synchronism at \textit{Polyb. 3.40.2}, and the picture at \textit{Polyb. 3.41.2} of the departure of both consuls early in the spring, both came from the same source, a source which Polybius either has misinterpreted at \textit{Polyb. 3.40.2}, or, more probably, has conflated with another – more likely – tradition, in which the Roman war preparations follow the return of the senatorial envoys with apprehension.}} The siege of Saguntum was just a warning of his true objective; the crossing of the Ebro would have infringed on Hasdrubal’s agreement.\footnote{\textit{Polybius (3.40.2) implies that early in 218 B.C. the Romans were expecting Hannibal to cross the Ebro.}} It was surely this threat of treaty-breaking that united the Senate and led to the despatch of an ultimatum to Carthage: some of them might have hesitated after the attack on Saguntum, but they hesitated no longer at the river crossing.\footnote{\textit{Scullard 1952:211}.} Rome used the sector between Saguntum and the Ebro to detect and foreshadow Hannibal’s real intentions, which appear clear in the striking discordance between Polybius and Livy. The Greek author confirms a crucial piece of information: the Senate decided to push to completion the establishment of the colonies on the Middle Po, Cremona and \textit{Placentia} (modern Piacenza),\footnote{\textit{Eckstein 1987:327}; \textit{Frank 1928:815}; \textit{Toynbee 1965:2.265-66}; \textit{Errington 1971:45}; \textit{McDonald 1979:46}.} following: a) the return of the senatorial ‘war embassy’ from Carthage with the unsatisfactory Punic response to the Roman ultimatum, and b) the arrival at Rome of the news that Hannibal had crossed the Ebro sooner than expected.\footnote{\textit{Liv. 3.40.2-3}.} Hannibal might or might not have crossed the Ebro; the Carthaginian Senate gave this final indifferent answer: “\textit{Proinde omittite}”\footnote{\textit{Eckstein 1987:327}; \textit{Frank 1928:815}; \textit{Toynbee 1965:2.265-66}; \textit{Errington 1971:45}; \textit{McDonald 1979:46}.}
Sagunti atque Hiberi mentionem facere et quod diu parturit animus vester aliquando pariat!" ("Drop all allusions to Saguntum and the Ebro, and speak out plainly what has long been secretly hatching in your minds!").\footnote{Liv. 21.18.12.} The question is linked with Hannibal’s real intentions and his monitoring by Rome, which had the time to prepare for the invasion. Scullard seems to insist on the same focal point: it was not the fall of Saguntum which caused trouble between Rome and Carthage, nor the crossing of the Ebro, but rather something a further step back: Hannibal’s departure from New Carthage for the North in command of a huge army (May 218 B.C.).\footnote{Scullard 1952:210-212; Eckstein 1983:255.} To what other end could this immense force be directed? The siege of Saguntum would not have appeared a direct threat to Rome or Italy, but it surely could only mean that Hannibal, having conquered Spain south of the Ebro, now intended to conquer the whole peninsula up to the Pyrenees. It was clear to the Romans that, in crossing the Ebro with such an immense army, marching eastward, he was heading to Italy. The connection Saguntum-Hiberum raises questions related to space and time – such as Hannibal’s timing in crossing the Ebro and the role of the Roman embassy – in order to solve the problem of Hannibal’s act of war as breach of the treaty.

### 5.4.1 The question of Saguntum

The position on Saguntum within the treaty is crucial: comprehension of the treaty and any controversies surrounding it require an understanding of the topographical and chronological position of the Iberian oppidum. Despite Livy’s statement that Saguntum had to be in the middle of the two empires, the fact of the matter is that Saguntum and Hiberum do not match this topographical statement. Indeed, not only do they not lie in the same area, they are actually very far apart from each other. The main problem is the fact that, at some point, the Romans claimed that the Iberian city-state of Saguntum – on the coast nearly 150 km (100 mi) south of the Ebro – was not to be attacked either because of an assumed alliance with Rome or because it should be preserved as independent. The original agreement between Carthaginians and Romans is...
obscure, in terms of how it relates to the dispute and subsequent siege of Saguntum in the context of the outbreak of war. Everything depends on the superficial evidence provided by Polybius, who seems not to realise how nebulous his account of the alliance is. Polybius seems to be correct that it was Rome's ally in 220 B.C. and, in my opinion, deliberately vague about its status in 226 B.C. In this instance, surely, the 'argumentum e silentio' is cogent: had Saguntum been specifically mentioned in the treaty of 226 B.C. or formally allied with Rome already in that year? One should expect explicit mention of this to be found in the extant sources, all of which are pro-Roman and anxious to prove Rome's correctness. Although some of the ancient writers try to justify Rome's behaviour by brazenly asserting that Saguntum is north of the Ebro, none of them state concretely and unequivocally that Rome and Saguntum were already allies at the time that Rome in effect agreed to keep her hands off Spain. Painstaking investigations of all the available evidence fail to show that the treaty of 226 B.C. specifically did not exclude Saguntum from the Carthaginian sphere, nor could Täubler prove that Saguntum was already an ally of Rome at the time of the treaty. He merely declares that the treaty bound the Carthaginians not to invade the country to the north of the Ebro. Everything else about it has been assumed. Hannibal attacked Saguntum in autumn 219 B.C. and the Romans chose to regard his attack as a casus belli; the final conquest of the Iberian oppidum has been deemed the beginning of the Second Punic War.

There are two main questions concerning both Polybius and Livy, proposing the same issue but in different lights: temporal (or chronological) and topographical. Both Polybius and Livy seem to imply that attacking Saguntum involved 'consequentially' the crossing of the Ebro. Polybius expressly states that, “if one takes the destruction of Saguntum to be the cause of the war”, the Carthaginians breached both the 'Lutatius' treaty' (241 B.C.) and 'Hasdrubal's treaty' (226/5 B.C.). It means that someone regarded the attack on Saguntum

---

1237 Täubler 1921:42-6, 55.
1238 Reid 1913:183-4.
1239 Reid 1913:178.
1241 Polyb. 3.30.3
as a violation of the engagement entered into with Hasdrubal – but how can this have happened? If Saguntum’s relationship with Rome began before the Ebro treaty was struck, then it contradicts it, because the pact seemed to give Carthage a free hand south of the Ebro. If the Saguntum relationship started after the Ebro treaty was struck, then the Iberian city was outside of the treaty itself.\textsuperscript{1242} The reference might be evidence of the erroneous view of the causes of the war held by the ancient authors.\textsuperscript{1243} However, by reading Polybius more carefully, it is clear that the author identifies two separate events as causes. He considers the siege of Saguntum and the passage of the Ebro as antecedents (\textit{ἄρραται}) and not causes (\textit{ἄρτιως}) of the war.\textsuperscript{1244} However, Polybius seems to mention only the destruction of Saguntum, without adding to the account the subsequent crossing of the Ebro, a point that Rich argues as being merely a consequence of Polybius’ elliptical style of expression.\textsuperscript{1245} By touching on the crossing of the Ebro, he himself proves that it was not even a \textit{ἀρχή} of the war, since it took place after the Romans had declared war.\textsuperscript{1246}

Scholars prefer to focus their attention on the chronological aspect of the Roman ultimatum to Carthage, based on Saguntum and the Ebro River.\textsuperscript{[5.4]} However, I have reported the cases related to the chronology of the events to:

a) understand the problem(s); b) define the spatial context of the Ebro as \textit{finis};

 c) highlight that questions of time should be strictly related to the question of space. The last point is probably the most important and it will be considered in this section. I will show that there is a connection between the two landmarks, the Ebro and Saguntum – a fact that Polybius’ obscure account does not consider, but Livy’s does.

Polybius and almost the entire ancient tradition were never in any doubt that the pact was broken when Hannibal began his siege of Saguntum (219 B.C.), rather

\textsuperscript{1242} See, e.g., Hoyos 1998:162-3. Eckstein 2012a:222. Both authors have put under attack the thesis of Carcopino (1961; see discussion below) that there must have been a ‘second Ebro’, much nearer New Carthage and south of Saguntum, as no river fits the bill.

\textsuperscript{1243} Those ancient and modern authors who refers to at Pol. 3.6.1-2.

\textsuperscript{1244} Polyb. 3.6.


\textsuperscript{1246} Salmon 1960:134.
than when he crossed the Ebro. That looks clear from: a) the consequentiality of the events, as Hannibal crossed the Ebro after the presentation of the Roman ultimatum; b) it was the fate of Saguntum which prompted the Roman declaration of war.\[1247\] Why, therefore, did Polybius write as though Hannibal had already broken the treaty by the time of the Roman ultimatum, if he had not yet crossed the Ebro? Rich offers an alternative to Hoffman and Scullard, not focussing on the Roman embassy but literary ‘splitting’ the question in two parts.\[1248\] He provides two alternatives to the problem, without a resolution, namely: a) that the treaty was not binding on the Carthaginian state, as it was struck with Hasdrubal; b) that the embassy actually transposed the argument and its warning twice, when the envoys visited Hannibal (winter 220-219 B.C.) and in Carthage (June 218), admonishing Hannibal not to attack Saguntum or cross the Ebro.\[1249\] Despite the strong Polybian reference to the Ebro treaty, Rich assumes that “Saguntum was protected by the treaty of 241 B.C., and in any case the main point that he (Polybius) wanted to was make that… they (the Romans) could be seen to be in the wrong once the Sardinian affiar was identified as the true cause of the war”.\[1250\] This would explain the Carthaginians motivation for not discussing it.\[1251\] Scholars have insisted that, from the standpoint of international law, the Romans had no legitimate complaint against Hannibal’s attack on Saguntum. So, by choosing to make an issue of Saguntum, if the Romans did not have the strict letter of the law on their side, it is highly probable that when they decided to regard the Carthaginian attack on the city as a casus belli – although they believed it gave them an excuse to attack without being the aggressors – it made them appear to behave with remarkable inconsistency.\[1252\]

\[1247\] The only passage which appears to give any support to Hoffmann (1951) is Zonaras 8.22.1. See Rich 2011a:11.
\[1248\] Rich 2011a:12
\[1249\] So Täubler 1921:57-9; Gelzer 1963:2.33; Rich 2011a:11-2.
\[1250\] This view implies that the Ebro treaty in fact played no part in the Carthaginians’ discussions with the Roman embassy in 218 B.C. It seems to me an open question whether Polyb. 3.21.1 means that in their reply to the embassy the Carthaginians merely passed over the treaty without mention. See Gelzer 1963:2.30.
\[1251\] Walbank 1979: comm. on 1.335.
\[1252\] Salmon 1960:135
The solution to the problem can be found by reorganising the temporal order of things, matching the different stages of Hannibal’s march (siege, ultimatum, crossing the river) with the Roman embassy steps (Rome – Carthago Nova – Carthage – Rome). However, the spatial issue concerning the topographical positioning of Saguntum and the Ebro remains unsolved. Saguntum is 100 miles south of the Ebro, well within the area which the Romans had agreed to recognise as the Carthaginian ‘sphere of influence’ seven years earlier. Topographically speaking, no scholar has connected Saguntum and the Ebro. In order to make Hannibal a breaker of the treaty and for the quietening of the Roman conscience, further developments were needed. Ancient writers adopted several solutions to the problem: a) supposing Saguntum to be situated north of the Ebro; b) presuming a full alliance of some standing between Rome and Saguntum before or after the treaty; c) introducing a clause which specially safeguarded Saguntum or all ‘Greek cities’ in Spain. The sophisticated hypothesis above has offered to modern authors different solutions to escape this kind of intellectual embarrassment: a) Scullard suggested that the Romans might have fixed the theoretical limits of Hasdrubal’s aggression at the Pyrenees; b) Oertel saw the treaty as a compromise, where Rome sought to confine Carthage to a line south of Saguntum; and c) Schulten’s view is that the limit set was “a very considerable concession by Rome”.

5.4.2 The clause

The annalistic tradition of the time of the late Roman Republic, and many modern scholars, have found it necessary, under these circumstances, to insert a special protective clause about the district of Saguntum into the Ebro treaty,

---

1253 Reid 1913:186-7
1254 Saguntum as Greek city (Strabo 3.4.6; Liv. 21.7.2) was included within those. Reid 1913:190.
1256 Oertel 1932:225.
1258 Cf. Liv. 21.2.7; Appian. Iber. 6.7.
against the clear statement of Polybius, who does not mention this clause. According to them, either Saguntum alone or all Greek cities of Spain were declared to be autonomous and free. The remainder of the peninsula was acknowledged to be subject to either Rome or Carthage and their allies, as Livy shows. Dorey quite convincingly proposed a different clause present in the Hasdrubal treaty. As Livy states that there was a previous treaty, Dorey assumes that the Romans struck a private foedus with the Saguntines, who gave themselves to Rome (dedicii). The Romans, therefore, were forced to base their claim to protect Saguntum on the treaty of Lutatius, signed in 241 B.C. at the conclusion of the First Punic War, which contained a clause that “neither side should attack the allies of the other”. The fact is that the treaty of 241 B.C. is unlikely to be the one Livy refers to, because Carthage seems not to recognise it at the Roman presentation of the ultimatum in June 218 B.C. Such a clause has not only to be considered as unhistorical from the point of view of cautious source criticism because it is found only in the inferior and late sources about the antecedents of the Second Punic War. As well as this, despite the fact that Hannibal accused the Romans of acting as judges, on the invitation of an autonomous state to the south of the Ebro, no express provision against such diplomatic moves can be found in any version of the Ebro treaty. It is possible that Livy has been inserted into the list of the authors who would have had the clause as stated at the beginning of this chapter: that Saguntum was in the middle of the two empires and had to be independent and

1259 Polyb. 2.13.7: διόπερ ἁμα τῷ διαπρεσβευσάμενοι πρὸς τὸν Ασδρούβαν ποιήσασθαι συνθήκας, ἐν αἷς τὴν μὲν ἄλλην Ἰβηρίαν παρεσιώττων, τὸν δὲ καλούμενον Ἴβηρα ποταμὸν οὐκ ἔδει Καρχηδονίους ἐπὶ πολέμῳ διαβαίνειν.
1260 Sumner (1968:219-20, n. 41) considers with no basis that the annalistic tradition is manifestly mendacious. In his opinion, the inclusion of the spurious clause exempting Saguntum shows that Livy is not a faithful record; it is in fact an interpretation of the agreement.
1261 Dorey 1960:5. Cf. Polyb. 3.27.3: "κειμένων Ἰταλίας μεταξὺ καὶ Σικελίας. τὴν ἀσφάλειαν ἑτέρων τοῖς ἑκατέρων συμμάχοις".
1262 Heichelheim 1955:217; Dorey 1960:3: “It is more likely that what Hannibal really accused the Romans of doing was putting to death the leaders of the anti-Roman faction at Saguntum, a thing they may well have done as soon as they had accepted the deditio".
autonomous. After all, Livy does not dodge the problem. On the contrary he faces it, clearly stating:

\[ \text{Ciuitas ea longe opulentissima ultra Hiberum fuit, sita passus mille ferme a mari.} \]

That city (Saguntum) was by far the wealthiest of all beyond the Ebro; it was situated about a mile from the sea.

The main doubt or question from Livy’s account is this: How is it possible that Saguntum was in the middle of the two Empires if it is 100 miles (150 km) south of the Ebro? It seems clear enough that the solution has to be found somewhere else.

### 5.5 Where was the Ebro?

#### 5.5.1 Polybius and the collocation of the Ebro and Saguntum

In his references to the regions of the Mediterranean coast, Polybius is also careless in his expression about the topographical position of Saguntum. Did Polybius assume that Saguntum lay to the north of the Ebro, instead of a hundred miles to the South? This raises the question of Ebro and Saguntum’s identification and positioning, when compared with Livy’s account. In some passages, Polybius makes quite clear that Saguntum lay south of the Ebro and in others he seems to be unclear and mistakenly thinks that it lies north of the river, so that Hannibal had to cross the river in order to attack it. Polybius appears to be yet more puzzled, when he inconveniently uses the phrase ‘within the Ebro’ (\( \text{ἐν τῷ Ιβερῷ} \)) referring to Saguntum. Polybius is thought to have used the Roman perspective, which would be restricted to the land lying north of the Ebro, but limited just to the

---

1266 Liv. 21.2.7.
1267 Liv. 21.7.2.
1268 Polybius clearly locates Saguntum south of the Ebro at 3.14.9, 97.6, 98.5. Passages which have been suspected of implying that it lay north of the Ebro are 3.15.5, 30.3, 61.8; 4.28.1. Appian (Hisp. 7) locates it north of the Ebro.
1269 Polyb. 3.14.
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river. However, an examination of the passages reporting the same phrase\textsuperscript{1270} seems to show that the words loosely indicate ‘Hispania Citerior’, which was not limited by the river. It can also mean the districts to the south of the river, subdued by Hannibal, from the Carthaginian perspective.\textsuperscript{1271} In this way, we might claim that the point of view is different, whether from Roman side or from Carthaginian.\textsuperscript{1272} There is no escape from the supposition that Polybius must have inserted elements drawn from different writers, who adopted one or other of these views. The geographical error was doubtless the earliest and more likely to have been adopted by writers, whom Polybius would then have drawn on. He took the Roman view that Hannibal was a violator of the agreement between Hasdrubal and Rome, not assessing the foundation of the issue and not realising the contradiction he had created.\textsuperscript{1273} Moreover, he did not link any territorial reference to the limitations of the sea (capes, promontories). Previous Romano-Punic treaties had been agreed on the basis of coastal and maritime features, which stated the presence of the parties beyond a certain ‘fixed line’, such as the much discussed Peace of Callias between Periclean Athens and the Persian Kingdom,\textsuperscript{1274} and in well-known Roman treaties of the 4\textsuperscript{th} and 3\textsuperscript{rd} centuries B.C. with Tarentum and with Carthage,\textsuperscript{1275} which are connected to subdivisions or delimitations of imperia by the sea.\textsuperscript{1276}

\textsuperscript{1270} Polyb. 3.76; 10.7; 10.35.
\textsuperscript{1271} Polyb. 3.4.
\textsuperscript{1272} Some scholars have justified Polybius’ expression with a lack of knowledge, because at the time of the treaty, Spain was such a terra incognita (unknown land) to most Romans. Cf. Bekker-Nielsen 1988.
\textsuperscript{1273} Reid 1913:186-7
\textsuperscript{1274} For the problems connected with the Peace of Callias: Meritt, Wade-Gery & McGregor 1950:275-6, 281; Wade-Gery 1940:121-2; Bury & Meiggs 1951:3.359-60, 842, 878; Bengtson 1950:196; Accame 1952. For the Roman treaties Appian, Samn. 3.10; Schachermeyr 1930; Frank 1940:1.6-7, 34-5; Rupprecht 1939; Beaumont 1939; Cary & Scullard 1975:60, 93, 100-105.
\textsuperscript{1275} Heichelheim 1955:216.
\textsuperscript{1276} In the earlier treaties between Carthage and Rome, the Carthaginians had made a practice of specifying certain geographical points beyond which the Romans and their allies might not proceed. In the first treaty “the Romans and their allies are not to sail beyond the Kalon Akrotaterion unless compelled by tempest or enemies” (Polyb. 3.22.5). Walbank (1957: comm. on 3.22.5) has identified the point referred as Promunturium Pulchri (Cap Farina). In the second treaty, “the Romans are not to raid, trade, or colonise beyond Kalon Akrotaterion, Mastia of Tarsis” (Polyb. 3.24-4). It is notable that here a natural geographical feature on the Spanish coast is not named. One might have expected the equivalent of Cape Palos to be specified, even though it may be that no name of this cape was sufficiently well known to be used. Schoulten (1955:233) states, rather loosely, that *Kap Palos bildete im 2. karthagisch-römischen
5.5.2 Hiberum: Ebro or Júcar

One potential solution is enclosed in the following question: Was the river that Hasdrubal agreed not to cross a different one from the Ebro? This doubt has been raised by Carcopino, who advocated a ‘radical’ solution to the problem based on the topographical point of view. In his opinion, all the problems and contradictions linked to the treaty originate in the erroneous identification of the river ‘Iber’ with the modern Ebro. Supposedly, the river was actually another one well closer to the limit of Carthaginian control and south of Saguntum. Carcopino begins his argument by claiming that the river was the ancient Sucro (modern Júcar), which he believes was at one time called Iber. He asserts that Polybius “est renseignée avec exactitude sur ces deux Iberes”, ignoring or taking for granted the existence of two different rivers – both named Hiberus – which he never bothers to identify or explain. His argument is based on two passages: a) where Iber is undoubtedly the Ebro, because the Saguntines were included within the Ebro, as “after the defeat of this host, no one south of the Iber rashly ventured to face him except the people of Saguntum” (“’Tων ἠπτηθέντων οὐδεὶς ἔτι τῶν ἐντὸς Ἴβηρος ποταμοῦ ῥαδίως πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἀντοφθαλμεῖν ἐτόλμα πλὴν Ζακανθαίων”: from Hannibal’s viewpoint); b) when the Roman envoys warn Hannibal to leave Saguntum alone (Ῥωμαῖοι μὲν διεμαρτύροντο Ζακανθαίων ἀπέχεσθαι κεῖ σθαι ἐν τῇ ἐπ᾽ Ἀσδρούβου γενομένας Vertrag von 348 v.C. die Nordgrenze des karthagischen Gebiets und die Südgrenze des römischen Schiffahrts”. Berthelot (1934:99) considers the lugum Trete or Traete (Avienus Or. mar. 452) rather “la hauteur littorale tres accentuée (444 m.) qui se termine au cap de Palos”. Cape Palos is apparently the Promunturium (quod vocatur) Saturni in Pliny (N.H. 3.19); Ptolemy (2.6.14) may rather be Punta Aguillones, as suggested by the nearby place names Escombreras and I. de Escombrera. Cf. Sumner 1968:229. 
1279 Carcopino 1961:35. 
1280 Polyb. 3.14.9.
Polybius gives no sign of awareness that he is actually talking about two different rivers in these adjacent passages.

Carcopino’s theory is based on evidence that the *Iber/Hiberus* seems to have been the name of more than one river in the Iberian Peninsula. Avienus – probably drawing indirectly on a Periplus of the 6th century B.C. – designates as *Hiberus* a river West of Cadiz and Tartessos, namely the Rio Tinto. Although there is no clear evidence of whether or not the Rio Tinto continued to be called *Hiberus*, we know that in the 4th century Scylax had already named the Ebro as *Iber*. In order to identify the *Iber/Hiberus* as a name for the Júcar, Carcopino adduces arguments which have been considered quite weak. Firstly, the French scholar considers the restored passage of Livy’s in which Hannibal makes a speech before the battle of Ticinus, reading:

---

1281 Polyb. 3.15.5.
1282 Avien. *Or. mar.* 479-80, “Attollit inde se Sicana civitas propinquo ab amni sic vocata Hibericis”.
1284 Avien. *Or. mar.* 248-9; Berthelot 1934:77 (modern Odiel or Rio Tinto).
1285 Plin. *N.H.* 3.7 names the Rio Tinto and the Odiel as the Luxia and Urius (or Urium); cf. Schulten 1953:336-7, who sees in Strabo 3.5.9 (from Posidonius) a reference to the Iber/Rio Tinto and also in Strabo 3.4.19 (based on Asclepiades of Myrlea); his interpretations are reasonable.
1286 Avien. *Or. mar.* 503 refers to the Ebro as Hiberus; according to Schulten (1953:337), this is interpolation, and the original name of the Ebro is indicated in Avien. *Or. mar.* 505, “*Oleum flumen*”; this he regards as a translation of “Elatog, which would be in turn a corruption of Iberic Elaisos. That is possibly rather strained. Berthelot (1934:106-7) regards the *Oleum flumen* as “*un torrent côtier*,” possibly with an original Iberic name Elaisus, which he would connect with the Laietes/Laeetani. Schulten (1953:309) overlooks the Scylax (Ps.-Scylax) text when he states that Hiberus and Ip as the name of the Ebro first appear in Cato and Polybius.
1287 Citing Avienus, Carcopino (1961:57-8) avows himself baffled by “*Hibericis*”. A. Berthelot (1934) has given the translation “*proche du fleuve auquel les Hiberes donnent ce nom*”. He has therefore understood Hibericus as an ablative (says Carcopino) equivalent to Hiberis and depending on vocata. Carcopino’s condemnation of this “*du point de vue grammatical*” is evidently vitiated by his failure to recognise the dative of the agent. His second condemnation is that Avienus never calls the Iberians Hiberici elsewhere, always Hiberi (actually there are four examples of Hiberi: Avien. *Or.Mar.* 250, 472, 552, 613). The third condemnation is that it ought not to be said that the Iberians called the Jucar by the name (Sicanus) which it bore before their arrival on its banks. If there is perhaps a point here (which is doubtful since it postulates a rather vigilant attention to logic on the poetaeter’s part), it could be met by conceding that Hibericus is meant as a general designation for the inhabitants of the Iberian peninsula. Cf. Sumner 1968:222-3.
“Ne transieris Hiberum; ne quid rei tibi sit cum Saguntinis. Ad Hiberum est Saguntum. Nusquam te vestigio moveris”.1289

“Do not cross the Ebro, see that you have nothing to do with the Saguntines. But Saguntum is not on the Ebro. You must not move a step anywhere”.

His explanation sees Hannibal claiming not to have infringed the ‘Ebro frontier’, because the Ebro – evidently the Júcar here – was near Saguntum. But since Hannibal would have had to cross the Júcar to get at Saguntum, “the explanation explains nothing”.1290 On the inspiration of P. Pédech,1291 Carcopino introduces two further pieces of Livy’s text into the discussion:1292

civilis alius furor in castris ad Sucronem ortus; octo ibi milia militum erant, praesidium gentibus quae cis Hiberum incolunt impositum1293

From citizens sprang a different outbreak in the camp near Sucro. Eight thousand soldiers were there, posted as a garrison for the tribes dwelling on this side of the Ebro.

Since the garrison was ad Sucronem – “whether one sees in Sucro the name of the river Júcar or that of the town which derived its name from it”1294 – its task was to guard the tribes cis (behind) the Hiberus, which cannot be the Ebro. Therefore, Sucro equates to Hiberum and, in turn, to Júcar. This implies that Livy uses two different names, Sucro and Hiberus, for the same river in the same sentence; consequently, one would contend that the passage proves that the Júcar is not also called Hiberus. It is correct that the garrison ad Sucronem was placed in surveillance over the gentes ‘cis Hiberum’ (north of the Ebro), but the expression does not allow for the fact that it was also to watch over the gentes between the Ebro and the Júcar. Carcopino strangely does not refer to

1289 Liv. 21.44.6.
1290 An acceptable sense is given by the punctuation adopted by Walters and Conway: Ad Hiberum est Saguntum? (But, as the editors recognise, the sentence could well be a gloss). Sumner 1968:224.
1291 Pédech 1958:442.
1292 Carcopino 1960:341-44.
1293 Liv. 28.24.5-6.
the parallel account of Livy,\textsuperscript{1295} which removes any doubt that the river in question was the Ebro.\textsuperscript{1296}

Carcopino also raises the question of why Livy mentioned so unimportant a place as Onussa.\textsuperscript{1297}

\begin{quote}
a) \textit{ab Gadibus Carthaginem ad hiberna exercitus redit; atque inde profectus praeter Onusam urbem ad Hiberum per maritimam oram ducit.}
From Cádiz Hannibal returned to New Carthage, to the winter quarters of his army; setting out from thence, he marched along the coast, past the city of Onusa, to the Ebro.

b) \textit{itaque ad Onusam classe provecti; escensio ab navibus in terram facta. cum urbem vi cepissent captamque diripuissent, Carthaginem.}\textsuperscript{1298}
So they spread their sails for Onusa, where they disembarked and stormed and sacked the city, and thence laid a course for Carthage.
\end{quote}

Livy’s mention of the town of Onussa does not seem random, suggesting that he knew it was important for some reason. He situates Onussa south of the Ebro, which would appear to identify it with Peniscola, situated some 30 miles south of the Ebro.\textsuperscript{1299} However, new studies have precisely confirmed its identification with the settlement of Puig de la Misericordia en Vinaròs (Province of Castellón).\textsuperscript{1300} He must surely have found the name in Silenus (via Coelius), who wrote from the Carthaginian side and was “\textit{cum eo (sc. Hannibale) in castris. quamdiu fortuna passa est}” (“with him in the camp, and lived with him as long as fortune allowed”).\textsuperscript{1301}

The second reference to Onussa (b) concerns the sequel of the naval battle in 217 B.C. between Cn. Scipio and Hasdrubal, which, according to Polybius\textsuperscript{1302} and Livy,\textsuperscript{1303} was fought off the Ebro, where the Massiliots notably took part. Carcopino holds that it could not have been fought at the Ebro, because: a) Hasdrubal could not have been so imprudent as to plan a combined land and

\begin{footnotes}
\textsuperscript{1295} Liv. 26.41-42.
\textsuperscript{1296} Livy in particular 26.41.1,6,23; 42.1; 42.6, “\textit{septimo die ab Hibero Carthaginem ventum est simul terra mareque}”. See Sumner 1968:226.
\textsuperscript{1297} Also in Polyaen.8.16.6.
\textsuperscript{1298} Liv. 22.20.4.
\textsuperscript{1299} Cf. Schulten 1935:66-7.
\textsuperscript{1300} Pérez Vilatela 1994.
\textsuperscript{1301} Nepos Hann. 13
\textsuperscript{1302} Polyb. 3.95.4-5
\textsuperscript{1303} Liv. 22.19-5.
\end{footnotes}
sea advance over a distance so great as that between New Carthage and the Ebro; and b) Cn. Scipio, starting from Tarraco, arrived near the mouth of the Iber and in a day and a night’s sailing he must have travelled, not the 60 kilometres from Tarraco to the Ebro, but the 250 km from Tarraco to the Júcar. Therefore the battle was fought off the Júcar. Scullard proposed that Hannibal might have received the critical message that Rome declared war when he was at Carthage. If so, Onussa would have been the place where he made his final decision to advance and cross his Rubicon, the river Ebro.

5.5.3 Building the concept of finis: Livy’s evidences

This section will be used to show the Livian perspective on the ‘question of the Ebro’ through his evidence. Livy delineates a very clear picture of the interested areas of Spain at the time of events. He makes clear that the extension of Carthaginian dominion did not reach either the Ebro or Saguntum before Hannibal’s campaign. [FIG 28 (left)] In AUC, Hannibal started his Iberian campaign of 220 B.C. by conquering the territory of the Olcades, a population in the southeast coast of Spain. This passage is also crucial as it has been interpreted as a first step in the march to Rome.

But since an attack on them must certainly provoke the Romans to hostile action, he marched first into the territory of the Olcades — a tribe living south of the Ebro, within the limits of the Carthaginians but not under their dominion — that he might appear not to have aimed at the Saguntines but to have been drawn into that war by a chain of events, as he conquered the neighbouring nations and annexed their territories.

Livy emphasises this event and mainly the relationship between the Carthaginian territories and the Natives twice, saying that: a) Hannibal broke through their borders (Olcadum prius fines) and consequently invaded their

---

1304 Polyb. 3.95.5.
1305 Sumner 1968:225
1306 Scullard 1952:214-5.
1307 Liv. 21.5.3.
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territory (*induxit exercitum*); and b) the Olcades were under the protection (or jurisdiction) of the Carthaginians (*gens in parte magis quam in dicione Carthaginiensium erat*). Even though this invasion had not been considered a direct threat to Saguntum (*ut non petisse Saguntinos*), the Romans were already concerned about his movements (*Romana arma movebantur*), as they foreshadowed Hannibal’s future plans. His strategy is quite interesting, as he began conquering the neighbouring populations (*sed rerum serie, finitimis domitis gentibus*) in order to annex them to his empire (*iungendo que tractus ad id*). Livy also provides crucial information from the Roman point of view: *Olcadum – ultra Hiberum ea gens...erat* (Olcades were a population beyond Ebro). On this generic information, the territory of the Olcades has been positioned on three pieces of evidence: a) In 219 B.C., the year after Hannibal’s attack, exiles of the Olcades incited the Carpetani and neighbouring tribes to attack Hannibal near the Tagus on his return South; b) the topographic resemblance between the ancient ethnos Olcades and the modern town of Alcoy (Alcoy has produced archaeological evidence indicating that it was a significant Iberian centre); and c) in a list of troops Hannibal sent to Africa in the winter 219/218 we find the mercenaries taken from Thersitai, Mastianoi, Oretes Iberes and Olkades. This official order might suggest either a topographical or a temporal order of conquest of the Olcades, as they lay beyond the Oretes (Oretani). In both cases, the main point of Livy’s account is that he supports the whole line adopted in the text, since he regards

1308 Liv. 21.5.3
1309 Polyb. 3.14.3: Liv. 21.5.7.
1310 Forbiger 1877:3.66 n. 71; Menendez Pidal 1952:32.
1311 Cf. Garcia y Bellido 1952:1.2.464-466, 473, 491 n. 4
1312 Polyb. 3.39.9
1314 Hannibal’s own inscribed record, Polyb. 3.39.18-9
1315 De Sanctis 1907:3.1.416, places the Olcades on the Upper Guadiana; so also Walbank 1979: comm. on 3.13.5, “in what is now called La Mancha”; i.e. south to southeast of the Carpetani. Schulten (1937:7.789,n.1) took this view, but in (1935:24) placed them between the Oretani and Salamanca, between the Tagus and the Guadiana, regarding this campaign as a preliminary to that of the following year (so also Almagro Basch 1952:372).
the attack on the Olcades as a move in the direction of Saguntum.\footnote{If the Olcades are correctly located here, the non-reappearance of their name will be explained by its being submerged under the later, general designation of Contestani. Cf. J. Malaquer de Motes 1954:1.3.313-4; Sumner 1968:216-7 n. 36.} Livy finalises the antecedents to Hannibal’s expedition to Italy, stating that:

\begin{quote}
\textit{et iam omnia trans Hiberum praeter Saguntinos Carthaginiensium errant.}\footnote{Liv. 21.5.17.}
\end{quote}

And already the whole country beyond the Ebro belonged to the Carthaginians, except the territory of the Saguntines.

The quality of Livy’s geographical knowledge of Roman and Carthaginian Spain is evident from his account, as well as the positioning of, and the relationship between, Saguntum and the Ebro. In three different contexts, he emphasises both the crucial role played by the Ebro and its vicinity to Saguntum a few years after the controversy around the treaty. The ‘line of the Ebro’ is considered a strong strategic checkpoint or means of defence: a) as shown at the beginning of this chapter, with the position kept by Cato at Ampurias in 185 B.C.; b) in 206 B.C., after the disastrous attempt to conquer Cadiz and Cnæus, and Publius Scipios’ fall, when Lucius Marcius saved Roman power in Spain by settling behind the Ebro;\footnote{Liv. 25.37, 28.17.11 and 26.37.8-9; cf. Cic. \textit{Pro Balbo} 17.2. This Roman \textit{eques} collected the scattered remnants of the two armies (his and Gaius Laelius’), entrenched himself in safe quarters on the north of the Ebro, and even inflicted a defeat upon Hasdrubal son of Gisco. Cf. Shuckburgh 1892:382.} and 3) during Scipio’s consulship, in 211 B.C.

This last point provides perhaps the best information, which emerges by comparing Livy’s previous accounts, where again we see the ‘line’ of the Ebro as a defensive and tutelary segment behind which the Romans felt themselves to be safe. In 211 B.C., Romans and Carthaginians confronted each other in the Hiberian Peninsula, as well as in Italy. Livy knows precisely the Carthaginian authorities’ subdivisions at that time and the positions assigned to the Roman generals in Spain, showing a good command of Hiberian geography. During the war against Hannibal’s brothers, the consul Publius Cornelius Scipio:

\begin{quote}
\textit{profectus ab Tarracone et civitates sociorum et hiberna exercitus adit, conlaudavitque milites quod duabus tantis deinceps cladibus icti provinciam}
\end{quote}
obtiiuissest, nec fructum secundarum rerum sentire hostis passi omni cis Hiberum agro eos arcuiissent, sociosque cum fide tutati essent.\textsuperscript{1319}

...was sent to Tarraco. From there he paid visits to the friendly tribes, and also inspected the winter quarters of the army. He praised them warmly for having maintained their hold on the province after sustaining two such terrible blows, and also for keeping the enemy to the south of the Ebro, thereby depriving them of any advantages from their victories, and also affording protection to their own friends.

The consul was able to hold the line of Ebro against three Carthaginian armies. The Livian account clearly shows the purpose of the river as both a demarcation line – which possibly included the newest ‘provinciam’ – and mainly as a means of defence. It appears quite clear that the great military success is due to keeping the enemy south of the Ebro or “to hold (arcuiissent) the territories (agros) behind the Ebro (cis Hiberum)”. Moreover, in the same context Livy also writes from the Carthaginian perspective. By withdrawing into their respective winter-quarters, the Punic generals were assigned to three different sectors of the Iberian Peninsula, which roughly reflect the future subdivision of Roman Spain into the provinces of Lusitania, Baetica\textsuperscript{1320} and Terraconensis:

\begin{quote}
\textit{In hiberna diversi concesserant, Hasdrubal Gisgonis usque ad Oceanum et Gadis, Mago in mediterranea maxime supra Castulonensem saltum; Hasdrubal Hamilcaris filius proximus Hibero circa Saguntum hibernavit.}\textsuperscript{1321}
\end{quote}

Hasdrubal, the son of Gisgo, to Cádiz on the coast, Mago into the interior above the forest of Castulo, Hasdrubal, the son of Hamilcar, near the Ebro in the neighbourhood of Saguntum.

Once more Saguntum and Ebro are very close to each other in Livy’s account. But how close? Livy is mindful not to use the prepositions \textit{trans}- or \textit{cis}-, but Hasdrubal’s command might cover the region from Saguntum to the Ebro. If the topographical positioning of the Ebro and Saguntum are correct, Hasdrubal did not cross the Ebro, remaining in a safe area quite far from the river, which once again works as demarcation line. On the Roman side, the winter-camp was at Tarraco, which does not lie on the Ebro. However, Tarraco’s position was equidistant from the Ebro, like Saguntum, albeit on the opposite side; and was considered to be ‘close’ to the river.

\textsuperscript{1319} Liv. 26.20.1-2.  
\textsuperscript{1320} For the earliest reference of the senatorial province see Liv. 28.2.15.  
\textsuperscript{1321} Liv. 26.20.6.
We can draw two main conclusions from Livy’s historical evidence and perspective: a) Ebro and Saguntum are part of the same context; the way they are presented suggests that they are close to, and in some way linked to, each other; b) the Romans chose the Ebro as a strategic and tactical means of checking the Carthaginians and fending them off from Northern Spain.

### 5.6 Conclusions

My investigation has shown Rome’s reasons for concluding a treaty in Spain and has analysed Polybius’ version of events, supported by modern scholars. They hold that the Romans exacted the undertaking not to cross the Ebro from Hasdrubal, because they were afraid that he might join forces with the imminent Gallic invasion.\(^{1322}\) Therefore, political motives led to the decision to agree on a natural feature as a *finis*, which reflected also the interests of Massilia, as Errington has argued.\(^{1323}\) Finally, I have considered the geophysical and geopolitical arguments and events. It has been shown that the choice of the Ebro line as limit has been regarded as puzzling both in ancient and modern times. As I have already noted, this was one of the factors which led Carcopino and others to adopt the extreme view that the Ebro was not the river referred to in the treaty.\(^{1324}\)

![Fig 28] The background work done so far has just helped to visualise issues and the idea of *finis*, the concept of which goes far beyond the simple idea of geographical line. The main question – and possibly the most important one – still remains: What considerations would be expected to have governed the selection of the *finis*? From Rome’s point of view, the further South the ‘line’ was drawn, the better.\(^{1325}\) Probably, the ‘practical line’ of Ebro was not really a boundary in the way we would conceive of it. As already noted in the first chapter, the application of modern categories to ancient standards and the

\(^{1322}\) Rich 2011a:20-1.


\(^{1324}\) A summary of his positions in: Carcopino 1960.

\(^{1325}\) Sumner 1968:228.
unconsidered Roman perspective may have created problems regarding the interpretation of the treaty. It means that – whether the Ebro was considered as a border, even in a treaty – it is not to be considered as a ‘defined line’.\textsuperscript{1326} It represents a line in the exact moment in which it is crossed, for example working as a sort of checkpoint. That is clear from Livy, when he numerically defines Hannibal’s army. He specifically gives the number of the soldiers present in the Carthaginian expedition:

\begin{quote}
\textit{nonaginta milia peditum, duodecim milia equitum Hiberum traduxit.}\textsuperscript{1327}
\end{quote}

He had ninety thousand foot soldiers and twelve thousand horses when he crossed the Ebro.

Now, if we do not consider Livy’s information as vague, then we have to think that some sentinel counted them, at least approximately.

It is more than understandable that scholars considered Rome’s procedure of declaring war quite paradoxical.\textsuperscript{1328} Even without bringing Saguntum into it, the Roman policy would be hard to comprehend. Did the final agreement allow the Carthaginians to push their dominions as far as the Ebro, leaving Saguntum at their back? In ‘Polybius’ treaty’ there is no trace of the ‘Saguntine clause’; in Livy, it is more than evident. Rich himself seems to have misunderstood the terms of the agreement, fluctuating between Livy and Polybius. According to him, “both sides undertook to refrain from crossing the Ebro and to guarantee the freedom of Saguntum”, when Polybius says that only the Carthaginians were forbidden to do this.\textsuperscript{1329} Polybius’ account may perhaps be taken to indicate that a request from the Saguntines for assistance was conveniently interpreted by the chroniclers on the Roman side as equivalent to a total surrender of their interests into Roman hands (\textit{pist} = \textit{deditio in fidem}).\textsuperscript{1330} We have already discussed the fact that this would not justify war, and that the view of Polybius’ existing agreements could not reasonably be

\textsuperscript{1326} For a sceptical position regarding the concept of the border in the debates leading up to the Second Punic War, see Brunt 1990:300; Ando 2008:505, n. 36.

\textsuperscript{1327} Liv. 21.23.2

\textsuperscript{1328} Cf. Carcopino 1961:44.

\textsuperscript{1329} Rich 2011a:5

\textsuperscript{1330} Polyb. 3.15.8.
Rich still insists – showing the modern limits in understanding the Roman and mainly the Livian perspective – that “if the treaty with Hasdrubal imposed reciprocal obligations on the Romans in respect of Spain south of the Ebro, the connection with Saguntum will have been in conflict with the treaty”.\textsuperscript{1331} Rich’s vision recalls the common attitude that other cultures had about the idea of border, as an impassable line. Polybius is Greek, not Roman. Specific Roman political terms might have been quite obscure to Greeks.\textsuperscript{1332} Those are concepts which were probably hard to understand or even to translate for non-Romans, let alone the weight and the acceptations of the words used.\textsuperscript{1333} Only Livy believed in a complete treaty before the beginning of the siege, stating clearly the position of Saguntum ‘in the middle’ (\textit{in medio}) of two \textit{imperia}. Yet there has been inexplicable criticism of Livy. For instance, Reid’s opinion that Livy’s account of the \textit{foedus} would not have included the Saguntines, who were supposed to dwell between the Ebro and the Pyrenees, has no basis.\textsuperscript{1334} This is due to the fact that Polybius mentions as the only provision of the treaty that the Carthaginians were not to cross the Ebro for war, and in his first reference to the treaty he also states that “they said nothing about the rest of Spain”.\textsuperscript{1335} Many scholars have supposed that the Romans also gave a reciprocal undertaking not to cross the Ebro themselves. Neither of these Mediterranean powers were restricted from crossing the Ebro peacefully, for example for commerce; nothing was said about their position in Spain south

\begin{footnotes}
\textsuperscript{1331} Rich 2011a:28
\textsuperscript{1332} Polybius can hardly grasp the meaning of ‘\textit{deditio in fidem}’ or ‘\textit{civitas foederata, immunes or libera’}. The problem and its interpretations has been faced by Flurl 1969. See also Nicolet 1980:118.
\textsuperscript{1333} See Livy’s specification in clarifying the comparison made between the two treaties – Hasdrubal’s and Lutatius’ by the Carthaginian Senate (21.18.10-11): “You told us that you refused to be bound by the treaty which your consul, C. Lutatius, concluded with us, because it did not receive the authorisation of either the senate or the Assembly. A fresh treaty was accordingly made by your government. Now, if no treaties have any binding force for you unless they have been made with the authority of your senate or by order of your Assembly, we, on our side, cannot possibly be bound by Hasdrubal’s treaty, which he made without our knowledge”. Livy’s explanation (21.19.2-4): “For had it been a matter for argument, what ground was there for comparing Hasdrubal’s treaty with the earlier one of Lutatius? In the latter it was expressly stated that it would only be of force if the people approved it, whereas in Hasdrubal’s treaty there was no such saving clause. Besides, his treaty had been silently observed for many years during his lifetime, and was so generally approved that, even after its author’s death, none of its articles were altered”.
\textsuperscript{1334} See the discussion in Liv. 21.18 and cf. 19: \textit{Hasdrubalis foedere}. See Reid 1913:187
\textsuperscript{1335} Polyb. 2.13.7. Other references to the prohibition on the Carthaginians crossing the Ebro: Polyb. 3.6.2, 15.5, 27.9.29, 3.30.3.
\end{footnotes}
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of the Ebro; and no restriction was placed on the Romans in respect to Spain. After all – as Rich rightly affirms – a Roman undertaking not to cross the river would have been nonsense, as Rome’s occupation of the soil did not even reach Northern Italy.\textsuperscript{1336} Scholars understood there was a duality in the treaty: ‘Polybios’ linearity’ is incompatible with ‘Livy’s spatiality’. The geometrical patterns (triangles) – which Polybios applies to geographical features – reveal a criss-crossing series of lines forming a triangular-shape, which clearly contrasts with Livy’s spatial view of geo-political features.\textsuperscript{1337} [6.2.3] This point has led to the need to interpret the treaty as an establisher of ‘spheres of influence’, which the scholars have not yet been able to detect as \textit{imperia}.

The Polybian ‘linear vision’ of the boundary of the Ebro is much more explicit in Hannibal’s speech to his troops after crossing the Alps and just before the first battle.\textsuperscript{1338} Surprisingly enough in Livy’s version, Hannibal turns the tables; he accuses and explicitly blames the Romans for having broken the terms of the treaty first, on two occasions,\textsuperscript{1339} and for not respecting those lines that they themselves had drawn.\textsuperscript{1340}

\begin{quote}
\textit{circumscriptit includitque nos terminis montium fluminumque quos non excedamus; neque eos quos statuit terminos observat. “Ne transieris Hiberum! ne quid rei tibi sit cum Saguntinis! ad Hiberum est Saguntum? Nusquam te vestigio moveris! parum est quod veterrimas provincias meas Siciliam ac Sardiniam ademisti? adimis etiam Hispanias? et inde si decessero, in Africam transcendes? transcendes dico?”}\textsuperscript{1342}
\end{quote}

They confine and enclose us within mountains and rivers as boundaries, but they do not observe the limits which they themselves have fixed. “Do not cross the Ebro, see that you have nothing to do with the Saguntines. But Saguntum is not on the Ebro. You must not move a step anywhere. Is it a small matter, your taking from me my oldest provinces, Sicily and Sardinia? Will you cross over into Spain as well, and if I withdraw from there, will you cross over into Africa? Do I say, will cross over? You have crossed over.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{1336} Rich 2011a:6.
\item \textsuperscript{1337} Clarke 1999:103.
\item \textsuperscript{1338} Steele 1907:436.
\item \textsuperscript{1339} Cp. Appian. \textit{Iber}. 7.3. Polybios’ passage (3.15.8) has to be interpreted with the help of the preceding passage Polyb. 3.15.7. Cf. also the same motives which appear in a more novelistic setting in Liv. 21.18 (esp.10).
\item \textsuperscript{1340} Liv. 21.44.5-6.
\item \textsuperscript{1341} “At liberum est Saguntum!” Krauss (1994:chap. ii. §7): “ad Hiberum est Saguntum”.
\item \textsuperscript{1342} Liv. 21.44.5-7.
\end{itemize}
Of course, Hannibal’s reference to the broken treaty mentions some sort of
broken clause, because no armed Roman invasion of Saguntine, or any other,
territory to the south of the Ebro, had ever taken place. Livy twice has
Hannibal use the word *terminus*, choosing his terminology carefully in order to
distinguish the words *terminus* and *finis*. Rome might be accused of imperialistic
behaviour, imposing her *termini* which can or cannot be crossed. However,
provisions forbade her from crossing specified ‘natural features’ in previous
treaties, where normally the dominant – or most powerful entity – imposed her
own rules in not crossing such lines. Rome had to accept such restrictions in its
first two treaties with Carthage and in an early treaty with Tarentum, as well as
imposing them in their peace treaties with the Illyrians in 228 and Antiochus in
188 B.C. The idea of boundaries resembling imaginary lines seems to
belong to the Greeks (Polybius), Carthaginians (Hannibal through
Livy), Latins and Etruscans, to which Rome adapted, imposing the ‘lines’ which could or could not be crossed and being accused of imperialistic
behaviour.

The actual solution to the problem comes from Rich. The Carthaginians were
bound by Hasdrubal’s undertaking not to cross the Ebro for war, and the
protection accorded to each side’s allies under the treaty of 241 B.C. did extend
to those, like Saguntum, who had only become allies after the treaty was
concluded. A huge apparatus of later sources gives a version of the treaty in
which the ban on crossing the Ebro applies to both sides, but, as we have seen,
this version also includes a guarantee for Saguntum, which clearly betrays it as
unhistorical. My final question is, in the Roman view, did then the
Carthaginians have permission to expand up to the Ebro?

---

1343 Heichelheim 1955:216.
1344 Carthage: Polyb. 3.22.4-7, 24.4, 11. Tarentum: Appian Samn. 7. Illyrians: Polyb. 2.12.3;
Appian Ill. 7. Antiochus: Polyb. 21.43.14; Liv. 38.38.9. Cf. Täubler 1921:60-2; Dahlheim 1968,
156-7; Rich 2011a:20-1.
1345 Rich 2011a:8
1346 Saguntum protected by the Ebro treaty: Liv. 21.2.7, 18.9; Appian Hisp. 7, 11; Florus Epic.
1.22.4; Zon. 8.21.4; Silius Italicus 1.294-5. The embassy to Hannibal: Cic. Phil. 5.27; Liv. 21.6.8,
9.3; Appian Hisp. 11; Zon. 8.21.7-8. Both of these distorted versions may have originated with
defend the authenticity of this version of the embassy to Hannibal is wholly implausible.
In my opinion, to understand the Livian perspective we should expand this vision, on the basis of the Roman experience. From the Saguntine incident, it is perhaps possible to draw conclusions about the function that the Iberian city served for the Romans. As Salmon has already suggested, Rome did not move at all to send military aid to her ally beyond the Ebro (Saguntum) during Hannibal’s attack. The Romans were simply using the town as ‘look-out post’ to check Hannibal’s policy and movements. With his exceptional intuition, Salmon stated: “The plain fact is, of course, that, legal niceties aside, Saguntum was the acid test of Carthaginian intentions”.1347 This idea is confirmed by the events that followed Saguntum’s fall. Rome did not intervene to save the Iberian city and instead chose the best checkpoint in order to save Massilia. Romans, on their way to and from Spain, made the Phocean colony their regular port of call.1348 Scipio’s soldiers disembarked at the mouth of the Rhodanus (modern Rhone) to check Hannibal’s march, but they arrived three days later.1349 Probably for this reason, Hannibal had carefully avoided passing by Massilia and crossing the Rhone at its mouth, preferring to engage skirmishes with Gallic allies of Massilia.1350

We should embrace a different view in order to understand the Ebro treaty. Salmon’s last sentence, therefore, detects a new vision of ‘bordering line’, as expressed in the Roman conception. His exceptional intuition helps to identify the finis as not just a line but an expanded sector, which encompassed key points or areas behind and beyond the natural feature named as finis. First of all we should reconsider the Livian term finis and then expand the definition of the concept to include other features previously discussed.[1.4.1] Secondly, we should focus on the function that Saguntum served for the Romans and the

---

1347 Salmon 1960:135.
1348 In 218 B.C. Roman envoys returning from Carthage were first greeted hospitably at Massilia; so Liv. 21.20.7-9.
1350 Liv. 21.29.2-4
value of *finis*. Thirdly, we must consider and apply the definition of *fines* to the concept of *imperium*.\(^{1351}\) We should expand this vision of an imaginary line superimposed on the River Ebro, based on the Roman point of view. *Finis* might be, not just ‘a line’, but an expanded sector, encompassing key points or areas.

Livy believed that a treaty had been signed before the beginning of the siege, stating clearly the position of Saguntum ‘in the middle’ (*in medio*) of two *imperia*. To his eyes, there was no difference between the siege of Saguntum and the crossing of the Ebro: both would have infringed Hasdrubal’s agreement as Hannibal would already have entered its opponent’s *imperium*.\(^{1352}\) Rome used Saguntum as ‘look-out post’ to monitor the sector between the Iberian *oppidum* and the Ebro and determine Hannibal’s real intentions.

For the Romans, the treaty did not serve simply to draw a line which should not be crossed. Probably, this is a common imperialistic view, but Rome was not used to being restrained behind any line – as in the case of the treaty with Tarentum – and as it appears in Scipio’s words on Spain:

\[
\textit{non ut ipsi maneamus in Hispania, sed ne Poeni maneant, nec ut pro ripa Hiberi stantes arceamus transitu hostes, sed ut ulтро transeamus transferamusque bellum.}^{1353}
\]

We must not remain stationary here, defending the bank of the Ebro against the enemy’s passage of the river; we must cross over ourselves and shift the seat of war.

It is also possible to contextualise the connection between the idea of the line and the Livian phrase ‘*transire Hiberum*’,\(^{1354}\) when at the end of the 1st century B.C. the argument of crossing rivers was seen as an ‘act of war’.\(^{1355}\) In the following chapters, I will show how Rome tended to be very precise in

\(^{1351}\) “*Imperium sine fine*”: Cf. Brund 1990:300-2.
\(^{1352}\) Polybius (3.40.2) implies that early in 218 B.C. the Romans were expecting Hannibal to cross the Ebro.
\(^{1354}\) Cf. Liv. 21.16.6.
composing her treaties or agreements, thwarting any notions of invasion that her enemies may have.
Chapter 6. Alps: Italy’s wall?

6.1 Introduction and aims

This chapter aims to analyse the Alps as finis focusing primarily on its use within Livy’s work, and using it as a starting point for discussion. The term finis appears in the same context as the Alps in only two cases. Livy states the Alps is a finis: a) indirectly, during the Hannibalic War or Second Punic War, when Hannibal was about to leave Italy: 1356

Provinciae iis non permixtae regionibus, sicut superioribus annis, sed diversae extremis Italiae finibus, alteri adversus Hannibalem Brutti et Lucani, alteri Gallia adversus Hasdrubalem, quem iam Alpibus adpropinquare fama erat, decreta. 1357

Their provinces were not contiguous, as in former years, but widely separated, at the extreme fines of Italy. One was to act against Hannibal in Bruttium and Lucania, the other in Gaul against Hasdrubal, who was reported to be now nearing the Alps. Whichever of them should receive Gaul in the allotment was to choose the army he preferred out of the two that were in Gaul and in Etruria and the one at the city.

and b) directly, twenty years (186-183 B.C.) after the end of the Hannibalic War, when a group of wandering people crossed the Alps to settle in the Venetian plain:

Alpes prope inexsuperabilem finem in medio esse: non utique iis melius fore quam qui eas primi pervias fecissent 1358

That the Alps, an almost impassable barrier, lay between the two countries, and whoever should pass in future, should meet no better fate than those who first proved them to be passable.

The following chapter will be divided into two sections. The first will consider Hannibal’s campaign and his journey through the Alps (including several aspects of the crossing, with an appendix at the end of his journey). The second

1357 Liv. 27.35.10.
1358 Liv. 39.54.12.
will examine the invasion of the Eastern Alps by the Gallic tribes and the foundation of Aquileia, where the Livian connection – Alps / finis – is more concrete. Each section will evaluate different topics, highlighting the features of the Alps and the attributes that it begins to acquire as a finis: a) as prominent, impassable natural feature;[6.1; 6.2] b) as a delimiter (extremis) of a territory or area (in this case of Italy);[6.2] c) by their function, view and structure in relation to their crossing (alpine passes: iuga or saltus) and the advantages and disadvantages of holding that passage;[6.1] d) as sacred,[6.1] juridical or legal barrier;[6.2] and e) the view or vision\textsuperscript{1359} from the top of the mountains, which guarantees a sort of visual control.[6.1; 6.2] This discussion regarding these topics will not necessarily follow this rigid order.

Although Livy straightforwardly applies the ‘label’ of finis to the Alps only in the passage on Aquileia, both the above passages provide more elements and features linkable with the finis – some of which are common to both. The data drawn from both passages allow us to enrich our knowledge of the term finis and, even better, the Livian understanding of the relationship between a delimiting feature and the territory that it is delimiting. Besides showing different features that become associated with, or are characteristic of a finis, the final objective for this investigation is to provide further evidence of the finis as a zonal feature rather than a linear one.

\subsection*{6.1.1 Livian premise to Alps}

This section examines Livy’s use of the Alps at a functional level. In two very early cases both narratively and chronologically,\textsuperscript{1360} the mountain belt is used as a feature of enclosure to define an area associated with ethnically defined groups, which extends from the Alps to the sea. Livy compares delimitative terms of the first passage, when defining the territory inhabited by the

\begin{footnotesize}\begin{enumerate}
\item \textsuperscript{1359} So Edel (1995:154): “Aristotle reckoned the physic of vision must involve an emanation from the eye to the object, and I his apparent acceptance of the idea that in the act of vision the eye takes on the colour of the object. […] He opposes the view that an emanation from the eye can reach as far as the stars or coalescence somewhere on the way with the object”.
\item \textsuperscript{1360} Liv. 1.1.3 and 1.2.5.
\end{enumerate}\end{footnotesize}
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Euganeans\textsuperscript{1361} between the sea and the Alps (\textit{Euganeisque qui inter mare Alpesque incolebant})\textsuperscript{1362} and that of the Etruscans.\textsuperscript{1363} In the former case, the Alps served to delimit the area where the Venetian population of Euganeii lived,\textsuperscript{1364} whilst in the latter case, Livy set the latitudinal limits of Etruscan \textit{fama},\textsuperscript{1365} as stretching from the Alps to the Strait.\textsuperscript{1366}[2.2] Livy recalls two geographical settings, displaying practically two limits on the Italian soil: the Mountains and the Sea. Indeed, the geographical collocation of the Euganeans is described by Livy\textsuperscript{1367} in the same way he defines the extent of Etruscan \textit{fama}. The distinction between the two Livian passages is mainly based on Euganeans' real presence (\textit{incolere}) in that territory\textsuperscript{1368} and Etruscans' "renown of her people’s name" (\textit{fama nominis}), but the delimitation is given by two similar natural features: the mountain range of the Alps and the sea or a strait (\textit{fretum}).\textsuperscript{1369} Mussi, following Semple’s school of thinking, points out: “The Italian peninsula is situated in an interesting geographical position, severed as it is from the rest of Europe by a major natural barrier, the Alps, while the sea comprises the rest of its natural frontiers”.\textsuperscript{1370} These two elements delimited the territoriality of Italy, as well as the population which had settled in or had an influence on that specific area.

By underlining this point, my aim is to show that Livy delimited an area of genuine occupation, as well as an area of ‘renown’, through the use of two natural limits at the extremities of the territory. Therefore, the Alps in Livy work as a delimitative, geographical element, which encloses (or creates) the peninsula and its population in the North. About’s poetic words recall this last concept: “Nature, which has done everything for the Italians, has taken care to

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{1361} Smith 1870:873, s. ‘\textit{Euganei}’; Pulgram 1958:166; Kronasser 1957:104; Cornell 2001:110, F59.
\item \textsuperscript{1362} Liv. 1.1.3; cf. Menis (1988:19) identifies them with the palaeo-veneti; Atchity & McKenna 1998:139; Knox & McKeown 2013:294.
\item \textsuperscript{1363} Liv. 1.2.5.
\item \textsuperscript{1364} Liv. 1.1.3; Bačić 1995:236; Mellor 2004:173.
\item \textsuperscript{1365} On the concept of \textit{fama} in Livy: Hardie 2012:226-272; on the same topic in Virgil: Syson 2013.
\item \textsuperscript{1366} Kennedy, Sydnor Roy & Goldman 2013:24-5.
\item \textsuperscript{1367} The importance of Livy’s origins is stressed in: Macadam et al. 1971:267.
\item \textsuperscript{1368} Cf. Plin. \textit{N.H.} 3.19.23, 20.24, where the Euganeans are said to have Latin rights, whose towns listed by Cato in number of 34; Rackham 1958:99; Beneš 2011:45.
\item \textsuperscript{1369} On this point, see Bonfante 1999.
\item \textsuperscript{1370} Mussi 2001:xi.
\end{itemize}
surround their country with magnificent barriers. The Alps and the sea protect it on all sides, isolate it, bind it together as a distinct body, and seem to design it for an individual existence". In *AUC*, Livy depicts the extension of Italy, from the Alps to the southern regions, repeating this concept in different ways and contexts. Livy is undoubtedly affected by the Augustan policy for a whole, unified Italy, depicting its completeness. This concept of the unity of the ‘geographical’ Italy is quite important as Livy provides conceptual, real and intratextual *fines* when telling us of Hannibal’s campaign.

### 6.1.2 Geographical premise

The grounds for this section are embryonically present in the study undertaken by Semple, who writes about the ‘barrier boundary’ of the Mediterranean, which “occupies the subsidence areas in the broad belt of young, folded mountains which cross Southern Europe and the neighbouring parts of Africa and Asia”. As Horden and Purcell’s early forerunner, Semple defines the Mediterranean’s geographical location as immensely important, due to the fact that it lies on the northern margin of the trade-wind tract. Those two factors give it the isolating boundaries of mountains and deserts, making it in a peculiar sense an enclosed sea. It is enclosed, not only by the land, but by barrier forms of the land. These barrier boundaries exercised a dominant influence upon Mediterranean history and, moreover, usually form part of a wider system. In this context, mountain ranges and rivers – but also seas and deserts – working as filters, have passage spots, which Semple defines as ‘breaches’. The breaches in these wide barriers were varied in their geographical character and are often referred to as the

---

1371 About 2008:17.
1372 Semple 1915.
1373 Horden & Purcell 2000.
1375 Semple 1915:27. The Alps are not just a barrier created by man, they also affect the whole European climate, “preventing air from Continental Europe and from the Mediterranen sea, and are responsible for its climatology. Only in few cases when a strong pressure gradient is present between the two sides of the Alps, the orographic barrier ca be overpassed”. (from Sandroni & Cerruti 1989:14). Cf. George (2009:387): “The Alps also form a barrier to the mass movement of air and are responsible for the sharp climatic divide between Atlantic, Continental and Mediterranean influences”.
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Mediterranean Basin, considered an enclosed ‘entity’ or system. I would rather define them as ‘osmotic areas’: extended areas often next to some natural feature, where an exchange of any type was possible. They have crowded into their narrow channels streams of trade, migration, colonisation and conquest. The Alps have drawn peoples from remote sources and directed them to equally remote destinations and the following statement highlights the difference between barrier and passageway: “Other ranges have proved to be less of a barrier, imposing restrictions on movement rather closing it off altogether”.\textsuperscript{1376} In her definition of breaches of the Mediterranean Basin, Semple deems the Sea as enclosed in a contiguous straight line of mountain ramparts from the folded ranges behind Gibraltar to the massive Taurus System.\textsuperscript{1377} In this arch, Semple considered four main ‘breaches’: a) the Bosporus-Hellespont; b) the Balkan barriers and the Morava-Vardar furrow; c) the Rhone Valley and d) passes of the Julian Alps and the Karst.\textsuperscript{1378} More recently, King has stressed that the European landscape presents startling diversity through the presence of mountain ranges: “In physical terms it varies from the barrier of the high Alps, through rich agricultural plains, to marshy shifting swamps at river mouths”.\textsuperscript{1379} I shall use the last two examples to highlight the importance of these ‘osmotic areas’ in relation to Livy. In order to have a clearer picture of the Alps during the Hannibalic invasion, I shall also cursorily consider the whole of Hannibal’s journey in connection with the crossing of natural features, excluding the questions related to the Ebro, handled in the previous chapter.[5.2; 5.4; 5.5]

### 6.2 Hannibal’s journey

For about two thousand years, since Hannibal crossed the Alps, historians have argued as to which pass he walked through and several scholars have tried to

\textsuperscript{1376} Ostergren & Le Boss 2011:63.
\textsuperscript{1377} Semple 1915:27.
\textsuperscript{1378} Semple 1915:29-30; Pyrenees, Alps and Balkans also sounders the Mediterranean from the Temperate zone, cf. Gordon Childe 1958:15.
\textsuperscript{1379} King 1990:7.
follow the routes through the Alps. However, I consider this argument a purely theoretical exercise, reserved only for those who love detecting precision in history. For the purposes of my enquiries, the relation of the passage to the link between mountain ranges and other natural features is of far greater importance than exactly which pass was used by the Carthaginian. However, *fines* are likely considered as obstacles, by possessing on or around them key passage points, where their crossing used to take place. Brown indicates the main arguments in this area – raised by de Beer and which I am partially following – that Hannibal’s journey can be helpful for illustrating the importance of specific areas which granted passage through the Alpine range.

6.2.1 Natural sets, barriers and challenges

_Fines_, as rivers and mountain ranges, can be considered ‘barriers’ in terms of the difficulties one faces in crossing them. They can be traversed only in specific crossing places or areas, as von Humboldt remarked: “It is only in the writings of the great historians, C. Julius Caesar, Livy, and Tacitus that we meet some examples […], where they are compelled to describe battlefields, the crossing of rivers or difficult mountain passes, in their narrations of the struggle of man against natural obstacles”. Hannibal had to bear in mind the fact that, along his journey once he left Spain, he would have to cross three wide rivers and three broad mountain ranges, the sets Hiberum / Rhone / Po,

---

1380 Cf. i.e. Whitaker 1794:1, passim; Walbank 1985:107-19; Prevas 1998; Terrell 1922; Hutchinson 2013:166; as last work, which sums up the previous researches: Mahaney 2008:39-54.
1381 On this point see e.g. the very pertinent remarks of Walbank 1956 ad loc.; Salmon 1960:137.
1382 On the position of the so-called Island, at the junction between the river Isaras/Skaras and Rhone; the pass used by Hannibal’s army: the entranceway on the western slope, and the eastern way out to Italy; the attack in the gorge by the Allobroges on his approach to the main pass, cf. Brown 1963:38.
1383 Brown 1963:38.
1384 Beer 1955.
1387 Specifically on Livy’s crossing: Terrell 1922.
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Hannibal also knew that it would have been foolish for a big army to cross the Alpine barrier, even free of heavy siege equipment. The interminable march over the Alps (magis iter immensum Alpesque) was staggeringly costly in men and in the even more important pack animals. As Salmon remarked, in the long run Hannibal did not fail in any strategic field: logistics, strategy and still less in tactics, but he was unable to solve the problem of how to bring a siege-train with him into Italy, which represented his weakest link. When we think of the concept of finis as barrier from here onward, it must be made clear that, while ‘barriers’ are not impassable to human beings, they present two main problems: a) they require a passageway to be crossed, which can be a bridge (or boats), a mountain pass or a gate; b) men alone may be more likely to cross them, but the transport of heavy gear/equipment, such as siege machines, animals or wagons, heavily restrained and sometimes made it impossible for them cross. Salmon – by giving his eminent opinion on the difference between rivers and mountains – pinpointed that “it would have been difficult but presumably not impossible to get it across rivers like the Rhone and Po: all history proves that rivers are obstacles, but by no means insuperable barriers, to an attacking force. Mountains, on the other hand, are a very different proposition. They have always proved to be much more than mere temporary hindrances to military operations.”

Of the three mountain barriers, the Alps were without a doubt the most difficult obstacle to cross. Nevertheless, even the smaller barrier of the Apennines was also disastrous for Hannibal’s army, in spite of the lighter nature of the

---

1389 For a contemporary understanding of the connective tissue formed by mountain ranges and rivers: see Ertl 2008:5.
1390 Probably these connections are also unwillingly reported by Roberts 2006:69.
1391 Liv. 21.29.7.
1392 Liv. 22.3.1. Once Hannibal finally descended the Alps into the plains of northern Italy: he had lost at least one-third of the 40,000 men with whom he had started out from Spain and all his elephants except one.
1393 Salmon 1960:137.
1394 Salmon 1960:37. Cf. Liv. 21.43.4: “circa Padus amnis — maior Padus ac violentior Rhodano” (round you is the river Po — the Po, a greater and more turbulent river than the Rhone).
journey which did not involve transporting any heavy gear.\textsuperscript{1396} The Romans decided to try to halt him at ‘river barriers’ such as \textit{Trebia} (modern Trebbia) and \textit{Ticinus} (modern Ticino)\textsuperscript{1397} and ‘land crossing’ (Lake \textit{Trasumennus}, modern Trasimene),\textsuperscript{1398} showing that strategically, at the end of the 3\textsuperscript{rd} century, water barriers were still favoured over the highest mountain ranges. However, Livy makes three broad distinctions between Ebro-, Rhone-, and Po- regions, to be translated Ebro, Rhone and Po basins.\textsuperscript{1399} As well as this, he associates, explicitly or indirectly, the three rivers with the mountain ranges Hannibal had to cross. Livy repeats a general scheme of Hannibal’s journey based on the three natural sets in consequential/chronological order: Ebro-Pyrenees / Rhone-Alps / Po-Apennines. In Livy’s account,\textsuperscript{1400} these three sets of features seem remarkably well defined, as he knows exactly the stepping stones of Hannibal’s journey, showing that all these points had had a crucial importance in Rome’s expansion to the West, before becoming key points in Hannibal’s campaign.

In order to understand Livy’s concept of \textit{finis}, we have to bear in mind that the Alps form a belt of mountains sometimes broader than 200 km, increasing in height from the Rhone Valley to the main watershed.\textsuperscript{1401} The Rhone – like the Ebro – represents a landmark. In Livy’s account, it is quite clear that some natural features are more prominent than others but they are not still a \textit{finis} (at least in the remnant books). That is clear after Hannibal’s crossing of the Rhone: he spoke to his men, saying that for armed soldiers nothing is impassable or insurmountable (\textit{quid invium aut inexsuperabile esse?})\textsuperscript{1402} and that they could look to end their march in the field that lay between the Tiber

\textsuperscript{1396} Mainly Liv. 21.58.3 and 22.2.5-10. This decision helped in carrying a quicker journey, but was fatal when he had to siege Rome.
\textsuperscript{1397} Blits 2014:24.
\textsuperscript{1398} Blits 2014:25.
\textsuperscript{1399} Freshfield 1886:640.
\textsuperscript{1400} In Liv. 21.30.5, Pyrenees, Rhone and Alpes are listed as milestones: “\textit{nunc, postquam multo maiorem partem itineris emensam cernant, Pyreneaeum saltum inter ferocissimas gentes superatum, Rhodanum, tantum amnem, tot milibus Gallorum prohibentibus, domita etiam ipsius fluminis vi traiectum, in conspectu Alpes habeant, quarum alterum latus Italiae sit}” (But now, when they could see that they had measured off the greater part of it; when they had made their way, through the fiercest tribes, over the Pyrenees; when they had crossed the Rhone —that mighty river —in the teeth of so many thousand Gauls, overcoming, too, the violence of the stream itself; when the Alps, the other side of which was in Italy, were in full sight).
\textsuperscript{1401} Beer 1969:146.
\textsuperscript{1402} Liv. 21.30.9.
and the walls of Rome (*itineris finem sperent campum inter iacentem Tiberi ac moenibus Romanis*). The same Livian ‘topics’ can possibly be identified elsewhere in almost-contemporaneous authors: ‘imperial’ directions of conduit are probably part of the propaganda within the Augustan circle, which Silius Italicus takes up from Livy:

\[
\text{nunc, o nunc, socii, dominantis moenia Romae credite uos summumque louis conscendere culmen, hic labor Ausoniam et dabit hic in uincula Thybrim.}
\]

Now, comrades, now—believe that you are even now scaling the walls of imperial Rome and the lofty hill of Jupiter.* Our present toil shall make Italy and the Tiber our prisoners.

Present in Silius’ passage is the entire pattern which Livy had bound to *fines*: Rome, her walls, Italy (*Ausonia*) and the Tiber (*Thybris*). Hutchinson reports the presence of Jupiter as “an element of poetic sublimity and metaphysics”, which instead might be considered an element preserving those *fines* which protect Rome. [4.3.1; 3.5.3]

From the Livian passage above and its comparison with Silius, we face three interesting points, reflecting the other Livian topics tackled in this study: a) Hannibal’s vision, in which there are no barriers, in comparison with Livy, who considered the Alps (almost) impassable; b) the different acceptance of *fines*, [*Finis A*] related to the end of his journey (*itineris finem*), which ends at that *campus* (field); c) the associative connection between Tiber and the walls of Rome (*Tiberi ac moenibus Romanis*). Once again Livy associates—although in a different way—the Tiber with the Roman Walls and, in turn, with

---

1404 On the common points, the use of same words and semantic see Hutchinson 2013:170.
1405 Sil. It. 5. 500-11.
1407 Hutchinson 2013:167.
1408 Here, it is highly possible that Livy meant the *Campus Martius*.
the term *finis*.\textsuperscript{1410}[2.2.8; 6.3.4] The connection between Rome and the Alps is certainly not casual, as it is already present in Silius Italicus:

\begin{quote}
\textit{iamaque aut nocturno penetrat Capitolia visu aut rapidis fertur per summas passibus Alpes.} \textsuperscript{1411}
\end{quote}

\textit{...and sometimes he penetrates the Capitol with his gaze at night or at another time he marches at speed over the peaks of the Alps.} \textsuperscript{1412}

The Alps are thus introduced as a barrier whose crossing would enable Hannibal to enter Rome victoriously. In conclusion, Livy constructs a kind of ordered pattern, repeating in sequence a well-defined scheme. The associations between rivers and mountain ranges – Hiberum-Pyrenees, Rhone-Alps, Po-Apennines – are accompanied by a fourth set, through Livy’s association of the Tiber with the City Walls. These sets represented three main trials, leading Hannibal toward the conquest of Rome, where he faced the final set: the Tiber and the Servian Walls. But it is not the case that Hannibal’s chance of winning against Rome stopped right at the foot of her walls.\textsuperscript{1413}

\section*{6.2.2 Material and sacred breaking of the \textit{finis}}

Hannibal’s passage over the Alps – within his long journey from Carthago Nova to South Italy – is considered a deed comparable to those of Hercules.\textsuperscript{1414} And during the tough crossing of the mountains, Hannibal used a particular stratagem in order to make sure that his army passed over the Alps. Although they might not seem to have any connection to each other, some scholars have connected these two passages of Livy. In this section, I underline the importance of Hannibal’s deed related to the crossing of a \textit{finis}. And I show that it was Hannibal’s action of crossing the Alps – and therefore the \textit{finis} – that might have, in theory, led the Carthaginian to fail in his mission.

\textsuperscript{1410} See Fields 2008:4.
\textsuperscript{1411} Sil. It. 1.64-65
\textsuperscript{1414} DeWitt 1941.
6.2.2.1 Hannibal’s pietas

The first of Livy’s references to the Alps is related to a mention of Hercules, using the term *inexuperabilis* (the same term which we will find applied to *finis* in the second part of this chapter) for the Alps. Livy reports that at the end of the 6th century B.C. the Gauls wanted to cross the Alps to settle into the Po Valley, but the mountains looked too high to be crossed:

*Alpes inde oppositae erant quas inexsuperabiles visas haud equidem miror, nulladum uia, quod quidem continens memoria sit, nisi de Hercule fabulis credere libet, superatas.*

There the Alps stood over against them (the Gauls); and I for one do not wonder that they seemed insuperable, for as yet no road had led across them – as far back at all events as tradition reaches — unless one chooses to believe the stories about Hercules.

Livy himself – referring to Hercules’ drawing away Geryon’s oxen – states that Hercules’ labours are fantasies, questioning the reader if he is ready to believe them. Yet when Livy’s account was written, 200 years after Hannibal’s labours are supposed to have taken place; Hannibal’s memory among the Romans was generally surrounded by Herculean fables. And it is also the case that Livy’s utilisation of Herculean analogy dovetails with his predilection for using material belonging to the realm of propaganda – something which fits neatly with the realm of mythology. The general impression is that Hannibal was plainly re-enacting the tenth canonical labour of Hercules, encouraging a belief in his heroic dimensions and accomplishment that would continue to resonate in historical artifacts from later periods. Furthermore, one tradition – as preserved in Cornelius Nepos – states that Hannibal used the same pass as Hercules in crossing those Alps:

---

1415 Liv. 5.34.6.
1417 Spaeth 1929:99.
1418 Syme (1939:459-75) has treated Augustus’s use of public display with a similar skepticism; triumphs and religious festivals are primarily instruments of propaganda, treated together with literature and the arts as a medium for “organising public opinion”. Cf. Feldherr 1998:14.
1419 DeWitt 1941; DeWitt 1943:29.
1420 DeWitt 1943:29.
which separate Italy from Gaul and which nobody ever crossed before with an army except the Greek Hercules, for which reason this pass is called Graius.  

