

Saint Petersburg State University

*Manuscript Copyright*

Roman A. ISAENKO

**THE RITUAL OF EVOCATION IN ANCIENT ROMAN LITERARY AND  
EPIGRAPHIC SOURCES**

Scientific Specialty 5.9.7.

Classical, Byzantine and Modern Greek Philology

THESIS SUBMITTED

IN FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF  
CANDIDATE OF SCIENCES IN PHILOLOGY

Translation from Russian

Supervisor

Dr. Sci. in Philology, professor

Michael M. POZDNEV

Saint Petersburg – 2023

**CONTENTS**

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| <b>Introduction</b> .....   | 3   |
| <b>Chapter 1. Adoption of Religious Practices in Ancient Rome</b> ..... | 7   |
| <b>Chapter 2. The <i>Aeneid</i></b> .....                               | 27  |
| <b>Chapter 3. Veii</b> .....  | 38  |
| <b>Chapter 4. Falerii</b> .....   | 62  |
| <b>Chapter 5. Volsinii</b> .....  | 72  |
| <b>Chapter 6. Carthage</b> .....  | 85  |
| <b>Chapter 7. Isaura Vetus</b> .....                                    | 102 |
| <b>Chapter 8. Jerusalem</b> .....                                       | 110 |
| <b>Chapter 9. A Secret Ritual?</b> .....                                | 121 |
| <b>Conclusions</b> .....  | 133 |
| <b>References</b> .....   | 148 |

## INTRODUCTION

**Relevance of the research.** The thesis *The Ritual of Evocation in Ancient Roman Literary and Epigraphic Sources* examines a ritual that is rarely overlooked in books on Roman religion. According to the ancient encyclopaedists, the ritual of evocation was performed during sieges: Roman generals would promise the patron deity, who protected the besieged city, new temples and equally lavish worship in Rome, expecting that the deity summoned in this way would abandon the besieged and make the capture of the city possible. The ritual often attracts the attention of scholars because it illustrates some of the traits traditionally associated with Roman religion: for example, the hazy boundaries between a priest and a public official, as well as a certain mercantilism, the underlying belief that a deity could become a reliable business partner should they be approached in a proper manner and offered fair terms.

**The topic's level of development.** Counted among the researchers who dealt with the ritual of evocation in their works on Roman religion are the influential names of Georg Wissowa, Kurt Latte, and Mary Beard [Wissowa 1902; Latte 1960; Beard et al. 1998]. Evocation is a dedicated subject of study for the monographs penned by Vsevolod Basanoff and Gabriella Gustafsson [Basanoff 1947; Gustafsson 2000]. Despite the scholarly interest in this topic persisting for centuries, it appears that at least one peculiarity of the ancient literary sources, because of which this ritual is known to us, continues to pose an unsolved problem – and perhaps is not even fully recognized as a problem in need of solving. For some reason, all ancient texts that give a detailed description to the ritual of evocation are encyclopaedic in character, while the ancient historians who describe the course of individual sieges and mention actions that, in the light of the information offered by the encyclopaedists, could be recognized as stages of the ritual, seemingly do not realize that they are describing a ritual instead of disconnected actions and events.

**The object of the study, its purposes and objectives.** The object of this study is ancient Roman literary and epigraphic sources containing descriptions – or potential descriptions – of the ritual of evocation. Among them are Pliny the Elder's *Natural History*, Servius' commentary on Vergil's *Aeneid* and Macrobius' *Saturnalia*, the works of ancient historians who described sieges carried out by the Romans – Livy, Tacitus, Diodorus of Sicily, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, and many others – as well as a votive inscription carved on the order of the commander Publius Servilius Vatia on a stone found on the territory of modern Turkey.

The purpose of the study is to answer the question presented above: why do the historians of antiquity avoid discussing the ritual of evocation in their narrations describing the capture of cities by the Romans, if this ritual is known to the ancient encyclopaedists?

To accomplish this purpose, three intermediate objectives are set:

1. To examine the information on the ritual of evocation transmitted by the encyclopaedists.
2. To examine the literary and epigraphic accounts of the sieges, which ancient or modern writers associate the ritual of evocation with, and to determine whether the events of these sieges match the encyclopaedic descriptions of this ritual, and whether the authors of these accounts are aware of the ritual, or whether they think that they are describing disconnected actions.
3. To examine the historical context, in which the earliest of the encyclopaedic accounts of the ritual were composed, and to determine whether this context was capable of influencing the content of these accounts.

**The structure of the thesis.** The thesis consists of an introduction, nine chapters and the conclusions. The introduction briefly outlines the subject of the dissertation, its purpose and objectives. Chapter 1 defines the place of the thesis' subject in the study of Roman religion, examines the encyclopaedic testimonies of the ritual of evocation and

the views of modern scholars on this ritual. Chapters 2–8 examine the individual sieges, which the rite of evocation is associated with. Chapter 9 explores the question of whether the rarity of historiographical accounts of the ritual could be explained by a prohibition to disclose it. The conclusions examines the religious politics of the age of Augustus and offers the final interpretation of the facts.

**Dissertation hypotheses.**

1. There is no dependable evidence that the sieges of Veii, Falerii, Volsinii, Carthage, Isaura Vetus, and Jerusalem were accompanied by the ritual of evocation.

2. There is no reason to think that in those cases, when the conquest of these cities was followed by religious adoptions, these adoptions were carried out with a codified military ritual of any kind.

3. The authors of the historical accounts of these sieges are either unaware of the ritual of evocation, or do not consider the events of these sieges to be its examples.

4. There is no reason to think that Vergil's portrayal of the siege of Troy in the second book of the *Aeneid* includes a reference to the ritual of evocation, as Servius and Macrobius believe.

5. The encyclopaedic tradition of the descriptions of the ritual of evocation can be traced back to Verrius Flaccus, who may have served the interests of his patron Augustus (who concerned himself with overcoming the consequences of civil wars) and wished to depict the history of Roman religious adoptions as less conflicted than it was in reality by emphasizing the consent of the adopted gods.

**Scientific novelty, theoretical and practical value of the thesis.** The dissertation offers a fundamentally new perspective on the ritual of evocation as a patriotic myth created centuries after the religious adoptions associated with it. The results of the study can be used in the writing of textbooks and reference books.

**Evaluation of the results.** The preliminary results of the conducted study were published in the scholarly journal *Philologia Classica*, indexed in the Scopus and Web of Science databases, as well as the Higher Attestation Commission list [Isaenko 2017 (1); 2017 (2); 2019]. They were also the subject of presentations at the International Philological Conferences held at Saint Petersburg State University in 2016 and 2017.

## CHAPTER 1

## ADOPTION OF RELIGIOUS PRACTICES IN ANCIENT ROME

As told in ancient Roman legends, the practice of borrowing of religious cults and ceremonies from other peoples dates back to the city's very founding: according to Livy, Romulus, following the murder of Remus, honored Hercules with a sacrifice performed in accordance with the Greek rite,<sup>1</sup> adhering to the example set by king Evander, who, as the legend goes, had previously ruled the place of Rome's future founding and met the Greek hero in person as he drove the cattle of Geryon through Italy (1, 7).<sup>2</sup> To

---

<sup>1</sup> According to Roman sources, the Greek rite was distinguished by the participants adorning their otherwise uncovered heads with laurel wreaths. Servius (*In Aen.* 8, 276; 8, 288) and Macrobius (*Sat.* 3, 12, 2) mention that the *praetor urbanus* made use of such a wreath as he made sacrifices to Hercules. Livy, describing the establishment of the *Ludi Apollinares* in the years of the Second Punic War, notes that spectators had their heads adorned with wreaths (25, 12, 15). Varro, proposing a dubious etymology of *rica* ("veil") from *ritus* ("ritual"), states that the Roman rite required women to cover their heads during sacrifice (*Ling.* 5, 130).

<sup>2</sup> This legend is additionally recounted by Dionysius of Halicarnassus (*Ant. Rom.* 1, 39–40), Vergil (*Aen.* 8, 184–275), and Ovid (*Fast.* 1, 543–584). An unusual variant is transmitted by Diodorus Siculus: he does not mention the struggle between the Greek hero and Cacus, who takes Geryon's cattle from him, instead stating that Heracles is welcomed by local denizens named Cacius and Pinarius (4, 21, 1–4). It is implausible that this cult of Hercules, connected to the altar *Ara Maxima* in the *Forum Boarium* (Suet. *Rel.* Reiff. 176), could have such an early origin or that kings could be involved in its establishment. The cult was originally overseen by the Potitii and the Pinarii, two patrician families, and priesthood was hereditary. According to the tradition, the cult obtained the public status towards the end of the fourth century BCE, an event that has its own legend associated with it: shortly after Appius Claudius, censor in 312–308 BCE, had made the decision to reimburse the Potitii with 50,000 asses in exchange for teaching public slaves how to conduct the cult's sacred rites, all men belonging to this family perished, and Appius Claudius lost his eyesight, for which he was given the *cognomen* Caecus, "the Blind" (Liv. 9, 29, 9–11; Festus *Gloss. Lat.* 270 L). In the opinion of Robert Ogilvie, the cult arrived in Rome no earlier than the fifth century BCE

the same Evander Livy attributes the establishment of the Lupercalia, one of Rome's oldest festivals, which the historian considers to be a form of worship of Pan Lycaeus, brought from Arcadia.<sup>3</sup>

Legends allot an important part in the formation of Roman religion to the cultural influence of the Sabines, whose partial assimilation by the Romans became the foundation of the tale of the rape of the Sabine women.<sup>4</sup> A list of gods whose altars were set up in Rome in fulfillment of a vow made by the Sabine king Titus Tatius, who had become

---

[Ogilvie 1965: 56]. James Greenough reasons that the cult emerged under the influence of Greek traders, supported by the *Ara Maxima*'s position at a marketplace [Greenough 1891: 23].

<sup>3</sup> According to R. Ogilvie [Ogilvie 1965: 52–53], the notion of the Lupercalia having Arcadian origins may be rooted in the similarity between the festival's name and the epithet of Pan (both the Latin *lupus* and the Greek *λύκος* have the same meaning of “wolf”) as well as the existence of an Arcadian ritual, alluded to by Theocritus, which had young men strike an image of Pan with squills, in a manner similar to the Roman Luperci who struck passers-by with wolf skins (*Id.* 7, 106–108).

<sup>4</sup> Assimilation of the Sabines took centuries. In 504 BCE, a Sabine man named Attius Clausus, who feared for his safety because he supported peace with the Romans, migrated to Rome in the company of his clients, where he received land and senatorial station and founded the *gens* Claudia (Liv. 2, 16, 3–5; Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 5, 40, 3–5; Plut. *Pop.* 21). A different, less plausible account is given by Suetonius, according to whom this migration took place during the reign Romulus (Suet. *Tib.* 1, 1). In 460 BCE, the Capitoline Hill was seized in the uprising of Appius Herdonius, a Sabine man who had the support of Roman slaves and exiles and sought the aid of neighboring Italic peoples: the Volsci, the Aequi, and the Sabines (Liv. 3, 15–18; Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 10, 14–16). In 290 BCE, a Sabine uprising was suppressed by the consul Manius Curius Dentatus (Liv. *Per.* 11). Afterwards, Sabine cities were granted the *civitas sine suffragio* (the rights of the Roman citizens, excluding the right to participate in popular assemblies), and in 268 BCE they obtained full citizenship (Vell. Pat. 1, 14, 6–7). In the opinion of Gary Farney and Giulia Masci, it is possible that the integration of Sabine families into the Roman elite had not begun until the 5th century BCE, and that the legends tracing the start of this process back to the time of the city's founding appeared only in the 3rd century BCE, after the Sabines had gained citizenship [Farney, Masci 2017: 553].



Romulus' co-ruler following the reconciliation of the two peoples, is given by Varro: Ops, Flora, Vediovis, Saturn, Sun, Moon, Vulcan, Summanus, Larunda, Terminus, Quirinus, Vortumnus, Lares, Diana, and Lucina (*Ling.* 5, 74). In the opinion of Georges Dumézil, this catalog cannot be considered authentic, yet the nature of the gods comprising it is meaningful and reflects genuine Roman beliefs concerning the Sabine religious element and its character. The list primarily consists of deities connected to activities, objects, and events that are of particular importance to a predominantly agricultural society: farming, celestial bodies, the underworld, and childbirth [Dumézil 1974: 181–182]. Sabine origins are traditionally ascribed to Numa Pompilius, the second king of Rome, to whom Livy attributes a number of religious innovations: construction of a temple of Janus, introduction of a calendar distinguishing *dies fasti* and *dies nefasti* (days respectively allowing and prohibiting public activity), appointment of the first three flamens (who served Jupiter, Mars, and Quirinus) and the first pontiff, establishment of the priestly college of the Salii, adoption of the cult of Vesta from Alba (1, 19–20).

The republican period saw a number of religious adoptions inspired by the advice of the Sibylline Books, which were consulted by a pair of priests comprising the college of *duumviri sacris faciundis*, later expanded to ten *decemviri* (Liv. 6, 42, 2) and later still to fifteen *quindecimviri* (Serv. *In Aen.* 6, 73).<sup>5</sup> In 292 BCE, the cult of Aesculapius was brought to Rome from Epidaurus. As the legend tells, the reason for this adoption was an epidemic that had lasted for three years and ended only after a temple had been

---

<sup>5</sup> The law that increased the number of the college's members to ten was proposed in 367 BCE by the plebeian tribunes Lucius Sextius and Gaius Licinius in the plebs' struggle for political rights: five of the *decemviri* were selected from the patricians, while the other half was chosen from the plebeians (Liv. 6, 42, 2). The time and circumstances of the college's second expansion are not clearly attested. According to a popular hypothesis, shared by Georg Wissowa [Wissowa 1902: 416], it occurred under Sulla, who likewise expanded the colleges of pontiffs and augurs to fifteen members (Liv. *Per.* 89). Additionally, Cassius Dio mentions that Caesar appointed an additional, irregular member to each of the three aforementioned colleges to reward his supporters (42, 51, 4).

dedicated to the Greek healer deity on an island in the middle of the Tiber. The temple was settled by a snake, worshiped as Aesculapius' sacred animal, which had supposedly joined the Roman embassy in Epidaurus by its own will (Liv. *Per.* 11; Val. Max. 1, 8, 2; Ov. *Met.* 15, 622–744).

In 204 BCE, the Roman pantheon was joined by Cybele. According to Livy, at the times of the Second Punic War, when Rome's safety was threatened by Hannibal, the Sibylline Books advised that Italy would be safeguarded from the external foe if the mother of the gods were to arrive from Pessinus, a city in Asia Minor. The Romans sent an embassy to Attalus, the king of Pergamon, which secured his support and obtained a holy stone, revered by the locals as Cybele embodied. After a festive arrival in Rome, the stone was temporarily placed at the temple of Victory, located in the Palatine Hill, before a temple of her own could be dedicated to the goddess. The festival of Megalesia was established in her honor and included theatrical performances (Liv. 29, 10–11; 29, 14; 36, 36).

The worship of foreign deities did not require the initiative or support of state institutions to spread throughout Rome – it could also proliferate as a result of cultural ties that naturally emerged between the Romans and the surrounding peoples. It is likely that the cult of Bacchus arrived in Rome in such a way.<sup>6</sup> The Bacchic mysteries, which became the subject of all kinds of gossip and fears described by Livy (39, 8–18), earned the government's disapproval and were restricted by the Senate's famous decree concerning the Bacchanalia in 186 BCE.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> According to Livy, these Bacchic mysteries were established by a Greek of humble origins who spread his teachings in Etruria (39, 8, 3–4). Tenney Frank argues [Frank 1927: 129–131] that they ultimately originated in the Greek cities of the southern Italy: many of their inhabitants found themselves in Roman slavery after the Second Punic War (enslavement of thirty thousands citizens of Tarentum is mentioned by Livy (27, 16, 7)), and the loss of prior social structures may have led to the ecstatic cult taking an even more uninhibited form. Plato states that the Dionysia were celebrated on a particularly grand scale in Tarentum (*Leg.* 637b).

Festus' dictionary mentions a third way of adopting religious cults as it defines the term *sacra peregrina* (*Gloss. Lat.* 268 L):

Peregrina sacra appellantur, quae aut euocatis dis in oppugnandis urbibus Romam sunt †conata†, aut quae ob quasdam religiones per pacem sunt petita, ut ex Phrygia Matris Magnae, ex Graecia Cereris, Epidauro Aesculapi: quae coluntur eorum more, a quibus sunt accepta.

“Those rites are called foreign which were gathered<sup>8</sup> in Rome after the gods had been summoned from the cities that were to be attacked or those which were sought out of some pious considerations in times of peace, as it happened with [the cult of] the Great Mother from Phrygia, Ceres from Greece, and Aesculapius from Epidaurus. These rites are performed according to the customs of the peoples from whom they were adopted.”

---

<sup>7</sup> In the opinion of Mary Beard, John North, and Simon Price, the Senate's ire may have been provoked by the cult's high level of organization: it had an internal hierarchy and maintained a treasury, which potentially constituted the rudiments of a parallel society, threatening the authority of the institutions that traditionally regulated the social life: government and family [Beard et al. 1998: 132–134]. Sarolta Takács supposes that the conspicuous persecution of the bacchantes was the Senate's way of showing its disapproval of unrestricted Greek cultural influences, as well as its power to intervene in the internal cultural matters of allied cities [Takács 2000: 310]. According to John Scheid, the government's displeasure may have been caused by a deviation from customary social roles: young men were initiated by women [Scheid 1994: 398–399]. Robert Rousselle believes that the public opinion may have been turned against the cult by contemporary dramatic works, which depicted the tragic fates of kings who opposed Dionysus: Pentheus and Lycurgus [Rousselle 1987: 195–198].

