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Every year on the night of 14 August, the city of Tivoli in the central Italian region of Lazio stages its oldest and most cherished public religious observance: the Inchinata. This liturgical ritual features cult images of Christ and the Virgin Mary on giant wooden litters. The two images are made to “bow” to each other in a symbolic greeting in the center of Piazza Trento at the climax of the annual Assumption procession (Figure 1). The spectacle is widely known in central Italy and recognized as an iconic institution of the city of Tivoli. It is a centuries-old event in which the clergy, civic officials, and the faithful of the community bodily participate.

In this article, I examine the Inchinata’s origins and early development between the twelfth century and the first half of the thirteenth, positioning the spectacle within the larger picture of regional urban politics of that time. I analyze the Inchinata as a case study of how public performance and ritual activation of civic space were used to serve local interests in Lazio’s nascent municipal communes. Located in the “hinterlands” of Rome, these forerunners of the modern European city appropriated imagery and rituals from contemporary and ancient Roman sources. In doing so, they both emulated and challenged the political and religious hegemony of the “urbs.” The Tiburtine procession served as a vehicle for constructing religious and social narratives as different sectors of the community negotiated a period of intense conflict and competition with Rome and tension between the episcopacy and the lay community within the commune itself. The Inchinata evolved as an adaptation of imported “official” liturgical rites to a native apotropaic ritual and local narratives embedded in its topography. Through the cosmographical choreography of the procession, the young municipality may have used this amalgamation to invoke the New Jerusalem as an appeal to divine authority for the right to self-rule.

The Performance and Meaning of the Inchinata

The Tiburtini (as the inhabitants of Tivoli are called) stage the nocturnal rite of the Inchinata procession every year in the city’s historic center.1 A Mass is celebrated in the Cathedral of San Lorenzo (Figures 2 and 3 A) in the northwest neighborhood of San Paolo, near remnants of the medieval gate Porta Maggiore (Figure 3 B).2 After the Mass, the men of the Confraternity of the Savior, Tivoli’s most prestigious lay confraternity, carry to the door of the church on a massive processional litter a wooden triptych featuring an early twelfth-century cult image of Christ Enthroned—the trittico del Salvatore (Savior triptych).3 In the piazza outside, the procession begins, led by musicians, confraternity and guild members carrying statues of their patron saints, and the bishop and other clergy. Dressed in bright-red smocks, the members of the Confraternity of the Savior exit the cathedral with the icon, taking their place in the procession. They are followed by the municipal officials and townspeople. The Savior image is processed northeast along the boundary of the city and its partially destroyed, partially inglobed defensive wall (Figure 4). The city wall was originally built in Roman times and then was expanded in the mid-eleventh century.4

The procession enters the neighborhood of Castroveterere, Tivoli’s oldest district. It stops at Ponte Gregoriano (Figure 5 A; see Figure 3 C), the bridge over the Anio River near the city’s northernmost extant gate, Porta San Martino (see Figure 3 D). Here, the confraternity performs
a ceremony with the icon that invokes its protective power, both as a mediator of Christ’s atonement and as an apotropaic guard against material dangers (Figure 6). At the center of the bridge a reader utters the proclamation that here the Tiburtini defended the city against the armies that came from Abruzzo. As the icon faces east toward the edge of the city in the direction of Abruzzo, the bishop recites a vernacular version of the antiphon *Da pacem Domine* deriving from Psalm 122: “Lord, give peace to our days, we hope in you; you are our help, our only God.” The people respond, “Let
there be peace inside your walls and abundance in your city.”

The men of the confraternity lift the heavy wooden litter of the Savior triptych and turn it to face north, the direction of the ruined round Roman temple—“the temple of the Sibyl and Rome,” as announced by the reader—on the acropolis, the high rocky spur overlooking the river gorge at the edge of the medieval city (see Figures 3 E and 5 B). The bishop recites the Eucharistic prayer Salvator Mundi: “Our Savior, who through your blood and your cross redeemed the world, save us.”

“The icon is turned again so that it is facing west, toward the interior of the city, as the bishop recites a second time, “Lord, give peace to our days.” The icon is turned once more, this time to the south, facing the Anio. The bishop prays, “Free this city from the violence of the waters of the river. We supplicate you: hear us!”

While he says these words, the prior of the confraternity takes a candle from the foot of the icon, lights it, and throws it, burning, into the river below.

The company then continues southward along the Anio. After the recitation of litanies and penitential invocations, it enters the neighborhood of Trevio and reaches the southeast corner of the city and Porta San Giovanni (see Figure 3 F). As the icon faces the doorway of the fourteenth-century Hospital of San Giovanni Evangelista (Figure 7; see Figure 3 G), the hospital’s chaplain approaches and tosses rosewater on the image’s feet with an aspergillum (Figure 8). A reader then recites a vernacular version of the Gregorian supplicatory chant.
Deus a quo desideria: “O God, from whom come holy desires, just counsel and good works, bestow on us your servants that peace that the world cannot give: make our hearts follow your desire and free from the oppression of guilt, under your protection may we enjoy tranquil days.” Following the prayer, the chaplain censes the icon and readings are made from the New Testament Gospels of John and Matthew.

The procession advances northwest, into the neighborhood of Santa Croce and toward the spot where Porta Avenzia stood until the fifteenth century (see Figure 3 H). There the procession reaches its destination, Piazza Trento, with its twelfth-century Franciscan church of Santa Maria Maggiore (see Figures 1 and 3 J). As the participants approach the piazza, they intone the litany of the saints (Figure 9). The bishop recites the antiphons for the Gregorian office of the Assumption: “Today the Virgin Mary is received into heaven” and “The angels rejoice, the archangels are gladdened at the exaltation of Mary.” The Savior triptych is positioned under a specially erected arch adorned with myrtle. In the church doorway awaits the masons’ guild with a second giant litter, this one carrying a thirteenth-century panel painting of the Virgin Mary in a half-length pose of intercession. This Marian image, known as the Madonna delle Grazie (Madonna of the Graces), is brought out into the piazza to meet the throng under her own arch of myrtle (Figure 10). After Gospel readings from Luke and John, the two facing litters are inclined toward each other three times in a triple bow of salutation as the people shout “Misericordia! Misericordia!” (Mercy! Mercy!) and fireworks explode from the façade and roof of the church in a spectacular play of light and
sound (Figure 11). This dramatic ritual is called the Inchinata (the bow) and symbolizes the apocryphal reunion of Mary with her son Jesus Christ when she was assumed into heaven at the end of her mortal existence. Like the ceremonies and liturgy at the bridge and hospital, the bowing ritual expresses themes of intercession and salvation. These themes are also expressed in the iconography of the Savior triptych itself—most prominently in the figures of Mary and John the Evangelist at Christ’s sides, turning toward him in attitudes of supplication, and in the scene of Mary’s Assumption on the bottom left wing (Figure 12).11

After the climactic bow, both icons are carried into Santa Maria Maggiore, where they stay for the night, facing each other across the nave. Here, in a type of bridal chamber, the reunited images evoke the medieval tradition of the mystical marriage of Christ, which conflated the figure of Mary with Ecclesia, personification of the church. The next morning, Assumption Day, Mass is celebrated and the triple bow between the icons is repeated in the piazza (Figure 13), after which the Savior triptych is taken by procession back to its home in the cathedral (Figure 14), bringing the year’s protective perambulation of the city full circle.