We might speculate that Nepos limited his comment to the Graian Alps, since it is impossible to say whether Nepos means that Hannibal crossed in the same place as Hercules. It is not worth pursuing this enquiry, however, for his whole statement is confused. Hercules’s army consisted of cows, and Polybius tells us that whole Gallic groups, before Hannibal’s coming, had ‘often’ crossed the Alps, carrying their valuables: gold and cattle. Hannibal made a formal commencement of his march into Italy by visiting the shrine of Hercules at Cádiz, invoking the hero as his patron. This region was the ultimate West, well beyond the Pillars of Hercules (Gibraltar); there was even a tradition that the true Pillars were at Cádiz. Moreover, Hannibal followed the ‘Road of Hercules’ from Spain across the Pyrenees, through southern Gaul, and the Alps, the same Domitian’s Way that was tracked by D. Ahenobarbus in 118 B.C. In crossing the Alps he performed labours in the heroic manner; one of these, perhaps not quite understood by later writers, was the famous fracturing of the side of the cliff with ‘vinegar’. This was obviously a Herculean exploit and therefore to be treated with some caution, yet Livy accepted it uncritically, to the consequent embarrassment of commentators.

---

1422 Nep. Hann. 3.4.
1423 Cf. Serv. ad Aen. 10.13.
1424 Ruch 1968:43; cf. Spaltenstein 1990:1.188.
1426 Liv. 21.21.9: “Gadibus profectus Herculi vota exsolvit novisque se obligat votis si cetera prospera evenissent” (Hannibal left for Cádiz, where he discharged his vows to Hercules, and bound himself by fresh obligations to that deity in case his enterprise should succeed). Cf. Sil. It., Punica 3.14-16. Stafford 2012; Stepper 2002:76.
1427 Polyb. 3.5.5; Liebeschuetz 1979:172.
1428 Cf. Berthelot 1935.
1429 Polyb. 3.39.8; Strabo 4.1.3; the Romans had used this road to reach Spain and had called it Domitian’s Way. But the earliest name we have for it is “the road of Hercules of Tyre”: Paris 1939:119; Thomas 1964:101; Trümpler 2005:114; Robb 2013:x; Sulimani 2011:216.
1431 DeWitt 1943:30.
6.2.3 Polybius and Livy: the Alpine view and the *iuga*

The previous section leads us to the main point – the importance of the *iuga* (passes) in the Livian narrative concerning the Alps – and has illustrated the almost total impassibility of the Alps, which were often considered by Livy to serve as an effective barrier-wall. In this section, I face two main challenges: a) the detection of more features of *finis* through the Gauls’ crossing of the Alps, and b) the difference(s) between Polybius and Livy on this point. The previous section is also significant here because it connects the Herculean passage with the Gallic transit through the Alps, providing us with two more clues about the value of the *iuga* or *saltus* and the sacred value of the Alps in Livy’s eyes. Livy explains that, even before Hannibal’s time, the Western Alps had been frequently crossed and re-crossed by Gallic hordes, which had passed through Gaul until they came to lands already occupied and ill-suited for pasture.

*ibi cum velut saeptos montium altitudo teneret Gallos circumspectarentque quanam per iuncta caelo iuga in alium orbem terrarum transirent, religio etiam tenuit quoddam allatum est advenas quaerentes agrum ab Saluum gente oppugnari. massilienses erant ii, navibus a Phocaea profecti. id Galli fortunae suae omen rati adiuvere ut quem primum in terram egressi occupaverant locum patientibus Saluis communirent. ipsi per Taurinos saltus saltumque Duriae Alpes transcenderunt.*

While they were there fenced in as it were by the lofty mountains, and were looking about to discover where they might cross, over heights that reached the sky, into another world, superstition also held them back, because it had been reported to them that some strangers seeking lands were beset by the Salui. These were the Massilians, who had come in ships from Phocaea. The Gauls, regarding this as a good omen of their own success, lent them assistance, so that they fortified, without opposition from the Salui, the spot which they had first seized after landing. They themselves crossed the Alps through the Taurine passes and the pass of the Duria.

[Liv. 5.34.7-9.]

Livy is aware of the constant Gallic crossings, connecting their invasions with places between the Alps and Apennines and supporting the

---

1432 Freshfield 1917:5.
1433 Liv. 5.33.2-6 (exp. 2): “eam gentem traditur fama dulcedine frugum maximeque vini, nova tum voluptate, captam Alpes transisse agrosque ab Etruscis ante cultos possedisse” (The story runs that this race, allured by the delicious fruits and especially the wine — then a novel luxury — had crossed the Alps and possessed themselves of lands that had before been tilled by the Etruscans). Cf. Freshfield 1917:7.
1434 Gauls crossed the Alps and settle in the regions previously cultivated by the Etruscans; cf. Putnam 2008:9.
tradition which stresses the importance of the passes by reporting again the same pass used by Hannibal (*per Taurinos saltus*).\(^{1436}\) He criticises Coelius Antipater in favour of Valerius Antias\(^ {1437}\) for the view that Hannibal crossed the Alps via ‘*Cremonis iugum*’,\(^ {1438}\) (? modern Col du Cramont) because this pass and the Poeninum *eum non in Taurinos sed per Salassos montanos ad Libuos Gallos deduxerint* (led him not in the territory of the Taurinii but, passing through the territory of the Salassi, reaching to the Libii Gauls).\(^ {1439}\) Nor did Polybius believe that Hannibal’s passage was a novel feat: like Livy, he also insists on the regularity of Celtic local tribes crossing to and fro.\(^ {1440}\)

Livy’s first-hand knowledge of *saltus* (passes) is also present in another passage, which is comparable to the one above. Livy tracks the paths of different invasions, which he seems to know intimately. The connective link with Massalia emerges again in Livy,\(^ {5.3.1}\) when at the moment of its foundation (about 540 B.C.) the Gauls … *per Taurinos saltus saltumque Duriae Alpes transcenderunt*\(^ {1441}\) (crossed the Alps through the Taurine passes and the pass of the Duria). The kind of reverence for the Alps attributed to the Gauls here is probably a Livian transposition of Roman beliefs concerning the crossing of a *finis*. The Gauls fulfilled a sort of ritual in order to engender a good omen for their Alps crossing, and this is because, from the Livian perspective, *finis* are embedded with a ‘sacred aura’ and the Romans were not used to crossing them without a fetial ritual.\(^ {2.2.8; 3.5.3; 4.2.3}\) Once again Livy underlines the key role of Massilia, linking the arrival of the new Phocean colonists with the Gauls’ crossing of the Alps, and once again he insists on the sacred role of the *finis*. The ‘ritual’ of helping the Greek colonists worked, as the Gauls succeeded in

\(^{1436}\) Liv. 21.38.6.  
\(^{1437}\) “As emerges most clearly from A.H. Macdonald’s brilliant analysis of 21.31, where Livy switches from Antipater to Antias, suspecting that they are incompatible, and, rightly, that Antipater was wrong, but failing to realise that he had not correctly matched the geographical points that Hannibal had reached in his two authorities”: in Horsfall 1987:198-9.  
\(^{1437}\) Beer (1967) believes it to be the *Cremonis iugum*, which Coelius gave as Hannibal’s pass (Livy 21.38.6); cf. Walbank 1956:37-8; cf. also Lazenby 1998:43; Cornell 2013:392; Packard 1968:1.352.  
\(^{1438}\) Beer (1967) believes it to be the *Cremonis iugum*, which Coelius gave as Hannibal’s pass (Livy 21.38.6); cf. Walbank 1956:37-8; cf. also Lazenby 1998:43; Cornell 2001:392; Packard 1968:1.352.  
\(^{1439}\) Walbank 1956:42.  
\(^{1440}\) Brown 1963:42.  
\(^{1441}\) Liv. 5.34.9.
passing over the Alps and – according to Scullard – “…waves of other peoples surmounted the icebound barrier of the Alps and poured down into the rich plains of Lombardy […]”,\textsuperscript{1442} setting up the city of Mediolanum (modern Milan).\textsuperscript{1443} Although Livy’s knowledge and beliefs are not explicit in the above passage (on the Gallic tribes’ disposal in Northern Italy), it serves to underline a few key connections: a) the sacred value and impassibility attributed to the Alps as \textit{finis}; b) the importance of the passes from which the Gallic hordes invaded Italy; c) the occupied area, between the Alps and Apennines; and d) the cities or places which were focal points and would be key access points (or passage spots) in the Augustan period.

On the contrary, no similar indications are to be found in Polybius. Yet it is worth comparing his writing with that of Livy in order to elucidate, through such disparities, some of the main features of the Alps as \textit{finis}, which appear in the Late Republic. As in the case of the Ebro treaty, this comparison is useful to illustrate the very different perceptions of some key places.\textsuperscript{[5.2.1]} Livy’s account of Hannibal’s crossing of the Alps is to be found in 21.31.1 ff. If we leave aside the passage 21.31.9-12, and the first words of 32.6, his version corresponds to that in Polybius, 3.49.5-56, sufficiently closely to suggest that both go back ultimately to the same source.\textsuperscript{1444} However, it does not mean that their point of view matched: indeed Brown already sensed some sort of mismatching between the two authors, confirming that “…it is impossible to reconcile Livy and Polybius, despite claims to the contrary”.\textsuperscript{1445} As ‘direct’ witness of the places through which Hannibal passed, Polybius was questioned several times, but as early as the end of the 19\textsuperscript{th} century there were already reactions against the depreciation of Livy’s narrative of the Second Punic War and the exaggerated estimate of Polybius’s claims as a geographer.\textsuperscript{1446}

\textsuperscript{1442} Scullard 1935:3.
\textsuperscript{1443} Liv. 5.34.10. Cf. Calderini 1938.
\textsuperscript{1444} Walbank 1956:37; cf. Hoyos & Yardley 2009. However, the best comparison has been undertaken by Lazenby 1998. A very good comparison of the author’s passages is present in the footnotes of Blits 2014:31-4.
\textsuperscript{1445} Brown 1963:38; see also Hutchinson 2013:166. For more discrepancies between the authors: Walbank 1985:108.
\textsuperscript{1446} “I have been working at Hannibal’s passage of the Alps. How bad a geographer is Polybius, and how strange that he should be thought a good one. Polybius is so very bad a writer” (Dr.
Polybius was careful to avoid and condemn the field of rhetoric, but he was sometimes as guilty as Livy in this respect. Furthermore, Polybius treated Alpine geography somewhat casually, making, for instance, no mention of the first pass as distinct from the second, but instead treating them as if they were one,\textsuperscript{1447} his method explicitly designed to avoid boring and confusing his readers with an excess of meaningless names.\textsuperscript{1448} To what extent can Polybius’ demonstrable lack of interest in orientation, his lack of research into the pass through which Hannibal broke into Italy, and his assertion that Hannibal advanced towards the highest passes of the Alps, while ruling out the lower and easier passes,\textsuperscript{1449} be considered reliable? These are the main reasons why Polybius can often be seen to be inaccurate and simply mistaken about certain places, why his basic ideas and conceptions can be seen to be wrong,\textsuperscript{1450} and why he does not provide even generic geographical details. Yet Livy is not entirely free of blame in this regard. For instance, he gives very little detail of the later stages of the approach,\textsuperscript{1451} as remarked by Reid: “No one of course would dispute that his aptitude for historic writing was far superior to that of Livy, but the difference between the two is not immeasurable, as some critics would have us believe”.\textsuperscript{1452} Through this comparative analysis of the two authors, I aim to show the following: a) that Livy displays a good knowledge of the Alps, based on the importance he assigns to the \textit{iuga} and \textit{saltus} (passes) as connectors and gateways implanted between the two sides of the Alpine range; and consequently b) the difference between Polybian ‘linearity’ and Livian ‘spatiality’, based on the zonal Livian extension of the Alpine range.\textsuperscript{1453}

The first point to stress is that – even though Polybius’ and Livy’s accounts overlap – the latter seems to have a greater awareness of the gateways which

\textsuperscript{1447} DeWitt 1943:30.
\textsuperscript{1448} Polyb. 3.36.3.
\textsuperscript{1449} Brown 1963:41.
\textsuperscript{1450} See. i.e. on Polybius errors: Dunbabin 1931:53.
\textsuperscript{1451} Brown 1963:38.
\textsuperscript{1452} Reid 1913:176.
\textsuperscript{1453} On this concept, it is very interesting to consider the idea of three-dimensionality belonging to the Alps: cf. Braudel 1949:1.206.
open on the finis Alpium. When Livy refers to the Alps, he draws the audience’s attention to the Alpine gorges and passageways (iuga). Livy roots his origins in a Alpine subregion, displaying in his text – in Walsh and Sommella’s opinion – a “consoling evidences of the Paduan’s knowledge of the Alpine passes”.\textsuperscript{1454} It is not difficult then to imagine Livy’s personal understanding (“una conoscenza liviana diretta”) of the Western Alps.\textsuperscript{1455} In his descriptions of the Alps, Livy bestows upon the passes a crucial role; likewise when he mentions the Pyrenees\textsuperscript{1456} and the fact that Caesar would later follow in these footsteps.\textsuperscript{1457} It is evident from the way he shows to the reader the connection between the two slopes of the Alpine range – as we will see from this chapter in the case of Aquileia – and the importance of the iuga.\textsuperscript{1458} The general understanding is that Livy is much more concise than Polybius, but he in fact seems to spend more time highlighting features which explain the nature of the Alps. By stressing an apparently unimportant point, he shows the difference between the two sides of the Alps, affirming in Hannibal’s journey:

\begin{quote}
\textit{ceterum iter multo quam in ascensu fuerat, ut pleraque Alpium ab Italia sicut breviora ita arrectiora sunt, difficilius fuit}\textsuperscript{1459}
\end{quote}

the way was much more difficult than the ascent had been, as indeed the slope of the Alps on the Italian side is in general more precipitous in proportion as it is shorter.

This information shows us a more “comprehensive and detailed view” from Livy, who displays a more complete understanding of the material environment by offering an interesting detail about the mountain range.\textsuperscript{1460} Horsfall’s opinion is clearly mistaken, then, in affirming that Livy would have “no clear mental image

\textsuperscript{1454} Cf. i.e. Liv. 21.38; Walsh (2007:195) and Sommella (1967:45).
\textsuperscript{1456} Liv. 21.30.5.
\textsuperscript{1457} Caes. B.G. 1.37.1; B.C. 3.19.2. See Asso 2010:132.
\textsuperscript{1458} The Alps resembled much more the features of an hourglass than a barrier, as suggested by their height, and of the 23 main passes, 17 were already in regular use under the Romans. And it is no coincidence that, just after the Hannibal’s experience, the Roman magistrates engaged in transalpine discussions and began to consider the mountain passages as key routes. It is likely that the terrestrial route opened by Hannibal connecting Spain to Italy allowed the Romans to create the new province of Gallia Narbonensis, formalised in 118 B.C. through the colony and capital of Narbo Martius (modern Narbonne). Both Polybius and Livy confirm the Roman interest in that route, the former walking the route and the latter using the sources of the last quarter of the 2nd century B.C. Cf. Duggan 1994:9; Pregill & Volkman 1993:145.
\textsuperscript{1459} Liv. 21.35.11.
of Alpine topography, at least on the French side". Moreover, it shows how Livy is very careful to consider both sides of the Alpine range as a whole. As we have seen, Polybius resolved not to list the names of the passes, meaning that, paradoxically, Livy actually preserved more information on Hannibal’s route. These facts once again expose Horsfall’s inaccuracy when making claims such as: “Savoy, therefore, whether to Polybius or to Livy, was not much more familiar than Hyrcania, and no clear and generally accepted nomenclature for the Alpine passes existed”. Livy gives so much detailed information about which people crossed the Alps, from which passes they came down to Italy and in which places they settled. Livy’s usage of a common terminology for the places that opened to the *iuga* is typical within his narration:

\[
in \text{ipsis portis hostium fatigatos subsistere—quid Alpes aliud esse credentes quam montium altitudines?}\]

…were they halting now, as though exhausted, at the very gates of their enemies? What else did they think that the Alps were but high mountains?

Livy’s *fines* have *gates* in the same way as city walls, and some areas have access points, which serve the double function of checking enemies or allowing passage. Likewise, for Sutrium and Nepet in Etruria the ‘entranceways’ to the Alps are compared to *portae* (gates). Although in some cases Livy appears to be implicit, cities take the place and function of checkpoints, opening and closing their access on the Italian slopes, since already the Gauls “*cum transcendisset Alpes, ubi nunc Brixia ac Verona urbes sunt locos tenuere*”. ([The Gauls] crossed the Alps by the same pass, established themselves where the cities of Brescia and Verona are now). Therefore, the Alpine passes

---

1463 Liv. 05.35.1-2. Cf. Liv. 21.30.8: “*eos ipsos quos cernant legatos non pinnis sublime elatos Alpes transgressos. ne maiores quidem eorum indigenas sed advenas Italiae cultores has ipsas Alpes ingentibus saepe agminibus cum libenis ac coniugibus migrantium modo tuto transmisisse*”. (Those very ambassadors whom they beheld had not crossed the Alps in the air on wings. Even the ancestors of these men had not been natives of Italy, but had lived there as foreign settlers, and had often crossed these very Alps in great companies, with their children and their wives, in the manner of emigrants).
served as the neck of an hour-glass, controlling human movements through them easily either way. 1466

The second point to stress in the comparison Polybius-Livy is the linear view of the former author. The Megapolitan follows Eratosthenes’ and Hipparchus’ geometrical patterns, where triangles have major importance. 1467 Sicily is clearly a triangle, 1468 but also Italy is depicted with a triangular shape. Yet, the most important comparison for our aims is Polybius’ view of Northern Italy:

τὴν δὲ λοιπὴν τὴν παρὰ τὲς ἄρκτους καὶ τὴν μεσόγαιαν παρατείνουσαν ὁρίζει κατὰ τὸ συνεχὲς ἢ τῶν Ἀλπεων παρώρεια, λαμβάνουσα τὴν μὲν ἄρχην ἀπὸ Μασσαλίας καὶ τῶν ὑπὲρ τὸ Σαρδῷον πέλαγος τόπων, παρήκουσα δὲ συνεχῶς μέχρι πρὸς τὸν τοῦ παντὸς Ἀδρίου μυχόν, πλὴν βραχέος, ὃ προκαταλήγουσα λείπει τοῦ μὴ συνάπτειν αὐτῷ. ἔστι δὲ τὸ μὲν ὅλον ἔδω καὶ τῆς ταῦτα τὰ πεδία περιγραφούσης γραμμῆς τριγωνοειδές. τοῦτο δὲ τοῦ σχήματος τὴν μὲν κορυφὴν ὃ τῶν Ἀπεννίνων καὶ ὧν τῶν Ἀλπεινῶν σύμπτωσις οὐ μακρὰν ἀπὸ τοῦ Σαρδωνία πελάγους ὑπὲρ Μασσαλίας ἀποτελεῖ. 1469

The third side, or base of this triangle, is on the North, and is formed by the chain of the Alps stretching right across the country, beginning at Marseilles and the coast of the Sardinian Sea, and with no break in its continuity until within a short distance of the head of the Adriatic. To the south of this range, which I said we must regard as the base of the triangle, are the most northerly plains of Italy, the largest and most fertile of any with which I am acquainted in all Europe. This is the district with which we are at present concerned. Taken as a whole, it too forms a triangle, the apex of which is the point where the Apennines and Alps converge, above Marseilles, and not far from the coast of the Sardinian Sea.

Polybius shows a “wider sense of geographical space” as the regions he describes are ‘spatial patterns’. However, he put emphasis on linear elements such as river courses, mountain ranges and roads, not as singular elements capable of creating a spatial pattern, but as linear features, which in conjunction with others form a geometrical shape. 1470 Clarke underlines that “Polybius totally confounds generalisation about ancient concepts of space”. 1471 She sensed that there is something wrong with the Polybian concept of the Roman world, but she does not justifity such affirmation. Probably Rawson is not far from the truth when she asserts that “the people in antiquity thought in

---

1466 Freshfield 1917:4-5.
1467 Dicks (1960) shows that the shape of India was conceived as a rhombus; cf. Strabo 2.1.34.
1468 Polyb. 1.42.3.
1471 Clarke 1999:103,n. 59.
predominantly linear terms, through itineraries and periplous journey”, but evidently the scholar does not consider the Livian view. 1472

6.2.4 Breaking the *fines*

The Alps represent a forbidden place, whose shrouded sacredness Hannibal violates by penetrating it, 1473 in the same way that we saw earlier,[4.2.3] where boundaries could be broken metaphorically by passing through them. However, in Livy’s narration Hannibal literally disintegrates the obstacle of the Alps, and while Livy does not state clearly that Hannibal is performing a forbidden action by crossing over the Alps, it is his silence on one particular episode which implies that Hannibal is guilty of *impietas*. Polybius reports that Hannibal – after crossing the Rhone and speaking to his troops – offered ‘a prayer to the gods’ before crossing the Alps.

τοῦ δὲ πλήθους ἐπισημαινομένου καὶ μεγάλην ὁρμὴν καὶ προθυμίαν ἐμφαίνοντος, ἐπαινέσας αὐτοὺς καὶ τοῖς θεοῖς ὑπὲρ ἁπάντων ἔσος, παραγγείλας ἑαυτὸς καὶ παρασκευάζεσθαι μετὰ σπουδῆς, ὡς εἰς τὴν αὔριον ἀναζυγῆς ἐσομένης. 1474

When the men applauded him, exhibiting great enthusiasm and ardour, he commended them and, after offering a prayer to the gods on behalf of all, dismissed them, bidding them get everything ready expeditiously as they would start on their march next day.

Yet Livy does not mention this episode at all. This is an act – a standard example of *virtus romana (pietas)* – deliberately omitted by Livy. For a start, Polybius uses his name as theophoric, which you would have thought is a hefty clue. And examples of Hannibal’s *pietas* creeps even into Livy – before he crossed the Ebro, Livy tells us “he went to Cádiz and discharged his vows to Hercules, binding himself with fresh ones”. 1475 So why did Livy ignore this later

1472 Rawson 1985:259. Cf. Nicolet (1991:70) also points out that these geometrical exemplifications – very useful in terms of practical exploitation of distances – “produced also a grossly distorted universe as seen in the Peutinger Table”. Contra Grafton, Most & Settis 2010:392, who affirm that Pythagora’s followers, Philolaous and later Aristotle (*Met.* 354b) established the notion of a spherical earth.
1473 Sil. Pun. 15.509, where the Alps are named *moenia (sc. Italiæ)*. For the parallel in Liv. 21.35.9, see Wezel 1873:10.
1474 Polyb. 3.44.13.
ritual? When two historians provide different accounts of the same event, it may be because they used different, independent sources. However, when an event is present in one account and not in another, it is more likely that one of the historians deliberately omitted the event for other reasons. In this instance, therefore, it would seem that Livy is deliberately trying to deprive Hannibal of the ‘pietas romana’. In Livy’s view, this would have shown Hannibal’s total disrespect for the sacred value of the fines and left him condemned by his own guilt. In Silius’ Punica 3, Hercules is clearly identified as a paradigm for boundary-breaking primacy. Even before Hannibal ventures off the track beaten by Hercules, we are told that the height of the Alps goes beyond the giants’ combination of Pelion and Ossa, while the Carthaginian soldiers see traversing the Alps as itself an act of transgression.

\[\text{At miles dubio tardat uestigia gressu,}
\text{impia ceu sacros in finis arma per orbem,}
\text{Natura prohibente, ferant diuisque repugnent.}
\text{contra quae ductor++non Alpibus ille nec ullo}
\text{turbatus terrore loci, sed languida maestis}
\text{corda uiurum fouet hortando reuocatque uigorem.}\]

The soldiers moved slow with lagging steps, bearing arms in the forbidden across the world up to finis, in defiance of Nature and in opposition to Heaven. But their general would have none of it—he was not terrified by the Alps or all the horror of the place; and his words raised the courage of his men and revived their energy when they were faint with fear.

Silius’ motives here mirror those of Livy; but within these two, so to speak, Alpine viewpoints, it is also emphatically made clear that Hercules himself was the first to surmount the natural barrier: “Hercules was the first to approach the untried heights” (“primus inexpertas adiit Tirynthius arces”). As Šubrt has remarked, Hercules is the hero who overcame the Alps, thus establishing a precedent for transgressing the magic frontier. Šubrt considers the episode as the breaking of boundaries and of fas, but he does not discuss how the

---

1476 Sil. It. 3.494-5.
1477 Sil. It. 3.500-2.
1478 Sil. It. 5.500-5.
1479 Sil. It. 3.496; Tipping 2010:20.
The impassability of the Alps is finally broken and what the relationship is with the crossings of other mountains such as the Pyrenees.\textsuperscript{1481}

In Livy, the theoretical action of breaking the boundaries (\textit{fines}) is also followed by Hannibal’s material fracture of the rocks in order to allow his army to pass through the Alps. Livy reports an interesting allusion to Hannibal’s alleged use of fire and vinegar (the ancient substitute for dynamite) as an aid to clearing natural obstacles from his path in his passage over the Alps:

\begin{quote}
\textit{inde ad rupem muniendam, per quam unam via esse poterat, milites ducti, cum caedendum esset saxum, arboribus circa inmanibus dieictis detruncatisque struem ingentem lignorum faciunt eamque, cum et vis venti apta faciendo igni coorta esset, succendunt ardentiaque saxa infuso aceto putrefaciunt. Ila torridam incendio rupem ferro pandunt molluntque anfractibus modicis clivos, ut non iumenta solum sed elephanti etiam deduci possent.}\textsuperscript{1482}
\end{quote}

They set fire to it (the timber) when a wind had arisen suitable to excite the fire, then when the rock was hot it was crumbled by pouring on vinegar (\textit{infuso aceto}). In this manner the cliff heated by the fire was broken by iron tools, and the declivities eased by turnings, so that not only the beasts of burden but also the elephants could be led down.

This ‘myth’ about breaking rocks with fire and vinegar is of more than usual interest,\textsuperscript{1483} and its origin seems to lie in the legend that Hercules also broke through the Alps in this fashion. Livy seems to be the first to reproduce this myth in writing; and, in any event, by Pliny’s time it had become an established trope in literature.\textsuperscript{1484} We are clearly facing a breaking of \textit{fines} in Livy’s view, although it is not clearly stated by the author. This theory has been confirmed in Lucan’s work / poem, which uses imagery and allusion to identify impious boundary violators. Lucan compares Caesar’s approach of the Rubicon, whereby he reveals himself as a foreign enemy, even anti-Roman, by crossing it.\textsuperscript{1485}

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{1481} The erotic story of Pyrene is adapted to the Pyrenees, see Lopez-Melero1991; Augoustakis 2003:248.
\textsuperscript{1482} Liv. 21.37. 2-3; Spaeth 1929:98.
\textsuperscript{1483} Some scholars considered Livy’s information as a ‘false myth’ due to Polybius’ lack of the same report about fracturing the cliff with vinegar; cf. DeWitt 1943:30.
\textsuperscript{1484} Spaeth 1929:99.
\textsuperscript{1485} Ahl (1976:107-112) observes that Lucan uses powerful imagery to designate Caesar as an enemy of the state and, in the process, connects his character to other historical enemies, like Hannibal. The first image occurs just before Caesar arrives at the Rubicon, when in Lucan (1.183) he crosses the Alps (Alpes): “\textit{iam gelidas Caesar cursu superaverat Alpes}”. Masters
\end{flushleft}
6.2.5 Vision from the Top

The Alps also have another feature, which is quite different from other kinds of *fines*. Contrary to the *fines* linked with water – i.e. seas, oceans, rivers, lakes are characterised by being flat or at a low altitudinal level –, mountains, promontories, hills and peaks in general provided a favourable position of control, surmounting the surrounding landscape. The concept of the control of space from a high spot has already been emphasised by Livy concerning the dominant position of the Capitoline Hill and specifically on the positioning of the *templum*.[3.3] This argument is quite marginal as it is only tangentially linked to the topic of *fines*, but it may be useful for understanding the importance of mountain ranges as *fines* and the (visual) control which may be exerted from them.1486

Scholars and ‘path-finders’ have remarked that Hannibal crossed the Alps through a pass and at its exit he commanded a view over the Po Valley,1487 leading him down into the territory of the Taurini.1488 Both Polybius and Livy record that Hannibal showed his troops the prospects of the ‘whole of Italy’ from a convenient point or a plateau.1489 Both historians claim that, after nine days of travel, Hannibal came to a vantage point from which he could look down on Italy, and encouraged his troops by showing them the close proximity to their goal. Polybius provides a definition of the Alps that conveys precisely the idea he wants to transmit to his readers: “The Alps seem to have the role of acropolis

(1992:3) remarks that Caesar’s actual crossing “has been passed over”. It appears that Caesar did not think crossing the Rubicon was a significant land mark. He only addresses the crossing of the Alps as relevant (Caes. B.C. 1.8-9). Ahl (1976:107-108) points out that this last example provides the climax to Caesar’s transformation into a Hannibal-like figure, citing Caesar’s own observation. Lucan (1.303-305) has been building the characterisation of Caesar as a foreigner, much like Hannibal, who leads an attack against Rome: “*non securus ingenti bellorum Roma tumultu concutitur, quam si Poenus transcenderet Alpes Hannibal*”. Here, Lucan gives no room for misunderstanding: Caesar is Hannibal’s counterpart.

1486 For Hannibal’s exploitation of landscape cf. Aeschin. 3.118-9; Hutchinson 2013:167.
1487 Polyb. 3. 54.2-3; Liv. 21.35.8.
1488 Polyb. 3. 60.2, 8; Liv. 21.38.5-6. Professor Wilkinson has proved conclusively that this pass was the Col du Clapier, that Hannibal reached it by following first the Isere and then the Arc, and that the ascent of the Alps began at St. Quentin on the Isere below Grenoble. No other route corresponds to the data given by Polybius and Livy. According to Polybius, Hannibal marched from the crossing-place to the ascent of the Alps in fourteen days, and crossed the Alps in fifteen more days marching. Dunbabin 1931:53.
1489 Berthelot 1935; DeWitt 1943:30.
for the whole of Italy”. By deploying a visual landscape to his troops, Hannibal metaphorically equates a territory (Italy) with a city: in much the same way that Livy compares territory to city.[2.2.5]

In Livy’s book 21, Hannibal encourages his army by stopping on a promontory on the Alps and displaying Italy spread below. From this hilltop, once the Alps had been crossed and the Romans and the Carthaginians were preparing for the first battle, Hannibal lectures his troops on the issues of the contest from this imaginary pinnacle. From here Hannibal presages the devastation of Italy, making from this cliff a thoroughfare for his troops.1492

Then Hannibal, who had gone head of the standards, made the army halt on a certain promontory which commanded an extensive prospect, and pointing out Italy to them, and just under the Alps the plains about the Po, he told them that they were now scaling the ramparts not only of Italy, but of Rome itself; the rest of the way would be level or downhill; and after one, or, at the most, two battles, they would have in their hands and in their power the citadel and capital of Italy.

Hannibal advancing in front of the standards onto a certain promontory from which there was a view far and wide (praegressus signa Hannibali in promunturio quodam, unde longe ac late prospectus erat), commanded the soldiers to halt and showed them Italy, and the plains around the Po lying beneath the Alps (Italiam ostentat subiectosque Alpinis montibus Circumpadanos campos); they were then crossing over the walls not of Italy alone (non Italiae modo), but of the city of Rome itself; after this all would be

1490 Polyb. 3.54.2; Polybius (5.8.7) also uses again the metaphor in another context by considering ‘all Aetolia’ as an acropolis; Clarke 1999:101; cf. Hutchinson 2013:167.
1491 Liv. 21.35.7-10.
1492 However, in Steele’s (1907:444) opinion it was “…not (just) fictitious, for there is deepest pathos in the scenes of joy and woe at Rome as they heard good or bad tidings from the field of battle; and beside that famous scene of Xerxes”.
1493 Liv. 21.35.7-10. Cf. Polyb. 54.2: “So he called them all together and tried to boost their morale. He had only one source of encouragement, and that was the sight of Italy, clearly spread out below. It lies so close up under these mountains that anyone gazing on both together would imagine that the Alps towered above Italy like an acropolis above its city”.
effortless.\textsuperscript{1494} By intensifying the text, Livy makes Rome the *arx* of Italy – that citadel which Hannibal will never take, regardless of how easy to cross the terrain would be from then onwards (*cetera plana, proclivia fore*).\textsuperscript{1495}

Despite Polybius and Livy’s claims to the contrary, it is, in fact, geographically impossible for Hannibal to have seen such a view from this position; either he could see the view because he was not in the position they claimed, or they were simply adding drama to the event. Indeed, I would agree with Reid’s conclusion that Hannibal was appealing “to his soldier imaginations, not to their eyes”.\textsuperscript{1496} Livy reports these passages as a redundant *topos*: again he compares the Alps to the Walls of Rome, calling them *moenia*. By repeating the same scene after having crossed the Rhone, he reminds them that they have to fight or die where they first meet the enemy, as they are now enclosed by the limits of mountains and streams which they should not pass, and wilfully ignoring those limits which they themselves had a hand in establishing.\textsuperscript{1497}\textsuperscript{[5.6]}

Every barrier they crossed was of course another victory along the path to the final goal of their campaign – a sort of ‘partition’:

\begin{quote}
\textit{nec est alius ab tergo exercitus, qui, nisi nos vincimus, hosti obsistat, nec Alpes aliae sunt, quas dum superant, comparari nova possint praesidia. hic est obstandum, milites, velut si ante Romana moenia pugnemus.}\textsuperscript{1498}
\end{quote}

There is no second army at our back to stop the enemy, in case we fail to beat him, nor are there other Alps to obstruct his advance while we make ready new defences. Here, soldiers, is the spot where we must make our stand, as though we were fighting before the walls of Rome.

In Polybius, the speech delivered by Hannibal on the summit of the Alps, and those addressed to the soldiers before the battle of the Ticinus by Scipio and Hannibal, are very much in the Livian style.\textsuperscript{1499} Livy amazingly provides a clear view of Italy, describing the Alps as “a citadel for the whole of Italy” ("\textit{arcem et caput Italieae}"),\textsuperscript{1500} which the soldiers could have held in the palm of their hand

\textsuperscript{1494} Jaeger 2006:402-3.  
\textsuperscript{1495} Cf. Hutchinson 2013:167.  
\textsuperscript{1496} Reid 1913:196.  
\textsuperscript{1497} Steele 1907:436.  
\textsuperscript{1498} Liv. 21.41.15.  
\textsuperscript{1499} Brown 1963:40.  
\textsuperscript{1500} Liv. 21.35.9. Cf. Liv. 1.55.6.
within just one, or at most two, battles.\textsuperscript{1501} Once again, scholars have tried to
find the exact point on some route from which a good view of the plains could
be discovered, with rivers of ink wasted on this topic.\textsuperscript{1502} I prefer to focus on the
symbolic importance of the passage. It is not impossible that some plateau
within the Alps provided a vivid, broad and paramount view of the Po Valley.
However, the disputants rarely refer to the next item in Hannibal’s oration, when
he points out to his soldiers the spot where Rome itself lay! Although this
pinnacle from which he looked at the ‘whole of Italy’ was probably an
embellished forecast “depicted by fictitious scenes”,\textsuperscript{1503} I contend that the
mountain altitude gave a certain tangible sense of control over the surrounding
landscape and over the enemy. This topic will be tackled by Livy again when
considering the advance of Phillip V on Mount Aemous (Balkans), during which
he tried to reach Italy from the Balkan Peninsula rather than by sea. His
elevated position on that mount would have allowed him to control three main
areas and conquer the Romans, emulating Hannibal’s journey as he did so.

\textbf{6.2.6 Fines Italiae: from Alps to Bruttium}

From \textit{AUC}, it is evident how the two \textit{fines} or two natural features are connected
to the notion of territory. As well as this, we have seen in the early description of
territorial areas that the Alps were a clear marker both of the material presence
of a population (the Euganeii) and of the ‘immanence’ (Etruscans’ \textit{fama}) spread
by a population itself\textsuperscript{1504}.\textsuperscript{[2.2]} The purpose of this section is to show another
feature of \textit{fines}: their delimitative nature. As shown previously about the
demarcation of territories inhabited by populations, Livy bestows upon certain
\textit{fines} the ability to define Italy as a whole.\textsuperscript{[2.2]} In a different way to other

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item \textsuperscript{1501} Jaeger 2006:402-3.
\item \textsuperscript{1502} Modern investigators have taken this literally and have searched for and found a place of
suitable dimensions and location in the neighbourhood of the Col Clapier hard by Mt. Cenis.
Berthelot 1935; DeWitt 1943:30.
\item \textsuperscript{1503} Steele 1907:444
\item \textsuperscript{1504} Liv. 1.2.5: “…quamquam tanta opibus Etruria erat ut iam non terras solum sed mare etiam
per totam Italiam longitudinem ab Alpibus ad fretum Siculum fama nominis sui implesset” (… so
great was Etruria’s richness/wealth that the renown of her people had been not only the inland
parts of Italy but also the coastal districts along the whole length of the land from the Alps to the
Straits of Messina).
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
instances (…), Livy identifies a territory (Italia) and not as the area of influence of a population or ethnic group as had been done previously.

Livy describes to us Hannibal’s departure from the southernmost shore of Italy: the Bruttium. In the temple of Juno, the Carthaginians set up a bronze inscription with his res gestae, an event Livy relates near the end of Hannibal’s campaign in Italy and at the end of a book, so that it concludes Hannibal’s war in Italy. Jaeger has already provided a wealth of detail about the end of Hannibal’s campaign, and in particular the place from where the Carthaginians set sail to Africa, which is important here for understanding those ‘limits’ of Italy which Livy had already emphasised. We need to consider the temple and the promontory as a whole and the end of the Livian narration as a clear reference to the end of the war in Italy, as opposed to the beginning of Hannibal’s journey in Italy, after his crossing over the Alps. As Jaeger has shown, the position of the temple is linked to its intratextual position. Livy’s first elaborate reference to, and only extended description of, the temple of Juno appears as a digression within the description of Croton. This geographical context makes the temple of Juno a logical place to consider the passage from an intratextual point of view, for the following reasons: a) the description comes at the end of the book 30; b) at this point, Hannibal put a definitive end to his adventure in Italy, departing to Africa; c) the topography of the promontory of Croton and the temple of Juno collocates them to a liminal space; d) Bruttium lies in direct opposition to the Alps. Cape Lacinium and the temple of Juno also appear as prominent features in several episodes from Books 21-45, two of which (from Books 24 and 30) provide bookends, as it were, for Hannibal’s inscription. Hannibal’s departure had a mirror-image effect, when he left his enemies’ country despondent. He looked back often on the Italian shores (respexisse saepe Italiae litora), aimed invective at gods and men, and called

---

1506 Liv. 27.35.10.
1508 On Cape Lacinium, see RE ‘Lacinium promuntorium’, vol. 12.345-6. For other books ending at the meeting point of land and sea, see the end of Aeneid 6 and beginning of 7, with Jeff Wills comment to Hinds 1998 (“Aen. 6.901 litore, 7.1 litoribus; the structural shores of Vergils poem?” See Vasaly 2002.
1509 Cf. in Polybius (FGrHist. 175 F.2), Juno’s warning to Hannibal to not remove the golden column in her temple: cf. Baronowski 2011:48.
down curses on himself and his own head as well (suum ipsius caput exsecratum), that he had not led his army, still bloody, from the victory at Cannae straight to Rome. Making these accusations, he lost his long hold on Italy (ex diutina possessio Italiae). This passage harks back to Hannibal’s first view of Italy in Livy, allowing him to cast his own retrospective gaze back to Book 21 from Book 30 and repeat the name of Italia in each passage of the last section.\footnote{Liv. 30.20.7-9.} From North to South, from his prospectus at one promontory, to his gaze back at another (respexisse), Hannibal surveys Italy.\footnote{Hannibal metaphorically flies rapidly to Italy and has to be (metaphorically) dragged away, in Liv. 30.30.14: “ex diutina possession Italiae est detractus”. He looks back to this scene himself, when he says to Scipio: “me sextum decimum iam annum haerentem in possessione Italiae detraxisti”.}

The temple stands on a promontory, Cape Lacinium,\footnote{Just one surviving column of the temple, and examples, see Spadea 1996. On the history and importance of the temple for South Italy, see Lomas 1993:32; De Sensi Sestito 1984.} which appears first in the extant text when Philip’s envoys land near the temple, avoiding carefully the ports of Brundisium and Tarentum and secretly making contact with Hannibal.\footnote{Liv. 23.33.4.} Livy identifies precisely where they disembark: “ad Laciniae Iunonis templum in terram egressi sunt”. After making their way to Hannibal and forming an alliance with Carthage, the envoys return to their ships. Livy is once again very precise about the place: “eodem ad Iunonis Laciniae, ubi navis occulta in statione erat, perveniunt”. In Livy’s picture of Italy, Bruttium is its furthermore corner (extremum Italiae angulum).\footnote{Liv. 27.51.13.} The value as political boundary of the Brettian promontory is only identifiable in Appian, however, as the surviving books of Livy do not refer to it. Appian tells us that a treaty was struck between Rome and Tarentum around 303 B.C.[4.4.1] The promontory or the temple marked the point beyond which the Romans were not allowed to sail. In 282 B.C., when the Romans crossed this invisible line in the sea and this point on the land, the Tarentines sank part of the Roman fleet and then insulted
Chapter 6. Alps: Italy’s wall?

The manner in which Livy places the passage within a wider context gives us different data to consider: a) If for Livy the Alps are Italy’s metaphorical walls, as we shall see, Cape Lacinium is its postern gate, where people come and go, sometimes covertly. b) Hannibal replaces the foundation and dedication of an altar, as he did at Cadis, as an act which ratifies through an inscription the definitive account of his achievements. Thus Hannibal’s version of his res gestae recedes behind Livy’s vivid and memorable scene while Hannibal recedes from the Italian shore. c) The vision of Italy as a unique entity is given by the completion of Italy from the Alps to Cape Lacinium; c1) fines seem not to represent an end of something, but an area of passage; c2) fines delimit an area, a region or a zone and consequentially, c3) they reinforce the idea of a unified Italy.

6.2.7 Defending the Alps at their passes?

This section introduces the second part of this chapter, which explores how the Romans began to consider the foundation of colonies/checkpoints along the Alpine passes and therefore along the finis. Despite difficulties, Hannibal’s army managed to reach Italy with a sufficient number of soldiers to engage in battles with Rome’s legions. We might therefore question why the Romans did not block him at the Alpine passes. After all, the Western Alps boast the highest mountains in Europe outside the Caucasus, and accordingly they are difficult to cross but comparatively easy to defend. In the same context of the Hannibalic War, but in the region of the Pyrenees, Livy had already expressed how Scipio had seized the opportunity to block the mountain passes as an easy

---

1515 App. Samn. 7.1. See also Dion. Hal. 19.5, 39.4, and Polyb. 1.6.5-7, with Walbank 1979 ad loc. See also Lomas 1993:39-58, esp. 50.
1516 Liv. 21.41.15.
1517 For other ways in which Hannibal’s words and actions shape the past, see Rossi 2004:359-360.
1519 Liv. 27.35.10.
1520 Hooker & Sewter 1961:139.
way to check the enemy (Hasdrubal). Therefore one might have thought it a fairly simple matter for the Romans, once they knew Hannibal’s general plan, to check the passes in the Western Alps and deny him entrance into Italy. As stressed by Salmon, they could not do so because: a) Rome’s authority did not extend as far as the Alps, and b) the number of the unknown Alpine passes (at least 6 of them, as we shall see) would not have given them the chance to block the right pass. Salmon’s thought about the control of the mountain range addresses the problem of the ‘extension of power’, which means extensions of imperium: an indirect control over an area not militarily subjected. The Romans’ material power extended neither to the mountains themselves nor even up to their territorial approaches like the passes (iuga). These areas in the North remained in non-Roman, and often hostile, hands right down to the time of Augustus. Of course it was nevertheless theoretically possible, as Stalin once put it, that Rome could have found people “willing to ‘lend’ her a frontier” and send a field force to block the passes; but in practice, such a field force would have quickly found its position untenable. The second reason why the Romans, with their Italian allies, did not block any passes, was that they did not have enough troops to man all the passes simultaneously.

We have seen that the Romans must have realised long before the war began that the Carthaginian attack would take the form of an invasion by land across the Western Alps.[5.2.2] They also had a very clear strategy in their mind, as in 218 B.C. Rome rushed in planting the colonies of Cremona and Placentia on the midstream of the Po River with the intention of checking Hannibal’s advance. They had decided to set up their outposts along the main Italian river as bases for their attacks, in an attempt to stop Hannibal advancing again

1521 By mentioning Scipio’s victory over Asdrubal at Baecula (Liv. 27.18.19), Livy tells of Asdrubal’s advance toward Pyrenees, and that Scipio was warned that it was sufficient just to block the mountain passes (Liv. 27.20). Cf. Heeren 1832:1.279-80.
1522 Salmon 1960:139.
1523 Stalin 1978.
on Trebbia and Ticinus (218 B.C.), two minor tributaries of the Po.\textsuperscript{1525} However, their ‘river-strategy’ was ultimately unsuccessful. From the Hannibalic invasion onwards, Rome was concerned about the southern sector of Alps, because the traditional invasion route into Italy was not the Western Alps, but the opposite wing of the Alps, which was much lower and ridged.

6.3 Aquileia: eastern Alps as infringing area

6.3.1 Introduction

The most important passage in the AUC regarding the Alps is the one in which Livy clearly defines them as ‘\textit{finis}’:

\begin{quote}
\textit{Alpes prope inexsuperabilem finem in medio esse: non utique iis melius fore quam qui eas primi pervias fecissent.}\textsuperscript{1526}
\end{quote}

That the Alps, an almost impassable finis, lay between the two countries, and whoever should pass in future, should meet no better fate than those who first proved them to be passable.

Although the passage is more complex than it first appears, Livy clearly connects and matches the term ‘\textit{finis}’ with the adjective ‘\textit{inexuperabilis}’ and he contextualises the same passage within the foundation of the Latin colony of Aquileia.\textsuperscript{1527}

6.3.2 Background

There are at least three main factors which made the western sector of the Alps crucial to the Romans: a) geographical, b) historical and c) economical.

A) The Oriental (West) – formed by the Julian Alps/ Venetian Plain (South) and the Carnic Alps (North) – Alps are a slender southeastern offshoot of the

\textsuperscript{1525} Rossi 2004:369.
\textsuperscript{1526} Liv. 39.54.12.
\textsuperscript{1527} Favero & Fossati 2000:22.
main system,\textsuperscript{1528} which present several natural features. In Hamzet’s words, these Alps formed a ‘naturally-made boundary’, including the Gulf of Trieste, the Karst Plateau, the Istrian Peninsula and the double Gulfs of Trieste and Fiume, making them part of a whole patched system.\textsuperscript{1529} As Livy underlined, the West slope of the Julian Alps presents steep and inapproachable escarpments, whereas rivers carved deep valleys and compelled accesses. The lowest point and the most dominant environmental element – where the barrier sinks to a level of 2,897 feet (= 883 m) – is a limestone plateau known to the ancients as the Mons Ocra,\textsuperscript{1530} where on its summit was the mansio ad Pirum (from which comes the modern name Peartree / Birnbaumerwald / Hrušica).\textsuperscript{1531} The Labacum or Emona Flumen (River Ljubljana) flowed on the eastern side of Mons Ocra, leading to the navigation of the Sava-Drava-Danube system; while on the western slope, the river Sontius (modern Isonzo/Soča) led up to the deep ridged valley of river Frigidus (modern Vipava/Vipacco) and to the fertile plan of Aquileia.\textsuperscript{1532} By far it was the easiest land passage into and out of Italy between Aquileia and Emona (modern Ljubljana) via the valley of the Vipava, the ‘Icy River’ (Fluvius Frigidus).\textsuperscript{1533}

B) This sector was crucial for the control of the whole area – and this must also have been clear to Livy when he reported the speech of Philippus V of Macedonia on reaching Italy from the Balkans – and for its connective net of roads. From Aquileia, important roads diverged in three directions. The first ran northwest through the Carnic Alps and Noricum to Veldidena (modern Wilden), where it merged in the Via Claudia Augusta.\textsuperscript{1534} To the Northeast, the old amber trade-route led over the Julian Alps into Pannonia past Lublijana, Poetovio and Savaria, to Carnuntum and Danube.\textsuperscript{1535} By commencing from Aquileia, the main

\textsuperscript{1528} Semple 1915:31.
\textsuperscript{1530} Ptol. 4.202; 207.5; 211.7; 314; Todorović 1964:70.
\textsuperscript{1531} This name survives in the Peartree Pass and the Birnbaumer Wald, the German name of the old Mons Ocra plateau. Dimitz 2013:19.
\textsuperscript{1532} On the connection between Aquileia and the Drava: Putnam 2008:31; VV.AA. 1979; Bavčer 1991.
\textsuperscript{1533} It. Ant. 128.-129.2; on the battle of Fluvius Frigidus: Curran 1997:109; Wilkes 2005:237.
\textsuperscript{1534} It. Ant. 256; 258; 259; 275; 279; 280.
\textsuperscript{1535} Skeel 2014:39.
road crossed the Julian Alps to Nauportus (modern Vrhnika), forming the first segment and the easiest route to Carnuntum. These paths followed the river valleys, meeting at the core of this area the Mons Ocra. Two roads intersected each other by ad Pirum. From the summit, one road dropped through the Ljubljanica River valley, while another path connected Santicum (modern Villach) – in a broad and lake-strewn basin at the head of navigation on the Drava – to Tergeste (modern Trieste) and to Lacus Lugeum (modern Lake Cerknica). Both paths led to Nauportus / Emona (modern Ljubljanika / Ljubljana). The first path crossed a tributary of the River Sontium (modern Isonzo /Soča): the River Frigidus (modern Vipava/Vipacco). From here, along these river valleys in the imperial period, the Romans started their massive conquests into Central-Eastern Europe. In the days of the Empire, a Roman military road ran along the other route from the Col di Tarvis over the Alps, connecting Aquileia with the navigable course of the Drava through the River Tiliaventus (modern Tagliamento) Valley.

C) According to Pliny, amber was brought by the Germans to Pannonia (Carinthia and Carniola), and purchased from them by the Veneti living on the north Adriatic coast. “There was also, of course, the long-established amber route running eastwards from Aquileia to the Danube at Carnuntum and then up
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1536 Strabo 4.6.10; 4.7.5.
1537 Rodewald 1976;36, 104.
1538 Ocra Mons (ἡ Ὄκρα), is the name given by Strabo to the lowest part of the Julian or Carnic Alps, over which was the pass leading from Aquileia to Emona, and from thence into Pannonia and the countries on the Danube. The mountain in question is evidently that between Adelsberg and Laybach, which must in all ages have been the principal line of communication from the Danube and the valley of the River Sava with Italy. Cf. Strabo 4.6.10; 7.5.2. Singleton 1985:2; Wilkes 2005:237; Horvat & Bavdek 2009:14-5; Strobel 2011:206; Toškan & Dirjec 2011:304; Valussi 1972:320.
1540 Strabo (4.6.10; 7.5.2) states that the distance between Aquileia and Nauportus was variously estimated from 350 to 500 stadia, or 40 to 57 miles. Semple 1915:33.
1541 Mommsen 1873.3.215. For the modern road in detail, see Krohn 1911, 61-62; Canstein 1837:235-58. Semple 1915:33; Dimitz 2013:19; Mesarović 1964:112.
1543 See i.e. Blodgett 2007.
1545 Pliny (N.H. 36.2.11) mentions the amber necklaces worn by the women of this region, not only as an ornament, but as a protection against sore throats. Cf. Tac. Germ. 45-6; Semple 1918:35; Charlesworth 1926:176; Rodewald 1976:104.
the March”. At the end of this process, in Aquileia, the amber was reworked and articles (mainly amber beads) were being manufactured for distribution across the whole Empire. This route used to connect Aquileia directly to the city of Noreia (modern Magdalensberg), even though Strabo supposed the traffic could use the rivers the whole way. From this area, the ancient amber route to the Baltic began, one of the earliest trade routes of Europe, connecting the Mediterranean with Northern Europe. The route led down the River Moravia (modern Morava) to the Danube, across the spreading spurs of the eastern Alps to the Sava Valley, the shrunken barrier of the Julian Alps, and the Mons Ocra Pass. Strabo emphasises the value of the Mons Ocra route for transporting military supplies to the Roman armies engaged in war with the Dacians on the lower Danube. Merchandise in large quantities was carried by wagon from Aquileia to Naupontus, and then by boat to Segestica (modern Sisek), an important distribution point at the confluence of the Savus (modern Sava) and Colapis (modern Kolpa) Rivers. The flourishing emporium for all this trade was the fortified town of Aquileia, at the head of the Adriatic. However, the location of Aquileia was not a fortunate one, as this area was continuously overrun, being as it was the first target of sieges by any invaders.

---

1547 Calvi 1977; Urbaczykin 2011:19, 513.
1548 Egger (1961) has led the campaign of investigations in Magdalensberg, confirming the site of Noreia even by Glaser (2006); see Rodewald 1976:36, 104.
1553 Parker 2010:168.
1554 Strabo 4.6.9-12; 5.1.8; Semple 1915:36.
1555 Strabo (5.1.8) speaks of the bartering of goods at Aquileia by natives from the hinterland, who brought slaves, cattle and hides, to exchange for wine, oil and product of the sea. Rodewald 1976:37.
1556 Semple 1915:33-4. The connections of Aquileia with the northern Europe were well known, as it worked as a trading and distribution centre between northern and southern Europe: see Campbell 2012:294.
6.3.3 The context

In 186 B.C. a group of Gauls – from the lands beyond the Alps (*Transalpinae gentes*) – crossed the Alps by a hitherto unknown route into Northeast Italy, invading the Venetian region. They were not a raiding party, but a migratory group seeking a new home. Causing no damage to the territory through which they passed, they eventually settled peacefully in an unpopulated area at the very eastern corner of modern Italy, carrying “all their property which they had brought with them or driven before them” ("quaeque alia aut populantes agros rapuerant aut secum attulerant"). This ‘corner’, as Livy defines it, is likewise comparable to the other two recesses of Italy: the opposite corner to the Venetian one in Ligurian territory and the one in Bruttium. They probably followed a well-known road through the Alpine valleys, which connected the very head of the Adriatic. Livy’s vague reference to the population who settled there (*Galli Transalpini*) makes it impossible, however, to understand what sort of tribe they were. He recalls Cicero’s *Transalpinae gentes* – where no more precise designation was ever known. By referring to the area around Massilia, Cicero’s passage is about the prohibition...
of planting grapes and olives by the “peoples on the other side of the Alps”.  

The discussion has opened with Patterson’s identification of Cicero’s Transalpinae Gentes with the ethnic group settled at Aquileia. However, Goudinou has shown that Patterson’s attribution to the ‘episode of Aquileia’ is without basis, as olive trees cannot be grown in this region. The common identification in both Cicero and Livy is important, for their use of the denomination ‘Transalpine’ creates a link with the opposite slope of the Alps.

Despite the Gauls’ peaceful intentions, Livy reports the Romans’ concerns, stressing that the Gauls started to build an oppidum, which could muster 12,000 fighting men. As a first action, the Romans sent envoys beyond the Alps to protest to the chieftains of the tribes, who disclaimed any responsibility for the group in Italy, claiming no ties with them. This means that the Romans (and Livy) considered the Gauls on the opposite slope to be responsible, and not those who lived across the Alps. No actions were undertaken by Rome until 183 B.C., when the Senate sent the consuls M. Claudius Marcellus and Q. Fabius Labeo, who probably had imperium over the whole Cisalpine Gaul. As the consuls were commanded to continue the war against Ligurian tribes in the Northwest of Italy, the Senate gave the task of quickly dealing with the new Gallic settlers to the praetor L. Julius Caesar. He was asked to put an end to the settlement without a war (sine bello), and would only be permitted to call upon the consuls and their legions in the event that a diplomatic solution failed. It is significant that we hear no more of this mission.

The next move was made by the consul, Claudius Marcellus, who sent word to the legions, whose command he was taking over, to march against the

---

1566 Harris 1979:86; Alexander 2003:64; It is quite understandable that the prohibition is useful to keep up the value of Italian products: Wilson 1966:67; Gruen 1986:1.313, n. 127.
1567 Goudinou 1983:198, n. 43.
1568 Bassetti 2011:68, identifies precisely the transalpine Gauls with the Taurisci, who occupied the territory as far as the River Livenza.
1570 Liv. 39.55.
So, it can be assumed likely that Caesar’s mission failed. After almost three years of uninterrupted occupation of the land, the Gallic settlers must have been surprised at the sudden renewed protests of Rome, and even more at the approach of the legions. If Livy is to be believed, they could have put a considerable force into the field. Instead, faced with the legions, they gave up without a fight in the belief that they could still get a reasonable agreement with Marcellus (certam, etsi non speciosam, pacem quam incerta belli praepontantes). They could hardly have expected the consul’s harsh and uncompromising response. Not only were they disarmed and ordered to leave that area, they were also deprived of their property, crops, and animals. Their oppidum was destroyed. At this, the Gauls sent envoys to protest. Introduced into the Senate by the praetor peregrinus, C. Valerius Flaccus, they stressed that they had entered Italy peacefully, had settled in an uncultivated area, and had harmed no one. They also protested that when they had surrendered to the consul they had not expected to be deprived of all they had. The Senate’s reply was that their settlement would not be allowed, but that, since the Gauls had surrendered, there was no justification for seizing their property. A commission was appointed, consisting of all the men with an interest in North Italy. They supervised the return of property to the Gauls as they left Italy. After this, the envoys crossed the Alps to warn the tribes against any further incursions.

---

1576 Gargola 1995:210, n.45.
1578 L. Furius Purpurio, as praetor in Cisalpine Gaul in 200 B.C., had defeated a serious rising of Gauls and Ligurians for which he may have got a triumph (Liv. 31.10.21-2). As consul in 196 B.C. he again fought in the area (Liv. 33.37). Q. Minucius Rufus, as consul in 197 B.C., fought against the same tribes (Liv. 32.28-9, 33.22 ff.). L. Manlius Acidinus (Fulvianus), later to be consul 179 B.C., was one of the IIIviri in charge of the foundation of Aquileia (Liv. 39.5 5). These men were chosen for their interest and experience in northern Italy. Those who consider it useful and significant to assign senators to family groups should consult Scullard 1951:64 ff.; Briscoe 1973:158; Bandelli 1988:71-3; Paterson 1978:456.
6.3.4 Alps: the (almost) impassable finis?

The previous digression on legal questions is due to the role of the ‘incident’ in the creation of the Latin colony at Aquileia. After analysing the background, we can grasp why Livy stressed the importance of the site on which Aquileia was built, giving the question extensive space in his account: the strategic placement of the colony needs to be linked with the finis. Cicero, referring to the Cisalpine Gaul, gave her three comparative features:

Est enim ille flos Italiae, illud firmamentum imperii populi Romani, illud ornamentum dignitatis.\textsuperscript{1580}

For that is the flower of Italy; that is the bulwark of the empire of the Roman people; that is the chief ornament of our dignity.

The word firmamentum reminds us why the colony was built in that exact point: its relationship with the finis as passageway on this side of the Alps and – if we embrace some scholars’ and Cicero’s suggestions – even to defend that finis.\textsuperscript{1581} Although quite an old comment, Bourguignon d’Anville and Horsley stated that Aquileia was the most “considerable in this territory […] It was a colony founded to serve as a barrier to Cisalpine Gaul, while the more remote provinces were not yet subjected”.\textsuperscript{1582}

Rome’s self-interested act against the Gauls seems to have been difficult to justify. The Celts, on the other hand, were seen as intruders, displacing Italians (Etruscans), and themselves being displaced by the Romans (as with Cato, it is Roman success in managing the landscape which comes across most strongly in Polybius).\textsuperscript{1583} Related to this preoccupation were attitudes to the Gauls on the Italian side of the Alps, and what might or could replace them: Cato also clearly employs a historical dynamic in which Romans (and all their moral and social

\textsuperscript{1580} Cic. Phil. 3.13.44.
\textsuperscript{1581} Placida 2005:25; Marchetti 1959.
\textsuperscript{1582} Bourguignon d’Anville 1791:1.158.
\textsuperscript{1583} As Williams (2001:60-2) remarks, the Etruscans themselves probably merited the loss of their land in Polybius view, unable to retain it after its bounty caused a slide into truphē (luxuriousness; despite Williams 2001:132 and n. 92, it remains unclear whether Cato knew of an Etruscan hegemony in N. Italy, probable as that may be). For Polybius’ othering of the Celts, apparently based on a perceived lack of rationality, see Williams 2001:82-7; this may set them apart culturally from the Romans and Italians, but note ibid. 87 on Celts and Greeks. Bispham 2007:59-60.
baggage) have, in the cases of the Boii and the Senones, replaced Gauls.\footnote{See Williams 2001:52-3. Also Williams 2001:60-2 on the historical dynamic in Polybius. Bispham 2007:59.} Considering Livy’s phrase on the ‘impassability’ of the Alps, the question is: Did Rome have the right to interfere with the Gallic settlement? Why did she refer to the Gauls beyond the Alps? Rome was probably at a point where she was reorganising the conquest of Cisalpine Gaul after the Second Punic War.\footnote{De Sanctis 1907:3.1.291 ff., part. 319-20; Calderini 1930:4-8; Paterson 1978:457.} Although some scholars confirm that Italy was seen already as reaching to the Alps,\footnote{Klinger 1956:13-6; Paterson 1978:457.} we should wonder if Rome had already extended her dominion over the whole Cisalpine region,\footnote{Archaeology has documented the gradual expansion in Cisalpine Gaul: Horvat 1997.} despite the fact that Hannibal’s invasion would have slowed down the organisation of the whole area.\footnote{Boatwright 2012:44.} I have shown that, 40 years earlier, the Roman \textit{imperium} extended up to the Ebro on the West front and it is utterly possible that in 183 B.C. the \textit{imperium} already reached the Alps.\footnote{Purcell 1990: Ramage 2003.} It is the same concept expressed by Heitland, who makes no reference to the \textit{imperium}, preferring to use the expression ‘sphere of influence’.\footnote{Heitland 1909:140.}

The break of the Second Punic War in the process of the conquest of Gallia Cisalpina triggered two effects: on the one hand, a general confusion of the Roman actions and, on the other, a change in status and policy in the same province. Furthermore, North Italy was the province of a Roman magistrate\footnote{Liv. 39.54.10: “nullius Romani magistratus, qui ei provinciae praeesset, permssi...” Paterson 1978:457.} and a checkpoint, so a strong colony in this region had probably already been considered. However, confirmation of some incomplete conquest or occupation of the whole area south of the Alps seems to be evident, as in 186 B.C. Rome protested with the Gauls but took no straightforward or military actions. The Senate took three years (183 B.C.) to find an agreement through diplomacy, creating an exceptional situation, which the Gauls believed had led to an understanding with the Romans. Marcellus’ behaviour probably did not reflect the Senate’s thinking, provoking his disapproval, as L. Piso’s fragment clearly
The main question remains similar to that put on the question of Ebro: To what extent would the Romans have thought of that area as theirs?

The senatorial envoys ordered the Gauls, who had invaded Northern Italy in 183 B.C. to return to where they had come from, since the Alps were “almost an impassable barrier in between” ("prope inexsuperabilem finem in medio"). Probably, the Gauls were seen as outsiders who had no business residing in Italy, for they had penetrated the natural barrier of the Alps: the ‘wall of Italy’. This last definition has been drawn from Cato the Elder (and Livy) through Servius:

\[
\text{Alpes quae secundum Catonem et Livium muri vice tuebantur Italian.}\]

According to Cato and Livy, Alps protected Italy as they work as a wall.

Potentially, we are able to backdate this definition to at least Cato the Elder’s time (234-149 B.C.). Scholars have contextualised the last phrase as belonging to Cato the Elder’s Origines, where the Alps are considered like a wall (murus) protecting Italy. The fragment from the Origines is probably taken from book 2, which begins with the far North of the geographical part of Italy, including Liguria, Gaul south of the Alps, and the Venetian regions.

Even though the idea and the concept of the Alps expressed by Cato in Servius is quite different from that of Livy, Williams and Lampinen both insist that Servius is making reference to Livy, and possibly to the Livian passage cited at

\begin{itemize}
  \item[1592] L. Piso fr. 35 (Peter), “et ab Aquileia ad XII lapidem deletum oppidum etiam invito senatu a M. Claudio Marcelllo”. De Sanctis 1907:4.1.428 claims that invito senatu is a misunderstanding. But it is clearly supported by Livy’s narrative. It was Marcellus’ brutality that shocked senators. The Senate’s opposition may have continued when Marcellus asked to march against the Istri (Liv. 39.55,4, reading ‘id senatui non placuit’). Paterson 1978:457.
  \item[1593] Lampinen 2009:31, n.20.
  \item[1594] Cato Orig. 85 (Peter) ap. Serv. ad Aen. 10.13; Chassignet 1986: Fr. 10.
  \item[1595] Serv. ad Aen. 10.13.
  \item[1596] F85P = iv. 10C = iv. 10B-W, from what is commonly agreed to be the narrative portion of the work, whereas northern Italy was treated in book 2. Amongst the long mountain barriers, the Italian range is still called the ‘Alpine wall’: cf. Dionelis and Ganouzi 2008:121.
  \item[1597] For the Origines, see Astin 1978 for a solid treatment; Cornell 1972 is a provocative and interesting attempt to uncover to the work alternative perspectives to a Romanocentric account of ancient Italy; Chassignet 1986 is an extremely useful edition.
  \item[1598] Dench 2005:169.
  \item[1599] Williams 2001:55-8, 77-8, 103-4, 175-82.
  \item[1600] Lampinen 2008:31.
\end{itemize}
the beginning of this section. However, in reality Servius seems to be speaking about an entirely different passage, as they – *murum vice* and *prope inexuperable* – do not match at all. As in *AUC*, it is not possible to find the precise reference to the Alps as ‘*muri vice*’. Thus we face three possibilities. Servius’ reference is to: a) the Livian “*Alpes prope inexsuperabilem*”, explained with different words; b) a passage in *AUC* stating literally “(*Alpes*) *muri vice tuebantur Italiam*” that was present in one of Livy’s lost books or; c) the passage when Livy compares the walls of Rome with the Alps themselves. My first aim is to work on data which are real and reliable in the *AUC*. The next step will be to contextualise the Livian statement at the beginning of this section.

Meanwhile in 181 B.C., by finding the Alps in this region not the ‘almost impassable barrier’ which they had supposed them to be, the Senate ordered the foundation of Aquileia as a Latin colony. The new settlement was a peculiarly remote outpost of the military frontier to protect the *finis* on that slope. This is confirmed in another passage of Livy, and also by the development of the colonies in Cisalpine Gaul. In 171 B.C. Aquileia was already complaining about a substantial lack of colonists in the settlement and for being the only bulwark against her neighbours:

*Ingressum hoc iter consulem senatus ex Aquileiensium legatis cognouit, qui querentes coloniam suam nouam et infirmam necdum satis munitam inter infestas nationes Histrorum et Illyriorum esse, cum peterent, ut senatus curae haberet, quomodo ea colonia muniretur.*

The senate heard of his proposed expedition through a deputation sent from Aquileia. They explained that theirs was a new colony and not yet in a satisfactory state of defence, lying as it did between two hostile nations, the Histri and the Illyrians. They asked the senate to consider how the colony could be protected.

Santoro Bianchi has pinpointed that the questions between the *Galli Transalpinii* and Rome about that Alpine sector must have been resolved, as in their complaint the Aquileians mentioned just the Istrians and Illyrians (*inter infestas*...
nationes Histrorum et Illyriorum). Moreover, the strategic place of the foundation is confirmed because at that time the nearest Roman colonies, Bononia (modern Bologna), Mutina (modern Modena), Parma, Placentia and Cremona, formed a series of continuous settlements marking a line of points along the Via Emilia. The civil government in the young province of Cisalpine Gaul was reassured by such a line. All these settlements were located at the northern foot of the Apennines along the new Via Aemilia, and all had been built within the four previous decades. Despite no apparent bordering area garrison in the vicinity, the foundation of Aquileia was a sudden materialisation of the frontier in this direction, meaning that the planting of this colony was either necessitated by danger or suggested by opportunity. That bulwark-city, on the scale of Aquileia, was clearly built so that the colony could work against possible Celt incursions, which might threaten the most vulnerable access to Italy. The Romans were – through the foundation of Aquileia – protecting one of the passageways which opened through the Alpine finis. Rome’s apprehension was confirmed in 179 B.C., when a different Gallic band of 3,000 arrived, pushing across the Alps and asking for land.

It is Philip of Macedonia’s project one year later (178 B.C.) that was of greater concern to Livy,[4.4.3] when he reports that the King would have led a horde of his mountain barbarians into Italy by this convenient northeast Italian frontier. In this passage, Livy once again stresses the importance of a key point overlooking and controlling the whole area surrounding the access to

---

1606 Otherwise, they would have mentioned also the Galli Transalpini to put more pressure on the roman Senate: Santoro Bianchi 1992:1.76.
1608 This was eight or ten times the usual allowance. The situation evidently required peculiar inducements, for the 3,000 militia colonists who were assigned to Aquileia received extraordinary allotments of land, 50 jugera, or 32 acres, to every foot soldier and 150 jugera, or 96 acres, to every horseman a Liv. 34.34. Semple 1915:37.
1609 M’Crindle (1940:194) backs the date to 181 B.C. instead.
Chapter 6. Alps: Italy's wall?

Italy. The view from the top of the Mont Haemus (Balkans) is comparable to Hannibal's dominant vision from the last promontory of the Alps:

cupido eum ceperat in verticem Haemi montis ascendendi, quia volgatae opinioni crediderat Ponticum simul et Hadriaticum mare et Histrum annem et Alpes conspici posse: subiecta oculis ea haud parvi momenti futura ad cogitationem Romani belli.

He (Philip V of Macedonia) had been seized with an earnest desire of ascending to the summit of Mount Haemus, for he gave credit to a vulgar opinion, that from thence could be seen at once the Pontic and Adriatic Seas, the river Danube, and the Alps; and he thought that having a view of all those places would be of no small consequence to forming his plans of a war with Rome.

The Romans also saw Macedonian involvement with the Dardanians and Bastarnae as an attempt to distract them with troubles on the bordering areas of Italy. In answer to that, the Romans were preparing for Philip and other menaces, conquering the peninsula of Histria (modern Istria) in 177 B.C. to extend their ‘scientific frontier’[1.3.4.1] across the mountain range, to secure their sea communication with Aquileia and to suppress Illyrian piracy in the upper Adriatic.

6.3.5 Aftermath of founding the colony of Aquileia: developments in the area

The policy of the Romans on this northeast frontier was quiescent and defensive, as though they were defenceless on this side. Founded as a colonia latina in 181 B.C., Aquileia played a key role in the economic and political development of the northern provinces. As the political and administrative centre of the Regio X (Venetia et Histria), it formed the starting (or end-) point of the amber route, and its river ports were a trading hub for the export of

---

1611 Followed by Cary & Warmington (1929:116) and Scullard (1951:289), he identifies Haemus with Mt Veien (2200 m.) or Mt Yumruksal (2375 m.) in the Balkan range, north of Plovdiv; see also De Sanctis 1909:3.1.255; M'Crindle 1940:249.
1612 Liv. 40.21.2. Cf. Liv. 24.13; 25.23 in 212 AD.
1613 Liv. 41.19.4-11; cf. Polyb. 22.14.12; Trog. Prol. 32; Papazoglou (1978:161-4) argues in favour of Phillip's plan to invade Italy. Although Livy pays significant attention to this, the alleged Dardanian threat to Italy remains obscure and difficult to credit. Geoffrey and Hammond 1988:470.
Chapter 6. Alps: Italy’s wall?

Mediterranean goods to the North.\textsuperscript{1615} However, their strategy led to impressive outcomes, when in 113 B.C. the migrating Cimbri approached the Eastern Alps. The Romans summoned an army to the heights near Aquileia in order to protect the passes, with the result that the barbarians withdrew to find their way by the upper Danube and the Burgundian Gate to the Rhone Valley approach to the Mediterranean.\textsuperscript{1616} Depredations of the mountain tribes behind Istria upon Tergeste and Aquileia in 35 B.C. made the Romans reflect on new plans for the regions, and in the time of Augustus an armed and effective expansion beyond the Eastern Alps. After all, in terms of expansion, Freeman points out that “it was resilient people (Gauls to the Romans) rather than the Alps who were to provide the main barrier to the Romans […]”.\textsuperscript{1617}

The conquest of all the highland hinterland was accomplished just after 10 B.C., when the tribes of the Julian Alps again did not respect properties. The control exerted by these tribes over the Peartree Pass (\textit{ad Pirum}) route for merchandise in particular, and armies bound for the new Danubian provinces, were still considered dangerous.\textsuperscript{1618} Besides, Aquileia also served as a central logistic base for the military campaigns in Illyria, Pannonia and Dalmatia under the reign of Octavian and Tiberius in the 1\textsuperscript{st} centuries B.C. and A.D., as well as in all main military campaigns into North Europe.\textsuperscript{1619} After having taken command of the whole area, the Romans began to reorganise it, building roads to the East and securing the path Aquileia-Emona from which it was possible to reach the Danubian limes. [FIG 32, 33] A key example of this 1\textsuperscript{st} century reorganisation is a boundary stone\textsuperscript{1620} recently discovered \textit{in situ} near Bevke.

\begin{footnotes}
\item[1615] Groh 2012.
\item[1617] Freeman 1996:164.
\item[1619] Groh 2012.
\item[1620] The boundary stone is made of Aurisina/Nabrežina limestone and has the shape of a cippus, most of which was roughly worked, as it was intended to be fixed relatively deep in the earth. Only its upper part is smoothly polished. It is wholly preserved, although the surface is badly damaged by erosion. Its dimensions are 130 x 50 x 16 cm; smoothly worked upper part:32 x 43 cm. The narrow upper panel:11 x 36 cm; height of the letters:8 cm. It was brought to the National Museum of Slovenia, where it is presently kept in the \textit{lapidarium} (inv. no. L 204; fig. 2). Inscription on the narrow upper panel: \textit{Finis} Inscription on one of the sides: AQUILEIEN/SIUM Inscription on the other side: EMONEN/SIUM. The letters are regular, elegant and carefully cut, the Emona side is damaged in its upper right corner, therefore the letter N is badly damaged. Q has a stiff tail, which may indicate an early date. An early date is
\end{footnotes}
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(12 km / 8 mi SW of Ljubljana). Šašel Kos pinpoints that “somewhere in the near vicinity a bridge or a ferry must have existed at least in the late Republican period, if not earlier – in addition to the inevitable road or path connecting the nearby settlements”. The place where the boundary stone was found provides the most crucial information for my purposes, indicating that Nauportus belonged to the territory of Aquileia. It means that – if the Alps were *fines*, as stressed by Livy – the “line delimiting the surface of a given area” did not overlap with the top of the mountain range and conversely Aquileia’s territory extended well beyond the Alpine range. In this way, the situation seems to embrace the Livian view of *finis* as zonal limit rather than a simple line. Therefore, Rome’s eastern flank along the Alps could easily be exploited by invaders approaching from the east side, and crossing the Carnic or Julian Alps to the lowlands at the head of the Adriatic.

Also suggested by the use of Aurisina limestone, which in the Emona Basin was used for the stone monuments of the late Republican and (early) Augustan periods.

1621 In the early summer of 2001, in the bed of the Ljubljanica River below (some 13 km to the southwest of Ljubljana), at the mouth of a supposed drainage ditch, some three hundred metres east of the confluence of the Ljubljanica River and the Borovniščica Stream. The point of discovery of the boundary stone is merely 1 km east of a farmhouse called Kamin, which is situated between the Zrnica and Borovniščica Streams. Near the mentioned farmhouse there is a relatively important find-spot from the early Roman period (coins, a bronze statuette of Apollo, a medallion with a Prima Porta Type portrait of Augustus, fragments of weapons: Istenič 2001; Istenič 2003). Šašel Kos 2002:373.


1623 Luthar 2013:47; cf. Šašel 2005: 481-2. Zaccaria’s (1992:163) hypothesis that the areas of Duino/Devin and Aurisina/Nabrežina did not belong to the ager of Tergeste, as had been supposed by Degrassi 1951, but rather to Aquileia.

1624 Šašel Kos’ definition (2002:373).

1625 The problem about the belonging of Nauportus to Aquileia’s territory is cogent: “It may be hypothesized that *de iure* Nauportus may have remained within the territory of Aquileia, while *de facto* it belonged to Emona”: in Šašel Kos 2002:379.