<sup>8</sup> The manuscript text is corrupted, but the context and the structure of the sentence suggest that this verb should be synonymous with the verb *sunt petita* used in the next clause. Early editions of Festus, completed by Antonio Agustín and Denis Godefroy, propose the readings *coacta* and *conlata* respectively.

The first of the methods mentioned by Festus is known as the ritual of evocation (from the verb *evocare*, “to call outside”). The most detailed description of this ritual is provided by Macrobius, who explains its purpose as follows (*Sat.* 3, 9, 2):

Constat enim omnes urbes in alicuius dei esse tutela, moremque Romanorum arcanum et multis ignotum fuisse ut, cum obsiderent urbem hostium eamque iam capi posse confiderent, certo carmine euocarent tutelares deos; quod aut aliter urbem capi posse non crederent, aut etiam si posset, nefas aestimarent deos habere captiuos.

“For it is known well that all cities enjoy the protection of one deity or another, and that the Romans had a custom, secret and unknown to many: when they besieged an enemy city and were already confident in their ability to capture it, they made use of a certain incantation to summon its patron deities, either because they did not believe that the city could be taken otherwise, or – even if it were possible – because they considered it sacrilegious to keep gods captive.”

Macrobius additionally cites a ceremonial formula, which he claims to have discovered in *Res Reconditae*, a lost work written by Serenus Sammonicus. If the formula’s own words are to be trusted, it was spoken during the siege of Carthage, which put an end to the Third Punic War, when Scipio Aemilianus commanded the Roman troops (*Sat.* 3, 9, 6–8):

Si deus, si dea est, cui populus ciuitasque Carthaginiensis est in tutela, teque maxime, ille qui urbis huius populi que tutelam recepisti, precor uenerorque ueniamque a uobis peto ut uos populum civitatemque Carthaginiensem deseratis, loca templa sacra urbemque eorum relinquatis, absque his abeatis eique populo ciuitati metum formidinem obliuionem iniciatis, proditique Romam ad me meosque ueniatis, nostraque uobis loca templa sacra urbs acceptior probatiorque sit, mihique populoque Romano

militibusque meis praepositi sitis ut sciamus intellegamusque. si ita feceritis, uoueo uobis templa ludosque facturum.

“Be they, whose protection is enjoyed by the people and the community of Carthage, a god or a goddess, [I beseech you], you in particular, who have assumed the protection of this city and the people. I reverently ask you and beg for your mercy: abandon the people and the community of Carthage, leave their lands, temples, shrines, and city, leave them, fill this people and community with fear, terror, and oblivion, and, having given yourselves [to us],<sup>9</sup> come to Rome to me and to my [countrymen]. May our lands, temples, shrines, and city become more agreeable and pleasing to you, and may you become predisposed to me, to the people of Rome, and to my soldiers, so that we may know and understand it. Should you do this, I vow to build temples in your honor and to establish games.”

Macrobius believes that this ritual was the reason why it was forbidden to divulge a sacred name supposedly given to Rome, as well as the name of the city’s tutelary deity (*Sat.* 3, 9, 3–5):

---

<sup>9</sup> Instead of the manuscript reading *proditique* Eduard Huschke proposes the reading *propitiique*, “gracious” [Huschke 1886: 12]. Robert Schilling in his turn suggests the reading *proditisque*, “having betrayed [the Carthaginians]” [Schilling 1966: 149–150]. However, the parallel passage in Livy (5, 21, 5: *Veientes ignari se iam a suis uatibus, iam ab externis oraculis proditos, iam in partem praedae suae uocatos deos* – “The Veians, oblivious that they had already been betrayed by their own seers and by foreign oracles, that gods had already been summoned to share in the spoils to be won from them”), which he cites in an abbreviated form, omitting the *ablativus auctoris* (*a suis uatibus, iam ab externis oraculis*), is not quite applicable: the Veians here are betrayed not by their tutelary deity, but by an Etruscan haruspex (5, 15, 4–11) and the Delphic oracle (5, 16, 8–11), which reveal to the Romans that Veii will fall only after the water is drained from the Lake Albano.

Nam propterea ipsi Romani et deum in cuius tutela urbs Roma est et ipsius urbis Latinum nomen ignotum esse uoluerunt. sed dei quidem nomen non nullis antiquorum, licet inter se dissidentium, libris insitum et ideo uetusta persequentibus quicquid de hoc putatur innotuit. alii enim Iouem crediderunt, alii Luam, sunt qui Angeronam, quae digito ad os admoto silentium denuntiat, alii autem quorum fides mihi uidetur firmior, Opem Consiuiam esse dixerunt. ipsius uero urbis nomen etiam doctissimis ignoratum est, cauentibus Romanis ne quod saepe aduersus urbes hostium fecisse se nouerant, idem ipsi quoque hostili euocatione paterentur, si tutelae suae nomen diuulgaretur.

“This is why the Romans themselves wanted for the deity, whose protection was bestowed to the city of Rome, and the Latin name of the city itself to remain unknown. Nevertheless, the name of the deity was included in a significant number of books by ancient authors – even if there was no consensus among them. Therefore, scholars of the antiquities are familiar with every opinion on this matter. Some considered this deity to be Jupiter, while others thought it to be Lua.<sup>10</sup> There are those who identify it with

---

<sup>10</sup> *Luam* is a conjecture proposed by Wilamowitz and accepted in Robert Kaster’s edition. All manuscripts read *Lunam*, «the Moon». There are two mentions in Livy that weaponry seized from the enemies was ritually incinerated and dedicated to *Lua Mater*, “Mother Lua” (8, 1, 6; 45, 33, 1–2), while Aulus Gellius testifies that priestly books included prayers addressed to *Lua Saturni*, “Lua of Saturnus” (*NA* 13, 23, 2). Ludwig Preller likewise suggests to read *Luae* in place of *Lunae* in Serv. *In Aen.* 3, 139, where it is said that Saturnus and this goddess hold the power to rob gardens of their fertility [Preller 1858: 418–419]. Georg Wissowa connects her name to the noun *lues*, “decay”, and considers her a hostile deity, who was opposed to Saturnus and needed appeasement [Wissowa 1902: 171–172]. G. Dumézil shares this opinion on the etymology of Lua’s name, but thinks that the Romans were capable of harnessing the decay governed by the goddess: in his view, the burning of seized weapons was a form of sympathetic magic, intended to weaken the armaments that remained in the enemies’ hands [Dumézil 1974: 282]. Hendrik Versnel considers *Lua Mater* and *Lua Saturni* to be two different goddesses and proposes to derive the name of the latter from the verb *luo* in the sense of “to liberate” (the *luo*, which commonly means “to redeem” and is cognate with the Greek *λύω* rather than the Greek *λόω* or the Latin *lavo*), connecting her to the

Angerona, who calls for silence by holding a finger up to her mouth.<sup>11</sup> Still others – whose opinion appears to be more dependable to me – asserted that it was Ops Consivia.<sup>12</sup> But the name of the city itself is unknown even to the most learned, because the Romans were wary that if they were to divulge the name of their haven, they too would be subjected to a summoning carried out by the enemy – and to the same fate that they often imposed on enemy cities, as they knew.”

---

unlocking of grain supplies [Versnel 1993: 182–184]. It is possible that the ancient theories, which consider Lua to be Rome’s tutelary deity, are based on her associations with Saturnus, who, according to the tradition, ruled in Italy during the Golden Age: legends claim that the Capitoline Hill used to be known as *Mons Saturnius* and that a city called Saturnia used to stand upon it (Varro *Ling.* 5, 42; Plin. *HN* 3, 68; Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 1, 34).

<sup>11</sup> Macrobius, referencing a first century BCE jurist Masurius Sabinus, states that Angerona is depicted with her “mouth bound and sealed” (*ore obligato atque signato*) at an altar of Volupia, the goddess of pleasure, in whose temple she was offered sacrifice (*Sat.* 1, 10, 7–8). The same kind of image is mentioned by Solinus, who speaks of Angerona’s own shrine (1, 6). Varro, in turn, claims that the goddess received sacrifice at the Curia Acculeia (*Ling.* 6, 23). Angerona’s name is likely etymologically connected with the verb *angere*, “to squeeze,” “to choke,” but the function reflected in it is unclear. Two ancient theories are recorded by Macrobius: according to Verrius Flaccus, appeasing Angerona would rid of anguish (*Sat.* 1, 10, 7), while Julius Modestus mentioned that she was worshiped because she had once helped the Roman people cure angina (*Sat.* 1, 10, 9). G. Dumézil notes that Angerona was offered sacrifice on December 21, the day of the winter solstice and the shortest day of the year, and considers this goddess to be the sun’s protector, who safeguards it from the threat posed every year by the reduction of daylight hours [Dumézil 1974: 341–343].

<sup>12</sup> *Ops Consiv(i)a* is an agricultural goddess connected to Consus, a deity whose name G. Dumézil derives from the verb *condere*, “to store,” regarding him as a protector of grain stockpiles [Dumézil 1974: 278]. In the opinion of G. Wissowa [Wissowa 1902: 168], she could be believed to be Rome’s patron because her shrine was located in the Regia, the palace of Numa Pompilius, where only the Vestals and the *pontifex maximus* were permitted (Varro *Ling.* 6, 21). As with Lua’s identification with the city’s patron, Ops’ connection to Saturnus may have contributed to this belief: due to the Greek influence, the goddess was identified with Rhea, the sister and consort of Cronus,

Finally, Macrobius reports that once the deities have been summoned from a besieged city, it can be dedicated to the gods of the underworld (with a ritual known as *devotio*), cites a formula used to accomplish this, once again naming Serenus Sammonicus as his source, and lists the cities where this rite was performed, appealing to the tradition of the annals (*Sat.* 3, 9, 6–13):

In antiquitatibus autem haec oppida inueni deuota: †Stonios†, Fregellas, Gabios, Veios, Fidenas; haec intra Italiam, praeterea Carthaginem et Corinthum, sed et multos exercitus oppidaque hostium Gallorum Hispanorum Afrorum Maurorum aliarumque gentium quas prisci locuntur annales.

---

who, in turn, was identified with Saturnus. Ovid, for example, claims that Saturnus married his sister Ops (*Met.* 9, 497–499).



“I discovered in ancient sources that the following cities were dedicated to the gods of the netherworld: Stonii,<sup>13</sup> Fregellae,<sup>14</sup> Gabii,<sup>15</sup> Veii, Fidenae<sup>16</sup> (these are located in Italy), besides Carthage and Corinth, as well as numerous enemy hosts and cities belonging to Gauls, Spaniards, Africans, Moors, and other peoples, of which ancient chronicles tell us.”

---

<sup>13</sup> No city with the name Stonii is known. The reading *Tonios* appears in the manuscripts, but *Tonii* are likewise unknown. E. Huschke suspects that *Thurios* may be the correct reading [Huschke 1886: 13]: during the Second Punic War, the people of Thurii betrayed Rome by letting the Carthaginian general Hanno into the city (Liv. 25, 15, 7–17; App. *Hann.* 34). Livy mentions that a Roman colony was settled in the Thurian territory in 194 BCE (34, 53, 1), suggesting that the city did not survive the war.

<sup>14</sup> Fregellae was a city situated in Latium. It rose in rebellion against Rome, and Gaius Gracchus was accused of aiding this revolt (Plut. *C. Grach.* 3; Aur. Vict. *De vir. Ill.* 65, 2). The city was destroyed by praetor Lucius Opimius in 125 BCE (Liv. *Per.* 60; Vell. Pat. 2, 6, 3; Val. Max. 2, 8, 4).

<sup>15</sup> *Gabios* is the reading of print editions, starting with the *editio princeps* published by Nicolas Jenson. Ludwig von Jan and James Willis' editions offer the reading *Gavios*, the origins of which are unclear. Other manuscript readings include *Cavios*, *Scavios* and *Camos* [Kaster 2010: 110; 2011: 70–71]. Out of all these variant readings, the only known toponym is Gabii. According to a legend told by Livy, this city was not destroyed when it came to be ruled by Rome. Sextus Tarquinius, a son of Rome's last king Tarquinius Superbus, feigned a quarrel with his father, convinced the people of Gabii to make him a general, used this position to eliminate Gabii's most influential citizens and surrendered the city to his father (Liv. 1, 53–54). In 462 BCE, Gabii was raided by the Volsci, whom the Romans clashed with at the time (Liv. 3, 8, 6), while in 383 BCE, the citizens of Gabii addressed the Roman Senate and voiced their grievances with raids conducted by Praeneste (Liv. 6, 21, 9). Additionally, Livy mentions Gabii as he describes the route to Rome taken by Hannibal in 211 BCE (26, 9, 12). Towards the end of the republic Gabii declines: the desolation that befell the city is mentioned by Cicero (*Planc.* 23), Dionysius of Halicarnassus (*Ant. Rom.* 4, 53, 1), Horace (*Epist.* 1, 11, 7–8), Propertius (4, 1, 34), and Lucan (*BCiv.* 7, 392–393). Macrobius' account appears to imply that Gabii was destroyed by the Romans, but other sources fail to mention any revolts that could cause this outcome.

The ritual of evocation is mentioned by Servius as he discusses a line in the *Aeneid*, which states that the gods had left Troy by the time when the city was captured. As Macrobius, Servius associates this rite with the idea of Rome's hidden patron deity (*In Aen.* 2, 351):

Excessere quia ante expugnationem euocabantur ab hostibus numina propter uitanda sacrilegia. *inde est, quod Romani celatum esse uoluerunt, in cuius dei tutela urbs Roma sit. et iure pontificum cautum est, ne suis nominibus dii Romani appellarentur, ne exaugurari possint. et in Capitolio fuit clipeus consecratus, cui inscriptum erat 'genio urbis Romae, siue mas siue femina'. et pontifices ita precabantur 'Iuppiter optime maxime, siue quo alio nomine te appellari uolueris': nam et ipse ait 'sequimur te, sancte deorum, quisquis es'.*<sup>17</sup>

“They have left because deities were summoned away from the enemies before a siege in order to avoid sacrilege. This is why the Romans wished to conceal the identity of the god who had the city of Rome under their protection, and the pontifical law cautioned against addressing the Roman deities with their proper names, so that it would prove impossible to banish them from their holy places. On the Capitoline Hill there was a consecrated shield with an inscription that read: “To the genius of the city of Rome, be they male or female.” The pontiffs prayed as follows: “Jupiter Optimus Max-

---

<sup>16</sup> A city in Latium, which, according to legends, was at odds with Rome since the times of the kings Romulus (Liv. 1, 14, 4–11; Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 2, 53, 2–4) and Tullus Hostilius (Liv. 1, 27, 3–11; Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 3, 6). After a number of clashes, in which Fidenae had allied with Veii and Falerii (Liv. 4, 17–19; 4, 22; 30; Diod. Sic. 12, 80, 6–8), the city was taken and ransacked by the Romans in 426 BCE (Liv. 4, 32–34; Flor. 1, 6, 4; Eutr. 1, 19).

<sup>17</sup> From this point onward, the use of italics in the quotations of Servius denotes text attributed to the so-called Servius Danielis.

imus, or by whichever other name you would prefer to be called.” Accordingly, Vergil himself says: “We follow you, o blessed god, whoever you are.”<sup>18</sup>

The ritual is given a similar description in Pliny the Elder’s *Natural History*, which cites Verrius Flaccus, who, in turn, deferred to the authority of unspecified writers. As other ancient authors, he sees the rite of evocation as the reason for the prohibition to disclose the name of Rome’s tutelary deity. However, he claims that the ritual was performed at the very beginning of a siege and names the priests of the college of pontiffs as the party responsible for conducting it, unlike Macrobius, who cites a formula that leaves this function to a general (Plin. *HN* 28, 18):

Verrius Flaccus auctores ponit, quibus credat in obpugnationibus ante omnia solitum a Romanis sacerdotibus euocari deum, cuius in tutela id oppidum esset, promittique illi eundem aut ampliorem apud Romanos cultum. et durat in pontificum disciplina id sacrum, constatque ideo occultatum, in cuius dei tutela Roma esset, ne qui hostium simili modo agerent.

“Verrius Flaccus cites authors, trusting whom he writes that during a siege, the Romans first of all used to summon the city’s tutelary deity and promise him the same or more opulent veneration among the Romans. This rite endures in the teaching of the pontiffs, and it is thought that it is the reason why the identity of Rome’s protector deity remains hidden, lest any enemies would accomplish anything similar.”

---

<sup>18</sup> These words (*Aen.* 4, 576–577) are spoken by Aeneas to Mercury who visits him in his sleep, warning of the danger posed by Dido and encouraging to flee Carthage. As suggested by Lucien Poznanski, this book of the *Aeneid* can be read as a commentary on contemporary political events: Aeneas, who temporarily abandons his destiny among the eastern opulence that Dido surrounds him with, is comparable to Mark Antony enthralled by Cleopatra [Poznanski 1981: 86].