Appropriation of a Model

This religious-apotropaic custom, which serves as the liturgical and social focus of the Tiburtine Feast of the Assumption, is remarkable for two reasons. First is its longevity. The Inchinata, as the procession itself has come to be called, has been
Figure 8 Ritual washing of the Savior triptych at the Hospital of San Giovanni Evangelista during the Inchinata procession, Tivoli, 2013 (author’s photo).

Figure 9 Savior triptych entering Piazza Trento during the Inchinata procession, Tivoli, 2009 (author’s photo).

Figure 10 Madonna delle Grazie icon being positioned under a myrtle arch to “greet” the arriving Savior triptych in front of the church of Santa Maria Maggiore at the culmination of the Inchinata procession, Tivoli, 2011 (author’s photo).
performed every year for at least the last seven hundred years. The first mention of the procession in the textual record dates to 1305; the city statutes of that year set forth a penalty for fighting in public on the eve of the Assumption, “when the men go with the Savior in procession.”

12 Subsequent textual descriptions and images demonstrate that the Inchinata has been practiced in Tivoli continuously over the intervening centuries (Figure 15). 13 The second reason the Inchinata is conspicuous is that it is a rare survival of a distinctive liturgical tradition once widespread in the emergent municipal
communes of Lazio and unique to this region. The ritual formula—the processing of a monumental panel painting of Christ Enthroned through the city by the clergy, civic officials, and townspeople, culminating in some form of symbolic encounter with the Virgin—was followed on the eve of the Assumption in communes such as Tivoli, Anagni, Viterbo, and Subiaco. It was inspired by a Roman model and was performed almost exclusively in Lazio.

Figure 13 Bowing ritual between the Savior triptych and Madonna delle Grazie on the morning of Assumption Day, Tivoli, 2011 (author’s photo).

Figure 14 Savior triptych in procession back to the Cathedral of San Lorenzo on the morning of Assumption Day, Tivoli, 2011 (author’s photo).
The prevalence of the custom was a major defining factor in medieval urban performance in Lazio, because these Assumption processions were the most important public spectacles of the liturgical year. Beyond their specific content, an examination of the processions’ origins, development, and topography reveals compelling clues about the urban culture and municipal politics of medieval Lazio that have yet to be adequately explored. The processions offer a unique analytical lens because their performance, with their intricate dialogue between moving actors and urban landscape, constructed narratives that served the interests of different sectors in the community that organized and participated in them. Alick McLean, Barbara Deimling, Max Seidel, Marvin Trachtenberg, and Franklin Toker have made important contributions to our understanding of how the late medieval city-states and communes of Tuscany and Umbria used architecture, urban space, and public performance to assert political authority or autonomy and to define themselves in relation to rival cities and to episcopal and papal powers. In contrast, scholarly attention to these phenomena in the communes of neighboring Lazio has been limited.

The twelfth- and thirteenth-century Savior panels that were carried in the processions—twelve of which are still extant—have attracted the attention of prominent art historians and have been the subject of several excellent recent studies. The scholarship points out that as protagonists of local annual Assumption processions, the panels functioned as civic palladia, communal protective devices. They had a corollary in the civic-apotropaic functions of religious cult images in other Italian city-states and communes of the period. For example, in 1176, the Lombard League, an alliance of northern Italian communes resisting Emperor Frederick Barbarossa, wheeled into the Battle of Legnano a carroccio, or sacred war wagon, on which was mounted Legnano’s city standard and a cross, which may have been the cross of Bishop Aribert of Milan. Aribert’s cross had been a symbol of freedom and military victory since Aribert defeated Barbarossa’s predecessor Conrad II in 1038. In 1261, the people of Siena processed an image of the Virgin in gratitude for her help in defeating the Florentine army in the Battle of Montaperti after the citizens invoked her intercession. From that time on, this icon was also carried in Sienese rogation processions (annual penitential circumambulations of the city).

Tivoli’s Inchinata and its counterparts around Lazio were inspired by an earlier Roman model. The Roman Assumption procession originated around the eighth century in a papal procession centering on the sixth-century panel painting of Christ Enthroned known as the Acheropita, which was kept in the Sancta Sanctorum, the pope’s private chapel at the Lateran Palace. Until the procession was suppressed in the sixteenth century by Pope Pius V (r. 1566–72), the Acheropita was carried from the Lateran to the papal basilica of Santa Maria Maggiore with stops at churches along the way, where the image was ritually washed and venerated (Figure 16). On the steps of Santa Maria Nova in the Forum, the Acheropita “greeted” an image of the Virgin and Child kept in that church. At the procession’s culmination at Santa Maria Maggiore, a similar ritual was performed with another icon of the Virgin and Child. In the early twelfth century, with the resurrection of republican government and the development of...
new social institutions, Rome’s Assumption procession became a civic event organized by religious lay societies. Most prominent among these was the Società dei Raccomandati del Salvatore ad Sancta Sanctorum, which was tasked with maintaining and carrying the Acheropita in the procession.²³

Modern scholarship often cites the replication of this procession and its cult image in Lazio beginning around the early twelfth century as an example of *imitatio Romae*, “imitation of Rome.” While the Roman procession was undoubtedly an inspiration for its late medieval analogues in the region, I believe this is a simplistic treatment of the rituals of Lazio’s communes that discounts these cities’ topographies and politics. As Keith D. Lilley has observed, the study of medieval civic rituals has a tendency to focus on content while neglecting location and topographical context.²⁴ Lilley notes that medieval urban space was not a neutral background; the streets, buildings, and landmarks that formed the scene for what he terms the “performed geography” of a ritual were chosen deliberately and were themselves keys to the ritual’s symbolism and indices of a community’s power structures.