1626 In 166-7 AD, the siege of Aquileia by the Quadi and Marcomanni (Eggenberger 1985:23) pushed the Romans to set up in-depth fortifications across this area: the *Claustra Alpium Iuliarum* (“Barrier of the Julian Alps”) was a fortification system running along the mountains, which began at *Castra ad fluvium Frigidum* (modern Ajdovščina) and ended at the hub of Nauportus (modern Vrhnika). Cf. Baedeker 1888:441-2; Krebs 1913:401, 409; Whittaker 1997:197. This fortification was a defensive inner system, set up between the imperial provinces of Italia and Pannonia, which controlled the most convenient passage along the Frigidus valley, a steep valley of the Isonzo and the Predil Pass, known as “Thermopylae of Carinthia”. In 388 AD and again in 394 AD, the emperor Theodosius advanced from Constantinople up the Danube to interfere in the turbulent affairs of decadent Rome. Again, he crossed the Peartree Pass (ad Pirum), settling on the banks of the River Sontius. The battle of the Frigidus River determined the conquest of the Roman Empire of the West by the Roman Empire of the East. Even in the Medieval period, Paulus Diaconus (720-800 AD), the official Lombard historian, underlined that the Alpine barrier “had an easy and broad entranceway” (*largius patentem et planissimum habet ingressum*). The Predil Pass was indeed the route of the invading Lombards...
6.3.6 The ‘inexuperabile’ boundary?

Why then have the Alps been considered as *inexuperabiles* if, in practical terms, they were not? Hannibal’s journey has shown that the issues were different: snow, lack of food, and difficulty of descent. These are circumstantial details, which are not likely to be imagined, and should therefore be accepted. However, that ‘prope’ makes the difference when considering the Alps as an ‘almost’ impassable boundary. The western Alps have never been a real barrier, either to Livy (*prope*) or to Jordan-Bychkov and Jordan: “So many low passes exist through which invaders can move that Italians, who live south of the mountains and look to them as a natural border, refer to the range as the ‘magnificent traitor’.” We have to consider the broadness of this particular *finis*. In Livy’s vision, the Po valley and the foothills of the Alps were part of Italy. He seems unaffected by the ideological implications of such definitions, seeing the North as Roman ‘*Italia*’. Cato’s view (and therefore also Livy’s) apparently would contrast with Polybius’ Italy extending up to the Alps, yet it was, as Williams has argued, part of the construction of new ideological boundaries of Italy during the 2nd century B.C., one consequence of which was a growing perception on Rome’s part that such *fines* could and should be ‘policed’. The boundary stone found between Aquileia and Emona seems to confirm the nature of the *finis*. The impression, following Livy, is that Rome wanted to give limits to the conquered area. In the case of the first two provinces, *Sicilia* and *Sardinia et Corsica*, as islands they had their proper limits

---

1627 Brown 1963:41.
1629 Liv. 2. 14. 6-7.
1630 Liv. 1.6.6, 2.14.7.
1631 See Williams 2001:55-7, 132. That Cato (F39P = ii. 9C = ii. 9B-W) considered Gallia Cisalpina as outside Italy (probably in his own day, note the tense of *uehere*, convey), which would be more clearly shown if the (surely correct) reading *aduehere* proposed by Cornell 1988 were adopted, describing thus the import of Gallic hams into Italy from Insubrian territory. See also Williams 2001:51 n. 109; Dench 1995:18-19, with earlier literature. Williams 2001:93, also draws attention to how Graeco-Roman depictions of Gauls as mercenary conditioned their perception of Gallic reasons for being in Italy, and distanced them further. Bispham 2007:59.
marked by the Mediterranean; North Italy was still in need of such markers.\footnote{Wilkes 2005.} The assimilation of such concepts is a process on which the Romans had still to work and the Hannibalic experience had already shown the limitations of the Alps as a ‘passable’ barrier. For instance, 
\textit{Iulia Concordia} (Concordia Sagittaria), next to Padua, may have been the first of a series of towns given the franchise or founded by the triumvirs and by Augustus on the northeast borders of Italy.\footnote{On the Alps as a boundary, see Williams 2001:48-58.} Later sources stress military reasons for a comparable reorganisation of Verona, as a second guardian of the safety of the Cisalpine plain against attacks from the Alps.\footnote{Panegyricus IX Constantino Augusto 8 reads: “Verona máximo hostium exercitu tenebatur. \textit{scilicet ut, quam coloniam Cn. Pompeius aliquando deduxerat, Pompeianus everteret}”. It may be, however, that this is only a reference to the granting of Latin rights to the area as a whole by the lex Pompeia. Ewins 1955:76.} Foundations in this region reflect the growing importance of the Alpine passes through which communications with the new Danubian provinces were maintained.\footnote{Ewins 1955:88.}
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7.1 Introductory guidelines

This chapter is devoted to understanding the treaty of Apamea in relation to *finis* and the territorial organisation contained within it. The first step in this digression is an analysis of the major questions related to the ‘territorial clauses’, followed by an assessment of the ‘territoriality’ and ‘spatiality’ of the land assigned to the conquering states.\(^\text{1636}\) Here, I attempt to show how this assessment can demonstrate a clear relationship between *finis*, geographical features and the surrounding space, and territory, breaking definitively the linear concept of *finis* itself – which so far the scholars have not reconsidered.\(^\text{1637}\) By commencing with the premises and the conclusions drawn from the chapters on the Ebro treaty and the Alps about the ‘spatiality’ of the concept of *finis*,\(^\text{[5.5.3; 6.3.5]}\) I will argue that the treaty of Apamea leads to two main outcomes for this study: a) the planned Roman political organisation in Anatolia and b) the geographical framework on which this Roman political organisation is plotted. Both sets of evidence go back to such a precise and planned reorganisation of Anatolia on the part of the Romans that I define it as ‘geo-political grid’ (my definition). The clauses of limitation imposed on Antiochus by Rome would appear to resemble a curbing or bordering delineated by two main natural features: a mountain range (Taurus) and an unidentified river. In reality the situation looks more complex, as these natural features formed the basis of a systematic subdivision of the new controlled territory. In other words, the *finis* is the axis, on which Rome built her overall geopolitical order around herself. In order to better understand this last concept, it is useful to draw a comparison

---

\(^{1636}\) Mainly the reference is to those ‘territorial clauses’ which concern the natural features linked with ‘non-synonymous concepts’, although there is no clear explanation on them in: McDonald 1967:1; McDonald & Walbank 1969:30. Probably McDonald was influenced by the drafts of the Vienna Convention (1969) about ‘territorial clauses’: Dörr and Schmalenbach 2011:492.

\(^{1637}\) An international boundary has been defined by Chukwurah (1981) as “a line of demarcation that excluded one nation-state from another “as “the limit of the legal, political and administrative powers of a nation-state over a given community on the one hand, and the beginning of the legal political and administrative powers of another nation-state over another given community”. Cf. Oyom Bassey & Oshita 2010:92; on the changing of prospective: Newman 2001:esp. 151.
with the Ebro treaty, bearing in mind two points: a) the difference between an occupational physical presence and/or imperium, and b) the concept of finis in Livy as a ‘spatial’ notion rather than just a ‘simple’ line.

7.1.1 Aims, structures and challenges

The treaty of Apamea is probably one of the most complete Republican treaties to have survived from the ancient sources, as it is extremely detailed in all its parts.\textsuperscript{1638} It reveals a clear and precise idea of Rome’s relationships developed in the 2\textsuperscript{nd} century B.C. onwards and her methods of dealing with foreign powers. Unlike the Ebro treaty, it is not as analytically problematic, meaning that I have been able to focus my research on three main points concerning the fines, which will help to build a complete picture: a) the complexity of the treaty due to an enhanced precision within its terms and clauses; b) the analysis of the natural features considered (fines) – a difficult task considering the scarcity of the main sources (Polybius and Livy) and the corrupted nature of those that are available; c) the reinvention of political and territorial structure in Anatolia by the Romans. The chapter structure will be as follows: a) a general historical introduction to help us understand the dynamics of the treaty;\textsuperscript{[7.1.3; 7.2]} b) a closer analysis of the treaty to give a clearer understanding of its clauses;\textsuperscript{[7.3-5]} c) the investigation and identification of the fines mentioned in the treaty;\textsuperscript{[7.4.1-2]} d) a focussed study on the M. Taurus in Livy, the importance of which is confirmed by an extensive series of references in AUC;\textsuperscript{1639}[7.6.1-.2; 7.6.6-.7] e) the relationship between the crucial finis of M. Taurus and the other ‘limits’ mentioned in the treaty;\textsuperscript{[7.4.2 esp. (B) and (C), 7.7.2]} f) the relationships between Rome and the states involved in the treaty, and their agreements on the political geography in Anatolia;\textsuperscript{[7.6]} g) the sacred value and sacredness attributed to the fines (M. Taurus) by Livy;\textsuperscript{[7.4.2 (B)]} h) the differences and the relationships between real occupation, ‘sphere of influence’, imperium and finis.\textsuperscript{[7.7.2]} The ultimate aim of the chapter is to


\textsuperscript{1639} Livy uses the Taurus mountain range 24 times, of which 8 times are in connection with the term finis or its derivate (finitimus, finitimarum).
confirm the broad view of the *fines* made by Livy – that it is not a ‘simple line’ – and to highlight that the treaty of Apamea led Rome to set up a political system based on the *finis* as main axis and her allied states.[7.7] This treaty reflects the last detectable stage of the Livian concept of *finis*, whereas the political situation in Anatolia looks now as an evolution of the ‘*finis*-system’.

### 7.1.2 Historical premises (background) to the treaty

This overview aims to introduce and explain the context in which the treaty of Apamea was struck, whilst also providing a clear idea of the prospective zones of Roman control in Anatolia and detailing the geo-political organisation in central-west Anatolia. The treaty of *Apamea* (modern Dinar)\(^{1640}\) has its roots in the expansionistic policy toward Greece that was being pursued simultaneously by the Seleucid Empire and by Rome:\(^{1641}\) the war in Greece constituted Rome’s first military excursion into Asia, bringing her face to face with the Seleucid Empire, the largest in the Hellenistic world at that time.\(^{1642}\)

[FIG 35] In 223 B.C., Antiochus III ‘The Great’ ascended to the throne of the Seleucid Empire.\(^{1643}\) After several campaigns in Asia, he turned toward Anatolia, managing to expel the Egyptian outposts of Ptolemy V Epiphanes and marching into Cilicia (Fifth Syrian War 202-200 B.C.).\(^{1644}\) In the early stages of his campaign he conquered the cities of *Korakesion* (modern Alanya), *Zephyrion* (modern Mersin), *Soloi* (modern Mezitli), *Aphrodisias* (near to modern Yeşilovacık), *Korykos/Corycus* (modern Kızkalesi), and *Selinus* (modern Gazipaşa) using his considerable naval advantage.\(^{1645}\) Then, in 197 B.C., following the Battle of *Cynoscephalae* (modern Mavrovouni) between Macedonians and Romans, Antiochus started a new expansive phase for his

---

\(^{1640}\) Apamea (Phrygia), formerly Kibotos, commercial centre of Phrygia, near Celaenae, now in Afyonkarahisar Province, Turkey.


\(^{1642}\) Kuht & Sherwin-White 1993:45.

\(^{1643}\) Cf. i.e. Kohn 2013:480; Friedman 2006:58.


\(^{1645}\) Bringmann 2007:91; Guy 2006:58.
kingdom in Anatolia and Europe.\footnote{1646} Cynoscephalae, meanwhile, had practically concluded the Second Macedonian War with a definitive victory for Rome, and T. Quinctus Flamininus declared the independence of Greece at the Isthmian games of 196 B.C. in Corinth (modern Korinthos), appealing to the idea of freedom.\footnote{1647} Probably due to his philhellenism, Flamininus laid the groundwork for, and took the lead in, all future negotiations between Roman and Seleucid armies.\footnote{1648} In summer 197 B.C., Flamininus was already greatly concerned about Antiochus’ aspirations towards Europe, even before Antiochus crossed the Hellespont one year later,\footnote{1649} so in 196 B.C. the two ‘generals’ met at Lysimachia (modern Bakla Burnu) in Thrace.\footnote{1650} Flamininus was probably the man who warned the Senate of the Seleucid menace,\footnote{1651} including references to and concerns about the Greeks of Asia,\footnote{1652} and his anxieties were confirmed two years later (195 B.C.) when Antiochus landed in Thrace with large forces.\footnote{1653} But, despite the fact that Antiochus’ move generated great concern among the Senate, he was still considered more of a long-term problem than an immediate threat.\footnote{1654} In 194 B.C., Flamininus was given the proconsular command in order to conclude his tasks: a) to keep the promise to evacuate the Roman garrisons from all Greek cities\footnote{1655} and b) to conclude the agreements with Antiochus.\footnote{1656} When they met, the consul listed his conditions to establish a ‘friendship between the Romans and the Seleucids:

unam, si nos nihil, quod ad urbes Asiae attinet, curare velit, ut et ipse omni Europa abstineat; alteram, si se ille Asiae finibus non contineat et in Europam transcendent,

ut et Romanis ius sit Asiae civitatum amicitias et tueri, quas habeant, et novas complecti.\textsuperscript{1657}

first, that if he wishes us to have no interest in what concerns the cities of Asia, he too must himself keep entirely out of Europe; second, that if he will not keep himself within the fines of Asia, but crosses into Europe, the Romans too shall have the right both to defend the existing friendships with the cities of Asia and to add new treaties of alliance.

Brunt has noted how this passage already makes clear Rome’s desire to draw a line between their and Antiochus’ reciprocal ‘spheres of authority’.\textsuperscript{1658} In my opinion, the passage says something different: that Rome was trying to intimidate Antiochus into staying in Asia and out of Europe, by abandoning the European Bosphorus (\textit{Europeae/Asiae fines}?). Rome was keen to relegate Antiochus to Asia, as further confirmed by Livy. Either way, Flamininus’ advice was ignored by Antiochus, who intervened soon after in Greek affairs when the Aetolians called him against Rome as commander–in-chief (\textit{strategos autokrator}) of their League.\textsuperscript{1659} At Thermopylae, he was defeated by the Scipios in 191 B.C., losing all his gains in Greece. Livy provides a second draft of the guidelines, which Antiochous had to follow to ensure ‘peace and harmony’:

\begin{quote}
\textit{finirent Europa imperium, id quoque immensum esse; et parari singula acquirendo facilius potuisse quam uniuersa teneri posse; quod si Asiae quoque partem aliquam abstrahere uelint, dummodo non dubis regionibus finiant uinci suam temperantiam Romana cupiditate pacis et concordiae causa regem passurum.}\textsuperscript{1660}
\end{quote}

Limit the \textit{imperium} to Europe, that even this was very large; that it was possible to conquer and gain it part by part more easily than to hold the whole; but if they wished to take some part of Asia too, provided they limited it by easily recognisable natural features, the king would permit his own self-restraint to be overcome by Roman greed for the sake of peace and harmony.

While Livy does not recount where the limits of the continents were, the impression is that Flamininus knew exactly what he meant (\textit{non dubis regionibus finiant}).\textsuperscript{1661}[3.3.1-4] Flamininus’ apparent philhellenism was intended to protect the independence of Greece from the Seleucids with an eye on Asiatic soil. Antiochus’ defeat made the Romans include in the new draft the

\begin{footnotes}
\item[1657] Liv. 34.58.2-3; cf. Polyb. 18.47.1-2.
\item[1658] Brunt (1990:300[170]) uses explicitly this expression, which should be different from ‘spheres of influence’. Cf. Badian 1958:76-9, who expressed already this concept.
\item[1659] Bringmann 2007:91; Guy 2006:58.
\item[1660] Liv. 37.35.5-7.
\item[1661] Limits of Europe and Asia? There is for the first time in history(?) the clear statement of two continental blocks.
\end{footnotes}
freedom of some Greek cities of Asia, \(^{1662}\) which the Romans would have defended in case of Seleucid attack. But the war against Antiochus was only the beginning: the Roman Senate soon ordered their generals (L. and P. Cornelius Scipio)\(^{1663}\) to land in Asia.\(^{1664}\) Their main task was to lead their army safely across Asiatic soil, in order to start realising their plans, the groundwork for which had doubtless been laid in consultation with Eumenes, King of Pergamum (modern Bergama).\(^{1665}\) Polybius and Livy agree on the nature of Scipios’ territorial demands made to Antiochus on the Dardanelles, when Rome proposed a first draft of her conditions for peace, which had probably been agreed with Eumenes:

\[
\text{τῶν δὲ πόλεων μὴ τὰς κατὰ τὴν Αἰολίδα καὶ τὴν Ἰωνίαν μόνον ἐλευθεροῦν, ἀλλὰ πᾶσις τῆς ἐπὶ τάδε τοῦ Ταύρου δυναστείας ἐκχωρεῖν.}\]

\[
et non Ionia modo atque Aeolide deduci debere regia praesidia, sed sicut Graecia omnis liberata esset, ita quae in Asia sint omnes liberari urbes: id aliter fieri non posse quam ut cis Taurum montem possessione Asiae Antiochus cedat.\]

the King’s garrisons should be withdrawn not only from Ionia and Aeolis, but, just as all Greece had been liberated, so all the cities which were in Asia should be set free; this could not be accomplished otherwise than by the retirement of Antiochus from the occupation of Asia on this side of the Taurus mountains.

The demands – that he must evacuate all Asia Minor North and West of the Taurus Mountains and pay the whole cost of the war – were considered too overbearing for Antiochus, who refused the proposal again. As a consequence, the joint navies of Rome and Rhodes delivered a crushing blow to the Seleucid fleet at Myonnesus.\(^{1668}\) At this point, Antiochus made decisive steps towards the peace process: he offered to pay half of the expenses of the war and he withdrew his garrison from Lysimachia, thus effectively surrendering his claims to Thrace and therefore retreating from Europe.\(^{1669}\) However, the Scipios remained firm on their demands, and once again they were refused by the

\(^{1662}\) Liv. 37.35.2. “Zmyrnam enim et Lampsacum et Alexandriam Troadem”

\(^{1663}\) Tucker 2010:423-4.

\(^{1664}\) The Senate had not much confidence in his abilities (Cic. Phil. 11.7), and it was only through the offer of his brother Africanus to accompany him as a legate that he obtained the province of Greece and the conduct of the war against Antiochus. Liv. 28.3.4, 17, 34.54.55, 36.45, 37.1.

\(^{1665}\) Eckstein 2006:300,n.193.


\(^{1667}\) Liv. 37.35.9-10.

\(^{1668}\) Liv. 37.26-30; Appian Syr. 27; Gruen 1986:638.

\(^{1669}\) Liv. 37.31.1-3; App. Syr. 28; Diod. 29.5. Mommsen 1871:2.319; Gruen 1986:638.
Seleucid king, who broke off all negotiations. In 190 B.C., a decisive battle took place near Magnesia ad Sipylum (modern Manisa) between the Pergamenes, Rhodians and Romans, who joined forces against Antiochus. Antiochus was routed, even though his forces outnumbered the Romans and their allies – Pergamum and Rhodes with volunteers from the Achaean League and Macedonia – by at least two to one. Consequently, the cities of Anatolia rushed to surrender themselves to Roman fides and the Scipios occupied Sardis (modern Sart). And soon after, a first draft of the agreement was immediately signed by the parties, an act which became known as the Peace of Apamea.

7.1.3 The Peace and the treaty of Apamea

The international and multilateral accord, ratified soon after the Battle of Magnesia, was the draft form of a more extensive and precise agreement. By its very nature this treaty was not a common agreement between two equal parties, but a consequential statement of the peace conditions, which Antiochus III was obliged to accept after the defeat at Magnesia. Thus, Antiochus became a ‘compelled’ signatory of the Peace, which was followed by the treaty of Apamea in 188 B.C. At this very early stage, the Scipios offered Antiochus the terms of peace made previously (easdem nunc uictores uictis ferimus) with the same territorial demands, as reported by the parallel accounts from Polybius and Livy:

δεῖν γὰρ αὐτούς ἐκ τῆς Εὐρώπης ἐκχωρεῖν καὶ τῆς Ἀσίας τῆς ἐπὶ τάδε τοῦ Ταύρου πάσης.  
Europa abstinate; Asia omni, quae cis Taurum montem est, decedite.

---

1673 The difference between Peace and treaty has been stressed by Livy in 37.55.3. Moreover the ‘foedus’ has been struck on the Capitol.
1674 Liv. 37.45.12; cf. Polyb. 21.17.3.
1675 Polyb. 21.17.3.
1676 Beside the territorial clauses in Liv. 37.45.14, see the other clauses in Liv. 37.45.15-18.
keep your hands off Europe; withdraw from all Asia on this side of the Taurus mountains.

Antiochus had to accept these immediate terms of the peace, which demarcated territories, guaranteed the security of useful allies to Rome and preserved the autonomous rights of the independent cities. But the peace concluded at Apamea in 190 B.C. was more deeply damaging to Antiochus III because of the other impositions stated in the final text of the treaty: a) first and foremost of Antiochus’ obligations was to surrender and leave all lands, cities and holdings beyond or north of the Taurus mountain range, the so-called Cis-Tauric Asia, to the Romans; b) he was permitted to repel aggression from western Asia Minor but not to regain territory or re-establish alliances there, and Rome reserved the right to arbitrate in such cases; c) the treaty also prohibited Antiochus and his offspring from undertaking military operations to reassert hereditary Seleucid claims in the Aegean area or in ‘Europe’ (i.e. the Thracian region); d) the recruitment of troops or mercenaries north of the Taurus Mountains was forbidden to the Seleucids; e) Antiochus’ second son – later to become Antiochus IV Epiphanes – had to go to Rome as a ‘hostage’; f) Antiochus had to pay a war indemnity of 15,000 talents; g) moreover – as Gruen has also noted – Rome proclaimed in the treaty, a friendship (amicitia) with Antiochus ‘for all time’.

The first stage of the agreement had ‘crystallised’ into an almost complete draft ‘on the field’. Negotiations, definition of clauses and ratification of the peace between Rome and Antiochus III were transferred to Rome. Here, the envoys of Pergamum, Rhodes and other Anatolian states and cities also

---

1677 Liv. 37.46.4.
1678 Polyb. 21.17.3; Cf. Liv. 37.35.10; 37.45.14; 37.52.4; 37.55.5; 38.27.7; 38.37.1; 38.38.4 Both writers looked on ‘hither-Asia’ as from Europe epitade tou taurou ‘cis Taurum montem’ – on this side of the Mt. Taurus. McNicoll 1997:118. Cf. Niese 1893:2.695-770; De Sanctis 1907:4.1.144-228; Will 1982:2.173-93; Gruen 1990:66.
1679 However, Pisidian mercenaries continued to serve in the Ptolemaic army. Cf. Bracke 1993:19-20.
1680 This tribute, unprecedented in ancient history, had to be paid in twelve annual instalments. They were 12,000 talents in addition to the 3,000 already paid and 540,000 modii of grain. Polyb. 21.43.19, cf. Polyb. 21.17.5 and 21.41.8; Liv. 38.38.13. Gruen 1986:640; Jagersma 1986:36-7.
attended. The Scipios’ treaty terms were agreed upon by the Roman Senate and included in the main draft of the treaty. Livy confirms that the final form was drafted by a commission of ten magistrates (decemviri). The commissioners repeated the ceremony of treaty ratification in Greece and again at Apamea in solemnity. Unlike with previous treaties, this time the Romans wanted to have the situation under control when defining exactly which areas required an intervention and constantly monitoring the situation. Rome was both denying Antiochus any point of strategic advantage in the western Taurus range and seeking to ensure there were no misunderstandings.

7.1.4 The control and the sacred awe of the finis

This section shows that Rome strengthened her political ideas on fines, while still preserving a sacred respect toward them. The treaty was recorded and deposited at Rome and a copy sent along with the ten legati to the consul of 188 B.C., Cn. Manlius Vulso. The new consul was sent along with officers to Syria, passing through Anatolia to sort out immediate disputes on the spot and

---

1683 Polyb. 21.24.3; Liv. 37.55.3.
1685 Polyb. 21.43.5-6; Liv. 38.38.4-5. See Errington 1989:286-9; McNicoll 1997:118.
1686 Livy’s statement (38.38.1) finds no support in Polybius (21.24.10-15) and is confirmed by the otherwise unknown Rhodes’ request of Soli (Liv. 37.56.7-10).
1688 Polyb. 21.35-6; 43-4; Liv. 38.15.37; Magie 1950:2.1134-5, 1156-8; McDonald 1967-3.
1689 Polyb. 21.24.5; Liv. 37.55.4. Gruen 1986:639. A debate has arisen about the fact that the treaty was modified by Manlius and the commissioners. Mommsen (1864:2.525-6) and De Sanctis 1907:4.206 thought it was not; against this was Täubler (1913:1.103-108) who maintained that a change was made in the clause on indemnities. The preliminary treaty required the payment of 2,500 talents when the treaty had been ratified at Rome (Polyb. 21.17.4-5; Liv. 37.45.14; App. Syr. 38), and this sum was actually paid not only before the ratification at Apamea but before the arrival of the commissioners (Polyb. 21.41.8-12; Liv. 38.37.7-9). The treaty as finally ratified does not mention this sum but speaks only of the 12,000 talents still due. Obviously a reference to a sum already paid would have been out of place. A clause of the kind common in treaties to the effect that Antiochus was to pay 2,500 talents immediately would have implied an additional payment. Thus, if the treaty when ratified at Rome contained such a clause, it must have been deleted by Manlius and the commissioners. Such a change would have been little more than a clerical correction bringing the document up to date and would not involve a real modification of the treaty. On the other hand, it is possible that even this clause was drafted at Rome in its final form, that the clause in the preliminary treaty concerning the 2,500 talents was considered sufficient, and that Manlius was ordered to collect the sum before the final ratification of the treaty. Larsen 1936:347,n.9.
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to exact the King’s personal oath. Vulso started a brief campaign along the main routes and, as pointed out by scholars, even along the line of the new borders stated in the treaty. The precise extent of Vulso’s campaign can be gauged from the messages sent throughout this action: a) displaying the extent of Rome’s influence over Asia Minor; b) intimidating and preventing the return of Antiochus; and c) patrolling and fixing the *fines* as the case might be.

Along the southern coast of Asia Minor, Antiochus remained in control of the territory lying outside the Taurus range, as far as Cilicia Tracheia, and for this reason it was thought necessary to limit any possible movement inland towards western Asia Minor. There was little danger of any effective attack across the Lycaonian frontier through central Anatolia against the new expanded territory of Pergamum and Rome’s concerns were alleviated further by Vulso’s campaign, which occupied Pamphylia, thereby monitoring Galatia and Cappadocia, and utterly denying them to Antiochus. Despite the fact that Vulso’s campaign served such a useful purpose in keeping Antiochus at bay, issues were raised regarding the sacrality of his actions during the campaign. Livy mentions this in two episodes, the first one at the beginning of the campaign against the Galatians and the second – which is more important to this study – at the end of it. The campaign against the Gauls of Asia commenced with the establishment of Vulso’s control over his army through a ritual purification. Manlius – after having met Eumenes’ brother Attalos and defeated the Galatians – threatened to march over the Taurus and attack Antiochos in Syria. Here, Livy goes back to the question of the sacredness of the *finis* – in this case the ‘Taurus Range’. However, during his campaign throughout the whole of Anatolia, M. Vulso:

---


1691 See Grainger 1995.


1693 Liv. 38.12.2-8.

1694 Livy (38.45.3) reports the information in a speech given by one of the Roman peace commissioners in the senatorial debate over the question of a triumph for Manlius. See Thonemann 2013:54; Grainger 1995.
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cupientem transire Taurum aegre omnium legatorum precibus, ne carminibus Sibyllae praedictam superantibus terminos fatales cladem experiri vellet.\textsuperscript{1695} wanted to cross the Taurus Mountains with difficulty restrained by the entreaties of all the ambassadors who besought him not to brave the curse denounced in the Sibylline verses against such as should pass those fatal limits.

The commissioners, who judged M. Vulso once he came back to Rome, “claimed he had acted purely out of self-interest, far overstepped the bounds of his lawful \textit{imperium}, and set off without the proper fetial procedures on what amounted to a personal, undeclared, and opportunistic war”.\textsuperscript{1696} It is quite obvious that the sacred nature of the \textit{fines} here is clear to other scholars, as shown by the Pelikan Pittenger’s statement above. The scholar resumes and summarises the elements to be linked with a bordering practice (\textit{fetials}, \textit{imperium}, sacredness of bounds), though without mentioning the word \textit{finis}. As shown already, the \textit{finis} has been already established as ‘dividing’ element between two \textit{imperia}, turning into a \textit{terminus}. It is interesting that Livy adapts Vulso’s story to the time his campaign took place, mentioning the sacredness of the \textit{finis}, but treating it as a marginal aspect. At that time the sacred value of a \textit{finis} was diminishing slightly, but was still present as a kind of reminiscence of the past; the legal, political and diplomatic issues were replacing the ‘sphere of sacredness’, but it had not yet disappeared entirely.

7.2 The treaty and the ‘Taurus line’\textsuperscript{1697}

7.2.1 Questions and problems

The first problem presented by the treaty concerns the territorial clauses, specifically the ‘dividing line(s)’ beyond which Antiochus could not venture.\textsuperscript{1698} The geographical conditions of the treaty have received formidable attention

\textsuperscript{1695} Liv. 38.45.3; Pelikan Pittenger 2008:96-7.
\textsuperscript{1696} Pelikan Pittenger 2008:98.
\textsuperscript{1697} This terminology has been taken by McDonald 1967:1 and esp. 4 and McDonald & Walbank 1969:30. But also Sherwin-White 1977:65. I will refer often to this as clashing argument to Livy’s view.
\textsuperscript{1698} On the concept of dividing line, already present in Strabo 2.1.1. See Bechard 2000:208.
since Mommsen’s argument.\textsuperscript{1699} Although the territorial clauses were repeatedly assessed until the post-WWII period by Kahrstedt, Meyer, Holleaux, and Ruge,\textsuperscript{1700} the questions still remain unresolved. Despite the amount of detail, McDonald brilliantly tackled the question, whilst also raising a number of unanswered questions linked with the treaty: “What kind of treaty was negotiated at Apamea? A Roman treaty, designed to secure Antiochus’ evacuation of western Asia Minor? Or a treaty in the Hellenistic style, under which Rome aimed to deny explicitly the entire Seleucid case for hereditary claims in Thrace and Asia Minor, regardless of the extent to which Antiochus had been able to assert these claims by actual occupation?” In considering the nature of borders, McDonald affirmed that “only a continuous river line provides a clear demarcation of territory; a mountainous area or steppe or desert land, often by its nature sparsely populated, may lack the local place-names to give precision to a frontier”.\textsuperscript{1701}

However, despite such precise questions, McDonald’s article on the ‘territorial clauses’ seems ultimately to shy away from this key topic. The scholar simply states that between the 3\textsuperscript{rd} and 2\textsuperscript{nd} centuries B.C., the Romans experienced the creation of a ‘frontier’ in Spain, North Africa and Asia Minor.\textsuperscript{1702} This affirmation has therefore left unaltered the analysis of the treaty itself. Although there is no doubt that strong references are made both to a mountain range and a river as physical entities ‘not to be crossed’ by the Seleucids, many controversies – chiefly of a topographical nature – have arisen around the following ‘edict’ drafted after the Peace of Apamea. My study raises a set of problems related to the ‘territorial clause’ within the treaty: a) To what extent can Polybius’ terminology be considered reliable and comparable with Livy’s testimony in order to show the consistent discrepancies between the Greek and Roman view? b) The concept of using geographical and therefore natural features ‘to limit’ a political entity is not as straightforward\textsuperscript{1703} as it appears, which is clear

\textsuperscript{1699} Mommsen 1864:2.527-32; but see Viereck 1909:372-3; McDonald 1967:4.
\textsuperscript{1700} Mommsen 1864:2.527-31; Kahrstedt 1924; Meyer 1925:145-6; Holleaux 1952:5.2.208-11, with bibliography; Ruge 1932:2.2169; McDonald 1967:1.
\textsuperscript{1701} McDonald 1967:1.
\textsuperscript{1702} McDonald 1967:1.
\textsuperscript{1703} See McDonald’s (1967:1) statement above about rivers.
The treaty outlines the re-definition, re-modelling or re-delimitation of those regions which were subject to Antiochus’ Empire (‘qui sub imperio eius erunt’). Our primary evidence and most reliable information consists of four literary excerpts: two from Polybius and two from Livy. Yet, in much the same way as the Ebro treaty, the comparison between Polybius and Livy only serves to raise new questions, indicated through their interpretation in the light of the preliminary evidence. Unfortunately, Polybius’ text has suffered corruption to a greater degree than the Livian excerpt during the course of their manuscript transmission. Hence, I will follow more strictly Livy’s account, which is doubtless derived partially from Polybius, when introducing the points at issue. Moreover, Livy faced a more detailed report of the original draft, leading to a better understanding of Rome’s international policy at that time. But, despite the constant use of Livy’s work, a comparison with Polybius’ passages will be used to exemplify the differences in their comprehension of the treaty. After all, Polybius provides only a brief summary of the senatorial decree of 189 B.C., which contrasts starkly with Livy’s more detailed version.

1704 Liv. 38.38.3.
1706 On Livy’s use of Polybius see Nissen 1863:194; McDonald 1967:1.
1707 Polyb. 21.24.6-8 (on which Liv. 37.55.54 depends); Polyb. 21.46.2-10 (on which Liv. 38.39.7-17 depends).
1708 The wider situation corresponds with what Polybius describes here and elsewhere, and Nissen took the Livian passage as ‘Polybian’, assuming abbreviation by the Polybian excerptor. Yet Livy’s detailed items do not fit the pattern of abbreviation. Mommsen saw the difficulty and concluded that Livy had interpolated them from an Annalistic source. If we think of a Roman Annalist who could have preserved these details, he is ‘Claudius (Quadrigarius) following Acilius’ (Liv. 35.14.5), and Livy may have copied the whole section 37.52-56 from his account. As a senatorial historian of the mid-second century B.C. Acilius was able to draw upon the same information about the settlement with Antiochus that was available to Polybius. Polyb. 21.18-24, cf. Liv. 37.52-6. See Nissen 1863:198-200, Mommsen 1864:2.522-4; cf. Meyer 1881:120-6;
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Although both of them used the same senatus consultum as the basis for their narration, Livy derived his information from a wider use of Roman annalistic sources, while the Polybian text here is not continuous but transmitted by an excerptor, who abbreviated it. Therefore, Polybius shows no evidence for territorial clauses and consequently the Livian text provides more detailed and comprehensible data for the topographical evidence and the conditions of the Roman settlement.

[APPENDIX 4] In the Livian text, the term ‘fines’ appears three times just in the first part of the edict (sententia), when the geographical limits of the ‘revised’ Seleucid Empire are established by Rome. Also, we have to assume an omission or corruption in Polybius’ text after χώρας is supplemented by Livy, who presumably confirmed the topographical coordinates in Polybius:

εκχωρείτω δὲ (Ἀντιόχος) πόλεων καὶ χώρας (. †.). μή έξαγέτω μηδὲν πλήν τῶν ὁπλῶν ὣν φέρουσι οἱ στρατιῶται: εἰ δὲ τι τυγχάνουσιν ἀπενηγεμένοι, καθιστάτωσαν πάλιν εἰς τὰς οὕτως πόλεις.

excedito (Antiochus) urbibus agris vicis castellis cis Taurum montem usque ad Tanaim amnem, et ea valle Tauri usque ad iuga, qua in Lycaonium vergit. ne qua praeter arma efferto ex iis oppidis agris castellisque, quibus excedat; si qua extulit, quo quaque oportebit, recte restituito.

He shall withdraw from the cities, lands, villages and strongholds on this side of the Taurus Mountain as far as the Halys River and from the valley as far as the ridges of Taurus where it slopes down into Lycaonia. He shall carry away nothing but his weapons from these towns, lands and fortresses from which he is withdrawing; if he has removed anything, he shall duly restore it to the place in which each item belongs.)

Kümpel 1893:23. On the senatorial historiography of the second century B.C., consult Gelzer 1907:93-110. We should recognise the diplomatic material that was available to the senatorial historians and Polybius in common at that time. McDonald 1967:2.


1711 Nissen 1863:8-11, 14; McDonald 1967:2.

1712 On the course of events, consult Niese 1893:2.739-44; on the geography and regional history, Magie 1950; on Roman policy: De Sanctis 1907:4.1.193-5; Holleaux 1952:5.2.413, 420-3 (= CAH, VIII, 222, 229-31); Badian 1964:122-6; on the treaty of Apamea, Täubler 1913:1.75-7, 442-7; on the general settlement, Meyer 1925:146-9; on the Greek cities, Bickerman 1937:217 ff; McDonald 1967:1.

1713 Liv. 38.38.[2]: “rex per fines regni sui eorumve”; [6]: “...cum rege Antiocho intraque fines regni eius sunt”; [11]: “Rhodiorum sociorumque quaeae edificiaque intra fines regni Antiochi sunt”.

1714 McDonald 1967:3.

1715 Polyb. 21.43.5-6.

1716 Liv. 38.38. 4-5.
The treaty of Apamea laid down what appear to be specific limitations between Antiochus and the Romans along the Taurus Mountains in southeastern Anatolia. This demarcation zone – which extended from the Taurus range to an unknown river (?Tanais) – mainly separated Cilicia from the rest of Asia Minor and presumably Lycaonia from Cappadocia. Chiefly, the Romans expelled the King from Asia Minor north-west of the Taurus Mountains, reshaping the status of the regions hitherto subject to him. Antiochus ‘agreed’ to evacuate the territory – or the sites – and to relinquish his claims over Anatolia “cis Taurum montem usque ad Tanaim amnem et ea valle Tauri usque ad iuga qua in Lycaoniam vergit” (“on the western Asia Minor side of the Taurus range as far as the river Tanais and along that valley of the Taurus as far as the heights where the Taurus faces towards Lycaonia”).

Further and more specific requests were considered by the Romans within the clauses of the treaty, but the bulk of the original agreement – prohibiting the passage beyond the Taurus Range – formed the basis for their final decisions. Therefore, it is quite understandable that the main preoccupation of scholars has been the research and explanation of what they themselves have called the ‘Taurus line’, which had been the core of Roman demands ever since the first discussions in autumn 190 B.C. And it is not surprising that the core passages (above) have given rise to an astonishing variety of interpretations and almost every detailed account of the settlement differs – slightly or significantly – from the others. We can speculate – having seen the two different passages in both Polybius and Livy – that the basic guidelines were drafted on the Asiatic soil just after the Battle of Magnesia, but more precise political conditions – such as territorial demarcation and military details – were arranged in Rome by the Senate in 189 B.C. Although the controversy is linked to the name of the river, the questions surrounding the demarcation of territory,

1717 Strabo 12.6.5.
the nature of the area or the precision in providing the local place-names also need to be distilled from the main information given by the ancient texts. Thus, they show the political situation in western Asia Minor in the territorial terms of a military treaty that defined the Taurus frontier as distinct e.g. from economic clause. The ‘Cistauric’ region is, however, still undefined with reference to the western end of the same range. In this area, the Taurus frontier has been defined by a river and its valley. Did this valley belong to the Taurus range? Was this valley part of the finis reaching to a point where the Taurus overlooked Lycaonia? Or did this specific clause stipulate not to cross an undefined zone?1721 For these reasons, many problems have arisen about the ‘territorial clauses’ of the treaty,1722 as argued by McDonald: “There is no more likely factor of dispute in a peace treaty than its definition of an inland frontier, even when the terms of the treaty are directly known: one has not to look far for instances where a topographical reference has proved to be equivocal”.1723

Starting with the above overview, I will try to answer two main questions: a) why the treaty has been so specific in every single point and clause, and to what extent those aspects are linked with the term finis. Mainly, I will analyse the striking comparison between the setting up of a ‘hypothetical line’ – as set by scholars as McDonald and Walbank – and the Livian focus on elements which have nothing to do with a line – as i.e. ‘ea valle’ or ‘urbibus agris vicis castellis’ are not lines!; b) what the nature of the relationship between space and ‘land marker’ – territory and finis – is, and in what way Rome is linked with a limit that she imposed, even though she did not occupy that space vacated by Antiochus.

1721 See Schaffer 1903:17, 46-8; for the upper Calycadnus terrain, cf. Sterrett 1888, with two maps.
1722 The most important contribution to the debate is given by: McDonald 1967. Nevertheless, controversies had developed in all its possible features. Mommsen 1864:2.527-30; Kahrstedt 1924; Meyer 1925:145-6; Holleaux 1952:5.2.208-10; Ruge 1932:2.2169.
1723 McDonald 1967:1.
7.3 The territorial clauses of the treaty

7.3.1 First terrestrial clause: The Taurus

Further and more specific requests were considered by the Romans within the clauses of the treaty, but the bulk of the original agreement is centred on the ‘territorial clauses’, concerning natural features. By denying Antiochus any point of strategic advantage in the western Taurus range, the Romans were to prevent the return of Seleucid power. Regardless of his present occupation, Rome determined to prevent any such expansion back into Anatolia. One of Rome’s concerns was that some of Antiochus’ descendants might attempt to emulate his expansionistic policy. Seleucus IV (Antiochus’ son) was warned by Rome to stay within the ‘Taurus Range zone’, drawn up in the treaty of Apamea. In this way, the Taurus Range as well as the Ebro River had the function of curbing Rome’s and Antiochus’ imperia through geographical limitations. Polybius in this circumstance is more useful than Livy, who instead takes for granted the concept of imperium. Acimociv considers the limitations applied to Antiochus as a problem linked to Rome’s security, stating clearly that the most important feature of the treaty of Apamea was “the forbidding of any (of Antiochus’) activity west of the Taurus [...] this barrier was the natural limit to Rome’s ‘sphere of influence’, beyond which she had no security interests”.

This equates to Polybius’ statement, which also introduces the first problem: what does the term ἐκχωρεῖν mean and what do we understand by this term? Seen as a reference to the soldiers, more often the term ἐκχωρεῖν might simply point to the ‘evacuation’ of troops and therefore

---

1724 As regards the text, it is read ‘Mysiae regias silvas’: Mysia regias silvas Bx: Mysias regias sylvas Mg. Editors have compared Liv. 38.39.15 (Polyb.) to emend: Mysiam regiam et Milyas Madvig, Mysiam < quam ademerat Prusias > regi, ac Milyada. But this passage concerns only Antiochus’ part of Mysia, from the Roman angle of policy, and the source may be Roman (Mommsen 1864:2.522-4). On the connection with Prusias of Bithynia, see Chr. Habicht 1956:94-7. In any event the region under attention here does not include Milyas in the South (Magie 1950:2.761-2). For the provisions affecting the Greek cities see the works cited in n. 3, especially Bickerman 1937:218-24 and Magie 1950:2.950-6; McDonald 1967:2.

1725 Diod. 29.24. For Antiochus’ IV emulation of his father see: Green 1990:438.


1727 Polyb. 21.43.5.
may just be linked to military operations. The literal translation is ‘to cede’ but this could mean also ‘to evacuate’ from actual occupation. However, it has been argued that it is an ‘evacuation’ of occupied places with (by implication) the wider ‘ceding’ of the rights of that area as well. Holleaux made the point by arguing generally that, with the term ἐκχωρεῖν, Polybius could be referring both to ‘relinquishing claims’ and to ‘evacuating’ occupied territory, which the ‘forced’ abandonment of a territory usually involves, alienating an area and passing the right to the winning power. Following this, Polybius appears to assume a wider significance for the verb ἐκχωρεῖν, moving from the Taurus Range into Anatolia and including the Tanais River, in view of the hereditary Seleucid claims. Nevertheless, the phrase δυναστείας ἐκχωρεῖν considers also future ‘relinquishment claims’, especially concerning the abrogated hereditary Seleucid rights in western Anatolia.

[FIG 39] Now, let us consider another Polybian narrative, which is fully followed by Livy: What does the phrase ἐπὶ τάδε τοῦ Ταύρου (‘cis Taurum montem’) signify? The ‘Cistauric’ region is still undefined with reference to the western end of the Taurus Range. In contrast to the Alps, Livy emphasises only a few times the word iuga (passes) in relation to the Taurus Range and the reason is given indirectly by McDonald, who clarifies that the Taurus Range is traversable only in two points along its extent. The Cilician mountains of the Taurus Range (modern Ak Dag, Geyik Dag, Gok Dag) rise steeply all of a

1728 Liv. 38.38.10: “Milites mercede conducendi ex iis gentibus quae sub dicione populi Romani sunt Antioco regi ius ne esto, ne voluntarios guidem recipiendi”. (King Antiochus shall not be authorised to hire soldiers from those peoples which are under the control of the Roman people, nor even to accept [10] volunteers therefrom). Cf. Prag 2011:19. McDonald 1967:3.
1729 Cf. Liddell & Scott 1940: A. depart, ἐκ χώρας’ SIG 679.53; leave a country, emigrate, Hdt.1.56, Hecat.30.J.; withdraw, ἐκ τῆς οἰκίας’ PAhm.2.30.44 (2nd cent. B.C.), etc.: metaph., ἐ. ἐκ τοῦ ζῆν Plb.2.21.2: so abs., Id. 7.2.1.2. slip out of, ἐξεχώρησε ἐκ τῶν ἄρθρων Hdt.3.129. 3. give way, retire, E.IA367, D.41.5; ὑπάρχοντων ἐκχωροῦσιν εὐκάρπω θέρει’ S.Aj.671; ἐ. τινι τινι give way to a person in a thing, Hp.Jusj.; τινι περί τινι’ Polyb. 21.20.1. 4. impers. of a motion of the bowels, Hp.Epid. 5.33. B. give up, cede, τινι τι’ IG 12(3).324.15 (Thera), PEleph.15.2 (3rd cent. B.C.), Sammelb.4414.8, etc.; τοῦ δαίμονι τι Vett. Val. 156.4.—Pass., CIG 4268 (Xanthus).
1731 Cf. Liv. 38.8.8: “non paucis urbibus eum, de quarum libertate certatum sit, sed omni Asia cis Taurum montem, opimo regno, excessisse” (He had ceded, not the few cities whose liberty was the ground of the dispute, but an opulent kingdom, all Asia on this side Mount Taurus).
1732 Nissen 1863:20-1, 206; McDonald 1967:3.
1734 Cf. Liv. 37.53.25; 37.56.8; 38.8.4; 38.12.4; 38.38.4; 38.45.3.
sudden in a high chain, running Northwest to form an almost impenetrable barrier. This terrain allowed military movement only at two narrow and easily controllable points: in the East, where the Cydnus River led up to the Cilician Gates and then to Cappadocia, and in the West, where the course of Calycadnus (modern Gök-su) provided access to Lycaonia.\footnote{MacDonald 1967:8.} The Taurus Mountain Range could be regarded as turning down to the sea in its mountain spurs either east or west of the Pamphylian plain.\footnote{Magie 1950:2.757, 761. McDonald 1967:1.} The position of Pamphylia and the control of routes through Cilicia Tracheia probably affected the strategic situation.\footnote{Pekman 1973:81; McNicoll (1997:156) talks about it as ‘strategic corridor’.} The question was: northwards, overlooking Lycaonia, should Antiochus keep the foothills or stay just behind the watershed montain top? Rome drew upon the legacy from the past in that region, preserving nothing other than the previous conditions. It took from Antiochus’ kingdom at least one satrapy,\footnote{The decree of friendship between Antiochus and Ilium shows again the importance given to the crossing of the Taurus in CIC 3595= GCIS 219, l. 12; cf. Jones 1993:75.} and Antiochus created at least one more between the Taurus Range and the Aegean Sea, which represented the two limits of this ‘province’. We are informed that after 213 B.C., a subsidiary kingdom centred at Sardis in Asia Minor was ruled by Zeuxis.\footnote{Polyb. 21.16.4.} Unlike his predecessor Achaius, he was not a relative of the King, but held the court rank of ‘father’ even before that date and therefore belonged to Antiochus’ innermost circle. Two inscriptions confirm the importance of Zeuxis as satrap of Lydia before and after Antiochus’ conquests, with extended responsibility for all the territores north of the Taurus Mountains.\footnote{The first decree (SEG 37:1010), published by Malay in 1987 from modern Balikesir, includes a letter dated to c. 209 from Antiochus Ill to Zeuxis – where he appears responsible for the cis-Tauric territories, appointing Nikanor as , high-priest of the all of the sanctuaries beyond the Taurus Mountains. The second Euromus decree (August, 197 B.C., lines 3-5) confirms the previous one: Zeuxis is termed ὁ ἀπολελειμμένος ὑπὸ τοῦ βασιλέως Ἀντιόχου ἐπὶ τῶν ἐπιτάδε τοῦ Ταύρου πραγμάτων (“[the man] left in charge of affairs on this side of the Taurus by King Antiochus”), in Ma 2003, no. 29:338. See Dreyer 2011:52.} Therefore, the meaning of the so-called ‘line of the Taurus’ would be merely twofold: strategic and administrative. From Livy’s view, the crossing of the Taurus Range is synonymous with imperial expansionism, like casting ambitions of domination on the other side of Asia.\footnote{Thornton 1995.} Livy is aware of
this point: Cilicia is the main passageway from Asia to Europe, whence Antiochus expanded his empire over the Taurus, reaching the Aegean coast of Anatolia.  

7.3.2 Second terrestrial clause: The ‘Tanais’

The readings ‘ad Tanaim amnen’ and ‘ea valle Tauri’ have been the centre of much dispute. The river ‘Tanais’ is otherwise unknown and the name has invited emendation. In fact, we do not yet know all the ancient names of the rivers in Asia Minor, especially with reference to their upper reaches or tributaries. Three main solutions have been proposed to sort out the question: (A) the first one has often been taken for granted and represents the ‘standard’ theory of the treaty, while the other two (B) and (C) belong to the same current of thinking.

A) The name Tanais was easily turned into Halys as a facile guess in the light of general knowledge. Holleaux applied broad historical references to this special treaty while seeking geographical description for his argument, which was objected to by Ruge. Nevertheless, the River Halys was thenceforth unanimously recognised as the river included in the Polybian and Livian texts. Outside of the treaty of Apamea, the function of the river Halys is linked to some ‘divisory’ aim and in two cases it is connected with the Taurus range.

---

1742 Liv. 35.13.4: (Antiochus) “per Ciliciam Tauro monte superato extremo iam hiemis Ephesum pervenit” (came through Cilicia, after passing Mount Taurus, to the city of Ephesus).
1744 If we don’t want to identify it as the ancient Tanais, which flows north of the Black sea and has been identified with the modern Don. Cf. Strabo (11.1) considered it as the boundary between Europe and Asia.
1745 About the emendations, authority and origins of the Livian text, see McDonald 1967:3-4, 7; Baronowski 1991:453.
1749 HALYS (“Ἄλυς, sometimes ᾿Αλυς; Kizil Irmak, turk. “red river”), the principal river of Asia Minor rises near Sivas. Its sources lay at the eastern end of the Central Anatolian Plateau, which form the boundary between Pontus and Armenia Minor, that is, at the point where the heights of Scoedises and Antitaurus meet. (Hdt. 1.72; Strab. 12. p.546; Eustath. ad Dionys. Per. 786; Ov. ex Pont. 4.10. 48) At first its course has a southwestern direction, traversing Pontus and Cappadocia, through which it forms a huge semicircle turning northwards to flow by several
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Flowing from the East, the Halys in mid-course turned north toward the Black Sea, and its lower line traditionally divided Anatolia between East and West.1750 After Manlius Vulso’s operations in Galatia, the Romans divided Anatolia roughly along the lower Halys line, which extended southwards to the Taurus.1751 This line was the demarcation that most conveniently indicated the political position, as demonstrated by the fact that it is quoted three times among later and earlier historians. With reference to the Second Punic War, Appian say that:

A1) συνενεωτέρισαν δὲ τοῖς Καρχηδόνιοις οἱ θ᾽ Ἕλληνες καὶ Μακεδόνες καὶ τῆς Ἀσίας οἱ ἐντὸς Ἅλυος καὶ τοῦ Ταύρου: καὶ τούτους ὑμᾶς ἄμα συγκατάκτασθαι προήχθησαν, ὃν Ἀντίοχος τε ἦν ὁ βασιλέως καὶ Φίλιππος καὶ Περσεύς.1752

…the Greeks, the Macedonians, and those peoples in Asia who lived this side of the Halys River and the Taurus Mountains joined the Carthaginians in a revolution, and therefore at the same time the Romans were led on to a conquest of these peoples, whose kings were Antiochus, Philip, and Perseus.

Sulla is shown speaking of Rome’s defeat of Antiochus, also using the same phraseology in Appian:

A2) Ἦμεις στρατῷ πρῶτον ἐς Ἀσίαν παρήλθομεν Ἀντιόχου τοῦ Σύρων βασιλέως πορθοῦντος ὑμᾶς. ἐξελάσαντες δ᾽ αὐτόν, καὶ τὸν Ἅλυν καὶ Ταῦρον αὐτῷ ἀπόθεμεν τῆς ἀρχῆς ὥρον.1753

We first came to Asia with an army when Antiochus, King of Syria, was despoiling you. We drove him out and fixed the boundaries of his dominions beyond the river Halys and Mount Taurus.

mouths into the Black Sea. According to Strabo (12, pp. 546, 561), the river Halys received its name from the salt-works in its vicinity or by owing a natural bitter-salty tasty; even though often its name is written without the aspiration, Alys (Eustath. ad Dionys. Per. 784). Pliny (N.H. 6.2), making this river come down from Mount Taurus and flow at once from South to North, appears to confound the Halys with one of its tributaries (lechel Irmak). The importance of the river is attested by the fact that its course has worked frequently as ‘territorial splitter’ or ‘boundary line’, dividing Asia in two parts, cis- and trans-Halyn. (Strab. 12. p. 534, 17. p. 840.) It formed the eastern boundary of Phrygia in the time of king Midas (8th century B.C.) and became the boundary between Lydia and Media according to the peace treaty that followed the “Battle of the Eclipse” (585 B.C.). At the time of the greatness of the Lydian empire the Halys formed the boundary between it and Persia, and on its banks Cyrus gained the decisive victory over Croesus. (Hdt. 1.53, 75. 84; Justin 1.7; Cic. Div. 2.5. 6; Lucan 3.272). Already in the first half of the 6th century B.C., the river also formed a border between Media and Cilicia in its first section, while the latter part was the boundary between Paphlagonia in the West, and Galatia and Pontus in the East. (Strab. 12. p. 544; Ptol. 5.4.3; Arr. Peripl. 16). 1750 See Herodotus just footnote above.
1751 Mahaffy & Gilman 1887:265; and mainly Sherwin-White 1984:42.
1752 Strabo 6.4.2.
1753 App. Mith. 9.62.
This was already a more ancient reference, as Herodotus stresses:

**A3)** Κροσέως ὄν Λυδός μὲν γένος, παῖς δὲ Ἀλυάττεω, τύραννος δὲ ἐθνέων τῶν ἐντὸς Ἄλυος ποταμοῦ, ὃς ἐκ βρέχον ἀπὸ μεσαμβρίης μεταξὺ Συρίων τε καὶ Παφλαγόνων ἐξεῖ πρὸς βορέην ἄνεμον ἀνέμον ἀπὸ τοῦ Εὔξεινον καλεόμενον πόντον.  

Croesus was a Lydian by birth, son of Alyattes, and sovereign of all the nations west of the river Halys, which flows from the South between Syria and Paphlagonia and empties into the sea called Euxine.

It is quite clear that the river cannot be other than the Halys, which is shown as having had a crucial importance in defining a territorial limit in different times and periods. Connecting the ‘Taurus line’ and Halys makes good sense in general terms, after Vulso’s Galatian campaign. However, we have moved a long way from the specific clauses of the treaty of Apamea to argue from a speech by Appian. Thus these parallels only serve to illustrate its broad usage in an earlier (Herodotus) or later (Appian) period. If the Romans did not conceive their treaty in Hellenistic terms, these incidental references are not relevant to our discussion. They do not just define an impassable limit. Although many of them worked also as a sort of barrier to restrain foes from invading, water streams were chosen for their ‘iconic acceptation’ and not just for diplomatic, strategic or defensive purposes, as the example of the Ebro and the Rubicon show.  

B) Despite the confirmation provided by later sources about the ‘Halys-Taurus line’, Mommsen discounted the Halys as irrelevant to Antiochus’ military evacuation and his stand in Pamphylia. Mommsen seemed to ascribe an extreme importance to Livy’s version: by amending the name ‘Tartaim’ to ‘Taurum’, he twisted it into the upper River Cestrus (modern Aksu), which divided Pamphylia down to the sea. He also put into the argument two other physical entities: the promontories Calycadnum (?modern Lissan el Kahpe)  

---

1754 Hdt. 1.6.1.
1756 Liv. 38.15.7.
1757 Mommsen 1864:2.511. The Taurus Cestrus equation stems from Liv. 38.15.7: “Ex Pamphylia rediens ad fluvium Taurum primo die, postero ad Xylinen quam vacant Comen posuit castra”. (Returning from Pamphylia, he encamped the first day on the river Taurus, the next at what they call Xylinos Comê). Cf. McNicoll 1997:118.
1758 CALYCADNUS (Καλύκαδνος, modern Ghiuk-Su), one of the largest rivers of Cilicia. (Strab. p. 670.) It rises in the range of Taurus, and after a general eastern course between the range of
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...and Sarpedonion (?modern Taçucu) (ne navigato citra Calycadnum neu Sarpedonion promunturia).\textsuperscript{1759} He provided a logical argument for a clear frontier line, which defined the limits of both the terrestrial and marine access and forbade Antiochus to cross them. At first glance, Mommsen’s main argument holds – as it looked east of Pamphylia, it need take us no farther than an inland point corresponding to Cape Sarpedonion on the coast. Furthermore, a military route led across the Taurus range into Lycaonia, opposite Laranda through this area up the Calycadnus River.\textsuperscript{1760} However, Mommsen’s theory is problematic for two reasons. Firstly, this line allowed Antiochus access to an area that led inland to Pisidia, thus threatening Eumenes’ communications with Lycaonia. Secondly, it does not correspond to the coastal point of Cape Sarpedonion, which marked the limit of his naval activity. Furthermore, the ‘Cestrus line’ could hardly have been subject to topographical confusion, as we know that Antiochus’ envoys disputed the position of Pamphylia under the treaty.\textsuperscript{1761} They held that Pamphylia lay ‘beyond Taurus’ and hence was not forfeit under the peace terms, though their military forces were formally


\textsuperscript{1760} McDonald 1967:6.

\textsuperscript{1761} Polyb. 21.46(48).10-11; Liv. 38.37.9-10; 39.17. Livy’s statement that part of Pamphylia was \textit{cis Taurum} and \textit{pars ultra} seems based on a misunderstanding of Polybius. Cf. Liebmann-Frankfort 1969:71-2; McDonald (1967) does not discuss the Pamphylian settlement. Strabo (13.4.17) defines Milyas as the highlands between Isinda-Termessus in the South and Sagalassus-Apamea in the North. This fits Polybius and Livy here, and the use of Cicero, \textit{Verr.} 2.1.95 and of Plin. \textit{N.H.} 5.147. For the controversy over Ptolemy 5.3.4 see Magie 1950. Sherwin-White 1976:1-2, n. 2); 2.775, n. 79; 2.1133, n. 4.
withdrawn. In any event, Rome ruled against Antiochus, and so the river Cestrus could hardly have figured in the treaty terms.

περὶ δὲ τῆς Παμφυλίας, Εὐμένους μὲν εἶναι φάσκοντος αὐτὴν ἐπὶ τάδε τοῦ Ταύρου, τῶν δὲ παρ᾽ Ἀντιόχου πρεσβευτῶν ἔπεκεινα, διαπορήσαντες ἀνέθεντο περὶ τούτων εἰς τὴν σύγκλητον.\footnote{Polyb. 21.46.11.}

Such were the gifts they gave to Eumenes. As for Pamphylia, since Eumenes maintained it was on this side of the Taurus, and the envoys of Antiochus said it was on the other, they were in doubt and referred the matter to the Senate.

Unfortunately Mommsen seems to have ignored Livy's reference to a River Taurus during the campaign of Manlius Vulso,\footnote{Liv. 38.15.7.} which began through South-central Anatolia when he made the city of Perge (next to modern Aksu) the headquarters for his movements.\footnote{Grainger 1995.} The river to be amended might have been the Taurus and not the Tanais.

C) The most recent solution equates the ‘Tanais amnis’ with the upper reaches of the Calycadnus. In stating the impassability of the Taurus range, McDonald himself admits to the presence of a few fluvial valleys and passes which in fact break this barrier, as the river Göksu does in beginning its course, carving into those steep mountains the passage which leads to Pisidia.\footnote{McDonald 1967:8.} For this reason, the Calycadnus line might be relevant to the territorial issues at stake in the western part of the Taurus range.\footnote{Errington 1998:288.} It is true that the Göksu first flows North, past the site of Astra (next to modern Hadim) towards Isauria, then turns eastwards to pass the site of Artanada (next to modern Dürlgerler) and bends to the Southeast to descend to the gorge of Mut. In its final course, it reaches the sea at Seleucia (modern Silifke) by Cape Sarpedonium,\footnote{Pitassi 2009:130.} after merging with another main branch from the West. In his conclusions, McDonald states that “Tanais-Calycadnus identification of the Taurus frontier fits the strategic
significance of Cilicia Tracheia inland as well as at Cape Sarpedonium".  

McDonald uses the same Mommsen paradigm, connecting the mountain range with the river and with a cape at the end of its mouth, and including them in the military terms of the Roman treaty with Antiochus. He insists exactly on this line, affirming that Livy had misrepresented Polybius, and claiming that “(de Pamphylia) pars eius citra pars ultra Taurum est” would distort the geography of the region. For this reason, he preferred to follow Polybius and, consequently, treated Pamphylia as a whole. However, there is no evidence for such an equation, and we need look no further for an example than the Peace of Callias to disprove McDonald’s contention that the land boundary of a treaty must coincide with the maritime limits. Even if the name ‘Tanais’ may have been corrupt, it nevertheless goes back to an early text and should not be entirely removed from the evidence. If Mommsen identifies the River Cestrus, McDonald simply changes the river (Tanais = Calycadnus = Göksu) in the manufacture of this fictional ‘line’, while leaving the ‘line’ itself unaltered both physically and conceptually. Moreover, he forces the name change from Tanais only onto the first segment of the Calycadnus – which still had its own identity – with no clear evidence for his theory. Fortunately, he goes on to cast doubt upon his own theory, affirming that “at its western end, by the Geyik Dag, this line left the coastal demarcation of Cilicia and Pamphylia sufficiently equivocal to explain, at least, Antiochus’ claim for access to Pamphylia”.

---

1769 McDonald 1967:8.
1770 McDonald 1967:3.
1772 It is rather as if an international treaty referred to the upper reaches of the Thames as the Isis. Cf. McNicoll 1997:118.
1773 Glareanus thought of a ‘Lalassis’ in Isauria, or the Melas or Catarrhactes in Pamphylia; at least he sought a river line in the western Taurus. Bude first turned to the Halys river, a facile guess too easy in the light of general knowledge. Gronovius followed him in proposing ‘ad Halyn’ for ‘ad Tanaim’ and cited a Dett. reading: ‘in scripto inveni ad Accayn amnem’; one may dismiss the palaeographic appeal. The common sense of Drakenborch (1778:5.230 on Liv. 38.38.4.) kept ‘ad Tanaim’ in the text. See McDonald 1967:4.
1774 See the obscure reference Artanadas ths potamias to Sterrett 1888:51.
1775 McDonald 1967:8.
7.3.3 Naval or maritime clauses

The political conditions in western Asia Minor were arranged in the final draft of the treaty under strict military details of both territorial and naval demarcation, within two clauses.\(^{1776}\) The treaty’s ‘naval clauses’ represent Rome’s decision to block any move on the part of Antiochus, preventing him from any operations west of two capes: *Sarpedonium* and *Calycadnum*. The imposition within the treaty of geographical limits on where the craft permitted to him might sail were an effective way of reducing Antiochus’ naval might over those capes.\(^{1777}\) But McDonald and Walbank (1969) scarcely consider the significance of these geographical limitations, focussing only on the number of ships Antiochus was limited to through the Polybian and Livian evidence. On the contrary, for my purposes the geographical limitations imposed on Antiochus westward to Cilicia are of greater significance. Antiochus had to surrender his main fleet and agree to restrict his navy to no more than ten larger open ships, each of not more than thirty oars.\(^{1778}\) This strong measure was also bolstered by the limitations on coastal access, denying him any marine activity west of the Calycadnus river mouth and Cape Sarpedonium.\(^{1779}\) Practically, Rome prohibited him from any access into the Aegean through Rhodian waters, which would suggest that it was the Rhodians who demanded that these naval clauses were included, as they had been previously (197 B.C.):

*legatos ad regem miserunt ne Chelidonias — promunturium Ciliciae est, inclutum foedere antiquo Atheniensium cum regibus Persarum*\(^{1780}\)

they sent ambassadors to the King, ordering him not to pass Chelidoniae — a promontory in Cilicia, made famous by the ancient treaty\(^{1781}\) between the Athenians and the Persian kings.

---

\(^{1776}\) McDonald & Walbank 1969:30.

\(^{1777}\) Polyb. 21.43.13-14; Liv. 38.38.8-9; McDonald & Walbank 1969:30.

\(^{1778}\) Polyb. 21.43.13: ἀποδότω δὲ καὶ τὰς ναῦς τὰς μακρὰς καὶ τὰ ἐκ τούτων ἄρμενα καὶ τὰ σκεῦη, καὶ μηκέτι ἐχέτω πλὴν δέκα καταφράκτων: μηδὲ λέμβον πλείοσι τριάκοντα κυπτῶν ἔχετω ἔλαιων ὑλῶν, μηδὲ μονήρη πολέμου ἐνέκεν; cf. Liv. 38.38.8: ‘neu plures quam decem naves actuarias, quorum nulla plus quam triginta remis agatur, habeto, neve minores belli causa.’ (He shall surrender also his warships and their rigging, and he shall have not more than ten decked ships nor more than ten merchant vessels, nor shall any of these be propelled by more than thirty oars, nor shall he have a ship of one bank for a war); cf. McDonald & Walbank 1969.

\(^{1779}\) Polyb. 21.45; Liv. 38.38; cf. Täubler 1913 1.442-4; McDonald 1967:3.

\(^{1780}\) Liv. 33.20.2.
Livy defines two main characteristics of the promontory: it is in Cilicia and it is a *finis* (*si eo fine*).\textsuperscript{1782} There was little advantage for Rhodes or Pergamum to be involved in Cilicia,\textsuperscript{1783} but this is where Antiochus’ strength lay in operational terms, and it was from here that he might have been able to apply his naval power along the coast and threaten the South Anatolian Coast and then the Aegean. For this reason, Rome was determined to limit the expansionist kings to their national territory and, especially in the case of Antiochus, block any means of military movement.\textsuperscript{1784} However, Rome respected Antiochus’ rights and did not consider the Rhodian request to move the naval *finis* to Cilicia. ‘McDonald’s line’ would have been set to the Calycadnus Pr. instead, which probably lay at the *finis* areas between Pamphylia and Cilicia.

The Senate’s focus, therefore, was merely on preventing Antiochus having a navy powerful enough that he could repeat the outcome of the so called Fifth Syrian War (202-195 B.C.), when in 197 B.C. Antiochus moved westwards by sea along the coast of Cilicia, Lycia and Caria towards the Aegean.\textsuperscript{1785} Rome’s policy, after the Second Punic War, was to be more careful to prevent any possible misunderstanding of the treaty, banning completely the Seleucids from Europe and from the territorial waters of her allies, over which she possibly exerted a ‘loose protectorate’.\textsuperscript{1786} Despite some disagreement on the detection

\textsuperscript{1781} Plut., *Cim.* 13: in 449 B.C., Cimon made a treaty providing that Persian warships should not pass this promontory.

\textsuperscript{1782} Although nowadays it is identified with the Chelidonium Pr. / Hiera Akra / Tauri Pr. Cf. BAtlas 65 D5; Scylax 100; RE *Tauros*, cols. 42, which is in Lycia.

\textsuperscript{1783} McDonald & Walbank 1969:31.

\textsuperscript{1784} This point reflects exactly the Ebro treaty, cf. McDonald & Walbank 1969:31.

\textsuperscript{1785} Liv. 33.19.10-11: “ipse cum classe centum tectarum navium, ad hoc levioribus navigiis cercurisque ac lembis ducentis proficiscitur, simul per omnem oram Ciliciae Lyciaeque et Cariae temptaturas urbes quae in dicione Ptolomaei essent, simul Philippum-necdum enim debellatum erat-exercitu navibusque adiuturus” (“Ordering them to wait for him at Sardis, he set out in person with one hundred decked ships and besides two hundred lighter vessels, schooners and brigs, with the double purpose of trying to win over the cities which had been under the control of Ptolemy along the whole shore of Cilicia, Lycia, and Caria, and of aiding Philip with his army and navy—for that war had not yet been ended”); cf. Polyb. 20.4-12, See Thiel 1946:255-62, n.6 and 273, against the scepticism of De Sanctis (1907:4.1.121, n. 16) about these numbers. McDonald & Walbank 1969:31.

\textsuperscript{1786} The First Punic War had been the first to confront Rome with a serious threat by sea, but the destruction of the Punic navy at the Aegates Islands seemed to have removed the danger; at any rate the peace of 241 B.C. shows the Romans satisfied to expel the Carthaginians from Sicily and the islands “lying between Italy and Sicily” (Polyb. 1.62.8-63; cf. 3.27.2), without making any special provisions for the navy. The conflict with the Illyrian pirates also ended with geographical limitations; Teuta agreed not to sail beyond Lissus with more than two lembi and
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of the natural features (Tanais ~ Halys), the scholars tended to join the naval clause with the terrestrial terms, creating a continuous, ‘imaginary’ line between land and sea, including: a) a mountain range (Taurus Range); b) a river (Tanais – Halys, Cestrum or Calycadnus); and c) at least a coastal point (Cape Sarpedon)\textsuperscript{1787} – although the adjoining of the coastal provision to this imaginary line raises more questions. The treaty of Apamea also prohibited Antiochus from undertaking military operations – to reassert hereditary Seleucid claims – in the Aegean or in ‘Europe’ (i.e. the Thracian region, see Lysimachia). In order to prevent an evasion of any of the treaty’s clauses, the Romans were much more precise than they had been in the Ebro treaty, extending the limitations on Antiochus across both the terrestrial and the naval/maritime front. In broader political terms, the treaty of Apamea blocked any resurgence of Seleucid ambitions in western Asia Minor. However, as was the case with Ebro, it did this mainly and directly through its ‘territorial clause’ with reference to the western Taurus range, thus the ‘naval clause’ probably should not be considered as part of a territorial-maritime continuity (as was the case with the Cape de la Nao or Cape Palos in the Ebro treaty). Even in the treaty of Apamea, two promontories are mentioned (while in the Ebro treaty they are not), when, if the Romans wanted merely to mark a single line, they could have simply drawn one from Taurus to ‘Tanais’. The presence of two promontories once again indicates a sectorial strip rather than a single line. Therefore, the concept of a wide maritime strip mirrored what the Romans built on a terrestrial basis, affirming their \textit{imperium} indirectly through their alliance with Pergamum and Rhodes.\textsuperscript{1788}

\footnotesize

\textsuperscript{1787} That the Taurus was the new boundary is stated in the treaty (Liv. 37.38.4); it is discussed by mainly in Macdonald 1967; Sordi 1982; Giovannini 1982; Grainger 2002:350.

\textsuperscript{1788} McDonald 1967:8.
7.4 Pergamum, Rhodes and other ‘Asiatic’ states

7.4.1 Background and aims

In this section I will consider the political position and the geographical settings of Pergamum, Rhodes and other Microasiatic states in the redrawing of their geopolitical structure, following the treaty of Apamea. Apparently, they served to link Rome to the Seleucid Empire, filling up this spatial gap through their possessions in Anatolia, before eventually functioning as a bridge, connecting the ideal concept of Roman imperium to the finis of the Taurus – a situation that bears a strong resemblance to conditions after the Ebro treaty, where Massalia served the same function.[5.3.1] My aim is to clarify this special relationship, underlining the similitudes and divergences to show how this political frame – built by Rome in Anatolia – corresponds to a political pattern, set up on the concept of finis. In other words, I aim to show how finis and territory are intimately connected, due to the fact that the finis has a spatial feature, in opposition to McDonald’s and Walbank’s view of a ‘linear boundary’ on the following other scholars as in the case of Ebro.[5.4]

The terms of the treaty – once it guaranteed the security of the allies – had chiefly to deal with the necessary political considerations and land assignations. Since Antiochus accepted the earlier terms by withdrawing behind the ‘Taurus line’, the Romans recognised their allies, meeting the ambitions of Pergamum and the Rhodians by preserving the autonomous rights of those cities. Rome demonstrated that she wanted no permanent military involvement in Anatolia by imposing peace and evacuating territories handed over to her main allies. Of course, it was not an act of generosity on Rome’s part: it paid to keep her allies on side. For this reason, the policy that the Roman Senate executed in 189 B.C., granting to Pergamum and Rhodes certain

\[\text{McDonald 1967:1.}\]
regions of Asia Minor north and west of the Taurus Mountains,\textsuperscript{1791} has been defined as “a loose protectorate”.\textsuperscript{1792} Again the modern terminology is unhelpful, as the ‘protectorate’ fails to tally with a completely different conception: the term and the Roman idea of \textit{imperium}. By rewarding Pergamum and Rhodes and expanding their territories, Rome physically and politically pushed her main allies towards abutting the Seleucian Empire.

As a counterpart, when negotiations were transferred to the Roman Senate, the Hellenistic states did not wish to interfere with the terms of the treaty.\textsuperscript{1793} This was a Roman matter and the ratification of the preliminary terms created no difficulty, as they met the ambitions of both Pergamens and Rhodians. Later, their main objective was to exert influence on the Roman Senate over what happened to Antiochus’ former territorial possessions, which he was now obliged to evacuate, and which remained vacant of his authority after his withdrawal. They were chiefly ceded to Eumenes II King of Pergamum and to the Rhodians, Rome’s major military allies in the Battle of Magnesia.\textsuperscript{1794} They also appear in the treaty, denoted as Asian states and the possessions of these two allies. The basic provisions of the treaty, regarding the major allies of Rome, were summed up in an early statement, written for the terms of the Peace:

\textit{summam tamen hanc fore, ut cis Taurum montem, quae intra regni Antiochi fines fuissent, Eumeni attribuuerentur praeter Lyciam Cariamque usque ad Maeandrum amnem; ea ut civitatis Rhodiorum essent; ceterae civitates Asiae quae Attali stipendiariae fuissent eaedem vectigal Eumeni penderent; quae vectigales Antiochi fuissent, eae liberae atque immunes essent.}\textsuperscript{1795}

All the territory on this side of the Taurus, which had been included within the \textit{fines} of Antiochus’ kingdom, would be assigned to Eumenes, with the exception of Lycia and Caria, as far as the Maeander; these were to be annexed to the republic of Rhodes. Of the other cities in Asia, those which had been tributary to Attalus were to pay their taxes to Eumenes, those which had paid tax to Antiochus were to be free from all taxation to a foreign power.

\begin{footnotes}
\item[1791] Cf. Polyb. 21.21.7.
\item[1792] McDonald 1967:1,3.
\item[1793] McDonald 1967:1.
\item[1794] On the possessions of Antiochus in Asia Minor until Magnesia see Schmitt 1957:158-175, 262-295; Baronowski 1991:450.
\item[1795] Liv. 37.55.5-6.
\end{footnotes}
By showing the political rewards given by Rome to her main allies and by studying the nations’ geopolitical situations – which were directly or indirectly involved in Anatolia – I will demonstrate that the Romans built a precise grid of states useful to their policy, that the concept of finis can be considered the key or starting point for the setting up of such a geopolitical system, and that this theory might be confirmed through a comparison with the Ebro treaty.

### 7.4.2 Pergamum

The Pergamens – as Rome’s main ally – specifically asked to be awarded all those regions that had formerly been subject to Antiochus, although this was an implicit request, as can be seen in the indirect speech that Eumenes’ delegates gave in front of the Roman Senate:

> quod terra marique res prospere gessissent, quodque regem Antiochum fusum fugatumque et exutum castris prius Europa, post et Asia, quae cis Taurum montem est, expulisserant.\(^{1796}\)

He went on to congratulate them upon their successes by sea and land and their expulsion of Antiochus, after he had been routed and driven out of his camp, first from Europe and then from the whole of Asia on this side the Taurus.

The Roman decemvirii – by executing the treaty as drafted by the Senate – assigned to Eumenes the greatest rewards, giving him the bulk of Antiochus’ lost possessions in Anatolia.\(^{1797}\) In Europe, the Pergamene Kingdom received the Thracian Chersonesus and Lysimachia.\(^{1798}\) In Anatolia, Eumenes’ dominions included: Lydia; both the Hellespontine and the Greater Phrygia along with the zone of western Pisidia known as Milyas; all Lycaonia and Caria north of Maeander (Hydrela); and the cities of Tralles (modern Aydın), Ephesus (modern Selçuk) and Telmessus (modern Fethiye).\(^{1799}\) In addition, Eumenes possibly obtained the ‘protectorate’ of Pamphylia and, at the very least, the

---

\(^{1796}\) Liv. 37.52.3-4.

\(^{1797}\) The names of them are listed in Liv. 37.55.7.