The ritual of evocation did not go unnoticed by Greek writers. It is mentioned by Plutarch, who shares his own ideas concerning the origins of the prohibition to name Rome's tutelary deity (Plut. *Quaest. Rom.* 61):

‘Διὰ τί τὸν θεὸν ἐκεῖνον, ᾧ μάλιστα τὴν Ῥώμην σώζειν προσήκει καὶ φυλάττειν, εἴτ' ἐστὶν ἄρρην εἴτε θήλεια, καὶ λέγειν ἀπείρηται καὶ ζητεῖν καὶ ὀνομάζειν· ταύτην δὲ τὴν ἀπόρρησιν ἐξάπτουσι δεισιδαιμονίας, ἱστοροῦντες Οὐαλέριον Σωρανὸν ἀπολέσθαι κακῶς διὰ τὸ ἐξειπεῖν;’ πότερον, ὡς τῶν Ῥωμαϊκῶν τινες ἱστορήκασιν, ἐκκλήσεις εἰσὶ καὶ γοητεῖαι θεῶν, αἷς νομίζοντες καὶ αὐτοὶ θεοὺς τινας ἐκκεκλήσθαι παρὰ τῶν πολεμίων καὶ μετωκηκέναι πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἐφοβοῦντο ταῦτὸ παθεῖν ὑφ' ἐτέρων· ὥσπερ οὖν Τύριοι δεσμοὺς ἀγάλμασι λέγονται περιβαλεῖν, ἕτεροι δ' αἰτεῖν ἐγγυητὰς ἐπὶ λουτρὸν ἢ καθαρμόν τινα προπέμποντες, οὕτως ᾤοντο Ῥωμαῖοι τὸ ἄρρητον καὶ τὸ ἄγνωστον ἀσφαλεστάτην εἶναι θεοῦ καὶ βεβαιωτάτην φρουράν· ἢ καθάπερ Ὀμήρῳ πεποίηται τὸ ‘γαῖα δ' ἐπὶ ξυνῆ πάντων’ ὅπως οἱ ἄνθρωποι τοὺς θεοὺς πάντας σέβονται καὶ τιμῶσι τὴν γῆν κοινῶς ἔχοντας, οὕτως ἀπεκρύψαντο τὸν κύριον τῆς σωτηρίας οἱ παλαιοὶ Ῥωμαῖοι, βουλόμενοι μὴ μόνον τοῦτον ἀλλὰ πάντας ὑπὸ τῶν πολιτῶν τοὺς θεοὺς τιμᾶσθαι;

““Why is it forbidden to speak of the deity that cares the most for Rome's salvation and protection, or to ask whether it is male or female, or to call it by name? Why is this prohibition connected to the fear of the gods, and why is it told that Valerius Soranus<sup>19</sup> died a foul death because he divulged it?” Perhaps, as some Roman historians

---

<sup>19</sup> Servius, crediting Varro and other unnamed writers, reports that Valerius Soranus was a tribune of the plebs, and that there are conflicting accounts concerning his death: according to some, he was crucified, and according to others, he fled to Sicily, where he was executed by the praetor on the Senate's orders (*In Aen.* 1, 277). Valerius Soranus' *praenomen*, Quintus, is mentioned by Aulus Gellius (*NA* 2, 10, 3). Conrad Cichorius identifies Valerius Soranus with Quintus Valerius, a supporter of Marius who was executed by Pompey on Sicily after a learned conversation (Plut. *Pomp.* 10, 4), and argues that the tribune was killed for purely political reasons, and that his death was

tell us, there are ways of summoning and conjuring the gods, and the Romans, having used them to summon some enemy gods and move them to Rome, came to fear that they themselves could fall prey to the same fate because of others? Or just as the Tyrians are said to have bound statues with chains, while other nations ask for guarantors when they send them elsewhere for washing or purification, so the Romans believed that the safest and strongest protection for the deity would be remaining unnamed and obscure? Or just as Homer says that “the earth still [remains] common to all,”<sup>20</sup> so that men would honor all the gods, believing that they had shared ownership of the earth, so did the ancestors of the Romans conceal who had power over their salvation, wanting their fellow citizens to venerate not only him, but all the gods?”

The willingness to adopt elements borrowed from the spiritual traditions of neighboring peoples, which, as the legends claim, had been exercised by the city’s founder, was a trait that distinguished the Ancient Roman religion for all of its existence. The

---

perceived as divine retribution by the superstitious [Cichorius 1906: 62–64].

<sup>20</sup> These words are spoken by Poseidon (*Il.* 15, 193), irritated by Zeus’ order to withdraw from battle. He believes that his brother should hold no power over him and Hades, as they all received an equal lot when the world was divided: Zeus was given the sky, Poseidon took the sea, Hades was granted the underworld, while the earth and Olympus were shared among them. Certain ancient commentators saw a contradiction between this line and line 189, which states that everything was divided: according to the scholia, Stesimbrotos, followed by Crates of Mallus, instead of the reading *τριχθὰ δὲ πάντα δέδασται*, “everything was divided into three parts,” favor the reading *τριχθὰ δὲ πάντ' ἃ δέδασται*, “everything that was divided, [was divided] into three parts.” (*Schol. A in Il.* 15, 189) (with a psilosis, common in the Ionian and Aeolic dialects). However, as pointed out in the commentary of Geoffrey Kirk and Richard Janko [Kirk, Janko 1994: 247–248], logical inconsistencies related to fractions are not uncommon in the Homeric epic: for example, Odysseus mentions to Diomedes that more than two thirds of the night have passed, and one third remains (*Il.* 10, 252–253). Plutarch’s manuscripts cite Homer imprecisely: manuscripts of the *Iliad* have the reading *ἔτι*, “[is] yet,” instead of the reading *ἔστι*, “is,” found in the manuscripts of the *Moralia*.

discipline of the haruspices originated in Etruria<sup>21</sup> Greek myths were adapted by Roman poets, and the late republican Rome saw a rise of the mystery cults of Eastern deities.<sup>22</sup> Therefore, the study of evocation as a form, which the process of adoption of new religious beliefs and cults could take, is a necessary element of the study of the Ancient Roman religion as a whole, which appears to have developed a syncretic character at the earliest stages of its evolution.

Georg Wissowa suggests that the formula recorded by Macrobius was fabricated and that the cult of Carthage's supreme goddess, known to the Romans as *Iuno Caelestis*, arrived in Rome significantly later than the time frame of the Third Punic War, during the reign of emperor Septimius Severus, but does not doubt the ritual's historicity otherwise, only limiting the time of its use to the earlier stages of the Roman expansion, characterized by wars against other Italic peoples [Wissowa 1902: 42–44, 312–314; 1907: 1152–1153].

Like G. Wissowa, Kurt Latte doubts that the cult of *Iuno Caelestis* was adopted in Rome as a result of the fall of Carthage [Latte 1960: 125]. He supposes that the ritual of evocation may have Etruscan origins [1960: 43], without giving a clear reason why (it is possible that he finds significance in *Iuno Regina* and *Minerva Capta*, two goddesses whose evocation he believes to be the most plausible, coming from Etruscan cities Veii and Falerii). Additionally, K. Latte theorizes that the legend of Aesculapius' sacred

---

<sup>21</sup> As told in a legend, this tradition of divination using animal entrails was founded by Tages, a young man who had appeared from beneath the earth to an Etrurian plowman (Cic. *Div.* 2, 50; Ov. *Met.* 15, 552–559; Festus *Gloss. Lat.* 492L). The Liver of Piacenza is an epigraphic monument to haruspicy: a bronze image of a sheep liver, the surface of which is divided into areas, inscribed with the names of Etruscan deities (TLE 719).

<sup>22</sup> As pointed out by M. Beard, J. North, and S. Price, these cults (dedicated to such deities as Isis, Mithras, and Jupiter Dolichenus), which flourished in the imperial age, could make use of names, terms, and imagery adopted from Eastern religions, but in many ways were original Roman constructs: for example, the initiation ceremonies of the Roman cult of Mithras had no direct prototype in Zoroastrianism [Beard et al. 1994: 278–283].

snake brought from Epidaurus may describe an updated form of the ritual of evocation [1960: 225–226]. Finally, he supports Stefan Weinstock [Latte 1960: 125], who believes that the concept of Rome's unknown patron deity was of late origin and emerged under the influence of Eastern notions of gods' unknowable nature [Weinstock 1950: 149].

The evocation of the Carthaginian goddess is not questioned by Vsevolod Basanoff, who also supposes the existence of a related rite *exoratio* (from the verb *exorare*, "to plead", "to appease"). According to V. Basanoff, this ritual promised veneration to the gods to which it was addressed, but did not ask them to leave the besieged city and was performed when there were no plans to destroy it after the conquest. According to the scholar, the Romans could use *exoratio* to address Iuno Caelestis during the Second Punic War as well as Iuno Curitis during the siege of Falerii [Basanoff 1947: 54-55, 63-66].

A foundation for the latest theories on the history of the ritual of evocation was provided by a votive inscription discovered in Asia Minor, carved in stone by order of the Roman general Publius Servilius Vatia Isauricus. He declares that he has fulfilled a vow he made to the patron deity of the city of Old Isaura, conquered by the Romans. According to Alan Hall, who discovered and published the inscription, it could signify that during the siege the Romans performed a ritual similar to evocation, while the stone could have been one of the building blocks used to construct a temple in honor of the summoned deity in accordance with the commander's vow [Hall 1973: 570]. In the opinion of Joel Le Gall, the rite performed by Publius Servilius was evocation itself and not a mere semblance of it, and the inscription demonstrates that all temples to the deities summoned in this manner were built in conquered territories that became part of the Roman state and not in Rome itself [Le Gall 1976: 522-524].

A more cautious conclusion is reached by Mary Beard, John North, and Simon Price, who argue that the ritual of evocation would not permit construction of temples on conquered lands until the late republican period, and that this change may have re-



flected a shift in the Roman worldview: the territory under Rome's control came to be seen as equally Roman [Beard et al. 1998: 132-134].

This view receives further development in the work of Gabriella Gustafsson, who, noting that the object of Publius Servilius' vow is ultimately unknown, proposes to expand the concept of evocation by assuming that the vows made by Roman generals did not need to involve temple construction or establishment of festivals in Rome or elsewhere, and that the primary purpose of the ritual was not to transfer cults to Rome, but to rid enemy cities of divine protection [Gustafsson 2000: 80-82, 155].

These primary theories are not without their shortcomings. As will be shown further, the universal model of the ritual of evocation described by Pliny the Elder, Servius, Macrobius and Plutarch does not fully correspond to any description of the events of any specific siege found in ancient historical literature. Individual episodes of these sieges may resemble individual elements of the ritual, but are not presented and apparently not understood as such by ancient historians. This allows us to doubt the point of view of G. Wissowa who believes that this universal model could be widely used during the wars waged in Italy [Wissowa 1907: 1153]:

„Denn wenn auch das Formular in seinen Grundzügen den Eindruck der Echtheit und Altertümlichkeit macht (s. über die Form zuletzt C. Thulin *Italische sakrale Poesie und Prosa*, Berlin 1906, 59ff.), so ist es doch sicher auf spätere Überarbeitung zurückzuführen, wenn die Formel auf Carthago eingestellt ist; denn es steht aus der Praxis unbedingt fest, daß die Römer die Anwendung der E. und Aufnahme der Gottheiten eroberter Städte auf die stammverwandte Nachbarschaft in Latium und dem südlichen Etrurien beschränkt haben (Wissowa *Religion und Kultus d. Römer* 43f.) und die Behauptung (Serv. Aen. XII 841), die Stadtgöttin von Karthago, die Caelestis, sei bereits bei der Einnahme der Stadt durch den jüngeren Scipio Africanus evoziert und nach Rom überführt worden, apokryph und erst nach der durch Septimius Severus erfolgten Aufnahme dieser Göttin unter die stadtrömischen Kulte erfunden ist (Wissowa a. a. O. 313); da der



mittelbare Gewährsmann des Macrobius, Serenus Sammonicus (Wissowa *Herm.* XVI 502ff.), der Zeit eben dieses Kaisers angehört, wird man diesen Mann für die Umgestaltung des Formulars verantwortlich zu machen haben.“

The hypothesis of M. Beard, J. North, and S. Price, which proposes that the ritual underwent changes over time leaves unclear the reasons why these changes may have occurred. Rituals tend to resist change, as their constancy serves as a guarantee of their efficacy: performers expect that the repetition of the same actions, words, and gestures should produce the same result, and deviation from them is capable of producing unintended consequences. It is more plausible that the extension of the concept of “Rome” could serve as a justification for changes caused by some insurmountable obstacles that would make it impossible to reenact the ritual in its former form rather than be the reason for these changes, but there were no obvious difficulties that could complicate conducting the rite in its classic form.

Finally, G. Gustafsson proposes to consider the inscription left by Publius Servilius to be the principal piece of evidence documenting the ritual of evocation [Gustafsson 2000: 80-82]. However, the inscription itself lacks any indication that the commander, by whose order it was written, performed a codified ritual that was repeatedly used by the Romans during sieges. It is not the inscription that tells us of the possible existence of such a custom, but the writings of ancient encyclopedists. If the inscription, discovered in Asia Minor instead of Rome, was composed in circumstances that do not quite match the descriptions contained in these encyclopedic writings, the more likely conclusion is that it has nothing to do with these descriptions, rather than that these descriptions were insufficiently exhaustive.

The aim of the present dissertation is to examine the sieges, during which, in the opinion of past scholars, the ritual of evocation may have been performed, to compare the events of these sieges with the information related about the ritual by Pliny the Elder, Servius, Macrobius, and Plutarch, and, as a result, to question whether or not this

information is credible, and to examine how, when, and for what purpose it may have become part of the Roman historical and cultural tradition, should its credibility appear lacking.

## CHAPTER 2

THE *AENEID*

Servius (*In Aen.* 2, 351) and Macrobius (*Sat.* 3, 9) both<sup>23</sup> believe that Virgil attributes a performance of the ritual of evocation to the Achaeans besieging Troy. They find a confirmation of this in the following lines (2, 351-353):

Excessere omnes adytis arisque relictis  
 di, quibus imperium hoc steterat; succurritis urbi  
 incensae. moriamur et in media arma ruamus.

“All the gods who shouldered this state have left the abandoned shrines and altars.<sup>24</sup> The city you are in a hurry to save is ablaze. Let us rush into the thick of battle and give up our lives.”

These words are spoken by Aeneas, who has lost hope of saving his home city and urges the Trojan warriors to meet the enemy in a final battle. Servius Danielis additionally refers to the ritual formula cited by Macrobius when he comments on the verse in which Aeneas calls the Trojans “oblivious,” as they pay no mind to the wooden horse

---

<sup>23</sup> See pp. 11–18.

<sup>24</sup> The ablative *adytis arisque relictis* is often understood to be a somewhat tautological clarification of *excessere*. For example, Nicholas Horsfall provides the following commentary: “The abl.abs. restates the action of the main verb, specifying shrines and altars. V., as will happen, is a little short of material with which to fill out the line between the indispensable pillars, initial verb and delayed subj.” [Horsfall 2008: 291]. However, as the parallels provided below will indicate, the implied actor of the participle *relictis* may be worshipers rather than gods themselves. This allows us to interpret the ablative in a separative (“have left the abandoned sanctuaries and altars”) or even causal (“have left because the sanctuaries and altars are abandoned”) way.

stopping at the gate four times, accompanied by the clang of weaponry ringing out from within (*In Aen.* 2, 244):

*Sane si peritiam Vergilii diligenter intendas, secundum disciplinam carminis Romani, quo ex urbibus hostium deos ante euocare solebant, hoc dixit; erant enim inter cetera carminis uerba haec 'eique populo ciuitatique metum, formidinem, obliuionem iniciatis': unde bene intulit 'inmemores caecique furore', tamquam quos dei perdiderant.*

“Indeed, if one is to properly take Vergil's erudition into account, he said this because he was aware of a Roman spell, which had often been employed to summon deities from enemy cities, for among others it included the following words: “Fill this people and community with fear, terror, and oblivion.” Therefore, it was apt of him to call “oblivious and blinded by madness” those who had seemingly been ruined by the gods.”

Servius Danielis does not name the source of this fragment of the formula, but references Serenus Sammonicus in other passages of his commentary on Vergil's poems (*In G.* 1, 30; 1, 102), allowing us to suspect that he too, like Macrobius, made use of Serenus' *Res Reconditae*.

The view of Servius and Macrobius, who see in these lines a reference of the ritual of evocation, finds support among modern commentators as well. The *Saturnalia* is mentioned by Thomas Page, who shows no doubt in the accuracy of Macrobius' assessment: “There was a regular formula (*carmen quo dii evocantur*) for summoning the gods of a besieged city to leave it; *Macr.* 3. 9.” [Page 1967: 234]. Roland Austin expands upon this point of view by suggesting that the poet's language may also be influenced by the language of ritualistic formulas (the formula transmitted by Macrobius does contain many sequences of synonyms, the like of which can be found in line 2,

351): “Possibly Virgil's *adytis arisque relictis* may preserve a trace of some such formula.” [Austin 1973: 153-154]. The same view is held by Randall Ganiban: “There was a regular formula (*carmen quo di evocantur*) for summoning the gods of a besieged city to leave it—a practice called *evocatio*.” [Ganiban 2012: 245].

There is another point of view, which appears more plausible and posits that the gods leave Troy because, in accordance with ancient beliefs, deities are generally inclined to abandon perishing cities. For example, it is propounded in the commentary of Robert Jordan: “It was commonly believed that the gods and goddesses left their temples when a city or town was doomed.” [Jordan 2002: 51-52].

Initially, it may appear impossible that Vergil would attribute knowledge of a ritual, presented by the sources as exclusively Roman, to the Achaeans, but such anachronisms are not unprecedented in the *Aeneid*. To give an example, as Sinon convinces the Trojans that the Achaeans are no longer a threat, he explains their departure as follows (2, 176-179):

Extemplo temptanda fuga canit aequora Calchas,  
nec posse Argolicis exscindi Pergama telis  
omina ni repetant Argis numenque reducant  
quod pelago et curuis secum auexere carinis.