The scholarship on the medieval Savior panels of Rome’s hinterlands lacks consideration of how the built environment shaped the public performances in which they were ritually carried through cities. Interest in this subject has been confined to the Acheropita and the Assumption procession in Rome.²⁵ With the exception of a handful of local historians, scholars have largely characterized the provincial processions as copies of the Roman spectacle, without further inquiry.²⁶ There have been no serious studies that locate the “replicas” within broader problems of ritual movement in the idiomatic urban contexts of the Roman periphery. Nor have any studies examined the way the processions’ organizers and featured actors interpreted these rituals, or the competing agendas of the various participants during a time when the communes sought political autonomy and became increasingly secularized.

The unique histories of the Laziale Savior panels and the public spectacles in which they were ritually carried through cities present an opportunity to examine the transmission of religious performance and image function between Rome and its neighboring urban centers in the Middle Ages.²⁷ They also highlight the sociopolitical tensions between center and periphery represented by these processes. The twelfth and thirteenth centuries—when most of the Acheropita reproductions were made and the “replica” processions were introduced in the provinces—were a period of major social and religious transformation in central Italy that saw the birth of the modern Italian city and new institutions such as municipal government, trade guilds, lay confraternities, and mendicant religious orders. In this era, these communities were redefined both institutionally and physically. The basic topography of most central Italian city centers—the churches, piazzas, housing blocks, and street dispositions—was largely established in this period of cultural and artistic revival, when weakened imperial and feudal overlordship and thriving commerce and industry combined to usher in the first widespread, sustained campaigns of urban renewal since antiquity.

When considered within this context, Lazio’s emergent independent communes’ adaptation of one of Rome’s oldest, most venerated public rituals is a more complex phenomenon than the concept of *imitatio Romae* conveys. Contrary to what the phrase suggests, *imitatio Romae* was more than mere mimesis. Such a view presupposes a passivity and homogeneity among the urban centers of medieval Lazio that is inconsistent with the historical reality. Communes of the “hinterlands,” such as Tivoli, Viterbo, and Subiaco, were strategic political agents and commercial and military powers. I argue that Lazio’s nascent communes, some of which were embroiled in contentious relationships with Rome and resisted increasingly centralized ecclesiastical authority, co-opted Roman ritual expressions of power to serve their own agendas.
The Laziale Savior panels vary in their iconography and architectural settings, suggesting local preferences and interests. Some of the panels that have survived as triptychs (they were probably all once triptychs) have wings featuring saints whose cults had a strong local presence.28 For example, the Anagni triptych (made in the thirteenth century) features Saint Andrew Segni, a thirteenth-century local saint (Figure 17). In the somewhat later Bracciano triptych (made in 1305), one of the wings features Saint Nicholas. Additionally, while the oldest panels from the twelfth and early thirteenth centuries were housed in cathedrals, implying episcopal patronage or purview, in some communes with later Savior panels, like Viterbo and Anagni, the panels were not housed in the cathedral but rather in a different church with strong civic associations. Viterbo’s Savior panel (thirteenth century) was housed in the collegiate church of Santa Maria Nuova, which had a particular importance in the civic life of the city: founded in 1080, it was the seat of civic assemblies and home of the city’s archive.29 Anagni’s Savior panel was kept in a collegiate church dedicated to the local thirteenth-century saint Andrew of Segni.

The Political Context

In the Gregorian Reform era of the mid-eleventh to early twelfth centuries, the papacy sought to revitalize the church and augment and solidify its authority. This strategy was implemented in a period of growing secular culture in Italy and the emergence of municipal governments throughout Lazio that pushed for autonomy. In this period, around 1100, copies of the Lateran Acheropita began to appear in communes throughout Lazio. Brenda Bolton and Hans Belting have observed that the papacy likely exported the cult of the Acheropita and the Assumption procession as part of a campaign to codify liturgical practice and secure loyalty in Lazio.30 The city of Rome experienced a flowering of processional liturgy in this period, starting in the early reform years of the late eleventh century.31 According to Bolton and Belting, this reinvigorated vehicle of papal presence in Rome was then exported into the surrounding territory. Rome may have encouraged the replication of the Acheropita and its liturgical functions, likely introduced into the communes through episcopal channels, as a kind of papal cult that brought the urban centers of Lazio more securely into Rome’s orbit.

The papal/episcopal diffusion of the Acheropita cult in Lazio seems to have existed for around a century and a half, since the majority of the surviving medieval reproductions of the Acheropita were made from the early twelfth to the mid-thirteenth centuries. Bolton has written about the program of Innocent III (r. 1198–1216) to return the Papal State to the sphere of church influence. She notes that Innocent sought to systematically establish “a unified region with its own special identity and purpose, having strong links with the church.” The region of central Italy was intended “to be one ‘Italia’ and in its creation the towns of the area were to be set apart as particular agents of the pope.”32 Innocent sent lay rectors to represent him in the communes and required an oath of obedience from his bishops. “The bishops were most important agents of the
pope, immediately subject as they were to him, in his position as archbishop of the region.”

Gerhard Wolf, Nino Zchomelidse, and others have persuasively argued, however, that the replicas of Rome’s Acheropita and Assumption procession in the medieval communes of Lazio came to function as assertions of civic identity. While the Acheropita’s cult may have originally spread as a papal cult, the monumental Savior panels took on meaning as local civic palladia, and the processions in which they were carried became local civic expressions.

Because of Tivoli’s felicitous location at the mouth of the Anio River valley, controlling the trade route through the Apennine Mountains, and because of its alliances with the Holy Roman Empire and prominent, well-connected abbeys such as Farfa, the city was an important urban power in the late Middle Ages. Previously ruled by a count representing the emperor, by 1126 Tivoli had established a form of independent municipal government with elected officials. Stubbornly Ghibelline and a stronghold of several Holy Roman emperors, Tivoli was a constant thorn in the side of the papacy, the nobility, and the urban elites of Rome between the twelfth and fifteenth centuries.

The Roman nobility’s efforts to feudalize the countryside and the papacy’s support of the territorial expansion policy of the Benedictine fief of Subiaco were ongoing sources of tension and armed conflict between Tivoli and Rome. As Chris Wickham observes in his recent volume on the formation of the Italian communes, enmity with Tivoli was a strong unifying factor in Roman civic identity:

Being part of Rome as a city, and pride in that, was as important here as it was in Milan and Pisa; fighting Tivoli gave Romans as much of a charge as fighting Como and Cremona did for Milan and sacking Palermo and the Balearics did for Pisa. Indeed, the military organization involved in fighting Tivoli must have brought [the districts of Rome] together very effectively.