\(^{1798}\) Kipfer 2000:564.

future city/harbour of Attaleia (modern Antalya).\textsuperscript{1800} Now, the Attalids could embrace an immense territory, fattened as it was ‘to ten times its previous extent.’\textsuperscript{1801} Pergamum bordered and – as some scholars have stressed – had the main function of guarding and defending Asia north as far as Bithynia; northeast to the Galatian Celts; east to Cappadocian; south to Lycia and Pamphylia; and southeast to the ‘Taurus line’ as far as Lycaonia. Its natural limits were the Taurus Range, the Meander and the Halys (?Tanais) rivers.\textsuperscript{1802} The idea of a defensive use for Pergamum (and Rhodes) remains, nevertheless, merely the conjecture of a few scholars.\textsuperscript{1803}

\textbf{7.4.3 Rhodes}

Ally and helpmate of Rome in the war on Antiochus III, Rhodes held an independent position, gaining much profit from the alliance both in prestige and territorial acquisitions. In 189 B.C. – in the immediate aftermath of the Syrian War – a Rhodian embassy was warmly welcomed by the Senate.\textsuperscript{1804} The embassy got what it came for, requesting that Caria (Hydrela) and Lycia be turned over to their state as reward for their assistance to the Roman cause during the war.\textsuperscript{1805} The Romans approved the general lines taken by Rhodes but – unlike with Pergamum – disputes arose immediately about: a) the naval limitations to impose on Antiochus and specifically on which maritime cape should be the western limit for his ships (see Chelydonium Pr.); b) the request

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{1800} Strabo 14.4.1. Probably, the city was founded during the campaign of M'. Vulso, when Attalus (Eumenes’ brother) joined him in Perge for the campaign against the Galatians. The notice is quite debated, see Cohen 1995:337-8.
\textsuperscript{1803} For details see Magie 1950:2.758-64, (Eumenes), 952-3 (Rhodes), 958-9 (the Greek cities); cf. Täubler 1913:1.76.
\textsuperscript{1804} Polybios – probably following or influenced by a Rhodian source – transmits the speech of their envoy: a noble and modest talk, refuting the insinuations of Eumenes about Rhodian ambitions and placing his state in a most favourable light (For the warm reception see Polyb. 21.18.2-3, 21.23.13, 21.24.10-15; the speech, Polyb. 21.22.5-21.23.12; cf. Bickerman 1937:233-4; Geertz 1956:22-5. Livy (37.54) somewhat reworked the talk in his version; cf. Nissen 1863:27. On Rhodian gains under the Peace of Apamea, see Berthold 1984:167-8; Schmitt 1957:84-92; Gruen 1975:64.
\textsuperscript{1805} Polyb. 22.5.2. Eckstein 1988:422.
\end{flushright}
of assignment of Soli in Cilicia; c) the free cities of Anatolia; and d) the Rhodian occupation of Lycia. On the one hand, the Senate instructed the ten commissioners for the Asian settlement to expand their territory called *Peraea Rhodia*, turning over Lycia – apart from Telmessus – and Caria south of the Meander to Rhodes. In this case, it is worth stressing that it is a river – the Meander – that limits the Rhodian ‘imperium’, breaking the region of Caria into two parts. Although Livy does not mention explicitly the Meander as a northern boundary of the newly-acquired possessions, the river delimits the inshore island’s properties. On the other hand, when the Rhodians, after ratification of the treaty at Rome, demanded Soli, the ambassadors of Antiochus were able to refuse and to insist on the terms of the treaty. The Rhodians pronounced themselves satisfied, however, as they had publicly demonstrated their patronage of Soli. Roman favours for Rhodes can also be identified in other instances. The treaty of Apamea specified that property in the *imperium* of Antiochus, which belonged to the Rhodians or their allies, should be restored to them. As consequence of such a favour, Rhodes created the Nesiotic League: exercising its leadership in the alliance of Aegean islands, directing a federal organisation, and controlling a federal navy. Polybius provides a noteworthy phrase, *(Ῥοδίων ἢ τῶν συμμάχων)*, which has been recognised as

---

1806 Liv. 37.56.8.
1807 Polyb. 21.24.7, 21.45.8; Liv. 37.55.5, 37.56.5-6, 38.39.13. Generally Fraser & Bean 1954; Gruen 1975.64.
1808 See mainly Mastrocinque 1979.
1809 Liv. 37.56.6.
1810 Polyb. 21. 24. 10-15; Liv. 37. 56. 7-10: “testante foedera Antipatro, adversus quae ab Rhodis non Solos, sed Ciliciam peti et iuga Tauri transcendi” (Antipater appealed to the provisions of the treaty and maintained that it was a violation of those provisions; the Rhodians were trying to secure, not Soli alone, but the whole of Cilicia, and wanted to transcend the limits of the Taurus).
1812 Moneys owed them should be collected, and goods imported by them should be duty free. Rhodian commerce flourished; harbour duties alone brought in revenues on a lavish scale. The island’s prestige was never higher. Polyb. 30.31.12; see, in general, Rostovtzeff 1941:676-91; Gruen 1975:66.
the Roman acknowledgement of the Rhodian ‘sphere of influence’ or Rhodian imperium.

7.4.3.1 The Lycian question

The question of Lycia is important for understanding the dynamics within the Anatolian Peninsula and comprehending Rome’s different attitudes towards Pergamum and Rhodes. Probably, Rome did not want trouble from her allies, in case they clashed with her geopolitical plans in building a sort of ‘geo-political grid’, built upon the imposed fines. The question of Rhodians’ acquisitions had arisen already when envoys of the ‘free city’ of Ilium (modern hill of Hisarlık) interceded for a diplomatic intervention with Rome on behalf of the Lycians, asking Rome “to pardon the offenses of the Lycians” for siding with Antiochus during the war. According to Polybius, the commissioners sought an agreement with both sides: they abjured harsh measures against the Lycians to please the Ilians, but met the Rhodians’ expectations by ceding them Lycia as a permanent possession. Each party interpreted the reply to its own advantage: the Ilians announced that Rome had granted Lycia its freedom; the Rhodians refused to grant Lycia anything but subject status, reporting that the region was presented as part of their state.

This atmosphere led to revolts, turmoil and war in Southwest Anatolia. Rhodes was unable to administer its requests and new possessions, in exerting an authoritarian regime on the Lycians, and Rome meanwhile grew progressively more suspicious of Rhodian aspirations as a result of the presumptive nature of the islands’ requests. In 181 B.C., Eumenes joined his forces with Rhodes in quelling the insurrection of the Lycians, who had received

1815 Ilium had already struck a pact of friendship with either Antiochus I or Antiochus III as stated in the decree (CIC 3595; GCIS 219) published or revisited by Jones 1993; Frisch 1975: no. 32
1816 They figure between minor Greek delegates engaged at Apamea in Polyb. 22.5.
1817 The Ilian diplomats faced a difficult task, since they had to deal not only with the anger of Rome against the Lycians, but also with a rival embassy from Rhodes, claiming that region. Cf. Polyb. 22.5.3, 6; Gruen 1975:64.
1818 Polyb. 22.5.1-10. Gruen 1975:64.
encouragement from senatorial pronouncements. However, there is nothing to suggest that Rome endeavoured to curb the activity or to dilute the authority of Rhodes. Rhodes had to subjugate and re-subjugate Lycian insurgents in the 180s and 170s. In 177 B.C., a Lycian delegation was given a hearing to complain of wrongs inflicted by Rhodes, and the Roman response requires attention. The Senate dispatched an embassy to Rhodes to reaffirm the intentions expressed at Apamea: the Lycians had not been given to Rhodes as a gift, but as friends and allies.

What is the meaning of that move? It has been argued, within the Polybian context, that Rome appears to have embroiled Rhodes and Lycia with a view to weakening or exhausting Rhodian resources. In my opinion, the message was no more than an expression of good faith: a request that Rhodes treat the fallen Lycians with the respect due to allies. When the Senate delivered its pronouncement, Lycia had already been crushed by Rhodian arms. Thus the misunderstanding continued and more Lycian uprisings followed. Despite

---

1821 A Rhodian delegation to Rome in 182 B.C. came to complain of the misfortunes suffered by Sinope, which had evidently been captured by Pharnaces of Pontus; Polyb. 23.9.2-3; Livy 40.2.6-8. Schmitt 1957:134, takes the Roman failure to act on this complaint as a sign of the senate’s distrust for Rhodes. But the senate did act: an embassy was dispatched to Asia and returned with sharp criticism of Pharnaces; Polyb. 23.9.3, 24.1.2. That Rome refrained from following up her diplomacy with armed force was standard procedure. It certainly does not imply disfavour for Rhodes. Nepos makes reference to an account of Roman campaigns in Asia under Cn. Manlius—an account written by Hannibal and sent off to Rhodes; Nepos, Hann. 13. 2. But it is fanciful to take this as evidence for Rhodian alienation from Rome-as Schmitt 1957:133. Gruen 1975:66.
1822 Gruen 1975:58.
1823 A pitiful tale was recounted by the Lycians, details added and exaggerated in the annalistic account followed by Livy. Polyb. 25.4.4; Liv. 41.6.8-10. Livy is not here dependent on Polybius; Nissen 1863:39-40; Gruen 1975:66.
1824 Polyb. 25.4.5. Livy’s formulation is somewhat different, with a Roman flavour and a Roman analogy—but no significant difference in substance; Liv. 41.6.11-12: “motus his senatus litteras Lyciis ad Rhodios dedit, nec Lycios Rhodiis nec ullos alii cuium quem qui nati liberi sunt in servitutem dari placere; Lycios ita sub Rhodiorum simul imperio et tutela esse ut in dicione populi Romani civitates sociae sint” (“The senate, moved by this appeal, entrusted the Lycians with a letter for the Rhodians, stating that it was not their pleasure that the Lycians should be enslaved by the Rhodians nor any people who had been born in freedom by any other people; the Lycians had been placed under the administrative control and at the same time the protection of the Rhodians on the same conditions as the allied states enjoyed under the guardianship of the Roman people”). Gruen 1975:66.
1825 The Rhodian leadership did not accuse Rome of double-dealing; rather they were convinced that the senate had been inadvertently misled. Polyb. 25.4.6-7; cf. Polyb. 25.5.5. Polybius’ sources here are clearly Rhodian; cf. Ullrich 1898:58. Gruen 1975:67.
1826 Polyb. 25.4.2: Gruen 1975:67.
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this, Rhodes swiftly sent a delegate to Rome to expound her case;\(^{1827}\) Lycian insurrection still raged (or was renewed) in 174 B.C. Rhodes was unfortunate or incapable enough, not only to have trouble with her subjects, but also in her diplomatic relationship with Rome.\(^{1828}\) Politically speaking, Rome did not provide support or aid, nor did it show even the smallest hint of concern. Indeed, Rome was not concerned about the Lycian-Rhodian skirmishes, as the main power and ally in Anatolia was Pergamum, which better managed the control of, and profit from, its territories.\(^{1829}\) However, Livy’s comment on this case is particularly apt: wars among foreign states are not suitable material for a historian fully occupied with recording the affairs of Rome. Livy’s statement clarifies that Rome was not interested in foreign questions that did not pertain to the \textit{status quo} of Apamea: conflicts within her \textit{imperium} would have weakened her position and exposed her to new threats.\(^{1830}\)

7.4.4 Bythinia

Briefly, I will now consider the case of Bythinia in order to show how Rome’s arrangement of the states in Asia Minor was not casual, but the outcome of a planned assignation of the political territories, which formed a ‘geo-political grid’ of states. This subdivision of the territory in Anatolia was made via an independent on-site assessment, leaving nothing to chance. If Pergamum and Rhodes formed the first range – strip, territorially speaking – of allies, the second belt of states was set between them and the Taurus, incorporating Bythinia, Galatia, Cappadocia and possibly Pamphylia.

As a consequence of his abstention from the Seleucid alliance,\(^{1831}\) Prusias came to Rome seeking reward for his actions during the war (\textit{merita sua in eo

\(^{1827}\) Polyb. 25.5.3.5. Gruen 1975:67.

\(^{1828}\) McNicoll 1997:118.

\(^{1829}\) Polyb. 30.5; 31.7; Liv. 44.15. McNicoll 1997:118.

\(^{1830}\) Liv. 41.25.8: “\textit{externorum inter se bella, quo quaeque modo gesta sint, persequi non operae est satis superque oneris sustinenti res a populo Romano gestas perscribere}” (“But the wars which foreign nations waged among themselves and the manner in which they were conducted, it is not worthwhile to relate in detail, since I carry enough and too much of a burden in describing in full the achievements of the Roman people”). Gruen 1975:67.

\(^{1831}\) Polyb. 21.11.1-13; Liv. 37.25.4-14; App. Syr. 23.
bello) as friend of the Roman People.\textsuperscript{1832} The King of Bythinia had a particular reward in mind: a swath of land taken from Antiochus III – held now by the Galatians – which Prusias claimed had never been officially assigned by the Roman Senate.\textsuperscript{1833} The Senate agreed to send an embassy to investigate the situation in the lands Prusias claimed. If this territory had not been assigned at Apamea, then it would certainly be given to Prusias; but if it had in fact been assigned to the Galatians, or had never belonged to Antiochus III in the first place, then the \textit{status quo} would be maintained.\textsuperscript{1834} It is uncertain whether the Bithynian territorial claims were justified, but Prusias did not receive the territory.\textsuperscript{1835} However, the Romans favoured Prusias’ interest in the region: in 165 B.C. we find another embassy from Bithynia in Rome, this time complaining of how Eumenes – surely in the course of his Galatian War – had seized certain ‘Bithynian places’.\textsuperscript{1836} This information notice, from Polybius, suggests that there was indeed a swath of disputed territory between Bithynia, Galatia and the Attalid kingdom. Currently, it is not possible to assess if the territories claimed in 165 B.C. are part of the same area already requested by Prusias in 188 B.C.\textsuperscript{1837} Even though the claimed areas might be the same, it is still interesting to note a kind of confusion prevalent amongst the different states – mainly on their peripheral areas – within the Taurus Range.\textsuperscript{1838} It is probably for

\textsuperscript{1832} Cf. Liv. 45.44.8.
\textsuperscript{1833} Liv. 45.44.9. Eckstein 1988:438.
\textsuperscript{1834} Liv. 45.44.10-12. Schwertheim (1988) argues that the area might belong to Mysia (see Liv. 37.56.2, Polyb. 21.46.10 and Liv. 38.39.15), which is not equivalent to Phrygia Epictetus (another name for Hellespontine Phrygia); after changing hands several times in the period 218-209, Mysia belonged to Antiochus III until 190 B.C. For earlier views on the status of Mysia in this period see Schmitt 1957:2-278; Walbank 1979:171-2; Briscoe 1981:350, 386. Schwertheim (1988) still affirms that Eumenes received only a portion of Mysia depends in part on the extraction of royal forests of Mysia (?) from the corrupt text of Liv. 37.56.2. Prusias (restored) took Mysia from Eumenes, and the traditional interpretation of Liv. 38.39.15, in which King Prusias (Prusia rex) took Mysia from Eumenes (understood) according to the traditional text of Polyb. 21.46.10 Antiochus wuld have been the abstractor of Mysia in Polyb. 21.46.10 and after Liv. 38.39.15, Antiochus (rex) took Mysia from Prusias (Prusia, dative case). Baronowski 1991:451-2.
\textsuperscript{1835} Eckstein 1988:439.
\textsuperscript{1836} Polyb. 30.30.1-3; cf. Liv. Per. 46. For discussion of the background and issues of this embassy, see Habicht 1957: 23. 1120-4 , esp. 1113. Eckstein 1988:438.
\textsuperscript{1837} Liv. 45.44.9.
\textsuperscript{1838} Note that in this embassy of 165 B.C., involving claims about territory, Prusias’ envoys make accusations against Antiochus IV as well as against Eumenes (Polyb. 31.1.3; cf. Liv. Per. 46) – and it was former Seleucid land that had been at issue in 167/166 B.C. Eckstein 1988:438.
\textsuperscript{1839} Polyb. 21.21.7-11. See Ceruti 1984. An account of the status of individual cities after 188 B.C. may be found in Bickerman 1937:235-9; Magie 1950:2.950 n. 60, 952 n. 61, 958 n. 75; Schmitt 1957:278-285; Bernhardt 1971; Mastrocinque 1979:201-5; Walbank 1979:106, 167;
this reason that the Romans drafted a detailed subdivision of this area in the treaty, as shown in the next section.

7.4.5 Cities, castles and oppida

[APPENDIX 4] The objective of this section is to outline: a) the precision in the ‘territorial clauses’ of the treaty in Livy – as opposed to Polybius; b) the role of the oppida in the Roman political and territorial setting of Anatolia, linked to the fines; and c) the fact that Livy writes from a 2nd century B.C. sources’ perspective. This last point deserves a longer explanation. Herewith, I will compare Strabo to Livy, showing the striking difference in the deployment of territories and arguing that, if Livy had written from what he would have perceived of as a perspective contemporary to himself, he would have used a territorial grid similar to Strabo. 1839 Briefly, I will analyse the role of the ‘cities’ in the treaty of Apamea, as in this list the oppida are also included. The treaty did not demarcate national territories, but supported a settlement under which such Roman allies as Pergamum and Rhodes, along with free Greek cities, held an independent place. Pergamum wished to obtain control of, and possibly annex, those Greek cities which had fought for the Seleucids in the recent war. 1840 On the contrary, the Rhodians wanted Rome to grant ‘freedom’ to the ‘Greek cities’, effectively making them independent. 1841 Moreover, they also suggested that the Romans should confine the Pergamene grant to regions that contained no ‘autonomous cities’, i.e. no Greek cities – the object of Rhodian solicitation. Eumenes reacted to the Rhodian proposal with vehemence, referring to those Greek cities which were enemies of Rome, as they had supported Antiochus until the Battle of Magnesia. 1842 Moreover, if the Greek cities were declared free, insisted Eumenes, those already subject to him would revolt. 1843

---

1839 Strabo 7.1.1.
1840 Polyb. 21.21.7-11.
1841 Polyb. 21.19.5-12; 21.22.7-8; 21.23 Cf. Liv. 37.53.2.
Polybius states that the Senate decided not to make all the Greek cities effectively independent, electing not to assign them to Eumenes alone, but to share them also with the Rhodian confederation. Accordingly, these cities assigned to the Pergamene and Rhodian jurisdiction were those – formerly Seleucid – which had supported Antiochus. The cities which did not support Antiochus were declared independent and excluded from the grants. [Cf. APPENDIX 4]

Once again, Livy is more precise than Polybius, revealing a more detailed version of the senatorial decree made by the ten commissioners on this point:

his quae praesentis disceptationis essent libera mandata; de summa rerum senatus constituit. Lycaoniae et Phrygiae et Myssiae, regias silvas, et Lydiae Ionaeque extra ea oppida, quae libera fuissent, quo die cum rege Antiocho pugnatum est, et nominatim Magnesiam ad Sipyolum, et Cariam, quae Hydrela appellatur, agrumque Hydrelitanum ad Phrygiam vergentem, et castella vicosaque ad Maenandrum ammum et oppida, nisi quae libera ante bellum fuissent, Telmesson item nominatim et castra Telmessium, praeter agrum, qui Ptolemaei Telmessii fuissent: haec omnia, quae supra sunt scripta, regi Eumeni iussa dari. Rhodiis Lycia data extra eundem Telmessum et castra Telmessium et agrum, qui Ptolemaei Telmessii fuissent: haec et ab Eumene et Rhodiis excepta. ea quoque his pars Cariae data, quae propior Rhodum insulam trans Maeandrum amnem est, oppida, vici, castella, agri, qui ad Pisidiarm vertunt, nisi quae eorum oppida in libertate fuissent pridie, quam cum Antiocho rege in Asia pugnatum est.

In matters pertaining to any discussion to be conducted on the spot, they were given a free hand; as to the chief issue involved, the Senate made the decision. All Lycaonia and both Phrygia and Mysia, which King Prusias had taken from him, were restored to the King, as well as the Milyae and Lydia and Ionia with the exception of those cities which had been free on the day when the battle with King Antiochus had been fought, and, by name, Magnesia near Sipylus and Caria which they call Hydrela and the territory of Hydrela which faces Phrygia, and the forts and villages along the Meander river and the towns, except those which had been free before the war; Telmessus also and the camp of the Telmessii, except the land which had belonged to Ptolemy of Telmessus. All these places which have been written down above were given to King Eumenes. The Rhodians were given Lycia except the same Telmessus and the camp of the Telmessii, except the land which had belonged to Ptolemy of Telmessus; this district was made an exception in the case of both Eumenes and the Rhodians. Also that part of Caria which is nearer to the island of Rhodes across the Meander river was given to them, and the towns, villages, forts and lands which face Pisidia except those of the towns which had been free the day before the battle had been fought with King Antiochus in Asia.

The passage reflects the political and territorial situation in western Anatolia, reporting the precise territorial terms of the treaty, defining the finis of Taurus (without calling it that explicitly) and agreeing substantially with Polybius on the

1844 Liv. 37.44.4; 37.45.1-3.
1846 Liv. 37.56.1-6 = Polyb. 21.46.8-10. Cf. Liv. 38.38.4.5.
question of the regions assigned to Rhodes and Pergamum. However, Livy specifies regions, areas, territories and natural features and even cities, casting light on key bulwarks like Telmessus. The *oppida* thus exempted had been free (*libera, in libertate*) before the Battle of Magnesia. In this context, ‘freedom’ must imply independence from Antiochus and territorial exclusion from his kingdom. Conversely, Livy notes that certain towns were excluded from the grants anyway. Following the Livian statement, we can detect the importance of the *oppida*. They seem to be the ‘sentinel’ of the territories closer to the *finis* of Taurus, probably part of the *finis* itself and justifying its ‘spatial feature’. The resemblance with other Livian passages, where the *finis* is joined to an *oppidum*, cannot be ignored. The free cities – lying along the bordering areas between the allies of Rome and the ‘second strip’ nations – are crucial to our argument. They highlight the different perceptions of Strabo and Livy, stressing that the latter’s writing reflects the perceptions of the 2nd century B.C. Strabo, who wrote at the time of Augustus, reports that the Romans did not pay any attention to the traditional borderlines between the different tribes, as established in the course of past history, when they created the assizes (*conventus*) in Asia. But he struggles when explaining the difficulties in distinguishing the borders of Phrygia, Caria, Lydia and Mysia. The Roman assize-system extinguished the traditional interstate division, drawing functional

---

1847 On the text of Liv. 37.56.2-6 see Engel 1983 and Engel 1978. Livy (37.56.2) refers to ‘*Lydiae Ioniaeque oppida*’, whereas Polyb. 21.46.10 (cf. Liv. 38.39.16) mentions only Lydia. Livy provides more detail rather than introduces an additional region. In Polyb. 21.46.10 and Liv. 38.39.16, Lydia probably includes the ancient Hellenic foundations of Ionia and Aeolis. From the time of Alexander the Great until probably the early third century B.C., the Ionian and Aeolian Leagues each formed a separate satrapy. After that time, however, they came under the supervision of the Seleucid viceroy based at Sardis, who was also satrap of Lydia. See Bengtson 1964:1.215-223, 2.12-15, 90-115; Robert 1964:1.11-14; Baronowski 1991:453; McDonald 1967:2.

1848 Livy uses three expressions of time: “*quo die cum Antiocho pugnatum est; ante bellum; pridie quam cum Antiocho rege in Asia pugnatum est*”. Briscoe (1981:386-7) believes that the provisions must have been the same in all cases, and that the day before the battle is correct (cf. Walbank 1979:168).


rather than historical boundaries. A variable number of adjacent communities were attributed to the district, which had its principal city.\textsuperscript{1851} This statement resonates strongly with the resubmission of the ‘Halys-Taurus line’, but it coincides with the new Augustan ideology of redrawing boundaries. However, we still face two different cases. Strabo’s in his geography points out that the assizes had been founded to serve the practical needs of the proconsul’s jurisdiction. On the other hand, Livy emphasises the importance of the ‘fortified’ cities, which lay in those areas, which were exposed to foreigner states and functioned as a bulwark in much the same way as Telmessus. Their position, function and denomination (\textit{oppida}) in the administration of the Asiatic soil reminds us of the previous case studies analysed, as they worked as a defensible position.[2.6.8; 5.4.1;6.3.3]

7.4.6 Pamphylia

Scholars have attributed a strong relevance to Pamphylia, justified by the role that this region played on the Anatolian ‘geo-political grid’ after the disposals of the treaty. After all, this region was left in a position which has been considered and defined as equivocal following the agreements of Apamea.\textsuperscript{1852} My aim is to place this role in the context of a \textit{finis}, considering this state as a ‘natural \textit{arcifinium}’ of the \textit{finis} of the Taurus Range.[1.2] Pamphylia lies isolated between the high massif of Cilicia Aspera (the southern part of the Taurus Mountains) in the East and the lower rocky block of Lycia in the west, with the Pisidian range to the North. This compact plain is enriched by the deltas of the Pisidian rivers, notably the \textit{Cestros} and the \textit{Eurymedon} (modern Köprüçay) and is crossed by three main difficult routes, which connect the coastal harbours with the practicable accesses of the Pisidian mountains. The first road runs northwest from Attaleia – past Termessus – into and through the mountainous Milyas region that lies behind Lycia, leading to \textit{Cibyra} (modern Gölhisar), and thence to \textit{Laodicea} (next to modern Denizli) on the upper Maeander (Lycus) in

\textsuperscript{1851} See OGI 458, 1. 65; cf. Modestinus, \textit{Dig.} 27.1.6.2; Habicht 1975:68.
\textsuperscript{1852} For details see Magie 1950:2.758-64, (Eumenes), 952-3 (Rhodes), 958-9 (the Greek cities); cf. Täubler 1913:1, 76. McDonald 1967:3.
Carian Asia. The second easier route runs northwards from Attaleia to Sagalassus in the heart of Pisidia, and thence to Apamea on the Phrygian plateau; it has a branch northeast to Antiochia in Pisidia (next to modern Yalvaç) and Philomelium (modern Akşehir), which is more difficult to traverse. The third road runs north and northeast from Side through the highest section of the Pisidian Mountains, passing between the great Lake Caralis and the northern end of the Taurus into the elevated plateau of Lycaonia. From the communication centre of Iconium (modern Konya), there is easy access to Cappadocia by the central highway that links Apamea, Iconium and Mazaca (modern Kayseri). Pamphylia thus formed the southern gateway to the Pergamene Kingdom and to the Rhodian Lycia toward the Taurus range, although it was more exposed to enemy attack by sea and land. In a single passage, Livy stresses the importance of the connection between Lycia and Pamphylia in relation to the city of Phaselis (next to modern Tekirova):

in confinio Lyciae et Pamphyliae Phaselis est; prominet penitus in altum conspicturque prima terrarum Rhodum a Cilicia petentibus et procul navium praebet prospectum. eo maxime, ut in obvio classi hostium essent, electus locus est. Phaselis is on the confines of Lycia and Pamphylia; it projects far into the deep, and is the first land sighted by travellers who are going to Rhodes from Cilicia and it allows ships to be sighted from afar.

Phaselis lies on the Chelidonias promontorium (modern Gelidonya Burnu), to which Livy assigns a particular importance: a) he establishes the importance of the city, shared between Lycia and Pamphylia through the use of the term (confinio); b) he notes that it projects far into the sea (prominet penitus in altum); and c) he points to the fact that it is the first land seen by people coming from Cilicia to Rhodes, from where ships could be seen at a great distance. We have enough data to consider Phaselis and the connected regions

---


1854 Liv. 37.23.1.

1855 Confinem: 4.49.3; in confinio:23.33.7; 37.23.1; confinis:45.29.8.
(Lycia and Pamphylia) as key zones. However, in the context of the treaty, we face two kinds of problem related to Pamphylia: a) whether the region was assigned to Pergamum or remained utterly or partially free (Pergamene ‘protectorate’?); and b) whether its territory was set up on purpose as a ‘strip’ of land to hold back or check Antiochus’ intentions (‘buffer zone’?). When the treaty was ratified, Eumenes also staked a claim to Pamphylia, allegedly grounding his demand in the fact that this region lay on the western side of the Taurus. Although the conclusion is still obscure, it has been proposed that the treaty granted utter freedom to Pamphylia, of which M. Vulso chose Perge as his headquarters for the expedition through the second strip countries (Pamphylia, Cappadocia and Galatia). The possibility that Pamphylia was a ‘Pergamene protectorate’ has been proposed, as Attalus II – Eumenes’ successor – eventually founded the city of Attaleia (modern Antalya) and a settlement at adjacent Corycus. But this then begs the question of how it was possible that an independent country as Pamphylia hosted a Pergamene settlement on its land. The solution which has been proposed concerns a parallel with Pisidia, which separates Lycaonia from Attalid Lydia. Although Pisidia is not listed among the donations of 188 B.C., Attalus II was allowed a free hand on it. Attalus II was influential at Termessus (modern Güllük), he controlled at least Amlada (modern Kızılca) in eastern Pisidia, as a tributary vassal, and he waged war against the Pisidian stronghold of Selge, which is accessible only from Pamphylia. So it seems that much of Pisidia and

---

1856 Cf. Liv. 37.23.2: This position was selected mainly because it lay on the route of the enemy fleet. Polyb. 21.46.11; Liv. 38.39.17. Gruen 1986:548, n. 82.
1857 In 169 B.C., an independent mission from Pamphylia formally renewed its friendship with the Roman people. Cf. Liv. 44.14.3.
1859 Pisidia, omitted in the texts of the donations of 189-8 (above, n. 3) is included in the Rhodian speech (Liv. 37.54.2). For Amlada, OGIS 751. For Termessus, Magie 1950:2.1136, n. 12. For Selge, Strabo 12.7.3; Trogus, Prol. 34; Polyb. 31.1(9).3; Magie 1950:2.750-1. The counter-alliance of Termessus and Adada, TAM 3.1.2, suggests that not all Pisidia was Pergamene; cf. the freedom of ‘Pisidian’ Antioch since 189 B.C., Strabo 12.8.14 (p. 577). For the topography of Selge cf. Bean 1968:1.138-41, supported by Polyb. 5.72-3, where Garsyeris enters Pamphylia from Milyas to attack Selge from the South. Cf. Sherwin-White 1976:2.
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Pamphylia were in Attalid hands. So what was the purpose of keeping Pamphylia semi-independent? Probably it was part of the second strip of regions abutting the Taurus, which presumably were part of the finis, including the width of the Taurus range as a whole. The more straightforward comparison goes back to the Ebro treaty, where two zonal areas were part of the same finis-system.

7.5 Conclusions: the theory of fines rebuilt

7.5.1 Challenges and structure

In this final section, I will summarise how the term finis is used in Livy in the treaty of Apamea. As a starting point, I will exploit the theories of Liebmann-Frankfort (1969) and Sherwin-White (1976), who tackled the aftermath and pioneered new perspectives on the function of the treaty of Apamea. I will demonstrate the validity of the two scholars’ theories, which foresaw the potential of the link between finis and imperium, although they were unable to achieve an outright connection between the two. They did not link them to their hypothesis, or indeed to each other. Moreover, they did not consider the ‘geo-political grid’ built around the Taurus as planned strategy, which is the aim of this section. I have shown that in Livy: a) the term finis is not limited to a single line (‘Taurus line’); b) the fines limited the Roman imperium; c) Rome’s

---

1861 The two regions passed to Rome by the Attalid inheritance of 133 B.C., though it is not certain when they came under direct administration. Their positions were somewhat isolated, at first, from the core of the new province of Asia by the assignment of Phrygia in the North to the King of Pontus, and by the survival of the free states of Caria and Lycia south of the Maeander, which were not part of the Attalid inheritance; cf. Waelkens 2004:455-68. There is no evidence for the current belief that western Caria was included in Asia from the first: see on this Jones 1971:59; Magie 1950:2.1044, n. 30. See the Sullan senatus consultum about Tabae and Stratonicia (OGIS 441-2; Sherk 1969: nos. 17-18; Crawford and Reynolds 1974:289) that these cities had always been under proconsular government. But these documents, like the later Lex Antonia about Ternessus (Sherwin-White 1976:11-14), restore the former freedom of the cities after the turmoil of the Mithridatic war at a time when the rest of Caria was doubtless under Roman rule. Gaertringen (1906: n. 121, 33), implies that Alabanda had free status c. 100 B.C. Le Bas & Waddington 1877:3.n. 409, may indicate provincial status for Mylasa c. 78/77 B.C. Further East, the tetrapolis of Cibyra survived as independent to c. 82; cf. (OGIS 762, c. 160-50 B.C.; cf. Strabo 13.4.17). Not much is left for a pre-Sullan conventus of Caria: why should the Senate add Caria to the new province when it was abandoning so much of the Attalid inheritance to the kings? Sherwin-White 1976:2.
imperium (referred to by other scholars as ‘sphere of influence’, ‘cordon sanitaire’ or ‘buffer zone’) is not a random entity, but a planned and organised idea, which puts Rome herself at the centre of the world; d) Rome was able to build all around herself a contiguous series of strips, which recalls the Varronian subdivision of the territory.\[4.2.3.1\] e) Finis is a zonal-system, which expands or overlaps over a plane: the territory: the natural features create that line, from which this plane origins.\[1.4.2; 5.6;\]

7.5.2 The ‘sensing’ of the finis as spatial feature

Between the 3rd and 2nd centuries B.C., Rome fought in Cisalpine Gaul, established the defence of the Alpine frontier, conquered large extensions during the Spanish wars, and annexed Macedonia and Africa with an increasing occupation of Transalpine Gaul. However, Rome still appeared restrained in building a provincial empire, based on the material conquest and organisation of the land.\[1862\] In considering the last sections of this chapter,\[7.2-4\] the definition given to the treaty of Apamea was that of “a more sophisticated version of Roman policy in Anatolia as a planned protectorate”.\[1863\] After all, until 133 B.C.,

---

1862 From 190 to 168 B.C., according to Afzelius’ evaluation of the detailed evidence of Livy (39.30.12; 40.36.8; 41.5.6-7, 21.2), from eight to ten legions, with their allied complement of five to eight thousand men apiece, were regularly deployed in the two Spain, North Italy, and in some years Sardinia, in consular and praetorian commands. The figure rises to twelve legions during the oriental wars, which required armies of four legions in some years, found in part by cutting down the garrison of northern Italy, while two legions remained around Rome as a short-term strategic reserve. Pressure did not abate after 150 B.C., when the African war required five consuls out of six from 149 to 147 B.C., and renewed troubles in Spain took two consular armies each year, under consuls and proconsuls, from 143 to 134. Meanwhile Macedonia became a praetorian commitment from 146 B.C. Between 125 and 120 B.C., the conquest of Transalpine Gaul occupied four consuls, conjointly in some years. These overlapped with two consuls operating in Sardinia (126-2 B.C.) and Nearer Spain (123-c.121 B.C.). Macedonia required consular attention from 114 to 107 B.C., overlapping with the Numidian war from 111 B.C. onwards, and with consular commands in North Italy in at least 113 and 109. The Numidian command in turn overlapped with consular activity in Gallia Transalpina from 107 to 105 B.C., when two armies were on foot in Gaul and a third in reserve in North Italy. Thus the sole intervention in Asia (31-29 B.C.) fell in a rare quiescent period: the annual Roman requirement from 125 onwards could hardly be less than nine legions. See, for the period before 167 B.C.: Afzelius 1944:47-8, 62-3, 79-9. For 146-101 B.C.: Ilari 1974:167 (with Strabo 4.1.1); Brunt 1971:427-8. For the consular commands from 150 B.C. on, see Broughton 1952, under each year. Sherwin-White 1977:65.

1863 Liebmann-Frankfort (1969) puts her views together. The theme is worked out in chs. 1-2. The kings are turned into ‘satellites’, ‘absorbed’, and even ‘integrated’, as an alternative to annexation or permissive expansion. Cf. Liebmann-Frankfort 1969: Bithynia:101-2; Pergamum:103-4; Cappadocia:108-9. So, e.g., when Attalus II restores Ariarathes, it must be
the Senate was still unwilling to annex provinces even in European Greece and, beyond the Aegean, far from seeing an increase in Roman intervention, the Anatolian states were left free to practise their mutual antipathies. In Polybius’ and Livy’s accounts, the problem related to Eumenes and the Rhodians, in their role as advisers to Rome, is treated as one of control. Rome did not wish to take over the direct government of any Anatolian territory, as she was not in need of material / physical extension of her dominions. Sherwin-White has stressed that the key function of the allied nations was not primarily to defend Anatolia, but to manage it. This theory would explain the indifference of the Senate to the machinations of the Asiatic kings. Although the Romans are depicted as reluctant imperialists, the Senate did not ignore the situation, but instead supervised and controlled its interests in the East by sending missions, legations and even a military force to control the territory. Polybius and Livy had already noted that, in moments of concern or trouble – i.e. with Macedonia or the Seleucid King – the Senate showed great energy and initiative, sending ultimatums to suit the situation. Rome had a ‘controlling policy’ which was mainly defensive, but became aggressive under foreign attack, and her aim was to create an area or a zone safe enough not to expose herself to a direct threat.

Sherwin-White revealed a new view of the treaty of Apamea, foreseeing these conclusions: “Any solution needs a clear understanding of the strategic geography of the region and its political role within the Kingdom of Pergamum on the advice of Rome (Liebmann-Frankfort 1969:114-5), despite Polyb. 32.10-12; Sherwin-White 1977:65.
1869 This view is repeated in the Roman tradition by Sallust’s report of Mithridates’ gibe that the Romans turned Eumenes into the watchman of their conquests: “post habitum custodiae agri captivi” in Sall. Hist. 4, fr. 69. 8.
1872 Acimovic 2007:111, 119. Cf. e.g. the frequent missions to Macedonia, Achaea and the Anatolian kingdoms leading up to the war with Perseus: Liv. 42.17.1; 19.7-8, 26.7-8, 37.45.1-5. Sherwin-White 1977:66. When the young prince Demetrius escaped dramatically from Rome to Antioch, and dethroned the Roman nominee, all the alarm bells rang. The experienced and authoritative Tiberius Gracchus was sent (Polyb. 31.15.7-11) “to look at things in Greece, to keep an eye on the other kings, and to watch developments in Syria”; Sherwin-White 1977:66.
that became the province of Asia”. Before this pronouncement, Liebmann-Frankfort (1969) had already proposed the ‘buffer state theory,’ through which he carefully constructs a rampart of states between the lands under Roman control and the Seleucid power. The rampart originally consisted of the Kingdom of Pergamum and the State of Rhodes, both greatly enlarged by the donations of 189 B.C. Soon after, the campaign of M. Vulso, together with the Roman diplomacy, added as vassal states the Galatian confederation, Bithynia and Cappadocia, vastly enlarging the ‘buffer area’. However, a ‘buffer theory’ considers the interposition of an obstacle between two conflictual powers. Theoretically, the ‘buffer zone’ impedes any sort of effective military action between the two main powers, either through its own political strength or through the difficulty of its terrain. Sherwin-White argued that “it was not the situation between the Roman state and the Seleucid Kingdom in the time of its strength”. In his opinion, Rome did not directly control any territory adjacent to Anatolia down to the annexation of Macedonia, and Rome did not need buffers for her own protection after the great victories of Magnesia and Pydna (modern Pydna–Kolindros). Furthermore, “the ancient sources that discuss the reorganisation of the Asian kingdoms after Magnesia do not talk about defence, but about management”.

Liebmann-Frankfort limits her theory just to the territorial acquisitions – without considering the presence of the finis – while Sherwin-White does not examine the concept of imperium at all. However, by joining both theories together – the ‘buffer zone’ theory and its subsequent criticism – they become effective and valid for explaining the Roman organisation of Anatolia. Here, the ‘demarcation zone’ – which incorporates the Taurus peaks, the Tanais River and the capes Calycadenus and Sarpedon – is definitively and legally fixed in every single point. Since the first negotiations, Rome’s major concern was to mark definite, impassable, existing fines, considered as lines by the most competent scholars on this topic. These limits had a double significance: they were natural

1876 See McDonald 1967 on the ‘Taurus line’.
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features that had been turned into legal features, regulated and recognised by mutual agreements between the parties. This is exactly what Scipio asked of Antiochus – as clearly stated by Livy – after the Battle of Thermopylae (191 B.C.):

*quod si Asiae quoque partem aliquam abstrahere velint, dummodo non dubiis regionibus finiant, vinci suam temperantiam Romana cupiditate pacis et concordiae causa regem passurum.*

If, however, they wanted to annex some part of Asia, provided it was defined by clearly defined areas, the King would, for the sake of peace and concord, allow his own sense of moderation and equity to give way before the Roman greed for territory.

Livy’s passage is crucial for three main reasons:

A) It shows the true Roman interests: Antiochus could occupy some parts of Asia on condition that the *fines* of those areas he wanted to obtain were commonly decided and marked and that those *fines* could not lead to misleading interpretations (*non dubiis*). In other words, Scipio asked Antiochus to be honest. After the Battle of Magnesia he was instead forced to accept the established clauses in the treaty of Apamea: "Rome had resolved that the imbroglio which had provoked her entrance into Asian conflict would not be repeated". This notion is relevant to Hannibal’s escalation, as a result of the unclear or undetailed Ebro treaty. In my opinion, the treaty of Apamea represents a better implementation of the process of drawing up a treaty, particularly in comparison with the Ebro treaty, which was imprecise and therefore open to different interpretations. Through its numerous clauses, the treaty of Apamea avoided any ambiguity in the final draft.

B) Scipio uses the verb *finire*, which contrasts with the verb *terminare*, putting a ‘natural’ subdivision on the territories.[3.3.1-4; 4.3.1] Scipio already had in mind the evacuation plan and his view was based on previous historical boundaries, which existed before the Romans came to the East. There was still the Taurus Mountain, which was a *finis* but was not a *terminus* chosen due to its

---

1877 Liv. 37.35.7.
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history and natural features. The distinction between the two words is clear enough to Livy, even though the view of a foreigner to a Roman might lead to a misunderstanding of the terminology. It looks clear to a Greek’s eyes, as demonstrated in the words of Eumenes’ envoys:

“...terminus est nunc imperii vestri mons Taurus; quidquid intra eum cardinem est, nihil longinquum vobis debet videri”.

The boundary of your empire, at present, is Mount Taurus. Nothing within that line ought to be thought remote.

[FIG 42] Both passages suggest the existence of a ‘geo-political Roman grid’, built with specific aims. The first passage reports that the inner subdivision of space was done by the establishment of well delimited regions (regionibus finiant),[3.3.1-4] while the second records that the Taurus Range was called axis (cardo) as part of the terminatio operated by Rome and represented the main line from which the spatial plan and the ‘geo-political’ grid were generated.[1.4.1] Rome’s new tendency in defining the limits of different territories is evident from the Table of Polcevera (Liguria, Italy).[APPENDIX 5] The bronze table dated to 117 B.C. – also known as Sententia Minuciorum – is a document, which aimed to define the possessions of territory and to delimit it (agrum possiderent et qua fineis fieren). It states three main concepts functional to our argument: a) the difference between fines and termini (eos fineis facere terminosque statui iuserunt), b) the precision through which the Romans used to delimit territories and c) the zonal extension of fines,

---

1879 Cf. Liv. 37.53.25: “si vos ea mente ultra Tauri iuga emostis Antiochum, ut ipsi teneretis eas terras, nullos accolas nec finitimos habere quam vos malo” (If, then, your intention in removing Antiochus beyond the Taurus range is that you may hold those lands yourselves, I would rather have you than any others as my neighbours).

1880 Liv. 37.54.23.


1882 The table established the fines of the private (“Langatium fineis agri privati”) and public territory of the Veiturios (“Agri poplici, quod Langenses posident, hisce finis videntur esse”), each followed by a long and precise list of termini forming those fines.

1883 Cf. “ab rivo infimo, qui oritur ab fontei in Mannicelo ad flovium / Edem: ibi terminus stat; inde flovio suso vorsum in flovium Lemurim […]”. To be noted that the termini are made by natural
embrying part of the territory (*Quis intra eos fine agrum posedet Genuas aut Vitrius*). In the structure of the table, the *fines* are formed by a series of *termini* put together, which look much more like points within a plane with the aim of building up the *fines* themselves. The *termini* are very precise and the structure of the Tabula recalls – through its precision – the treaty of Apamea, although the instructions in the table are much more accurate than those in Livy, probably due to the chronological distance between the two documents and to an evolution in the delimitation. In the Polcevera table the *fines* look like very zonal areas (*ager compascuos*), belonging administratively to one party (*Langenses Veiturios*) but practically to the other disputant (*Genuates*), who had to pay a tax to the former in case they used that part of land.

In this context, the comparison with Hannibal’s speech might be more comprehensible, when he says that the Romans put *termini* around the world, limiting the space of other nations or peoples.\footnote{1884}{[1.5.1; 5.6]} And I do not think this is a coincidence. Is the Taurus Range the *terminus* of the Pergamene Kingdom?\footnote{1885}{Liv. 37.54.23.} Or is it the *finis* of the Roman *imperium*? The idea of power for the Romans was a sort of ‘open control’ and ‘accessible command’ (*imperium Romanum*), which contrasts starkly with the notion of territorial control, as Livy describes it:

\begin{quote}
*et hoc quo finem imperii Romani Taurum montem statuistis, quo libertatem, immunitatem civitibus datis, quo aliis fines adicitis, alias agro multatis, aliis vectigal imponitis, regna augetis minulitis donatis adimitis, curae vestrae censetis esse, ut pacem terra marique habeant.*\footnote{1886}{Liv. 38.48.4.}
\end{quote}

when you have made Mount Taurus the *finis* of the Roman Empire; when you grant liberty and independence to the states of that country; when you augment the territories of some; amerce others in a part of their lands; impose tribute.

In his view, the *finis* of Taurus would not be just that ‘remote line’ traced by the Romans, but an immanent geometrical plan which extended *ultra iuga Tauri* (over the passes of Taurus), was “*prope extra orbem terrae*” (“almost out of the
world") and where Antiochus had been relegated (exacto). The ‘barrier’ of Taurus, in geopolitical terms, had been defined as a more effective boundary than the porous, fringed, rich city coast of Ionia, Aeolis and Caria, which often acted as springboard for the conquest of Europe.

Even though the dichotomy between ‘linearity’ and ‘spatiality’ of the fines seems to be resolved, it still faced some ambiguity. This misunderstanding is due once again to Polybius who, contrary to Livy, was not able to comprehend the meaning of the areas. The comparison between the Livian passages of the two treaties (Ebro and Apamea) clarifies the Roman definition of finis as a term embedded in natural and political meaning. If we agreed on the theoretical existence of a ‘single line’ (Taurus-Tanais-Calycadnus), we would accept the simplest solution. But in Livy’s word – and hence in the Republican Roman conception – we have to consider the nature of finis again, which has embedded in it the conception of arcifinium.[1.4.1] As in the case of the Ebro, the treaty of Apamea shows that there is an area extending out on both sides of the finis.

Nevertheless, while Rome granted an augmentation of the Pergamene and Rhodian territories – with a real occupation – these did not extend as far as the so called ‘Taurus line’. None of them reached the Taurus, or the Halys (or whatever river it was), or less still the Calycadnus. More nations would form a further strip of territories – another ‘buffer zone’ – as far as the Taurus-Tanais (Halys) line. Pamphylia, Galatia and Cappadocia were the regions abutting the Taurus and they represented this sort of ‘buffer zone’, perhaps the arcifinium of the finis itself. Moreover, between the two areas – the territory of Pergamum and Rhodes and the neutral states east of them – the presence of independent oppida is attested. Their features recall those of a stronghold or bulwark positions. Can we imagine a similar disposition of states beyond Cilicia,
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mirroring the ‘cis-tauric’ situation?\textsuperscript{1890} Certainly Rome defined the northern *arcifinium* of the Taurus *finis* and possibly also claimed its southern slope, when Vulso wanted to cross it to land in Cilicia. Moreover, the Romans claimed “*ea valle Tauri usque ad iuga, qua in Lycaoniam vergit*” ("also that valley of Taurus all the way through the mountain passes, where it slopes down into Lycaonia").\textsuperscript{1891}

### 7.5.3 Finis and imperium

In 189/8 B.C. the Romans were so concerned with containing the Seleucids that they established a demilitarised zone in Asia Minor and a ‘buffer zone’ in Bythinia, Cappadocia, Galatia and Pamphylia to prevent the return of their enemy’s offspring. Rome assumed the authority, but not the material or military control, to defend this front. For the scholars post-WWII, Rome moved to the ‘Taurus line’ that margin of security for the defence of Europe, after the Aegean Sea failed in its function of ‘buffer area’.\textsuperscript{1892} This Roman containment policy had its basis in their perception of a threat, whether or not that threat was in actual fact real. Rome at this time was improving her ideas of *finis* as applicable to a more complex reality: strategic areas, built around herself, far enough to be safe but close enough to keep control of events. The *imperium* would be immanent over these areas and limited by established *fines*. The idea of ‘cordon sanitaire’\textsuperscript{1893} might be real and have been built with specific plans. Scholars have insisted on the existence of the ‘line’, without considering the involvement of territories, states, areas and zones. They have perceived the importance of ‘buffer zones’ without linking them to actual bordering concepts or *fines*. A *finis* is a wider concept than a *terminus*: the *terminatio* is a human act, artificial and created by man, conjoining two or more *termini*. The *finis* is natural and already existent.\textsuperscript{1894} It cannot be changed, modified or disposed by human needs, but

\textsuperscript{1890} If we consider the passage of Livy (38.38.4) where ‘*ea valle*’ is an area forbidden to be crossed.

\textsuperscript{1891} Liv. 38.38.4.

\textsuperscript{1892} Liebmann-Frankfort 1969:65.

\textsuperscript{1893} Although the context is roughly late, the same area of Pamphylia/Cilicia as considered having the same value. Cf. Hoyland 2011:108,n.235.

\textsuperscript{1894} Cf. Liv. 38.45.3.
its function can be agreed upon. In Livy, the importance of the Taurus range is an epochal benchmark used by the Romans to impose their conditions in future wars.\textsuperscript{1895} As with the Ebro treaty, Livy ‘locks’ the term \textit{imperium} with the word \textit{finis} in the treaty of Apamea.\textsuperscript{1896} Probably, the Romans used the term \textit{finis} not to put a limit on their expansion, but on their \textit{imperium}. The \textit{imperium} is therefore a sort of emanation of the Roman ‘sphere of control’, but it is not a practical and real control based for example on military occupation; it is a sort of ‘emanating’ jurisdiction. The \textit{imperium} is an emanation, augmented through the expansion of the \textit{fines} themselves: in other words, the \textit{imperium} gives decisional power to Rome, the limit of which is marked by \textit{fines}.

### 7.5.4 Centre of the world?

The Roman notion of territory is structured as a continuous series of land strips, through which the world is subdivided. In other words, if we try to visualise the Livian conceptual \textit{finis}, the Roman world appears based on a series of concentric ‘territories’, which fade to the outskirts of the \textit{imperium}: Rome and Italy (Ager Romanus) – Allied Territory (Gabinus) – Friendly or Allies’ Territory (Peregrinus) / \textit{Finis} / Enemy’s Territory (\textit{hostieus}) and the unknown (\textit{incertus}).[4.2.3.1] Of these, the first three areas are subject to the Roman \textit{imperium}. Compared to the Ebro treaty, the situation of Apamea looks more complex, but the two in fact mirror each other as confirmed by Livy. In the speech of the Rhodian embassy after the Roman Senate, Rome equates her might (\textit{imperium}) on both sides with the \textit{Urbs} in the middle:

\begin{quote}
“adistis Graeciae, adistis Asiae urbes plerique; nisi quod longius a vobis absumus, nulla vincimur alia re. Massilienses, quos, si natura insita velut ingenio terrae vinci posset iam pridem efferassent tot indomitae circumfusae gentes, in eo honore, in ea merito dignitate audimus apud vos esse, ac si medium umbilicum Graeciae incolerent”.
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{1895} The consul M. Fulvius reminded to the Aetolians, who were still continuing the war to follow Antiochus’ example. Liv. 38.8.8: “\textit{non paucis urbis eum, de quarum libertate certatum sit, sed omni Asis cis Taurum montem, opimo regno, excessisse}” (He had ceded not only those few cities whose liberty had been the cause of quarrel, but the whole of Asia on this side the Taurus – a rich and fertile realm).

\textsuperscript{1896} Liv. 38.48.4 (\textit{imperium}); cf. Liv. 37.54.23 (\textit{terminus}).

\textsuperscript{1897} Liv. 37.54.20-1.
“You have, most of you, visited the cities of Greece and Asia: we are at no disadvantage compared with them, except that we are at a greater distance from you. If the native temperament of the Massilians could have yielded to the influence of their soil they would have been long ago barbarised by the wild untamed tribes all round them, but we are given to understand that they are held in as much honour as though they were living in the heart of Greece”.

The reference to the influence of the soil (*ingenio terrae vinci posset iam pridem efferassent*) clarifies this view: in the Ebro treaty, the Massaliotes’ possessions would have mirrored the Pergamene and Rhodian ‘sphere of influences’. Besides, the Rhodians as Greeks claimed their superiority over wild untamed tribes (*indomitae circumfusae gentes*); a concept which Rome started shaping and fitting to herself. We are on the way toward Rome’s acquisition and claim of her centrality over the Greek world, as Livy at this point still refers several times to the ‘*umbilicum orbi terrarum*’ of Delphi. As Jaeger has affirmed after Pydna (168 B.C.), the sense of ‘centre of the universe’ does not belong to Greece anymore, but to Rome. She asserts that, in the description of Emilius Paullus’ journey, Rome is the new cultural centre of the world and particularly the Capitoline, from where the space around her is organised. This treaty might confirm this theory, already hinted at in the Ebro treaty. The treaty of Apamea represents a milestone in Rome’s policy, where the new *finis* lays “*prope extra orbem terrae*” (almost out of the world). Rome is becoming conscious of her cosmological immanence. She is about to become the heir of Greece in occupying the central place in the notion of the infinite *oikoumene*, usually translated with *orbis terrarum*.

---

1898 Cf. Liv. 38.48.3; 41.23.20; 37.54.20; 35.18.20.
1899 Jaeger 1997:3.
1900 Liv. 38.8.4.
Chapter 8. Conclusions

This study has centred on demonstrating how Livy’s conception – and by extension the Roman conception – of finis stands in stark and unexpected contrast to any modern bordering practice. The significance of choosing Livy lies in both his quantitative usage of the term and to his qualitative identification of fines with those natural features that are related to territorial demarcations. Furthermore, I have also explained how the figure of Livy is crucial in the process of detecting the fines in the Roman word. Firstly in his exhaustive journey through the foundation of the Republic, I detected his use of finis in different and relevant circumstances, showing a progressive change in this use through the history of the Republic’s expansion. Secondly, Livy used the term more than any other available author, although it is impossible to establish whether by chance or following the ‘Augustan guidelines’. Thirdly, Livy’s writing clearly reveals an intimate connection between the concept of finis and natural features both in an intratextual sense and within the material environment. Fourthly, Livy provides a sort of climax in the concept of finis, which starts with the example of the Tiber as finis, associated with a pax (peace), and terminates with the treaty of Apamea, where it seems to have become intertwined with a political construction built on the concept of finis. This entire thesis has been organised around rebuilding the Livian conception of finis, following the framework of Livy’s own work as he uses the evidence to elucidate the main features of finis. My method has been to highlight the contexts in which the term finis has been used, revealing that it displays a kaleidoscopic range of facets. This has been achieved by making a basic distinction between the temporal values of finis (as ‘end’ or ‘ending’ of a temporal action) in Livy,[Finis A] before focussing on the spatial value of the term.

[APPENDIX1; 2] Fines B to fines H are linked to specific natural features,[1.4.2] which are different – in terms of position, shape and features – from the surrounding material environment. I pointed out that,[1.3] while natural features (rivers, mountain ranges, promontories) have always been exploited as an element of substantial subdivision between two environmental or political areas,
the term *finis* has been scarcely used or studied. The premises for identifying the bordering practices in Livy have been grounded on the analysis of the basic concept of *finis* and its identification with geographical features.

*Finis* belongs to that category of the bordering concepts.[1.4.1-2] Yet, although studies have sought interpretations of and explanations for the idea of borders, boundaries and frontiers in the Roman world, they have neglected the term *finis*, probably considering it on a simple level as a synonym for ‘border’, ‘boundary’ or ‘frontier’. These correlations with different modern terms are not helpful, however, for clarifying either the meaning or the concept of *finis*. In the past, scholars have chosen to use their own languages to determine the identification of such features, and have therefore limited their understanding of *fines* by translating the Latin according to the terminology available in their own tongue, which do not contain the same nuances of meaning. I have shown that the translation of such Latin terminology into modern vocabulary has confused scholars and actually damaged international dialogue on the subject, crystallising nationalistic positions.

After collecting the data on the usage of *finis* in Livy, it became clear that none of the current bordering concepts used by scholars on the subject could accurately be applied to the term. Therefore, the *finis* cannot be identified with or translated as ‘border’, ‘boundary’, ‘limit’, ‘liminal’ or ‘a barrier’. It might share with these terms some features (i.e. the divisional purpose, the difficulty in crossing or some sacred distinctiveness) but it also has its own features, which differentiate it as a unique object for study. I have demonstrated – by uncovering its main features – that *finis* cannot be compared to any modern bordering concept.

The feature that contrasts most strikingly with modern bordering concepts – as apparent from evidence in the ancient sources – is the ‘spatiality’ of the *finis*. The presumed ‘linearity’, which labels the idea of bordering, does not work if applied to the *finis*. The idea of a single line has just a ‘nominal’ value, whereas the *finis* does not merely identify itself with a single natural feature in a linear way –it encompasses a broader area behind and beyond the natural landmark (river, mountain range, etc.). This ‘spatiality’ of *fines* was clear to Roman
authors of any period: a finis presents a ridge between two adjacent areas – called arcifinium – which should not be acquired, thus equating the concepts of finis and pomerium.

8.1 Summary

By reporting the case of the Tiber in chapter 2, I proceeded to examine and explain the first of Livy’s statements concerning the concept of finis. It represents a sort of manifesto, emphasising the different views regarding fines as found at the beginning and at the end of AUC. Chapter 2 identified and clarified the main arguments, while also revealing the main features of a finis, such as: a) the link between a finis and a natural feature; b) the finis as the main term of an ‘international’ of a perceived agreement between Latins and Etruscans; c) the attitude of the Romans to the idea of finis, as demonstrated by their aim of gaining control of the farthest stronghold of the arcifinium;[2.6.8; 5.4.1;6.3.3] d) the defensive means of a finis; and e) the sacred importance of the finis, related to the belief that it should not be crossed without a ritual.

In chapters 3 and 4, I considered the connection between sacrality, political expansion and fines. Chapter 3 also showed that fines are crucial to the process of subdivision and limitation of corresponding space. The connection between Romulus’ first expansion and the templum of Jupiter Feretrius is undeniable. It confirms a subdivision and delimitation of the whole material environment based on the detection and/or establishment of the fines. The templum might also be considered a microcosmic embodiment of the larger expansion of Rome’s imperium, following Livy’s examples on Romulus, Ancus and Augustus. The temple of Jupiter Feretrius seems also to have been connected with the boundary stone, which recalls the terminatio made by Romulus himself once he set up the temple. Chapter 3 chiefly serves to demonstrate the connection between the religious aspects of the fines and their political value.
Chapter 4 stressed the key function performed by the fetials during Rome’s process of expansion, and her methods for dealing with the sacred aspect of *fines*. I showed that the fetials’ procedure provided the Romans with the means to cross the *fines* without provoking any adverse supernatural consequences. The intimate connection between the fetials, the *templum* of Jupiter Feretrius and the *fines* pinpoints that this link is not casual. Politically speaking, I also demonstrate a strong link between *fines* and territory (*ager*), providing further evidence for the spatial characteristics of the *fines* and its function of subdividing the surrounding areas. The presence of schematic concentric circles articulated through the *fines* – which create a blurred division of territory – represents also the schematic subdivision of the world surrounding Rome: a key concept in order to understand the subsequent chapters.

Chapters 5 (Ebro), 6 (Alps) and 7 (Apamea) work as case studies, helping to test the features of the *finis* identified in the previous chapters, and most substantially the chapter concerning the Tiber (Chapter 2). By means of this mechanism, these three chapters provide evidence of the different characteristics that can be attributed to the *finis*. Particularly in Chapter 5 and 7 (the treaties of the Ebro and Apamea), I presented the *fines* as the primary means for defining both territorial delimitations of treaties and especially the limits of the *imperium*. Nevertheless, the chapters show a particular climax in Livy’s narrative, following the chronological evolution of the concept of *finis* within the Roman state mentality. The set of Chapters 5, 6 and 7 – which concern events in close chronological proximity – shows an evolution of the concept of *finis*, which includes a clearer definition of its features. By comparing the three chapters mentioned above with chapter 2, it becomes clear that their definition of *finis* looks slightly different to that of the Tiber as *finis*. My comparison thus demonstrates the Livian trend in considering *fines* as the main axes of any political agreement, and serves to show how that relationship likewise had a hand in the evolution of the Roman concept of *finis*, especially from the 3rd century onward. This analysis has shown that, as in the political cases of the treaties of Ebro and Apamea, the definition of *finis Italicae* in the western Alps helped to shape solutions to a diverse range of issues. The scholarly background presented in those case studies was exploited to show
that the concept of finis cannot be compared with any modern concept of bordering. In these instances, contemporary scholars have been unable to sort out the issues raised by ancient authors, because they applied modern understandings of bordering practices to the Livian (Roman) conception. [FIG 43]

8.2 Deduction

The data, as synthesised in the table above, show that the fines have common features, which can be summarised as follows:

A) Finis is linked to a natural feature, such as: a river, a mountain range, a strait, a cape or promontory. However in some cases, Livy seems to give clues to other different natural features, which can be considered a finis: fossae, freta, claustrae, iuga, saltus or silvae.

B) The arcifinium is part of the finis and, like the pomerium, encompasses two strips of land behind and beyond itself, which conceptually form part of the finis.

C) “The finis is an (almost) impassable ‘barrier’”. The natural features superimposed upon and identified with the finis are considered difficult to cross, and this point is linked with the movement of people and routes. Fines have the ability to check the advance of enemy forces, to create casualties or, at the very least, to slow the enemy down.

D) Through a finis, certain passageways exist as connective links between two areas and differ from the sorts of natural features they allow access through: bridges and fords on rivers, passes on mountains, and straits on seas (‘osmotic points’).

E) Fines work also as dividing element between two kingdoms, from both a practical point of view, delimiting the real extension (material occupation) of a realm, and from a theoretical point of view, delimiting an area which is not materially controlled by a kingdom (imperium).
F) On the range of *fines*, we can find settlements with the connotation of bulwark or sentinel. In all four case studies Livy makes reference to such settlements, naming them *oppida*.

G) A *finis* has a sacred value: its impassability is not just physical, but also sacred (religious or magical), necessitating the performance of a specific ritual before its crossing is permitted.

H) *Fines* as natural features are special places from which it is possible to control or check the surrounding landscape. The *fines* themselves, or the places within them chosen as bulwarks or sentinels, have a much broader view of the surrounding area, allowing for better control and subdivision of that area.

I) Two *fines* geographically opposite delimit a territory (*ager*), area and/or a region, which is named by the population who is settled between them. Therefore, the *finis* belongs to that population, who claim the rights over it.

J) The ‘Roman’ revolution – with an eye to imperialistic policy – lay in claiming the *arcifinium* through the occupation of the opposite side of the *finis*.

I have also provided evidence that assumptions among scholars regarding the perception of different and changing landscapes in both the modern and the ancient world is questionable. The impression given is that, prior to technological advancements, the human being had to deal with different, often inexplicable realities which formed his environment and his will or natural desire to expand or grow his dominion. The present study, on the contrary, has shown that natural features are part of a transformable and distinctive landscape on which different people act as part of a ‘living area’. Livy’s literary evidence has provided enough elements to identify the structural function of the *fines* in the expansive process of Rome’s *imperium*, which are detectable throughout the entire story of the Republic, which contrasts with Whittaker’s statement of a lack of evidence of a Roman frontier policy in the period of the Republic.1901

1901 Whittaker 1997:26: “It is impossible to find any evidence of a Roman frontier policy in the period of the Republic, despite the strong Roman sense of organised social and political space”.
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8.3 Limitations and further developments

Primarily, the research conducted so far has not only involved reviewing the term *finis* in other authors, but has also encompassed all terminology used in Latin to identify the bordering concepts (i.e. the term *limes*). This study has been ‘naturally’ shaped by the chronological limitations provided by the remnant books of *AUC*. The missing books of *AUC* might have provided more answers to the development of the concept of *finis* up to the Augustan period. However, the last books of *AUC* have clearly shown an evolving process in the detection of bordering practices and natural features, becoming more precise in description and identification.

From the 2nd century B.C., Roman generals began a process which led to a new definition of ‘bordering practices and concepts’ in the Early Empire. The idea of a marked landscape – and its monumentalisation – changed with the rise to power of prominent individuals, when the Romans encountered the Greek culture. Livy highlights the role of the consuls M. Quintus Flamininus and L. Aemilius Paullus: the latter’s monument erected at Delphi can be deemed as evidence of this new rising trend. From then onwards, the Romans began to connect battlefield trophies with landmarks and delimitative areas. This conception represents an evolution (as attested by the treaty of Apamea) in the accepted function of bordering practices; the Romans felt the necessity to materialise this function, highlighting such spots, areas or passages. Cn. Domitius Ahenobarbus’ and Q. Fabius Maximus’ trophy taken from the Arvernii and Allobrogii in Gaul is the first Roman ‘land battle mark’ trophy, which is noted as being unprecedented in Roman history.\(^{1902}\) It was set up on the ‘Island’: a particular area between the rivers Isere and Rhone, which Livy – and not Polybius – had pointed out as being a key place in Hannibal’s advance. The trophy built by Marius or Sulla’s and Caesar’s monuments at Chaironeia and Zela, all confirm a trend, which saw Pompey as a major contributor to this evolving concept. Pompey’s propaganda had been accompanied by trophies

\(^{1902}\) Strabo 4.1.11; Florus 1.37.4-6; Ebel 1975:367; Welch 2006:13.
and statues bearing representations of the oikoumene, a global world map. The most famous was built in late 72 B.C. on the Pyrenees. The marking of places of victory with a specific séma – like a trophy – was designed to have an immediate impact on the surrounding landscape. Romans turned this ephemeral conception of the nature of trophy into a monumentum, aspiring, for themselves and their relatives, to the immortality exemplified by these structures. Cicero, erecting a shrine (fanum) to his daughter Tullia to secure her immortality, recalled the victory-monument set up after the battle of Leuctra in 371 B.C. Victory or landmark monuments found a definitive consecration in Augustus and had a connection with the landscape, as well as possibly even acquiring a new distinctive function: trophies, altars and arches. The perception of an evolving bordering concept of finis is already present in Cicero who confirms that “once the Alps, but now Oceanus is the limit of Roman imperium”.

Particularly with Augustus, the space is reorganised, transformed and finally manipulated through new definitions of imperia (provincial subdivision), new monumental models and key places, both historical and geographical. The Augustan period reveals a common element across Livy’s writing, probably spread around by the imperial propaganda. While this evidence can be documented throughout Livy’s work, it is still more detectable in Augustus’ Res Gestae, where different elements provide us with an intimate connection between Augustan and Livian writing precisely on the issue of fines.

- [...] AEDES IN CAPITOLIO IOVIS FERETRI [...]FECI.
  I built the temple of Jupiter Feretrius on the Capitol...

- OMNIUM PROVINCIARUM POPULI ROMANI, QUIBUS FINITIMAE FUERUNT GENTES QUAE NON PARENT IMPERIO NOSTRO, FINES AUXI. GALLIAS ET HISPANIAS PROVINCIAS, [TEM GERMANIAM QUA INCLUDIT OCEANUS A GADIBUS AD OSTIUM ALBIS FLUMINIS PACAVI. ALPES A

1904 Ebel 1976:100; Ebel 1975:359. Contra Badian 1966:905-908, Badian 1964:88-97, who argues convincingly that, for the Romans, the Alps and the Pyrenees were not the natural frontiers.
1906 RG 19.
I extended the *fines* of all the provinces which were bordered by races not yet subject to our empire. The provinces of the Gauls, the Spains, and Germany, bounded by the ocean from Cádiz to the mouth of the Elbe, I reduced to a state of peace. The Alps, from the region which lies nearest to the Adriatic as far as the Tuscan Sea, was brought to a state of peace without waging on any tribe an unjust war. My fleet sailed from the mouth of the Rhine eastward as far as the *fines* of the Cimbri [...].

Augustus followed the example of Pompey’s policy, electing for the monumentalisation of crucial places and thus continuing the trend imported from the early campaigns in Greece. The trophies constructed by Augustus were physical and symbolic reminders of places and events, such as the impressive Augustan monument at La Turbie, which announced the total subjection of the Alpine tribes and mirrored Pompey’s monument in the Pyrenees. And this is not the only example: the Trophy at Actium/Nikopolis represented the place where the unity of the empire was safe, marking forever the central divisional point between East and West, while the altar on the River Elbe sealed the *finis* of *imperium*. However, this monumentalisation of the landscape seems deeply embedded in Livy. Here, early religious beliefs played a major role, contributing to the issue of legality with rituals intended to create a differentiation between two environmental areas through the highlighting of such points. These programmes seem to follow the tradition from the Republican Period: by describing scenes from Rome’s earliest history, Livy uses monuments to highlight special places and events: the *Columna Horatia*, *Tigillum Sororum* and *Templum of Jupiter Stator*, if not even the *Rostra* and the

---

1907 RG 26.
1908 RG 30.
several arches erected in Rome. Livian monuments recall Augustus’ programme in setting up the basis for a connective net, where relevant places, monuments and natural features become interconnected with the surrounding regions, provinces, roads and Rome herself.

Roman monumentality consisted of a blend of structural form and natural context. In this respect, these massive Roman structures had to capture travellers’ and citizens’ attention from the very first moment. The whole landscape was now ready to be literally, artistically and materially flagged, as evoked in the following passage from Apuleius:

“Vt ferme religiosis uiantium moris est, cum aliqui lucus aut aliqui locus sanctus in uia oblatus est, uotum postulare, pomum adponere, paulisper adsidere: ita mihi ingresso sanctissimam istam ciuitatem, quanquam oppido festine<m>, praefanda uenia et habenda oratio et inhibenda properatio est. Neque enim iustius religiosam moram viatori obiecerit aut ara floribus redimita aut spelunca frondibus inumbrata aut quercus cornibus onerata aut fagus pellibus coronata, uel enim colliculus sepimine consecratus uel truncus dolamine effigiatu uel cespes libamine umigatus uel lapsis uguine delibutus. Parua haec quippe et quamquam paucis percontantibus adorata, tamen ignorantibus transcursa.”

Although Apuleius’ description belongs to the early 2nd century AD, the idea of a ‘marked’ landscape is well reflected artistically in the bucolic style of wall-painting popular in Roman houses in the Early Empire. This attitude is also reflected in the systematic programme provided by the Tabula Siarensis, which shows the consequences of Augustus’ bordering practices and the clear development of a new strategy, emerging in Rome through the establishment of monuments along consistent places touched by Germanicus. In this way, the impalpable lines of time and space became tangible in these areas, where

---

1910 See i.e. Thomas 2007.
1911 Apul. Flor. 1
1912 On the changes of the 1st century AD see Arena 2009:81-3.
monuments loomed over the surrounding landscape while simultaneously being embedded in that same environment. These methods of visualising bordering practices, both natural and human, represent an opportunity to more clearly comprehend those elements as they expand or contract, when they are viewed in the context of Livy’s evolutionary process, as discussed earlier. Such visualisation is thus a further step in the comprehension of bordering concepts for this research. I hope to have evidenced that the concept of finis can gain a new significance through the redefinition of its use in Livy’s work. As such, it suggests that Whittaker’s comment on the absence of ‘a Roman frontier policy’ in the Republican period [Introduction: Issues and problems] needs to be requalified. Livy’s writing shows that there was, both quantitatively and qualitatively, a border policy by the end of the Republic, which needs to be revisited and reassessed in order to better comprehend the Imperial frontier policy. In this sense, the Imperial policy takes its ‘frontier mentality’ from the Republican mindset, which evolved through the Augustan period, making Livy witness and reporter of this change.
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Livy 1.32.8

‘audi Jupiter, audites fines, audiat fas!’

‘hear Jupiter, hear fines, hear ye sacred law!’
Varro L.L. 5.33: 
Ut nostii augures publici disserunt, agrorum sunt genera quinque:

According to our augures publici there are five kinds of land:
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Figure 29 – Map 7. Europe. Places named in Chapter 6. See inset FIG 31.
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Figure 32 – Map 8. Western Alps (shaded area). Places named in Chapter 6.
Figure 33 – Image 10. The boundary stone from Bevke (right) and the exact place of discovery (after Šašel Kos 2002).
Figure 34 – Map 12. Mediterranean. Hypotetic subdivision of the Imperia (Antiochus, Carthage, Rome) and real occupation (dotted area). See inset at FIG 35.
Figure 35 – Map 13. Greece and Anatolia (Asia Minor). Antiochus’ real occupation (small dots) and expansion (large dots).
Figure 36 – Map 14. Eastern Mediterranean. Subdivision of Imperia after the treaty of Apamea.
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Figure 38 – Map 15. Anatolia. Places named in chapter 7. See inset FIG 39.
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Figure 40 – Map 17. Anatolia. Visualisation of subdivisional areas.
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Figure 42 – Diagram 6. Anatolia. Geo-political grid, extrapolated (rendered) from the physical map.
Figure 43 – Diagram 7. Anatolia. Geo-political grid, explained.
APPENDIX 2: List of the passages (AUC) mentioning the term *finis* and its classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification of the Term <em>Finis</em>:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. END OF SOMETHING (CENSO, SPEECH, WAR, DAY, KINGDOM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B₁. NATURAL FEATURE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B₂. DELIMITING SACRED AREAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B₃. MENTIONED IN FETIALES’ RITUAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B₄. GENERAL NON-SYNONYMOUS CONCEPT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B₅. BELONGING TO A POPULATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B₆. BELONGING TO INHABITANTS OF A CITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B₇. BELONGING TO A GEOPOLITICAL ENTITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B₈. ROMANUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B₉. CONNECTED WITH CONCEPTUAL OR EFFECTIVE POWER (IMPERIUM, REGNUM, PROVINCIA, IURIS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B₁₀. STRONGHOLD, BULWARK, COLONY OR CAMP WORKING AS BORDER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASSAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.32.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.32.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.10.5  Inde exercitu victore reducto ipse, cum factis vir magnificus tum factorum ostentator haud minor, spolia ducis hostium caesi suspensa fabricato ad id apte ferculo gerens in Capitolium escendit ibi que ea cum ad quercum pastoribus sacram deposuisset, simul cum dono designavit templo Iovis finis cognomen que addidit deo. He was no less anxious to display his achievements than he had been great in performing them, so, after leading his victorious army home, he mounted to the Capitol with the spoils of his dead foe borne before him on a frame constructed for the purpose. He hung them there on an oak, which the shepherds looked upon as a sacred tree, and at the same time marked out the site for the temple of Jupiter, and addressing the god by a new title, uttered the following invocation:

DESIGNARE SING. FINIS 753-717 B2

1.44.2  ibi instructum exercitum omnem suovetaurilibus lustravit; id que conditum lustrum appellatum, quia is censendo finis factus est. There the whole army was drawn up, and a sacrifice of a pig, a sheep, and a bull was offered by the king for its purification. This was termed the 'closing of the lustrum', because it was the last act in the enrolment.

CENSIRE/FACERE SING. FINIS 578-534 A

1.3.5  pax ita convenerat, ut Etruscis Latinis que fluvius Albula, quem nunc Tiberim vocant, finis esset. When terms of peace were being arranged, the river Albula, now called the Tiber, had been fixed as the boundary between the Etruscans and the Latins.

ESSE SING. FINIS Iron Age B1

1.55.3  inter principia condendi huius operis movisse numen ad indicandam tanti imperii molem traditur deos; nam cum omnium sacellorum exaugurationes admitterent aves, in Termini fano non addixere: id que omen augurium que ita acceptum est, non motam Termini sedem unum que eum deorum non evocatum sacratis sibi finibus firma stabilia que cuncta portendere. At the very time when he began this task the gods are said to have exerted their power to show the magnitude of this mighty empire. For whereas the birds permitted that the consecrations of all the other shrines should be rescinded, they refused their consent for the shrine of Terminus. This omen and augury was thus construed: the fact that the seat of Terminus was not moved, and that of all the gods he alone was not called away from the place consecrated to him, meant that the whole kingdom would be firm and steadfast.

EVOCARE PLUR. FINIBUS 534-510 IMPERIUM B2

1.56.3  his laboribus exercita plebe, quia et urbi multitudinem, ubi usus non esset, oneri rebatur esse, et colonis mittendis occupari latius imperii finibus volebat, Signiam Circeios que colonos misit, praesidia urbi futura terra mari que After making the plebeians toil at these hard tasks, the king felt that a populace which had now no work to do was only a burden to the City; he wished, moreover, by sending out settlers, to extend the frontiers of his dominions. He therefore sent colonists to Signia and Circei, to safeguard the City by land and sea.