“Calchas proclaims that they must flee immediately across the sea, and that Pergamus cannot be destroyed with Argive weapons, unless they ask for new omens in Argos and bring back the deity that they brought with them by sea in ships with curved keels.”<sup>25</sup>

As Servius observes, this describes a Roman practice (*In Aen. 2, 178*):

---

<sup>25</sup> A reference to the Palladium, Troy's protective image of Minerva, stolen by Odysseus and Diomedes (*Aen. 2, 162–175*).

Et respexit Romanum morem: nam si egressi male pugnassent, reuertebantur ad captanda rursus auguria.

“Vergil mentioned a Roman custom: if the Romans marched out and performed poorly in battle, they would return to receive auguries again.”<sup>26</sup>

Thus, it is generally possible for Vergil to project Roman religious realities into the Greek past, but if knowledge of the ritual of evocation specifically were attributed to the Argive army, the poet would make it more difficult for himself to solve certain problems. The *Aeneid* pursues a specific ideological goal: to present the newly established Roman Empire as a rightful heir of the Trojan legacy brought to Italy by Aeneas, with the Trojan religious cults acting as one of the connecting threads providing this continuity. According to Sabine Grebe, Vergil presents Augustus' reign as the culmination of Roman history, reached under the guidance of the gods. Like Aeneas, Augustus establishes order in Italy, putting an end to an era of war, while the closing of the gates of the temple of Janus heralds the return of the Golden Age [Grebe 2004: 36-41].

Aeneas departs on his journey across the Mediterranean Sea because Hector's shadow urges him to find a new home for the Trojan penates<sup>27</sup> (2, 293–295):

<sup>26</sup> An example of this practice is given by Livy, who mentions that the dictator Lucius Papirius Cursor returned to Rome to receive new auspices during the Second Samnite War (8, 30, 2).

<sup>27</sup> The penates are household deities of prosperity. G. Wissowa [Wissowa 1902: 145] and G. Dumézil [Dumézil 1951: 358-359] derive their name from the noun *penus* ("stock", "storehouse"). According to the tradition followed by Livy, the penates of the Trojan royal house were brought to Italy by Aeneas, who founded the city of Lavinium, named after his wife, the daughter of king Latinus (1, 1, 4-11). According to Macrobius, when Roman consuls, praetors, and dictators assumed office, they came to Lavinium to offer sacrifice to the penates and Vesta (Sat. 3, 4, 11). As Eric Orlin notes, this form of integration of other cities into the Roman state (inclusion of Roman magistrates in ceremonies held in other cities), in a sense an opposite of the practice of bringing foreign cults to Rome, has other examples: the *Feriae Latinae*, held on the Alban Mount and celebrated by the cities of the Latin League, and the cult of Iuno Sospita in Lanuvium [Orlin 2010: 43-45].

Sacra suosque tibi commendat Troia penatis;  
 hos cape fatorum comites, his moenia quaere,  
 magna pererrato statuas quae denique ponto.

“Troy entrusts you with her holies and penates: take them, so they would share your fate, and seek out a great keep for them, which you will finally build after long wandering across the sea.”

The religious continuity between Aeneas and Augustus is emphasized by parallel lines found in the third and the eighth books of the poem. Aeneas mentions “the penates and the great deities”<sup>28</sup> as he lists the companions who accompanied him on his journey (*Aen.* 3, 8-12):

Vix prima inceperat aestas  
 et pater Anchises dare fatis uela iubebat,  
 litora cum patriae lacrimans portusque relinquo  
 et campos, ubi Troia fuit. feror exsul in altum  
 cum sociis natoque, penatibus et magnis dis.

“Summer had barely come as my father Anchises gave an order to entrust the sails to the mercy of fate. With tears I was leaving the shores and harbors of my fatherland, and the fields where Troy had stood. As an exile I was carried away into the sea with my comrades and my son, the penates and the great deities.”

---

<sup>28</sup> The meaning of this phrase was a subject of debate among ancient commentators: as noted by Servius (*In Aen.* 3, 12; 8, 679), some interpreted it as a hendiadys, identifying the great gods with the pentates, while others thought that these gods were Jupiter, Minerva, and Mercury.

Vergil partially reproduces the last line, as he describes the Battle of Actium depicted on Aeneas' shield. Augustus substitutes Aeneas, the Senate substitutes his companions, the people substitute his son, while the penates and the great gods remain unchanged (*Aen.* 8, 678-681):

Hinc Augustus agens Italos in proelia Caesar  
 cum patribus populoque, penatibus et magnis dis,  
 stans celsa in puppi, geminas cui tempora flammās  
 laeta uomunt patriumque aperitur uertice sidus.

“Here Caesar Augustus leads the Italians into battle, together with the senators and the people, the penates and the great deities. He stands on a high stern, with two fires burning on his triumphant face, and a paternal star visible above his head.”<sup>29</sup>

If the Achaeans who besieged Troy were to perform the ritual of evocation, it would mean that the cults of the deities who protected the city were transferred to Greece. Such a reading cannot reflect the intent of Virgil, who wishes to present these cults as one of the sources of legitimacy of Augustus' new empire.

It is possible to clarify the meaning of Aeneas' words in the lines 2, 351-352 by referencing parallel passages found in other texts that depict gods departing from a dying city. Euripides' tragedy *The Trojan Women* begins with Poseidon announcing his intent to leave the pillaged Troy, as ruined cities are unable to pay the gods their due honors (23-27):

Ἐγὼ δέ – νικῶμαι γὰρ Ἀργείας θεοῦ,  
 Ἥρας, Ἀθάνας θ', αἶ συνεξεῖλλον Φρύγας –

---

<sup>29</sup> After Caesar's assassination a comet was observed in the sky, interpreted as a sign of his apotheosis (Plut. *Caes.* 69, 3; Suet. *Iul.* 88).



λείπω τὸ κλεινὸν Ἴλιον βωμούς τ' ἐμούς·  
 ἐρημία γὰρ πόλιν ὅταν λάβῃ κακή,  
 νοσεῖ τὰ τῶν θεῶν οὐδὲ τιμᾶσθαι θέλει.

“As I am defeated by the Argive goddesses Hera and Athena, who worked together to exterminate the Phrygians, I leave the glorious Ilion and my altars: whenever calamitous desolation overtakes a city, the property of the gods is damaged and is no longer revered.”<sup>30</sup>

In Aeschylus' tragedy *Seven against Thebes*, Eteocles advises the chorus of Theban women not to rely solely on the protection of the gods and notes that they may follow the example of Euripides' Poseidon if the city falls (216-218):

Πύργον στέγειν εὔχεσθε πολέμιον δόρυ;  
 οὐκοῦν τάδ' ἔσται πρὸς θεῶν· ἀλλ' οὔν θεοὺς  
 τοὺς τῆς ἀλούσης πόλεος ἐκλείπειν λόγος.

“You pray to the gods, so that the towers would repel the enemy's spear? They are sure to grant their protection - and yet it is said that they leave a city if it has been taken.”

In the scholia on Aeschylus, a comment on the chorus' appeal to the gods, reminding them of the veneration they enjoy in Thebes (304a), makes a reference to a lost tragedy by Sophocles (fr. 452 Radt):

---

<sup>30</sup> Peter Burian compares Poseidon's reasoning and the words of Artemis [Shapiro, Burian 2009: 81], who remarks that it is unfitting for the gods to witness death as she leaves the dying Hippolytus (Eur. *Hipp.* 1437–1439).

Εἴρηται δὲ καὶ ἐν Ξοανηφόροις Σοφοκλέους, ὡς οἱ θεοὶ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰλίου φέρουσιν ἐπὶ τῶν ὤμων τὰ ἑαυτῶν ζόανα εἰδότες ὅτι ἀλίσκεται ἡ πόλις.

“In the *Image Bearers*<sup>31</sup> of Sophocles, it is likewise told how the gods carry their images away from Ilion on their own shoulders, having understood that the city is taken.”

Diodorus Siculus' description of the siege of Tyre, conducted in 332 BC by Alexander the Great, also mentions the fear of a god's possible departure that enveloped the citizenry (17, 41, 7-8):

Ἐωρακένας δὲ τις ἔφησεν ὄψιν καθ' ἣν ὁ Ἀπόλλων ἔλεγε μέλλειν ἑαυτὸν ἐκλιπεῖν τὴν πόλιν. τοῦ δὲ πλήθους ὑπονοήσαντος ὅτι πεπλακῶς εἶη τὸν λόγον χαριζόμενος Ἀλεξάνδρῳ καὶ διὰ τοῦτο τῶν νεωτέρων ὀρμησάντων ἐπὶ τὸ λιθοβολῆσαι τὸν ἄνθρωπον οὗτος μὲν διὰ τῶν ἀρχόντων <ἐκ>κλαπεῖς καὶ καταφυγὼν εἰς τὸ τοῦ Ἡρακλέους ἱερὸν διέφυγε τὴν τιμωρίαν διὰ τὴν ἰκεσίαν, οἱ δὲ Τύριοι δεισιδαιμονήσαντες χρυσαῖς σειραῖς προσέδησαν τὸ τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος ζόανον τῇ βάσει, ἐμποδίζοντες, ὡς ᾤοντο, τοῦ θεοῦ τὸν ἐκ τῆς πόλεως χωρισμόν.

“Someone claimed that he saw a dream, in which Apollo proclaimed that he intended to leave the city. Many suspected that he had invented this story to appease Alexander, so the youth assembled to stone him, but he escaped with the help of the au-

<sup>31</sup> Stephan Radt shares Friedrich Welcker's doubts that Sophocles' tragedy could feature a chorus composed of gods. In their opinion, the scholia could refer to an individual scene from a tragedy known by another name, such as *Laocoon* [Welcker 1839: 66-67]. However, "collective" names of Greek tragedies do not necessarily indicate the chorus's role: in *Seven against Thebes*, the chorus is composed of the Theban girls, as was mentioned before, rather than the titular military leaders besieging the city, while in Euripides' *Heraclides* it consists of Athenians, rather the children of Hercules.

thorities and fled to the temple of Heracles, where he avoided punishment by pleading for asylum. The Tyrians were struck by superstitious fear and chained the statue of Apollo to its pedestal in the hope of preventing the god from leaving the city.”

A somewhat different account of this legend is given by Curtius Rufus, who does not mention that the man who saw the dream was persecuted and places the bound statue of Apollo in the sanctuary of Hercules (4, 3, 21-22):

Cumque unus e ciuibus in contione indicasset, oblatam esse per somnum sibi species Apollinis, quem eximia religione colerent, urbem deserentis molemque a Macedonibus in salo iactam in siluestrem saltum esse mutatam, quamquam auctor leuis erat, tamen ad deteriora credenda proni metu aurea catena deuinxere simulacrum araeque Herculis, cuius numini urbem dicauerant, inseruere uinculum quasi illo deo Apollinem retenturo.

“At the assmebly one of the citizen claimed that he had dreamed that Apollo, who was particularly revered [in Tyre], was leaving the city, and that the dam built at sea by the Macedonians turned into a forested mountain. Although this witness was unreliable, [the Tyrians], who in their fear were ready to believe even the worst, bound the image of the god with a golden chain and chained it to the altar of Hercules, who had the city under his protection, as if this god could hold Apollo back.”

A third version of the legend is attested in Plutarch. Here the dream is seen not by one, but by many of the city's inhabitants, while the accusations of support for Alexander are brought against the god himself, justifying his captivity, rather than the dreamer (*Alex.* 24, 3-4):

Τῶν δὲ Τυρίων πολλοῖς κατὰ τοὺς ὕπνους ἔδοξεν ὁ Ἀπόλλων λέγειν, ὡς ἄπεισι πρὸς Ἀλέξανδρον· οὐ γὰρ ἀρέσκειν αὐτῷ τὰ πρασσόμενα κατὰ τὴν πόλιν. ἀλλ' αὐτοὶ μὲν ὥσπερ ἄνθρωπον αὐτομολοῦντα πρὸς τοὺς πολεμίους ἐπ' αὐτοφώρῳ τὸν θεὸν εἰληφότες, σειράς τε τῷ κολοσσῷ περιέβαλλον αὐτοῦ καὶ καθήλουν πρὸς τὴν βᾶσιν, Ἀλεξανδριστὴν καλοῦντες.

“Many of Tyre's citizens dreamed of Apollo, who told them that he was leaving them for Alexander, because the events taking place in the city displeased him. They caught the god at the scene of the crime, as if he were a man intending to defect to the enemy, put fetters on his statue and nailed it to the pedestal, calling him a devotee of Alexander.”

The departure of God from Jerusalem during the Roman siege in 70 CE is described by Josephus Flavius (*BJ* 6, 296-300) and Tacitus (*Hist.* 5, 13, 1). These accounts are examined more closely in chapter 8.

Finally, a related legend, which diverges only in the fact that it is a general who gets abandoned by a god, rather than a city, is told by Plutarch. According to it, a ghostly Bacchic procession was heard in Alexandria the night before Mark Antony's defeat and suicide (*Ant.* 75, 3-4):

Ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ νυκτὶ λέγεται μεσούσῃ σχεδόν, ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ καὶ κατηφείᾳ τῆς πόλεως διὰ φόβον καὶ προσδοκίαν τοῦ μέλλοντος οὔσης, αἰφνίδιον ὀργάνων τε παντοδαπῶν ἐμμελεῖς φωνὰς ἀκουσθῆναι καὶ βοὴν ὄχλου μετ' εὐασμῶν καὶ πηδήσεων σατυρικῶν, ὥσπερ θιάσου τινὸς οὐκ ἀθορύβως ἐξελαύνοντος· εἶναι δὲ τὴν ὀρμὴν ὁμοῦ τι διὰ τῆς πόλεως μέσης ἐπὶ τὴν πύλην ἔξω τὴν τετραμμένην πρὸς τοὺς πολεμίους, καὶ ταύτῃ τὸν θόρυβον ἐκπεσεῖν πλεῖστον γενόμενον. ἐδόκει δὲ τοῖς ἀναλογιζομένοις τὸ σημεῖον ἀπολείπειν ὁ θεὸς Ἀντώνιον, ᾧ μάλιστα συνεξομοίων καὶ συνοικειῶν ἑαυτὸν διετέλεσεν.

“It is said that on that night, when it was near the middle, amid the silence and gloom that enveloped the city, which anticipated and dreaded what was to come, one could suddenly hear the melodious sound of various instruments and the clamor of a crowd, along with cheering cries and revelry worthy of satyrs, as if a rowdy procession was moving away. Its approximate route went through the center of the city towards the section of the outer wall that was facing the enemy, where the clamor, having reached its peak, subsided. Interpreters of this sign thought that Antony had been abandoned by the god, whom he imitated and took as his model the most.”

Therefore, an exodus of the gods from a doomed city is a motif fairly common in ancient descriptions of sieges. Its presence does not depend on the ritual of evocation: it is known not only to Roman authors and appears in descriptions of sieges, in which the Roman army took no part. When Vergil mentions the departure of the gods from Troy, he most likely follows Greek examples and, like Sophocles and Euripides, sees its cause in the inevitable abandonment of Troy's temples rather than in the impact of a ritual performed by the Achaeans.<sup>32</sup>

---

<sup>32</sup> This chapter is a revision of a previously published article [Isaenko 2017 (2)].

## CHAPTER 3

## VEII

In 396 BCE, a Roman army under the command of Marcus Furius Camillus occupied the Etruscan city of Veii. Once the city had fallen, the statue of its patron goddess, known to the Romans as *Iuno Regina* (“Juno the Queen”),<sup>33</sup> was transferred to Rome, where a new temple was built on the Aventine Hill to honor the deity. A legend describing this event is told by Livy (5, 22):<sup>34</sup>

Namque delecti ex omni exercitu iuuenes pure lautis corporibus candida ueste, quibus deportanda Romam regina Iuno adsignata erat, uenerabundi templum iniere, primo religiose admouentes manus, quod id signum more Etrusco nisi certae gentis sacerdos adtrectare non esset solitus. dein cum quidam seu spiritu diuino tactus seu iuuenali ioco: “uisne Romam ire, Iuno?” dixisset, adnuisse ceteri deam conclamauerunt. inde fabulae adiectum est uocem quoque dicentis uelle auditam; motam certe sede sua parui molimenti adminiculis sequentis modo accepimus leuem ac facilem tralatu fuisse,

<sup>33</sup> Raymond Bloch [Bloch 1972: 392] and Eric Orlin [Orlin 2010: 37] identify this goddess with the Etruscan Uni. According to Erika Simon [Simon 2006: 47, 51], Uni influenced by Greece and Phoenicia: this goddess's feud with Heracle, the Etruscan Heracles, is depicted on reliefs and amphorae, while the Pyrgi Tablets, a set of golden plates with a parallel inscription in Etruscan and Phoenician (KAI 277), identify Uni with Astarte.

<sup>34</sup> Robert Ogilvie notes that some elements of Livy's account closely resemble episodes of other sieges, which allows us to doubt their historicity and suspect them to be formulaic components of military chronicles. During the siege of Veii (5, 7, 2-3), as in had previously happened in Fidenae (4, 33, 2), the besieged armed themselves with torches and raided the Roman positions. The ten year term of the siege of Veii may be influenced by the Greek legends of the Trojan War [Ogilvie 1965: 628]. According to Tesse Stek, the Roman conquest and the adoption of the cult of the city's patron did not put an end to the worship of the goddess in Veii: offerings dated from the 4th to the 2nd centuries BCE were discovered by archaeologists [Stek 2010: 31].

integramque in Auentinum, aeternam sedem suam, quo uota Romani dictatoris uocauerant, perlatam, ubi templum ei postea idem qui uouerat Camillus dedicauit.