After continual clashes with its upstart neighbor, Rome subdued Tivoli in 1143, and the right to appoint the rectore—or principal civic magistrate—was claimed first by the papacy and then by the Roman Senate. However, Tivoli continued to resist the imposition of Roman authority and allied itself with the Holy Roman Empire, placing itself under the protection of Frederick Barbarossa, for whom Tivoli became a stronghold in Lazio, and then Henry VI. In 1254, Rome again subdued its neighbor. Tivoli retained most of its political independence, but it was required to pay tribute to the Roman Senate, and the papacy retained the right to appoint bishops to the Tiburtine diocese. The fact that these bishops were now usually Roman—and that the Tiburtine lay community widely viewed them and their often nonnative canons as greedy and neglectful of their parochial duties—was a source of increasing friction. While these developments are rather late in the period analyzed in this study, given the long-standing hostilities between the Tiburtini and the papacy, there may have been much earlier tensions between Tivoli’s bishopric and the lay community. Guido, the head of the Tiburtine diocese from 1125 to 1154, during Innocent II’s pontificate, was one of seven suburbanian cardinal bishops (individuals appointed by the papacy to represent its interests in the countryside immediately surrounding Rome). Guido had been camerlengo of the Roman Curia in 1123 and was a strong supporter of Innocent.

The twelfth century was a golden age for Tiburtine community building and infrastructure. The commune embarked on an extensive building campaign that produced much of the urban fabric and many of the features we see today. Many of the city’s churches, including the cathedral and Santa Maria Maggiore, were built or rebuilt in the twelfth century. That era was also a high point for Tivoli’s political and military ambitions. Tiburtine nobles held extensive lands and castles in Lazio, including Rome’s Castel Sant’Angelo. Until the fifteenth century, the commune flexed its political and military muscle in clashes with Rome and Rome’s allies in the territory, especially Subiaco. According to historian Sandro Carocci, “Tivoli’s campaign of expansion . . . excited the hostilities of the Romans and especially the papacy, which feared the growing strength of a city strategic for Rome’s control of the region and often hostile to the popes.”

Against this backdrop of tension and rivalry with Rome, key elements of Tivoli’s Inchinata can be understood as expressions of civic autonomy. Tivoli’s fourteenth-century municipal statutes suggest that the Inchinata was organized and regulated from an early date by the commune itself. By the late fourteenth century and possibly earlier, its protagonists were lay confraternities and trade guilds, not clerics. It is likely, however, that the bishop continued to lead the procession, as he does today. The documentation on Rome’s Assumption procession reveals that by the late Middle Ages the rite in that city was organized by lay confraternities, who took over that stewardship from the papacy. I would argue that a similar phenomenon happened in Tivoli and other Laziale communes, where local organization of the procession became an act of resistance against papal hegemony and efforts of the Roman secular elites to subjugate the hinterlands, and possibly also against local episcopal control—although not necessarily in an adversarial way (Figure 18). In the case of the episcopacy, the process of appropriation probably did not reflect a neat binary of interests, but rather a negotiation of them. David Foote has elucidated the complex relationship between bishops and lay communities in the early communes of central Italy. Municipal officials were often urban elites whose families were closely tied to the bishopric and its religious and political interests. As the communes were developing their civic institutions, it was not uncommon for the...
leaders to look to the bishop to represent them in official matters. Foote observes that, “in effect, the bishopric [of Orvieto] was a field for a multidirectional tug-of-war among a variety of political and religious actors, all competing for access to episcopal institutions in pursuit of their interests and in their quest to implement their idea of an ordered society.”

In sum, the historical evidence suggests that shortly after the Savior triptych and the Inchinata procession were introduced in Tivoli in the early twelfth century, probably under episcopal purview in cooperation with the papacy, Tivoli’s lay community co-opted the rite while leaving the bishop as its ceremonial head. This lay community consisted of civic leaders, economic elites, trade guilds, and, later, after the second half of the thirteenth century, lay religious confraternities, often in affiliation with urban mendicant communities such as the Franciscans, Dominicans, and Augustinians, who had complex relations with each other and with the established ecclesiastical hierarchy. I believe the Inchinata procession absorbed long-standing local rituals and cult sites to form a kind of amalgamation of native and outside elements. This may have occurred as a process of negotiation over time, in which the episcopacy insinuated itself into an existing rogation-style ritual. Subsequently, different groups within the lay community appropriated and exploited this synthesis as a vehicle for expressing civic autonomy in the face of challenges to the community’s political autonomy and economic interests.

**An Encoded Procession Route**

Giovanni Maria Zappi’s sixteenth-century account of the Inchinata is a rich narrative source about the event, providing many details about its performance at that time. Analysis of the premodern procession is complicated, however, by the fact that the earliest surviving record of the Inchinata’s liturgy, made by local historian Vincenzo Pacifici, dates only to 1929. This raises the question of what we really know about the liturgy as performed in the Middle Ages. I have compared the 1929 Latin liturgy and the vernacular translation performed today with rogation liturgies performed in late medieval central Italy. The comparison reveals key parallels in aspects such as Gospel readings during ceremonial pauses at landmarks along the boundary of the city and Gregorian chants containing psalms, praises, and supplications.

Today’s liturgy for the climax of the Inchinata, when the procession reaches Santa Maria Maggiore, contains Italian versions of the same Latin antiphons found in medieval Roman texts. These parallels suggest the possibility of continuity in the performance of the Inchinata between premodern and modern times.

Similarly, there are no medieval or early modern textual descriptions of the Inchinata’s route. Zappi does not mention the bridge ceremony, which was first recorded by Pacifici. Therefore we do not know when this part of the Inchinata originated. Nevertheless, with the exception of the bridge ritual, the route and ceremonies of today’s Inchinata are consistent with Zappi’s narrative description of the event, which repeatedly emphasizes the antiquity of the rite. And the apotropaic practice of throwing ceremonial objects into bodies of water to implore divine help or favor was not uncommon in the Middle Ages. Moreover, the route of today’s Inchinata incorporates all four of the commune’s medieval neighborhoods that are named and described in the city statutes of 1305. The disposition of the late medieval city is intact, as is much of its original physical fabric (Figure 19). The procession’s route, a circuit
of the inhabited area of the medieval city following the walls as they stood in the late Middle Ages, links the Inchinata with a tradition of supplicatory processions in which sacred images believed to be endowed with supernatural powers were carried in and around cities in apotropaic rituals.