OCCUPARE PLUR. FINES 534-510 IMPERIUM FINES B9
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PASSAGE</th>
<th>TEXT</th>
<th>TRANSLATION</th>
<th>VERB</th>
<th>PREPOS.</th>
<th>GENRE</th>
<th>DECL.</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>LINK</th>
<th>FINIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.18.7</td>
<td>inde ubi prospectu in urbm agrum que capto deos precatus regiones ab oriente ad occasum determinavit, dextras ad meridiem partes,laevas ad septentrionem esse dixit, signum contra, quod longissime conspectum oculi ferebant, animo finivit; tum lituo in laevam manum translato dextra in caput Numae imposita precatus ita est: 'Iuppiter pater, si est fas hunc Numam Pompilium, cuius ego caput teneo, regem Romae esse, uti tu signa nobis certa adclarassis inter eos fines, quos feci'</td>
<td>After surveying the prospect over the City and surrounding country, he offered prayers and marked out the heavenly regions by an imaginary line from east to west; the southern he defined as 'the right hand', the northern as 'the left hand.' He then fixed upon an object, as far as he could see, as a corresponding mark, and then transferring the lituus to his left hand, he laid his right upon Numa's head and offered this prayer: 'Father Jupiter, if it be heaven's will that this Numa Pompilius, whose head I hold, should be king of Rome, do thou signify it to us by sure signs within those boundaries which I have traced.' Then he described in the usual formula the augury which they desired should be sent. They were sent, and Numa being by them manifested to be king, came down from the 'templum.'</td>
<td>ADCLARARE</td>
<td>INTER</td>
<td>PLUR.</td>
<td>FINES</td>
<td>716</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.32.6</td>
<td>legatus ubi ad fines eorum venit, unde res repetuntur, capite velato filo – lanae velamen est'</td>
<td>When the envoy has arrived at the frontiers of the people from whom satisfaction is sought, he covers his head with a bonnet —the covering is of wool — and says:</td>
<td>VENIRE</td>
<td>AD</td>
<td>PLUR.</td>
<td>FINES</td>
<td>640-616</td>
<td>B3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.32.6</td>
<td>audi, Iuppiter', inquit; 'audite, fines' – cuiscumque gentis sunt, nominat – ; 'audiat fas: ego sum publicus nuntius populi Romani; iuste pie que legatus venio verbis que meis fides sit'</td>
<td>'Hear, Jupiter; hear, ye boundaries of' —naming whatever nation they belong to; —'let righteousness hear!I am the public herald of the Roman People; I come duly and religiously commissioned; let my words be credited'.</td>
<td>PLUR.</td>
<td>FINES</td>
<td>640-616</td>
<td>B3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.32.8</td>
<td>haec, cum finis superscandit, haec, quicumque ei primus vir obvius fuit, haec portam ingendi, haec forum progressus paucis verbis carminis concipiendi que iuris iurandi mutatis peragit.</td>
<td>These words he rehearses when he crosses the boundary line, the same to what man soever first meets him, the same when he enters the city gates, the same when he has come into the market-place, with only a few changes in the form and wording of the oath.</td>
<td>SUPERSCANDERE</td>
<td>SING.</td>
<td>FINIS</td>
<td>640-616</td>
<td>B3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.10</td>
<td>Finisque ille tam effuse vagandi Etruscis fuit.</td>
<td>Thus the raiders were hemmed in and cut to pieces, for they were no match for the Romans in fighting strength, and were shut off from every line of retreat. This was the last time the Etruscans roamed so far afield.</td>
<td>ESSE</td>
<td>SING.</td>
<td>FINIS</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Passage 1.33.9

*nec urbs tantum hoc rege crevit, sed etiam ager finesque. Silva Mesia Veientibus adempita usque ad mare imperium prolatum et in ore Tiberis Ostia urbs condita, salinae circa factae egregie que rebus bello gestis aedis Iovis Feretrii amplificata*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PASSAGE</th>
<th>TEXT</th>
<th>TRANSLATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.33.9</td>
<td>nec urbs tantum hoc rege crevit, sed etiam ager finesque. Silva Mesia Veientibus adempita usque ad mare imperium prolatum et in ore Tiberis Ostia urbs condita, salinae circa factae egregie que rebus bello gestis aedis Iovis Feretrii amplificata</td>
<td>And this reign was a period of growth, not only for the City, but also for her lands and boundaries. The Maesian Forest was taken from the Veientes, extending Rome's dominion clear to the sea; at the Tiber's mouth the city of Ostia was founded, and salt-works were established near-by; while in recognition of signal success in war the temple of Jupiter Feretrius was enlarged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERB</td>
<td>PREPOS.</td>
<td>GENRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CREO</td>
<td>PLUR.</td>
<td>FINES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Passage 1.50.8

*is finis orationi fuit; aversi omnes ad Tarquinium salutandum.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PASSAGE</th>
<th>TEXT</th>
<th>TRANSLATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.50.8</td>
<td>is finis orationi fuit; aversi omnes ad Tarquinium salutandum.</td>
<td>This was the end of the speech; all turned to salute Tarquinius.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERB</td>
<td>PREPOS.</td>
<td>GENRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACERE</td>
<td>SING.</td>
<td>FINIS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Passage 2.15.3

*ita induxisse in animum, hostibus potius quam regibus portas patefacere; ea esse vota omnium, ut, qui libertati erit in illa urbe finis, idem urbi sit.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PASSAGE</th>
<th>TEXT</th>
<th>TRANSLATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.15.3</td>
<td>ita induxisse in animum, hostibus potius quam regibus portas patefacere; ea esse vota omnium, ut, qui libertati erit in illa urbe finis, idem urbi sit.</td>
<td>The Roman people were not living under a monarchy, but were free. They had resolved to throw open their gates to enemies sooner than to kings; in this prayer they were all united, that the day which saw the end of liberty in their City might also see the City's end.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERB</td>
<td>PREPOS.</td>
<td>GENRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESSE</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>SING.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Passage 2.53.4

*Dum haec ad Veios geruntur, Volsci Aequi que in Latino agro posuerant castra populati que fines errant.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PASSAGE</th>
<th>TEXT</th>
<th>TRANSLATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.53.4</td>
<td>Dum haec ad Veios geruntur, Volsci Aequi que in Latino agro posuerant castra populati que fines errant.</td>
<td>While these victories were being won at Veii, the Volsci and the Aequi had encamped on Latin soil, and had laid waste the country.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERB</td>
<td>PREPOS.</td>
<td>GENRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESSE</td>
<td>PLUR.</td>
<td>FINES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Passage 2.16.8

*fuso que ingenti exercitu, qui se ingredientibus fines consulibus ferociter obtulerat, omne Auruncum bellum Pometiam compulsum est.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PASSAGE</th>
<th>TEXT</th>
<th>TRANSLATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.16.8</td>
<td>fuso que ingenti exercitu, qui se ingredientibus fines consulibus ferociter obtulerat, omne Auruncum bellum Pometiam compulsum est</td>
<td>Upon the defeat of the great army which had boldly issued forth to meet the invasion of their territory by the consuls, the whole weight of the Auruncan war fell upon Pometia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERB</td>
<td>PREPOS.</td>
<td>GENRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INGREDIRE</td>
<td>PLUR.</td>
<td>FINES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Passage 2.30.8

*oratores Latinorum ab senatu petebant, ut aut mitterent subsidium aut se ipsos tuendorum finium causa capere arma sinerent.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PASSAGE</th>
<th>TEXT</th>
<th>TRANSLATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.30.8</td>
<td>oratores Latinorum ab senatu petebant, ut aut mitterent subsidium aut se ipsos tuendorum finium causa capere arma sinerent</td>
<td>Emissaries from the Latins begged the senate either to send them help or permit them to take up arms themselves in defence of their country.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERB</td>
<td>PREPOS.</td>
<td>GENRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUERE</td>
<td>PLUR.</td>
<td>FINIUM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Passage 2.40.7

*non tibi quamvis infesto animo et minaci [perveneras] ingredienti fines ira ce cidit?* Did not your anger fall from you, no matter how hostile and threatening your spirit when you came, as you passed the boundary? Did it not come over you, when Rome lay before your eyes: 'Within those walls are my home and my gods, my mother, my wife, and my children?'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PASSAGE</th>
<th>TEXT</th>
<th>TRANSLATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2.40.7  | non tibi quamvis infesto animo et minaci [perveneras] ingredienti fines ira ce cidit? | Did not your anger fall from you, no matter how hostile and threatening your spirit when you came, as you passed the boundary? Did it not come over you, when Rome lay before your eyes: 'Within those walls are my home and my gods, my mother, my wife, and my children?'
<p>| VERB | PREPOS. | GENRE | DECL. | CASE | DATE | LINK | FINIS (TYPE) |
| INGREDIRE | PLUR. | FINES | 488-487 | B₄ |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PASSAGE</th>
<th>TEXT</th>
<th>TRANSLATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.9.3</td>
<td>nisi, quanta vi civititates eam expetant, tanta regna reges defendant, aequari summa infirmis; nihil excelsum, nihil, quod supra cetera emineat, in civitatibus fore; adesse finem regnis, rei inter deos homines que pulcherrimae.</td>
<td>Unless the energy with which nations sought to obtain it were matched by the efforts which kings put forth to defend their power, the highest would be reduced to the level of the lowest; there would be nothing lofty, nothing that stood out above the rest of the state; there was the end of monarchy, the noblest institution known to gods or men.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.30.9</td>
<td>Vetusius consul missus est; is finis populationibus fuit.</td>
<td>It seemed safer that the Latins should be defended without arming them, than that they should be suffered to resume their weapons. Vetusius the consul was dispatched to them, and this ended the pillaging.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.16.1</td>
<td>praeter ea tamen, quae denuntiabantur, ne Veientium neu Sabinorum id consilium esset timere et, cum tantum in urbe hostium esset, mox Sabinae Etruscae que legiones ex composito adessent, tum aesterni hostes Volsci et Aequi non ad populandos, ut ante, finis, sed ad urbem ut ex parte captam venirent</td>
<td>The situation became clearer to the senators and the consuls. Still, besides the dangers with which they were publicly threatened, they were afraid that this might be a ruse of the Veientes or the Sabines, and that while there were so many enemies within the City, Sabine and Etruscan levies might presently combine for an invasion; or again that their perpetual foes, the Volsci and Aequi, might come, not as before to lay waste their fields, but to the City, which they would regard as already partly captured.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.12</td>
<td>non tamen sustinuere aciem Romanam Aequi; pulsi que cum in fines suos se recepissoent, nihil inflatoribus ad pacem animis ferox multitudo increpare duces, quod in aciem, qua pugnandi arte Romanus excellat, commissa res sit;</td>
<td>Nevertheless they were unable to withstand the attack of the Romans. And yet, when they had been defeated and had fallen back to their own territory, the warlike soldiers, their spirit as little inclined to peace as ever, complained against their generals for having staked the cause on a pitched battle, a species of fighting in which the Romans excelled;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.63.7</td>
<td>deinde ipsi paucis post diebus ab duobus exercitibus, utroque per iram consule ingresso in fines, plus cladium, quam intulerant, acceperunt.</td>
<td>A few days after this they themselves had to confront two armies, for both the consuls indignantly invaded their borders, and they suffered greater losses than they had themselves inflicted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.45.9 accendunt insuper hostes ferocius multo, ut statuisse non pugnare consules cognitum est: quippe impune se insultaturas, non credi militia arma, rem ad ultimum seditionis erupturam, finemque venisse Romano imperio. Then the consuls issued an order to abstain from fighting, declaring that if any man fought without orders they should treat him as an enemy. Dismissed with these words, the less inclination the soldiers discovered in the consuls the greater became their own eagerness for the fray.

VENIRE SING. FINEM 480 IMPERIUM ROMANUS B₉

2.49.9 et donec nihil aliud quam in populationibus res fuit, non ad praesidium modo tutandum Fabii satis erant, sed tota regione, qua Tuscius tergmine a Romano adiacet, sua tuta omnia, infesta hostium vagantes per utrumque finem fecere. And so long as nothing more than plundering was afoot the Fabii were not only an adequate garrison for the fort, but in all that region where the Tuscan territory marches with the Roman they afforded universal security to their own countrymen and annoyance to the enemy, by ranging along the border on both sides.

FACERE PER SING. FINEM 479-478 B₁

3.3.1 Relicto itaque castris praesidio egressi tanto cum tumultu invasere fines Romanos, ut ad urbem quoque terrum pertulerint. Leaving a garrison, therefore, in their camp, they crossed the Roman border in so headlong an incursion as to carry terror even to the City.

INVADERE PLUR. FINES 466-465 ROMANUS B₄ B₁₀

3.26.2 alterum Nautius contra Sabinos duxit castris que ad Eretum positis per expeditiones parvas, plerumque nocturnas incursionibus, tantam in Sabino agro reddidit, ut paravi etiam ad eam prope intacti finem Romani viderentur. Pitching his camp at Eretum, lie sent out little expeditions, chiefly nocturnal raiding parties, and so liberally repaid on their own fields the depredations of the Sabines, that the Roman territories in comparison seemed scarcely to have been touched by war.

PLUR. FINES 458 ROMANUS B₈

3.36.1 Ille finis Appio alienae personae ferendae fuit; suo iam inde vivere ingenio coepit novos que collegas, iam priusquam inirent magistratum, in suos mores formare. Appius now threw off the mask he had been wearing, and began from that moment to live as his true nature prompted him. His new colleagues too he commenced, even before they entered upon office, to fashion after his own character.

SING. FINIS 450 A
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PASSAGE</th>
<th>TEXT</th>
<th>TRANSLATION</th>
<th>VERB</th>
<th>PREPOS.</th>
<th>GENRE</th>
<th>DECL.</th>
<th>CASE</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>LINK</th>
<th>FINIS (TYPE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.44.1</td>
<td>Sequitur alius in urbe nefas ab libidine ortum, haud minus foedo eventu, quam quod per stuprum caedem que Lucretiae urbe regno que Tarquinios expulerat, ut non finis solum idem decemviris, qui regibus, sed causa etiam eadem imperii ammittendi esset.</td>
<td>This outrage was followed by another, committed in Rome, which was inspired by lust and was no less shocking in its consequences than that which had led, through the rape and the death of Lucretia, to the expulsion of the Tarquinii from the City and from their throne; thus not only did the same end befall the decemvirs as had befallen the kings, but the same cause deprived them of their power.</td>
<td>SING.</td>
<td>FINIS</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>IMPERIUM</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5.12</td>
<td>difficile ad fidel est in tam antiqua re, quot pugnaverint ceciderint ve, exacto adfirmare numero; audet tamen Antias Valerius concipere summas: Romanorum Cecidisse in Hernico agro quinque milia octingentos, ex praedatoribus Aequorum, qui populabundi in finibus Romanis vagabantur, ab A. Postumio consule duo milia et quadringentos caeso; ceteram multitudinem praedam agentem, quae inciderit in Quinctium, nequaquam pari defunctam esse caede; interfecta inde quattuor milia et exequendo subtiliter numerum ducentos ait et triginta.</td>
<td>It is hard to make a trustworthy statement, in a matter of such antiquity, as to just how many fought and how many fell; yet Valerius Antias ventures to specify the totals, saying that the Romans lost five thousand eight hundred in the country of the Hernici; that of the Aequian marauders who were roaming about and pillaging within the Roman borders two thousand four hundred were slain by Aulus Postumius, the consul; and that the rest of the expedition, which stumbled upon Quinctius as they were driving off their booty, got off by no means so lightly, for their killed amounted, so he says, with minute particularity, to four thousand two hundred and thirty.</td>
<td>VAGARE</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>PLUR.</td>
<td>FINIBUS</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>ROMANUS</td>
<td>B₈</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.67.10</td>
<td>qui finis erit discordiarum? ecquando unam urbem habere, ecquando communem hanc esse patriam licebit?</td>
<td>What end will there be to our dissensions? Will a time ever come when we can have a united City? Will a time ever come when this can be our common country?</td>
<td>ESSE</td>
<td>SING.</td>
<td>FINIS</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.71.1</td>
<td>Victoriam honestam ex hostibus partam turpe domi de finibus sociorum iudicium populi deformat.</td>
<td>The glory of defeating the enemy was sullied by a shameful judgment given by the people in Rome regarding the boundaries of her allies.</td>
<td>DEFORMO</td>
<td>DE</td>
<td>PLUR.</td>
<td>FINIBUS</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>B₂</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5.4</td>
<td>L. Valerius ad praesidium urbis reliquus, consul Postumius ad arcendas populationes finium missus</td>
<td>Lucius Valerius was left to defend the City, while the consul p.Postumius was sent out to protect the frontier from pillage.</td>
<td>MITTERE</td>
<td>PLUR.</td>
<td>FINIUM</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>ROMAE</td>
<td>B₄</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASSAGE</td>
<td>TEXT</td>
<td>TRANSLATION</td>
<td>VERB</td>
<td>PREPOS.</td>
<td>GENRE</td>
<td>DECL. CASE</td>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>LINK</td>
<td>FINIS (TYPE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.23.7</td>
<td><em>ita bifarium consules ingressi hostium fines ingenti certamine hinc Volscos, hinc Aequos populantur</em></td>
<td>Thus at two points the consuls invaded the enemy's borders, and with keen rivalry devastated the lands of the Volsci on the one hand, and those of the Aequi on the other.</td>
<td>INGREDIRE</td>
<td>PLUR.</td>
<td>FINES</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>VOLSCI - AEQUI</td>
<td>B₅</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.19.8</td>
<td><em>cum hostes in arce, in Capitolio essent, exulum et servorum dux profanatis omnibus in cella lovis optimi maximis habitaret, Tusculi ante quam Romae sumpta sunt arma; in dubio fuit, utrum L. Mamilius, Tusculanus dux, an Valerius et C. Claudius consules Romanam arcem liberarent; et qui ante Latinos ne pro se quidem ipsis, cum in <em>fines</em> suo <em>finibus</em> sumus, nunc, nisi Latini sua <em>sponte</em> arma sumpsissent, capi et deleti eramus.</em></td>
<td>When foes were in the Citadel, foes in the Capitol, when the captain of slaves and exiles, profaning everything, was quartered in the very shrine of Jupiter Optimus Maximus, it was Tusculum —not Rome —where the first sword was drawn. It was a question whether Lucius Mamilius, the Tusculan general, or Publius Valerius and Gaius Claudius, the consuls, would free the Roman Citadel; and we who, until then did not allow the Latins to touch their weapons, even in their own defence, though they had an enemy within their borders, had now, unless the Latins had armed of their own free will, been taken captive and destroyed.</td>
<td>HABERE</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>PLUR.</td>
<td>FINIBUS</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>B₄</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6.4</td>
<td>*vix instantes sustinentibus clades repente legati Hernici nuntiant in agro suo Aequos Volscos que coniunctis copiis castra posuisse; inde exercitu ingenti <em>fines</em> suos <em>depopulari</em></td>
<td>when suddenly envoys from the Hernici appeared, announcing that the Aequi and the Volsci had joined forces and established a camp in their territory, from which base they were devastating their land with an enormous army.</td>
<td>DEPOPULAARE</td>
<td>PLUR.</td>
<td>FINES</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>HERNICI</td>
<td>B₅</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3.7</td>
<td><em>vocato dein senatu cum ex auctoritate patrum iustitio indicto profectus ad tutandos <em>fines</em> esset Q Servilio praefecto urbis relictio, hostem in agris non invenit</em></td>
<td>After that he set out to defend the frontier, leaving Quintus Servilius as prefect of the City, but did not meet with the enemy in the field.</td>
<td>TUERE</td>
<td>PLUR.</td>
<td>FINES</td>
<td>466-465</td>
<td>ROMAE</td>
<td>B₄</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.31.7</td>
<td><em>tum abiecta lege, quae promulgata consenuerat, tribuni lenius agere cum patribus: <em>fines</em> tandem certaminum facerent.</em></td>
<td>Then the tribunes, discarding the law, which, in the time it had been before the people, had lost its vitality, began to treat more moderately with the patricians: Let them at last put an end, they said, to these disputes;</td>
<td>FACERE</td>
<td>SING.</td>
<td>FINEM</td>
<td>456-454</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.52.6</td>
<td>*si decemviri <em>fines</em> pertinaciae non <em>faciunt, ruere ac deflagrare <em>omnia</em> passuri estis?</em></td>
<td>‘If the decemvirs persist in their obstinacy, will you suffer everything to go to wrack and ruin?’</td>
<td>FACERE</td>
<td>SING.</td>
<td>FINEM</td>
<td>449</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAGE</td>
<td>PASSAGE</td>
<td>TEXT</td>
<td>TRANSLATION</td>
<td>VERB</td>
<td>PREPOS.</td>
<td>GENRE</td>
<td>DECL.</td>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>LINK</td>
<td>FINIS (TYPE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.25.9</td>
<td>Romam ut rediere legati, senatus iussit alterum consularem contra Gracchum in Algidum exercitum ducere, alteri populationem finium Aequorum provinciam dedit</td>
<td>On the return of the envoys to Rome, the senate ordered one consul to lead an army to Algidus, against Gracchus, and to the other assigned the task of devastating the territories of the Aequi.</td>
<td>DARE</td>
<td>PLUR.</td>
<td>FINIUM</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>AEQUI</td>
<td>B₅</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8.4</td>
<td>igitur nuntiantibus Hernici in fines suos transcendisse hostis inpigre promissum auxilium.</td>
<td>Accordingly, when the Hernici reported that the enemy had crossed their borders, they were promptly offered assistance.</td>
<td>IGITUR</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>SING.</td>
<td>FINIS</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>HERNICI</td>
<td>B₅</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4.8</td>
<td>Neque is finis periculi fuit; namque et proxima noce et postero die tanta vi castra sunt circumsessa atque oppugnata, ut ne nuntius quidem inde mitti Romam posset.</td>
<td>At the first attack he was repulsed and withdrew into his camp. Nor did this end his danger, for both that night and the following day his camp was so viciously hemmed in and assaulted that not even a messenger could be got off to Rome.</td>
<td>ESSE</td>
<td>SING.</td>
<td>FINIS</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3.9</td>
<td>sic finem iustitio, quod quadriduum fuit, redditus Quincti consulis in urbem fecit.</td>
<td>So the suspension of the courts, which had lasted four days, was lifted on the return of the consul Quinctius to the City.</td>
<td>SING.</td>
<td>FINEM</td>
<td>466-465</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.1</td>
<td>negabant consules iam ultra ferri posse furores tribunicios; ventum iam ad finem esse; domi plus belli concitari quam foris.</td>
<td>and the tribune was arousing the people against the consuls. The consuls declared that the frenzy of the tribunes could no longer be endured; the end had now been reached, and there was more war being stirred up at home than abroad.</td>
<td>ESSE</td>
<td>AD</td>
<td>SING.</td>
<td>FINEM</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.10</td>
<td>Quia tum concessum sit de tribunis, iterum concessum esse; finem non fieri.</td>
<td>Because they had yielded then, in the matter of the tribunes, they had yielded a second time;</td>
<td>FACERE</td>
<td>SING.</td>
<td>FINEM</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.71.6</td>
<td>eo rem se vetustate oblitteratam, ceterum suae memoriae inifixam adferre,a agrum, de quo ambiatur, finium Coriolanorum fuisse captis que Coriolis iure belli publicum populi Romani factum</td>
<td>Hence it came that he was telling them of a matter forgotten with the lapse of years, but fixed in his own memory, namely that the disputed land had been a part of the territory of Corioli, and had consequently, on the capture of that town, become, by right of conquest, the property of the Roman People.</td>
<td>ESSE</td>
<td>PLUR.</td>
<td>FINIUM</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>CORIOLANI</td>
<td>B₆</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.70.7</td>
<td>is finis pugnae aeques equestris fuit.</td>
<td>His words did not fall upon deaf ears. With a single rush the Romans routed the entire body of cavalry.</td>
<td>ESSE</td>
<td>SING.</td>
<td>FINIS</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.58.9</td>
<td>Oppius quoque ductus in vincula est et ante iudicii diem finem ibi vitae fecit.</td>
<td>Oppius too was led to prison, and before the day of trial he there put an end to his life.</td>
<td>FACERE</td>
<td>SING.</td>
<td>FINEM</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASSAGE</td>
<td>TEXT</td>
<td>TRANSLATION</td>
<td>VERB</td>
<td>PREPOS.</td>
<td>GENRE</td>
<td>DECL.</td>
<td>CASE</td>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>LINK</td>
<td>FINIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7.8</td>
<td>stratae passim matres crinibus templae verrentes veniam irarum caelestium finemque pesti exposcunt.</td>
<td>Everywhere were prostrate matrons, sweeping the floors of the temples with their hair, while they besought the angry gods to grant them pardon and end the pestilence.</td>
<td>EXPONERE</td>
<td>SING.</td>
<td>FINEM</td>
<td>463</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.4</td>
<td>Finem ergo non fieri nec futuram, donec, quam felices seditiones, tam honorati seditionum auctores essent.</td>
<td>There was no end in sight, nor would be, so long as the fomenters of insurrection were honoured in proportion to the success of their projects.</td>
<td>FACERE</td>
<td>SING.</td>
<td>FINEM</td>
<td>445</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.55.1</td>
<td>Sed nulla erat consularis actio, quam impediendo id, quod petebant, exprimerent, cum mira opportunitate Volscos et Aequos prae datum extra fines exisse in agrum Latinum Hernicum que adventur</td>
<td>But the consuls had no measure on foot which the tribunes could oppose and so wring from them what they wanted, when, by a wonderful piece of luck, the Volsci and Aequi were reported to have crossed the border and raided the lands of the Latins and the Hernici.</td>
<td>EXIRE</td>
<td>EXTRAPLUR.</td>
<td>FINES</td>
<td>409</td>
<td></td>
<td>B₅</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.58.1</td>
<td>quibus venientibus ad finem legatio Veientium obvia fuit.</td>
<td>Arriving at the frontier, these men were met by an embassy of the Veientes.</td>
<td>ESSE</td>
<td>AD</td>
<td>SING.</td>
<td>FINEM</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>B₃</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.39.4</td>
<td>diversi Volsci hinc consulem ac legiones sustinere, altera fronte instare Tempanio atque equitibus; qui cum saepe conati nequissent perrumpere ad suos, tumulo quodam occupato in orbem se tutabantur nequaquam inulti; nec pugnae finis ante noctem fuit.</td>
<td>The Volscians, facing two ways, sustained on one side the onset of the consul and the legions, and on the other front pressed home their attack upon Tempanius and his troopers; who, having failed, in spite of many attempts, to force their way through to their friends, had seized a certain mound and, forming a circle, were defending themselves, not without taking vengeance on their assailants. The battle did not end till nightfall.</td>
<td>ESSE</td>
<td>SING.</td>
<td>FINIS</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.59.2</td>
<td>tres tribuni, postquam nullo loco castra Volscorum esse nec commissuros se proelio apparuit, tripertito ad devastandos fines discessere</td>
<td>The three tribunes, on its appearing that the Volsci had no camp anywhere and did not propose to risk a battle, divided their army into three and advanced in different directions to lay waste the country.</td>
<td>DISCEDERE</td>
<td>PLUR.</td>
<td>FINES</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>VOLSCI</td>
<td>B₅</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASSAGE</td>
<td>TEXT</td>
<td>TRANSLATION</td>
<td>VERB</td>
<td>PREPOS.</td>
<td>GENRE</td>
<td>DECL.</td>
<td>CASE</td>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>LINK</td>
<td>FINIS (TYPE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.33.5</td>
<td>agité,. nominis Romani ac virtutis patrum vestraeque memores vertile incendium hoc in hostium urbeg et suis flammis delete Fidenas, quas vestris beneficiis placere non potuistis. legatorum hoc vos vestrorum colonorumque sanguis vastatique fines monent'. ad imperium dictatoris mota cuncta acies.</td>
<td>Will you not seize these self-same brands, and each for himself —if we must fight with fire, not with javelins —attack them with their own weapons? Come, call to mind the Roman name, your fathers' valour and your own; turn this blaze upon the enemy's city and destroy Fidenae with its own flames, since your kindness was powerless to gain its friendship! The blood of your envoys and your colonists and your devastated borders exhort you to do as I say.'</td>
<td>MONERE</td>
<td>PLUR.</td>
<td>FINES</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>B₂</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6.3</td>
<td>plebes ad id maxime indignatione exarist, quod auspiciari, tamquam invisi diis immortalibus, negarentur posse; nec ante fines contentionum fuit, cum et tribunum acerrimum auctorem plebes nacta esset et ipsa cum eo pertinacia certaret, quam victi tandem patres, ut de conubio feretur, concessere, ita maxime rati contentionem de plebis consilibus tribunos aut totam deposituros aut post bellum dilaturos esse contentam que interim conubio plebem paratam dilectui fore.</td>
<td>At this the plebs fairly blazed with indignation, because it was declared that; they could not take auspices, as though they were hated by the immortal gods; nor was the controversy ended —for the plebeians had got a most energetic champion in their tribune, and rivalled him themselves in determination, —until at last the patricians were beaten, and allowed the law regarding intermarriage to be passed, chiefly because they thought that so the tribunes would either wholly give over their contention for plebeian consuls or would postpone it until after the war, and that the plebs meantime, contented with the right to intermarry, would be ready to submit to the levy.</td>
<td>ESSE</td>
<td>ANTE SING.</td>
<td>FINIS</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.24.7</td>
<td>Deposito suo magistratu, inposito fine alteri cum gratulatione ac favore ingenti populi domum est reductus</td>
<td>Thus, having resigned his own magistracy and assigned a limit for the other, he was escorted to his home by the people, with striking manifestations of rejoicing and good-will.</td>
<td>INPONERE</td>
<td>SING.</td>
<td>FINE</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.49.5</td>
<td>quam noxam cum se consensus omnium Aequorum defensuros sperassent, deserti ab suis ne memorabili quidem bello per obsidonem levem que unam pugnam et oppidum et fines amisere</td>
<td>The consequences of this outrage they had hoped to avoid by means of the co-operation of all the Aequi; but, having been abandoned by their friends, they lost their town and their lands, in a war which does not even merit description, as the result of a siege and a single skirmish.</td>
<td>AMISERE</td>
<td>PLUR.</td>
<td>FINES</td>
<td>415-414</td>
<td>B₁₀</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASSAGE</td>
<td>TEXT</td>
<td>TRANSLATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.54.6</td>
<td>pro ingenti itaque victoria id fuit plebi, quaesturam que eam non honoris ipsius fine aestimabant, sed patefactus ad consilium ac triumphos locus novis hominibus videbatur.</td>
<td>And so the plebs felt that they had won a great victory, not estimating the significance of that quaestorship by the limits of the office itself, but feeling that the way to consulships and triumphs was thrown open to new men.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.56.6</td>
<td>iam non exercitus modo armatos, sed colonias etiam in suos fines mitti; nec ipsos modo Romanos sua divisa habere, sed Ferentium etiam de se captum Hernici donasse.</td>
<td>They would presently be sending out, not merely armed expeditions across their borders, but colonies too; and not only, they said, had the Romans divided up their possessions amongst themselves, but they had even taken Ferentum from them and bestowed it on the Hernici.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.58.6</td>
<td>Insequenti anno et Cn. Corneliis Cossis, Num. Fabio Ambusto, L. Valerio Potito tribunis militum consulari potestate Veienis bellum motum ob superbum responsum Veientis senatus, qui legatis repetentibus res, ni facesserent propere ex urbe finibusque, daturos, quod Lars Tolumnius dedisset, responderi iussit.</td>
<td>The following year, when Publius and Gnaeus Cornelius Cossus, Numerius Fabius Ambustus, and Lucius Valerius Potitus were consular tribunes, war broke out with Veii on account of the insolent reply of the Veientine senate, who, when envoys demanded restitution of them, bade them be ?? answered that unless they got quickly out from their city and their borders, they would give them what Lars Tolumnius had given the others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1.1</td>
<td>Pace alibi parta Romani Vei que in armis erant tanta ira odio que, ut victis fines adesse apparet.</td>
<td>Peace was now established elsewhere, but Romans and Veientes were at war, and their rage and animosity were such that the end was clearly at hand for those that should be vanquished.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1.7</td>
<td>Eodem anno adversus Volscos populantem Hernici fines legionem ductae a Furio consule, cum hostem ibi non invenissent, Ferentium, quo magna multitudine Volscorum se contulerat, cepere.</td>
<td>The same year the Volsci laid waste the borders of the Hernici, and the legions were led out to meet them by the consul Furius. Not finding the enemy there, they captured Ferentum, to which a great number of Volsci had retired.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.21.13</td>
<td>is fines sanguinis fuit.</td>
<td>This ended the slaughter.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.29.1</td>
<td>Tribunorum plebis actiones quia nondum inveniretur finem, et plebs continuare latoribus legis tribunatum et patres reficere intercessores legis adnisi sunt; sed plus suis comitibus plebs valuit.</td>
<td>The measures introduced by the tribunes of the plebs being still undecided, the commons strove to prolong the tenure of the supporters of the bill, and the patricians to re-elect the tribunes who had vetoed it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.3.1  *Is tum iam non promptus ingenio tantum, sed usu etiam exercitatus talem orationem habuit:* 'si umquam dubitatum est, Quirites, utrum tribuni plebis vestra, an sua causa seditionum semper auctores fuerint, id ego hoc anno desisse dubitari certum habeo; et cum laetor tandem longi erroris vobis finem factum esse, tum, quod secundis potissimum vestris auctoribus hic error est sublatus, et vobis et propria: and I congratulate both you, and on your account the state as well, that it has happened at a time, of all others, when your affairs are prospering.

5.4.10  *perficitur autem, si urgemus obsessorum, si non ante abscedimus, quam spei nostrae finem captis Veis inposuerimus.* And we shall end it, if we press our beleaguered foes, and quit them not till we have fulfilled our hopes and captured Veii.

5.13.4  *cuius insanabili perniciei quando nec causa nec finis inveniebatur, libri Sibyllini ex senatus consulto aditi sunt.* Unable to discover what caused the incurable ravages of this distemper, or would put an end to them, the senate voted to consult the Sibylline Books.

5.46.10  *missi que Ardeam legati ad Camillum Veios eum perduxere, seu [quod] magis credere libet non prius profectum ab Ardea, quam conpererit legem latam, quod nec iniussu populi mutari finibus posset nec nisi dictator dictus auspicia in exercitu habere.* whence envoys were despatched to Ardea for Camillus, and fetched him to Veii; or rather—as I prefer to believe that he did not quit Ardea until he had learnt that the law was passed, since he could not change his residence without the People's command, nor take the auspices in the army till he had been appointed dictator—the curiate law was passed and Camillus declared dictator, in his absence.

5.5.11  *videte, quot res quam inutiles sequantur illam viam consili, iactura operum tanto labore factorum, vastationis inminens finium nostorum, Etruscum bellum pro Veiente concitatum* See how many undesirable consequences attend that line of policy: the loss of works constructed with such effort; the imminent devastation of our fields; the Etruscans, instead of the Veientes only, aroused to war with us.
5.12.5 | a M Furio in Faliscis et a Cn Cornelio in Capenate agro hostes nulli extra moenia inventi; praedae actae incendiis que villarum ac frugum vastati fines; oppida nec oppugnata nec obsessa sunt. | Marcus Furius in the Faliscan country, and Gnaeus Cornelius in the territory of Capena, meeting no enemies afield, drove off booty, and burning farmhouses and crops, laid waste the land, but the towns they neither assaulted nor besieged; | VASTARE | PLUR. | FINES | 400 | B_{10} |

5.35.3 | tum Senones, recentissimi advenarum, ab Utente flumine usque ad Aesim fines habuere. | Then the Senones, the latest to come, had their holdings from the river Utens all the way to the Aesis. | HABERE | AD | PLUR. | FINES | 391 | B_{1} |

5.36.3 | et quoniam legatione adversus se maluerint quam armis tueri socios, ne se quidem pacem, quam illi adferant, aspernari, si Gallis egentibus agro, quem latius possident quam colant Clusini, partem finium concedant; aliter pacem impetrari non posse. | and inasmuch as they had chosen to defend their allies by negotiation rather than by the sword, they would not, for their own part, spurn the peace which the Romans proposed, if the men of Clusium, who possessed more land than they could till, would surrender to the Gauls, who needed land, a portion of their territory; on no other terms could they consider granting peace. | CONCEDERE | PLUR. | FINIUM | 390 | CLUSIUM | B_{6} |

5.5.3 | non differimus igitur bellum isto consilio, sed intra fines nostros accipimus. | So we are not postponing the war, if we act on your advice, but are receiving it within our own borders. | ACCIPERE | INTRA | PLUR. | FINES | 403 | B_{4} |

5.28.6 | primo rem communiter gesserunt; fusis inde acie hostibus Aemilium praesidio Verruginem obtinere placuit, Postumium fines vastare. | At first they exercised the command conjointly; afterwards, when they had routed the enemy in battle, they arranged that Aemilius should hold Verrugo with a garrison, while Postumius should lay waste the country. | VASTARE | PLUR. | FINES | 394 | AEOYI | B_{4} |

5.5.6 | cum tantum laboris exhaustum sit et ad finem iam operis tandem perventum, relinquenda ne haec censusit, ut ad aestatem rursus novus de integro his instituendis exsudetur labor? When they have expended all this labour, and the end of their task is at last in sight, do you: vote for abandoning these things, that when summer comes they may sweat and toil again to produce them afresh? | PERVENIRE | AD | SING. | FINEM | 403 | A |

5.51.6 | iam omnium primum Veiens bellum – First of all, the war with Veii. How many years we per quot annos quanto labore gestum! – fought, and with what painful exertion! And the end non ante cepit finem, quam monitu deorum aqua ex lacu Albano emissa est. came not, until, admonished by Heaven, we drew the water off from the Alban Lake. | CAPERE | SING. | FINEM | 390 | A |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PASSAGE</th>
<th>TEXT</th>
<th>TRANSLATION</th>
<th>VERB</th>
<th>PREPOS.</th>
<th>GENRE</th>
<th>DECL.</th>
<th>CASE</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>LINK</th>
<th>FINIS (TYPE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.18.16</td>
<td>. inde de regno agendi ortum initium</td>
<td>It was thus, they say, that the agitation for kingly power was begun; but there is no very clear tradition with whom or to what length his plans were matured.</td>
<td>PERVERSIRE</td>
<td>AD</td>
<td>SING.</td>
<td>FINEM</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.6.8</td>
<td>nihil deinde timeat, an hic sit terror</td>
<td>or whether our name inspire such dread, that men believe that once a Roman army has sat down before a town, it will never budge, either from the weariness of a protracted siege or from the rigours of winter, that it knows no other end of war but victory, and relies in its campaigns not more on swiftness than on perseverance?</td>
<td>SING.</td>
<td>FINEM</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.31.2</td>
<td>cuius noscendi gratia Sp Servilius Priscus Q Cloelius Siculus censores</td>
<td>But when Spurius Servilius Priscus and Quintus Cloelius Siculus had been made censors in order that they might investigate the situation, they were prevented from doing so by a war; for first frightened messengers, and then the country-folk fleeing from the fields, brought word that the Volscian legions had crossed the border, and were everywhere devastating Roman territory.</td>
<td>INGREDIRE</td>
<td>PLUR.</td>
<td>FINES</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>ROMANUS</td>
<td>B8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.41.11</td>
<td>tanta dulcedo est ex alienis fortunis praedandi, nec in mentem venit altera lege solidudines vastas in agris fieri pellendo finibus dominos, altera fidem abrogari, cum qua omnis humana societas tollitur?</td>
<td>of others. Is it so sweet to plunder others of their fortunes? Does it not occur to them that one of their laws will make vast deserts in the country-side, by driving the landlords out from their demesnes, while the other will wipe out credit, and with it all</td>
<td>PELLERE</td>
<td>PLUR.</td>
<td>FINIBUS</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>B4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.33.2</td>
<td>finis certaminis fuit, postquam utrisque apparuit nihil per alteros stare, quo minus incepta perseverentur.</td>
<td>the Latins had but just revolted after a long peace; their spirits were still fresh; and they meant to continue boldly with the war. The dispute came to an end as soon as each party saw that the other could not prevent it in any way from carrying out its policy.</td>
<td>ESSE</td>
<td>SING.</td>
<td>FINI</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.19.4 Tum tribuni consulari potestate tribuni que plebi — nam ei, quia eundem et suae potestatis, quem libertatis omnium, finem cernebant, patrum auctoritati se dediderant — hi tum omnes, quid opus facto sit, consultant. Thereupon the consular tribunes and the tribunes of the plebs — for they too, perceiving that their own authority would come to an end with the general liberty, had made their submission to the Fathers — all these men, I say, thereupon took counsel together, what was needful to be done.

6.13.6 fugae sequendi que non ante noctem finem fuit. Flight and pursuit continued until nightfall.

6.25.7 Intranibus fines Romanis non demigratum ex propinquis itineri locis, non cultus agrorum intermissus, patentibus portis urbis togati obviam frequentes imperatoribus processere, commeatus exercitu comiter in castra devehitur. When the Romans entered their territory, they did not withdraw from the places near the line of march, nor break off their labour in the fields; the gates of their city stood wide open; the citizens, wearing the toga, came out in great numbers to meet the generals; ex urbe et ex agris devehitur.

6.27.7 passim iam sine ullo discrimine bella quaerit: ab Antio Satricum, ab Satrico Velitras, inde Tusculum legiones ducas; Latinis, Herniciis, Praenestinis iam intentari arma civium magis quam hostium odio, ut in armis terant plebem nec respirare in urbe aut per otium libertatis menimisse sinat aut consistere in contione, ubi aliquando audiant vocem tribuniciam de levando faenore et fine aliarum iniuriarum agentem quod si sit animus plebi memor patrum libertatis, wars were now sought indiscriminately, far and wide; from Antium the legions had been marched to Satricum, from Satricum to Velitiae, from there to Tusculum; now it was the Latins, the Hernici and the Praenestini who were threatened with attack, more out of hatred of Rome's citizens than of her enemies. The object was to wear the plebeians out with service and give them no time to take breath in the City, or leisure to bethink them of liberty or to stand in the assembly, where they might sometimes hear the voice of a tribune urging the reduction of interest and the removal of their other grievances.

6.9.11. magna caedes fugientium et in urbe et per agros est factura plures a Furianis intra moenia caesi; Valeriani expeditiores ad persequendos fuere nec ante noctem, quae conspectum ademit, finem caedendi fecere. Great was the carnage they suffered as they fled, both in the city and in the fields. Furius's men slew more within the walls; the soldiers of Valerius were more lightly equipped for pursuit, and kept up the massacre until night made it impossible to see.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PASSAGE</th>
<th>TEXT</th>
<th>TRANSLATION</th>
<th>VERB</th>
<th>PREPOS.</th>
<th>GENRE</th>
<th>DECL.</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>LINK</th>
<th>FINIS (TYPE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.31.7</td>
<td>quippe a Volsci timentibus, ne interim exercitus ab Roma exiret, incursiones in extrema finium factae erant; Romano contra etiam in hostico morandi causa erat, ut hostem ad certamen eliceret</td>
<td>In fact, the Volsci had confined their pillaging to the borders, because of their fear lest an army might come out from Rome while they were at it; the Romans, on the contrary, were partly actuated, in remaining on hostile ground, by the desire of luring the enemy into a battle.</td>
<td>FACERE</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>PLUR.</td>
<td>FINIUM</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>EXTREMA ROMANUS</td>
<td>B₄</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.21.9</td>
<td>De Praenestinorum quoque defectione eo anno primum fama exorta; arguentibus que eos Tusculanis et Gabinis et Labicanis, quorum in fines incursatum erat, ita placide ab senatu responsum est, ut minus credi de criminibus, quia nollent ea vera esse, appareret</td>
<td>The Praenestines, too, were that year, for the first time, reported as disloyal; evidence against them was given by the Tusculans, the Gabini, and the Labicani, whose borders they had invaded; but the senate returned so mild an answer that it was evident that they refused to believe in the charges because they wished them not to be true.</td>
<td>INCURRERE</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>PLUR.</td>
<td>FINES</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>TUSCULANI/ GABINI /LABICANI</td>
<td>B₈</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4.8</td>
<td>exercitum alterum in Aequos non ad bellum – victos namque se fatebantur – sed ab odio ad pervastandos fines, ne quid ad nova consilia relinqueretur virium, duxere, alterum in agrum Tarquiniensem</td>
<td>These men led one army against the Aequi, not to war—for they confessed themselves vanquished—but from hatred, in order to waste, their territories and leave them with no strength to make new trouble; with another they invaded the district of Tarquinii, where they captured by assault the Etruscan towns Cortuosa and Contenebra.</td>
<td>PERVASTARE</td>
<td>PLUR.</td>
<td>FINES</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>AEQUI</td>
<td>B₅</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.42.9</td>
<td>et ne is quidem finis certaminum fuit.</td>
<td>The dictator was awarded a triumph with the consent of both senate and plebs. Hardly had Camillus brought the war to an end, when he was confronted with a fiercer opposition in the City. After desperate struggles the senate and the dictator were beaten, and the measures advocated by the tribunes were adopted.</td>
<td>ESSE</td>
<td>SING.</td>
<td>FINIS</td>
<td>368</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.39.12</td>
<td>patriciae hic vir gentis erat, cui cum militiae magna cum gloria actae finem pes alter ex vulnere claudus fecisset, ruri agere vitam procul ambitione ac foro constituit.</td>
<td>This man, who belonged to a noble family, had won great distinction in the wars, but lameness in one of his feet, resulting from a wound, had put an end to his campaigning, and had determined him to take up his residence in the country, far from the Forum and from politics.</td>
<td>SING.</td>
<td>FINEM</td>
<td>342</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.38.2 neque ita rei gestae familiae Italiae se finibus tenuit, sed Carthaginienses quoque legatos gratulatum Romam misere cum coronae aureae dono, quae in Capitolio in Iovi cella poneretur. Nor was the fame of this success confined to Italy; even the Carthaginians sent their envoys to Rome, with congratulations and the gift of a golden crown, weighing five and twenty pounds, to be placed in the shrine of Jupiter on the Capitol.

7.19.6 In bellum Etruscum intentatam, quia Caeritem populum misericordia consanguinitatis Tarquiniensis adiunctum fama ferebatur, legati Latini quoque exercitum conscriptum armatum que iam suis finibus inminere; inde populabundos in agrum Romanum venturos esse. While the citizens were occupied with thoughts of an Etruscan war —for it was rumoured that the people of Caere, out of compassion for their kinsmen of Tarquinii, had made common cause with them — came envoys from the Latins and turned their thoughts upon the Volsci, with a report that they had mustered and equipped an army, which was even then descending upon Latium, from whence it would invade and devastate the territory of the Romans.

7.12.69 Alius adventus hostium fuit proximo anno agris terribilior quam urbi: popubandii Tarquinienses fines Romanos, maxime qua ex parte Etruriae adiacent, peragravere; rebus que nequiquam repetitis novi consules iis C Fabius et C Plautius iussu populi bellum indixere; Fabio que ea provincia, Plauto Hernici evenere. Another hostile incursion was more terrifying to the countryside. The Tarquinienses, bent on plundering, ranged over the Roman territory, particularly that part which adjoins Etruria; and demands for reparation proving futile, the new consuls, Gaius Fabius and Gaius Plautius, declared war against them, as commanded by the people. This campaign fell to Fabius, that against the Hernici to Plautius.

7.19.8 inclinavit deinde pars maior curae in Etruscum bellum, postquam litteris Sulpici consulis, cui Tarquinii provincia evenerat, cognitum est depopulatum agrum circa Romanas salinas praedae que partem in Caeritum fines avectam et haud dubie iuventutem eius populi inter praedatores fuisset. But the Etruscan war afterwards came to be their chief concern, on the receipt of a dispatch from the consul Sulpicius, who had received the assignment to Tarquinii, with the news that the countryside lying near the Roman salt-works had been pillaged, and a part of the booty carried into the borders of the Caerites, whose soldiers had, without question, been amongst the depredators.

7.19.9 itaque Valerium consulem, Volscis oppositus castra que ad finem Tusculanum habentem, revocatum inde senatus dictatorem dicere iussit. And so the senate recalled Valerius the consul, who was opposing the Volsci and had his camp close to the Tusculan frontier, and ordered him to nominate a dictator.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PASSAGE</th>
<th>TEXT</th>
<th>TRANSLATION</th>
<th>VERB</th>
<th>PREPOS.</th>
<th>GENRE</th>
<th>DECL. CASE</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>LINK</th>
<th>FINIS (TYPE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.20.9</td>
<td>cum populatione peragrati <em>fines</em> essent, ab oppugnatione urbium tempertatum; legionibus que Romam reductis reliquum anni muris turribus que reficiendis consumptum et aedis Apollinis dedicata est</td>
<td>Having ranged over their lands and laid them waste, the Romans refrained from attacking their cities, and led their legions home. The rest of the year was consumed in repairing the walls and towers, and a temple was dedicated to Apollo.</td>
<td>PERAGRO</td>
<td>PLUR.</td>
<td>FINES</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>FALISCI</td>
<td>B₅</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.13.10</td>
<td>Priusquam comitiis in insequentem annum consules rogarent, Camillus de Latinis populis ad senatum rettulit atque ita disseruit: 'patres conscripti, quod bello armis que in Latio agendum fuit, id iam deum benignitate ac virtute militum ad <em>finem</em> venit.</td>
<td>before the consular elections for the following year were held, Camillus referred to the senate the disposition of the Latin peoples, and spoke as follows: 'Conscript Fathers, what was needful to be done in Latium in the way of war and arms has now by Heaven's favour and the valour of our troops been brought to a conclusion.</td>
<td>VENIRE</td>
<td>AD</td>
<td>SING.</td>
<td>FINEM</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.14.10</td>
<td>Campanis, equitum honoris causa, quia cum Latinis rebellare noluissent, Fundanis que et Formianis, quod per <em>fines</em> eorum tuta pacata que semper fuisset via, civitas sine suffragio data</td>
<td>The Campanians, out of compliment to their knights, because they had not consented to revolt along with the Latins, were granted citizenship without the suffrage; so too were the Fundani and Formiani, because they had always afforded a safe and peaceful passage through their territories.</td>
<td>ESSE</td>
<td>PER</td>
<td>PLUR.</td>
<td>FINES</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>FUNDANI/FORMIANI</td>
<td>B₆</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.17.1</td>
<td>Novi deinde consules a veteribus exercitu accepto ingressus hostium <em>fines</em> populo ad moenia atque urbem pervenerunt</td>
<td>The new consuls then took over the army from their predecessors, and entering the enemy's territory laid it waste as far as their city walls.</td>
<td>INGREDIRE</td>
<td>PLUR.</td>
<td>FINES</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>SIDICINI/CALES</td>
<td>B₅ B₆</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.19.10</td>
<td>Ingredienti <em>fines</em> senatus Fundanorum occurrit; negant se pro Vitruvio sectam que eius secutis precatum venisse, sed pro Fundano populo, quem extra culpam bellii esse ipsum Vitruvium iudicasse, cum receptaculum fugae Privernum habuerit, non patriam Fundos</td>
<td>as he crossed the border he was met by the Fundanian senate, who said that they had come to plead, not for Vitruvius and his followers, but for the people of Fundi, whom even Vitruvius himself had cleared of responsibility for the war, when he sought refuge in Privernum and not in his native city.</td>
<td>INGREDIRE</td>
<td>PLUR.</td>
<td>FINES</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>FUNDANI</td>
<td>B₆</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.24.16</td>
<td>is <em>finis</em> lacerationi fuit,</td>
<td>them. this ended the mutilation.</td>
<td>ESSE</td>
<td>SING.</td>
<td>FINIS</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 8.33.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PASSAGE</th>
<th>TEXT</th>
<th>TRANSLATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.33.1</td>
<td><em>His vocibus cum in se magis incitarent dictatorem quam magistro equitum placarent, iussi de tribunali descendere legati; et silentio nequiquam per praecenon temptato, cum prae strepitu ac tumultu nec ipsius dictatoris nec apparitorum eius vox audiretur, nox velut in proelio certamin finem fecit.</em></td>
<td><em>but the lieutenants by these words rather stirred up the wrath of the dictator against themselves than lessened his rancour against the master of the horse, and he ordered them to go down from the tribunal. He then sought by the mouth of a herald to procure silence, but without success, for the din and uproar were so great that it was impossible for the dictator himself or his attendants to be heard; and it was left for darkness, as though descending on a battle-field, to end the struggle.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### 8.32.13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PASSAGE</th>
<th>TEXT</th>
<th>TRANSLATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.32.13</td>
<td><em>ne tribunal quidem satis quietum erat; legati circumstantes seliam orabant, ut rem in posterum diem differret et irae suae spatium et consilio tempus daret: satis castigatam adulsectiam Fabi esse, satis deformatam victoriam; ne ad extremum finem suppliant tenderet neu unico iuveni, neu patri eius, clarissimo viro, neu Fabiae genti eam iniungeret ignominiam.</em></td>
<td><em>not even the tribunal itself was quiet; the lieutenants, standing about the dictator's chair, besought him to put the matter off until the morrow and allow time for consideration and for his anger to cool; he had sufficiently chastened the youth of Fabius, they said, and discredited his victory; it would not be well to carry out his punishment to the end, nor to fasten such humiliation upon a young man of extraordinary merit, nor on that most distinguished man, his father, and the Fabian family.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### 8.19.33

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PASSAGE</th>
<th>TEXT</th>
<th>TRANSLATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.19.33</td>
<td><em>missi tum ab senatu legati denuntiatum que Samnitibus, ut eorum populorum finibus vim abstinerent; valuit quod ea legatio, non tam quia pacem volebant Samnites, quam quia nondum parati erant ad bellum.</em></td>
<td><em>The embassy was effective, not so much because the Samnites desired peace, as because they were unprepared, as yet, for war. The same year saw the beginning of the war with Privernum.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### 8.1.6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PASSAGE</th>
<th>TEXT</th>
<th>TRANSLATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.1.6</td>
<td><em>ea Luae matri dare se consul dixit finesque hostium usque ad oram maritimam est depopulatus.</em></td>
<td><em>declaring that he gave these arms to Lua Mater, the consul proceeded to lay waste the enemy's country as far as the coast.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
misisset, haud procul Pandosia urbe, inminente Lucanis ac Bruttii finibus, tris tumulos aliquantum inter se distantes insedit, ex quibus incursiones in omnem partem agri hostilis faceret; et ducentos ferme Lucanorum exules circa se pro fidis habebat, ut pleraque eius generis ingenia sunt, cum fortuna mutabilem gerentes fidem.

and having sent to Epirus three hundred illustrious families, to be held as hostages, he took up his station not far from the city Pandosia, which looks down upon the borders of Lucania and Bruttium, on three hills that stand some little distance apart from one another, that he might thence make incursions into every quarter of the enemy's country. he had about him some two hundred Lucanian exiles, whom he trusted; but their loyalty, like that of most men of that nation, was prone to change with the change of fortune.

Hoc bello tam prospere commisso alteri quoque bello, quo Graeci obsidebantur, iam finis aderat.

while this war was beginning in so prosperous a fashion, the other, against the Greeks, was in a fair way to be concluded.

sed quoniam vos, regno inpotenti finem ut inponatis, non inducitis in animum, nos, quamquam armis possimus adserere Latium in libertatem, consanguinitati tamen hoc dabimus, ut condiciones pacis feramus aequas utrisque, quoniam vires quoque aequari dis inmortalibus placuit.

but, since you cannot make up your minds to bring your impotent sovereignty to a close, we — though able by force of arms to give Latium her freedom — willnevertheless concede so much to kinship as to offer terms of peace fair and equal to both sides, since the immortal gods have willed that we should be of equal strength.

exercitus utroque ducti, et cura tuendorum finium hostes prohibiti coniungere arma

this command was assigned by lot to Brutus, that against the Samnites to Camillus. armies were dispatched in both directions, and the enemy, concerned to protect their borders, were kept from joining forces.

ex his tot populis unus ingens exercitus duce Latino fines Samniti ingressus plus populationibus quam proelis cladium fecit; et quamquam superiores certaminibus Latini erant, haud inviti, ne saepius dimicandum foret, agro hostium excessere

one great army, gathered out of all these nations, invaded the borders of the Samnites, under a Latin general, but wrought more havoc by pillage than in battle; and although the Latins came off best in all encounters, they were not unwilling to retire from the enemy's country, that they might not have to fight so often.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PASSAGE</th>
<th>TEXT</th>
<th>TRANSLATION</th>
<th>VERB</th>
<th>PREPOS.</th>
<th>GENRE</th>
<th>DECL.</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>LINK</th>
<th>FINIS (TYPE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.4.8</td>
<td>bellum nostro nomine cum Paelignis gessimus; qui ne nostrorum quidem finium nobis per nos to defend our own borders by ourselves, never tuendorum ius antea dabant, nihil intercesserunt</td>
<td>we waged war on our own account with the Paeligni; those who aforetime withheld from us even the right to defend our own borders by ourselves, never interposed.</td>
<td>TUERE/DARE</td>
<td>PLUR.</td>
<td>FINIUM</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>B₄</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.45.1.</td>
<td>Sulpicio Saverrione Sempronio Sopho consulibus Samnites, seu finem seu dilationem bellii quaerentes, legatos de pace Romam misere.</td>
<td>in the consulship of Publius Sulpicius Saverrio and Publius Sempronius Sophus, the Samnites, whether seeking to end or only to postpone hostilities, sent envoys to Rome to treat for peace.</td>
<td>QUÆRERE</td>
<td>SING.</td>
<td>FINEM</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.6.10</td>
<td>Postero die cum iuvenes nobiles, missi a Capua, ut proficiscentes ad finem Campanum prosequerentur, revertissent vocati que in curiam percutantibus maiori bus natu multo sibi maestiores et abiectioris animi visos referrent: adeo silens ac prope mutum agmen incessisse;</td>
<td>on the following day, when the young nobles sent from Capua to attend them to the borders of Campania had returned, and were called into the senatehouse and questioned by the elders, they reported that they had seemed to be much more sorrowful and dejected than before: their column had marched on in silence and almost as though dumb incessisse;</td>
<td>PROSEQUIRE</td>
<td>AD</td>
<td>SING.</td>
<td>FINEM</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>B₄</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.29.5</td>
<td>eadem in comparando cohibendo que bello consilia et apud Etruscus fuere: neutri finibus egressi.</td>
<td>field. but the Etruscans followed the same policy, preparing for war but preventing it from breaking out. neither side went beyond their own frontiers.</td>
<td>EGREDIRE</td>
<td>PLUR.</td>
<td>FINIBUS</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>B₄</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.26.9</td>
<td>latior que et re et personis quaestio fieri, haud abnuenta dictator sine fine uella quaestionis suae ius esse</td>
<td>The enquiry began to take a wider range, in respect both of charges and of persons, and the dictator was nothing loath that there should be no limit to the jurisdiction of his court.</td>
<td>FACIO</td>
<td>SING.</td>
<td>FINE</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.11.1</td>
<td>T. Manlio consuli provincia Etruria sorte eventi; qui vixdum ingressus hostium fines cum exerceretur inter equites, ab rapido cursu circumagendo equo effusus extemplo prope expiravit.</td>
<td>The command in Etruria fell by lot to Titus Manlius the consul. he had barely entered the territory of the enemy, and was exercising with the cavalry, when, in wheeling his horse about after a swift gallop, he was thrown</td>
<td>INGREDIRE</td>
<td>PLUR.</td>
<td>FINES</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>ETRURIA</td>
<td>B₇</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.11.11</td>
<td>Principio huius anni oratores Lucanorum ad novos consules venerunt questum, quia conditionibus perciperse nequeverint ad societatem armorum, Samnites infesto exercitu ingressos fines suos vastare bello que ad bellum cogere</td>
<td>in the beginning of this year Lucanian envoys came to the new consuls to complain that the Samnites, since they had been unable by offering inducements to entice them into an armed alliance, had invaded their territories with a hostile army and by warring on them were obliging them to go to war.</td>
<td>INGREDIRE</td>
<td>PLUR.</td>
<td>FINES</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>LUCANI</td>
<td>B₅</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9.32.9. *nullum umquam proelio fugae minus nec plus caedis fuisset, ni obstinatos mori Tuscos nox texisset, ita ut victores prius quam victi pugnandi finem facerent.*

Victory hung in the balance and many perished on both sides, including all the bravest, and the event was not decided until the Roman second line came up with undiminished vigour to relieve their exhausted comrades in the first; and the Etruscans, whose fighting line was supported by no fresh reserves, all fell in front of their standards and around them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PASSAGE</th>
<th>TEXT</th>
<th>TRANSLATION</th>
<th>VERB</th>
<th>PREPOS.</th>
<th>GENRE</th>
<th>DECL.</th>
<th>CASE</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>LINK</th>
<th>FINIS (TYPE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.32.9.</td>
<td><em>nullum umquam proelio fugae minus nec plus caedis fuisset, ni obstinatos mori Tuscos nox texisset, ita ut victores prius quam victi pugnandi finem facerent.</em></td>
<td>Victory hung in the balance and many perished on both sides, including all the bravest, and the event was not decided until the Roman second line came up with undiminished vigour to relieve their exhausted comrades in the first; and the Etruscans, whose fighting line was supported by no fresh reserves, all fell in front of their standards and around them.</td>
<td>FACIERE</td>
<td>SING.</td>
<td>FINEM</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10.20.1 *XXDum ambo consules omnis que Romana vis in Etruscum bellum magis inclinat, in Samnio novi exercitus exorti ad populandos imperii Romani fines per Vescinos in Campaniam Falernum que agrum transcendunt ingentes que praedas faciunt* while both consuls and all the strength of Rome were being devoted mainly to the Etruscan war, new armies rose up in Samnium to waste the territories under Roman sway, and crossing over into Campania and the Falernian district, through the land of the Vescini, gathered in huge spoils.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PASSAGE</th>
<th>TEXT</th>
<th>TRANSLATION</th>
<th>VERB</th>
<th>PREPOS.</th>
<th>GENRE</th>
<th>DECL.</th>
<th>CASE</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>LINK</th>
<th>FINIS (TYPE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.20.1</td>
<td><em>XXDum ambo consules omnis que Romana vis in Etruscum bellum magis inclinat, in Samnio novi exercitus exorti ad populandos imperii Romani fines per Vescinos in Campaniam Falernum que agrum transcendunt ingentes que praedas faciunt</em></td>
<td>while both consuls and all the strength of Rome were being devoted mainly to the Etruscan war, new armies rose up in Samnium to waste the territories under Roman sway, and crossing over into Campania and the Falernian district, through the land of the Vescini, gathered in huge spoils.</td>
<td>POPULARE</td>
<td>PLUR.</td>
<td>FINES</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>IMPERII ROMANII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10.11.2 *tertius ab eo casu dies finis vitae consuli fuit.* ?? and ere long breathed his last, for the third day following the accident saw the end of the consul's life.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PASSAGE</th>
<th>TEXT</th>
<th>TRANSLATION</th>
<th>VERB</th>
<th>PREPOS.</th>
<th>GENRE</th>
<th>DECL.</th>
<th>CASE</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>LINK</th>
<th>FINIS (TYPE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.11.2</td>
<td><em>tertius ab eo casu dies finis vitae consuli fuit.</em></td>
<td>?? and ere long breathed his last, for the third day following the accident saw the end of the consul's life.</td>
<td>ESSE</td>
<td>SING.</td>
<td>FINIS</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10.12.2 *benigne responsum Lucanis ictum que foedus; fetiales missi, qui Samnitem decedere agro sociorum ac deducere exercitum finibus Lucanis iuberent, quibus obviam missi ab Samnitibus, qui denuntiarent, si quod adissent in Samnio concilium, haud inviolatos abituros.* The Lucanians received a friendly answer, and the league was formed. fetials were then sent to command the Samnites to leave the country belonging to Rome's allies, and withdraw their army from the territory of Lucania. they were met on the way by messengers, whom the Samnites had dispatched to warn them that if they went before any Samnite council they would not depart unscathed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PASSAGE</th>
<th>TEXT</th>
<th>TRANSLATION</th>
<th>VERB</th>
<th>PREPOS.</th>
<th>GENRE</th>
<th>DECL.</th>
<th>CASE</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>LINK</th>
<th>FINIS (TYPE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.12.2</td>
<td><em>benigne responsum Lucanis ictum que foedus; fetiales missi, qui Samnitem decedere agro sociorum ac deducere exercitum finibus Lucanis iuberent, quibus obviam missi ab Samnitibus, qui denuntiarent, si quod adissent in Samnio concilium, haud inviolatos abituros.</em></td>
<td>The Lucanians received a friendly answer, and the league was formed. fetials were then sent to command the Samnites to leave the country belonging to Rome's allies, and withdraw their army from the territory of Lucania. they were met on the way by messengers, whom the Samnites had dispatched to warn them that if they went before any Samnite council they would not depart unscathed.</td>
<td>DEDUCERE</td>
<td>PLUR.</td>
<td>FINIBUS</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>B3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10.16.2 *itaque insequenti quoque anno, L. Volumnio Ap. Claudio consulibus, Decius, qui consul in Samnio relictus a collega fuerat, proconsul idem populari non destitit agros, donec Samnium exercitum nusquam se proelio committentem postremo expulit finibus.* so in the following year likewise —the consulship of Lucius Volumnius and Appius Claudius —Publius Decius, who had been left behind in Samnium, when consul, by his colleague, ceased not as proconsul to lay waste the farms, until finally he forced the army of the Samnites — which would nowhere risk a battle — to withdraw from the country.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PASSAGE</th>
<th>TEXT</th>
<th>TRANSLATION</th>
<th>VERB</th>
<th>PREPOS.</th>
<th>GENRE</th>
<th>DECL.</th>
<th>CASE</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>LINK</th>
<th>FINIS (TYPE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.16.2</td>
<td><em>itaque insequenti quoque anno, L. Volumnio Ap. Claudio consulibus, Decius, qui consul in Samnio relictus a collega fuerat, proconsul idem populari non destitit agros, donec Samnium exercitum nusquam se proelio committentem postremo expulit finibus.</em></td>
<td>so in the following year likewise —the consulship of Lucius Volumnius and Appius Claudius —Publius Decius, who had been left behind in Samnium, when consul, by his colleague, ceased not as proconsul to lay waste the farms, until finally he forced the army of the Samnites — which would nowhere risk a battle — to withdraw from the country.</td>
<td>EXPELLERE</td>
<td>PLUR.</td>
<td>FINIBUS</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>SAMNIUS</td>
<td>B7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASSAGE</td>
<td>TEXT</td>
<td>TRANSLATION</td>
<td>VERB</td>
<td>PREPOS.</td>
<td>GENRE</td>
<td>DECL.</td>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>LINK</td>
<td>FINIS (TYPE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.17.2</td>
<td>quin urbes et moenia adgredimur? nullus iam exercitus Samnio praesidet; cessere finibus ac sibimet ipsi exilium conscivere.</td>
<td>why do we not assail cities and walled towns? there is no longer any army defending Samnium; they have withdrawn beyond their borders, sentenced to banishment by their own decree.’</td>
<td>CESSERE</td>
<td>PLUR.</td>
<td>FINIBUS</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>B₄</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.20.2</td>
<td>Volumnium magnis itineribus in Samnium redeuntem − iam enim Fabio Decio que prorogati imperii finis aderat − fama de Samniti exercitu populationibus que Campani agrgi ad tuendos socios convertit.</td>
<td>as Volumnius was returning by long marches into Samnium —for now the extension of authority granted to Fabius and Decius was drawing to a close —a rumour about the Samnite army and its depredations in the territory of Campania turned him aside to the defence of the allies.</td>
<td>PROROGARE/ ADESSE</td>
<td>SING.</td>
<td>FINIS</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>IMPERII</td>
<td>FINES</td>
<td>B₉</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.9.5</td>
<td>an, si eadem superbia, qua sponsonem istam expresserunt nobis Samnites, coegissent nos verba legima dedentium urbes nuncupare, deditionum populum Romanum vos, tribuni, diceretis et hanc urbem, templa, delubra, finies, aquas Samnitium esse?</td>
<td>If the Samnites with that same arrogance with which they extorted this capitulation from us had compelled us to pronounce the solemn form of words of those who surrender cities, would you tribunes assert that the Roman People had been surrendered, and that this City, with its temples, its holy places, its bounds and waters, was become the property of the Samnites?</td>
<td>ESSE</td>
<td>PLUR.</td>
<td>FINES</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>ROMANOS</td>
<td>B₄</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.35.1</td>
<td>Alteri consuli M. Atilio nequaquam tam facile bellum fuit cum ad Luceriam duceret legiones, quam oppugnari ab Samniti exercitu audierat, ad finem Lucerinum ei hostis obvius fuit.</td>
<td>The other consul, Marcus Atilius, had by no means so easy a war. he was marching, at the head of his legions, towards Luceria, which he had heard was being besieged by the Samnites, when the enemy met him at the Lucerine frontier.</td>
<td>ESSE</td>
<td>AD</td>
<td>SING.</td>
<td>FINEM</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>B₄</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.37.1</td>
<td>Consul alter Postumius, quia in Samniti exercitu belli deerat, in Etruriam transduco exercitu primum pervastaverat Volisiniensem agrum; dein cum egressis ad tuendos finies haud procul moenibus ipsorum depugnat; duo milia octingenti Etruscorum caesi; ceteros propinquitas urbis tutata est</td>
<td>The other consul, Postumius, in default of enemies in Samnium, transferred his army to Etruria.there he first devastated the lands of the Volisinienses, and then, when they came out to defend their territory, defeated them at no great distance from their own walls. two thousand eight hundred Etruscans were slain; the rest were saved by their nearness to the city.</td>
<td>EGREDIRE-TUERE</td>
<td>AD</td>
<td>PLUR.</td>
<td>FINES</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>VOLSINII</td>
<td>B₆</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.8.7</td>
<td>interea consules exercitum scribere, armare, educere placet nec prius ingredi hostium finies, quam omnia iusta in deditione nostra perfecta erunt</td>
<td>meantime I move that the consuls enroll an army and arm it and lead it forth, yet without crossing the borders of the enemy, until all the ceremonies incident to our surrender shall have been completed.</td>
<td>INGREDIRE</td>
<td>PLUR.</td>
<td>FINES</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>SAMNITI</td>
<td>B₅</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASSAGE</td>
<td>TEXT</td>
<td>TRANSLATION</td>
<td>VERB</td>
<td>PREPOS.</td>
<td>GENRE</td>
<td>DECL.</td>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>LINK</td>
<td>FINIS (TYPE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.32.2</td>
<td>Samnium ambobus decreta provincia est, quia tres scriptos hostium exercitus, uno Etruriam, altero populationes Campaniae repeti, tertium tuendis parari finibus fama erat.</td>
<td>Samnium was assigned them both for their province, in consequence of a report that the enemy had raised three armies, with one of which they meant to return into Etruria, with another to resume the devastation of Campania, while the third was making ready for the defence of their frontiers.</td>
<td>TUERE</td>
<td>PLUR.</td>
<td>FINIBUS</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>B₄</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.14.5</td>
<td>Ubi in hostium fines ventum est, uterque populabantus effuso agmine incedit</td>
<td>arrived at the borders of the enemy, each spread his army over a wide front and pillaged.</td>
<td>VENIRE</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>PLUR.</td>
<td>FINES</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>SAMNII/SI</td>
<td>B₇</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.17.5</td>
<td>vultis vos pro virtute spes gerere? omnes Samnitium urbes fortunae que in urbibus relictæ vestrae sunt, quando legiones eorum tot proeliis fusas postremo finibus expulístis.</td>
<td>lest these should encumber the marching army with heavy baggage, Decius called the soldiers together and thus addressed them: ‘will this single victory or these spoils content you? will your expectations not be equal to your courage? all the cities of the Samnites and the riches left behind in them are yours, since, after defeating their legions in so many battles, you have in the end expelled them from their country.</td>
<td>EXPELLERE</td>
<td>PLUR.</td>
<td>FINIBUS</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>URBES SAMNITIUM</td>
<td>B₆</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.10.6</td>
<td>Eodem anno ab Etruscis adversus indutias paratum bellum; sed eos talia molientis Gallorum ingens exercitus fines ingressus paulisper a proposito avertit.</td>
<td>The Etruscans planned to go to war that year in violation of the truce; but while they were busy with this project an enormous army of Gauls invaded their borders and diverted them for a little while from their purpose.</td>
<td>INGRESSE</td>
<td>PLUR.</td>
<td>FINES</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>ETRUSCI</td>
<td>B₅</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.32.4</td>
<td>velut ex conposito ibi obvium habuere hostem, ubi et vastare ipsi Samnitium agrum prohibérentur et egressi inde in pacata sociorum que populi Romani fines Samnitem prohibérent</td>
<td>as though it had been prearranged, they encountered the foe in a place where they themselves were prevented from laying waste the territory of their enemies, while they prevented the Samnites from coming out into the district which had been pacified and the territory of the allies of the Roman People.</td>
<td>PROHIBERE</td>
<td>PLUR.</td>
<td>FINES</td>
<td>294</td>
<td></td>
<td>B₄</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.27.5</td>
<td>consules Fulvio, ut ex Falisco, Postumio, ut ex Vaticano agro exercitum ad Clusium admoveant summa que vi fines hostium depopulentur, scribunt</td>
<td>The consuls wrote to Fulvius and Postumius to march from their respective posts in the Faliscan and Vatican districts to Clusium, and lay waste the territories of the enemy with the utmost rigour.</td>
<td>POPULARE</td>
<td>PLUR.</td>
<td>FINES</td>
<td>295</td>
<td></td>
<td>B₆</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASSAGE</td>
<td>TEXT</td>
<td>TRANSLATION</td>
<td>VERB</td>
<td>PREPOS.</td>
<td>GENRE</td>
<td>DECL. CASE</td>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>LINK</td>
<td>FINIS (TYPE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.1.7</td>
<td>coloniam aegre patientes velut arcem suis finibus inpositam summa vi expugnare adorti ab ipsis colonis peluntur.</td>
<td>p.when Marcus Livius Denter and Marcus Aemilius were consuls, the Aequi resumed hostilities. Indignant that a colony had been established, like a citadel, within their borders, they attacked it with great fury.</td>
<td>INPOSITA</td>
<td>PLUR.</td>
<td>FINIBUS</td>
<td>303-302</td>
<td>B&lt;sub&gt;10&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.12.7</td>
<td>inde in Faliscum agrum copiis reductis cum inpedimenta Faleriis cum modico praesidio reliquisset, expedito agmine ad depopulandos hostium finibus incedit</td>
<td>hurriedly abandoned. Scipio then led his troops back into the Faliscan territory, and having left his baggage with a small guard in Falerii, set out with his army in light marching order to ravage the territory of the enemy.</td>
<td>INCEDERE</td>
<td>PLUR.</td>
<td>FINES</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>FALISCI/ FALERII</td>
<td>B&lt;sub&gt;6&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>B&lt;sub&gt;5&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.32.5.</td>
<td>cum castra castris conlata essent, quod vix Romanus totiens victor auderet, ausi Samnites sunt — tantum desperatio ultima temeritatis facit — castra Romana oppugnare, et quamquam non venit ad finem tam audax inceptum, tamen haud omnino vanum fuit.</td>
<td>on the camps being established over against each other, what the Romans would hardly have dared to do, victorious as they had so often been, the Samnites ventured —such temerity does utter hopelessness beget, —that is, to assault the enemy's camp; and although their desperate enterprise did not fully succeed, still, it was not altogether futile.</td>
<td>VENIO</td>
<td>AD</td>
<td>SING.</td>
<td>FINEM</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.27.6</td>
<td>huius populationis fama Etruscos ex agro Sentinate ad suos finibus tuendos movit</td>
<td>The reports of this devastation drew off the Etruscans from the region of Sentinum to the defence of their own frontiers.</td>
<td>TUERE-MOVERE</td>
<td>AD</td>
<td>PLUR.</td>
<td>FINES</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>ETRUSCI</td>
<td>B&lt;sub&gt;5&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.47.6</td>
<td>Multis rebus laetus annus vix ad solacium unius mali, pestilentiae urenis simul urbem atque agros, suffecit; portento que iam similis clades erat, et libri aditi, quinam finis aut quod remedium eius mali ab diis daretur.</td>
<td>its devastation was now grown portentous, and the Books were consulted to discover what end or what remedy the gods proposed</td>
<td>DARE</td>
<td>SING.</td>
<td>FINIS</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.19.11</td>
<td>inde extemplo abire finibus Volcanorum iussi ab nullo deinde concilio Hispaniae benigniora verba tulere.</td>
<td>Being then bidden straightway to depart out of the borders of the Volciani, they received from that day forth no kinder response from any Spanish council. Accordingly, having traversed that country to no purpose, they passed over into Gaul.</td>
<td>ABIRE</td>
<td>PLUR.</td>
<td>FINIBUS</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>VOLCIANI</td>
<td>B&lt;sub&gt;5&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.25.13</td>
<td>Finis et Gallis territandi et pavendi fuit Romanis, ut e saltu invio atque impedito evasere.</td>
<td>The alarming onsets of the Gauls and the panic of the Romans ended when they got clear of the tracklesswoods and thickets.</td>
<td>SING.</td>
<td>Gallis</td>
<td>FINIS</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASSAGE</td>
<td>TEXT</td>
<td>TRANSLATION</td>
<td>VERB</td>
<td>PREPOS.</td>
<td>GENRE</td>
<td>DECL.</td>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>LINK</td>
<td>FINIS (TYPE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.30.11</td>
<td>proinde aut cederent animo atque virtute genti per eos dies totiens ab se victae aut itineris finem sperent campum interiacentem Tiberi ac moenibus Romanis.</td>
<td>their enterprise? Had Gauls once captured that which the Phoenician despaired of approaching? Then let them yield in spirit and manhood to a race which they had so often vanquished in the course of the last few days, or look to end their march in the field that lay between the Tiber and the walls of Rome.</td>
<td>SPERARE</td>
<td>SING.</td>
<td>FINEM</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>B₄</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.14.3</td>
<td>quod imperium crudele, ceterum prope necessarium cognitum ipso eventu est: cui enim parci potuit ex iis, qui aut inclusi cum coniugibus ac libris domos super se ipsos concremaverunt aut armati nullum ante finem pugnae quam morientes fecerunt?</td>
<td>Hannibal, deeming it no time to hesitate, when such an opportunity offered, attacked with all his strength and captured the city out of hand. He had given orders that all the grown inhabitants be put to the sword—a cruel command, but found in the upshot to have been well-nigh inevitable; for who could be spared of those who either shut themselves up with their wives and children and burned the houses over their own heads, or took arms and never gave over fighting till they died?</td>
<td>FACERE</td>
<td>ANTE</td>
<td>SING.</td>
<td>FINEM</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.36.3</td>
<td>ibi cum velut ad finem viae equites constissent, miranti Hannibali, quae res moraretur agmen, nuntiatur rupem inviam esse.</td>
<td>There the cavalry came to a halt, as though they had reached the end of the road, and as Hannibal was wondering what it could be that held the column back, word was brought to him that the cliff was impassable.</td>
<td>CONSTITUERE</td>
<td>AD</td>
<td>SING.</td>
<td>FINEM</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.20.5</td>
<td>sedato tandem fremitu resonsum legatis esse neque Romanorum in se meritum esse neque Carthaginiensem iniuriam, ob quae aut pro Romanis aut adversus Poenos sumunt arma;contra ea audire sese gentis suae homines agro finibusque Italiae pelli a populo Romano stipendium que pendere et cetera indigna pati.</td>
<td>When at last the uproar had been quelled, the Gauls made answer to the envoys that they owed the Romans no kindness nor the Carthaginians any grudge, to induce them to draw the sword in behalf of the former or against the latter; on the contrary, ?? they heard that men of their own race were being driven from the land and even out of the borders of Italy by the Roman People, and were paying tribute and suffering every other humiliation.</td>
<td>PLUR.</td>
<td>FINIBUS</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>ITALIA</td>
<td>B₇</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASSAGE</td>
<td>TEXT</td>
<td>TRANSLATION</td>
<td>VERB</td>
<td>PREPOS.</td>
<td>GENRE</td>
<td>DECL.</td>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>LINK</td>
<td>FINIS (TYPE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.24.5</td>
<td>et per nuntios quidem haec; ut vero reguli Gallorum castris ad liberrim</td>
<td>Thus far his emissaries. But when the Gallic chieftains, moving up their camp at once near liberr,</td>
<td>TRANSMITTERE</td>
<td>PER</td>
<td>PLUR.</td>
<td>FINES</td>
<td>218</td>
<td></td>
<td>B10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>extemplo motis haud gravate ad Poenum venerunt, capti donis cum bona pace exercitum per fines suos praeter Ruscinonem oppidum transmiserunt.</td>
<td>came, nothing loath, to the Phoenician, they were captivated by his gifts, and permitted the army to march unmolested through their borders and past the town of Ruscino.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.5.3</td>
<td>quibus oppugnandis quia haud dubie Romana arma movebantur, in Olcadum prius fines – ultra Hiberum ea gens in parte magis quam in dicione Carthaginiensem erat – induxit ut non petisses Saguntinos,</td>
<td>But since an attack on them must certainly provoke the Romans to hostile action, he marched first into the territory of the Olcades —a tribe living south of the Ebro, within the limits of the Carthaginians but not under their dominion—that he might appear not exercitum, to have aimed at the Saguntines but to have been sed rerum serie, finitimis domitis drawn into that war by a chain of events, as he gentibus, iungendo que tractus ad id bellum videri posset</td>
<td>INDUCERE</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>PLUR.</td>
<td>FINES</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>OLCADES</td>
<td>B5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>que medius inter imperia duorum populorum libertas servaretur.</td>
<td>he conquered the neighbouring nations and annexed their territories.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.2.7</td>
<td>cum hoc Hasdrubale, quia mirae artis in sollicitandis gentibus imperio que suo iungendis fuerat, foedus renovaverat populus Romanus, ut finis utrisque imperii esset annis Hiberum Saguntinis que medius inter imperia duorum populorum libertas servaretur.</td>
<td>With this Hasdrubal, because of the marvellous skill which he had shown in tempting the native tribes to join his empire, the Roman People had renewed their covenant, with the stipulation that neither side should extend its dominion beyond the Ebro, while the Saguntines, situated between the empires of the two peoples, should be preserved in independence.</td>
<td>ESSE</td>
<td>SING.</td>
<td>FINIS</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>IMPERIUM</td>
<td>B9</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.7.4</td>
<td>Hannibal infesto exercitu ingressus finis pervastatis passim agris urbem tripertito adgreditur.</td>
<td>Crossing their borders with a hostile army Hannibal laid waste their country far and wide and advanced in three divisions against their city. There was an angle of the wall that gave on a valley more open and more level than the other ground about the town.</td>
<td>INGRIDIRE</td>
<td>PLUR.</td>
<td>FINES</td>
<td>219</td>
<td></td>
<td>B4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.56.7</td>
<td>finis insequendi hostis Poenis flumen Trebia fuit, et ita torpentes gelu in castra rediere, ut vix laetitiam victoriae sentirent.</td>
<td>The Phoenicians pursued their enemies no further than to the river Trebia, and got back to camp so benumbed and chilled as hardly to feel the joy of victory.</td>
<td>ESSE</td>
<td>SING.</td>
<td>FINIS</td>
<td>218</td>
<td></td>
<td>B1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASSAGE</td>
<td>TEXT</td>
<td>TRANSLATION</td>
<td>VERB</td>
<td>PREPOS.</td>
<td>GENRE</td>
<td>DECL.</td>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>LINK</td>
<td>FINIS (TYPE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.60.1</td>
<td>Ubi <em>finem</em> fecit, extemplo ab ea turba quae in comitio erat clamor flebilis est sublatus, manus que ad curiam tendebant orantes, ut sibi liberos, fratres, cognatos redderent.</td>
<td>As soon as he had finished speaking, the throng in the Comitium began to utter doleful cries, and holding out their hands to the Curia besought the senators to give them back their sons, their brothers, and their kinsmen.</td>
<td>FACERE</td>
<td>SING.</td>
<td>FINEM</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.47.4</td>
<td><em>sub equestris finem</em> certaminis coorta est peditum pugna, primo et vinbus et anmis par, dum constabant ordines Gallis Hispanis que: tandem Romani, diu ac saepe conisi, aequa fronte acie que densa inpulere hostium cuneum nimis tenuem eo que parum validum, a cetera prominentem acie.</td>
<td>Towards the end of the cavalry engagement the infantry got into action. At first they were evenly matched in strength and courage, as long as the Gauls and Spaniards maintained their ranks; but at last the Romans, by prolonged and frequent efforts, pushing forward with an even front and a dense line, drove in the wedge-like formation which projected from the enemy's line, for it was too thin to be strong;</td>
<td>ESSE</td>
<td>SING.</td>
<td>FINEM</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.57.4</td>
<td><em>hoc nefas</em> cum inter tot, ut fit, clades in prodigium versum esset, decemviri libros adire iussi sunt, et Q. Fabius Pictor Delphos ad oraculum missus est sciscitatum, quibus precibus supplicis que deos possent placare et quaenam futura <em>finis</em> tantis cladibus foret.</td>
<td>Since in the midst of so many misfortunes this pollution was, as happens at such times, converted into a portent, the decemvirs were commanded to consult the Books, and Quintus Fabius Pictor was dispatched to Delphi, to enquire of the oracle with what prayers and supplications they might propitiate the gods, and what would be the end of all their calamities.</td>
<td>FORE</td>
<td>SING.</td>
<td>FINIS</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.34.7</td>
<td>id foedus inter omnes nobiles ictum, nec <em>finem</em> ante belli habituros quam consulem vere plebeium, id est hominem novum, fecissent;</td>
<td>After that the consuls had employed the arts of Fabius to prolong the war, when they were able to have ended it.</td>
<td>FACERE</td>
<td>SING.</td>
<td>FINEM</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.27.1</td>
<td><em>Postquam neque elicere Poenum ad certamen obversati castris poterant neque castrorum oppugnatio facilis erat, urbem Ascuam, quo <em>finem</em> hostium ingrediens Hasdrubal frumentum commenatus qua alios convexerat, vi capiunt omni que circa agro potiuntur; nec iam aut in agmine aut in castris ullo imperio continerit.</em></td>
<td>After the Tartesii had repeatedly failed to draw the Carthaginian out to battle by facing his camp, and it was also not easy to assault the camp, they took by storm the city of Ascuia, to which Hasdrubal, on entering the land of the enemy, had brought grain and other supplies;</td>
<td>INGREDIRE</td>
<td>PLUR.</td>
<td>FINES</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>ASCUA IMPERIUM</td>
<td>B6 B9 B10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASSAGE</td>
<td>TEXT</td>
<td>TRANSLATION</td>
<td>VERB</td>
<td>PREPOS.</td>
<td>GENRE</td>
<td>DECL.</td>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>LINK</td>
<td>FINIS (TYPE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.58.9</td>
<td>ubi Romam venire eos nuntiatum est, Carthaloni obviam lictor missus, qui dictatoris verbis nuntiaret, ut ante noctem excederet finibus Romanis.</td>
<td>When the news reached Rome that they were coming, a lictor was sent to meet Carthalo on the way and warn him in the name of the Dictator to depart before nightfall out of Roman territory.</td>
<td>EXCEDERE</td>
<td>PLUR.</td>
<td>FINIBUS</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>ROMANIS</td>
<td>B₈</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.37.11</td>
<td>pulsus finibus Lucanis Hanno retro in Bruttios sese recepit.</td>
<td>He slew above two thousand men, and captured two hundred and eighty soldiers and some forty-one military standards. Driven out of Lucanian territory, Hanno withdrew into the land of the Bruttians.</td>
<td>RECEPIRE</td>
<td>PLUR.</td>
<td>FINIBUS</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>LUCANI</td>
<td>B₄</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.42.10</td>
<td>nunc propraetoris unius et parvi ad tuendam Nolam praesidii praeda sumus; iam ne manipulatim quidem sed latronum modo percursant totis finibus nostris neglegentius, quam si in Romano vagarentur agro.</td>
<td>Already they roam over our whole territory, not even in maniples, but after the manner of brigands, with less caution than if they were wandering in the country around Rome.</td>
<td></td>
<td>PLUR.</td>
<td>FINIBUS</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>NOSTRI (ROMANUS)</td>
<td>B₄</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.1.6</td>
<td>ubi fines Neapolitanorum intravit, Numidas partim in insidiis – et pleraeque cavae sunt viae sinus que occulti –, quamque apte poterat, dispositio, alios praes actam praedam ex agris ostentantis obequitare portis iussit</td>
<td>On entering the territory of the p.Neapolitans, he stationed some of the Numidians in ambush, wherever he conveniently could (and most of the roads are deep-cut and the turnings concealed). Other Numidians he ordered to ride up to the gates, making a display of the booty they were driving along before them from the farms.</td>
<td>INTRARE</td>
<td>PLUR.</td>
<td>FINES</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>NEAPOLITANS</td>
<td>B₆</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.28.7</td>
<td>Decreta Carthaginiensium et Hasdrubalis iter ubi ad Romanos sunt perlata, omnibus ommissis rebus ambo duces lunctis copis ire obviam coepit atque obsistere parant, rati, si Hannibali, vix per se ipsi tolerando Italiae hosti, Hasdrubal dux atque Hispaniensis exercitus esset lunctus, illum finem Romani imperi fore.</td>
<td>Therefore he exacted money in haste and came down to the Hiberus. When news of the decrees of the Carthaginians and Hasdrubal’s expedition reached the Roman commanders, both dropped everything, and uniting their forces prepared to meet and resist his efforts, thinking ?? that if Hannibal, who was himself an enemy Italy could scarcely endure, should be joined by Hasdrubal as a general and by an army from Spain, that would be the end of the Roman power.</td>
<td>FORE</td>
<td>SING.</td>
<td>FINEM</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>ROMANI IMPERII</td>
<td>B₉</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
23.6.5 postremo vincit sententia plurium, ut idem legati, qui ad consulem Romanum ierant, ad Hannibalem mitterentur; priusquam iretur certum que defectionis consilium esset, Romam legatos missos a Campanis in quibusdam annalibus invenio postulantes, ut alter consul Campanus fieret, si rem Romanam adiuvari vellent; indignatione orta summoveri a curia iussos esse missum quo dictorem, qui ex urbe educeret eos atque eo die manere extra fines Romanos iuberet. But action was postponed for a few days by the weighty advice of the older men. Finally the view of the majority prevailed, that the same legates who had gone to the Roman consul should be sent to Hannibal. Before they went to him and before the plan to revolt was settled upon, I find in some of the annals that legates were sent to Rome by the Campanians with the demand that, if they wished them to aid the Roman state, one of the consuls should be a Campanian; that resentment was aroused and the legates were ordered to be removed from the Senate House, and that a lictor was sent to lead them out of the city and bid them lodge that night outside of Roman territory.