“The young men selected from the entire host, who were charged with taking *Iuno Regina* to Rome, thoroughly washed their bodies, put on white vestments, and entered the temple with trepidation. At first, they piously extended their hands, for the Etruscan custom only permitted a priest of a certain lineage to touch this statue. Then someone, prompted either by divine inspiration or youthful mischief, asked: "Do you want to go to Rome, Juno?" The others exclaimed together that the goddess nodded. Later, this tale grew with the addition of the claim that they had also heard the goddess' voice respond that she wanted to leave. Regardless, it is said that she was moved without much effort and proved to be light and convenient during the transfer, as if she was following of her own will. She was brought safely to the Aventine, to her eternal dwelling, where she was called by the vows of the Roman dictator, and where later she was dedicated a temple by the same Camillus who had vowed it to her.”

This legend is also attested by Dionysius of Halicarnassus, who emphasizes the supernatural elements of the story, in contrast to Livy, who is somewhat embarrassed of them (*Ant. Rom.* 13, 3):

Ὁ αὐτὸς Κάμιλλος ἐπὶ τὴν Οὐιεντανῶν πόλιν στρατεύων ἠῤῥατο τῇ βασιλείᾳ Ἦρα τῇ ἐν Οὐιεντανοῖς, ἐὰν κρατήσῃ τῆς πόλεως τό τε ξόανον αὐτῆς ἐν Ῥώμῃ καθιδρύσειν καὶ σεβασμοὺς αὐτῇ καταστήσεσθαι πολυτελεῖς. ἀλούσης δὲ τῆς πόλεως, ἀπέστειλε τῶν ἰπέων τοὺς ἐπιφανεστάτους ἀρουμένους ἐκ τῶν βάθρων τὸ ἔδος· ὡς δὲ παρήλθον οἱ πεμφθέντες εἰς τὸν νεῶν, καὶ τις ἐξ αὐτῶν εἶτε μετὰ παιδιᾶς καὶ γέλωτος εἶτε οἰωνοῦ δεόμενος, εἰ βούλοιο μετελθεῖν εἰς Ῥώμην ἢ θεός, ἤρετο, φωνῇ γεγωνῶ τὸ ξόανον ἐφθέγγατο, ὅτι βούλεται. τοῦτο καὶ δις γέγονεν· ἀπιστοῦντες γὰρ οἱ νεανίσκοι, εἰ τὸ ξόανον ἦν τὸ φθεγγόμενον, πάλιν ἤροντο τὸ αὐτὸ καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν φωνὴν ἤκουσαν.

“The same Camillus, as he was setting out against the city of Veii, made a vow to Hera the Queen, who was revered by its inhabitants: if he captured the city, he would bring her statue to Rome and establish luxurious festivals in her honor. After the city had been taken, he sent the most distinguished of the cavalymen to remove the statue from its pedestal. When the soldiers who had received this order entered the temple, and one of them, either out of childishness and joviality or in want of a sign, asked whether the goddess wished to be transferred to Rome, the statue loudly proclaimed that she did. Moreover, this occurred twice: the young men, disbelieving that the statue could speak, asked the same question again and heard the same voice.”

A similar description of these events is given by Valerius Maximus, whose account is notable for giving the name *Iuno Moneta*<sup>35</sup> to the goddess brought from Veii (1, 8, 3):

Nec minus uoluntarius in urbem nostram Iunonis transitus. captis a Furio Camillo Veis milites iussu imperatoris simulacrum Iunonis Monetae, quod ibi praecipua religione cultum erat, in urbem translaturi sede sua mouere conabantur. quorum ab uno per iocum interrogata dea an Romam migrare uellet, uelle se respondit. hac uoce audita Iulus in admirationem uersus est, iamque non simulacrum sed ipsam caelo Iunonem petitam portare se credentes laeti in ea parte montis Auentini, in qua nunc templum eius cernimus, collocauerunt.

“Juno was no less willing to come to our city. When Furius Camillus had captured Veii, his soldiers on the orders of their commander attempted to move an image of *Iuno Moneta*, which was treated there with particular reverence, from its pedestal with the intent of taking it to Rome. When one of them jokingly asked the goddess if she

<sup>35</sup> According to Livy, the dictator Lucius Furius vowed to dedicate the temple to *Iuno Moneta* during a campaign against the Italic tribe of Aurunci (7, 28, 1-4). It is possible that the common nomen shared by the two generals is the reason for Valerius Maximus' confusion.



wished to move to Rome, she replied that she did. When this voice was heard, jokes made way for astonishment, and the rejoicing soldiers, now certain that it was not a statue they carried, but Juno herself who had heard them from heavens, put her in the same part of the Aventine Hill where we can see her temple today.”

A fourth account of this story is given by Plutarch, who references Livy, yet contradicts him in some specifics<sup>36</sup> (*Vit. Cam.* 6):

Διαπορθήσας δὲ τὴν πόλιν, ἔγνω τὸ ἄγαλμα τῆς Ἥρας μεταφέρειν εἰς Ῥώμην, ὥσπερ εὔξατο. καὶ συνελθόντων ἐπὶ τοῦτο τῶν τεχνιτῶν, ὁ μὲν ἔθυε καὶ προσηύχετο τῇ θεῷ δέχεσθαι τὴν προθυμίαν αὐτῶν καὶ εὐμενῆ γενέσθαι σύνοικον τοῖς λαχοῦσι τὴν Ῥώμην θεοῖς, τὸ δ' ἄγαλμα φασιν ὑποφθεγζάμενον εἰπεῖν, ὅτι καὶ βούλεται καὶ συγκαταινεῖ. Λίουιος δὲ φησιν εὔχεσθαι μὲν τὸν Κάμιλλον ἀπτόμενον τῆς θεοῦ καὶ παρακαλεῖν, ἀποκρίνασθαι δὲ τινὰς τῶν παρόντων, ὅτι καὶ βούλεται καὶ συγκαταινεῖ καὶ συνακολουθεῖ προθύμως.

“Having destroyed the city, Camillus decided to bring the statue of Hera to Rome in accordance with his vow. When artisans gathered before the statue, he offered a sacrifice and reverently asked the goddess to accept the favor of the Romans and become a benevolent neighbor to the gods who had come to protect Rome. The statue is said to have quietly uttered that it wished for this and agreed. Livy states that Camillus touched

---

<sup>36</sup> Livy only has the young men extend their hands towards the goddess, daring not to touch her. In Plutarch, Camillus himself takes their place and touches the statue. R. Ogilvie believes that Plutarch could have made a mistake because he cited Livy from memory [Ogilvie 1965: 678]. According to Vsevolod Basanoff, the reason for this error could have been the proximity of another address to the gods in Livy's narrative (5, 21, 1-3), which does come from Camillus [Basanoff 1947: 48]. Both R. Ogilvie and V. Basanoff note that dramatically the role of a speaker fits the general better than the unnamed young men.

the goddess, addressed and beseeched her, while some of those who were present responded that she had the same wish, agreed, and was willing to follow.”

Not a single one of these sources specifies that the actions of Camillus or his soldiers were part of an established ritual that Roman generals or pontiffs performed during numerous other sieges. Nevertheless, these events are most commonly mentioned in academic writings as examples of the ritual of evocation. According to Georg Wissowa, the transfer of the cult of Juno from Veii to Rome is the oldest known instance of the ritual: "Das gilt vor allem von der Burggöttin und Stadtherrin von Veji, Juno Regina, deren auf Grund einer evocatio erfolgte Überführung nach Rom das älteste bekannte Beispiel dieses Verfahrens bildete." [Wissowa 1902: 43]. Kurt Latte considers the siege of Veii to be only a certain example of this ritual: "In der Frühzeit mag der Ritus öfter vollzogen worden sein, aber einen Beleg kennen wir nur von der Iuno Regina aus Veii (Liv. 5, 21, 3. 22, 7. 23, 7. 31, 3)". [Latte 1960: 125]. As he examines the connection between the rituals of *evocatio* and *devotio*, Hendrik Versnel cites the transfer of the statue of Juno as a known example of evocation: "Moreover, about Vei and Carthage we know that an *evocatio* of the tutelary goddess had taken place. In Vei this was Iuno Regina, and Livy 5, 21–23 gives a circumstantial account of the whole affair". [Versnel 1976: 382]. Gabriella Gustafsson notes that there is some contradiction between the skepticism with which Livy brings up the statue's capability of speech and his apparent readiness to believe in its ability to nod. G. Gustafsson theorizes that the surprised cry of the young men who witnessed the nod could have been an established part of the ritual, and therefore Livy mentions it without additional comment [Gustafsson 2000: 53]. As "the earliest reported instance of *evocatio*" the legend of the fall of Veii is described by John Kloppenborg, who discusses this rite in an article, in which he suggests that the ritual of evocation may be alluded to in the prophecy of the destruction of the Second Temple in the Gospel of Mark [Kloppenborg 2005: 434]. In an article exam-

ining the history of destruction of places of worship by the Romans, Steven Rutledge calls the siege of Veii “the most famous instance of [*evocatio*].” [Rutledge 2007: 180].

The first argument in favor of recognizing the transfer of the statue of Iuno Regina as an instance of the ritual of evocation is provided by a vow made by Camillus just before the assault (Liv. 5, 21):

Tum dictator auspicato egressus cum edixisset, ut arma milites caperent, 'tuo ductu' inquit, “Pythice Apollo, tuoque numine instinctus pergo ad delendam urbem Veios, tibi hinc decimam partem praedae uoueo. te simul, Iuno regina, quae nunc Veios colis, precor, ut nos uictores in nostram tuamque mox futuram urbem sequere, ubi te dignum amplitudine tua templum accipiat.”

“As the auspices had been finished and the soldiers had already been ordered to take up their arms, the dictator came forward and said: “Pythian Apollo, it is under your guidance and inspired by your will that I march forth to destroy the city of Veii, and I vow to dedicate to you a tenth of the spoils won here. At the same time, I pray that you, Juno the Queen, who now protects Veii, will follow us to our – and soon to be your – city after our victory, where you will be greeted with a temple worthy of your greatness.””

According to Robert Ogilvie, Camillus' address shows influence of the formula recorded by Macrobius: "L. abbreviates the prayer prefacing it with an extraneous invocation of Apollo but the italicized words<sup>37</sup> show that the elements of the original prayer are still perceptible." [Ogilvie 1965: 675]. However, the two appeals to the gods possess

---

<sup>37</sup> That is, the following words of Macrobius' formula: *teque maxime ille qui urbis huius populi que tutelam recepisti, precor... propitii que Romam ad me meosque ueniatis... uoueo uobis templa ludosque facturum.*

a number of differences in both their content and form. First of all, it is important to note that Camillus' appeal is addressed not only to Juno of Veii, but to Apollo of Delphi as well. Moreover, it is Apollo who appears to be the more important figure for determining the success of the siege: he is the first one to receive the general's vow, his guidance and inspiration are portrayed as the force that should lead to the destruction of Veii, and a part of the spoils is promised to him in return. Juno is only addressed after Apollo, and it is not victory that Camillus asks for from her, but only for her consent to come to Rome after victory has already been achieved. Therefore, in Livy's mind, Veii's tutelary goddess remains in the city during the assault, as the statue's miraculous nod likewise indicates, which would not have been possible if Juno had already left Veii before the assault, which is what the ritual of evocation would have required of her.

Unlike Macrobius' formula, Camillus' vow does not ask the goddess to instill the people of Veii with confusion. The commander expresses no doubt in his ability to capture the city without her support and shows no fear of committing sacrilege by taking her prisoner against her will. Camillus does not ask Juno to leave Veii because it would advance military goals, but because it will later make it possible to claim that her arrival in Rome is voluntary. The purpose of his vow is not to achieve something impossible without divine intervention, but to present the planned transfer of the sacred statue as the will of the goddess herself. By making this vow, Camillus avoids becoming a plunderer of temple property who would turn a statue of Juno into a monument to his military accomplishment, instead becoming an obedient executor of the divine will. The goddess of Veii is not offered a tenth of the spoils because she herself is part of these spoils.

Lastly, the most striking stylistic feature of the formula cited in the Saturnalia is the abundance of synonymic or almost synonymic word sequences: *populus ciuitasque Carthaginiensis; urbis huius populique; precor uereorque ueniamque a uobis peto; loca templa sacra urbemque eorum; metum formidinem obliuionem; acceptior probatorque; mihique populoque Romano militibusque meis; sciamus intelligamusque; templa lu-*

*dosque*.<sup>38</sup> Camillus' address to Juno never makes use of this device: in the phrase *nostram tuamque mox futuram urbem* the present and the future are contrasting, not complementary.

An important argument for interpreting the siege of Veii as an instance of the ritual of evocation is Livy's use of the participle *evocati*, applied to the deities honored in the city, in the description of ignorance shown by the citizens of Veii who were unaware of the impending assault (5, 21, 5-7):

Veientes ignari se iam a suis uatibus, iam ab externis oraculis proditos, iam in partem praedae suae uocatos deos, alios uotis ex urbe sua euocatos hostium templa nouasque sedes spectare, seque ultimum illum diem agere, nihil minus timentes quam subrutis coniculo moenibus arcem iam plenam hostium esse, in muros pro se quisque armati discurrunt mirantes, quidnam id esset, quod, cum tot per dies nemo se ab stationibus Romanus mouisset, tum uelut repentino icti furore inprouidi currebant ad muros.

“The citizens of Veii, unaware that they had already been betrayed both by their own prophets and by foreign oracles, that some gods had already been summoned (*uocatos*) to take part in the division of the spoils that would be won here, while others had been summoned away (*evocatos*) from their city by vows, and that they themselves were living the last day of their lives, least of all were afraid of the fact that the enemies had tunneled under the walls and already overwhelmed the fortress. Everyone, armed as they saw fit, ran to the walls, failing to understand what was happening: after not a sin-

---

<sup>38</sup> The propensity for repetition displayed by the Roman prayer formulas is noted by Frances Hickson Hahn, who believes that this feature either stems from lack of confidence in the choice of words or shows a desire to magnify the power of an appeal to the gods with such linguistic redundancy. The hymn of the Arval Brethren (CIL VI: 2104), recited to avert crop failures, is a vivid illustration of this trait: each line is uttered three times, the same deity is addressed with three different names (Marmar, Mars, Marmor), and a fivefold repetition of the cry *triumpe* concludes the prayer [Hahn 2007: 240-244].

gle Roman had left his post for so many days, why were they now carelessly rushing toward the walls, as if struck by a sudden fit of rage?”

However, Roman authors do not use the verb *evocare*, the participle *evocatus*, or the noun *evocatio* as technical terms, denoting a specific military ritual, even in contexts related to religion or magic. When Pliny the Elder compares the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* and marvels at how much attention the art of witchcraft receives in the latter poem in comparison with the former, he uses the phrase *evocatio inferum* to refer to communication with the shadows of the dead (*HN* 30, 5):

Maxime tamen mirum est, in bello Troiano tantum de arte ea silentium fuisse Homero tantumque operis ex eadem in Ulixidis erroribus, adeo ut uel totum opus non aliunde constet, siquidem Protea et Sirenum cantus apud eum non aliter intellegi volunt, Circe utique et inferum euocatione hoc solum agi.

“It is extremely remarkable that Homer, as he described the Trojan War, left this art completely unmentioned, while in the course of Ulysses' travels a significant part of poem's events happens because of it, to the point that almost the entire poem consists of nothing but it, for nobody would interpret the scenes featuring Proteus and the singing of the sirens, described by him, otherwise, while the scenes featuring Circe and the summoning of the denizens of the underworld (*inferum evocatione*) involve nothing but it.”

Pliny also speaks of summoning the gods (*imagines deorum evocare*) and the shadows of the dead (*umbrae inferum evocatae*) when he explains the origins of the names of stones that had supernatural properties attributed to them (*HN* 37, 192):

Anancitide in hydromantia dicunt euocari imagines deorum, synochitide teneri umbras inferum euocatas, dendritide alba defossa sub arbore quae caedatur securium aciem non hebetari.

“It is said that anancitide is used in hydromancy to summon images of the gods, while synochitide contains summoned shadows of the dead, and if a white dendritide<sup>39</sup> is buried under a tree that is about to be cut down the axes' edges will not blunt.”

Servius uses the phrase *evocatio umbrae* in the same sense when he describes two forms of communion with the dead and the differences between them (*In Aen.* 6, 149):

Est et alia opportunitas descendendi ad inferos, id est Proserpinae sacra peragendi. duo autem horum sacrorum genera fuisse dicuntur: unum necromantiae, quod Lucanus exsequitur, et aliud sciomantiae, quod in Homero, quem Vergilius sequitur, lectum est. sed secundum Lucanum in necromantia ad leuandum cadauer sanguis est necessarius, ut “pectora tunc primum feruenti sanguine supplet”, in sciomantia uero, quia umbrae tantum est euocatio, sufficit solus interitus: unde Misenus in fluctibus occisus esse inducitur.

“There is another way to descend to the inhabitants of the underworld: to perform the rites of Proserpine. It is said that there were two varieties of these rites: one was necromancy, described by Lucan, while the other was sciomancy, described by Homer, who is emulated by Vergil. However, according to Lucan, blood is required to revive a corpse with necromancy, so that “[the Thessalian witch] would first fill the chest with bubbling blood,”<sup>40</sup> while in sciomancy, as summoning a shadow (*evocatio umbrae*) is

<sup>39</sup> The names of these stones come from the Greek words *ἀνάγκη* (“compulsion”), *συνέχω* (“to contain”) and *δένδρον* (“tree”).