The use of images as urban protective devices in times of crisis is documented from the early Middle Ages. The earliest records of the Lateran Acheropita describe it as functioning in this manner. The Liber pontificalis records that during the Lombard invasion of Rome led by King Aistulf, Pope Stephen II (r. 752–57) walked barefoot from the Lateran to Santa Maria Maggiore with the Acheropita on his shoulders. During the pontificate of Leo IV (r. 847–55), the Acheropita defeated a plague-bearing basilisk when it was carried in the Assumption procession. During the Avar siege of Constantinople in 626, Patriarch Sergius carried the miraculous Kamuliana image of Christ in a procession along the city walls. These practices continued into the later Middle Ages. For example, the fourteenth-century Synopsis of John Lazaropoulos recorded that during the Turkish siege of Trebizond (1205–6) Emperor Alexios Komnenos walked along the city walls weeping and entreating Mary and Saint Eugenios while the archbishop accompanied him with an icon of the Virgin, the Hodegetria Chrysokephalos, and the abbot of the monastery carried the head of Saint Eugenios. In 1060, the citizens of Amiens organized a procession around the city walls with the relics of Saint Honoratus to end a drought.

The route and liturgical ceremonies of Tivoli’s Inchinata reveal something more specific than these examples: they have distinct elements of rogation. Rogations were supplicatory processions staged in medieval Europe on certain feast days (rogation days). Participants in the processions circled their cities and towns while reciting litanies, penitential hymns, and prayers and supplicating God to bless the crops and proffer protection from outside enemies. The rogations were rooted in the ancient Robigalia, a ritual procession performed to protect the fields...
during the annual agricultural festival, a tradition that was later Christianized. In the Christianized version, according to Thomas Boogaart, “recitation of benedictions at cardinal points reoriented communal life with its invisible sacred pivots, reharmonizing the community with biocosmic rhythms.”

The routes of medieval rogation processions have been documented in urban communes around Italy. These processions included all parts of the city, sanctifying the community and mapping its sacred and civic geography. According to Augustine Thompson, in Bologna during the rogation litanies on the feast day of Saint Mark, the procession circled the city walls, stopping at the four principal gates, at each of which the bishop chanted a Gospel incipit toward the respective cardinal direction. Thompson has studied similar rituals in Siena, Pisa, Volterra, and Verona. Because of the similarities in their conception and purpose as intercessory or supplicatory acts, annual civic processions on other days during which divine intercession against adversity was implored took the routes and rituals of the rogations. Every year on 5 February, the feast day of Saint Agatha, an image of the saint was carried around Florence to ward off fires. The thirteenth-century liturgical text from the cathedral, Mores et consuetudines ecclesiae Florentinae, describes the circular nature of that procession. The text specifies that from the cathedral the procession “proceeds to make a circuit of the city” with “the image of Saint Agatha preceding us through the streets.” Following the general outline of the city walls, the procession stopped at four key boundary points of the city, where Gospels were sung.

Tivoli’s Inchinata appears to be related to a similar custom. It is performed as a circumambulation of the city during which participants chant psalms and litanies and stop at key civic landmarks corresponding with the four cardinal directions to read from the Gospels and recite supplicatory antiphons and responses. I interpret the Inchinata’s itinerary as designed not just to process through but also to encompass the commune, articulating its four urban districts and its defensive walls and imbuing its portals with symbolic significance. The spatial relationship of the procession’s beginning and end points and its two stopping points in between superimposes a rough cross on the city and forms a matrix that sacramalizes the community at the four directions (Figure 20).

In his work on medieval processions in Florence, Franklin Toker has demonstrated that the rogation processions were sometimes performed as a series of circuits made in different parts of the city on different days. Together they encompassed the urban fabric as a whole. Tivoli’s Inchinata has a similar scheme. The nocturnal procession travels only two-thirds of the way around the city; the circuit is then completed the following morning, when the Savior triptych is returned to its home in the cathedral.

This rogational paradigm was likely a preexisting rite already used by the Tiburtini for apotropaeic ceremonial occasions. It could have been implemented by the lay community as a convenient framework for the imported Roman Assumption procession liturgy and icon-bowing ritual when these were introduced around the beginning of the twelfth century by the papacy or episcopacy. Boogaart describes similar phenomena in other places in medieval Europe and observes that “rogation processions continually evolved in response to Church reforms and changing local devotional needs.” For instance, idiosyncratic Eucharistic processions borrowing from antecedent ritual practice, often rogation rites, emerged in individual European towns and cities in the fourteenth century as constructs of the lay community to accommodate papal bulls encouraging Eucharistic devotion.

These factors invite a reconsideration of the notion that Tivoli’s Inchinata is a mere replica of the Assumption procession in Rome. Rome’s procession was not circular, did not follow the city walls, and did not use the gates. It featured elements of the letania, or supplicatory procession, but it was also shaped by the cortege, or papal stational liturgy, involving ceremonial movement from the Lateran Palace to the various stational churches and back to the palace. Deriving from ancient imperial triumphal processions, the cortege focused attention on specific personages: the pope, cardinals, archbishops, and other clerical elites. This aspect of the Roman Assumption procession was changing by the twelfth century as the ritual took on a more civic character, and by at least the thirteenth century it featured lay confraternities. But while the number of churches and monuments at which the Roman procession stopped varied over time, the route of the procession changed little. According to the earliest textual record of the Acheropita being carried in the Roman Assumption procession—the biography of Leo IV (r. 847–55) in the Liber pontificalis—the procession left from the Lateran and made its way northwest to Sant’Adriano in the Forum and then northeast to Santa Maria Maggiore. The return of the Acheropita to its home at the Lateran in a southeasterly direction completed the journey. While later texts from the fifteenth century record additional stops at San Clemente, Santi Cosma e Damiano, and Santa Prassede, all of these churches were located on the already established route. Therefore, the Roman procession seems to have always taken the shape of a triangle superimposed on the southeast corner of the city, a zone that was largely uninhabited in the Middle Ages. So the cosmological elements of Tivoli’s Inchinata and its apotropaic aspect of urban circumscription seem to have been, if not absent in the Roman procession, at least notably less pronounced. Of course, the intramural area of Rome was far greater than that of Tivoli, and a procession that made a complete circuit of the walls in a single night would not have been feasible. But it is also true that the medieval Roman procession made no attempt
to circumscribe even the *inhabited* area of the city, which by that time had contracted to small settlements mainly clustered around the Tiber in the area of Campo Marzio and Trastevere.