23.42.9 magni dictatores cum magistris equitum, bini consules cum binis consularibus exercitibus ingrediebant fines nostros; ante explorato et subsidis positis et sub signis ad populandum ducebant: After first reconnoitring and posting reserves, and in regular array they would lead out for a raid. But now we are the prey of a single propraetor and a small garrison assigned to the defence of Nola.

24.22.13 ibi in aram Concordiae, ex qua pridie Polyaenus contionatus erat, escendit orationem qua eam orsus est, qua primum cunctationis suae veniam petivit: se enim clausas habuisse portas non separatem suas res a publicis, sed strictis semel gladiis timentem, qui finis caelibus esset futurus, utrum, quod satis libertati[s] forret, contenti nece tyranni essent, an, quicumque aut propinquitate aut adfinitate aut aliquis ministeriis regiam contigissent, alienae culpae rei trucidarentur. On the following day at dawn he opened the gates of the Island and came to the market-place of Achradina. There he mounted the altar of Concord, from which Polyaenus had addressed the people the day before, and began a speech in which he first begged pardon for his hesitation. For he had kept the gates closed, he said, not that he wished to separate his cause from that of the people, but because he feared what limit there would be to slaughter, when words should once be drawn;
24.29.1 DIES HAUD ITA MULTI INTERCESSERUNT, CUM EX LEONTINIS LEGATI PRAESIDIUM FINIBUS SUIS ORANTES VENERUNT [l]; QUAE LEGATIO PEROPPORTUNA VISA AD MULTIDUMEN INCONDITAM AC TUMULTUOSAM EXONERANDAM DUces QUE Eius ABLEGANDOS.

Not many days had elapsed, when ambassadors from Leontini arrived, pleading for a force to defend their territory. The request of this embassy seemed very timely for the purpose of relieving the city of a disorderly and turbulent multitude and of sending away its leaders.

24.44.4 PROROGATA IMPERIA PROVINCEAE QUE, M. COMMANDES AND ASSIGNMENTS WERE CONTINUED AS FOLLOWS: FOR MARCUS CLAUDIUS SICILY, WITH THE BOUNDARIES WHICH Hiero’s kingdom had had; for Publius Lentulus, as propraetor, the old province; for Titus Ocatilius the fleet; and for them new armies were not added. So also for Marcus Valerius Greece and Macedonia, with the legion and the fleet which he had; for Quintus Mucius Sardinia, with its old army — there were two legions; for Gaius Terentius one legion which he already commanded, and Picenum.

24.32.8 NOX CAEDIBUS FINEM FECIT.

Thus Achradina also is taken by assault, and all the magistrates, except those who escaped in the midst of the uproar, are slain. Night put an end to the slaughter.

25.11.10 IS QUE FINIS HANNIBALI FUIT EA PARTE ARCEM OPPUGNANDI.

Hannibal summoned the leading men of Tarentum and laid before them all the difficulties of the situation, saying that he neither saw a way to take so well fortified
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PASSAGE</th>
<th>TEXT</th>
<th>TRANSLATION</th>
<th>VERB</th>
<th>PREPOS.</th>
<th>GENRE</th>
<th>DECL. CASE</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>LINK</th>
<th>FINIS (TYPE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25.23.1</td>
<td>XXIII. Cum maxume Capua circumvallaretur, Syracusarum oppugnatio ad finem venit, praeterquam vi ac virtute ducis exercitus que, intestina etiam proditione adiuta.</td>
<td>Just as Capua was being encircled the siege of Syracuse came to an end, expedited not only by the vigour and valour of the general and the army but also by treachery within.</td>
<td>VENIRE</td>
<td>AD</td>
<td>SING.</td>
<td>FINEM</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 24.7.8  | incerto rerum statu Ap Claudius bellum oriens ex propinquo cum cerneret, senatum litteris certiorem fecit Siciliam Carthaginensi populo et Hannibali conciliari; ipse adversus Syracusana consilia <ad> provinciae regni que fines omnia convertit praesidia | In the unsettled state of affairs Appius Claudius, seeing a war beginning near at hand, informed the senate by letter that Sicily was being won over to the Carthaginian people and Hannibal. For his own part, to meet the schemes of the Syracusans, he concentrated all his garrisons on the frontier between the province and the kingdom. | CONVERTERE | PLUR. | FINES | 215 | B 
<p>| 25.5.10 | Cannensis reliquiae clads hic exercitus erat, relegatus in Siciliam, sicut ante dictum est, ne ante Punici belli finem in Italiam reportarentur. | At the same time a letter from Marcus Marcellus in Sicily was read in the senate concerning demands of the soldiers serving under Publius Lentulus. This army was the remnant of the disaster at Cannae, and, as has been said above, was relegated to Sicily, not to be brought back to Italy before the end of the Punic War. | REPORTARE | SING. | FINEM | 212 | A |
| 25.6.19 | neque ignominiae finem nec virtutis praemium petimus; modo experiri animum, et virtutem exercere liceat. | It is neither an end of our disgrace nor a reward for our courage that we ask. Only let us prove our spirit and put our courage into practice. It is for hardship and danger we are asking, that we may do the duty of men and soldiers. | PETERE | SING. | FINEM | 212 | A |
| 26.1.10 | huic generi militum senatus eundem quem Cannensibus finem statuerat militiae. | for this class of soldier the senate had established the same term of service as for the men who were at Cannae. | STATUERE | SING. | FINEM | 211 | A |
| 26.17.10 | addita insequensnox spatium dedit et alios emittendi; nec postero die an end. | and on the following day the business did not reach res finem inuenit. | INVENIRE | SING. | FINEM | 211 | A |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PASSAGE</th>
<th>TEXT</th>
<th>TRANSLATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26.25.1</td>
<td>itaque quia primo uere moturus exercitum in Graeciam erat, Illyrios finitimas que eis urbes ab tergo metu quietas ut Macedonia haberet, expeditionem subitam in Oriconorum atque Apolloniatium fines fecit, egressos que Apolloniatas cum magno terrore ac pauore compulsit intra muros</td>
<td>as Philip was wintering at Pella, the estrangement of the Aetolians was reported to him. Accordingly, because he intended at the beginning of spring to move his army into Greece, in order that Macedonia should keep the Illyrians in her rear and the cities near them intimidated, he made a sudden incursion into the territories of Oricum and Apollonia, and when the Apollonians came out of their city, he drove them inside their walls, causing great panic and alarm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.25.15</td>
<td>per haec incitatis animis castra in extremis finibus suis obua hosti posuerunt.</td>
<td>having aroused their spirits by these means, they pitched camp facing the enemy at their very frontier.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.25.16</td>
<td>Aetolorum impetum tardauerat primo coniurationis fama Acarnanicae; deinde auditus Philippi aduentus regredi etiam in intimos coegit fines</td>
<td>the Aetolians’ attack was delayed at first by the report of the oath of the Acarnanians, and then news of Philip’s approach forced them to retire far back into the interior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.46.10</td>
<td>quoad dedita arx est, caedes tota urbe passim factae, nec uili puberum qui obuius fuit parcebatur; tum signo dato caedibus finis factus.</td>
<td>until the surrender of the citadel there was slaughter everywhere throughout the city, and they did not spare any adult who met them. Then the signal was given and an end was made of slaughter. The victors turned to the spoils, which were immense and of every kind.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.1.6</td>
<td>Prorogatum et M. Marcello ut pro consule in Sicilia reliqua belli periferet eo exercitu quem haberet: si supplemento opus esset, suppleret de legionibus quibus Cornelius pro praetore in Sicilia praesesset, dum ne quem militem legeret ex eo numero quibus senatus missionem reditum que in patriam negasset ante belli finem.</td>
<td>the command of Marcus Marcellus also was continued, that as proconsul in Sicily he might finish the remainder of the war with the army which he had; if he should need reinforcements, he should provide them from the legions which Publius Cornelius, the propraetor, ?? commanded in Sicily, provided he did not enlist any soldier from the number of those to whom the senate had refused a discharge and a return to their home towns before the end of the war.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VERB</th>
<th>PREPOS.</th>
<th>GENRE</th>
<th>DECL.</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>LINK</th>
<th>FINIS (TYPE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FACERE</td>
<td>PLUR.</td>
<td>FINES 211</td>
<td>ORICINI / APOLLONIA</td>
<td>B6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PONERE</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>PLUR.</td>
<td>FINIBUS 211</td>
<td>EXTREMUS</td>
<td>B10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COAGERE</td>
<td>PLUR.</td>
<td>FINES 211</td>
<td>INTIMUS AETOLI</td>
<td>B5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACIO</td>
<td>SING.</td>
<td>FINIS 210</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEGARE</td>
<td>SING.</td>
<td>FINEM 211</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASSAGE</td>
<td>TEXT</td>
<td>TRANSLATION</td>
<td>VERB</td>
<td>PREPOS.</td>
<td>GENRE</td>
<td>DECL.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.14.12</td>
<td>tum in fugientes equitatum immittit Marcellus, nec ante finis sequendi est factus quam in castra pauentes compulsi sunt.</td>
<td>Then, as they fled, Marcellus sent his cavalry against them, and pursuit did not end until in alarm they were driven into their camp.</td>
<td>SEQUIRE</td>
<td>ANTE</td>
<td>SING.</td>
<td>FINIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.32.1</td>
<td>profecti ab Dymis coniuncto exercitu transeunt Larisum amnem, qui Eleum agrum ab Dymaeo dirimit. Primum diem quo fines hostium ingressi sunt populando absumperunt; postero die acie instructa ad urbem accesserunt, praemissis equitibus qui obequitando portis promptum ad excursions genus lacesserent Aetolorum</td>
<td>Setting forth from Dymae and uniting their armies, they crossed the river Larisus, which separates the Elean territory from that of Dymae. The first day on which they entered the territory of the enemy they spent in devastation. On the next day, drawing up a battle-line, they approached the city, after sending the cavalry in advance; it was to ride up to the gates and provoke the Aetolians, a race of men alert for sallies.</td>
<td>INGREDIRE</td>
<td>PLUR.</td>
<td>FINES</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.35.10</td>
<td>prouinciae iis non permixtæ regionibus sicut superioribus annibus, sed diversæ extremis Italie finibus, alteri aduersus Hannibalem Bruttii Lucani, alteri Gallia aduersus Hasdrubalem, quem iam Alpibus adpropinquare fama erat, decreta.</td>
<td>The provinces assigned to them were not locally indistinguishable, as in the preceding years, but separated by the whole length of Italy. To the one was assigned the land of the Bruttii and Lucania facing Hannibal, to the other Gaul facing Hasdrubal, who was reported to be already nearing the Alps. Whichever of them should receive Gaul in the allotment was to choose the army he preferred out of the two that were in Gaul and in Etruria and the one at the city.</td>
<td>PLUR.</td>
<td>FINIBUS</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>EXTREMUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.40.10</td>
<td>Priusquam Claudius consul in prouinciam perueniret, per extremum finem agri Tarentini ducentem in Sallentinios exercitum Hannibalem expeditis cohortibus adortus C. Hostilius Tubulus incomposito agmini terribilem tumultum intulit; ad quattuor milia hominum occidit, nouem signa militaria cepit.</td>
<td>Before Claudius, the consul, reached his province, as Hannibal was leading his army along the very border of the territory of … into the country of the Sallentini, Gaius Hostilius Tubulus with cohorts unencumbered by baggage attacked him and caused terrible confusion in the straggling column.</td>
<td>ADHORTERE</td>
<td>SING.</td>
<td>FINEM</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASSAGE</td>
<td>TEXT</td>
<td>TRANSLATION</td>
<td>VERB</td>
<td>PREPOS.</td>
<td>GENRE</td>
<td>DECL.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.20.4</td>
<td>ibi conferentibus quid in cuiusque provinciae regione animorum Hispanis esset, unus Hasdrubal Gisgonis ultimam Hispaniae oram quae ad Oceanum et Gades uergit ignaram adhuc Romanorum esse, eo que Carthaginiensibus satis fidam in consequence sufficiently loyal to the censebat; inter Hasdrubalem alterum et Magonem constat beneficiis Scipionis occupatos omnium animos publice priuatim que esse, nec transitionibus finem ante fore quam omnes Hispani milites aut in ultima Hispaniae amoti aut traducti in Galliam forent.</td>
<td>There, as they were exchanging information concerning the spirit of the Spaniards in the territory assigned to each of them, Hasdrubal, the son of Gisco, was alone of the opinion that the most remote part of Spain, which extends toward the Ocean and Gades, was still unacquainted with the Romans and in consequence sufficiently loyal to the Carthaginians. The other Hasdrubal and Mago agreed that, both as states and as individuals, all men were prepossessed owing to the favours of Scipio; and there would be no end to desertions until all the Spanish soldiers had been either segregated in the farthest part of Spain, or led over into Gaul.</td>
<td>FORE</td>
<td>SING.</td>
<td>FINEM</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.43.5</td>
<td>qui ubi ad consulem peruenerunt litterae At the same time two troops of Samnites were sent que lectae per interpretam sunt et ex as an escort. When they had reached the consul, captivis percontatio facta, tum Claudius non id tempus esse rei publicae ratus quo consiliis ordinatis, provinciae suae quisque finibus, per exercitus suos cum hoste destinato ab senatu bellum gereret – audendum ac nouandum aliquid improuium, inopinatum, quod coeptum non minorem apud ciues quam hostes terorem faceret, perpetratum in magnam laetitiam ex magno metu uerteret.</td>
<td>At the same time two troops of Samnites were sent as an escort. When they had reached the consul, and the letter had been read by an interpreter and the captives questioned, Claudius thereupon judged that the situation of the state was not such that they should carry on the war by routine methods, each consul within the bounds of his own province, operating with his own armies against an enemy prescribed by the senate.</td>
<td>PLUR.</td>
<td>FINIBUS</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASSAGE</td>
<td>TEXT</td>
<td>TRANSLATION</td>
<td>VERB</td>
<td>PREPOS.</td>
<td>GENRE</td>
<td>DECL.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.8.16</td>
<td>altero L. Cincium partem insulae, qua regnum Hieronis fuerat, tueri iussit; altero ipse ceteram insulam tuebatur diuisam quondam Romani Punici que imperii finibus, classe quoque nauium septuaginta partita ut omni ambitu litorum praesidio orae maritimae essent.</td>
<td>Having attached these foreign auxiliary forces to each of the Roman legions, he preserved the appearance of two armies. With the one he ordered Lucius Cincius to defend that part of the island where had been the kingdom of Hiero; with the other he himself defended the rest of the island, formerly divided by the boundaries between the Roman and the Punic empires. The fleet also of seventy ships was divided, so that they might protect the seacoast around its entire circuit.</td>
<td>DIVIDERE</td>
<td>PLUR.</td>
<td>FINIBUS</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.17.9</td>
<td>per omnia pacata eunti, ut cuiusque populi finis transiret prosequentibus excipientibus sociis, Indibilis et Mandonius cum suis copiis occurrerunt</td>
<td>As Scipio was passing through an entirely peaceful region, while allies escorted and welcomed him whenever he crossed the boundary of a tribe, Indibilis and Mandonius with their forces met him.</td>
<td>TRANSIRE</td>
<td>PLUR.</td>
<td>FINES</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.17.10</td>
<td>Magnum in omnia momentum Syphax adfecianti res Africæ erat, opulentissimus eius terræ rex, bello iam expertus ipsos Carthaginienses, finibus etiam regni apte ad Hispaniam, quod freto exiguo dirimuntur, positis.</td>
<td>A factor of great importance in every respect for a man planning an attack upon Africa was Syphax, the richest king in that land and one who had already gained experience even of the Carthaginians in war, while boundaries of his kingdom were also well situated with reference to Spain in being separated from it by a narrow strait only.</td>
<td>PONERE</td>
<td>PLUR.</td>
<td>FINIBUS</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.25.11</td>
<td>tranquillam seditionem iam per se languescentem repentina quies rebellantium Hispanorum fecit; redierant enim in fines omissos incepto Mandonius et Indibilis, postquam uiuere Scipionem allatum est</td>
<td>For Mandonius and Indibilis had abandoned their project and retired to their borders when they had news that Scipio was alive. Nor was there either a fellow-citizen or foreigner any longer with whom the soldiers might share their madness.</td>
<td>REDERE</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>PLUR.</td>
<td>FINES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.29.12</td>
<td>hunc finem exitum que seditio militum coepta apud Sucronem habuit.</td>
<td>Such was the end and outcome of the mutiny of the soldiers which began at Sucro.</td>
<td>SING.</td>
<td>FINEM</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.3.3</td>
<td>sita in Maesessum finibus est, Bastetanae gentis ager frugifer; argentum etiam incolae fodiunt.</td>
<td>It is situated in the territory of the Maesesses, a Bastetanian tribe. Its land is fruitful; the inhabitants mine silver also.</td>
<td>ESSE</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>PLUR.</td>
<td>FINIBUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.22.4</td>
<td>magnum etiam comitatum, quia paucis parum tutum fuerat, transgredientem finis positis insidias circumuentum iniquo loco interfecerant</td>
<td>Even a caravan — large because there had been too little safety for small numbers — crossing their territory had been entrapped in an unfavourable spot by an ambuscade and cut to pieces.</td>
<td>TRANSGREDIRE</td>
<td>PLUR.</td>
<td>FINES</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASSAGE</td>
<td>TEXT</td>
<td>TRANSLATION</td>
<td>VERB</td>
<td>PREPOS.</td>
<td>GENRE</td>
<td>DECL. CASE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.44.2</td>
<td>multum interest alienos populere fines an tuos uri, excsindi uideas; plus animi est inferenti periculum quam propulsanti</td>
<td>A great difference it makes whether you are seeing the land of others ravaged or your own being burned over and devastated. More spirit has an aggressor than a defender.</td>
<td>POPULERE</td>
<td>PLUR.</td>
<td>FINES</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.44.3</td>
<td>ad hoc maior ignotarum rerum est terror; bona mala que hostium ex propinquo, ingressus fines adspicias</td>
<td>More spirit has an aggressor than a defender. Besides there is greater dread of things unknown; on entering the territory of the enemy you have a near view of their advantages and disadvantages. (!!)</td>
<td>INGRESIRE</td>
<td>PLUR.</td>
<td>FINES</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.7.10</td>
<td>et Attalus primo Oreum se recepit: inde, cum fama accidisset Prusian, Bithyniae regem, in fines regni sui transgressum, adspicias</td>
<td>Attalus also retired at first to Oreum; and then, when the report reached him that Prusias, King of Bithynia, had crossed into territory belonging to his kingdom, he sailed over to Asia, forsaking the Roman cause and the Aetolian war.</td>
<td>TRANGREDIRE</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>PLUR.</td>
<td>FINES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.31.5</td>
<td>Mandonius et Indibilis in fines regressi paulisper, dum quidnam de seditione statueretur scirent, suspensi quieuerunt, si ciuium errori ignosceretur non diffidentes sibi quoque ignosci posse</td>
<td>Mandonius and Indibilis returned into their own territory and for a time remained quietly on the alert, until they should know what decision was reached in regard to the mutiny, not without confidence that, if a misunderstanding on the part of Roman citizens should be pardoned, they themselves also might possibly be pardoned.</td>
<td>REGREDIRE</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>PLUR.</td>
<td>FINES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.4.5</td>
<td>extremis finibus Cartaginiensium circa ipsa moenia Vitiae praedae actae sunt</td>
<td>The same year a Roman fleet under Marcus Valerius Laevinus, the proconsul, was sent over from Sicily to Africa, and in the territory of Utica and Carthage they ravaged the country far and wide. Along the edge of the Carthaginian territory, close to the very walls of Utica, booty was carried off.</td>
<td>ESSE</td>
<td>PLUR.</td>
<td>FINIBUS</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.5.5</td>
<td>nec Acamanes solum Boeoti que et qui Euboearm incolunt in magno metu erant, sed Achaii quoque, quos super Aetolicum bellum Machanidas etiam, Lacedaemonius tyrannus, haud procul Argiuorum fine positis castris terrebat</td>
<td>The inhabitants of Euboea greatly alarmed but also the Achaeans, who in addition to the Aetolian war were further terrified by Machanidas, tyrant of Sparta, who had pitched his camp not far from the Argive frontier.</td>
<td>PONERE</td>
<td>SING.</td>
<td>FIN</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.29.9</td>
<td>Vix finem dicendi fecerat cum ex praeparato simul omnium rerum terror oculis auribus que est offusus.</td>
<td>Scarcely had he made an end of speaking when, in accordance with previous orders, their eyes and ears were assailed by terrifying sights and sounds everywhere.</td>
<td>FACERE</td>
<td>SING.</td>
<td>FINEM</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
29.12.12 primus Philippus praetor uerba fecit et petit simul ab rege et ab imperatore Romano ut finem belli facerent darent que eam Epirotis ueniam.

The first to speak was Philip, the magistrate, begging the king and at the same time the Roman general to make an end of the war and grant that favour to the Epirotes.


Although Africa had not been openly assigned as a province, while the senators kept the matter dark, I believe, for fear the Carthaginians might know in advance, nevertheless the people were aroused to hope that the war would be waged that year in Africa, and that the end of the Punic war was at hand.

29.31.0 instando stimulando que peruincit ut exercitum ad fines Maesuliorum admovet, atque in agro de quo saepe cum Gala non uerbis modo disceptatum sed etiam armis certatum fuerat, tamquam haud dubie iuris sui, castra locet

By insisting and goading him on Hasdrubal brought him to the point of advancing his army to the frontier of the Maesulians and pitching his camp as though upon soil to which he was unquestionably entitled—land concerning which he had not only argued with Gala repeatedly but had contended also in arms.

28.8.6 reddidit inde Achaeis Heraeum et Triphyliam, Alipheram autem Megalopolitis, quod suorum fuisse finium satis probabant, restituit

The allies rejoiced when they listened to the king. Thereupon he delivered Heraea and Triphylia to the Achaeans, but restored Aliphēra to Megalopolis, because the citizens of the latter gave sufficient proofs that it had belonged to their territory.

28.20.2 qui enim conuenire, quem modo ciuitas iuuem admodum unum recuperandae Hispaniae delegent ducem, quem recepta ab hostibus Hispania ad imponendum Punico bello finem creauerit consulem, spe destinauerit Hannibalem ex Italia retracturum,

then, after Spain had been rewon from the enemy, elected him consul to put an end to the Punic war, and counted upon him to draw Hannibal out of Italy and to conquer Africa.
29.32.14 quattuor equitum ad eum confluerent, iam que non in possessione modo paterni regni esset, sed etiam socios Carthaginensium populos Masaesuliorum que fines – id Syphaxis regnum erat – vastaret. The results were that within a few days six thousand armed foot-soldiers and four thousand horsemen flocked to him, and that now he was not merely in possession of his father’s kingdom but was even laying waste lands of allies of the Carthaginians and those of the Masaesulians, the kingdom, that is, of Syphax. Consequently, having provoked Syphax to war, he established himself between Cirta and Hippo on a mountain range that in every way was favourable.

29.13.4 et M. Livio et Sp. Lucretio cum binis legionibus quibus aduersus Magonem Galliae praesidio fuissent prorogatum imperium est; et Cn. Octaviio ut, cum Sardiniam legionem que Ti. Claudio tradidisset, ipse naubis longis quadraginta maritimam oram, quibus finibus senatus censuisset, tutaretur. Marcus Livius also and Spurius Lucretius had their commands continued, with two legions each to defend Gaul against Mago. So Gnaeus Octavius also, with the order that, after turning over Sardinia and the legion to Tiberius Claudius, his duty should be the defence of the sea-coast with forty war-ships within an area to be defined by the senate.

29.30.3 cum iis praemisso nuntio ad paternos suos que amicos cum ad fines regni peruenisset, quingenti ferme Numidae ad eum conuenuerunt. When with that escort, after first sending word to his father’s friends and his own, he had reached the frontier of the kingdom, about five hundred Numidians joined him.

29.10.7 in eiusdem spei summam conferebant P Scipionis uelut praesagientem animum de fine belli quod depoposcisset prouinciam Africam. To the facts supporting that same hope the senators added Publius Scipio’s state of mind, virtually forecasting the end of the war, in that he demanded Africa as his province.

29.5.6 Galli summam ad id suam voluntatem esse dice; sed cum una castra Romana intra fines, altera in finitima terra Etruria prope in conspectu habeant, si palam fiat auxilis adiutum ab se esse Poenum, exemplo infestos utrimque exercitus in agrum suum incursuros. The Gauls said that they were entirely willing to do so, but that since they had almost before their eyes one Roman camp within their borders and another in the neighbouring land of Etruria, if it should become known that they had aided the Carthaginian by furnishing auxiliaries, forthwith hostile armies would invade their territory from both directions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PASSAGE</th>
<th>TEXT</th>
<th>TRANSLATION</th>
<th>VERB</th>
<th>PREPOS.</th>
<th>GENRE</th>
<th>DECL.</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>LINK</th>
<th>FINIS (TYPE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30.1.10</td>
<td>Scipioni non temporis sed rei gerendae fine, donec debellatum in Africa foret, prorogatum imperium est;</td>
<td>Publius Scipio’s command was prolonged, not for a fixed time but to the completion of his task, until the war in Africa should be over.</td>
<td>GERERE</td>
<td>SING.</td>
<td>FINE</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>IMPERIUM</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.32.9</td>
<td>is finis Bucari sequendi fuit, nec ingredi flumen auso nec habere credenti se iam quem sequeretur.</td>
<td>That was the end of pursuit for Bucar, as he did not dare enter the river and believed he had no one left to pursue.</td>
<td>SEQUIRE</td>
<td>SING.</td>
<td>FINIS</td>
<td>204</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.32.10</td>
<td>adesse finem belli ac laboris; in manibus esse praedam Carthaginis, reditum domum in patriam ad parentes liberos coniuges penates que deos.</td>
<td>The end of the war and hardship was at hand, he said, the spoils of Carthage within reach, and the return home to their native city, to parents, children, wives and household gods.</td>
<td>ADESSE</td>
<td>SING.</td>
<td>FINEM</td>
<td>202</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.37.2</td>
<td>populandi que finem eo die Romanus faceret.</td>
<td>Whereupon the peace terms were stated to them: they were to live as free men under their own laws; to hold the cities and territories which they had held before the war, with the same boundaries.</td>
<td>FACERE</td>
<td>SING.</td>
<td>FINEM</td>
<td>202</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.37.2</td>
<td>quas urbes quosque quibusque finibus ante bellum tenuissent, tenerent;</td>
<td>Whereupon the peace terms were stated to them: they were to live as free men under their own laws; to hold the cities and territories which they had held before the war, with the same boundaries.</td>
<td>TEUERE</td>
<td>PLUR.</td>
<td>FINIBUS</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>B⁴</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.40.2</td>
<td>ubi cum L. Veturius Philo pugnatum cum Hannibale esse suprema Carthaginiensis belli finemque tandem lugubri bello impositum ingenti laetitia patrum exposuisse,</td>
<td>There Lucius Veturius Philo to the great joy of the senators set forth how they had fought with Hannibal in a battle that was for the Carthaginians their last, and that at length an end had been made of a war of grievous losses.</td>
<td>SING.</td>
<td>FINEM</td>
<td>202</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.30.4</td>
<td>tibi quoque inter multa egregia non in ultimis laudum hoc fuerit, Hannibalem, cui de tot Romanis ducibus victoriam di dedissent, tibi cessisse, te que huic bello uestris prius quam nostris cladibus insigni finem imposuisse.</td>
<td>For you also, among your many distinctions, it will prove not the least of your honours that Hannibal, to whom the gods have given the victory over so many Roman generals, has submitted to you, and that you have made an end of this war, which was memorable at first for your disasters and then for ours.</td>
<td>IMPONERE</td>
<td>SING.</td>
<td>FINEM</td>
<td>202</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
30.42.5 aduersus ea M. Furius, missus ad id ipsum ab Aurelio ex Macedonia, very purpose from Macedonia by Aurelius, disseruit Aurelium relictum ne socii order to prevent allies of the Roman people from atque iniuria ad regem being exhausted by raids and forced by acts of deficerent finibus sociorum non violence to go over to the king’s side; that he had not gone beyond the boundaries of the allies; that he fessi populationibus ui had exerted himself that raiders should not come atque iniuria ad regem deficerent; dedisse operam ne impune in agros eorum populatores transcenderent.

In reply Marcus Furius, who had been sent for the very purpose from Macedonia by Aurelius, maintained that Aurelius had been left behind in order to prevent allies of the Roman people from being exhausted by raids and forced by acts of violence to go over to the king’s side; that he had not gone beyond the boundaries of the allies; that he had exerted himself that raiders should not come over into the allies’ lands with impunity.

30.40.6 de prouincis consulum nihil ante placebat agi quam legati Philippi regis et Carthaginiensium auditi essent; bellum finem alius, principium alterius prospiciebant animis. As for the consuls’ provinces, the senators were not disposed to take up the matter until the envoys of King Philip and those of the Carthaginians had been heard. They foresaw the end of one war, the beginning of another.

30.28.8 Has formidines agitando animis, ipsi curas et metus augebant, etiam quod, cum adsuisset per aliquot annos bellum ante oculos alii atque alii in Italae partibus, lenta spe in nullum propinquum debellandi finem, gerere, erexerat omnium animos Scipio et Hannibal uelut ad supremum certamen comparati duces. By brooding over such terrifying thoughts men were adding to their own anxieties and fears, for another reason too: whereas year after year it had been their habit to carry on a war before their eyes in one part and then in another of Italy, with hope deferred and looking to no immediate end of the conflict, all men’s interest was now intensified by Scipio and Hannibal, as it were, pitted against each other for the final combat.

31.1.1 Me quoque iuuat, uelut ipse in parte laboris ac periculi fuerim, ad finem bellorum Punicorum periuenisse. I, too, feel as much relief in having reached the end of the Punic War as if I had taken a personal part in its toils and dangers.

31.2.11 qui nisi quod populatus est et cum Boiorum fines, et cum Ingaunis Liguribus foedus ict, nihil quadrat esset in provinciis alius in provinciis alius in provinciis alius in provinciis alius in provinciis alius in provinciis alius in provinciis return to Rome. Beyond ravaging the Boian country and making a league with the Ligurian Ingauni the consul did nothing worth mentioning in his province before his return to Rome.
31.26.11 | Per eos ipsos dies quibus Philippus in Achaia fuit Philocles praefectus regius, ex Euboea profectus cum duobus milibus Thracum Macedonum que ad depopulandos Atheniensium fines, regione Eleusinis saltum Cithaeronis transcendit |
| During this same period while Philip was in Achaea, his prefect Philocles left Euboea with two thousand Thracians and Macedonians to plunder the territory of the Athenians in the region of Eleusis, and crossed the pass of Cithaeron. |

31.27.13 | Consul Sulpicius eo tempore inter Apolloniam ac Dyrrachium ad Apsum flumen habebat castra, quo arcessitum L Apustium legatum cum parte copiarum ad depopulandos hostium fines mittit |
| The consul Sulpicius was at that time encamped along the Apsus river between Apollonia and Dyrrachium, and summoning to him there his lieutenant Lucius Apustius he sent him with part of the troops to ravage the enemy's country. |

31.43.1 | Per eos dies et Athenagoras regius praefectus Dardanos recipientes se in fines adeptus postremum agmen primo turbauit; dein, postquam Dardani conversis signis direxere aciem, aequa pugna iusto proelio erat |
| At the same time, moreover, Athenagoras, the king's prefect, overtaking the Dardani as they retired into their own country, threw the rear of the column into confusion; then, after the Dardani had faced about and formed their line, there was a regular battle on equal terms. |

31.19.5 | is ad primos fines regni legatis obuiam progressus, ut scriberent ipsi quas ullam pacem bonam iustam que fore sibi cum populo Romano |
| The third errand was to Vermina, who met the ambassadors at the frontier and left it to them to lay down terms of peace satisfactory to Rome, while for his own part he promised to maintain a just and lawful peace with the Roman people. |

31.33.4 | per Dassaretiorum fines exercitum ducebat, frumentum quod ex hibernis extulerat integrum uehens, quod in usum militi satis esset praebentibus agris |
| He was leading the army through the territory of the Dassareti, carrying with him untouched the grain he had brought from winter quarters, since the country supplied adequately the needs of the soldiers. |

31.30.5 | omnia sepulcra monumenta que diruta esse in finibus suis, omnium nudatos manes, nullius ossa terra tegi. |
| All the tombs and monuments in their land had been destroyed, the shades of all the dead left naked, no man's bones left with their covering of earth. |
31.2.7 Ampius ingressus hostium fines primo populationes satis prospere ac tuto fecit Ampius, after entering the enemy’s country, at first conducted raids with considerable success and without losses; then, choosing, near the fortified town of Mutilum, a camp-site suitable for reaping the crops—for the grain was now ripe

INGRESSO FACERE PLUR. FINES 201 BOII B5

31.8.2 suppliantio inde a consulibus in triduum ex senatus consulto indita est, obsecrati que circa omnia puluinaria die ut quod bellum cum Philippo populus iussisset, id bene ac feliciter ueniret; consulti que ab consule Sulpicio, bellum quod indiceretur regi Philippo utrum ipsi utique nuntiari iruberent, an satis esset in finibus regni quod proximum praesidium esset eo nuntiari.

A three-day period of supplication was then declared by the consuls on the authorization of the senate, and the gods were implored at all their seats, that this war which the people had declared upon Philip might succeed and prosper. The fetials were consulted by the consul whether they would direct that the declaration of war against King Philip be delivered to him in person, or whether it was sufficient to announce it at the first fortified post in his territory. The fetials replied that in whichever way he acted he would act correctly.

ESSE IN PLUR. FINIBUS 200 B3 B10

31.5.5. per eos dies opportune irritandis ad bellum animis et litterae ab M. Aurelio legato et M. Valerio Laeuno praetore adlatae, et Atheniensium nova legatio venit, quae regem adpropinquare finibus suis nuntiaret, breui que non agros modo sed urbem etiam in dicione eius futuram, nisi quid in Romanis auxilii foret.

In these days two things occurred opportune for arousing popular sentiment in favour of the war: the arrival of the dispatches from the commissioner Marcus Aurelius and Marcus Laevinus the praetor, and the coming of a new embassy from the Athenians, which brought word that the king was approaching their borders and that in a short time not only their farms but Athens itself would be in his power unless there should be some assistance from the Romans.

ADPROPINQUARE PLUR. FINIBUS 200 ATHENIENS B6
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PASSAGE</th>
<th>TEXT</th>
<th>TRANSLATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31.5.7</td>
<td>cum renuntiassent consules rem diuinam rite peractam esse, et precationi adnuisse deos haruspices respondere, laeta que exta fuisse, et prolationem finium victoriam que et triumphum portendi, tum litterae Valeri Aureli que lectae et legati Atheniensium auditl</td>
<td>When the consuls had reported that the sacrifices had been duly performed and that the gods had given approval to their prayers, that the soothsayers had given answer that the entrails were propitious and portended an extension of territory, victory, and a triumph, then the letters of Valerius and Aurelius were read and the Athenian embassy given audience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.10.12</td>
<td>multis hinc atque illinc uolneribus acceptis cum etiam, ut in proelio iusto, aliquot cecidissent, nox pugnae finem fecit.</td>
<td>When many had been wounded on both sides, and a considerable number had even fallen, as in a regular engagement, night put an end to the fighting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.27.1</td>
<td>Eodem anno legati ab rege Attalo coronam auream ducentum quadraginta sex pondo in Capitolio posuerunt, gratias que senatui egere quod Antiochus legatorum Romanorum auctoritate motus finibus Attali exercitum deduxisset.</td>
<td>In the same year ambassadors from King Attalus deposited on the Capitoline a golden crown of a weight of two hundred forty-six pounds, and expressed to the senate his gratitude because Antiochus, influenced by the authority of the Roman ambassadors, had withdrawn his army from the frontiers of Attalus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.31.1</td>
<td>Minucius consul primo effusis populationibus peragrauerat fines Boiorum; deinde, ut relictis Insubribus ad sua tuenda receperant sese, castris se tenuit, acie dimicandum cum hoste ratus</td>
<td>The consul Minucius had at first wandered far and wide through the country of the Boi, raiding in every direction, but later, when they had left the Insubres and returned to defend their possessions, – he remained in camp, thinking that he would fight a regular battle with the enemy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.4.2</td>
<td>ceterum incepto absistere eum coegit subitus Aetolorum aduentus, qui Archidamo duce inter custodias Macedonum moenia ingressi nec nocte nec die finem ullaem erumpendi nunc in stationes nunc in opera Macedonum faciebant.</td>
<td>but he was compelled to give up his enterprise by the sudden attack of the Aetolians, who, under the command of Archidamus, slipped through the screen of Macedonian patrols into the city, and never, either by night or day, ceased making sallies, now against the Macedonian outposts, now against their siege-works. The nature of the place, – too, aided them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASSAGE</td>
<td>TEXT</td>
<td>TRANSLATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.35.3</td>
<td>ulgo credebant de industria rem in it was the general opinion that he had purposely</td>
<td>SING.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>serum tractam, ne tempus dari posset deferred his arrival until late, so as to give</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Achaeis and Aetolians no time to reply to him, and he himself confirmed this belief by asking that the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>others retire, that time might not be wasted in argument and that some end might be set to the affair, and that he be permitted to confer with the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roman commander by himself.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.3.4</td>
<td>sed utcumque, seu iniuncta seu But whatever the facts were, whether their service</td>
<td>SING.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>suscepta foret militia, et eam was compulsory or voluntary, it was, they said,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>exhaustam et finem aliquem militandi finished, and it was right that there be some end to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fieri aequum esse.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.34.4</td>
<td>indignari inde coepit Aetolos like the Romans, ordered him to retire from Greece,</td>
<td>ESSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Romanos pedi Graecia iubere, qui although they could not say within what boundaries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>quibus finibus Graecia sit dicere non Greece lay; for in Aetolia itself, the Agraei, the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>possent; ipsius enim Aetolie Agraeos Apodoti, the Apodoti, the Amphilochoi, who comprise a great part</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>permagna eorum pars sit, Graeciam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>non esse.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.8.12</td>
<td>senatus legatis ita responderi iussit: that both the beginning and the end of rendering</td>
<td>SING.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>quod rex Attalus classe copis que alius assistance was under the control of those who</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>duces Romanos iuuisset, id gratum wished the Roman people to enjoy their aid; that</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>they would send ambassadors to Antiochus to point</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>out that the Roman people was employing the aid of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attalus and his ships and soldiers against the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>common enemy Philip;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.7.5</td>
<td>Eodem anno Cn Baebius Tamphilus, During the same year, Gnaeus Baebius Tamphilus, who</td>
<td>INGREDIRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>qui ab C Aurelio console anni prioris had succeeded Gaius Aurelius, consul of the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>prouinciam Galliam acceperat, temere preceding year, as governor of the province of Gaul,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ingressus Gallorum Insurbum fines rashly invaded the territory of the Insubrian Gauls</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>prope cum toto exercitu est and was cut off with almost his entire army;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>circumuentus;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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When all was ready on the appointed day, he at once set out by night through the country of the Phliasii and arrived at Cleona, no one knowing what he was planning.

When Philip learned that the Dardani had crossed the borders, out of contempt for his stricken kingdom, and were then laying waste the farther frontiers of Macedonia, although he was hard pressed in every quarter of the world, since fortune que exigente fortuna urgebatur,

Many are the noble ventures which the Rhodians have undertaken on land and sea, to testify to their loyalty to the Roman people and in behalf of the whole race of the Greeks, but they have done nothing more glorious than on this occasion, when, unterrified by the magnitude of the impending war, they sent ambassadors to the king, ordering him not to pass Chelidoniae—a promontory in Cilicia, made famous by the ancient treaty between the Athenians and the Persian kings: if Antiochus did not keep his fleet and army within this limit, they vowed that they would oppose him, not from any ill-will towards him, but to prevent his joining Philip and interfering with the Romans who were undertaking to liberate Greece.

This was the end of the war with Philip.

Many men fell in the battle, many more through their lust for booty while roving through the fields. Those to whom flight was possible returned to their country without even risking the hazard of a battle.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PASSAGE</th>
<th>TEXT</th>
<th>TRANSLATION</th>
<th>VERB</th>
<th>PREPOS.</th>
<th>GENRE</th>
<th>DECL.</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>LINK</th>
<th>FINIS (TYPE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33.36.4</td>
<td>Marcellum Boiorum ingressum fines, fatigato per diem totum mille uia facienda castra in tumulo quodam ponentem Corolamus quidam, regulus Boiorum, cum magna manu adortus ad tria milia hominum occidit;</td>
<td>The consuls departed to their provinces. As Marcellus was entering the territory of the Boi, and was pitching camp on a certain hill, his troops being exhausted by building roads all the day, a chieftain of the Boi, Corolamus by name, fell upon him with a large force and killed about three thousand of his men;</td>
<td>INGREDIRE</td>
<td>PLUR.</td>
<td>FINES</td>
<td>196</td>
<td></td>
<td>B₄ B₁₀</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.14.7</td>
<td>regiae copiae peditum equitum que uagae Pellēn&lt;enх&gt;ensem et Philiasium et Cleonaeum agrum depopulabantur;postremo exprobrantes metum hosti in fines Sicyoniorum transcendeabant, naibus etiam circumuecti omnem oram Achaiae uastabant</td>
<td>The king's infantry and cavalry were roaming about and ravaging the lands of Pellene, Philius and Cleonae, and finally crossed into the territory of Sicyon, taunting the enemy with cowardice; likewise they skirted with their ships the whole coast of Achaean and laid it waste.</td>
<td>TRASCENDERE</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>PLUR.</td>
<td>FINES</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>SICYONI</td>
<td>B₆</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.30.6</td>
<td>ne plus quinque milia armatorum haberet neue elephantum ullum; bellum extra Macedonias fines ne iniussu senatus gereret;mille talentum daret populo Romano, dimidium praesens dimidium pensionibus decem annorum</td>
<td>that he should wage no war outside Macedonia without the permission of the senate; that he should pay to the Roman people an indemnity of one thousand talents, half at once and half in ten annual instalments.</td>
<td>GERERE</td>
<td>EXTRAPLUR.</td>
<td>FINES</td>
<td>196</td>
<td></td>
<td>B₄</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.37.6</td>
<td>quos non adepti, Pado repente nauibus traiecto Læuos Libuos que cum peruastassent, redeuntes inde per Ligurum extremos fines cum agresti praeda in agmen incidunt Romanum</td>
<td>Failing to overtake them, and suddenly crossing the Po in boats, when they had laid waste the country of the Laevi and Libui, and were returning from there loaded with the spoils of the country along the edges of the Ligurian territory, they encountered the Roman column.</td>
<td>REDERE</td>
<td>PER</td>
<td>PLUR.</td>
<td>FINES</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>EXTREMUS LIGURI</td>
<td>B₅</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.2.10.</td>
<td>quamquam ne domi quidem uos, si sui iuris finibus matronas contineret pudor, quae leges hic rogarentur abrogarentur ue curare decuit'.</td>
<td>And yet, not even at home, if modesty would keep matrons within the limits of their proper rights, did it become you to concern yourselves with the question of what laws should be adopted in this place or repealed.'</td>
<td>PLUR.</td>
<td>FINIBUS</td>
<td>195</td>
<td></td>
<td>B₉</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.32.11</td>
<td>quam tu ipse, cum iam prope in finibus Lacedaemoniorum essem?</td>
<td>Of what were you yourself guilty, at a time when I was practically on the frontiers of the Spartans?</td>
<td>ESSE</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>PLUR.</td>
<td>FINIBUS</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>LACEDAEM ONI</td>
<td>B₆</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASSAGE</td>
<td>TEXT</td>
<td>TRANSLATION</td>
<td>VERB</td>
<td>PREPOS.</td>
<td>GENRE</td>
<td>DECL.</td>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>LINK</td>
<td>FINIS (TYPE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.56.1</td>
<td>Nihil eo anno belli exspectantibus consulibus litterae M. Cinci – praefectus is Pisis erat – adlatae: Ligurum uiginti milia armatorum, coniuratione per omnia conciliaula uniuersae gentis facta, Lunensem primum agrum depopulatos, Plisanum deinde finem transgressos, omnen oram maris peragrasse.</td>
<td>Though the consuls expected no war that year, a letter came from Marcus Cincius —he was the prefect at Pisa—announcing that twenty thousand of the Ligures were in arms, had caused a conspiracy to be formed in all the towns of the whole tribe, and had first devastated the fields around Luna and then had entered the territory of Pisa and overrun the whole sea-coast.</td>
<td>TRANSGREDIRE</td>
<td>SING.</td>
<td>FINEM</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>B₄</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.58.1</td>
<td>Ad ea Quinctius: ‘quoniam uobis distincte agere libet et genera iungendarum amicitiarum enumerare, ego quoque duas condiciones ponam, extra quas nullam esse regi nuntietis amicitiae cum populo Romano: unam, si nos nihil quod ad urbex Asiae attinet curare uelit, ut et ipsa omni Europa abstineat; alteram, si se ille Asiae finibus non contineat et in Europam transcendet, ut et Romanis ius sit Asiae ciuitatum amicitias et tueri quas habeant et nouas complecti.’</td>
<td>Quinctius replied thus: ‘Since it is your pleasure to discuss the matter systematically and to enumerate the different ways of establishing friendships, I shall set forth two conditions without which you may report to the king that there is no way to form a friendship with the Roman people: first, that if he wishes us to have no interest in what concerns the cities of Asia, he too must himself keep entirely out of Europe; second, that if he will not keep himself within the limits of Asia, but crosses into Europe, the Romans too shall have the right both to defend the existing friendships with the cities of Asia and to add new treaties of alliance.’</td>
<td>CONTINERE</td>
<td>PLUR.</td>
<td>FINIBUS</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>B₄</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.13.7</td>
<td>patres nostri, cum &lt;in&gt; Hispania Carthaginienium et imperatores et exercitus essent, ipsi nullum in ea militem haberen, tamen addi hoc in foederum uoluerunt ut imperii sui Hiberus fluuus esset finis.</td>
<td>Our fathers, when the Carthaginians had both generals and armies in Spain, and they themselves had not a single soldier here, still demanded that it be stated in the treaty that the Ebro river should be the boundary of their empire;</td>
<td>ESSE</td>
<td>SING.</td>
<td>FINIS</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>IMPERIUM</td>
<td>B₁</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.46.4</td>
<td>Boiorix tum regulus eorum cum duobus fratribus tota gente concitata ad rebellandum castra locis apertos posuit, ut appareret dimicaturos si hostis fines intrasset</td>
<td>Boiorix, their chieftain at the time, with his two brothers, had aroused the whole people to revolt and had placed his camp in open country, so that it was clear that they would fight if the enemy entered their territory.</td>
<td>INTRARE</td>
<td>PLUR.</td>
<td>FINES</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>BOII</td>
<td>B₅ BO 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.47.8</td>
<td>Galli receperes in intima finium sese, consul Placentiam legiones duxit</td>
<td>The Gauls retired into the interior of their country, while the consul led his legions to Placentia.</td>
<td>RECEPERE</td>
<td>PLUR.</td>
<td>FINIUM</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>INTIMUS GALLI</td>
<td>B₅</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
34.62.8 Carthaginenses iure finium causam tutabantur, quod intra eos terminos esset quibus P Scipio victor agrum qui iuris esset Carthaginienium finisset, et confessione regis, qui cum Aphthirem profugum ex regno suo cum parte Numidarum vagantem circa Cyrenas persequeretur, precario ab se iter per eum ipsum agrum tamquam haud dubie Carthaginienium iuris petisset

The Carthaginians maintained their case by their boundary-rights, because the district was within the limits which Publius Scipio, when he conquered them, had set for the land which should be under Carthaginian jurisdiction, and by the king's own admission, who, when he was pursuing Aphthir, a fugitive from his country, who was wandering around Cyrene with a party of Numidians, had requested, as a favour from them, a right of way through this very country as if it had without question belonged to the Carthaginians.

35.4.1 Cum bellum Ligustinum ad Pisas constitisset, consul alter, L Cornelius Merula, per extremos Ligurum fines exercitum in agrum Boiorum induxit, ubi longe alia belli ratio quam cum Liguribus erat

While the Ligurian war was at a standstill around Pisa, the other consul, Lucius Cornelius Merula, led his army through the farthest lands of the Ligures into the country of the Boii, where the war was conducted in a fashion far different from that in the war with the Ligures.

35.3.5 Ligures multitudine freti et in aciem exibant, parati de summa rerum decernere, et abundantes militum numero passim multas manus per extrema finium ad praedandum mittebant, et cum coacta uis magna pecorum praedae que esset, paratum erat praesidium per quos in castella eorum uicos que ageretur

The Ligures both marched out to battle, trusting in their numbers and prepared to risk a decisive engagement, and, since they had abundance of men, sent out many parties to plunder in all directions on the borders of the territory, and when a large number of animals and much booty had been collected, guards were available to conduct them to their forts and villages.

35.4.4 Boii ut egressum e finibus suis hostem sensere, sequabantur silenti agmine, locum insidiis quaerentes.

When the Boii saw that the enemy had withdrawn from their territory, they followed stealthily, seeking a place for an ambush. At night they passed the Roman camp and seized a defile through which the Romans had to march.

35.26.9 ipse Philopoemen in leui speculatoria naue fugit, nec ante fugae finem quam Patras ventum est fecit.

The rest of the fleet, when their flagship was lost, fled as fast as the oars could drive them. Philopoemen himself escaped in a light scouting vessel and did not stop his flight until he reached Patrae.
35.27.9. *ita perculsis hostibus Philopoemen protinus ad depopulandam Tripolim Laconici agri, qui proximus *finem Megalopolitarum est, duxit, et magna ui pecorum hominumque inde abrepta, priusquam a Gytheo tyrannus prae sidium agris mitteret, discessit.

Having thus inflicted a defeat upon the enemy, Philopoemen marched straight to ravage Tripolis in Spartan territory, this being nearest the borders of the Megalopolitae, and having ?? carried off thence a large number of animals and men departed before the tyrant from Gytheum could send guards over the land.

35.48.7. *itaque non cum Philippo nec Hannibale rem futuram Romanis, principe altero unius ciuitatis, altero Macedoniae tantum regni *finibus incluso, sed cum magno Asiae totius partis que Europae rege.

At this time to speak of money, at this time to speak of other equipment for war, he said was useless: they themselves were aware that the kingdoms of Asia had always been rich in gold. Therefore the Romans would not have to do with Philip or Hannibal, the one the chief of a single state, the other confined only within the bounds of the Macedonian kingdom, but with the mighty lord of all Asia and part of Europe.

36.10.13 *itaque hiemem + stare + apud suos causatus, rex unum tantum moratus diem, ab Larisa recessit et Demetriadem rediit, Aetoli que et Athamanes in suos receperunt se *fines.

So the king, using as a pretext to his men the approach of winter, delayed only one day and retired from Larisa and withdrew to Demetrias, and the Aetolians and Athamanes returned to their own countries.

36.10.14 *Appius etsi, cuius rei causa missus erat, solutam cernebat obsidionem, tamen Larisam ad confirmandos in reliquum sociorum animos descendit; duplex que laetitia erat, quod et hostes excesserant *finibus, et intra moenia praesidium Romanum cernebat.

Although Appius saw that the siege had been raised, which had been the purpose of his coming, he yet went down to Larisa to reassure the minds of the allies for the future; and there was double joy, both because the enemy had left their country and ?? because they saw a Roman garrison within the walls.

36.17.15 *quid deinde aberit quin ab Gadibus ad mare rubrum Oceano *finis terminemus, qui orbem terrarum amplexu finit, et omne humanum genus secundum deos nomen Romanum ueneretur?

What then will be lacking, that we shall not bound our empire by the ocean from Gades to the Red Sea, that ocean which holds the earth in its embrace, and that the whole human race will not reverence the Roman name next after the gods?

36.35.14 *bellum quod cum Antiocho rege in Graecia gestum est a M'. Acilio console hunc *finem habuit.

The war which was waged with King Antiochus in Greece by Manius Acilius the consul came thus to an end.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PASSAGE</th>
<th>TEXT</th>
<th>TRANSLATION</th>
<th>VERB</th>
<th>PREPOS.</th>
<th>GENRE</th>
<th>DECL.</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>LINK</th>
<th>FINIS (TYPE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36.18.4</td>
<td>ab dextro Macedonibus ad ipsum munimentorum finem, qua loca usque ad mare inuia palustri limo et as far as the sea, closed it in with swampy mud and quagmires claudunt, elephantos cum adsueto praesidio posuit, post eos equites, tum modico intervallo relict ceteras copias in secunda acie.</td>
<td>On the right, next to the Macedonians, at the very end of the fortification, where the ground, impassable as far as the sea, closed it in with swampy mud and quicksands, he stationed the elephants with their usual guard and behind them the cavalry; then, a short distance to the rear, the rest of his troops in the second line.</td>
<td>SING.</td>
<td>FINEM</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>B₁₀</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.20.4</td>
<td>reuocato extemplo milite finis populandi factus; castigati tantum uerbis Boeoti ob ingratum in tantis tam que recentibus beneficiis animum erga Romanos.</td>
<td>The soldiers were at once recalled and an end put to the pillaging; the Boeotians received only a verbal reproof for their ingratitude to the Romans after such notable and recent acts of kindness.</td>
<td>POPULARE</td>
<td>SING.</td>
<td>FINIS</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.12.5</td>
<td>itaque uixdum iis egressis Antiochus in finibus et mox ad portas erat, et trepidantibus qui expertes proditionis fuerant, tum multuose que iuuentem ad arma uocantibus, ab Clito et Mnasilocho in urbem est inductus;et alii sua voluntate adfluentibus, metu coacti etiam qui dissientiebant ad regem conuenerunt.</td>
<td>Accordingly, when the ambassadors had barely set out, Antiochus was already at the frontier and soon before the gates, and while those who were without knowledge of the treachery were in panic and were excitedly calling the youth to arms, he was admitted into the city by Clytus and Mnasilochus; and as some flocked to him voluntarily, those who disagreed also, under the compulsion of fear, joined the king.</td>
<td>ESSE</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>PLUR.</td>
<td>FINIBUS</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>B₄</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.45.4</td>
<td>Polyxenidas non prius quam in portu Ephesi fugae finem fecit.</td>
<td>Polyxenidas did not stop his flight until he reached the harbour of Ephesus.</td>
<td>FACERE</td>
<td>SING.</td>
<td>FINEM</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.18.1</td>
<td>Per idem tempus Seleucus Antiochi filius, cum per omne hibernorum tempus exercitum in Aeolide continuisset partim sociis ferendo opem, partim quos in societatem percere non poterat depopulandis, transire in finis regni Eumenis, dum is procul ab domo cum Romanis et Rhodiis Lyciae maritima oppugnaret, statuit</td>
<td>About the same time Seleucus, the son of Antiochus, after holding the army in Aeolis for the whole period of the winter, partly assisting his allies, partly plundering those whom he could not win over to his alliance, decided to invade the territory of Eumenes while he was far from home, engaged with the Romans and Rhodians in the naval operations off Lycia.</td>
<td>TRANSIRE</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>PLUR.</td>
<td>FINES</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>REGNI</td>
<td>B₉</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASSAGE</td>
<td>TEXT</td>
<td>TRANSLATION</td>
<td>VERB</td>
<td>PREPOS.</td>
<td>GENRE</td>
<td>DECL.</td>
<td>CASE</td>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>LINK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.26.10</td>
<td>Aemilium et Sami segnis diu mora</td>
<td>Aemilius, idle at Samos, was chafing under the long delay, thinking of nothing less than that Polyxenidas, twice challenged by him ?? in vain, would offer the opportunity for battle, and he thought it a disgrace that the fleet of Eumenes should assist the consul in transporting the legions into Asia while he was entangled in aiding the beleaguered Colophon, an operation of indefinite duration.</td>
<td>HABERE</td>
<td>SING.</td>
<td>FINEM</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.33.1</td>
<td>Per idem fere tempus consuli,</td>
<td>About the same time the consul, having crossed the territories of the Aenians and Maronians, received the news of the defeat of the royal fleet off Myonnesus and the abandonment of Lysimachia by its garrison.</td>
<td>PLUR.</td>
<td>FINES</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>B4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.55.4</td>
<td>quibus omnibus datum responsum decem legatos more maiorum senatum missurum ad res Asiae disceptandas componendas que;summam tamen hanc fore, ut cis Taurum montem quae intra regni Antiochi fines fuisse Eumeni attribuerentur, praeter Lyiciam Cariam que usque ad Maeandrum amnem;</td>
<td>Then other embassies also from Asia were heard. To all these the same reply was given, that the senate, in the fashion of their forefathers, would send ten commissioners to adjudge cases arising in Asia and to settle differences; yet the general principle followed would be this, that on this side of the Taurus mountains the districts which had been within the boundaries of the kingdom of Antiochus should be assigned to Eumenes with the exception of Lycia and Caria as far as the Meander river;</td>
<td>ESSE</td>
<td>PLUR.</td>
<td>FINES</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.1.10</td>
<td>Telum oppidum, litteris a praefecto praesidii interceptis et arce ob regis occupata, paucos dies obсидientibus restitit;deinde id quoque traditum Amynandro est, et omnis Athamania in potestate erat Athenaeum castellum, praeter finibus Macedoniae subiectum.</td>
<td>The town of Theium, since the despatch had been intercepted by Xeno, the prefect of the garrison, and the citadel had been seized by the king’s troops, held out for a few days against the besiegers; finally it also was delivered to Amynander, and all Athamania was in his hands except the fortress of Athenaeum, lying on the borders of Macedonia.</td>
<td>PLUR.</td>
<td>FINIBUS</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>B10 B7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

96
So far as I am concerned, I should prefer to seem, in other respects, to have yielded something to anyone, though it was within the limits of my rights, than to have struggled too stubbornly to maintain it; but in a contest of friendship towards you, of goodwill towards you, of respect which is due you, I cannot willingly be overcome.

The city lies on the borders of the Pisidians, on the side which faces the Pamphylian sea.

Since no embassy met him at the frontier, the consul sent out parties to plunder the fields.

There he maintained his camp for many days because he had come to the frontiers of the Tolostobogii.

It has three seas about equidistant from it, the Hellespont, the sea at Sinope and the shores of the opposite sea where the Cilicians of the coast dwell; besides, it adjoins the borders of several strong states, and their mutual needs concentrated their intercourse at this place especially. At this time the Romans found it deserted by the flight of the inhabitants, but likewise filled with abundance of all things.

This was the end of the pursuit.

These were the conditions: 'The people of the Aetolians shall uphold the sovereignty and dignity of the Roman people without fraud; they shall permit no army which is being led against the allies and friends of the Romans to cross their borders and shall aid such an army in no way;
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PASSAGE</th>
<th>TEXT</th>
<th>TRANSLATION</th>
<th>VERB</th>
<th>PREPOS.</th>
<th>GENRE</th>
<th>DECL.</th>
<th>CASE</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>LINK</th>
<th>FINIS</th>
<th>TYPE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37.53.8</td>
<td>hanc ego maximam hereditatem a patre accepi, qui primus omnium Asiae Graeciam que incolumit in amicitiam uenit uestram, eam que perpetua et constanti fide ad extremum vitae finem end of his life;</td>
<td>This is the greatest inheritance I have received from my father, who first of all the inhabitants of Asia and Greece entered into your friendship and who maintained it with constant and true faith to the very end of his life;</td>
<td>PERDUCERE</td>
<td>AD</td>
<td>SING.</td>
<td>FINEM</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.58.8</td>
<td>in Asia totius Asiae steterunt uires, ab ultimis orientis omnium gentium contractis auxiliis.</td>
<td>In Asia the strength of all Asia from the farthest parts of the east and of all nations stood as his assembled army.</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>PLUR.</td>
<td>FINIBUS</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>B4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.32.1</td>
<td>ne extemplo gereretur hiemps impediit;incursionibus tamen paruis, latrocinii magis quam belli modo, non terra tantum sed etiam naibus a mari fines eorum uastati</td>
<td>Winter prevented the immediate prosecution of the war; nevertheless, their territories were devastated by small raids, more like brigandage than war, not only on land but also by ships from the sea.</td>
<td>VASTARE</td>
<td>PLUR.</td>
<td>FINES</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>LACEDAEMONI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.33.1</td>
<td>qui ueris initio exercitu indicto castra in finibus Lacedaemoniorum posuit,legatos deinde misit ad deposcendos auctores defectionis, et ciuitatem in pace futuram, si id fecisset, pollicentes, et illos nihil indicta causa passuros.</td>
<td>He at the beginning of spring called out the army and encamped within the borders of the Lacedaemonians, and then sent ambassadors to demand the men responsible for the revolt and to promise that the state should be at peace if they did this and that those men should suffer no injury without the opportunity to plead their cause in court.</td>
<td>PONERE</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>PLUR.</td>
<td>FINIBUS</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>LACEDAEMONI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.38.1</td>
<td>Ibi ex decem legatorum sententia foedus in haec fere uerba cum Antiocho conscriptum est: ‘amicitia regi Antiocho cum populo Romano his legibus et condicionibus esto: ne quem exercitum, qui cum populo romano sociis ue bellum gesturus erit, rex per fines regni sui eorum ue qui sub dicione eius erunt transire sinito, neu commenatu neu qua alla ope iuutato;idem Romani socii que Antiocho et ipsis sub imperio eius erunt praestant</td>
<td>There in accordance with the decision of the ten commissioners the treaty with Antiochus was drafted in about this language: ‘There shall be friendship between King Antiochus and the Roman people on these conditions and terms: the king shall permit no army which shall purpose to wage war with the Roman people or its allies to march through the territories of his kingdom or of his allies, and he shall not aid them with grain or with any other form of assistance; the Romans and their allies shall guarantee the same to Antiochus and to those who are under his control.</td>
<td>PER</td>
<td>PLUR.</td>
<td>FINIBUS</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>IMPERIUM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASSAGE</td>
<td>TEXT</td>
<td>TRANSLATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.38.11</td>
<td>Rhodiorum sociorum ue quae aedes</td>
<td>If the Rhodians or the allies own any houses or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>aedificia que intra fines regni Antiochi</td>
<td>buildings within the boundaries of the kingdom of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sunt, quo iure ante bellum fuerunt, eo</td>
<td>Antiochus, they shall belong to the Rhodians or the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rhodiorum sociorum ue sunto; si quae</td>
<td>Rhodians on the same basis as before the war; if</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pecuniae debeatur, earum exactio esto;</td>
<td>any moneys are due, the right to collect them shall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>si quid ablatum est, id conquirendi esto</td>
<td>exist; if anything has been taken away, the right</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cognoscendi rependi que item ius esto</td>
<td>shall exist to search for, identify and recover it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.39.14</td>
<td>regi Eumeni Chersonesum in Europa et</td>
<td>Upon King Eumenes they bestowed, in Europe, the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lysimachiam, castella uicos agrum quibus</td>
<td>Chersonesus and Lysimachia, the strongholds,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>finibus tenuerat Antiochus, in Asia Phrygiam utramque —</td>
<td>villages and lands within the boundaries of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>alteram ad hellespontum maiorem alteram uocant — et Mysiam,quam —</td>
<td>Adipecerunt; in Asia, both Phrygias — the one on the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>et Lycaoniam et Milyada et Lydiam et</td>
<td>Hellespont, the other which they call the Greater;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nominatim urbes Trallis atque Ephesus et</td>
<td>and they gave back to him Mysia, which King Prusias</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Telmessum.</td>
<td>had taken from him, and Lycaonia and Milies and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lycaoniam et Milyada et Lydiam et Lydia and expressly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the cities of Tralles and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>nominatim urbes Trallis atque Ephesus et Telmessum.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.14.4</td>
<td>huic agmini iam finis ingrediendi legati</td>
<td>To test his attitude, the consul sent Gaius Helvius</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>occurrerunt, nuntiantes paratum esse</td>
<td>ahead with four thousand infantry and five hundred</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tyrannum imperata facere;</td>
<td>cavalry. As this column was crossing the frontier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ambassadors met them, bringing word that the tyrant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>was ready to do their bidding;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.20.4</td>
<td>tertio die cum omnibus ad loca exploranda</td>
<td>The third day he proceeded with his entire force to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>professus, quia nemo hostium extra munimenta processit, tuto</td>
<td>reconnoitre the ground, and, because no one of the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>circumuectus montem, animaduerit meridiana</td>
<td>enemy came out beyond the fortifications, he rode in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>regione terrenos et placide ad quendam finem colles esse, a</td>
<td>safety around the mountain, and observed that on</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>septentrione arduas et rectas prope rupes,atque omnibus ferme alis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>inuis itinerae tria esse, unum medio monte, qua terrena erant,</td>
<td>the southern side the hills were covered with earth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>duo difficilia, ab hiberno solis ortu et ab aestuio occasu.</td>
<td>and sloped gently up to a certain point, that ??</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>on the north there were steep and almost perpendicular</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>cliffs, and that although almost everything else was</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>impassable there were three roads, one in the centre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>of the mountain, where it was covered with soil, two</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>difficult, on the side of the winter rising of the sun</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and of its summer setting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
38.14.5 orabant ut pacatus fines iniret cohiberet que a populatione agri militem, et in corona aurea quindecim talenta adferebant
they begged that he would enter their country peacefully and restrain the soldiery from laying waste the land, and brought him fifteen talents in the form of a golden crown.