<sup>40</sup> This line (*BCiv.* 6, 667) describes the actions of the sorceress Erichtho, who, at the request of Sextus Pompeius, revives the body of a recently departed soldier to have him predict the outcome of the

all it involves, premature death alone is sufficient. Because of this, it is mentioned that Misenus died among the waves.”<sup>41</sup>

The verb *evocare* is used in a different sense by Ulpian, who employs it to denote a ritual meant to rid a sanctuary of its sacred status and remove sacred objects from it without incurring the wrath of the gods (*Dig.* 1, 8, 9, 2):

Illud notandum est aliud esse sacrum locum, aliud sacrarium. sacer locus est locus consecratus, sacrarium est locus, in quo sacra reponuntur, quod etiam in aedificio priuato esse potest, et solent, qui liberare eum locum religione uolunt, sacra inde euocare.

“It should be noted that a sacred place and a sanctuary are not the same. A sacred place is a place dedicated to the gods, and a sanctuary is a place where sacred objects are stored, which can take place in a private building as well, and those who wish to vacate such a place in a devout manner usually call (*evocare*) the sacred objects out of it.”

Livy himself uses the participle *evocatus* in the same sense, synonymous with *exauguratus*, when he describes the omen that accompanied the construction of the temple

Battle of Pharsalus. According to Sergio Casali [Casali 2011: 104-109], Lucan's description of the afterlife is a pessimistic inversion of the sights observed by Aeneas in Vergil: while Virgil prefers to take a reconciliatory tone, and even the yet unborn souls of Caesar and Pompey are shown as friends (*Aen.* 6, 826-831), Lucan emphasizes the conflicts, and the dead man resurrected by Erichtho tearfully says that the civil war has caused discord among the shadows of dead Romans (*BCiv.* 6, 775-781).

<sup>41</sup> Misenus is punished by Triton for challenging the gods to a conch playing contest (*Verg. Aen.* 6, 160-174). As Aeneas gathers wood for Misenus' funeral pyre, Aeneas discovers a golden bough (6, 175-211), which the Sibyl uses to calm Charon (6, 398-410). Earlier, Servius observes (*In Aen.* 6, 107) that the death of one of the hero's companions, Elpenor, who falls from the roof of Circe's house, precedes communication with the world of the dead in the *Odyssey* as well (10, 552-560).



of Jupiter on the Tarpeian Rock during the reign of Tarquin the Proud, a project that made it necessary to void the sacred status of the sanctuaries already present there (1, 55, 3-4):

Inter principia condendi huius operis mouisse numen ad indicandam tanti imperii molem traditur deos; nam cum omnium sacellorum exaugurationes admitterent aues, in Termini fano non addixere. idque omen auguriumque ita acceptum est, non motam Termini sedem unumque eum deorum non euocatum sacratis sibi finibus firma stabiliaque cuncta portendere.

“It is said that at the very beginning of this construction the gods expressed their will by foretelling the greatness the state would achieve: although the [prophetic] birds allowed for all the sanctuaries to be relieved of their sacred station, they did not extend this approval to the temple of Terminus.<sup>42</sup> The sign presented by this augury was interpreted as follows: that the dwelling of Terminus was not moved, and that he alone of all the gods was not summoned (*evocatum*) out of the boundaries consecrated to him foretells absolute resilience and stability.”

---

<sup>42</sup> Terminus is the god of boundary marks. The festival celebrated in his honor is described by Ovid (*Fast.* 2, 639-658). According to Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Youth (*Νεότης*, *Iuventas*) also refused to leave the hill, and her altar together with the altar of Terminus remained in Minerva's sanctuary – in Dionysius' account the new temple is dedicated to Juno and Minerva in addition to Jupiter, with whom they formed the Capitoline Triad (*Ant. Rom.* 3, 69, 3-6). Georges Dumézil doubts that Juno and Terminus had already had their own altars on the Capitoline Hill before the temple was built there and interprets these deities as ancient aspects of Jupiter as the patron of initiation and fair distribution of land among the full-fledged members of the community [Dumézil 1974: 210-213].

Consequently, the mere use of the participle *evocatus* in Livy's account of the siege of Veii is not sufficient to declare this account a depiction of the ritual of evocation: the actions described in the legend must be presented as elements of the ritual.

The scene of the address to the statue of Juno is not quite consistent with the available descriptions of the ritual. The formula provided by Macrobius contains the words *militibus meis* ("to my soldiers"), indicating that it is meant to be recited by a general (*Sat.* 3, 9, 8), while Pliny the Elder states that the ritual of evocation was performed by priests who belonged to the college of pontiffs (*HN* 28, 18). The testimonies of Macrobius and Pliny are not necessarily contradictory: for example, in Livy, the consul Publius Decius Mus recites a formula dictated by the pontiff when he performs the ritual of *devotio* (8, 9). It is quite possible that the commander and the pontiff could have acted together in the same manner when performing the ritual of evocation. However, in the legend of the fall of Veii, the statue of Juno is addressed by simple soldiers, chosen by Camillus for their youth and tidiness, and not by ranking officials, authorized to represent the Roman people. Livy, Dionysius of Halicarnassus and Valerius Maximus also note that the young soldiers addressing the statue of the goddess are driven either by mischief or by divine inspiration: their actions and words are improvised on the spot and therefore cannot be part of any ritual which by definition regulates the actions and words of the participants.

Additionally, there exists a number of legends that display typological relation to the story of the transfer of the statue of Veii's supreme goddess to Rome, but at the same time are in no way connected to the ritual of evocation. The motif of the statue coming to life for a variety of reasons is often found in both ancient and more recent legends and folk tales. In *The Lover of Lies*, Lucian tells of a statue of the general Pelichus, to which healing properties were attributed, and which punished a thief who stole offerings made to it by preventing him from finding his way out and ultimately lashing him to death (19-20). The biography of the emperor Marcus Claudius Tacitus, featured in *Historia Augusta*, states that a statue of Apollo descended from a roof on its own and laid

on a bed, foreshadowing the emperor's imminent death (17, 5). In *Gesta Regum Anglo-rum*, an English 12th century writer William of Malmesbury relays a legend, in which a statue of Venus considers itself to be the lawful wife of a young Roman who puts an engagement ring on the goddess' finger, so that it won't get in his way as he plays ball (205).<sup>43</sup> The Aarne-Thompson catalogue of folk tales includes the story of a man who invites a monument or a skull to dinner, only for the guest to make an invitation of its own and carry him off to the world of the dead (470A), which provides the basis for the legend of Don Juan and its countless adaptations.

It is possible to cite three ancient legends that show a particular resemblance to the story of the fall of Veii. The first of them is told by Herodotus (5, 82-86): when Epidaurus falls victim to a bad harvest, its inhabitants seek the advice of the Delphic oracle and are instructed by the Pythia to install statues in honor of the fertility goddesses Damia and Auxesia. They are to be carved of wood from the olive trees, which the Athenians agree to provide on the condition that the people of Epidaurus will send annual sacrifices to Athena Polias and Erechtheus. Some time later, the images are stolen by the Aeginians, and Epidaurus stops sending sacrificial offerings to Athens as a result. The Athenians send an army to Aegina to return the statues to Epidaurus and regain access to the offerings. The Athenian soldiers, having proven unable to move the images with their own hands, wrap them around with ropes and begin to pull. The Athenian and Aeginian versions of the legend disagree on what happens next: the Athenians claim

---

<sup>43</sup> In the opinion of Paull Franklin Baum, it is difficult to date this legend, adapted by Prosper Mérimée into the short story *La Vénus d'Ille*, where it receives a darker conclusion. The conflict between Roman religion and Christianity, represented by Venus and the priest Palumbus, to whom the young man turns for help, forms the plot's thematic core, which may suggest an origin in the late antiquity. The Wild Hunt motif (Palumbus tells the young man to deliver a letter to the man walking at the end of a night procession) may speak in favor of a Germanic influence and, therefore, a later origin. The medieval origin may also be hinted at by the characterization of Palumbus, who resembles a conjurer of demons more than does a priest that he is supposed to be, but these elements could have been added to the narrative at a later date [Baum: 1919, 536-544].

that sounds of thunder could be heard, the earth shook, the minds of the soldiers became clouded, and they began to strike one another until only one remained alive. According to the Aeginians, the outcome was as follows:

Ἀθηναίους μὲν νυν, ἐπεῖτε σφι οὐδεὶς ἐς μάχην κατίστατο, ἀποβάντας ἀπὸ τῶν νεῶν τραπέσθαι πρὸς τὰ ἀγάλματα, οὐ δυναμένους δὲ ἀνασπάσαι ἐκ τῶν βάθρων αὐτὰ οὔτω δὴ περιβαλομένους σχοινία ἔλκειν, ἐς οὗ ἑλκόμενα τὰ ἀγάλματα ἀμφοτέρω τῶντο ποιῆσαι, ἐμοὶ μὲν οὐ πιστὰ λέγοντες, ἄλλω δέ τεω· ἐς γούνατα γάρ σφι αὐτὰ πεσεῖν, καὶ τὸν ἀπὸ τούτου χρόνον διατελέειν οὔτω ἔχοντα.

“When nobody came to fight the Athenians, they disembarked from their ships and headed toward the statues. Unable to remove them from their pedestals, the Athenians wrapped them with cords and began to pull, until both of the images they were trying to move did the same thing (I find this story implausible, but someone else may think otherwise): they fell to their knees and have remained in this state ever since.”

Another legend, one connected to the adoption of the cult of Cybele, is told in the *Fasti* by Ovid. Unlike Livy's account, the king of Pergamum initially refuses the Roman embassy's request and changes his decision only after the voice of the goddess herself rings out (4, 265-270):

Mittuntur proceres. Phrygiae tum sceptrum tenebat

Attalus: Ausoniis rem negat ille viris.

mira canam. longo tremuit cum murmure tellus,

et sic est adytis diva locuta suis:

‘ipsa peti volui, nec sit mora, mitte volentem.

dignus Roma locus, quo deus omnis eat.’

“The city's best men are sent out. At that time, Attalus ruled over Phrygia, and he denied the Ausonians their request. I shall sing of a miracle. The earth shook with an extended roar, and the goddess proclaimed from her sanctuary: "It was my own wish to be sought. Release me without delay – such is my will. Rome is a place worthy of becoming every deity's destination.”

Another miracle follows when the ship carrying the goddess, having arrived in Italy, runs aground, and the Romans find themselves powerless to move it. Cybele is approached by Claudia Quinta, suspected of infidelity, who asks the goddess to follow her to prove her chastity, prompting the following outcome (4, 325-328):

Dixit et exiguo funem conamine traxit

(mira, sed et scaena testificata loquar):

mota dea est sequiturque ducem laudatque sequendo:

index laetitiae fertur ad astra sonus.

“She fell silent and pulled on the cord with little effort. I shall describe a miracle, to which the stage is a witness:<sup>44</sup> the goddess moved, followed her guide, and by following acquitted her. A joyful cry reaches the stars.”<sup>45</sup>

A third legend is told in the *Deipnosophistae* by Athenaeus, who cites Menodotus (15, 672a-e):

<sup>44</sup> According to R. J. Littlewood, during the Megalesia, a festival dedicated to the Great Mother, the audience was shown theatrical performances, which depicted the aetiological legends of the cult of Cybele's arrival in Rome [Littlewood: 1981, 387].

<sup>45</sup> As in *Iuno Regina*'s case, Livy removes or downplays the legend's supernatural elements: Attalus does not refuse the Romans, giving no reason for a divine intervention (29, 11, 7), while Claudia Quinta is only mentioned in passing by the historian, who briefly remarks that she managed to improve her reputation on that day (29, 14, 12).

Ἀδμήτην γάρ φησιν τὴν Εὐρυσθέως ἐξ Ἄργουςφυγοῦσαν ἐλθεῖν εἰς Σάμον, θεασαμένην δὲ τὴν τῆς Ἥρας ἐπιφάνειαν καὶ τῆς οἴκοθεν σωτηρίας χαριστήριον βουλομένην ἀποδοῦναι ἐπιμεληθῆναι τοῦ ἱεροῦ τοῦ καὶ νῦν ὑπάρχοντος, πρότερον δὲ ὑπὸ Λελέγων καὶ Νυμφῶν καθιδρυμένου· τοὺς δ' Ἀργείους πυθομένους καὶ χαλεπαίνοντας πείσαι χρημάτων ὑποσχέσει Τυρρηνοὺς ληστικῶ βίῳ χρωμένους ἀρπάσαι τὸ βρέτας, πεπεισμένους τοὺς Ἀργείους ὡς, εἰ τοῦτο γένοιτο, πάντως τι κακὸν πρὸς τῶν τὴν Σάμον κατοικούντων ἢ Ἀδμήτη πείσεται. τοὺς δὲ Τυρρηνοὺς ἐλθόντας εἰς τὸν Ἡραίτην ὄρμον καὶ ἀποβάντας εὐθέως ἔχεσθαι τῆς πράξεως. ἀθύρου δὲ ὄντος τότε τοῦ νεῶ ταχέως ἀνελέσθαι τὸ βρέτας καὶ διακομίσαντας ἐπὶ θάλασσαν εἰς τὸ σκάφος ἐμβαλέσθαι· λυσαμένους δ' αὐτοὺς τὰ πρυμνήσια καὶ τὰς ἀγκύρας ἀνελομένους εἰρεσίᾳ τε πάσῃ χρωμένους ἀπαίρειν οὐ δύνασθαι. ἡγησαμένους οὖν θεῖόν τι τοῦτ' εἶναι πάλιν ἐξενεγκαμένους τῆς νεῶς τὸ βρέτας ἀποθέσθαι παρὰ τὸν αἰγιαλόν· καὶ ψαιστὰ αὐτῶ ποιήσαντας περιδεεῖς ἀπαλλάττεσθαι. τῆς δὲ Ἀδμήτης ἔωθεν δηλωσάσης ὅτι τὸ βρέτας ἠφανίσθη καὶ ζητήσεως γενομένης εὐρεῖν μὲν αὐτὸ τοὺς ζητοῦντας ἐπὶ τῆς ἠόνας, ὡς δὲ δὴ βαρβάρους Κᾶρας ὑπονοήσαντας αὐτόματον ἀποδεδρακέναι πρὸς τι λύγου θωράκιον ἀπερείσασθαι καὶ τοὺς εὐμηκεστάτους τῶν κλάδων ἐκατέρωθεν ἐπισπασαμένους περιειλῆσαι πάντοθεν. τὴν δὲ Ἀδμήτην λύσασαν αὐτὸ ἀγνίσαι καὶ στῆσαι πάλιν ἐπὶ τοῦ βάρου, καθάπερ πρότερον ἴδρυτο. διόπερ ἐξ ἐκείνου καθ' ἕκαστον ἔτος ἀποκομίζεσθαι τὸ βρέτας εἰς τὴν ἠόνα καὶ ἀφαγνίζεσθαι ψαιστὰ τε αὐτῶ παρατίθεσθαι· καὶ καλεῖσθαι Τόναια τὴν ἑορτήν, ὅτι συντόνως συνέβη περιειληθῆναι τὸ βρέτας ὑπὸ τῶν τὴν πρώτην αὐτοῦ ζήτησιν ποιησαμένων.

“He recounts that Admete, daughter of Eurystheus,<sup>46</sup> having fled from Argos, came to Samos. Grateful to Hera, who had appeared before her and helped her escape from her native city, she wished to reward the goddess and took it upon herself to care for her sanctuary, which exists to this day and was originally founded by the Leleges

<sup>46</sup> Admete is additionally mentioned by Apollodorus, who has Eurystheus order Heracles to bring the girdle of Hippolyta at her request (*Bibl.* 2, 5, 9).

and nymphs. Having learned of this and angered by it, the Argives bribed the Tyrrhenians, who made their living by piracy, to steal the wooden image. The Argives were convinced that if they were to succeed, the Samos' inhabitants would cause all manner of trouble for Admete. Having arrived at Hera's cove, the Tyrrhenians disembarked and immediately got to work. Since the temple did not have any doors at the time, they swiftly took possession of the image, brought it to the sea, and loaded it on board. However, when they undid the mooring ropes, raised the anchors, and began to row together, they were unable to leave. Having realized that it was a miracle of some sort, they brought the image back from the ship, put it near the shore, baked sacrificial cakes for it, and fled in great terror. At dawn, when Admete discovered that the image was missing, and a search began, the search party found it on the shore. The Carian barbarians, believing it to have left by itself, propped it against a fence of willow branches, entwined it with the longest branches on both sides, and bound it on all sides. Admete removed the fetters from the statue, washed it, and put it back on its pedestal, just as it had stood before. Since then it has been a yearly custom to bring the statue to the shore, wash it, and offer sacrificial cakes to it. This festival is called *Τόναια*,<sup>47</sup> because the statue was tightly bound by those who first looked for it.”