**Construction of a Communal Narrative**

I construe the Inchinata to be a conflation of borrowings from Rome (a cult image and certain liturgical elements) with a local, preexisting rogation-style ritual that gave the procession its cosmographical character. Since this amalgamation probably occurred around the time the commune was establishing its political autonomy, the procession may have taken on a third level of meaning: its cosmological elements may have been infused with civic references embedded in the local topography. I propose that the Savior triptych, through the performed geography of the Inchinata, functioned as the mediator of a communal narrative that wove Tivoli’s real history and its legendary history into a new civic vision. The salvific content of the liturgy and the supplicatory rituals with the icon were adapted to performance within a unique local landscape. The key to the icon’s performance was its dialogue with specific monuments the Tiburtini considered to possess an especial sanctity or historical authority.

Each of the principal monuments of the Inchinata’s itinerary—the cathedral, Ponte Gregoriano, Santa Maria Maggiore, and San Pietro—are connected to long-standing local saints’ cults. The cathedral, the starting point of the procession, is dedicated to the Early Christian martyr Lawrence, Tivoli’s patron saint and protector (see Figure 20 A). The church, its dedication, and the veneration of Lawrence as Figure 20 Tivoli’s historic center showing the cross axis between Inchinata sites (map by author).
The city’s protector-saint date to the early Middle Ages. The cathedral is first recorded in the biography of Leo III (r. 795–816) in the Liber pontificalis. In the cathedral’s now-destroyed medieval apse fresco, Saint Lawrence was depicted adjacent to the scene of Christ crowning Mary. Ernst Kitzinger and William Tronzo have observed that the Coronation of the Virgin iconography in the twelfth-century apse mosaic of Rome’s Santa Maria in Trastevere and the thirteenth-century apse mosaic in Rome’s Santa Maria Maggiore refer to the Feast of the Assumption and its procession. Francesco Ferruti has suggested that, likewise, the Coronation of the Virgin scene in Tivoli’s cathedral apse referenced the Feast of the Assumption and its local festivity—the Inchinata. In the fresco, Tivoli’s patron saint Lawrence was brought into visual and ideological connection with the Inchinata. This connection between the Feast of the Assumption and the Tiburtine cults of the Savior and of Saint Lawrence is strengthened by the appearance of Saint Lawrence next to Christ in the Savior triptych’s silver ceremonial revetment, its cladding for the Inchinata procession.

The Savior triptych is also connected to local Early Christian saints’ cults through the Tiburtine legend that the Savior triptych was given to the cathedral by fifth-century pope-saint Simplicius (r. 468–83), a native of Tivoli. From the very moment the Savior icon emerges from the cathedral for its annual circumambulation of the city in the Inchinata procession, it invokes the spiritual and historical authority of two Early Christian figures with ties to Tivoli: patron saint and protector Lawrence and local hero Pope Simplicius. A third connection between the Savior triptych and local Early Christian saints’ cults is a Tiburtine legend that the icon was painted by the Evangelist Luke.

Another layer of historical significance at the cathedral site invokes Tivoli’s ancient past, deepening the symbolism of the processional topography and further binding the Savior triptych to a specific place. The cathedral stands at the center of what was once the city’s Roman forum (Figure 21). The later Tiburtini believed this to be the location of the temple of Hercules Victor. In reality, the temple stood on the southwestern flank of the city, where its remains can still be seen, but the historical import of the forum area for the early medieval Tiburtini was probably the reason they built the cathedral there. Several scholars have noted that the feast day of Saint Lawrence, which falls on 10 August, closely approximates the timing of the festival of Hercules Victor (13 August) and Feriae Augusti, the mid-August harvest festival instituted by Emperor Augustus. This is not a coincidence, because the cult of Augustus came to be closely associated with that of Hercules Victor. Later, this popular festival, which celebrated both the man-god Hercules and the man-god Augustus, was Christianized through assimilation into the cult of the Early Christian martyr-saint Lawrence, who replaced Hercules as patron of the city.

In these ways, Tivoli’s cathedral and its dedication form Christian iterations of the city’s older Roman traditions. At this site, the city’s most important cult image—the Savior triptych—resided, and from this spot its most elaborate public liturgical procession issued. And the procession was performed for a mid-August festival—the Assumption—that coincided with all the other ancient celebrations here cited. The Savior icon became associated with a long tradition of local spiritual and cultural authority at that site, a special place of collective memory going back beyond the city’s Early Christian history to its pre-Christian past.

Similarly, at Ponte Gregoriano (see Figures 5 A and 20 C) the Inchinata rites contain several layers of local meaning. In the original medieval performance there was a complex significance to the supplication “Save us!”—a significance
that was connected to the site itself. On one level, the bishop was imploring the Lord for spiritual salvation through Christ’s atonement. On another level, the Tiburtini were asking God for a more immediate, literal salvation: salvation from the city’s enemies, probably most especially from Subiaco, one of Tivoli’s perennial nemeses in the late-Middle Ages. It is telling that the original Latin version of the response to the antiphon *Da pacem Domine* that is said at this moment in the bridge ceremony contained more specific and potent references to conflict and warfare. The original Latin translates to English as “Give us peace in our days since there is no one else to fight for us if not you, God, our God. Let there be peace in your city and abundance in your towers.” On a third level, the people were asking salvation from natural forces: the devastating floods that struck Tivoli until the nineteenth century, when the Anio was partially diverted outside the city to the northeast.

Ponte Gregoriano is not the original site on the procession route, however, since no bridge existed at this location before the nineteenth century. The Inchinata’s medieval procession route most likely continued several dozen meters further north to the original site of the bridge, at the edge of the acropolis (Figure 22; see Figures 5 B and 20 E). This route followed the city walls more closely and more fully encompassed the neighborhood of Castrovetere than does today’s route, which includes only a corner of that section of the city. In other words, this route, which brought the procession up to the acropolis, would have been more consistent with medieval rogation paradigms.