38.32.4 magna ibi non discceptatio modo sed altercatio fuit, cui consul, cum alia satis ambitiose partem utramque fouendo incerta respondisset, una denuntiatione, ut bello abstinerent donec Romam ad senatum legatos misissent, finem imposuit.
Not only a lively debate took place there but also a violent quarrel, to which the consul, although in other respects, favouring both sides in a spirit of conciliation, he had given ambiguous replies, put an end by the one peremptory demand that they should refrain from war until they had sent ambassadors to the senate in Rome. Both sides sent embassies to Rome.

38.25.5 trecentos equites Attalus praesidii causa cum adduxisset, iact<at>ae sunt pacis condiciones; finis rei quia absentibus ducibus imponi non poterat, conuenit uti consul reges que eo loco postero die congrederentur.
Both parties attended this conference. When Attalus had brought up with him a bodyguard of three hundred cavalry, terms of peace were discussed; since a conclusion to the matter could not be reached in the absence of the principals, it was agreed that the consul and the chiefs should meet in that place the following day.

38.48.3 equidem aliquid interesse rebar inter id tempus, quo nondum in iure ac dicione uestra Graecia atque Asia erat, ad curandum animaduertendum que quid in iis terris fieret et hoc, quo finem imperii Romani Taurum montem statuistis, quo libertatem immunitatem ciuitatibus datis
For my part, I thought that there was some difference between that time, when Greece and Asia were not yet under your control and sway, as regards your interest and concern in what ?? was happening in those lands, and this time, when you have fixed the Taurus mountain as the boundary of the Roman empire, when you bestow liberty and immunity upon cities.

38.41.4 eo die ad Hebrum flumen peruentum est, inde Aeniorum finis praeter Apollinis, Zerynthium quem uocant Zerynthius.
Then they crossed the frontiers of the Aenians near the temple of Apollo, whom the natives call Zerynthius.
### PASSAGE 38.33.5 nunquam alias exsules Lacedaemoniorum Achaei se cum adduxerant in finis, quia nihil aeque alienaturum animos ciuitatis uidebatur; tunc exercitus totius prope antesignani exsules erant

Under no other circumstances had the Achaeans taken Lacedaemonian exiles with them to the frontiers, because it was obvious that nothing would offend so much the feelings of the state; on this occasion practically the whole of the advance troops of the army consisted of exiles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VERB</th>
<th>PREPOS.</th>
<th>GENRE</th>
<th>DECL.</th>
<th>CASE</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>LINK</th>
<th>FINIS (TYPE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADDUCERE</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>SING.</td>
<td>FINIS</td>
<td>B5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PASSAGE 38.48.4, quo aliis fines adicitis alias agro multatis alius uectigal imponitis, regna augetis minuitis donatis adimits, curae uestrae censetis esse ut pacem terra mari que habeant

increase the territory of some, deprive others of their lands, impose tribute upon others, enlarge, diminish, give, take away kingdoms, and deem it your responsibility that they shall have peace on land and sea.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VERB</th>
<th>PREPOS.</th>
<th>GENRE</th>
<th>DECL.</th>
<th>CASE</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>LINK</th>
<th>FINIS (TYPE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADICERE</td>
<td>PLUR.</td>
<td>FINES</td>
<td>B4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PASSAGE 38.38.5 ne militem neu quem alium ex regno Eumenis recipito, si qui earum urbiuom ciues quae regno abscedunt cum rege Antioco intraque fines regni eius sunt, Apameam omnes ante diem certam redeunto; qui ex regno Antioci apud Romanos socios qui sunt, ii ius abeundi manendi que esto; seruos seu fugitiuos seu bello captos, seu quis liber captus aut transfuga erit, reddito romanis sociis que

He shall carry away nothing but his weapons from these towns, lands and fortresses from which he is withdrawing; if he has removed anything, he shall duly restore it to the place in which each item belongs. He shall harbour no soldier or other person from the kingdom of Eumenes. If any citizens of those cities which are separating from his kingdom are with King Antiocbus and within the borders of his kingdom, they shall all return to Apamea before a designated day; whatever persons from the kingdom of Antiocbus are with the Romans or their allies shall have the right to depart or to remain.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VERB</th>
<th>PREPOS.</th>
<th>GENRE</th>
<th>DECL.</th>
<th>CASE</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>LINK</th>
<th>FINIS (TYPE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ESSE</td>
<td>PLUR.</td>
<td>FINES</td>
<td>B9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PASSAGE 38.59.4 nam quid de finibus regni dicam? Asiam omnem et proxima Europae tenuisse Antiocchum.

For what (returning to their first charge) shall I say about the boundaries of the kingdom of Antiocbus?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VERB</th>
<th>PREPOS.</th>
<th>GENRE</th>
<th>DECL.</th>
<th>CASE</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>LINK</th>
<th>FINIS (TYPE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ESSE</td>
<td>PLUR.</td>
<td>FINIBUS</td>
<td>B9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PASSAGE 38.1.9 ubi ea dies aduenit, et Aymander cum mille Aetolis in finibus erat, ex composito quattuor simul locis praesidia Macedonum expulsa, litterae que in alias urbes passim dimissae, ut uindicarent sese ab impotentii dominatione Philippi et <regem> restituerent in patrium ac legitimum regnum.

When this day came and Aymander with a thousand Aetolians was at the frontiers, according to agreement the Macedonian garrisons were expelled from the four places at once, and a despatch was sent in all directions to the other towns, summoning them to free themselves from the headstrong rule of Philip and to return to their hereditary and lawful sovereign. On all sides the Macedonians were expelled.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VERB</th>
<th>PREPOS.</th>
<th>GENRE</th>
<th>DECL.</th>
<th>CASE</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>LINK</th>
<th>FINIS (TYPE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ESSE</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>PLUR.</td>
<td>FINIBUS</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>MACEDONI A</td>
<td>B7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASSAGE</td>
<td>TEXT</td>
<td>TRANSLATION</td>
<td>VERB</td>
<td>PREPOS.</td>
<td>GENRE</td>
<td>DECL. CASE</td>
<td>DATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.60.46</td>
<td>L. Scipionem, qui regem opulentissimum orbis terrarum deuicerit, imperium populi Romani propagauerit in ultimos terrarum fines regem Eumenem Rhodios alias tot asiae urbes deuinxerit populi Romani beneficis, plurimos duces hostium in triumpho ductos carcere inclusiont, non passurum inter hostes populi Romani in carcere et uinculis esse, mitti que eum se iubere</td>
<td>Lucius Scipio himself, who had conquered the richest king in the world, extended the empire of the Roman people to the most distant limits of the earth, bound King Eumenes, the Rhodians, and so many cities of Asia by obligations to the Roman people, had led in his triumph and thrown into prison so many leaders of the enemy, he would not permit to lie in prison and in chains among the enemies of the Roman people, and he ordered him to be released.</td>
<td>PLUR.</td>
<td>FINES</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>IMPERIUM POPULI ROMANI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.27.10</td>
<td>Q. Fabium Labeonem, cum in regione ea fuisset, derexisse finem Philippo ueterem uiam regiam quae ad Thraciae Paroream subeat, nusquam ad mare declinantem; Philippum nouam postea defexisse uiam, qua Maronitarum urbes agros que amplectatur</td>
<td>only that Quintus Fabius Labeo, when he had been in that region, had fixed as the boundary for Philip the ancient royal road which leads to Parorea in Thrace, nowhere approaching the sea: Philip had later laid out a new road which encompassed the cities and lands of the Maroneans.</td>
<td>SING.</td>
<td>FINEM</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>B4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.27.10</td>
<td>de iure etiam finium paucia adiecerunt:</td>
<td>And as to the boundary rights, they had little new to say:</td>
<td>PLUR.</td>
<td>FINIUM</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>B9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.28.2</td>
<td>ciuitates Macedonum, quae a me inter indutias defeceerant, reddi mihi aequum censebam, non quia magna accessio ea regni futura esset – sunt enim et parua oppida et in finibus extremis posita -, sed quia multum ad reliquos Macedonas continendos exemplum pertinebat.</td>
<td>The cities of the Macedonians which had revolted from me during the truce I deemed it right that I should recover, not because it would be an important addition to my kingdom—for they are small towns and, moreover, situated on the farthest frontiers—but because it was a valuable precedent for holding within bounds the other Macedonians.</td>
<td>PONERE IN PLUR.</td>
<td>FINIUS</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>B10 B10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.47.1</td>
<td>cum haud facile esset aut ea quae obicerentur aut quae adversus ea dicenda erant memoria complecti – nec enim multa solum, sed etiam pleraque oppido quam parua erant, de controversia finium, de hominibus raptis pecoribusque abactis, de iure aut dicto per libidinem aut non dicto, de rebus per uiu aut gratiam iudicatis –,</td>
<td>Demetrius, who was then quite a young man, had to answer all these complaints. Since it was not easy to remember either all the charges which were made or what was to be said in reply to them—for they were not only numerous but many of them also trivial in the extreme, dealing with boundary disputes, men abducted or animals driven off, justice either administered by caprice or not administered, decisions rendered as a result of violence or influence</td>
<td>PLUR.</td>
<td>FINIUM</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>B4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PASSAGE</td>
<td>TEXT</td>
<td>TRANSLATION</td>
<td>VERB</td>
<td>PREPOS.</td>
<td>GENRE</td>
<td>DECL.</td>
<td>CASE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.17.4</td>
<td>contione dimissa magnus terror urbe tota fuit, nec moenibus se tantum urbis aut finibus Romanis continuit, sed passim per totam Italiam litteris hospitum de senatus consulto et contione et edicto consulum acceptis, trepidari coeptum est.</td>
<td>When the meeting was dismissed there was great panic in the whole City, nor was this confined only to the walls or the boundaries of Rome; but gradually through all Italy, as letters were received from their friends concerning the decree of the senate, concerning the assembly and the edict of the consuls, the terror began to spread.</td>
<td>PLUR.</td>
<td>FINIBUS</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>ROMANUS</td>
<td>B8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.54.12</td>
<td>itaque se cum iis legatos ad consulem missuros, qui, si redeant unde uenerint, omnia iis sua reddi iubeant, quique protinus eant trans Alpes, et denuntient Gallicis populis multitudinem suam domi contineant: Alpes prope inexsuperabilem finem in medio esse; non utique iis melius fore quam qui eas primi peruias fecissent.</td>
<td>Accordingly, the senate would send with them ambassadors to the consul who would direct him, on condition that they would return whence they had come, to give back all their property, and who would then cross the Alps and warn the Gallic tribes to keep their population at home: the Alps were an almost insuperable boundary betweenthem: in any case they would fare no better than those who had first made them passable.</td>
<td>ESSE</td>
<td>SING.</td>
<td>FINEM</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>B1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.27.6</td>
<td>nam Philippum quidem quo aut merito in populum Romanum aut iure imperii, cum tam procul a finibus Macedoniea absint, ciuitatibus his praesidia imposuisse?</td>
<td>In consequence of what service to the Roman people, they asked, or of what right to rule had Philip imposed his garrisons upon these cities when they were so far away from the boundaries of Macedonia?</td>
<td>PLUR.</td>
<td>FINIBUS</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>IMPERIUM</td>
<td>B8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.20.8</td>
<td>prius sequendi Ligures finem quam fugae Romani fecerunt.</td>
<td>The Ligurians desisted from their pursuit before the Romans stopped their flight.</td>
<td>SING.</td>
<td>FINEM</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.24.8</td>
<td>Athamanes quoque uenerunt legati, non partis amissae, non finium iacturam querentes, sed totam Athamaniam sub ius iudicium que regis uenisesse;et Maronitarum exsules + erant + pulsi, quia libertatis causam defendissent ab regio praesidio; ei non Maroneam modo sed eliam Aenem in potestate nuntiabant Philippi esse</td>
<td>Athamanian ambassadors had also arrived, complaining, not of the occupation of part of their kingdom or of the loss of territory, but that all Athamania had come under the sovereignty and sway of the king; exiles of the Maroneans had also come, expelled because they had defended the cause of liberty against the king's garrison: they brought the news that not only Maronea but also Aenus was in the power of Philip.</td>
<td>PLUR.</td>
<td>FINIUM</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>ATHMANI / ATHAMANIA</td>
<td>B5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.11.10</td>
<td>Postquam dicendi finem Perseus fecit,</td>
<td>After said that, Perseus gave up,</td>
<td>FACERE</td>
<td>SING.</td>
<td>FINEM</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
40.22.10 socii erant, sed propter inopiam haud secus quam hostium fines Macedones populi sunt: rapiendo enim passim villas primum, dein quosdam etiam uicos euastarunt, non sine magno pudore regis, cum sociorum uoces nequiquam deos sociales nomen que suum implorantes audiret.

They were allies, but on account of their need the Macedonians pillaged them just as if theirs were hostile territory: in their plundering they first wasted the farm-houses far and wide, then even certain villages, not without great shame on the king's part, when he heard the voices of his allies calling in vain upon the gods who protect alliances and upon his own name.

40.25.1 ubi primum in hostium finibus castra posuit, legati ad eum per speciem pacis petendae spectu substantially asked him to come to him, although under the guise of seeking peace.

40.38.2 eos, consulta per litteras prius senatu, deducere ex montibus in agros campestres procul ab domo, ne reditus spes esset, Cornelius et Baebius statuerunt, nullum alium ante finem rati fore Ligustini belli.

First consulting the senate by letter, Cornelius and Baebius determined to move them down from the mountains to lands on the plains, far from home, that there might be no hope of return, thinking that there would be no end to the Ligurian war until this was done.

40.25.4 ad hoc decem dierum indutiae cum darentur, petierunt deinde ne trans montes proximos castris pabulatum lignatum que milites irent: culta ea loca suorum finium esse.

When a truce for ten days was granted for this purpose, they then asked that the soldiers should not cross the mountains nearest the camp in quest of forage and wood: these, they said, were the cultivated parts of their territory.

40.16.5 Ligurum duo milia fere ad extremum finem provinciae Galliae, ubi castra Marcellus habebat, uenerunt, uti recipierentur grantes.

About two thousand Ligurians came to the most remote boundary of the province of Gaul, where Marcellus was encamped, and asked that they be received under his protection.

41.10.1 Dum haec Romae geruntur, M Junius et A Manlius, qui priore anno consules fuerant, cum Aquileiae hibernassent, principio ueris in finis Historum exercitum introduxerunt;

While all these things were being done at Rome, Marcus Junius and Aulus Manlius, who had been consuls the preceding year, after wintering at Aquileia, in the beginning of spring led the army into the land of the Histrians;

41.11.10 Sub Histrici finem bellii apud Ligures concilia de bello habere coepit.

Toward the end of the Histrian war the Ligurians began to hold councils regarding war.

41.21.10 cum pestilentiae finis non fieret, senatus decreuit uti decemviri libros Sibyllinos adirent.

Since the pestilence would not come to an end, the senate decreed that the decemvirs should consult the Sibyline Books.
41.23.1 *haec una ex omni Graecia gens et Atheniensium ciuitas eo processerat irarum ut finibus interdiceret Macedonibus.*

This one people out of all Greece, together with the Athenian state, had gone so far in their anger as to exclude Macedonians from their territories.

**VERB:** INTERDICERE  
**PREPOS.:** PLUR.  
**GENRE:** FINIBUS  
**DECL. CASE:** 174  
**DATE:** B₄

41.24.15 *sed commercium tantum iuris praebendi repetendi que sit, ne interdictione finium + nostros quoque et nos segni + arceamus, ne seruis nostris aliquo fugere liceat.*

only intercourse of proffering and receiving justice, and that we shall not exclude ourselves from the territory of the kingdom by barring our frontiers to them; that it may not be permitted our slaves to flee anywhere —how is that against the Roman treaties?

**VERB:** ARCERE  
**PREPOS.:** PLUR.  
**GENRE:** FINIUM  
**DECL. CASE:** 174  
**DATE:** B₄

40.9.5 *itaque si mori tacitum oportet, taceamus, precati tantum deos ut a me coeptum scelus in me finem habeat, nec per meum latus tu petaris;*  

And so, if it is right that I should die in silence, let me be silent, praying only to the gods that the crime which began with me may have its end with me, and that the sword may not reach through my body to yours.

**VERB:** HABERE  
**PREPOS.:** SING.  
**GENRE:** FINEM  
**DECL. CASE:** 185  
**DATE:** A

41.23.2 *itaque seruitiis ex Achaia fugientibus receptaculum Macedonia erat, quia cum finibus suis <iis> interdixissent, intrare regni terminos ipsi non audebant.*  

And so when slaves escaped from Achaea Macedonia was a refuge for them because, since the Achaeans had forbidden the Macedonians to enter their country, they themselves did not dare to cross the frontiers of their kingdom.

**VERB:** INTERDICERE  
**PREPOS.:** PLUR.  
**GENRE:** FINIBUS  
**DECL. CASE:** 174  
**DATE:** B₄

41.1.4 *eae naues ad proximum portum in Histriae fines cum onerariis et magno commeatu missae, secutus que cum legionibus consul quinque milia a mari posuit castra.*  

These ships were sent to the nearest harbour in Histician territory with transports and a large quantity of supplies, and the consul, following with the legions, encamped about five miles from the sea.

**VERB:** MITTERE  
**PREPOS.:** IN  
**GENRE:** FINES  
**DECL. CASE:** 180  
**DATE:** HISTRIA

41.22.6 *triduum non plus Delphis moratus, per Pthiotidem Achaiam Thessaliamque sine damno inuriaeque eorum, per his kingdom without doing any damage or injury to those through whose lands he marched.*

**VERB:** PLUR.  
**PREPOS.:** FINES  
**GENRE:** 174  
**DECL. CASE:** ACHAIA / THESSALIA
41.23.6 nam qui regibus Macedonum Macedonibus que ipsis finibus interdixissemus + manere que id decretum +, scilicet ne legatos ne nuntios admitteremus regum, per quos aliquor ex nobis animi sollicitarentur, il contionantem quodam modo absentem audimus regem, et, si dis placet, orationem eius probamus.

For we who had forbidden to the kings of the Macedonians and to the Macedonians themselves admission to our territories and who knew that the decree was still in force, namely that by which we had made provision that we should not receive the ambassadors or the messengers of the kings, through whom the sentiments of some of us might be affected, we, I say, are now listening to the king who, so to say, speaks to us though absent, and (heaven help us!) we even approve his speech.

41.19.7 Dardani cum Bastarnas non modo non excedere finibus suis, quod sperauerant, sed grauiores fieri in dies cemerent, subnixos Thracum accolarum et Scordiscorum auxiliis, audendum aliquid uel temere rati, omnes undique armati ad oppidum quod proximum castris Bastarnarum erat conueniunt.

When the Dardanians saw that the Bastarnae were not only not leaving their territory, as they had hoped, but were growing more troublesome every day, and were relying on the aid of the neighbouring Thracians and the Scordisci, they decided that they must venture something, even rashly, and all from all sides met in arms at the town which was nearest to the camp of the Bastarnae.

41.19.8 hiemps erat, et id anni tempus elegerant ut Thrases Scordisci que in finis suos abirent

It was now winter, and they chose that season of the year, as supposing that the Thracians and Scordiscians would return to their own countries.

41.17.9 et C Claudius proconsul, auditae rebellione Ligurum, praeter eas copias quas se cum Parmae habebat subitarius collectis militiae, exercitum ad fines Ligurum admovit

And Gaius Claudius the proconsul, hearing of the revolt of the Ligurians, in addition to the troops which he had with him at Parma, raised emergency troops and moved his army to the frontiers of the Ligurians.

42.25.12 qua uoce eum accensus restitisse atque uoce clara denuntiassse sibi ut triduo regni sui decederen finibus.

. At these words he stopped and in a towering rage shouted out a warning to them to leave his dominions within three days.
42.26.2 Cum Macedonicum bellum exspectaretur, Gentium quoque, Illyriorum regem, suspectum Issaei legati fecerunt, simul questi fines suos eum depopulatum, simul nuntiantes uno animo uiuere Macedonum atque Illyriorum reges; communi consilio parare Romanis bellum, et specie legatorum Illyrios speculatores Romae esse, Perse auctore missos ut quid ageretur scirent.

Whilst war with Macedonia was anticipated, Gentius, King of the Illyrians, also fell under suspicion. Envoys from Issus laid complaints before the senate about his ravaging their borders and asserted that he and Perseus were living on the most perfect understanding with each other and were planning war with Rome in close cooperation. Illyrian spies had been sent to Rome at the instigation of Perseus, ostensibly as envoys, really to find out what was going on.

42.41.11 sin autem hoc et ex foedere licuit et iure gentium ita comparatum est ut arma arms propulsentur, quid tandem me facere decuit, cum Abrupolis fines mei regni usque ad Amphipolim peruastasset, multa libera capita, magnam uim mancipiorum, multa milia pecorum abegisset?

If, however, it is allowed by treaty and established as a rule of international law that arms may be repelled by arms, what ought I to have done after Abrupolis had devastated the frontiers of my kingdom right up to Amphipolis, and carried off many freeborn persons, a large body of slaves, and many thousand head of cattle?

42.23.3 Carthaginienses foedere inligatos silere; prohiberi enim extra fines efferre arma; As the Carthaginians were bound by their treaty they took no action, for they were forbidden to carry their arms outside their frontiers.

42.23.3 quamquam sciant in suis finibus, si inde Numidias pellant, se gesturos bellum, though they knew quite well that if they were to drive the Numidians out, they would be warring within their own frontiers.

42.20.4 haruspices in bonum uersurum id prodigium, prolationem que finium et interitum perduellium portendi responderunt, quod ex hostibus spolia fussent ea rostra quae tempestas disiecisset.

The reply of the augurs was to the effect that the portent would prove to be favourable, for it portended the widening of frontiers and the destruction of enemies; those ships' beaks which the storm had thrown down had been taken as spoils from the enemy.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PASSAGE</th>
<th>TEXT</th>
<th>TRANSLATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42.53.1</td>
<td>Cum per omnem orationem satiis frequenti adsensu succulamatum est, tum uero ea vociferatio simul indignantium minitantium que, partim iubentium bonum animum habere regem, exorta est ut finem dicendi faceret, tantum iussis ad iter parare; iam enim dicit mouere castra ab Nymphaeo Romanos.</td>
<td>There had been frequent bursts of applause all through the speech, but at this point such a shout of indignation and defiance arose, and encouraging cheers for the king, that he brought his speech to a close, only adding that they must be prepared to march, as there was a report that the Romans were already advancing from Nymphaeum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.25.4</td>
<td>suae orationis summam fuisse foedus cum Philippo ictum &lt;es&gt; se, cum ipso eo post mortem patris renouatum, in quo diserte prohiberi eum extra fines arma efferre, prohiberi socios populi Romani laecessere bello.</td>
<td>The sum and substance of their address to him was that a treaty had been concluded with Philip and, after his father's death, renewed with him; that in it were clauses expressly forbidding him to carry his arms beyond his frontiers or to make hostile aggression upon the allies of Rome.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.1.6</td>
<td>priusquam in &lt;provincias&gt; magistratus proficiscerentur, senatui placuit L Postumium consulem ad agrum publicum a priuato terminandum in Campaniam ire, cuius ingentem modum possidere priuatos paulatim proferendo fines constabat.</td>
<td>The senate decreed that before the magistrates departed for their provinces, Lucius Postumius the consul should proceed to Campania to determine the boundaries between the public and private lands, since it was well known that private persons, by gradually moving their boundaries outward, were occupying a very large part of it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.6.2</td>
<td>ubi conlaudata gente quod constanter uetus decretum de arcendis aditu finium regibus Macedonum tenuissent, insigne adversus Persea odium Romanorum fecit;</td>
<td>Here he commended them for having firmly retained the old decree forbidding the Macedonian kings any approach to their territories, and he made it quite clear that the Romans regarded Perseus as an enemy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.23.7</td>
<td>ipsum nullum praeterquam suae libidinis arbitrio &lt;finem&gt; facturum.</td>
<td>Himself would set no limit except in accordance with his own pleasure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.24.8</td>
<td>agrum qua culusque sit possideri uelle, nec nouos statuere fines sed ueteres obseruare in animo habere</td>
<td>They wish every man to remain in possession of his own land; it is not their intention to fix new boundaries, but to preserve the old ones.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
42.67.4 *eo fama adfertur + Autlesbim +*, News reached him there that Autlebis, a Thracian chief, and Corragus, an officer of Eumenes, had invaded the dominions of Cotys and occupied a district called Marene.

43.10.1 *Haud procul inde Uscana oppidum finium imperique Persei erat* Not far from there lay Uscana, a town belonging to the lands and realm of Perseus.

42.41.8 *ego tamen istos, ut primum in Macedonia admonitus a uobis comperi, requisitos abire ex regno iussi et in perpetuum interdixi finibus meis.* Nevertheless, as soon as I was advised by you and ascertained that these men were in Macedonia, I ordered that search should be made for them, and that they should quit the kingdom, and I forbade them ever to cross my frontiers.

43.18.1 *Perseus principio hiemis egredi Macedoniae finibus non ausus, ne qua in regnum uacuum inrumperent Romani, sub tempus brumae, cum <in>exsuperabiles ab Thessalia montes niuis altitudo facit,* Perseus did not dare to leave the limits of Macedonia at the outset of winter, for fear that at some point the Romans might raid his undefended realm. About the winter solstice, however, when the depth of snow makes the mountains impassable from Thessaly,

43.22.1 *Eo die ad finem Ae tolici castra posita; inde altero die ad Stratum peruentum;ubi prope Inachum ammam castris <positis>, cum exspectaret effusos omnibus portis Aetolos in fides suam uenturos, clausas portas atque ipsa ea nocte qua uenerat receptum Romanum praesidium cum C. Popilio legato inuenit.* On that day camp was pitched at the edge of Aetolian territory; thence on the second day they arrived at Stratus. Although, when he pitched camp there near the Inachus River, Perseus expected the Aetolians to come streaming out of every gate to put themselves under his protection, he found that the gates were closed and that on the very night when he had arrived a Roman garrison, under the staff-officer Gaius Popilius, had been received.

43.5.4 *inde ex medio regressum itinere hostiliter peragrasse finibus suos; caedes passim rapinas que et incendia facta; nec se ad id locorum scire propter quam causam consul pro hostibus fuerint* He left them quite peaceably, his intention being apparently to make war elsewhere, and then in the middle of his march he turned back and invaded their territory, spreading everywhere bloodshed, rapine and fire, nor did they up to that moment know the consul's reason for treating them as enemies.

44.10.12 *finium is ager Cassandrensium erat, longe fertillissimus omnis orae quam praeteruerci fuerant* This land belonged to the territory of Cassandrea and was by far the most fertile of all the coast they had passed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PASSAGE</th>
<th>TEXT</th>
<th>TRANSLATION</th>
<th>VERB</th>
<th>PREPOS.</th>
<th>GENRE</th>
<th>DECL.</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>LINK</th>
<th>FINIS (TYPE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44.14.12</td>
<td>per quos stetisset quo minus belli finis fieret, aduersus eos quid sibi faciendum esset Rhodios consideratueros esse.</td>
<td>If either party was responsible for preventing the ending of the war, the Rhodians would deliberate as to what action they ought to take against this party.</td>
<td>FACERE</td>
<td>SING.</td>
<td>FINIS</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.22.17</td>
<td>traditum memoriae est maire quam solita frequentia prosequientium consulem celebratum, ac prope certa spe ominatos esse homines finem esse Macedonio bello, maturum que reditum cum egregio triumpho consulis fore.</td>
<td>History records that the consul was escorted by an unusually great throng of persons paying their respects to him, and that men prophesied with almost sure expectation that the Macedonian war would come to an end, and that the return of the consul would be prompt and in great triumph.</td>
<td>ESSE</td>
<td>SING.</td>
<td>FINEM</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.10.8</td>
<td>peruaestatis finibus eius, legentes oram Antigoneam peruenient.</td>
<td>After devastating its territory they followed the shore and arrived at Antigonea.</td>
<td>Pervastare</td>
<td>PLUR.</td>
<td>FINIBUS</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>B₄</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.29.7</td>
<td>et iam cum accessissent animi Dinoni ac Polyarato, qui Persei partium erant, non benigne modo responsum regibus est, &lt;sed&gt; palam pronuntiatum bello finem se auctoritate sua imposituros esse;itaque ipsi quoque reges aequos adhiberent animos ad pacem accipiendam.</td>
<td>Since, then, the boldness of Dinn and Polyaratus, who sided with Perseus, was on the increase, not only was a cordial response given to the kings, but the flat statement was made that the Rhodians would by their influence bring an end to the war, and that therefore the kings ?? themselves should make up their minds calmly to accept peace.</td>
<td>Imponere</td>
<td>SING.</td>
<td>FINEM</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.27.8</td>
<td>nam cum trecenta talenta Pellae miss&lt;is&gt; a Gentio numerasset, signare eos pecuniam passus;inde decem talenta ad Pantauchum missa, ea que praesentia dari regi iussit; reliquam pecuniam, signatam Illyriorum signo, portantibus suis praecipit paruis ilinernibus uheurent;dein cum ad finem Macedoniae uentum esset, subsisterent ibi ac nuntios ab se opperirentur.</td>
<td>The same miserliness caused a rift with Gentius. For when Perseus had counted out three hundred talents for the envoys sent by Gentius to Pella, he permitted them to affix their seal to the money; then he sent ten talents to Pantauchus and ordered this paid at once to the king.His own people were transporting the rest of the money marked with the seal of the ?? Illyrians, and he ordered them to convey it by short stages, and then when the Macedonian frontier was reached, to halt there and wait for messengers from him.</td>
<td>Venire</td>
<td>SING.</td>
<td>FINEM</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>B₄</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.43.8</td>
<td>petebat Amphipolim; sed nocte a Pella exierat, properans ante lucem Axium amnem traicere, eum finem sequendi propter difficultatem transitus fore ratus Romanis.</td>
<td>His escort was composed of about five hundred Cretans. He was making for Amphipolis; but he had left Pella at night because of his anxiety to cross the Axius River before dawn, since he thought that because of the difficulty of crossing this would be the limit of the Roman pursuit.</td>
<td>Ferre</td>
<td>SING.</td>
<td>FINEM</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>B₁</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
45.13.11 senatus qui de finibus cognoscerent statuerent que quinque uiros misit, Q. Fabium Buteonem, Cornelium Blasio, Blasionem, T. Sempronium Muscam, L. Naeuium Balbum, C. Appuleium Saturninum.

The senate sent five men to investigate the facts about the boundary and make a decision, namely, Quintus Fabius Buteo, Publius Cornelius Blasio, Titus Sempronius Musca, Lucius Naevius Balbus, and Gaius Apuleius Saturninus.

45.29.10 pronuntiavit deinde neque conubium neque commercium agrorumaedificiorum que inter se placere cuquam extra fines regionis suae esse

Paulus then announced that it had been decided that no one should be allowed the right of marriage or of trading in land or buildings outside the bounds of his own region.

45.29.12 Dardanis repetentibus Paeoniam, quod et sua fuisset et continens esset finibus suis, omnibus dare libertatem pronuntiavit qui sub regno Persei fuissent.

When the Dardanians asked for the return of Paeonia, on the ground that it had been theirs and adjoined their boundaries, Paulus proclaimed that freedom was being given to all those who had been subjects of Perseus.

45.29.14 regionibus quae adfines barbaris essent – excepta autem tertia omnes erant – permisit ut praesidia armata in finibus extremis haberent.

The regions which bordered on barbarians—and this was true of all except the third—were allowed to have armed guards along their frontiers.

45.39.10 maiores uestri omnium magnarum rerum et principia exorsi a dis sunt, et finem statuerunt.

Nay more—shall we rob not only Paulus, but even the gods, of the honour that belongs to them? For it is to the gods too, not only to men, that we owe a triumph. Your ancestors made the gods their starting-point in every important enterprise, and likewise resorted to them at the conclusion.

45.9.2. Hic finis belli, cum quadriennium continuum bellatum esset, inter Romanos ac Persea fuit

This was the end of the war between the Romans and Perseus, after four years of steady campaigning, and also the end of a kingdom famed over a large part of Europe and all of Asia.

45.9.2. idemque finis inclut per Europae plerumque atque Asiam omnem regni.

This was the end of the war between the Romans and Perseus, after four years of steady campaigning, and also the end of a kingdom famed over a large part of Europe and all of Asia.
45.9.4. _Macedonum <gens> obscura admodum_ obscura admodum

The Macedonian nation was of no great reputation fama usque ad Philippum Amyntae until the time of Philip, son of Amyntas. Later, when it filium fuit; inde ac per eum crescere had proceeded to expand under him, it was still cum coepisset, Europae se confined within the bounds of Europe, though tamen _finibus_ continuit, Graeciam embracing all Greece and part of Thrace and omnem et partem Thraciae atque Illyrici _Illyricum._ amplexa.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PASSAGE</th>
<th>TEXT</th>
<th>TRANSLATION</th>
<th>VERB</th>
<th>PREPOS.</th>
<th>GENRE</th>
<th>DECL.</th>
<th>CASE</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>LINK</th>
<th>FINIS (TYPE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 45.9.6  | _superfudit deinde se in Asiam, et_ Thereafter it overflowed into Asia, and Alexander, in tredecim annis, quibus Alexander the thirteen years of his reign, first brought under his regnuit, primum omnia qua Persarum sway all the well-nigh boundless empire that had prope immenso spatio imperium fuerat belonged to the Persians, and then traversed Arabia suae dicionis fecit; Arabas hinc Indiam and India, where the Indian Ocean embraces the que, qua terrarum ultimos _finis_ rubrum uttermost ends of the earth.
| PERAGRARE | SING. | FINIS | 168 | IMPERIUM | B₁ |

45.9.7 _tum maximum in terris macedonum_ thereafter at the death of Alexander it was torn into regnum nomen que; _inde morte_ many kingdoms, as each leader snatched at Alexandri distractum _<in>_ _multa regna_, resources for his own account, and its strength was dum ad se quisque oves _rapidunt_, dismembered; yet it endured for a hundred and fifty laceratis uiribus a summō _culmine_ years from the topmost pinnacle of its fortune to its fortunae ad ultimum _finem_ centum final end. _quinquaginta annos stetit._

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PASSAGE</th>
<th>TEXT</th>
<th>TRANSLATION</th>
<th>VERB</th>
<th>PREPOS.</th>
<th>GENRE</th>
<th>DECL.</th>
<th>CASE</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>LINK</th>
<th>FINIS (TYPE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 45.9.7  | _tum maximum in terris macedonum_ thereafter at the death of Alexander it was torn into regnum nomen que; _inde morte_ many kingdoms, as each leader snatched at Alexandri distractum _<in>_ _multa regna_, resources for his own account, and its strength was dum ad se quisque oves _rapidunt_, dismembered; yet it endured for a hundred and fifty laceratis uiribus a summō _culmine_ years from the topmost pinnacle of its fortune to its fortunae ad ultimum _finem_ centum final end. _quinquaginta annos stetit._
| AD | SING. | FINEM | 168 | A  |
APPENDIX 2.1. Finis in Livy's Periochae.

Liuiani operis periochae

Per. 1: Ib Latinis victis montem Aventinum adsignavit, fines protulit, Hostiam coloniam deduxit.

Per. 46: legati Prusiae regis questi sunt de Eumene, quod fines suos popularetur, dixerunt que eum conspirasse cum Antiocho adversus populum R. societas cum Rhodis deprecantibus iuncta est.

Per. 49: placuit tamen, quod contra foedus naves haberent, quod exercitum extra fines duxissent, quod socio populi R. et amico, Masinissae, arma intulissent, quod filium eius, Gulussam, qui cum legatis Romanis erat, in oppidum non recepissent, bellum his indici.

Per. 60: M. Fulvius Flaccus primus transalpinos Liguras domuit bello, missus in auxilium Massiliensium adversus Salluvios Gallos, qui fines Massiliensium poplabantur.

Liuius (Titus Liuius) – Ab urbe condita (fragmentum in cod. palimps. Uaticano seruatum)

Per. 91: profectus inde in Bursaonum et Cascantinorum et Graccrutariorum fines, evastatis omnibus proculcatis que segetibus, ad Calagurim Nasicam, sociorum urbem, venit; transgressus que amnem propinquum urbi ponte facto castra posuit.
# APPENDIX 3: List of the natural features in Livy with more citations and linked to a *finis* (in alph. order).

## ALPS – MOUNTAIN RANGE

| 1.1.3 | euganeisque, qui inter mare Alpesque incolebant, pulsis, Enetos Troianosque eas tenuisse terras. et in quem primum egressi sunt locum Troia vocatur, pagoque inde Troiano nomen est: gens universa Veneti appellati. | There, driving out the Euganei, who dwelt between the sea and the Alps, the Eneti and Trojans took possession of those lands. And in fact the place where they first landed is called Troy, and the district is therefore known as Trojan, while the people as a whole are called the Veneti. | Situation before Diomedes’ arrive to Italy – Venetians: definition of inhabited territory Between Alps and sea. |
| 1.2.5 | nec deinde Aborigines Trojanis studio ac fide erga regem Aeneam cessere. fretusque his animis coalescentium in dies magis duorum populorum Aeneas, quamquam tanta opibus Etruria erat ut iam non terras solum sed mare etiam per totam Italicam longitudinem ab Alpibus ad fretum Siculum fama nominis sui iniplisset, tamen, cum moenibus bellum propulsare posset, in aciem copias duxit. | Accordingly, trusting to this friendly spirit of the two peoples, which were growing each day more united, and, despite the power of Etruria, which had filled with the glory of her name not only the lands but the sea as well, along the whole extent of Italy from the Alps to the Sicilian Strait, Aeneas declined to defend himself behind his walls, as he might have done, but led out his troops to battle. | Situation before Enea’s arriving to Italy – Etruscans: population (etruscans) well-known between Alps and the strait (of Messina). |
| 5.33.2-6 | eam gentem traditur familia dulcedine frugum maximeque vini, nova tum voluptate, captam Alpes transisse agrosque ab Etruscis ante cultos possesse; et invexisse in Galliam vinum inliciendae gentis causa Arruntem Clusiunum ira corruptae uxoris ab Lucumone, cui tutor is fuerat, praepotente iuvene et a quo expeti poenae, nisi externa vis quaesita esset, nequirent; hunc transeatibus Alpes ducem auctoremque Clusium oppugnandi fuisset, equidem haud abnuerim Clusium Gallos ab Arrunte seu quo alio Clusino adductos; sed eos qui oppugnaverant Clusium non fuisset qui primi Alpes transierint satis constat. ducentis quique annis ante quam Clusium oppugnarent urbemque Romam caperent, in Italiam Galli transcenderunt; nec cum his primum Etruscorum sed multo ante cum iis qui inter Appenninum Alpesque incolebant saepe exercitus Gallici pugnavere. | The story runs that this race, allured by the delicious fruits and especially the wine —then a novel luxury—had crossed the Alps and possessed themselves of lands that had before been tilled by the Etruscans; and that wine had been imported into Gaul expressly to entice them, by Arruns of Clusium, in his anger at the seduction of his wife by Lucumo. This youth, whose guardian he had been, was so powerful that he could not have chastised him without calling in a foreign force. He it was who is said to have guided the Gauls across the Alps, and to have suggested the attack on Clusium. Now I would not deny that Arruns or some other citizen brought the Gauls to Clusium, but that those who besieged Clusium were not the first who had passed the Alps is generally agreed. Indeed it was two hundred years before the attack on Clusium and the capture of Rome, that the Gauls first crossed over into Italy; neither were the Clusini the first of the Etruscans with whom they fought; but long before that the Gallic armies had often given battle to those who dwelt between the Apennines and the Alps. | Crossing the Alps/Invasion of the Padanian plane. Territory is between the Apennines and the Alps (Gallia Cisalpina?) |
5.34.6 is quod eius ex populis abundabat, Bituriges Arvernos Senones Haeduos Ambarios Carnutes Aulercos excivit. prefectus ingentibus peditum equitumque copiis in Tricastinos venit. Alpes inde oppositae erant quas inexsuperabiles uisas haud equidem miror, nulladum uia, quod quidem continens memoria sit, nisi de Hercule fabulis cedere libet, superatas.

5.34.9 Massilienses erant ii, navibus a Phocaea profecti. id Galli fortunae suae omen rati adiuvere ut quem primum in terram egressi occupaverant locum patientibus Saluis communirent. ipsi per Taurinos saltus saltusque Duriae Alpes transcenderunt.

5.35.1-2 alia subinde manus Cenomanorum Etitovio duce vestigia priorum secuta eodem saltu favente Belloveso cum transcendisset Alpes, ubi nunc Brixia ac Verona urbes sunt locos tenuere. Libui considunt post hos Salluviique prope antiquum gentem Laeves Ligures incolentes circa Ticinum ammem. poenino deinde Boii Lingonesque transgressi cum iam inter Padum atque Alpes omnia tenerentur, Pado ratibus traiecto non Etruscus modo sed etiam Umbros agro pellunt; intra Appenninum tamen sese tenuere.

21.23.1-2 hoc visu laetus tripertito Hiberum copias traiecit praemissis qui Gallorum animos, qua traducendus exercitus erat, donis conciliarent Alpiumque transitus spectarentur. nonaginta milia peditum, duodecim milia equitum Hiberum traduxit.

21.25.2 cum perinde ac si Alpes iam transisset, Boi sollicitatis Insubribus defecerunt nec tam ob veteres in populum Romanum iras quam quod nuper circa Padum Placentiam Cremonamque colonias in agrum Gallicum deductas aegre patiebantur. when, as though he had already crossed the Alps, the Boi, after rousing up the Insubres, revolted. To this they were incited not so much by their old animosity against the Roman People as by vexation at the recent establishment of colonies in Gallic territory, near the Po, at Placentia and Cremona.

21.29.7 multitudo timebat quidem hostem nondum oblitterata memoria superioris belli, sed magis iter immensus Alpesque, rem fama utique inexpertis horrendam, metuebat. The rank and file were fearful of the enemy—for their memory of the former war was not yet erased—but more fearful of the interminable march over the Alps, an undertaking which rumour made appalling, at any rate to the inexperienced.

Gallic invasion: The Alps look to them insuperable as no road had led across them.

Gallic invasion: passage through the Alps.

Gallic invasion: the new invader need approval to cross the Alps. Everything taken between Alps and Apennines.

Connection: Ebro-Alps

Crossing the Alps as key-point of the war
nunc, postquam multo maiorem partem itineris emensam cernant, Pyrenaeum saltum inter fercissimas gentes superatum, Rhodanum, tantum amnem, tot milibus Gallorum prohibentibus, domita etiam ipsius fluminis vi traiectum, in conspectu Alpes habeant, quorum alterum latus Italieae sit, in ipsis portis hostium fatigatos subsistere—quid Alpes alid esse credentes quam montium altitudo: nullas prope terras caelum contingere nec inexsuperabiles humano generi esse. Alpes quidem habitari colli gignere atque alere animantes; pervias fauces esse exercitibus. eos ipsos quos cernant legatos non pinnis sublime elatos Alpes transgressos. ne maiores quidem eorum indigenas sed advenas Italiae cultores has ipsas Alpes p. ingentibus saepe agminibus cum liberis ac coniugibus migrantium modo tuto transmisisse.

postero die profectus adversa ripa Rhodani mediterranea Galliae petit, non quia rectior ad Alpes via esset, sed quantum a mari recessisset minus obvium fore Romanum credens, cum quo, priusquam in Italiam ventum foret, non erat in animo manus conserere. quartis castris ad Insulam pervenit. ibi Issara Rhodanuscque amnes diversis ex Alpibus decurrentes agris aliquantum amplexi confluent in unum; mediis campis Insulae nomen inditum.

ob id meritum commeatu copiaque rerum omnium, maxime vestis, est aditus, quam infames frigoribus Alpis praeparari cogebant. sedatis Hannibal certaminibus Allobrogum cum iam Alpes peteret, non recta regione iter instituit sed ad laevam in Tricastinos flexit; inde per extremam oram Vocontiorum agri tendit in Tricorios, haud usquam impedita via priusquam ad Druentiam flumen pervenit. Is et ipse Alpinus amnis longe omnium Galliae fluminum difficillimum transitu est; nam cum aquae vim vehat ingentem, non tamen navium patiens est, but now, when they could see that they had measured off the greater part of it; when they had made their way, through the fiercest tribes, over the Pyrenees; when they had crossed the Rhone —that mighty river —in the teeth of so many thousand Gauls, overcoming, too, the violence of the stream itself; when the Alps, the other side of which was in Italy, were in full sight; —were they halting now, as though exhausted, at the very gates of their enemies What else did they think that the Alps were but high mountains They might fancy them higher than the ranges of the Pyrenees; but surely no lands touched the skies or were impassable to man. The Alps indeed were inhabited, were tilled, produced and supported living beings; their defiles were practicable for armies. Those very ambassadors whom they beheld had not crossed the Alps in the air on wings. Even the ancestors of these men had not been natives of Italy, but had lived there as foreign settlers, and had often crossed these very Alps in p. great companies, with their children and their wives, in the manner of emigrants.

Setting out the following day he advanced up the Rhone towards the interior of Gaul, not that it was the more direct way to the Alps, but believing that the farther he retired from the sea, the less likely he was to fall in with the Romans, with whom he had no mind to fight a battle until he should arrive in Italy. The fourth day’s march brought him to the Island. There the rivers Isara and Rhone, rushing down from different Alps, unite their waters, after enclosing a considerable territory, and the Island is the name which has been given to the plains lying between them. In requital of this service he was assisted with provisions and supplies of every sort, particularly clothing, which the notorious cold of the Alps made it necessary to provide. Having settled the contentions of the Allobroges, Hannibal was now ready for the Alps; but instead of marching directly towards them, he turned to the left, to the country of the Tricastini, and thence proceeded through the outer borders of the territory of the Vocontii to the Tricori, by a road which nowhere presented any difficulties, until he came to the Druentia. This, too, is an Alpine river and by far the most difficult of all the rivers of Gaul to p. cross; for, though it brings down a vast volume of water, it does not admit of navigation.
| 21.32.2 | ceterum ubi deserta munimenta nec facile se tantum praegressos adsecururum videt, ad mare ac naves redit, tutius faciliusque ita descendenti ab Alpibus Hannibali occursurus. | But finding the works deserted, and perceiving that he could not readily overtake the enemy, who had got so long a start of him, he returned to the sea, where he had left his ships, thinking that he would thus be more safely and easily enabled to confront Hannibal as he descended from the Alps. | Hannibal crosses the Alps |
| 21.35.4 | nono die in iugum Alpium perventum est per invia pleraque et errores, quos aut ducentium fraus aut, ubi fides iis non esset, temere initae valles a coniectantibus iter faciebant. | On the ninth day they arrived at the summit of the Alps, having come for the most part over trackless wastes and by roundabout routes, owing either to the dishonesty of their guides, or — when they would not trust the guides — to their blindly entering some valley, guessing at the way. For two days they lay encamped on the summit. | Hannibal crosses the Alps: note the value of *iugum* (pass) |
| 21.35.8 | praegressus signa Hannibal in promunturio quodam, unde longe ac late prospectus erat, consistere iussit militibus Italian ostentat subiectosque Alpinis montibus circumpadanos campos, | Then Hannibal, who had gone on before the standards, made the army halt on a certain promontory which commanded an extensive prospect, and pointing out Italy to them, and just under the Alps the plains about the Po | Hannibal crosses the Alps: Hannibal’s vision from a high point. |
| 21.35.11 | ceterum iter multo quam in ascensu fuerat, ut pleraque Alpium ab Italia sicut breviora ita arrectiora sunt, difficilius fuit. | But the way was much more difficult than the ascent had been, as indeed the slope of the Alps on the Italian side is in general more precipitous in proportion as it is shorter. | Hannibal crosses the Alps |
| 21.38.1 | hoc maxime modo in Italiam perventum est, quinto mense in Carthagine nova, ut quidam auctores sunt, quinto decimo die Alpibus superatis. | Such were the chief features of the march to Italy, which they accomplished five months after leaving New Carthage — as certain authorities’ state — having crossed the Alps in fifteen days. | Hannibal crosses the Alps, travelling from Carthago Nova |
| 21.38.6 | id cum inter omnes constet, eo magis miror ambigi, quam Alpes transire, et volgo credere Poenino—atque inde nomen ei iugo Alpium inditum—transgressum, Coelium per Cremonis iugum dicere transisse; | Since all are agreed on this point, I am the more astonished at the difference of opinion in regard to his route over the Alps, and that it should be commonly held that he crossed by the Poenine Pass and that from this circumstance that ridge of the Alps derived its name — and that Coelius should state that he crossed by the ridge of Cremo; | Hannibal crosses the Alps: importance of the passes in breaking into Italy |
| 21.38.9 | et auxerant inter se opinionem, Scipio, quod relictus in Gallia obvius fuerat in Italiam transgresso Hannibali, Hannibal et conatu tam audaci traiciendarum Alpium et effectu. | Each had increased the other’s good opinion — Scipio, because, though left behind in Gaul, he had confronted Hannibal at his crossing over into Italy; Hannibal by the audacity with which he had conceived and executed his passage of the Alps. | Hannibal crosses the Alps: ‘Alps have been crossed in few days!’ |
| 21.40.7 | nisi creditis qui exercitu incomili pugnam detractavere, eos duabus partibus peditum equitumque in transitu Alpium amissis spei spei nactos esse. | unless you think that those who avoided battle when their strength was unimpaired would, now that they have lost two-thirds of their infantry and cavalry in the passage of the Alps, have become more hopeful! | Hannibal crosses the Alps: Alps worked as first barrier, damaging Hannibal’s army |
| 21.40.10 | cum hoc equite, cum hoc pedite pugnaturi estis; reliquias extervas hostis, non hostem habetis, ac nihil magis vereor quam ne, cum vos pugnaveritis, Alpes vicisse Hannibalem videantur. | That is the cavalry, that the infantry with which you are to fight; you have no enemy — only the last relics of an enemy! And I fear nothing more than this, that when you have fought, it may seem to have been the Alps that conquered Hannibal. | Hannibal crosses the Alps: which slowed down Hannibal. First defence |
In a cavalry engagement — for this was the arm with which I was given the opportunity of fighting — I put the enemy to rout: his infantry column, marching hastily off as if in flight, I could not overtake by land; returning therefore to my ships I accomplished with all possible expedition so circuitous a voyage and march, and am come to confront this redoubtable enemy almost at the very foot of the Alps. Does it look as though I were avoiding battle and had blundered upon him unawares

On the right and on the left two seas encompass you, and you have not a single ship, even to flee in; round you is the river Po — the Po, a greater and more turbulent river than the Rhone; behind you tower the Alps, which you hardly scaled when you were fresh and vigorous.

Such was the first battle fought with Hannibal, in which it was clearly seen that the Phoenician was superior in cavalry and that consequently open plains, like those between the Po and the Alps, were ill-suited to the Romans for campaigning.

‘How would our fathers groan’, he cried, ‘that were wont to wage war about the walls of Carthage, could they see us, their offspring, two consuls and two consular armies, cowering within our camp in the heart of Italy; and the Phoenician in full sway over all the territory between the Alps and the Apennines!’

It chanced to be the time of year when the days are shortest, and it was snowing in the region between the Alps and the Apennines, and the proximity of rivers and marshes intensified the bitter cold.

In attempting to cross the Apennines he was assailed by a storm so terrible as almost to surpass the horrors of the Alps. With the wind and rain blowing full in their faces, at first — because they must either have dropped their arms or else, if they struggled against it, be caught by the hurricane and hurled to the ground — they halted;

The question was put to them in this form: ‘Do you will and so order that these things be done in the manner following If the Republic of the Roman People, the Quirites, shall be preserved for the next five years — as I would wish it preserved — in these wars, to wit, the war of the Roman People with the People of Carthage and the wars with the Gauls on this side of the Alps,

Between Alp and Apennines

Between Alps and Apennines

Between Po and Alps

Strategic issues: ‘Between Po and Alps’

Hannibal crosses the Alps: Roman Strategy

Hannibal crosses the Alps: landscape and strategic situation of Hannibal. Picture of Northern Italy

Highlighting a territory as ‘before’ ‘behind’ the Alps
On first learning by report that Hannibal had crossed the Alps, although he had rejoiced at the outbreak of war between the Romans and the Carthaginians, still, as their resources were not yet known, he had wavered, uncertain which of the two peoples he wished to have the victory.

Gone was that force and energy, lost the strength of body and spirit with which they had crossed the ranges of the Pyrenees and the Alps.

but that if he had set out on so long a march without funds, he would scarcely have made his way to the Alps. Therefore he exacted money in haste and came down to the Hiberus.

it was not to wage war with the people of Regium and Tarentum that they had crossed the Alps. where the Roman legions were, there ought the Carthaginian armies also to be. Thus at Cannae, thus at Trasumennus, by coming to grips and pitching camp near the enemy, by trying their luck they had met with success.

so with a fleet of thirty ships (and they were all quinqueremes ) Scipio set out from the mouth of the Tiber, sailed along the coast of the Tuscan Sea and past the Alps.and the Gallic Gulf, and then rounding the promontory of the Pyrenees, landed his troops at Emporiae, a Greek city, for they also are sprung from Phocaea.

it was this that raised and set up all the scattered debris. when Hasdrubal after the rout at Cannae was on his way to the Alps and Italy — and if he had joined his brother even the name of the Roman people would be no more — you were the very first, soldiers, to stand in his path under the command and auspices of my father

To the one was assigned the land of the Bruttii and Lucania facing Hannibal, to the other Gaul facing Hasdrubal, who was reported to be already nearing the Alps. Whichever of them should receive Gaul in the allotment was to choose the army he preferred out of the two that were in Gaul and in Etruria and the one at the city.

Hasdrubal had left his winter quarters and was already crossing the Alps;
plurimum in eam rem adiuvit opinio Hannibalis, quod, etsi ea aestate transiturum in Italiam fratrem crediderat, recordando quae ipse in transitu nunc Rhodani, nunc Alpium cum hominibus locisque pugnando per quinque menses exhaustisset, hauququaquam tam facilernque transitum expectabat; ea tardius movendi ex hibernis causa fuit. ceterum Hasdrubali et sua et aliorum spe omnia celeriora atque expeditiora fuere. non enim receperunt modo Arverni eum deincepsque aliae Gallicae atque Alpinae gentes, sed etiam secutae sunt ad bellum. et cum per munita pleraque transitu fratris, quae antea invia fuerant, ducebat, tum etiam duodecim annorum adsuetudine perviis Alpibus factis inter mitiora iam transibant hominum ingenia.

Of the greatest assistance in that direction was Hannibal’s miscalculation. He had believed, indeed, that his brother would come over into Italy that summer; but when he recalled what he had himself endured during five months, recordando quae ipse in transitu nunc Rhodani, nunc Alpium, in conflicts with men and the nature of the country, he looked forward to a crossing by no means so easy and so soon accomplished. This accounted for his slowness in leaving winter quarters. But for Hasdrubal everything moved more quickly and more easily than had been expected by himself and others. For not only did the Arverni, and then in turn other Gallic and Alpine tribes, receive him, but they even followed him to war. And not merely was he leading an army through country for the most part made passable by his brother’s crossing, although previously trackless, but, thanks to the opening up of the Alps by twelve years of habitual use, they were also crossing through tribes now less savagely disposed.

pro comperto habere Hasdrubalem ingenti iam coacto exercitu proximo vere Alpes traiecturum, nec tum eum quicquam aliud morari nisi quod clausae hieme Alpes essent.

that they had established that Hasdrubal with a huge army already concentrated would cross the Alps the next spring, and that at that time nothing else was detaining him than that the Alps were closed by the winter.

All the senators were indeed of the opinion that the consuls must take the field at the earliest possible moment. For they felt that Hasdrubal must be met as he came down from the Alps, to prevent his stirring up the Cisalpine Gauls or Etruria, which was already aroused to the hope of rebellion.

igitur Poenus Savone, oppido Alpino, praeda deposita et decem longis navibus in statione ad praesidium relictis,

The Carthaginian, therefore, having deposited his plunder at Savo, an Alpine town, left ten ships of war for the protection of Italy.

iguctusque Lucretio, si se Mago ex Liguribus propius urbe moveat, obviam ire parat, si Poenus sub angulo Alpium quietus se contineat, et ipse in eadem regione circa Ariminum Italiae praesidio futurus.

Consider how far this policy of yours corresponds with that of your parent. He, setting out in his consulship for Spain, returned from his province into Italy, that he might meet Hannibal on his descent from the Alps; while you are going to leave Italy when Hannibal is there, not because you consider such a course beneficial to the state, but because you think it will redound to your own honour and glory; Descending the Alps looks like ‘the way to Rome’ was free of obstacles.

Marcus Livius led his army of volunteer slaves out of Etruria into Gaul, and having joined Lucretius, prepared to meet Mago in case he should move from Liguria nearer to the city; but intending, if the Carthaginian should keep himself quiet under the angle formed by the Alps, to remain himself also in the same quarter, near Ariminum, for the protection of Italy.

It took five months to cross Rhone and Alps
qui senex vincendo factus Hispanicis, Gallias, Italiam ab Alpibus ad fretum monumentis ingentium rerum complessel. ducere exercitum aequale m stipendiis suis, duratum omnium rerum patientia quas vix fides fiat homines passes, perfusum miliens cruore Romano, exuvias non militum tantum, sed etiam imperatorum portantem.

who, having grown old in victory, had filled Spain, Gaul, and Italy, from the Alps to the strait, with monuments of his vast achievements; who commanded troops who had served as long as he had himself; troops hardened by the endurance of every species of suffering, such as it is scarcely credible that men could have supported; stained a thousand times with Roman blood, and bearing with them the spoils not only of soldiers but of generals.

haec terra marique in parte Italiae quae iacet ad Alpes gesta.

Such were the transactions by sea and land in that part of Italy which is adjacent to the Alps.

legatis Romanis de ea re trans Alpes missis responsum est neque profectos ex auctoritate gentis eos, nec quid in Italia facerent sese scire.

Ambassadors were sent from Rome, over the Alps, on this business, and to them an answer was given that ‘they had not emigrated by the authority of their state, nor did their countrymen know what they were doing in Italy.’

introduci in senatum a C. Valerio praetore exposuerunt se superante in Gallia multitudine inopia coactos agrì et egestate ad quaerendum sedem Alpes transgressos, quae inculta per solitudines viderent, ibi sine ulius iniuria consedisse.

being introduced to an audience of the senate, by the praetor Caius Valerius, represented, that ‘in consequence of a redundancy of people in Gaul, they had been compelled by the want of land, and indeed of every thing, to cross the Alps in quest of a settlement: that they had settled in those lands which they found waste and uncultivated without doing injury to any.

itaque se cum iis legatos ad consulem missuros, qui si redeant unde venerint, omnia iis sua reddi labeant, quique protinus eant trans Alpes, et denuntient Gallicis populis, multitudinem suam domi continant: Alpes prope inexsuperabilem finem in medio esse: non utique iis melius fore quam qui eas primi pervias fecissent.

They would therefore send to the consuls ambassadors, who would order all their effects to be restored, provided they returned to the place whence they came; and who would also proceed to the other side of the Alps, and give warning to the Gallic states to keep their people at home. That the Alps, an almost impassable barrier, lay between the two countries, and whoever should pass in future, should meet no better fate than those who first proved them to be passable.’

eos senatus excedere Italia iussit et consulem Q. Fulvium quaerere et animadvertere in eos qui principes et auctores transcendendi Alpes fuissent.

But the senate ordered them to quit Italy, and enjoined the consul Quintus Fulvius to search after and punish those who had been the first to advise them to cross the Alps.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41.16.8</td>
<td>litteraeque Romam extemplo scriptae, quibus non modo rem exponeret, sed etiam gloriaretur sua virtute ac felicitate neminem iam cis Alpes esse hostem populi Romani, agrisque aliquantum captum, qui multis milibus hominum dividit viritit posset.</td>
<td>He immediately despatched a letter to Rome, in which he not only represented this success, but likewise boasted that through his good conduct and good fortune there was not one enemy of the Roman people left on this side the Alps; and that a large tract of land had been taken, which might be distributed among many thousand men, giving each a share.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.5.10</td>
<td>legati cum Gallis missi trans Alpis C. Laelius, M. Aemilius Lepidus, ad ceteros populos C. Sicinius, P. Cornelius Blasio, T. Memmius.</td>
<td>Caius Laelius and Marcus Aemilius were sent ambassadors with the Gauls, to the regions on the northern side of the Alps; and Caius Cicinius, Publius Cornelius Blasio, and Titus Memmius, to the other states</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.5.7</td>
<td>nec responderi tantum iis gentibus, sed legatos mitti, duos ad regulum trans Alpis, tres circa eos populos placi, qui indicarent, quae patrum sentimentia esset.</td>
<td>It was voted not only to make a reply to these peoples, but to send envoys, two to the prince beyond the Alps and three to the several other peoples; the envoys were to announce what the opinion pronounced by the Fathers was.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AXIUS – RIVER**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39.53.15</td>
<td>qui ex Illyrico per Pelagoniam fluentes in Axium annem editur, haud proximus Stobis, vetera urbe:</td>
<td>This is a district of Paeonia, near the river Erigonus, which, flowing from Illyricum through Paeonia, is not far from Stobi, an ancient city.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.43.8</td>
<td>securit eum sunt admodum quingenti Cretenses. petebat Amphipolim; sed nocte a Pella exierat, properans ante lucem Axium annem traicere, eum finem sequi propter difficultatem transitus ore ratus Romanis.</td>
<td>He took the road to Amphipolis; leaving Pella in the night, and hastening to get over the river Axius before daylight, as he thought that it, from the difficulty of passing it, would put an end to the further pursuit of the Romans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.29.7-8</td>
<td>secundam fore regionem, quam ab ortu Strymon ampleret erat, arnis, praeter Sinticen Heracleam et Bisaltas, ab occassuque Axius terminaret fluvius, additus Paeonius, qui prope Axium flumen ad regionem orientis coletum. tertia pars facta, quam Axius ab oriente, Peneus annis ab occasu cingunt; ad septentrionem Bora mons obicitur; adjuncta huic parti regio Paeonia, qua ab occasu praeter Axium annem proprigatur;</td>
<td>That the second district should be the country enclosed by the river Strymon, on the east, where were excepted Sintice-Heraclea and Bisaltica, and by the river Axius on the west; to which should be added the Pœnians, who dwell near the river Axius, and on its right bank. The third district comprised the territory bounded by the river Axius on the east, the Peneus on the west, and Mount Bora on the north. That to this division should be joined that tract of Paeonia, which stretches along the western side of the Axius;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CHELIDIONIUM – PROMONTORY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33.20.1</td>
<td>Multa egregie Rhodii pro fide erga populum Romanum proque uniuerso nomine Graecorum terra marique ausi sunt, nihil magnificentius quam quod ea tempestate non territ non mole imminentis bell legatos ad regem miserunt ne Chaledoniis—promunturium Ciliciae est, inclutum foedere antiquo Atheniensium cum regibus Persarum—superaret: si eo fine non contineret classem copiasque suas</td>
<td>The Rhodians, out of a faithful attachment to the Roman people, and an affection for the whole race of the Greeks, have performed many honourable exploits, both on land and sea: but never was their gallantry more eminently conspicuous than on this occasion, when, nowise dismayed at the formidable magnitude of the impending war, they sent ambassadors to tell the king, that he should not double the point of Cheledoniae, which is a promontory of Cilicia, rendered famous by an ancient treaty between the Athenians and the king of Persia;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cyprum nihilo minus petens, cum Chaelidoniarum promunturium superasset, paulisper seditione remigum est retentus in Pamphylia circa Eurymedontem amnem. but nevertheless steered towards Cyprus; and, when he had passed the promontory of Chelidonium, was detained some little time in Pamphylia, near the river Eurymedon, by a mutiny among his rowers.

but nevertheless steered towards Cyprus; and, when he had passed the promontory of Chelidonium, was detained some little time in Pamphylia, near the river Eurymedon, by a mutiny among his rowers.

Setting out by the Unlucky Way, the right arch of the Porta Carmentalis, they came to the river Cremera, a position which seemed favourable for the erection of a fort. Lucius Aemilius and Gaius Servilius were then chosen consuls. And so long as nothing more than plundering was afoot the Fabii were not only an adequate garrison for the fort, but in all that region where the Tuscan territory marches with the Roman they afforded universal security to their own countrymen and annoyance to the enemy, by ranging along the border on both sides. Then came a brief interruption to these depredations, while the men of Veii, having called in an army from Etruria, attacked the post on the Cremera, and the Roman legions, led thither by Lucius Aemilius the consul, engaged them in a pitched battle; though in truth the Veientes had scarcely time to draw up a battle-line, for at the first alarm, while the ranks were falling in behind the standards and the reserves were being posted, a division of Roman cavalry made a sudden charge on their flank and deprived them of the power not only of attacking first, but even of standing their ground. And so they were driven back upon Saxa Rubra, where they had their camp, and sued for peace. It was granted, but their instinctive fickleness caused them to weary of the pact before the Roman garrison was withdrawn from the Cremera.

This confidence so won upon them that on catching sight of some flocks at a distance from the Cremera, across a wide interval of plain, they disregarded the appearance here and there of hostile arms, and ran down to capture them. Their rashness carried them on at a swift pace past an ambuscade which had been laid on both sides of their very road.

Quintus Considius and Titus Genecius, the proposers of the agrarian measure, cited Titus Menenius to appear for trial. He had incurred the dislike of the plebs owing to the loss of the outpost on the Cremera, when he as consul had occupied a permanent camp not far away; and so they were driven back upon Saxa Rubra, where they had their camp, and sued for peace. It was granted, but their instinctive fickleness caused them to weary of the pact before the Roman garrison was withdrawn from the Cremera.

Praesidium Cremerae. Stronghold: Garrison on the river. Military plan
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6.1.11 tum de diebus religiosis agitari coeptum, dieisque a. d. quintum decimum kal. Sextilis, duplici clade insignem, quo die ad Cremeram Fabii caesi, quo deinde ad Aliam cum exitio urbis foede pugnatum, a posteriori clade Alliensem appellare insignem religione rei ullius publice privativisque agendae fecerunt. Then they proceeded to deliberate about days of evil omen. The th of July was notorious for a double misfortune, since it was on that day that the Fabii were massacred at the Cremera and that subsequently the rout at the Allia occurred, which resulted in the destruction of the City. From the latter disaster they named it the Day of the Allia, and forbade any public or private business to be done that day.

9.38.16 Macer Licinius tertia etiam clade, quae ad Cremeram accepta est, abominandum eam curiam facit. the first return. Licinius Macer makes this ward unlucky also for a third disaster—that of the Cremera.

GADES – STRAIT

21.21.9 Hannibal cum recensisset omnium gentium auxilia, Gades profectus Herculi uota exsoluit nouisque se obligat uotis, si cetera prospera euenissent. In the early days of spring they reassembled according to orders. After reviewing the whole of the native contingents, Hannibal left for Gades, where he discharged his vows to Hercules, and bound himself by fresh obligations to that deity in case his enterprise should succeed.

21.22.4 classis praeterea data tuendae maritimae orae, quia qua parte belli uicerant ea tum quoque rem gesturos Romanos credi poterat, quinquaginta quinqueremes, quadriremes duae, triremes quinque; sed aptae instructaeque remigio triginta et duae quinqueremes erant et triremes quinque. ab Gadibus Carthaginem ad hiberna exercitus rediit; The protection of the coast required a fleet, and as it was natural to suppose that the Romans would again make use of that arm in which they had been victorious before, Hasdrubal had assigned to him a fleet of warships, including quinqueremes, quadriremes, and triremes, but only quinqueremes and the triremes were ready for sea. From Gades he returned to the winter quarters of his army at New Carthage, and from New Carthage he commenced his march on Italy.

24.45.5 Syphax cum paucis equilibus in Maurusios ex acie Numidas—extremi prope Oceanum aduersus Gades colunt—refugit, adfluventibusque ad famam eius undique barbaris ingentes breui copias arnruit, Gades as connecting point between Carthaginian Africa and Spain

26.20.6 in hiberna diuersi concesserant, Hasdrubal Gisgonis usque ad Oceanum et Gades, Mago in mediterranea maxime supra Castulonensem saltum; Hasdrubal Hamilcaris filius proximus Hibero circa Saguntum hibernat. The Carthaginian armies withdrew into their respective winter-quarters: Hasdrubal, the son of Gisgo, to Gades on the coast, Mago into the interior above the forest of Castulo, Hasdrubal, the son of Hamilcar, near the Ebro in the neighbourhood of Saguntum.

27.20.4 ibi conferentibus quid in cuisque provinciae regione animorum Hispanis esset, unus Hasdrubal Gisgonis ultimam Hispaniae oram quae ad Oceanum et Gades uergit ignaram adhuc Romanorum esse eoque Carthaginiensibus satis fidam sensebat: When they came to compare notes as to the feeling in the different provinces, Hasdrubal Gisgo considered that as the distant coast of Spain between Gades and the ocean still knew nothing of the Romans, it was so far faithful to Carthage.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28.2.15-16</td>
<td><em>Poenus cum castra tum forte in Baetica ad sociorum animos continendos in fide haberet, signis repente sublatis fugae magis quam itineris modo penitus ad Oceanum et Gades ducit. ceterum, quoad continuisset exercitum, propositum bello se fore ratus, antequam freto Gades traiceret exercitum omnem passim in ciuitates diuisit ut et muris se ipsi et armis muros tutarentur.</em></td>
<td>The Carthaginian, in order to ensure the loyalty of his allies, had his camp at that time, as it happened, in Baetica. Nevertheless he suddenly took up his standards and with the appearance of a flight rather than of a march led his men all the way to the Ocean and Gades. But before taking ship along the strait to Gades, thinking he would be the object of attack so long as he kept his army together he scattered his entire force among the cities in every direction, that they might defend themselves by walls and at the same time defend walled cities by their arms.</td>
<td>Subdivision of Spain. Gades as key point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.12.13</td>
<td><em>ibi tum Hasdrubal Gisgonis, maximus clarissimusque eo bello secundum Barcinos dux, regressus ab Gadibus rebellandi spe, adiuuante Magone Hamilcaris filio dilectibus per ulteriorem Hispaniam habitis ad quinquaginta milia peditum, quattuor milia et quingentos equites armauit.</em></td>
<td>Here Hasdrubal, son of Gisco, the greatest and most renowned general concerned in the war, next to the Barcine family, returning from Gades, and encouraged in his hopes of reviving the war by Mago, son of Hamilcar, by means of levies made throughout the Farther Spain, armed as many as fifty thousand foot and four thousand five hundred horse.</td>
<td>Gades as strategic point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.2.5</td>
<td>Gaditanis item petentibus remissum, ne praefectus Gades mittetur adversus id quod iis in fidem populi Romani venientibus cum L. Marcio Septimo convenisset.</td>
<td>A deputation from Gades came with a request that no prefect might be sent there, as this would be in contravention of the agreement made with L. Marcius Septimus when they placed themselves under the protection of Rome.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HIBERUM – RIVER</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.2.7</td>
<td><em>cum hoc Hasdrubale, quia mirae artis in sollicitandis gentibus imperio que suo iungendis fuerat, foedus renovaverat populus Romanus, ut finis utriusque imperii esset amnis Hiberus Saguntinis que mediis inter imperia duxerat.</em></td>
<td>With this Hasdrubal, because of the marvellous skill which he had shown in tempting the native tribes to join his empire, the Roman People had renewed their covenant, with the stipulation that neither side should extend its dominion beyond the Ebro, while the Saguntines, situated between the empires of the two peoples, should be preserved in independence.</td>
<td>Second Punic War: causes of the Second Punic War. Description of the area of the Ebro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.5.3</td>
<td><em>quibus oppugnandis quia haud dubie Romana arma movebantur, in Olcadum prius fines – ultra Hiberum ea gens in parte magis quam in dicione Carthaginiensium erat – induxit exercitum, ut non petisse Saguntinos, sed rerum serie, finitimis domitis gentibus, iungendo que tractus ad id bellum viderit posset.</em></td>
<td>But since an attack on them must certainly provoke the Romans to hostile action, he marched first into the territory of the Olcades—a tribe living south of the Ebro, within the limits of the Carthaginians but not under their dominion—that he might appear not to have aimed at the Saguntines but to have been drawn into that war by a chain of events, as he conquered the neighbouring nations and annexed their territories.</td>
<td>Causes of the Second Punic War: description of the area of the Ebro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.5.17</td>
<td><em>Hannibal agmine quadrato ammem ingressus fugam ex ripa fecit uastatisque agris intra paucos dies Carpetanos quoque in deditionem accept; et iam omnia trans Hiberum praeter Saguntinos Carthaginiensium erant.</em></td>
<td>He followed up his victory by laying waste their fields, and in a few days was able to receive the submission of the Carpetani There was no part of the country beyond the Ebro which did not now belong to the Carthaginians, with the exception of Saguntum.</td>
<td>Ebro as limitation line of power. Military actions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.7.2</td>
<td><em>Dum ea Romani parant consultantque, iam Saguntum summa ui oppugnabatur. Ciuitas ea longe opulentissima ultra Hiberum fuit, sita passus mille ferme a mari.</em></td>
<td>During these proceedings in Rome the siege of Saguntum was being pressed with the utmost vigour. That city was by far the wealthiest of all beyond the Ebro; it was situated about a mile from the sea.</td>
<td>Positioning of Saguntum in relation with Ebro</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Poenum hostem veteranum, trium et viginti annorum militia durissima inter Hispanas gentes semper victorem, duci acerrimo adsuetum, recentem ab excidio opulentissimae urbis, Hiberum transire, trahere secum tot excitos Hispanorum populos, conciturum avidas p. semper armorum Gallicas gentes; cum orbe terrarum bellum gerendum in Italia ac pro moenibus Romanis esse.

But the Carthaginians, a veteran enemy which for three-and-twenty years had seen hard and rough service amongst the Spanish tribes, and had always been victorious, trained under a general of exceptional ability, were now crossing the Ebro fresh from the sack of a most wealthy city, and were bringing with them all those Spanish tribes, eager for the fray. They would rouse the various Gaulish tribes, who were always ready to take up arms; there would be the whole world to fight against; the battleground would be Italy; the struggle would take place before the walls of Rome.

vos enim quod C. Lutatius consul primo nobiscum foedus icit, quia neque auctoritate patrum nec populi iussu icum erat, negastis vos eo teneri; itaque aliud de integro foedus publico consilio icum est. si vos non tenent foedera vestra nisi ex auctoritate aut iussu vestro icta, ne nos quidem p. Hasdrubalis foedus, quod nobis insciis icit, obligare potuit. proinde omittite Sagunti atque Hiberi mentionem facere et quod diu parturit animus vester aliquando pariat!

the Saguntines are exempted from attack. I shall meet that with your own arguments. You told us that you refused to be bound by the treaty which your consul, C. Lutatius, concluded with us, because it did not receive the authorisation of either the senate or the Assembly. A fresh treaty was accordingly made by your government. Now, if no treaties have any binding force for you unless they have been made with the authority of your senate or by order of your Assembly, we, on our side, cannot possibly be bound by Hasdrubal's treaty, which he made without our knowledge. Drop all allusions to Saguntum and the Ebro, and speak out plainly what has long been secretly hatching in your minds.'

ad Bargusios primum venerunt; a quibus benigne excepti, quia taedebat imperii Punici, multos trans Hiberum populos ad cupidinem novae fortunae erexerunt.

The Bargusii were the first they visited, and being warmly welcomed by them, for men were wearying of the Punic sway, they aroused in many nations south of the Ebro a desire to revolt.

ita peragratis Hispaniae Galliaeque populis legati Romam redeunt haud ita multo post quam consules in provincias prefecti erant. civitatem omnem expectatione bellorum et invenere satis constante fama iam Hiberum Poenos traherent.