All of these legends depict an attempt to move a cult statue or an object representing the goddess. In the cases where the relocation displeases the deity, a miracle occurs, and the statue conveys its displeasure and its preference for the current location: the statue of Hera becomes so heavy that even a ship is unable to move it, while the statues of Damia and Auxesia kneel. On the other hand, on the occasions, when the deity prefers to move to a new location, as it happens with Juno and Cybele, it manifests its

---

<sup>47</sup> From the noun *τόνος*, “tension”. According to Wilamowitz, the myth of the golden throne with invisible fetters, made for Hera by Hephaestus, who desired to take his revenge on her because she had cast him down from Olympus (Paus. 1, 20, 3), may have emerged to explain the origin of this festival [von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff 1895: 235].

approval with verbal assent, and the object embodying it becomes supernaturally light. None of these three legends describe conquest. Two of them have no connection to Rome, while Cybele is presented by Festus<sup>48</sup> as an example of a goddess whose worship was brought to Rome in a way different from evocation. Therefore, the emergence of legends of this type does not depend on the ritual of evocation, and the events they describe should not be interpreted as stages of this ritual.

It is difficult to suggest that Livy describes the ritual of evocation in book 5, but does not draw special attention to it because he does not consider it to be important enough. The book concludes with a speech given by Camillus, who persuades the Romans not to leave the city ransacked by the Gauls and argues that Rome owes its military successes to piety and its failures to irreverence toward the gods and toward the universal laws that they watch over (5, 51, 5-7):

*Intuemini enim horum deinceps annorum uel secundas res uel aduersas, inuenietis omnia prospere euenisse sequentibus deos, aduersa spernentibus. iam omnium primum Veiens bellum – per quot annos quanto labore gestum! – non ante cepit finem, quam monitu deorum aqua ex lacu Albano emissa est. quid haec tandem urbis nostrae clades noua num ante exorta est, quam spreta uox caelo emissa de aduentu Gallorum, quam gentium ius ab legatis nostris uiolatum, quam a nobis, cum uindicari deberet, eadem neglegentia deorum praetermissum?*

“Indeed, consider the successes and the failures of the last several years, and you shall discover that all was well when the gods were obeyed and adverse when they were spurned. First of all, the war against Veii - fought for so many years, with such difficulty! - did not end before the water had been drained from Lake Albano, as the gods had instructed. And what of the unprecedented calamity that recently befell our city - did it happen before we had neglected the heavenly voice that had foretold the invasion

---

<sup>48</sup> See p.11.



of the Gauls,<sup>49</sup> before our ambassadors had violated the law of nations, before we, because of the same neglect of the gods, had overlooked a crime, when retribution was necessary?”<sup>50</sup>

Therefore, it is important for Livy to demonstrate that Camillus was pious during the successful war against the Etruscans: it is piety that the historian identifies as the source of his victories. Thus, it would have been quite appropriate to mention that the transfer of *Iuno Regina's* cult, which concluded the siege of Veii, was accomplished in accordance with an ancient ritual performed by Roman generals to show their respect for the gods who were at risk of being taken prisoner. Nevertheless, this goes unmentioned in both the siege's description and Camillus' speech near the end of book 5, in which he notes that the transfer of the foreign deity's cult by itself was a pious act, traditional to Rome, but never claims that the manner in which this transfer was conducted constituted a special ritual, sanctified by ancient tradition (5, 52, 10):

At etiam, tamquam ueterum religionum memores, et peregrinos deos transtulimus Romam et instituimus nouos. Iuno regina transueta a Veis nuper in Auentino quam insigni ob excellens matronarum studium celebrique dedicata est die!

---

<sup>49</sup> The Romans are warned of the coming Gallic invasion by a divine voice that rings out in the night, but is not heeded at first. Once the Romans are convinced of its veracity, it becomes the object of religious worship under the name *Aius Locutius* or *Aius Loquens* (5, 32, 6-7). In the opinion R. Ogilvie, the plebeian Marcus Caedicius, who tells the tribunes of the voice, is a late addition to the legend that owes its existence to the resemblance between Marcus' family name and the noun *caedes*, “massacre” [Ogilvie 1965: 698].

<sup>50</sup> After the inhabitants of the Etruscan city of Clusium, endangered by the Gauls, turn to Rome for help, the Romans dispatch three brothers from the *gens Fabia* as envoys to inform the Gauls that Clusium enjoys Rome's protection. The negotiations fall through, the Clusians and the Gauls fight, and the Fabii take part in battle on the side of the Clusians. Later on, the Romans refuse to hand the ambassadors, who have tainted themselves with blood, over to the Gauls (5, 35, 4 – 5, 36). According to R. Ogilvie, these events are completely fictitious [Ogilvie 1965: 716].

“As if remembering the ancient piety, we, once again, both brought foreign gods to Rome and instituted the worship of new ones. How solemn and notable for the matrons' exceptional diligence was the day when *Iuno Regina*, who had recently been brought from Veii, had a temple on the Aventine dedicated to her!”

It is likewise difficult to suggest that Livy does not call the actions described in book 5 an example of the ritual of evocation because he believes that the reader will understand it themselves. In comparison, it is possible to cite a description provided by Livy in book 8 to a different military ritual, *devotio*, which a Roman general performs to establish a magical link between himself and the enemy army and by accepting death voluntarily condemns his enemies to the same fate (8, 9, 4-8):

In hac trepidatione Decius consul M. Valerium magna uoce inclamat. “deorum” inquit “ope, Valeri, opus est: agedum, pontifex publicus populi Romani, praei uerba, quibus me pro legionibus deuoueam”. pontifex eum togam praetextam sumere iussit, et uelato capite manu subter togam ad mentum exserta super telum subiectum pedibus stantem sic dicere: “Iane, Iuppiter, Mars pater, Quirine, Bellona, Lares, diui nouensiles, di indigetes, diui quorum est potestas nostrorum hostiumque, diique manes, uos precor, ueneror, ueniam peto feroque, uti populo Romano Quiritium uim uictoriamque prosperetis, hostesque populi Romani Quiritium terrore formidine morteque adficiatis. sicut uerbis nuncupauit, ita pro re publica Quiritium, exercitu legionibus auxiliis populi Romani Quiritium legiones auxiliaque hostium mecum deis manibus Tellurique deuoueo”.

“At this dire hour, the consul Decius loudly called out to Marcus Valerius and said: “Valerius, divine assistance is needed. Come, pontiff appointed by the Roman people, tell me the words with which I can dedicate myself to the chthonic gods in my legions' place.” The pontiff told him to put on a *praetexta*, cover his head, stretch his arm under the toga toward his chin, stand with his feet on top of a spear, and say: “Janus,

Jupiter, Father Mars, Quirinus, Bellona, the Lares, *di novensiles*, *di indigetes*,<sup>51</sup> the gods who hold power over us and our enemies, the divine Manes – I reverently ask you, beg for your mercy, and invoke you to grant the Roman Quirites strength and victory and to instill fear, terror, and death in the enemies of the Roman Quirites. By speaking these words, in place of the Quirites’s state, the army, the legions, the auxiliary troops of the Roman Quirites, I dedicate the legions and the auxiliary troops of the enemies along with myself to the divine Manes and to the earth.””

There can be no doubt that a codified ritual is described here: the words are not improvised by the general on the spot, but are spoken after the pontiff, who prescribes certain dress and gestures. Afterward, Livy shares a number of additional details concerning the conduct of this ritual, stating that any Roman soldier and not only a general can become its object and describing what course of action should be taken in cases when the person dedicated in this manner manages to survive (8, 10, 11–14):

Illud adiciendum uidetur, licere consuli dictatorique et praetori, cum legiones hostium deuoueat, non utique se, sed quem uelit ex legione Romana scripta ciuem deuouere. si is homo qui deuotus est moritur, probe factum uideri: ni moritur, tum signum septem pedes altum aut maius in terram defodi, et piaculum hostia caedi. ubi illud signum defossum erit, eo magistratum Romanum escendere fas non esse. sin autem sese

---

<sup>51</sup> G. Wissowa sees these two categories as complementary groups of gods, which, taken together, describe the entire Roman pantheon: the “newcomer gods” whose worship came to Rome at a relatively late time and the “aboriginal gods” whose cults could be traced back to the remote antiquity [Wissowa 1902: 16–17]. Emil Goldmann, noting that Martianus Capella places *di novensiles* in the same area of the heaven as the water deities Fons and Lymphae (1, 46), identifies them with the *nymphae novae*, the spirits of new wells and springs, while the *di indigetes* are identified with river deities [Goldmann 1942: 46–51]. G. Dumézil considers the *di indigetes* to be unimportant deities, who lacked a proper cult, and believes that the name of this category was derived from lists of gods known as the *indigitamenta* [Dumézil 1974: 109–110].

deuouere uolet, sicuti Decius deuouit, ni moritur, neque suum neque publicum diuinum pure faciet qui sese deuouerit. Vulcano arma siue cui alii diuo uouere uolet, siue hostia siue quo alio uolet, ius est. telo, super quod stans consul precatus est, hostem potiri fas non est: si potiat, Marti suouetaurilibus piaculum fieri.

“It appears necessary to add that the consul, dictator, or praetor, who dedicates enemy troops to the chthonic deities, may dedicate not only himself, but any citizen enlisted in a Roman legion. If the dedicated perishes, it is considered that everything has gone well. Otherwise, an image seven feet high or higher is buried in the ground and an expiatory sacrifice is killed. Where this image is buried, Roman magistrates are not allowed to tread. If a general desires to dedicate himself, as Decius did, yet does not perish, he may not take part in sacred ceremonies, be it as a private person or as an official, without defiling them, if he dedicated himself. He has the right to dedicate weapons to Vulcanus or another god by offering an animal or another sacrifice. It would be impious for the enemy to take possession of the spear on which the consul was standing as he addressed the gods. If this does occur, a pig, a sheep, and an ox are offered to Mars as expiatory victims.”

As Livy concludes this digression, he justifies it by claiming that old Roman customs are forgotten (8, 11, 1):

Haec, etsi omnis diuini humanique moris memoria aboleuit noua peregrinaque omnia priscis ac patriis praeferendo, haud ab re duxi uerbis quoque ipsis ut tradita nuncupataque sunt referre.

“Although the memory of all religious and worldly traditions had perished because of the preference given to everything new and foreign before the ancient and do-

mestic, I found it useful to tell of it using the very same words by which this legend had been passed along and expressed.”

Livy, who lives in the age of Augustus, characterized by its course toward religious renewal, believes that the Roman religion is in decline and perceives the description of forgotten ancient customs, which embodied the piety of his ancestors, to be one of his history's tasks. Livy's tendency to turn historical episodes into self-contained moral parables is noted by R. Ogilvie [Ogilvie 1965: 18]. Despite this, he sees no reason to point out that the actions of the Romans who besieged Veii constituted a ritual that ensured the favor of the gods of the conquered peoples.

Therefore, the literary accounts of the siege of Veii lack any clear indication that the cult of *Iuno Regina* was transferred to Rome by means of the ritual of evocation, nor do they contain any indication that this transfer was at all conducted by means of any established ritual, one that would have been performed during other sieges as well. The young soldiers' address to the statue of the goddess reveals typological similarities with other legends involving images of the gods, which facilitate their transfer or interfere with it, – legends entirely unconnected to sieges. Therefore, the actions and words depicted in this legend should not be interpreted as stages of any specific ritual.<sup>52</sup>

---

<sup>52</sup> This chapter is a revision of a previously published article [Isaenko 2017 (1)].

**CHAPTER 4****FALERII**

In its war against Rome Veii found the support of Falerii and Capena (Liv. 5, 8, 4). In 394 BCE, Falerii was besieged by Camillus, who was quick to secure the city's surrender. The events of the siege laid ground for legends, of which one is particularly famous (5, 27, 1–11):

Mos erat Faliscis eodem magistro liberorum et comite uti; simulque plures pueri, quod hodie quoque in Graecia manet, unius curae demandabantur. principum liberos, sicut fere fit, qui scientia uidebatur praecellere erudiebat. is cum in pace instituisset pueros ante urbem lusus exercendique causa producere, nihil eo more per belli tempus intermisso diu modo breuioribus modo longioribus spatiis trahendo eos a porta, lusu sermonibusque uariatis longius solito, ubi res dedit, progressus inter stationes eos hostium castraque inde Romana in praetorium ad Camillum perduxit. ibi scelesto facinori scelestiorem sermonem addit, Falerios se in manus Romanis tradidisse, quando eos pueros, quorum parentes capita ibi rerum sint, in potestatem dediderit. quae ubi Camillus audiuit, “non ad similem” inquit “tui nec populum nec imperatorem scelestus ipse cum scelesto munere uenisti. nobis cum Faliscis, quae pacto fit humano, societas non est; quam ingenerauit natura, utrisque est eritque. sunt et belli sicut pacis iura, iusteque ea non minus quam fortiter didicimus gerere. arma habemus non aduersus eam aetatem, cui etiam captis urbibus parcitur, sed aduersus armatos et ipsos, qui nec laesi nec lacesiti a nobis castra Romana ad Veios oppugnarunt. eos tu, quantum in te fuit, nouo scelere uicisti: ego Romanis artibus, uirtute opere armis, sicut Veios uincam.” denudatum deinde eum manibus post tergum inligatis reducendum Falerios pueris tradidit, uirgasque eis, quibus proditorem agerent in urbem uerberantes, dedit. ad quod spectaculum concursu populi primum facto, deinde a magistratibus de re noua uocato senatu, tanta

mutatio animis est iniecta, ut qui modo efferati odio iraque Veientium exitum paene quam Capenatium pacem mallent, apud eos pacem uniuersa posceret ciuitas. fides Romana, iustitia imperatoris in foro et curia celebrantur; consensuque omnium legati ad Camillum in castra atque inde permissu Camilli Romam ad senatum, qui dederent Falerios, proficiscuntur.

“It was customary among the Falisci to have the same person act as an educator and a caretaker for their children, and a large number of children – as it is done in Greece to this day – was put together under the care of one. The children of the city's preeminent men, as it usually happens, were educated by the person whose learning was found to be exceptional. In times of peace, he developed a habit to bring the children out of the city to play and exercise. In times of war, he did not restrict this practice in any way and continued to take them beyond the gates for extended periods of time, traveling distances that were sometimes shorter and sometimes longer. When an opportunity presented itself, he, alternating between games and conversations, went further than usual and led the children to the enemy lines and eventually to the Roman camp, to Camillus' praetorium. There, he exacerbated his foul actions with a yet fouler speech and said that he was putting Falerii into the hands of the Romans by giving them power over the children, whose parents were in charge of the city. When Camillus heard this, he replied, "You are a foul man, unlike the people or the commander, whom you have approached bearing your foul gift. We may not be bound to the Falisci with agreements struck among men, but we are and shall continue to be united by nature, common from birth. Like peace, war has its laws, and we have been taught to wage it with honor as much as with courage. Our weapons are not turned against the generation that is spared even when cities are taken, but against those, who capable of holding arms, against those, who attacked the Roman camp near Veii, even though we had not harmed or provoked them. You have prevailed over these children by employing all of the unprecedented foulness that you hold within, while I shall prevail by employing Roman train-

ing, valor, toil, and arms, as I did against Veii.” Afterward, Camillus stripped the man bare, tied his hands behind his back, and handed him over to the children, so they would bring him back to Falerii, and gave them rods to strike the traitor with as they drove him to the city. At first, common people flocked to this spectacle. Later on, as the magistrates assembled the Senate to discuss the news, the mood changed so much that even all of those, who until recently were burning with fury and anger and would almost prefer the ruin that had befallen Veii to the peace brokered by Capena, asked for peace. At the forum and in the curia they praised the honesty of the Romans and the honesty of their commander. By unanimous decision, ambassadors were dispatched to Camillus’ camp and once they had his permission, they went to Rome to surrender Falerii before the Senate.”

The following century and a half in the history of relations between the two cities are defined by inconstancy. In 358 BCE, Rome was attacked by Tarquinius (Liv. 7, 12, 5–6), and the Falisci took part in the raids (7, 16, 2). In 351 BCE, Rome and Falerii agreed to a forty year truce (7, 22, 4–5). After the Roman victory over the Samnites in Suessula in 343 BCE, the Falisci decided to sign an indefinite peace treaty (7, 38, 1). In 298 BCE, the relations with the Falisci were trusting enough for the Romans to leave supplies in the city without significant protection (10, 12, 7), but as early as 293 BCE, the Falisci rebelled alongside the Etruscans, and Rome declared war on them (10, 45, 6–7). In the same year, a new truce was reached (10, 46, 12). In 241 BCE, Falerii started a new revolt, but Rome suppressed it, having forced the city to surrender in six days (Liv. Per. 20). Afterward, Falerii, which occupied an elevated position, was destroyed, and a new city was built at a more vulnerable location (Zonar. 8, 18).<sup>53</sup>

---

<sup>53</sup> According to Earnest Cary, the 12th century Byzantine historian Joannes Zonaras employed lost books of Cassius Dio as his principal source on the Roman history, alongside the works of Plutarch and Herodotus. Those parts of Zonaras’ text that do not mirror Plutarch or Herodotus can be used to reconstruct Dio's text [Cary 1914: XXI].



Three deities worshiped in Falerii received Roman cult: *Iuno Curritis*, *Minerva Capta*, and *Ianus Quadrifrons*. As the city was destroyed, scholars often suggest that the adoption of the cults of one or several of these deities could have occurred with the help of the ritual of evocation. For example, according to Gabriel Bakkum, all three deities could have come to Rome in this manner [Bakkum 2009: 39]. Lily Ross Taylor thinks that *Iuno Curritis* and *Minerva Capta* were evoked [Taylor 1923: 68, 74]. Kurt Latte does not exclude the possibility that the cult of *Minerva Capta* was adopted by means of evocation, but is not entirely certain [Latte 1960: 125].