The acropolis was one of the most strategic sites of the city. In the Middle Ages a bridge near the two Roman temples connected it to the small district of Cornuta. On the other side of the gate Porta Cornuta (see Figure 20 J) lay the road to Abruzzo. In Roman times, the acropolis was secured by Porta Variana, then later at the same site by the still-extant Porta San Martino (Figure 23; see Figure 20 D) and a tower and drawbridge over a moat that sealed it off in times of crisis. These thirteenth- and fourteenth-century defensive structures attest to the continued importance in the late Middle Ages of the acropolis, a high neck of land jutting out over the river gorge and commanding a sweeping view of the valley. This topographical situation suggests that the ceremony with the Savior icon is location specific. The liturgical formulas of the Inchinata modeled on both Rome’s Assumption procession and rogation processions appear to have been adapted intentionally for this site. In the Middle Ages, the bridge had important political and symbolic significance as the boundary between what was the main area of the inhabited city and the outlying district of Cornuta, beyond which the Via Tiburtina Valeria stretched toward Subiaco and Abruzzo. This road signified economic prosperity and military prowess for Tivoli. When the city was able to maintain the upper hand in the region, it was able to control the road—a major trade route—and collect substantial taxes from it. Thus the site had particular significance for the medieval Tiburtini as a crossroads of trade and conflict between Tivoli and neighboring powers, and the bridge and defensive gate symbolized that boundary.

As the site of two ancient Roman temples, the acropolis also had spiritual significance relating to the city’s legendary Christian history. In the second phase of the Inchinata bridge ceremony the icon is turned north, “toward the temple of the Sibyl,” referring to the round temple. In the early Middle Ages, both this temple and the rectangular one next to it were converted into *diaconiae*, charitable foundations operated by the church. The round temple, however, fell into disuse by the late Middle Ages. The round temple was historically associated with the Tiburtine sibyl Albunea. This sibyl, according to the Christianized sibylline texts, prophesied the birth of
Christ to Emperor Augustus, who built an altar, the Aracoeli, on the Capitoline Hill in Rome to commemorate the event. Jacopo da Voragine’s thirteenth-century *Golden Legend* and the thirteenth- and fourteenth-century pilgrim’s guides *Mirabilia Romae* and *Graphia aureae urbis Romae* celebrate the miracle and praise the Tiburtine sibyl as a venerable Christian prophetess. For the medieval Tiburtini, this temple would have symbolized both the glory of the city’s ancient past and Christianity’s victory over paganism.

The site is significant for another episode in legendary Early Christian history. Here at the falls of the Anio, the body of Saint Sinforosa was flung after she was brutally martyred by Emperor Hadrian in the second century on the occasion of the dedication of his new villa outside Tivoli. Tivoli had a special devotion to Saint Sinforosa. Her cult in the region goes back to the fourth century, when a *cella memoriae* was built for her outside Tivoli on the Via Tiburtina; it was later enlarged, becoming a Christian pilgrimage site included in the *Mirabilia urbis Romae*.

At the procession’s climax at Santa Maria Maggiore (see Figures 10 and 20 I), the Savior triptych as palladium invoked the spiritual, historical, and civic authority of the site. In the city statutes of 1305, Santa Maria Maggiore is designated as the place where the statutes themselves are to be kept, and its piazza is called *platea communis*, “piazza of the commune,” suggesting that it was the seat of the municipal curia or had some other official civic function. Additionally, while the Marian dedication of the church dates to 1084, popular local belief held that Tiburtine pope Simplicius founded Santa Maria Maggiore in the fourth century and that it was he who gave to the church the venerated image of the Madonna delle Grazie, which, like the Savior icon, was painted by Saint Luke.

The two churches that served as the beginning and end points of the procession—the Cathedral of San Lorenzo and Santa Maria Maggiore—shared special status in popular local culture as having origins in the city’s Early Christian past (see Figures 2 and 11). They were endowed with particularly sacred images, not only given to the city by local pope-saint Simplicius but also allegedly painted by the hand of the Evangelist Luke, apostle of Christ. We cannot know whether such legends were the cause or the effect of the Tiburtini’s selection of the Madonna delle Grazie as the object of the climactic ritual encounter with the Savior triptych, or of Santa Maria Maggiore as the backdrop for that ceremony. The church of Santa Maria Maggiore in Tivoli and the papal basilica of Santa Maria Maggiore in Rome are both prominent in their respective communities as the main Marian foundations, as the destinations of their respective Assumption processions, and as the homes of the Marian images used in those processions. I believe it probable that the founding of Santa Maria Maggiore in Tivoli in the eleventh century reflected a desire to emulate Rome’s principal Marian basilica of Santa Maria Maggiore. All of Tivoli’s most important medieval churches—San Lorenzo, Santa Maria Maggiore, San Pietro, and San Paolo (no longer extant)—bear the same dedications as principal Roman basilicas, and most of these Tiburtine churches are included in the itinerary of the Inchinata. This suggests there was an ambivalence to Tivoli’s sense of identity vis-à-vis the “urbs,” a tension between imitation and competition.

San Pietro is the final major monument encountered in the Inchinata procession (Figure 24; see Figure 20 K). On the second leg of its journey, on the morning of Assumption Day, the procession exits the piazza of Santa Maria Maggiore and returns to the cathedral along a course that takes it past San Pietro, whose apse juts into the north side of what is now Villa D’Este. The antiquity of this church is considerable. It first appears in the *Liber pontificalis* in the biography of Leo III as “S. Petrus Major.” Early modern sources reveal that San Pietro was one of the three churches believed by the Tiburtini to have been founded in the fifth century by Pope Simplicius. Archaeological excavations seem to confirm the historicity of this claim. Excavations under the current...
Romanesque church have found an earlier church dating to the eighth century, and below that, a Late Antique or Early Christian memoria or shrine.93 Saint Peter was said to have preached in the territory, and a number of Early Christian and early medieval shrines and churches were founded there to venerate him. The memoria under Tivoli’s San Pietro is probably one of them. The incorporation of this site into the procession route would have been an effective way indeed to sanctify and authorize the Savior icon’s homeward journey in the Inchinata.