So the envoys, having travelled through the nations of Spain and Gaul, returned to Rome, not long after the consuls had set out for their respective commands. They found the citizens all on tip-toe with expectation of the war, for the rumour persisted that the Phoenicians had already crossed the Ebro.

ab Gadibus Carthaginem ad hiberna exercitus redit; atque inde prefectus praeter Onusam urbem ad Hiberum per maritimam oram ducit.

From Gades Hannibal returned to New Carthage, to the winter quarters of his army. Setting out from thence, he marched along the coast, past the city of Onusa, to the Ebro.

in Italiam interim nihil ultra quam Hiberum transisse Hannibalem a Massiliensium legatis Romam perfatum erat.

In Italy meanwhile nothing more was known than that Hannibal had crossed the Ebro — which was the news that Massiliot envoys brought to Rome.

indignatos deinde quod quicumque Saguntum obsedissent velut ob noxam sibi dedi postularet populus Romanus, Hiberum traieciesse ad delendum nomen Romanorum liberandumque orbem terrarum.

Then, indignant that the Roman People should demand that whoever had laid siege to Saguntum be surrendered up to them, as though to expiate a felony, they had crossed the Ebro, in order to wipe out the Roman name and liberate the world.
crudelissima ac superbissima gens sua omnia suique arbitrii facit. cum quibus bellum, cum quibus pacem habeamus, se modum imponere aequum censet. circumscribit includitque nos terminis montium fluminumque quos non excedamus; neque eos quos statuit terminos observat. 'Ne transieris Hiberum! ne quid rei tibi sit cum Saguntinis!' at liberum est Saguntum. 'Nusquam te vestigio moveris!' They circumscribe and hem us in with boundaries of mountains and rivers which we may not cross; yet they do not observe those boundaries which they have set. 'Do not cross the Ebro! Have naught to do with the Saguntines!' But Saguntum is free. Do not budge from where you are in any direction!' Is it not enough that you have taken away my ancient provinces of Sicily and Sardinia Are you taking away Spain as well If I withdraw from these, shall you cross over into Africa Shall, do I say They have dispatched the two consuls of this year, the one into Africa, and the other into Spain!

The Carthaginians were encamped in Italy and almost within sight of Rome. Their object was, not to get back Sicily and Sardinia, taken from them after their defeat, nor to cross the Ebro and occupy northern Spain, but to expel the Romans from the land of their fathers and from their native soil.

Landing his army there and beginning with the Laeetani, he had brought all that coast, as far as the river Ebro, under Roman sway, partly by renewing old alliances and partly by forming new ones. The reputation which he there acquired for clemency and justice availed not only with the maritime tribes, but also with the more warlike clans inhabiting the interior and the mountainous parts; so that he was able not only to establish peaceful relations but even to conclude a military alliance with them, and several strong cohorts of auxiliaries were raised there. North of the Ebro Hanno was the Carthaginian commander, for Hannibal had left him there to defend that region. Feeling, therefore, that something ought to be done, before everything was lost to Carthage, he pitched his camp in sight of the enemy and offered battle.
Hiberum Hasdrubal cum octo milibus peditum, mille equitum, tamquam ad primum adventum Romanorum occursurus, postquam perdistas res ad Cissim amissaque castra accept, iter ad mare convertit. haud procul
Tarraco classicos milites navalesque socios vagos palantesque per agros, quod ferme fit ut secundae res neglegentiam creent, equite passim dimisse cum magna caede, maiore fuga ad naves compellit. nec diutius circa ea loca morari ausus, ne ab Scipione opprimeretur, trans Hiberum sese recepit. et Scipio raptim ad famam novorum hostium agmine acto, cum in paucos praefectos navium animadvertisset, praesidio Tarracone modico relicto Emporias cum classe rediit. vixdum digresso eo Hasdrubal aderat et Ilergetum populo, qui obsides Scipioni dederat, ad defectionem impulso cum eorum ipsorum juventute agros fideliis Romanis sociorum vastat. excito deinde Scipione hibernis toto cis Hiberum rursus cedit agro. Scipio relictam ab auctore defectionis Ilergetum gentem cum infesto exercitu invasisset, compulsi omnibus Atanagrum urbem, quae caput eius populi erat, Hasdrubal had not yet received definite tidings of this disaster when he crossed the Ebro with eight thousand infantry and a thousand cavalry, as though to confront the Romans at their first arrival; but on learning of the catastrophe at Cissis and the loss of the camp, he turned and marched in the direction of the sea. Not far from Tarraco he came upon the soldiers of the fleet and the naval allies, who were dispersed and wandering over the country-side, with the carelessness which usually attends success; and sending out his cavalry in all directions he drove them, with much slaughter and more confusion, to their ships. But not venturing to tarry longer in that region, lest Scipio should be down upon him, he retreated across the Ebro. Scipio, hearing of these new enemies, did indeed march thither with all speed; but after punishing a few of the ships’ captains, he left a garrison of moderate size in Tarraco and returned with the fleet to Emporiae. No sooner was he gone than Hasdrubal appeared, and inciting the Ilergetes, who had given Scipio hostages, to revolt, he used the young men of this very tribe to lay waste the fields of the allies who were faithful to the Romans. But this having roused Scipio from his winter quarters, he retreated again and abandoned all the territory north of the Ebro. Scipio invaded the country of the Ilergetes —left thus in the lurch by the instigator of their revolt —with fire and sword, and driving them all into the city of Atanagrus, the capital of that nation, laid siege to them.

On the second day out of Tarraco he came to an anchorage ten miles from the mouth of the river Ebro. Thence he dispatched two Massiliot scouting vessels, who reported that the Punic fleet was lying in the mouth of the river and their camp established on the bank.

The fleet now put about and returned to the northern part of the province, and thither flocked ambassadors from all the communities on this side of the Ebro and even from many places in farthest Spain; but the communities that gave hostages and really came under the rule and government of Rome were more than a hundred and twenty.

Nevertheless, this outbreak induced Hasdrubal, who was retreating towards the ocean, to turn back and cross the Ebro, for the purpose of protecting his allies.
Accordingly, while the Carthaginians were taken up with the Celtiberian campaign, they lost no time in crossing the Ebro, and seeing nothing of any enemy, marched directly on Saguntum, where it was said that hostages from all over Spain were being guarded in the citadel by a small garrison, to whose keeping they had been consigned by Hannibal.

Fear, he said, had until then kept the Spaniards down, because the Romans were a long way off; now the Roman camp was on this side of the Ebro, a sure stronghold and asylum for any who wished a change; those, accordingly, who were not bound by fear must be secured by kindness and generosity.

Thus it had actually come to pass that not only Samnium —whose territories, as though they lay beyond the Ebro, had already been surrendered to the Phoenicians —but Campania, and the districts both of Cales and Falerii had been utterly laid waste; while the dictator sat still at Casilinum and used the legions of the Roman People to protect his own estate.

he subsists on the plunder of each day; he has barely a third of that army which he led across the Ebro; more have perished by starvation than by the sword, and the few that are left have no longer any food.

In the very flush of renewed operations he met a blow in the desertion of the commanders of his ships, who, being severely reprimanded after their abandonment of the fleet at the Hiberus in their fright, had never p. since been entirely loyal either to the general or to the cause of Carthage.

Accordingly Hasdrubal at once sent a letter to Carthage, showing what a loss the mere report of his departure had caused; that if he were actually to leave the country, Spain would belong to the Romans before he should cross the Hiberus.

but that if he had set out on so long a march without funds, he would scarcely have made his way to the Alps. Therefore he exacted money in haste and came down to the Hiberus.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23.28.9-10</td>
<td>Troubled by these apprehensions, they concentrated their troops at the Hiberus, crossed the river, and after protracted deliberation, whether to pitch camp near that of the enemy or to be satisfied with keeping him from his projected march by attacking others of the Carthaginians, they prepared to attack a city which had its name Hibera from the river near by, the richest city of the region at that time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.41.1-2</td>
<td>In the same year operations in Spain were chequered. For Mago and Hasdrubal, before the Romans should cross the Ebro, routed immense forces of Spaniards. And farther Spain would have revolted from the Romans if Publius Cornelius had not hastily led his army across the Hiberus and arrived in the nick of time, while the allies were still wavering.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.37.5-8</td>
<td>But so preeminent was a mere Roman knight in his personal influence with the soldiers and in the respect they paid him that, after they had fortified a camp on this side of the Hiberus and decided that a commander of the army should be chosen in an election by the soldiers, relieving each other as sentries on the wall and in outpost duty until all had cast their votes, they unanimously conferred the high command upon Lucius Marcius. He then spent the whole time —and it was very short—in fortifying the camp and bringing up supplies. And the soldiers carried out all his commands, not only with energy, but also in no dejected spirit. But when the news came that Hasdrubal the son of Gisgo, on his way to wipe out the last remains of the war, had crossed the Hiberus and was approaching, and the soldiers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.17.3</td>
<td>then setting out for the river Ebro, he took over the army from Tiberius Fonteius and Lucius Marcius.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.20.2</td>
<td>and not allowing the enemy to feel any benefit from their successes, had kept them out of the whole region this side of the Ebro, and had loyally protected the allies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.20.6</td>
<td>The Carthaginian armies withdrew into their respective winter-quarters: Hasdrubal, the son of Gisgo, to Gades on the coast, Mago into the interior above the forest of Castulo, Hasdrubal, the son of Hamilcar, near the Ebro in the neighbourhood of Saguntum.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
in Spain at the beginning of spring Publius Scipio launched his ships, and after summoning the allied auxiliaries to Tarraco by an edict, he ordered the fleet and the transports to sail thence to the mouth of the river Ebro. Ebro is important not just as 'line' but also for its mouth able to host ships

but now with the favour of the gods we are preparing and striving, not to remain in Spain ourselves, but to prevent the Carthaginians from remaining, and not to stand on the bank of the Ebro and keep the enemy from crossing, but taking the offensive to cross over and shift the scene of the war.

Not make the enemy crossing

come now, veterans, lead a new army and a new commander across the Ebro, lead them over into lands often traversed by you with many deeds of bravery.

Crossing the Ebro (as probably the Alps) is sign of bravery

having fired the spirits of the soldiers by this speech, and leaving for the defence of the region Marcus Silanus with three thousand infantry and three hundred horsemen, all the rest of the forces — and they were twenty —five thousand infantry and two thousand five hundred cavalry —he led across the Ebro.

Military operations

on the seventh day from the Ebro they reached (New) Carthage by sea and land at the same time. camp was pitched opposite the city where it faces the north.

Ebro is once again the balance of power in Spain

some of these he answered and dismissed without stopping, some he postponed till he reached Tarraco, at which he had announced an assembly for all the allies new and old. and nearly all the peoples dwelling on this side of the Ebro came together, and many also from the farther province.

Ebro in the roman vision of Spain

Besides, a mutiny arose in the camp at Sucreo. Here were eight thousand men, stationed as a guard over the nations dwelling on this side the Iberus.

Forts on the Ebro

After this harangue he dismissed them, with orders to get themselves in readiness in every respect for marching the next day; when, setting out, he arrived at the river Iberus in ten days. Then crossing the river, he, on the fourth day, pitched his camp within sight of the enemy.
simul gratulatum, quod ita res per hos annos in Hispania atque Italia gessistis ut Hispaniam non Hibero amne tenus, sed qua terrarum ultimis finit Oceanus, domitam armis habeatis, Italiae, nisi quatenus vallum castrorum cingit, nihil reliqueritis Poeno.

and at the same time to offer you their congratulations on your having carried on your operations in Spain and Italy so successfully of late years, that you have subdued by your arms, and have gotten possession of Spain, not only as far as the river Iberus, but also to where the ocean forms the limit of the remotest regions of the world; while in Italy you have left nothing to the Carthaginian except so much space as the rampart of his camp encloses.

ab Tarracone deinde iter per praesidia Romana; circa Hiberum exercitus patris patruique tui post amissos imperatores ferociores calamitate ipsa facti;

There landing your soldiers, you marched them through countries entirely secure from danger to Tarraco, to join the allies and friends of the Roman people. After that, from Tarraco you marched through places garrisoned by Roman troops. On the banks of the Iberus were the armies of your father and your uncle, rendered.

eum iniussu senatus non Alpes modo sed Hiberum quoque transgressum, nec Romanis solum sed ante etiam Saguntinis privato consilio bellum intulisse;

They declared, that he had not only crossed the Alps, but the Iberus also, without the sanction of the senate; and that he had made war not only on the Romans, but previously on the Saguntines also, on his own individual responsibility.

patres nostri, cum in Hispania Carthaginiensium et imperatores et exercitus essent, ipsi nullum in ea militem haberent, tamen addi hoc in foedere voluerunt, ut imperii sui Hiberus fluvius esset finis; nunc cum duo praetores, cum consul, cum tres exercitus Romani Hispaniam obtineant, Carthaginiensium decem iam prope annis nemo in his provinciis sit, imperium nobis citra Hiberum amissum est.

Our fathers, at a time when the Carthaginians had in Spain both commanders and armies, and had themselves neither commander nor soldiers there, nevertheless insisted on its being an article of treaty, that the river Iberus should be the boundary of their empire. Now, when two praetors of the Romans, when a consul, and three armies are employed in Spain, and, for near ten years past, no Carthaginian has been in either of its provinces, yet we have lost that empire on the hither side of the Iberus.

et cum Tarraconom venit, iam omnis cis Hiberum Hispania perdomita erat, captivique et Romani et socium ac Latini nominis, variis casibus in Hispania oppressi, donum consuli a barbaris reducebantur.

so that, by the time when he arrived at Tarraco, all Spain on this side of the Ebro was in a state of perfect subjection; and the Roman prisoners, and those of their allies and the Latin confederates, who by various chances had fallen into the hands of the enemies in Spain, were brought back by the barbarians, as an offering to the consul.

consul interim rebellione Bergistanorum ictus, ceteras quoque civitates ratus per occasionem idem facturas, arma omnibus cis Hiberum Hispanis adimit.

The consul, meanwhile, alarmed at the rebellion of the Bergistans, and suspecting that the other states would act in like manner when occasion offered, took away their arms from all the Spaniards on this side of the Iberus.
34.19.10 deinde audito Saguntiae Celtiberum omnes sarcinas impedimentaque relicta, eo pergit ducere ad oppugnandum. postquam nulla moventur re, persoluto stipendo non suis modo sed etiam praetoris millibus relictoque omni exercitu in castris praetoris ipse cum septem cohortibus ad Hiberum est regressus. then hearing that all the baggage of the Celtiberians was deposited at Saguntia, he proceeded thither to attack that town, but was unable, notwithstanding, to provoke them to stir. Paying, therefore, his own troops and those of Minucius, he left the bulk of his army in the praetor’s camp, and, with seven cohorts, returned to the Iberus.

35.1.3 nec dubium est quin omnis Hispania sublatura animos fuerit, ni alter praetor P. Cornelius Cn. F. Scipio trans Hiberum multa secunda proelia fecisset, quo terrore non minus quinquaginta oppida ad eum defecerunt. In consequence of this, every state in Spain would certainly have resumed new courage, had not the other praetor, Publius Cornelius Scipio, son of Cneius, been successful in several engagements on the other side of the Iberus;

39.56.1 eodem anno A. Terentius proconsul haud procul flumine Hibero, in agro Ausetano, et proelia secunda cum Celtiberis fecit, et oppida, quae ibi communierant, aliquot expugnavit. In the same year Aulus Terentius Varro, the proprietor, fought some successful battles with the Celtiberians, not far from the river Iberus, in the territory of Auseta, reducing several towns, which they had fortified in that quarter.

21.44.5-6 Circumscribit includitque nos terminis montium fluminumque, quos non excedamus, neque eos, quos statuit, terminos obseruat: 'Ne transieris Hiberum; ne quid rei tibi sit cum Saguntinis.' Ad Hiberum est Saguntum 'Nusquam te vestigio moveris.' Again the ebro as key river

MEANDER RIVER

37.45.1 sub idem fere tempus et ab Trallibus et a Magnesia quae super Maeandrum est, et ab Epheso ad dedendas urbes venerunt. About this time deputies came from Tralles, from Magnesia on the Maeander, and from Ephesus, to surrender those cities.

37.45.19 cum iis mandatis ab rege missi erant legati ut omnem pacis condicionem acciperent; itaque Roman mitti legatos placuit. consul in hiberna exercitum Magnesiam ad Maeandrum et Tralles Ephesumque divisit. It was resolved, therefore, that ambassadors should be sent to Rome. The consul distributed his army in winter quarters at Magnesia, on the Maeander, Tralles, and Ephesus.

37.55.5 summam tamen hanc fore, ut cis Taurum montem, quae intra regni Antiochi fines fuissent, Eumeni attribuerentur praeter Lyciam Cariamque usque ad Maeandrum amnem; That the general plan was to be this: that the places on this side of Mount Taurus, which had been within the limits of the realm of Antiochus, should be assigned to Eumenes, excepting Lycia and Caria, as far as the river Maeander;

37.56.3 et nominativ Magnesiam ad Sipylum, et Cariam, quae Hydrela appellatur, agrumque Hydrelitanum ad Phrygiam vergentem, et castella vicosque ad Maeandrum amnem et oppida then the city of Caria, called also Hydrela, and the territory of Hydrela, stretching towards Phrygia, and the forts and villages on the river Maeander, and likewise the towns, excepting such as had been free before the war,

Lycia and Caria Treaty of Apamea

Land delimitation based on Maeander
### 37.56.6

**ea quoque iis pars Cariae data quae propior Rhodum insulam trans Maeandrum amnem est, oppida, vici, castella, agri, qui ad Pisidiam vergunt, nisi quae eorum oppida in libertate fuissent pridie, quam cum Antiocho rege in Asia pugnatum est.**

To the latter was given also that part of Caria which lies beyond the river Maeander nearest to the island of Rhodes, with its towns, villages, forts, and lands, extending to Pisidia, excepting those towns which had been in a state of freedom on the day before that of the battle with Antiochus.

---

### 38.12.9-10

**consul collaudato iuvene cum omnibus copiis ad p. Maeandrum progressus castra posuit, quia vado superari amnis non poterat et contrahendae naves erant ad exercitum traiciendum.**

The consul, after highly commending the young prince, having advanced with all his forces, encamped on the bank of the Maeander, for as that river could not be forded, it was necessary to collect shipping for carrying over the army.

---

### 38.13.4-7

**consul tribuno militum misso cum modica manu castellum vi cepit, captum Alabandensibus reddat. ipse nihil via degressus ad Antiochiam super Maeandrum amnem posuit castra. huius amnis fonts Celaeninis oriuntur. Celaenae urbs caput quondam Phrygiae fuit; migratum inde haud procul veteribus Celaenis, novaque urbi Apameae nomen inditum ab Apama sore Seleucis regis. et Marsyas amnis, haud procul a Maeandri fontibus oriens, in Maeandrum cadit, famaque ita tenet Celaenis Marsyan cum Apolline tiebarum cantu certasse. maeander ex arce summa Celaenarum p. ortus, media urbe decurrens, per Caras primum deinde Ionas in sinum maris editur qui inter Prienen et Miletum est.**

The consul, having sent a military tribune with a small party, took the fort by assault, and restored it to the Alabandians. He himself, not deviating from his route, pitched his camp at Antioch on the Maeander. The source of this river is in Celaenae, which city was formerly the metropolis of Phrygia. The inhabitants afterwards removed to a spot not far distant from Old Celaenae, and the name of Apama was given to their new city, from Apama the sister of king Seleucus. The river Marsyas also, rising at a little distance from the head of the Maeander, falls into the latter river, and report so has it, that at Celaenae Marsyas contended with Apollo in the music of the pipe. The Maeander, springing up in the highest part of the citadel of Celaenae, runs down through the middle of the city, then through Caria, afterwards through Ionia, and empties itself into a bay which lies between Priene and Miletus.

---

### 38.39.13

**rhodiis affirmata quae data priore decreto erant; Lycia et Caria datae usque ad Maeandrum amnem praeter Telmessum.**

Lycia and Caria were assigned to them as far as the river Maeander, except Telmessus.

---

### 36.17.15

**Asiam deinde Syriamque et omnia usque ad ortum solis ditissima regna Romano imperio apertos, quid deinde abert, quin ad Gabidus ad mare rubrum Ocean o finis terminemus, qui orbem terrarum amplexu finit, et omne humanum genus secundum deos nomen Romanum ueneretur in haec tanta praemia dignos parate animos, ut crastino die bene iuuantibus diis acie decernamus.**

and also, that you will open a way for the Roman power into Asia and Syria, and all the most opulent realms to the extremity of the East. What then must be the consequence, but that, from Gades to the Red Sea, we shall have no limit but the ocean, which encircles in its embrace the whole orb of the earth; and that all mankind shall regard the Roman name with a degree of veneration next to that which they pay to the divinities.

---

### 45.9.6

**Arabas hinc Indiamque, qua terrarum ultumos finis rubrum mare amplectitur,**

Hence it overspread the Arabias and India, as far as where the Red Sea forms the utmost boundary of the earth.

---

**RUBRUM – SEA/OCEAN**

**38.12.10**

Forts by the Meandrus (defensive line)

---

**38.13.4-7**

Complex geography of the places around Meandrus

---

**38.39.13**

Land delimitation based on Maeander

---

**36.17.15**

General idea of the extension of the Roman Republic

---

**45.9.6**

Red Sea as 'limit of the world'

---

**Taurus – Mountain Range**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Greek Text</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35.13.4</td>
<td>Antiochus rex, ea hieme Raphiae in Phoenice Ptolomaeo regi Aegypti filia in matrimonium data, cum Antiochiam se recepisset, per Ciliciam Tauro monte superato extremo iam hiemis Ephesum pervenit;</td>
<td>King Antiochus having, this winter, solemnized the nuptials of his daughter with Ptolemy, king of Egypt, at Raphia, in Phœnicia, returned thence to Antioch, and came, towards the end of the season, through Cilicia, after passing Mount Taurus, to the city of Ephesus.</td>
<td>Crossing the Taurus M. means peril or real occupation of territory.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.35.10</td>
<td>sed sicut Graecia omnis liberata esset, ita, quae in Asia sint, omnes liberari urbes; id ait fieri non posse, quam ut cis Taurum montem possessione Asie Antiochus cedat.</td>
<td>That this could be effected in no other way, than by Antiochus relinquishing the possession of that part of Asia on the hither side of Mount Taurus.’</td>
<td>The possession of Asia is linked with the freedom of the territories up to Taurus.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.45.14</td>
<td>Europa abstinete; Asia omni, quae cis Taurum montem est, decidite.</td>
<td>Resign all pretensions in Europe, and cede that part of Asia which lies on this side of Mount Taurus.</td>
<td>Treaty of Apamaea.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.52.4</td>
<td>quod terra marique res prospere gessissent, quodque regem Antiochum fusum fugatumque et exutum castris prius Europa, post et Asia, quae cis Taurum montem est, expulisset;</td>
<td>and had congratulated them ‘because they had carried on affairs successfully by sea and land, and because they had utterly routed, driven out of his camp, and expelled king Antiochus, first from Europe, and then from all Asia on this side of Mount Taurus.’</td>
<td>Treaty of Apamea: confirmation of Eumenes’ might, claiming territories behind Taurus.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.53.25</td>
<td>quid ergo postulas dicat aliquis. ego, patres conscripti, quoniam dicere utique volentibus vobis parendum est, si vos ea mente ultra Tauri iuga emostis Antiochum, ut ipsi teneretis eas terras, nullos accolas nec finitimos habere quam vos malo,</td>
<td>Conscript fathers, since I must obey you when you desire me to explain my wishes: if you have removed Antiochus beyond the mountains of Taurus with the intention of holding those countries yourselves, I wish for no other people to settle near me, no other neighbours than you; nor could I hope that my kingdom would be rendered safer or firmer by any other event.</td>
<td>The passes of Taurus. The fines are also a way to keep the distance between states.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.54.23</td>
<td>terminus est nunc imperii vestri mons Taurus; quidquid intra eum cardinem est, nihil longinquum vobis debet videri; quo arma vestræ pervenerunt, eodem ius hinc profectum perveniat.</td>
<td>The boundary of your empire, at present, is Mount Taurus. Nothing within that line ought to be thought remote. To whatever extent your arms have reached, let justice, emanating from Rome, spread.</td>
<td>The passes of Taurus. Limits of Eumenes’ kingdom.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.55.5</td>
<td>summam tamen hanc fore, ut cis Taurum montem, quae intra regni Antiochi fines fuissent, Eumeni attribuerentur praeter Lyciam Cariamque usque ad Maeandrum amnem;</td>
<td>That the general plan was to be this: that the places on this side of Mount Taurus, which had been within the limits of the realm of Antiochus, should be assigned to Eumenes, excepting Lycia and Caria, as far as the river Maeander; and that these last-mentioned should become the property of the Rhodians.</td>
<td>Limits of Eumenes’ kingdom.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.56.8</td>
<td>vocati sunt legati regis Antiochi actumque cum iis est nec quicquam impetratum testante foedera Antipatro, adversus quae ab Rhodiis non Solos, sed Ciliciam peti et iuga Tauri transcendi.</td>
<td>The ambassadors of Antiochus were called in, and the matter was proposed to them, but their consent could not be obtained; Antipater appealing to the treaty, in opposition to which, not only Soli, but Cilicia was sought by the Rhodians, and they were passing the summits of Taurus.</td>
<td>The passes of Taurus.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.8.4</td>
<td>Antiocho terra marique superato et prope extra orbem terrae ultra iuga Tauri exacto quam spem esse sustinendi bell.</td>
<td>Since Antiochus was vanquished by land and sea, and driven beyond the mountains of Taurus, almost out of the world, what hope remained of their being able to support it</td>
<td>The passes of Taurus.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Translation</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.8.8</td>
<td>non paucis urbibus eum, de quorum libertate certatum sit, sed omni Asia cis Taurum montem, opimo regno, excessisse.</td>
<td>He had ceded, not the few cities whose liberty was the ground of the dispute, but an opulent kingdom, all Asia on this side Mount Taurus. That he (the consul) would not listen to the Aetolians, treating concerning peace, unless they laid down their arms.</td>
<td>Treaty of Apamea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.12.4</td>
<td>qui et auxiliis iuvissent Antiochum, et adeo indomita haberent ingenia, ut nequiquam Antiochus emotus ultra iuga Tauri montis esset, nisi frangerentur opes Gallorum, de se quoque paucu, nec falsa nec immodica, adiecit.</td>
<td>that Antiochus was to no purpose removed beyond the range of Mount Taurus, unless the power of the Gauls was broken; he then spoke briefly of himself, in terms neither ill-grounded nor extravagant.</td>
<td>The passes of Taurus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.15.7</td>
<td>ex Pamphylia rediens ad fluvium Taurum primo die, postero ad Xylinen quam vocant Comen posuit castra. profectus inde continentibus itineribus ad Cormasa urbem pervenit.</td>
<td>Returning from Pamphylia he pitched his camp, the first day, at the river Taurus, and the second at Come Xyline, as they call it. Departing from which, he proceeded, by uninterrupted marches, to the city of Cormasa.</td>
<td>Presence of a ‘River Taurus’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.16.10</td>
<td>tamen tantum terroris omnibus quae cis Taurum incolunt gentibus iniecerunt, ut quas adissent quasque non adissent, pariter ultimae propinquus, imperio parerent.</td>
<td>Then leaving Bithynia, they advanced into Asia; and although, of their twenty thousand men, not more than ten thousand carried arms, yet such a degree of terror did they strike into all the natives, dwelling on this side of Taurus, that those which they-visited, and those which they did not visit, the most remote as well as the nearest, submitted to their authority.</td>
<td>Connection between Taurus M. and imperium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.27.7-8</td>
<td>Romanorum pars magna ea nocte in castris hostium mansit; ceteros in sua castra consul reduxit. postero die captivos praedamque recensuit, quae tanta fuit, quantam avidissima rapiendi gens, cum cis montem Taurum omnia armis per multos annos tenuisset, coacervare potuit. Galli ex dissipata passim fuga in unum locum congregati, magna pars saeclui aut inermes, nudati omnibus rebus, oratores de pace ad consulem miserunt. eos Manlius Ephesum venire iussit; ipse — iam enim medium autumni erat — locis gelidis propinquus Tauri montis excedere properans victorem exercitum in hiberna maritimae orae reduxit.</td>
<td>Next day, he took a review of the prisoners, and of the booty, the quantity of which was as great as a nation most greedy of rapine could amass, after holding possession, by force of arms, of all the country on this side Mount Taurus, during a space of many years. The Gauls, after this scattered and confused flight, reassembled in one place, a great part of them being wounded or unarmed, and as all were destitute of every kind of property, they sent deputies to the consul, to supplicate for peace. Manlius ordered them to attend him at Ephesus; and, being in haste to quit those cold regions, in the vicinity of Mount Taurus, as it was now the middle of autumn, he led back his victorious army into winter quarters on the sea-coast.</td>
<td>Roman operations in Asia are limited to the side behind (cis) of the M. Taurus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.37.1</td>
<td>hieme ea qua haec Romae gesta sunt, ad Cn. Manlium consulem primum, dein pro consule, hibernantem in Asia, legationes undique ex omnibus civitatibus gentibusque, quae cis Taurum montem incolunt, conveniente.</td>
<td>During the winter wherein these acts were performed at Rome, embassies from all the nations and states which dwell on this side of Mount Taurus, came together on all sides to Cneius Manlius, at first consul, and afterwards proconsul, passing the winter in Asia;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.38.4</td>
<td>excedito urbibus agris vicis castellis cis Taurum montem usque ad Halyn amnem, et a valle Tauri usque ad iuga qua in Lycaoniaram vergit.</td>
<td>Let him evacuate the cities, lands, villages, and forts on this side of Mount Taurus, as far as the river Halys; and from the foot of Mount Taurus to the summit, where it verges upon Lycaonia.</td>
<td>Lands, forts, country towns were abandoned by Antiochus. R. Halis and M. Taurus = line?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Translation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.39.17</td>
<td>de Pamphylia disceptatum inter Eumenem et Antiochi legatos cum esset, quia pars eius citra pars ultra Taurum est, integra res ad senatum reicitur.</td>
<td>When a dispute had arisen between Eumenes and Antiochus's ambassadors, concerning Pamphylia, because part of it lay on the hither side, and part on the further side of Taurus, the matter was referred wholly to the senate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.45.3</td>
<td>cupientem transire Taurum aegre omnium legatorum precibus, ne carminibus Sibyllae praedictam superantibus terminos fatales cladem experit vellet, retentum admosse tamen exercitum et prope in ipsis iugis ad divortia aquarum castra posuisse.</td>
<td>That Manlius, desiring to cross Mount Taurus, was with difficulty restrained by the entreaties of all the ambassadors, who besought him not to brave the curse denounced in the Sibylline verses against such as should pass those fatal limits. Nevertheless, he marched his army thither, and encamped almost on the very summit where the waters take opposite directions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.47.6</td>
<td>sed hostem omnino non vidisse inimici iactabant; ego, qui cum centum milibus ferocissimorum hostium signis collatis totiens pugnavi, qui plus quadraginta milia hominum cepi aut occidi, qui bina castra eorum expugnavi, qui citra iuga Tauri omnia pacatiora quam terra Italia est reliqui, non triumpho modo fraudor,</td>
<td>Fabius enjoyed a triumph; and yet his adversaries alleged, not that he had carried on an unjust war, but that he had not seen the enemy at all. Whereas I, who fought so many pitched battles with one hundred thousand of your fiercest enemies; who killed or made prisoners more than forty thousand; who stormed two of their camps; who left all the countries on this side of the summits of Taurus in greater tranquillity than is the country of Italy;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.47.11</td>
<td>mittite agedum legatos circa omnes Asiae urbes et quaeerite, utra graviori servitute, Antiocho ultra Tauri iuga emoto an Gallis subactis, liberati sint.</td>
<td>The farther Antiochus was removed, the more tyrannically would the Gauls have domineered in Asia; and all the countries on this side of Taurus you would have annexed to their empire, not to your own.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.48.1-4</td>
<td>Quo longius Antiochus emotus esset, hoc impotentius in Asia Galli dominarentur, et, quidquid est terrarum citra Tauri iuga, Gallorum imperio, non ustrum adiecissetis, curandum animadvertendumque quid in his terris fieret, et hoc quo finem imperii Romani Taurum montem statuisis, quo libertatem, immunitatem civitatibus datis, quo aliis fines adicitis, alias agro multatis, aliis vectigal imponitis, regna augetis minuitis donatis adimitis, curae vestrae censetis esse, ut pacem terra marisque habeant.</td>
<td>'But, allowing all this to be so; the Gauls formerly sacked Delphi, the common oracle to which all mankind resort, and the central point of the globe of the earth; yet the Roman people did not, on that account, proclaim or wage war against them. I really thought, that there was some distinction to be made between that period when Greece and Asia were not yet under your jurisdiction and dominion, and the present, when you have made Mount Taurus the boundary of the Roman empire; when you grant liberty and independence to the states of that country; when you augment the territories of some; amerce others in a part of their lands; impose tribute;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.53.3</td>
<td>Antiochum—recipit enim fratrem consortem huius gloriae L. Scipio— ultra iuga Tauri emovit, ut duobus Petilliis succumberet</td>
<td>Was it for this he took Syphax prisoner, conquered Hannibal, made Carthage tributary to you, and removed Antiochus beyond Mount Taurus (for Lucius Scipio received his brother Africanus as his associate in this glory); that he should crouch under two Petilliis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Why need I speak of the extent of the kingdom of Antiochus, or that he held all Asia, and the adjoining parts of Europe. Every body knows what a large portion of the surface of the earth that is, which stretches from Mount Taurus quite to the Aegean Sea; what a number, not only of cities, but of nations, it comprehends; and that this tract, as far as the summit of Mount Taurus, more than thirty days’ journey in length and ten in breadth, from one sea to the other, —has been taken from Antiochus, who is thereby removed to the most distant corner of the world.

The Romans were in want of neither money nor territory: but they considered that all human affairs, even kingdoms and empires, are subject to many casualties. They had themselves broken the power of the Carthaginians, and settled in the neighbourhood a very powerful king, as a yoke on their necks, and had removed Antiochus and his future successors beyond the mountains of Taurus.

It happened by singular good fortune that the Tiber having spread beyond its banks into stagnant pools afforded nowhere any access to the regular channel of the river, and the men who brought the twins were led to hope that being infants they might be drowned, no matter how sluggish the stream.

The story is as follows: Hercules, after slaying Geryones, was driving off his wondrously beautiful cattle, when, close to the river Tiber, where he had swum across it with the herd before him, he found a green spot, where he could let the cattle rest and refresh themselves with the abundant grass; and being tired from his journey he lay down himself.

Thence they turned to the left — for the Tiber stopped them on the right — and by their devastations struck terror into the farmers, whose sudden stampede from the fields into the City brought the first tidings of war.
| 1.15.2 | *itaque non castris positis, non exspectato hostium exercitu raptam ex agris praedam portantes Veios rediere. Romanus contra, postquam hostem in agris non inventit, dimicationi ultimae instructus intensioneque Tiberim transit.* | They made an incursion into Roman territory which more resembled a marauding expedition than a regular campaign; and so, without having entrenched a camp or waited for the enemy’s army, they carried off their booty from the fields and brought it back to Veii. The Romans, on the contrary, not finding their enemy in the fields, crossed the Tiber, ready and eager for a decisive struggle. | 1st War against Veii: Veientines’ military operations |
| 1.27.4 | *cum Fidenae aperte descissent, Tullus Mettio exercituque eius ab Alba accito contra hostes ducit. ubi Anienem transiit, ad confluentis conlocat castra. inter eum locum et Fidenas Veientium exercitus Tiberim transferat.* | Fidenae having openly revolted, Tullus summoned Mettius and his army from Alba, and led his forces against the enemy. Crossing the Anio, he pitched his camp at the confluence of the rivers. The Veientine army had crossed the Tiber between that place and Fidenae. | 1st War against Veii: Veientines’ military operations |
| 1.33.6-7 | *Ianiculum quoque adiectum, non inopia loci, sed ne quando ea arx hostium esset. id non muniri solum sed etiam ob commoditatem itineris ponte sublicio, tum primum in Tiberi facto, coniungi urbi placuit. Quiritium quoque fossa, haud parvum munimentum a planioribus aditu locis, Anci regis opus est.* | Janiculum was also annexed to the city, not from any lack of room, but lest it might some day become a stronghold of Rome’s enemies. It was decided not only to fortify it, but also to connect it with the City, for greater ease in passing to and fro, by a bridge of piles, the first bridge ever built over the Tiber. The Quirites’ Ditch also, no small protection on the more level and accessible side of town, was the work of King Ancus. | Annexing of Janiculum and building of the Sublicius bridge on Tiber |
| 1.37.2 | *ea quoque res in pugna terorem attulit Sabinis, et fusis eadem fugam impedit; multique mortales, cum hostem effugiissent, in flumine ipso periere; quorum fluitantia arma ad urbem cognita in Tiberi prius paene quam nuntiari posset insignem victoriam fecere.* | This was another source of alarm to the Sabines during the battle, and upon their being routed the same thing hindered their flight, so that many of them escaped the Romans only to perish in the stream; while their shields floated down the Tiber toward the City, and, being recognized, gave assurance that a victory had been won almost sooner than the news of it could be brought. | War against Sabines |
| 1.38.6 | *nam et muro lapideo, cuius exordium operis Sabino bello turbatum erat, urbem qua nondum munierat cingere parat, et infima urbis loca circa forum aliasque interiectas collibus convalles, quia ex planis locis haud facile evehebant aquas, cloacis fastigio in Tiberim ductis siccat, et aream ad aedem in Capitolio Iovis, quam voeverat bello Sabino, iam praesagiente animo futuram olim amplitudinem loci occupat fundamentis.* | For he set to work to encircle the hitherto unfortified parts of the City with a stone wall, a task which had been interrupted by the Sabine war; and he drained the lowest parts of the City, about the Forum, and the other valleys between the hills, which were too flat to carry off the flood-waters easily, by means of sewers so made as to slope down toward the Tiber. Finally, with prophetic anticipation of the splendour which the place was one day to possess, he laid foundations for the temple of Jupiter on the Capitol, which he had vowed in the Sabine war. | Building of Cloaca Maxima |
1.45.6-7 ut prima apta dies sacrificio visa est, bovem Romam actam
deductu ad fanum Dianae et ante aram statuit. ibi antistes
Romanus, cum eum magnitudo victimae celebrata fama
movisset, memor responsi Sabinum ita adloquitur: 'quidnam
tu, hospes, paras ' inquit, 'inceste sacrificium Dianae facere
quin tu ante vivo perfunderis flumine infima valle praefluat
Tiberis.' religione tactus hospes, qui omnia, ut prodigio
responderetur eventus, superet rite facta, extempta descendit
ad Tiberim. interea Romanus immolat Dianae bovem. id
mire gratum regi atque civitati fuit.

1.5.2
diripienda plebi sunt data, ut contacta regia praeda spem in
perpetuum cum iis pacis amitteret. ager Tarquiniorum, qui
inter urbem ac Tiberim fuit, consecratus Marti Martius
dinde campus fuit. forte ibi tum seges farris dicitur fuisse
matura messi. quem campi fructum quia religiosum erat
consumere, desectam cum stramento segetem magna vis
hominum simul immissa corbibus fudere in Tiberim tenui
fluentem aqua, ut mediis caloribus solet. ita in vadis
haesitantis frumenti acervos sedisse inlitos limo;

1.10.1
cum hostes adessent, pro se quisque in urbem ex agris
demigrant, urbem ipsam saepiunt praesidiis. alia muris, alia
Tiberi obiecto videbantur tuta:

1.11.1 Porsenna primo conatu repulsus, consiliis ab oppugnanda
urbe ad obsidendum versis, praesidio in Ianiculo locato ipse
in plano ripisque Tiberis castra posuit,
Porsinna, repulsed in his first attempt, gave up the plan of storming the
City, and determined to lay siege to it. Placing a garrison on Janiculum, he
pitched his camp in the plain by the banks of the Tiber.

1.12.5 'transire Tiberim', inquit, 'patres, et intrare, si possim, castra
hostium volo, non praeedo nec populationum in vicem uttor:
maius, si di iuvant, in animo est facinus.' adprobant patres.
abdito intra vestem ferro proficiscitur.

should sacrifice the animal to Diana would be the seat of empire, and this
prediction had reached the ears of the priest of Diana's shrine. On the
earliest day which seemed suitable for the sacrifice, the Sabine drove the
heifer to Rome, and bringing her to the shrine of Diana, led her up to the
altar. There the Roman priest, moved by the great size of the victim, which
had been much talked of, and recalling the prophecy, asked the Sabine,
'What is this that you are doing, stranger Would you sacrifice, unpurified,
to Diana Not so! First bathe in a running stream; the Tiber flows by in the
bottom of the valley.' The stranger, touched by a scruple and wishing to
do everything according to ritual, that the prodigy might be answered by
the event, at once descended to the Tiber. Meanwhile the Roman offered
the heifer to Diana, an act which was exceedingly acceptable to the king
and the citizens.

They refused to return it, and refused to confiscate it to the state, but gave
it up to the plebeians to plunder, that having had their fingers in the spoils
of the princes they might for ever relinquish hope of making their peace
with them. The land of the Tarquinii, lying between the City and the Tiber,
was consecrated to Mars and became the Campus Martius. It happened,
they say, that there was then standing upon it a crop of spelt, ripe for the
harvest. Since this produce of the land might not, for religious reasons, be
consumed, the grain was cut, straw and all, by a large body of men, who
were set to work upon it simultaneously, and was carried in baskets and
thrown into the Tiber, then flowing with a feeble current, as is usually the
case in midsummer.

When the enemy appeared, the Romans all, with one accord, withdrew
from their fields into the City, which they surrounded with guards. Some
parts appeared to be rendered safe by their walls, others by the barrier
formed by the river Tiber.

Porsinna, repulsed in his first attempt, gave up the plan of storming the
City, and determined to lay siege to it. Placing a garrison on Janiculum, he
pitched his camp in the plain by the banks of the Tiber.

'I wish', said he, 'to cross the river, senators, and enter, if I can, the
enemy's camp—not to plunder or exact reprisals for their devastations: I
have in mind to do a greater deed, if the gods grant me their help.'

War against Porsenna: Tiber as purificator

Campus Martius: the land
of the Tarquinii, lying
between the City and the
Tiber, was consecrated to
Mars and became the
Campus Martius.

War against Porsenna: Tiber as a defensive
barrier

War against Porsenna: Janiculum and Tiber as
military elements

War against Porsenna: Transire Tiberim, cross
the river
2.13.5 patres C. Mucio virtutis causa trans Tiberim agrum dono dedere quae postea sunt Mucia prata appellata. ergo ita honorata virtute feminae quoque ad publica decora excitate, et Cloelia virgo, una ex obsidibus, cum castra Etruscorum forte haud procul ripa Tiberis locata essent, frustrata custodes, dux agminis virginum inter tela hostium Tiberim tranavit sospitesque omnes Romam ad propinquos restituit.

The Fathers bestowed on Gaius Mucius, for his bravery, a field across the Tiber, which was later known as the Mucian Meadows. Now when courage had been thus distinguished, even the women were inspired to deeds of patriotism. Thus the maiden Cloelia, one of the hostages, eluded the sentinels, when it chanced that the Etruscans had encamped not far from the bank of the Tiber, and heading a band of girls swam the river and, under a rain of hostile darts, brought them all back in safety to their kinsmen in Rome.

2.34.5 ex Tuscis frumentum Tiberi venit; eo sustentata est plebs. incommodo bello in tam artis commeatibus vexati forent, ni Volscos iam moventes arma pestilentia ingens invasisset.

From the Tuscans corn came in by way of the Tiber, and with this the plebes were kept alive. A disastrous war would have been added to the distresses arising from the scarcity of provisions, had not a grievous pestilence descended upon the Volsci just as they were beginning hostilities.

2.51.2 tum quoque male pugnatum est, et Ianiculum hostes occupavere; obsessaque urbem super bellum annona premente—transierat enim Etrusci Tiberim,—ni Horatius consul ex Volscis esset revocatus. adeoque id bellum ipsis institut moenibus ut primo pugnatum ad Spei sit aequo Marte, iterum ad portam Collinam.

They would also have laid siege to Rome, which was suffering not only from war but from a scarcity of corn —for the Etruscans had crossed the Tiber —had not the consul Horatius been recalled from the Volscian country; and so nearly did that invasion approach the very walls of the City that battles were fought first at the temple of Hope, where the result was indecisive, and again at the Colline Gate.

3.13.10 pecunia a patre exacta crudeliter, ut divenditis omnibus bonis aliquamdiu trans Tiberim veluti relegatus devio quodam tugurio viveret.

The money was exacted from Caeso’s father without pity, so that he was obliged to sell all that he had and live for some time on the other side of the Tiber, like one banished, in a certain lonely hovel.

3.26.8 spes unica imperii populi Romani L. Quinctius p. trans Tiberim, contra eum ipsum locum ubi nunc navalia sunt, quattuor iugera colebat agrum, quae prata Quinctia vocantur.

The one hope of Rome, L. Quinctius, used to cultivate a four-acre field on the other side of the Tiber, just opposite the place where the dockyard and arsenal are now situated; it bears the name of the ‘Quinctian Meadows’. How the ‘Trans Tiberim’ was considered. ‘Digging out a ditch’.

4.12.11 multi ex plebe, spe amissa, potius quam ut cruciarentur trahendo animam, capitibus obvolutis se in Tiberim praecipitaverunt. and by this bitter inquisition rather revealed than alleviated the scarcity, so that many of the plebeians lost hope, and sooner than suffer torment by prolonging their existence, covered up their heads and threw themselves into the Tiber.

4.19.6 Dictator legionibus fugatis instat et ad castra compulsos caedit. Fidenatum plurimi locorum notitia effugere in montes. Cossus Tiberim cum equitatu transvectus ex agro Veientano ingentem detulit praedam ad urbem.

The dictator pressed on after the flying legions, and pursuing them to their camp cut them to pieces. Large numbers of the Fidenates escaped, thanks to their knowledge of the ground, into the mountains. Cossus crossed the Tiber with his cavalry, and from the fields of the Veientes brought a vast quantity of booty back to town.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.31.8</td>
<td>consultare inde principes duorum populorum Veios an Fidenas sedem belli caperent. Fidenae visae opportuniores; itaque traicto Tiberi Veientes Fidenas transtulerunt bellum.</td>
<td>Consultations followed between the leaders of the two nations whether they should take Veii or Fidenae for the headquarters of their campaign. Fidenae seemed the fitter; and accordingly the Veientes crossed the Tiber and transferred the war to Fidenae.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.32.8</td>
<td>votis deinde nuncupatis profectus mille et quingentos passus citra Fidenas castra locat, dextra montibus, laeva Tiberi amne saeptus.</td>
<td>Then, having offered vows to the gods, he marched out and encamped a mile and a half this side of Fidenae, protected on his right by mountains, on his left by the river Tiber.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.33.10</td>
<td>cum duae acies, duo diversa proelia circumventos Etruscos et a fronte et ab tergo urgerent neque in castra retro neque in montes, unde se novus hostis obiecerat, iter fugae esset, et equitem passim liberos frenis distulissent equi, Veientium maxima pars Tiberim effusi petunt, Fidenatium qui supersunt ad urbem Fidenas tendunt.</td>
<td>Now that two battle-fronts and two distinct attacks hemmed in the Etruscans and forced them back from front and rear; and there was no way for them to flee, either back into their camp or into the mountains, whence a new foe had appeared to block their path; and the horses, with loose reins, had borne their riders far and wide; —the Veientes for the most part ran in disorder to the Tiber, while those of the Fidenates who survived turned towards the city of Fidenae.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.49.2</td>
<td>ni Veiens bellum religio principum distulisset, quorum agros Tiberis super ripas effusus maxime ruinis villarum vastavit.</td>
<td>Veientine leaders, whose farms an overflow of the Tiber had laid waste, chiefly by ruining the farmhouses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.52.5-6</td>
<td>iam fames quam pestilentia tristior erat, ni dimissis circa omnes populos legatis qui Etruscum mare quique Tiberim accolunt ad frumentum mercandum, annonae foret subventum. superbe ab Samnitibus qui Capuam habebant Cumasque legati prohibiti commercio sunt, contra ea benigne ab Siculorum tyrannis adiuti; maximos commeatus summo Etruriae studio Tiberis devexit.</td>
<td>Indeed the famine would have been more baneful than the disease, had they not supplemented the supply of corn by dispatching emissaries to all the peoples round about who dwelt on the Tuscan sea or by the Tiber, to purchase it. The Samnites who held Capua and Cumae insolently refused to permit the envoys to trade with them, but the Sicilian tyrants, on the contrary, lent them generous assistance; and the largest supplies of all were brought down the Tiber, with the hearty goodwill of the Etruscans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.13.1</td>
<td>Anxur in Volscis brevi receptum est neglectis die festo custodis urbis. insignis annis hieme gelida ac nivosa fuit, adeo ut viae clausae, Tiberis innavigabilis fuerit. annonae ex ante convecta copia nihil mutavit.</td>
<td>The Volscian Anxur was recaptured owing to the laxity of the guard during a festival. The year was remarkable for such a cold and snowy winter that the roads were blocked and the Tiber rendered unnavigable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.38.5</td>
<td>in altera acie nihil simile Romanis, non apud duces, non apud milites erat. pavor fugaeque occupaverat animos et tanta omnium oblivio ut multo maior pars Veios in hostium urbem, cum Tiberis arceret, quam recto itinere Romam ad coniuges ac liberis fugerent.</td>
<td>In the other army there was no resemblance to Romans, either amongst officers or private soldiers. Terror and dismay had got hold of their spirits, and such complete forgetfulness of everything that a much greater number fled to Veii, a hostile city, though the Tiber was across their way, than by the straight road to Rome, to their wives and children.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.38.8  circa ripam Tiberis, quo armis abiectis totum sinistrum
  cornu defugit, magna strages facta est, multosque imperitos
  nandi aut invalidos, graves loricis alisque tegminibus,
  hauere gurgites;
  On the bank of the Tiber, whither the whole left wing had fled, after
  throwing away their arms, there was great slaughter, and many who could
  not swim, or lacked the strength, weighed down by their corslets and other
  armour, sank beneath the flood.

5.46.8  ingenti periculo transeundum per hostium custodias erat. ad
  eam rem Pontius Cominus, impiger iuvenis, operam
  pollicitus incubans cortici secundo Tiberi ad urbem defertur.
  This an active youth named Pontius Cominus undertook to do, and
  supporting himself on a strip of cork, floated down the Tiber to the City.

5.54.3  etsi minus injuriae vestrae meminisse iuvat — cum abessem,
  quotienscumque patria in mentem veniret, haec omnia
  occurrebant, colles campique et Tiberis et adsueta oculis
  regio et hoc caelum sub quo natus educatusque essem;
  Is our love of country confined to buildings and rafters And in truth I will
  confess to you — though: like not to recall the wrong you did me — that as
  often, during my absence, as I thought of my native place, all these
  objects came into my mind: the hills and the fields and the Tiber and the
  region familiar to my eyes, and this sky beneath which I had been born
  and reared. And I wish these things may rather move you now with love,
  Quirites, to make you abide in your own home, than afterwards, when you
  have left it, torment you with vain regrets.

7.3.2  quin etiam, cum medios forte ludos circus Tiberis superfuso
  irrigatus impedisset, id vero, velut aversis iam dis
  aspernantibus placamina irae, terrorem ingentem fecit.
  Indeed, it fell out quite otherwise; for the games were in full swing when
  an inundation of the Tiber flooded the circus and put a stop to them, an
  accident which — as though the gods had already turned a way, rejecting
  the proffered appeasement of their anger — filled the people with fear.

7.17.8  profectus ab urbe utraque parte Tiberis, ratibus exercitu,
  quocumque fama hostium ducebat, traiecto multos
  populatores agrorum vagos palantes oppressit;
  For which reason the people voted the more promptly everything that the
  dictator proposed. Marching out from the City and setting his army across
  the Tiber by means of rafts, wherever a rumour
  country. The sea was infested by fleets of Greeks, and so were the
  seaboard of Antium, the Laurentine district, and the mouth of the Tiber. It
  happened once that the sea-robbers encountered the land-raiders, and a
  hard-fought battle ensued, from which the Gauls withdrew to their camp
  and the Greeks to their ships, alike uncertain whether they had been
  defeated or victorious.

8.14.5-6 in Veliternos, veteres cives Romanos, quod totiens
  rebellissent, graviter saevitum: et muri electi et senatus
  inde abductus iussisque trans Tiberim habitare, ut eius qui
  cis Tiberim deprehensus esset usque ad mille pondo
  assium clarigatio esset nec priusquam aere persoluto is qui
  cepisset extra vincula capture haberet.
  The Veliterni, Roman citizens of old, were severely punished, because
  they had so often revolted: not only were their walls thrown down, but their
  senate was carried off and commanded to dwell across the Tiber, with this
  understanding: that if any should be caught on the hither side, his
  redemption should be set at a thousand pounds of bronze, and that he
  who had captured him might not release his prisoner from bondage until
  the fine was paid.
Concerning the senate of Privernum, it was decreed that any senator who had remained in Privernum after its defection from the Romans should dwell across the Tiber on the same terms as the Veliterni.

If the Etruscans had the spirit that once had animated Porsinna and their forefathers, there was no reason why they should not expel the Romans from all the country north of the Tiber, and compel them to fight, not for an intolerable sovereignty over Italy, but for their own existence.

Their enterprise Had Gauls once captured that which the Phoenician despaired of approaching Then let them yield in spirit and manhood to a race which they had so often vanquished in the course of the last few days, or look to end their march in the field that lay between the Tiber and the walls of Rome.

He himself went out by the Flaminian way to meet the consul and his army, and when, close to the Tiber near Ocriculum, he came in sight of the column and saw the consul riding towards him at the head of his cavalry, he dispatched an orderly to bid the consul appear before the dictator without lictors.

There were great floods twice that year and the Tiber overflowed the farms with great destruction of buildings and cattle and much loss of life.

Of those removed across the Tiber, neither the men themselves nor their descendants were to acquire or hold anywhere except in the districts of Veii, Sutrium or Nepete, with the provision that no one was to have a larger amount of land than fifty iugera.

No one of them should be a Roman citizen or reckoned a Latin, and that no one of them who had been at Capua while the gates were closed should remain in the city or in the territory of Capua beyond a certain date; that a region across the Tiber, but not touching the Tiber, be given them as a dwelling—place.

After the ship arrived at the mouth of the Tiber, Scipio, according to the directions given him, sailed out into the open sea, and, receiving the goddess from the priests, conveyed her to land.

The number of citizens rated was a hundred and forty-three thousand seven hundred and four. Extraordinary quantities of rain fell in this year, and the Tiber overflowed the lower parts of the city; and some buildings near the Flumentan gate were even laid in ruins.
They built one colonnade, on the outside of the gate Tergemina, to which they added a wharf on the Tiber: and another, reaching from the Frontinal gate to the altar of Mars, to serve as a passage into the field of Mars.

To expiate the other prodigies, a supplication was performed; the ox was ordered by the aruspices to be carefully preserved and fed. The Tiber, pouring into the city with more destructive violence than last year, swept away two bridges, and many buildings, particularly about the Flumentan gate.

But he would shortly give him the decree, and an answer, in Italy, from his camp on the banks of the Tiber.'

In consequence of a fire breaking out in the cattle-market, the conflagration, among the houses near to the Tiber, continued through all that day and the following night, and all the shops, with wares of very great value, were reduced to ashes.

Cornelius, yet remained in Rome, two tame oxen, it is said, climbed up by ladders on the tiles of a house in the Carinae. The aruspices ordered them to be burned alive, and their ashes to be thrown into the Tiber.

In order likewise to guard against fires, five assistants were joined to the triumvirs, so that each might have the charge of the buildings in his own separate district, on this side the Tiber.
Marcus Fulvius made contracts for works more numerous and of more use; a haven on the Tiber, and piers for a bridge across it; on which piers Publius Scipio Africanus and Lucius Mummius, who were the censors, many years after, bargained for the erection of arches; a court of justice behind the new bankers’ houses, and a fish-market surrounded with shops, which he sold to private persons;

ey repaired the Aemilian portico, and formed an ascent, by stairs, from the Tiber to the market-place. They paved, with flint, the portico, from the same gate to the Aventine, and built a court-house:

They also voted that the ships, which lay in the Tiber fit for sea, and ready to sail for Macedon, in case the king had been able to maintain the contest, should be hauled up, and placed in the docks, and that the seamen belonging to them should be discharged, after receiving a year’s pay;

In a few days after, Paullus was carried up the Tiber to the city, in a royal galley of vast size, which was moved by sixteen tiers of oars, and decorated with Macedonian spoils, consisting not only of beautiful armour, but of tapestry, which had been the property of the king; while the banks of the river were covered with the multitudes that poured out to do him honour. After a few days, arrived Anicius, and Cneius Octavius with his fleet.

When terms of peace were being arranged, the river Albula, now called the Tiber, had been fixed as the boundary between the Etruscans and the Latins.

In this case it is impossible for P. Cornelius and Ti. Sempronius to have been the consuls to whom the Saguntine envoys were sent at the beginning of the siege and who afterwards, whilst still in office, fought with Hannibal, one of them at the Ticinus, both shortly afterwards at the Trebia. Either all the incidents occurred within a much shorter period or else it was the capture of Saguntum, not the beginning of the siege, which occurred when those two entered upon office.
Accordingly, though still troubled with his wound, he marched silently away in the fourth watch of the next night to the river Trebia, and encamped on higher ground, where hills made it more difficult for cavalry to operate.

Whilst they frittered away the time there, rummaging in every nook and cranny without finding anything that really repaid them for the loss of time, they let their enemies slip through their fingers. The Romans had already passed the Trebia and were marking out their camp, when the Numidians caught sight of them and cut down a few loiterers whom they intercepted on the hither side of the stream.

In the village of Clastidium the Romans had got together a great quantity of corn. Thither Hannibal dispatched some soldiers, who were making preparations to assault the place, when hopes were held out of its betrayal. The price was not a large one: Dasius of Brundisium, who was in command of the garrison, accepted a bribe of four hundred gold pieces, and turned Clastidium over to Hannibal.

Though the war on land had come to a standstill at the Trebia, engagements had in the meantime been fought by land and sea off Sicily and the islands near the Italian coast, not only by Sempronius the consul, but even before his coming thither.

He himself, after settling the affairs of Sicily, took ten ships, and skirting the Italian coast, arrived at Ariminum. Thence he marched with his army to the Trebia and effected a junction with his colleague.

The country between the Trebia and the Po was in those days inhabited by Gauls, who in this struggle of two mighty peoples maintained a neutral attitude and plainly intended to court the good-will of the victor.

On the present occasion, while his colleague hesitated, Sempronius sent his cavalry, interspersed with about a thousand foot-soldiers, armed with darts, to protect the Gallic lands beyond the Trebia.

Mago and his thousand horse and thousand foot being thus dispatched, Hannibal ordered the Numidian cavalry to cross the Trebia at dawn, and riding up to the enemy's gates and discharging missiles against his outposts, to lure him into battle; and then, when the fight was on, to give ground insensibly and draw him across the river. Such were the orders of the Numidians.
The Phoenicians pursued their enemies no further than to the river Trebia, and got back to camp so benumbed and chilled as hardly to feel the joy of victory. Consequently, when, in the night that followed, the garrison of the camp, and such soldiers without arms for the most part—as had survived the rout, were crossing the Trebia on rafts, they either heard nothing, owing to the noise made by the rain, or being unable, for weariness and wounds, to bestir themselves, pretended not to hear; and unmolested Polybius (II. lxxiv, ), all but one perished from the effects of the rain and snow that followed the battle.

Battle of Trebia: finis of 'cheasing the enemy' or the 'border' was the river Trebia
| 26.41.11 | `iam quid hoc bello memorem omnibus aut ipse adfui cladibus aut quibus afui, maxime unus omnium eas sensi. Trebia, Trasumennus, Cannae quid aliud sunt quam monumenta occisorum exercituum consulumque Romanorum` | how many fleets, how many generals, how many armies were lost in the former war! and now in the present war what shall I say has happened in every disaster I was either present myself, or if absent, I above all others felt them. Trebia, Trasumennus, Cannae, what are they but memorials of Roman armies and consuls fallen. Topos: Trebia, Trasimenes and Cannae |
| 27.39.15 | `non ipse se solum ea oppugnatione impedit, sed Hannibalem post famam transitus eius tanto spe sua celeriorem iam moventem ex hibernis continuerat, quippe reputantem non solum quam lenta urbium oppugnatione esset, sed etiam quam ipse frustra eandem illam coloniam ab Trebia victor regressus temptasset.` | For Hannibal recalled not only how slow was the besieging of cities, but also how vainly he had himself attempted to take that same colony, upon returning as a victor from the Trebia. |
APPENDIX 4: The treaty of Apamaea after Polybius and Livy.

The Senate then appointed ten commissioners, to whom they gave the entire settlement of particulars; while as a general principle they decided that of Asia this side Taurus such inhabitants as had been subject to Antiochus were to be assigned to Eumenes, except Lycia and Caria up to the Maeander, which were to belong to the Rhodians; while of the Greek cities, such of them as had been accustomed to pay tribute to Attalus were to pay the same to Eumenes; and only those who had done so to Antiochus were to be relieved of tribute altogether.

Polybius 21.24.6-8

δόντες δὲ ταύτας τὰς ἀποκρίσεις μετά ταύτα κατέστησαν δέκα πρεσβευτὰς, οίς περὶ μὲν τῶν κατὰ μέρος ἐδωκαν τὴν ἐπιτροπὴν, περὶ δὲ τῶν ὅλων αὐτοὶ διέλαβον ὅτι δὲ τῶν ἐπὶ τάδε τοῦ Ταύρου κατοικούντων, ὅσοι μὲν ὕπ' Ἀντίοχον ἐπάττητον, τούτους Εὐμεῖνε δοθεὶσαν πλὴν Λυκίαν καὶ Καρίας τὰ μέχρι τοῦ Μαιάνδρου ποταμοῦ, ταύτα δὲ Ρωμαίους ὑπάρχειν, τῶν δὲ πολέων τῶν Ἑλληνίδων ὅσοι μὲν Ἀπάμειαν ἄρα ὑπέτελον, ταύτας τὸν αὐτὸν Εὐμεῖνε τελεῖν, ὅσα δὲ Ἀντίοχος, μένον ταύτας ἀφεῖσθαι τὸν φόρον.

Polybius 21.43.1-27

not be lawful for Antiochus to enlist soldiers or receive exiles from the territory subject to Rome. 'Such houses as belonged to the Rhodians or their allies, in the territory subject to Antiochus, shall continue to belong to the Rhodians as before the war: any money owed to them shall still be recoverable: and any property left behind by them, if sought for, shall be restored. 'The Rhodians shall, as before the war, be free from tribute. 'If Antiochus has given any of the towns to others which he is bound to restore, he shall remove from them also his garrisons and men. And if any shall wish hereafter to desert to him, he shall not receive them. 'Antiochus shall pay to the Romans ten thousand talents, in ten yearly installments, of the best Attic silver, each talent to weigh not less than eighty Roman pounds, and ninety thousand medemi of corn. 'Antiochus shall give twenty hostages, not less than eighteen nor more than forty-five years old, and change them every three years. 'If there be in any year a deficit in the installment paid, Antiochus shall make it good in the next year. 'If any of the cities or nations, against whom it has been hereby provided that Antiochus should not make war, should commence war against him, it shall be lawful for Antiochus to war with them; but of such nations and cities he shall not have sovereignty nor attach them as friends to himself. 'Such complaints as arise between the parties to this treaty shall be referred to arbitration. 'If both parties agree in wishing anything to be added to or taken from this treaty, it shall be lawful so to do.' (Histories. Polybius. Evelyn S. Shuckburgh. translator. London, New York. Macmillan. 1889. Reprint Bloomington 1962).
his quae praesentis disceptationis essent libera mandata; de summa rerum

Livy 38.38.1-18

ibi ex decem legatorum sententia foedus in haec verba fere cum Antiocho
conscriptum est: “amicitia regi Antiocho cum populo Romano his legibus et
condicionibus esto: ne quem exercitum, qui cum populo Romano sociisve bellum
conscriptum est: “amicitia regi Antiocho cum populo Romano his legibus et
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Livy 37.56.1-6.

his quae praesentis disceptationis essent libera mandata; de summa rerum

In matters pertaining to any discussion to be conducted on the spot, they were given a
free hand; as to the chief issue involved, the senate made the decision. All Lycaonia
and both Phrygias and Mysia, which King Prusias had taken from him, were restored to
the king, as well as the Milyae and Lydia and Ionia with the exception of those cities
which had been free on the day when the battle with King Antiochus had been fought,
and, by name, Magnesia near Sipylus and Caria which they call Hydrela and the
territory of Hydrela which faces Phrygia, and the forts and villages along the Meander
river and the towns, except those which had been free before the war; Telmessus also
and the camp of the Telmessii, except the land which had belonged to Ptolemy of
Telmessus. All these places which have been written down above were given to King
Eumenes. The Rhodians were given Lycia except the same Telmessus and the camp
of the Telmessii and the land which had belonged to Ptolemy of Telmessus; this
district was made an exception in the case of both Eumenes and the Rhodians. Also that part
of Caria which is nearer to the island of Rhodes across the Meander river was given to
them, and the towns, villages, forts and lands which face Pisidia except those of the
towns which had been free the day before the battle had been fought with King
Antiochus in Asia.
and their allies they shall be at liberty to depart or to remain. He shall restore to the Romans and their allies the slaves, whether fugitives or prisoners of war, or any free man who has been taken captive or is a deserter. He shall give up his elephants and not procure any more. He shall likewise make over his ships of war and all their tackle, nor shall he possess more than ten light decked ships, none of which may be propelled by more than thirty oars, and no smaller ones for use in any war which he may undertake. He shall not take his ships west of the headlands of the Calycadnus or the Sarpedon, save only such ships as shall carry money or tribute or envoys or hostages. Antiochus shall not have the right to hire mercenary troops from those nations which shall be under the suzerainty of Rome nor to accept them even as volunteers. Such houses and buildings as belonged to the Rhodians and their allies within the dominions of Antiochus shall be held by them on the same right as before the war. If any moneys are due to them they shall have the same right to exact them, if aught has been taken from them, they shall have the right of search and recovery. Whatever cities amongst those that are to be surrendered they hold as a gift from Antiochus; he shall withdraw the garrisons from them and provide for their due surrender. He shall pay 12,000 Attic talents of sterling silver in equal instalments over twelve years – the talent shall weigh not less than 80 Roman pounds – and 540,000 modii of wheat. To King Eumenes he shall pay 350 talents within five years, and in place of corn its value in money, 127 talents. He shall give twenty hostages to the Romans and exchange them for others in three years, that none may be less than eighteen or more than forty-five years of age. If any of the allies of Rome shall wantonly and without provocation make war on Antiochus, he shall have the right to repel them by force of arms, always providing that he shall not hold any city by right of war or receive it into friendship and amity. Disputes shall be determined before a judicial tribunal, or if both parties shall so will it, by war."

There was an additional clause dealing with the surrender of Hannibal, Thoas and Mnasilochus, as well as Eubulidas and Philo of Chalcidaea, and also a proviso that if it should afterwards be decided to add to, or repeal, or alter any of the articles, that should be done without impairing the validity of the treaty.
APPENDIX 5: The Polcevera Table.

QUINTUS (ET) MARCUS MINUCIUS QUINTI F(ILI) RUFI DE
CONTROVERSIEIS INTER / GENUAEIS ET VEITURIOS IN RE
PRAESENTI COGNOVERUNT, ET CORAM INTER EOS
CONTROVOSIAS COMPOSEIVERUNT, / ET QUAE LEGE AGRUM
PASSERENT ET QUAE FINEIS FIERENT DIXERUNT. EOS FINEIS
FACERE TERMINOSQUE STATUI UUSERUNT; / UEBI EA FACTA
ESSENT, ROMAN CORAM VENIRE IOUSERUNT. ROMAE CORAM
SENTENTIAM EX SENATI CONSULTO DIXERUNT EIDIBUS /
DECMBRIBUS LUCIUM CAECILIO QUINTI F(ILI) (ET) QUINTO
MUCIO QUINTI F(ILI) CO(NIUS) UUSERUNT, QUAE AGER PRIVATUS
CASTELI VITURIORUM EST, QUEM AGRUM EOS VENDERE
HEREDEMOQUE / SEQUI LICIT, IS AGER VECTIGALIS NE SIET.

LANGATIUM FINEIS AGRI PRIVATI: AB RIVO INFINO, QUI ORITUR AB
FONTE IN MANICELO AD FLOVIUM / EDEM: IBI TERMINUS STAT;
INDE FLOVIO SUSO VORSUM IN FLOVIUM LEMURIM; INDE FLOVIO
LEMRI SUSUS USQUE AD RIVOM COMBERANE; / INDE RIVO
COMBERANEA SUSUS USQUE AD COMVALEM CAEPTIAM: IBI
TERMINA DUO STANT CIRCUM VIAM POSTUMIAM; EX EIS TERMINIS
RECTA / REGIONE IN RIVO VENDUPALE; EX RIVO VINDUPALE IN
FLOVIUM NEVIAASCAM; INDE DORSUM FL<OVIO NEVIAASCAM IN
FLOVIUM PROCOBERAM; INDE / FLOVIO PROCOBERAM DEORSUM
USUE AD RIVOM VINELEASCAM INFUMUM: IBEI TERMINUS STAT;
INDE SUSRUM RIVO RECTO VINELESCA: / IBEI TERMINUS STAT
PROPTER VIAM POSTUMIAM, INDE ALTER TRANS VIAM POSTUMIAM
TERMINUS STAT; EX EO TERMINO, QUEI STAT / TRANS VIAM
POSTUMIAM, RECTA REGIONE IN FONTE IN MANICELO; INDE DEORSUM RIVO, QUEI ORITUR AB FONTE EN MANICELO, / AD TERMINUM,
QUEI STAT AD FLOVIUM EDEM AGRI POPPLICI, QUOD LANGENSES POSIDENT, HISCE FINIS VIDENTUR ESSE: UBI COMFLUONT / EDUS ET
PROCOBERA, IBEI TERMINUS STAT; INDE EDE FLOVIO SUSRUM IN MONTEM LEMURINO INFUMO: IBEI TERMINUS / STAT; INDE
SUSRUM RIVO IUGO RECTO MONTE LEMURINO: IBEI TERMINUS-U=S STAT; INDE SUSIUM IUGO RECTO LEMURINO: IBEI TERMINUS / STAT IN
MONTE PRO CAVO; INDE SUSIUM RIVO IUGO RECTO LEMURINO SUMMUM: IBEI TERMINUS STAT; INDE SUSIUM IUGO / RECTO IN
CASTELUM, QUEI VOCITATU=S E-ST ALIANUS: IBEI TERMINUS STAT; INDE SUSIUM IUGO RECTO IN MONTEM IOVENTIONEM: IBEI TERMINUS /
STAT; INDE SUSIUM IUGO RECTO IN MONTEM APENINUM, QUEI VOCATUR BOLPO: IBEI TERMINUS STAT; INDE APENINUM IUGO RECTO / IN
MONTEM TULEDONEM: IBEI TERMINUS STAT; INDE SUSIUM IUGO RECTO IN FLOVIUM VERAGLASCAM IN MONTEM BERIGIEMAM / INFUMO:
IBEI TERMINUS STAT; INDE DORSUM IUGO RECTO IN FLOVIUM TULELASCAM: IBEI TERMINUS STAT; INDE SUSIUM IUGO RECTO BLUSTIEMEO IN MONTEM CLAXELUM: IBEI TERMINUS STAT; INDE / DEORSUM
IN FONTE INBRIEMELUM: IBEI TERMINUS STAT; INDE RECTO RIVO INSECA IN FLOVIUM PORCOBERAM: IBEI TERMINUS STAT; / INDE DEORSUM

LEG-MOCOMETANIDIOMETICISIPLOCVSPRELAPILONIF.
IN FLOVIOM PORCOBERAM, UBEI CONFLOVONT FLOVI EDUS ET PORCOBERA: IBI TERMINUS STAT. QUEM AGRUM POPLICUM / IUDICAMUS
ESSE, EUM AGRUM CASTELANOS LANGENSES VEITURIOS PO[SI]DERE FRUIQUE VIDETUR OPORTERE. PRO EO AGRO VECTIGAL LANGENSES /
VEITURIS IN POPLICUM GENUAM DENT IN AN(N)OS SINGULOS VIC(TORIATOS)
N(UMMOS) CCCC. SEI LANGENSES EAM PEQUNIAM NON DABUNT NEQUE SATIS
/ FACIENT ARBITRATUU GENUATIUM, QUOD PER GENUENSES MO[R]A NON
FIAT, QUO SETIUS EAM PEQUNIAM ACIPIANT, TUM QUOD IN EO AGRO / NATUM
ERIT FRUMENTI PARTEM VICENSUMAM, VINI PARTEM SEXTAM LANGENSES IN
POPLICUM GENUAM DARE DEBENTO / IN ANNOS SINGOLOS. QUEI INTRA EOS
FINEIS AGRUM POSEDET GENUAS AUT VITURIUS, QUEI EORUM POSEDEIT
K(ALENDIS) SEXTIL(IBUS) L(UCIO) CAICILIO / (ET) Q(UINTO) MUUCIO
CO(N)S(ULIBUS), EOS ITA POSIDERE COLEREQUE LICEAT. EUS (!) QUEI
POSIDEBUNT, VECTIGAL LANGENSIBUS PRO PORTIONE DENT ITA UTI CETERI /
LANGENSES, QUI EORUM IN EO AGRO AGRUM POSIDEBUNT FRUENTURQUE.
PRAETER EA IN EO AGRO NI QUIS POSIDETO, NISI DE MAIORE PARTE /
LANGENSIUM VEITURIORUM SENTENTIA, DUM NE ALIUM INTRO MITAT NISI
GENUATEM AUT VEITURIUM COLENDI CAUSA. QUEI EORUM / DE MAIORE
PARTE LANGENSIUM VEITURI<OR>UM SENTENTIA ITA NON PAREBIT, IS EUM
AGRUM NEI HABETO NIVE FRUIMINO. QUEI / AGER COMPASCUOS ERIT, IN EO
AGRO QUO MINUS PECUS [P]ASCERE GENUATES VEITURIOSQUE LICEAT ITA
UTEI IN CETERO AGRO / GENUATI COMPASCUO, NI QUIS PROHIBETO NIVE QUIS
VIM FACITO, NEIVE PROHIBETO QUO MINUS EX EO AGRO LIGNA MATERIAMQUE
/ SUMANT UTANTURQUE. VECTIGAL ANNI PRIMI K(ALENDIS) IANUARIS
SECUNDIS VETURIS LANGENSES IN POPLICUM GENUAM DARE / DEBENTO.
QUOD ANTE K(ALENDAS) IANUAR(IAS) PRIMAS LANGENSES FRUCTI SUNT
ERUNTQUE, VECTIGAL INVITEI DARE NEI DEBENTO. / PRATA QUAE FUERUNT
PROXUMA FAENISICEI L(UCIO) CAECILIO (ET) Q(UINTO) MUUCIO CO(N)S(ULIBUS) IN AGRO POPLICO, QUEM VITURIES LANGENSES / POSIDENT
ET QUEM ODIATES ET QUEM DECTUNINES ET QUEM CAVATURINEIS ET QUEM MENTOVINES POSIDENT, EA PRATA, / INVITIS LANGENSIBUS ET
ODIATIBUS ET DECTUNINEBUS ET CAVATURINES ET MENTOVINES, QUEM QUISQUE EORUM AGRUM / POSIDEBIT, INVITEIS EIS NIQUIS SICET
NIVE PASCAT NIVE FRUATUR. SEI LANGUESES (!) AUT ODIATES AUT DECTUNINES AUT CAVATURINES / AUT MENTOVINES MALENT IN EO
AGRO ALIA PRATA INMITTERE, DEFENDERE, SICARE, ID UTI FACERE LICEAT, DUM NE AMPLIOREM / MODUM PRATORUM HABEANT QUAM
PROXUMA AESTATE HABUERUNT FRUCTIQUE SUNT. VITURIES QUEI CONTROVORSIAS / GENUENSIUM OB INIOURIAS IUDICATI AUT DAMNATI
SUNT, SEI QUIS IN VINCULEIS OB EAS RES EST, EOS OMNEIS / SOLVEI, MITTEI LEIBER<ARE>IQUE GENUENSES VIDETUR OPORTERE ANTE
EIDUS SEXTILIS PRIMAS. SEI QUOI DE EA RE / INIQUOM VIDEBITUR ESSE, AD NOS ADEANT PRIMO QUOQUE DIE ET AB OMNIBUS
CONTROVERSIS ET HONO(---) PUBL(---) LI(---). / LEG(ATI) MOCO METICANIO METICONI F(ILIUS); PLAUCUS PELIANI(O) PELIONI F(ILIUS).
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