Locality, Cosmology, and Autonomy

The evidence of the origins and performance of the medieval Inchinata suggests that the procession expressed elements of both the local and the cosmological. While the latter has associations with the ideal and the typological rather than the specific and the temporal, I do not assume the two constructs to be mutually exclusive. They may have been complementary, as Boogaart has argued in the case of the Holy Blood procession in late medieval Bruges. According to Boogaart, “Like many medieval rituals and art, the procession of Holy Blood bridged cosmic and civic history at different levels, implicitly associating community and cosmos, world salvation and the restoration of justice during historical time.”94 The Flemish spectacle was performed for the Feast of Corpus Christi and featured a relic of Christ’s blood. The relic was processed in a circle around the city, alternately inside and outside the wall, with pauses at the gates for prayers. Boogaart demonstrates that while the procession’s choreography applied a rogational scheme in its itinerary—and expressed all the cosmological and salvific symbolism that implies—it also referenced specific features of the local landscape. These references were a central part of the procession’s civic meaning because “residents identified the parallelism between cosmic history and their habitat.”95

Tivoli’s Inchinata appears to be characterized by a similar duality. The mingling of two seemingly disparate paradigms—the local and the ideal—enhanced the procession’s constructed message of communal autonomy. Several recent studies have offered evidence that civic leaders of some independent medieval city-states and communes applied cosmographical schemes to visual, textual, and performative representations of their cities. Through these schemes, they evoked the Heavenly Jerusalem and therefore appealed directly to divine authority to justify self-rule.96

Medieval metaphysics conceptualized the earthly and the Heavenly Jerusalem as a microcosm of the universe. From the ninth century there existed a tradition of depicting Jerusalem in visual and literary imagery as a circle inscribed with a cross and divided into four quadrants and with gates corresponding to the cardinal directions (Figure 25). Keith Lilley has elucidated how late medieval civic leaders applied this geometrical paradigm to their own young municipalities in imitation of the sacred model. This was prompted by the heightened place of Jerusalem in the popular imagination because of the Crusades and because of a flourishing interest in Neoplatonic cosmography, which was concerned with the geometrical perfection of the Christian universe. According to Lilley, “Stylized urban representations of all sorts—not just ‘maps’ but other images, too—tend towards showing the city as having a circular or square form, seemingly deliberately and self-consciously imitating the forms of Jerusalem with its cosmological symbolism.”97 Examples of such illustrations include a 1306 plan of the Tuscan New Town of Talamone, rendered as a circular wall enclosing a neat
quadripartite street grid, and a 1480 representation of Bristol, organized around the exaggerated X-shaped intersection of two thoroughfares, the four termini of which are gated towers (Figure 26). Some cities were actually built using a precise cross-in-circle or cross-in-square scheme (the latter was also a common geometrical paradigm applied in medieval illustrations of Jerusalem and the cosmos). Examples include Cittadella, near Padua, and Terranuova, one of the Florentine New Towns.

Lilley argues that in some cases, civic leaders applied this kind of cosmographical imagery to representations of their cities to deliberately construct parallels with the Heavenly Jerusalem for political reasons. He cites, for example, the wax municipal seals that were appended to English civic and corporate charters, endorsing the cities’ legal and constitutional status and functioning as icons of their authority and self-image. The seals appear to imitate Jerusalemic cosmographical schemes: each bears a portrait of a city that is round in shape and contained within a circular defensive wall. Lilley believes this design was strategic; the seals echo contemporary pictorial types featuring a round Jerusalem at the center of the world, physically and spiritually protected by its walls. Invoking divine moral authority in this way, the seals legitimated the cities’ municipal authority and jurisdiction.

Figure 25 Twelfth-century manuscript fragment with a crusader map of Jerusalem, possibly from a psalter (photo, Koninklijke Bibliotheek, The Hague).
Lilley’s case studies of such municipal seals are confined to English examples, and he does not in any case connect them to public ritual performance. But his general line of interpretation finds consonance with a study by Michelle Duran-McLure that connects Jerusalemic cosmographical symbolism to medieval Siena’s procession for the Feast of the Purification of the Virgin, which circumambulated the city wall and paused for responsorial prayers at its gates.99 Duran-McLure examines how the Sienese in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries sought to construct a civic image for their city as the New Jerusalem through public frescoes on the city gates and through ritual performance that featured those gates.

As a synthesis of two separate traditions—a local folk rite with pagan origins and a recent Roman liturgical import—the Inchinata must have had multiple levels of meaning for its early participants. As with Bruges’s procession of the Holy Blood, the performed geography of Tivoli’s Inchinata may have been understood by participants as bridging “cosmic and civic history at different levels,” its landscape a mediator of the historical and the metaphorical. As with Siena’s procession of the Purification of the Virgin, a salvific invocation of the Heavenly Jerusalem may have been a strategy for the young Tiburtine municipality to assert autonomy. The four monuments at the cardinal points—the cathedral, the

Figure 26 Schematized map of Bristol, England, 1480, in The Maire of Bristowe is Kalendar (photo, Bristol Record Office).
acropolis, San Giovanni, and Santa Maria Maggiore—form a virtual cross, and the procession route encircles the city (see Figure 20). The cosmographical formula of the procession traces out an image of the city as a mirror of the biblical Jerusalem (see Figure 25), linking what Lilley terms “the body politic and the divine archetype.” I believe this invocation of Jerusalem functioned as an appeal to an authority other than Rome for the city’s salvation and, through that, its right to rule.

Conclusion
Tivoli’s Inchinata is a complex manifestation of the way locality factored into medieval civic imagery and ritual in dialogue with multiple sources and references. Its cultic protagonist, the Savior triptych, and the procession’s culminating bowing ceremony were inspired by Roman models. Based on what can be inferred from today’s procession together with the literary and archaeological evidence, however, the medieval Inchinata’s route and liturgy differed in notable ways from the Roman spectacle. The Inchinata’s route employs archetypal geometry: a circular route around the city that follows the walls and emphasizes the gates and their adjacent landmarks corresponding to the four cardinal directions (the cathedral, the acropolis, the Hospital of San Giovanni, and the church of Santa Maria Maggiore). This implies apotropaic cosmological meaning. Yet the function of the medieval spectacle was not simply apotropaic, or even simply devotional. Its choreography and liturgy drew the city’s salvation and as justification for self-rule. Within this context Tivoli’s sacred topography may have transformed into a topography of rivalry with Rome.

The case of Tivoli and the Inchinata offers insights into how tensions between clergy and laity, and between center and periphery, in late medieval Italy were negotiated and expressed through public ritual performance. Examining the Inchinata expands our understanding of sociopolitical processes in the Laziale municipalities and their importance for the development of urban society. Due to the special role of Rome as both an economic and political center and the seat of the papacy and heart of Christendom, relations between “urbs” and periphery in Lazio were unique. Tivoli’s Inchinata demonstrates the nuances and difficulties of those relationships, the dynamism of urban culture in the so-called Roman hinterlands, and the enduring achievements of individual urban centers like Tivoli in a seminal stage of the modern city.
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