Ancient writers name Juno, specifically *Iuno Curritis*,<sup>54</sup> as Falerii's principal deity. Ovid calls the Falisci “worshippers of Juno” (*Iunonicolae*) (Fast. 6, 49–50). There was a tradition, according to which the cult of Juno had been brought to Falerii by the colonists from Argos, who had founded the city. Dionysius of Halicarnassus states that Hera's temple in Argos was the prototype for the temple of Juno built in Falerii (*Ant. Rom.* 1, 21, 2):

Πάντων δὲ περιφανέστατον μνημεῖον τῆς ἐν Ἄργει ποτὲ οἰκήσεως τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐκείνων οἱ τοὺς Σικελοὺς ἐξήλασαν, ὁ τῆς Ἥρας νεὸς ἐν Φαλερίῳ κατεσκευασμένος ὡς ἐν Ἄργει, ἔνθα καὶ τῶν θηπολιῶν ὁ τρόπος ὁμοῖος ἦν καὶ γυναῖκες ἱερὰ ἰατροῦσαι τὸ τέμενος ἢ τε λεγομένη κανηφόρος ἀγνὴ γάμων παῖς καταρχομένη τῶν θυμάτων χοροὶ τε παρθένων ὕμνουσῶν τὴν θεὸν ὠδαῖς πατρίοις.

---

<sup>54</sup> The spellings *Curitis* and *Quiritis* are also attested. As pointed out by L. R. Taylor, the spelling *Curritis* prevails in the inscriptions from Falerii [Taylor 1923: 66]. According to Festus (*Gloss. Lat.* 43L) and Plutarch (*Rom.* 29; *Quaest. Rom.* 87), Juno's epithet is derived from the Sabine word *curis*, “spear”. Servius (*In Aen.* 1, 8) claims that *Iuno Curritis* has chariot and spear as her attributes (*utitur curru et hasta*). Dionysius of Halicarnassus (*Ant. Rom.* 2, 50, 3) interprets the epithet as a reference to the Sabine king Titus Tatius, who dedicated an altar to Juno in every curia. The matter is further complicated by Tertullian's testimony, who claims that the epithet was derived from the epithet of a different Faliscan deity, *Pater Curris* (Apol. 24). If this is the case, it is possible that the epithet does not reflect any attributes of Juno herself.

“Of all the evidence that the people who displaced the Sicels<sup>55</sup> had once lived in Argos, the temple of Hera, built in Falerii in imitation of the one in Argos, is the most vivid: there, the sacrifices were performed in the same way, the priestesses tended to the sanctuary, the so-called “basket bearer,” a pure, unwed girl, prepared the sacrificial ceremonies, and the choirs of maidens sang hymns to the goddess that had been passed down from generation to generation.”

An elegy by Ovid describes the cult of Juno in Falerii, which he visited with his wife, who was a native of the city. The poet identifies Halaesus, who fled from Argos after killing Agamemnon, as the founder of the city and the goddess’ local cult (*Am.* 3, 13, 31–36):

Argiua est pompae facies; Agamemnone caeso  
 et scelus et patrias fugit Halaesus opes  
 iamque pererratis profugus terraque fretoque  
 moenia felici condidit alta manu.  
 ille suos docuit Iunonia sacra Faliscos.  
 sint mihi, sint populo semper amica suo!

“The procession has an Argive look. After Agamemnon had been slain, Halaesus fled both from the crime and from the wealth of the fathers.<sup>56</sup> Having traveled across the

---

<sup>55</sup> According to a tradition, which Thucydides (6, 2, 4) and Diodorus (5, 6, 3–5) follow as well, the Sicels, pressured by other Italic tribes, were forced to cross over to Sicily, which took its name from the name of this people (*Ant. Rom.* 1, 22, 1–2).

<sup>56</sup> Servius reports that the myth of Halaesus had several versions: according to some, he was Agamemnon’s companion, while according to others, he was his illegitimate son (*In Aen.* 7, 723). It is not entirely certain which of these variants Ovid has in mind: the *opes patriae* may be “paternal,” referencing kinship with Agamemnon, or they may be “belonging to fatherland,” which allows for a different interpretation.

earth and the sea, the wanderer laid down high walls with a happy hand. He taught his Falisci Juno's sacred rites. May they always prove kind both to me and to the people who perform them!”

However, as pointed out by L. R. Taylor, apart from religious similarities, there are no grounds for seeing an Argive colony in Falerii, and it is more plausible that the local cult of Juno was influenced by the Argive cult of Hera after its establishment, while the legends connecting the city's founding to the Greeks emerged at a much later point [Taylor 1923: 60–65; Bakum 2009: 35].

There is no historiographical evidence suggesting that the cult of *Iuno Curritis* arrived in Rome as a result of the conquest of Falerii. Ovid's Juno, who lists her places of worship that came to be under the Roman rule, comes closest to making such a statement (*Fast.* 6, 45–50):

Paeniteat, quod non foueo Carthagini arces,  
                   cum mea sint illo currus et arma loco;  
 paeniteat Sparten Argosque measque Mycenae  
                   et ueterem Latio supposuisse Samon;  
 adde senem Tatium Iunonicolasque Faliscos,  
                   quos ego Romanis succubuisse tuli.

“I might regret that I no longer side with the Carthaginian strongholds, although my chariot and armaments are kept there, that I subjugated Sparta, Argos, my Mycenae, and Samos to Latium. Remember the ancient Tatius<sup>57</sup> and the Falisci, who venerate Juno, whom I instilled with obedience to the Romans.”

---

<sup>57</sup> Ovid follows the tradition, which claims that the cult of *Iuno Curritis* was brought to Rome by the Sabine king Titus Tatius, who put an altar to the goddess in every curia (Dion. Hal. 2, 50, 3).

Some scholars – for example, R. J. Littlewood [Littlewood 2006: 19] – see this passage as a list of cities, from which local aspects of Juno may have been summoned to Rome with the ritual of evocation. However, one should consider the purpose that the goddess has in mind when she addresses the poet (6, 35-40):

An potuit Maio paelex dare nomina mensi,  
 hic honor in nobis invidiosus erit?  
 cur igitur regina vocor princepsque dearum?  
 aurea cur dextrae sceptrae dedere meae?  
 an facient mensem luces, Lucinaque ab illis  
 dicar et a nullo nomina mense traham?

“Could it be that a concubine successfully gave her name to the month of May,<sup>58</sup> while all that is left to me is to envy this honor? Why am I then called the goddesses' queen and mistress? Why is there a golden sceptre in my right hand? A month consists of bright days, for which I am called Lucina – is there not a single month from which I could derive my name?”

Juno seeks to convince Ovid that the name of the month of June comes from her (later on, Youth defends a rival etymology before the poet (6, 65–88)). It was this honor, granted to her by the Romans, that she valued so much that she allowed her other centres of worship to fall under Rome's rule. Furthermore, as Juno lists the conquered cities, she notes that they are still capable of competing with Rome as her cult centres: Carthage retains the possession of the goddess' sacred armament, while Falerii retain their loyalty to her. Ovid's elegy, in which he describes the rites celebrated in Juno's honor in a grove near Falerii (*Am.* 3, 13), also indicates that even after the destruction of the old city by the Romans, the Falisci did not become disillusioned in the goddess' pro-

---

<sup>58</sup> Hermes was born to Zeus and the nymph Maia (*Hom. Hymn. in Merc.* 1-9).

tection. The poet likewise is not surprised by the fact that Falerii continue to worship the goddess, who supposedly moved to Rome in exchange for an equally luxurious cult.

In the opinion of Vsevolod Basanoff, the Romans could have reached out to *Iuno Curritis* with *exoratio*, a hypothetical ritual, supposedly used to win the favor of the patron deity of a besieged city that was not planned to be destroyed after the conquest (in this case, the deity was not promised an equivalent cult in Rome). V. Basanoff finds traces of this ritual in the legend of Camillus and the teacher, in the abrupt change of mood among the citizens of Falerii that it depicts [Basanoff 1947: 54–55]. However, the legend does not feature any religious figures or images, and the situation itself is created by a denizen of Falerii rather than a Roman. Therefore, it is more likely that the legend has a secular nature and exists to serve two purposes: first, to show the moral superiority of the Roman elite over the local one, framing the conquest as beneficial to the conquered; second, to take the responsibility for the conquest away from the armed men who besieged the city and to transfer it to the conquered.

That the cult of *Minerva Capta* was brought to Rome from Falerii is mentioned by Ovid, who proposes four etymologies for the goddess' epithet, of which three are derived from the noun *caput*, “head,” while the fourth one is connected to the verb *capio*, “to take,” “to seize,” “to receive” (*Fast.* 3, 835–846):

Caelius ex alto qua mons descendit in aequum,  
           hic, ubi non plana est, sed prope plana uia,  
 parua licet uideas Captae delubra Mineruae,  
           quae dea natali coepit habere suo.  
 nominis in dubio causa est. capitale uocamus  
           ingenium sollers: ingeniosa dea est.  
 an quia de capitis fertur sine matre paterni  
           uertice cum clipeo prosiluisse suo?  
 an quia perdomitis ad nos captiua Faliscis

uenit? et hoc ipsum littera prisca docet.  
 an quod habet legem, capitis quae pendere poenas  
 ex illo iubeat furta recepta loco?

“Where the Caelian Hill transitions into a plain, where the road is not quite, but almost level, one can spot a small temple of *Minerva Capta*, where the goddess moved in on her birthday. The origin of her name is unclear. We call a skilled artisan “heady” – the goddess, too, is skilled. Or is it because she, lacking a mother, jumped out with her shield from the top of her father's head? Or is it because she came to us as a captive when the Falisci were subdued? It is what the ancient inscription teaches us.<sup>59</sup> Or is it that the laws of the goddess demand that those who take possession of property stolen from her sanctuary must pay with their head?”

It is impossible to say for certain what the inscription (or the letter) mentioned by Ovid was. He likely speaks of a dedicatory inscription adorning an image of the goddess or a votive offering kept in the temple. What we can be certain of is that while the form or content of the inscription connected it in some way to Falerii, it could not directly and unambiguously state that Falerii were the home of *Minerva Capta*'s cult – in this case, it would leave no room for the other three etymologies, presented by Ovid as equally probable.

The etymologies derived from the word *caput* are impossible, as they contradict the patterns of the Latin lexicological development. The etymology from the word *capio*

---

<sup>59</sup> Some manuscripts offer the following text: *et hoc signo littera prima docet* (“It is what the first letter on the image teaches us”). Ernest Alton, Donald Wormell, and Edward Courtney's edition accepts *signo*, but not *prima*, although the reading *littera prima* can also be understood, assuming that the inscription was written in the Faliscan alphabet (the Faliscan M, with which a dedicatory inscription to *Minerva* would likely begin, has a distinct appearance that combines the straight lines of the Latin alphabet with the general shape of the Greek μ). Regardless, determining which reading is authentic and what meaning Ovid places in it has little bearing on further conclusions.

is more convincing, but, as Thomas Köves-Zulauf [Köves-Zulauf 1993: 163–165] points out, its meaning is not necessarily obvious: people honor the gods because they hope for their protection and patronage. Therefore, an epithet emphasizing the goddess' weakness and vulnerability would seem unusual and inappropriate. T. Köves-Zulauf suggests that this participle may have an active rather than a passive meaning:<sup>60</sup> in his opinion, the epithet *Capta*, understood as “Receiving”, represents the function of social integration, of incorporating fully educated children as well as strangers into society [Köves-Zulauf 1993: 165–170]. This etymology is supported by Tiziano Cinaglia, who argues against the Faliscan origin of the goddess and proposes to view her as a Roman patron deity of coming of age [Cinaglia 2016: 69–72].

It should be added that *Minerva Capta* was not Falerii's supreme goddess – the Roman and Greek sources unanimously assign this role to *Iuno Curritis* – therefore, even if evocation had been performed, it would not have been directed at her. Furthermore, Servius (*In Aen.* 2, 351: *euocabantur... propter uitanda sacrilegia*) and Macrobius (*Sat.* 3, 9, 2: *nefas aestimarent deos habere captiuos*) agree that the purpose of the ritual was to show due reverence for the gods, while the epithet *Capta*, if it denotes the cult's transfer from Falerii, rather indicates that the Romans saw the goddess as a trophy.

An image of *Ianus Quadrifrons* was also brought to Rome from the captured Falerii, as Servius (*In Aen.* 7, 607) and Macrobius (*Sat.* 1, 9, 13) report. Nevertheless, the tradition does not connect his transfer to the ritual of evocation and does not present him as Falerii's patron deity. Therefore, this image was likely brought to Rome as an ordinary trophy.

---

<sup>60</sup> As a similar example, T. Köves-Zulauf brings up the Roman goddess Τύχη Βισκᾶτα (that is, *Fortuna Viscata*), mentioned by Plutarch (*Quaest. Rom.* 74), whose epithet comes from the verb *visco*, “to catch with bird lime,” and is more likely to have an active rather than a passive meaning.

## CHAPTER 5

## VOLSINII

Among the deities whose cults were brought to Rome with the ritual of evocation Georg Wissowa counts the Etruscan god Vertumnus,<sup>61</sup> who, in his opinion, was summoned from Volsinii by the consul Marcus Fulvius Flaccus in 264 BCE [Wissowa 1902: 233–234].

Clashes between Rome and the Volsinii were not uncommon. In 392 BCE, the Volsinians raided the Roman territory. In 391 BCE, the Romans responded with a military campaign, secured the surrender of 8,000 soldiers, and forced a twelve year peace treaty on Volsinii, with terms favorable to themselves (Liv. 5, 31–32). In 308 BCE, several Volsinian fortresses were destroyed by the consul Publius Decius Mus (9, 41). In 294 BCE, the consul Lucius Postumius Megellus defeated the Volsinians near the walls of their city, after which Volsinia, Perusia, and Arretium made a forty year peace deal with Rome and paid reparations (10, 37).

The background of the war, which resulted in the fall of Volsinii, is recounted by Valerius Maximus, who in the chapter on luxury tells of a slave revolt that took place in this city (9, 1, ext. 2):

Quae etiam Volsiniensium urbem grauibus et erubescendis cladibus implicauerunt. erat opulenta, erat moribus et legibus ordinata, Etruriae caput habebatur:

---

<sup>61</sup> Varro claims that Vertumnus, also known among the Romans as Vortumnus and Voltumna, was Etruria's supreme deity (*Ling.* 5, 46), but, as pointed out by Nancy Thomson de Grummond, the archaeological evidence suggests that it was the thunder god Tinia who had the leading role in the Etruscan pantheon. A mirror was discovered, possibly depicting Tages, a young man who emerged from the ground and taught the art of haruspicy to the culture hero Tarchon. Among the characters present on the mirror there is a bearded man holding a spear, who is given the name Veltune [de Grummond 2006: 29–30]. The functions of this deity remain unknown.



sed postquam luxuria prolapsa est, in profundum iniuriarum et turpitudinis decidit, ut seruorum se insolentissimae dominationi subiceret. qui primum admodum pauci senatorium ordinem intrare ausi, mox uniuersam rem publicam occupauerunt, testamenta ad arbitrium suum scribi iubebant, conuiuia coetusque ingenuorum fieri uetabant, filias dominorum in matrimonium ducebant. postremo lege sanxerunt ut stupra sua in uiduis pariter atque in nuptis inpunita essent ac ne qua uirgo ingenuo nuberet, cuius castitatem non ante ex numero ipsorum aliquis delibasset.

“The same [vices] entangled Volsinii in a web of grave misfortunes that would make one blush. This city was opulent, it was governed by customs and laws and thought to be Etruria's capital, but as soon as luxury penetrated it, it fell into the abyss of iniquity and dishonor: it submitted to the unlimited rule of slaves. At first, only a few of them dared to enter the senatorial class, but soon they occupied every public office. By their orders, wills were drawn up at their discretion, nobles were forbidden to hold feasts and meetings, and they married the daughters of their masters. Finally, they passed a law that decreed that the crimes they committed against widows and wives should go unpunished, and that no girl should marry a noble until one of their number had stolen away her chastity.”

According to Florus, Volsinii's former elite, having lost power, asked Rome for a military intervention (1, 16):

Postremi Italicorum in fidem uenere Volsini, opulentissimi Etruscorum, inplorantes opem aduersus seruos quondam suos, qui libertatem a dominis datam in ipsos erexerant translataque in se re p. dominabantur. sed hi quoque duce Fabio Gurgite poenas dederunt.

“The last of the Italic peoples to submit [to Rome] were the citizens of Volsinii, the wealthiest of the Etruscans, who pleaded for assistance against their former slaves, who had turned the freedom they received from their masters against them and, having taken the reigns, began to govern the city. But they, too, were made to pay by the general Fabius Gurges.”

*De Viris Illustribus*, attributed to Aurelius Victor (36), and Paulus Orosius' *Historiae Adversum Paganos* (4, 5) likewise identify these events as the cause of the war. Therefore, the ancient historiography featured an established tradition of framing the fall of Volsinii in a moralistic way: as punishment for deviation from the social hierarchy the contemporaries were accustomed to.

There is no extant ancient account of the siege itself (Livy described it in book 11 (Per. 11)), but it is depicted by the Byzantine historian Joannes Zonaras<sup>62</sup> (8, 7):

Δι' οὖν ταῦθ' οἱ Ῥωμαῖοι τὸν Φάβιον ἐπ' αὐτοὺς ἔστειλαν. καὶ ὃς τοὺς τε ἀπαντήσαντας αὐτῶ ἐξ ἐκείνων ἐτρέψατο καὶ πολλοὺς ἐν τῇ φυγῇ φθείρας κατέκλεισε τοὺς λοιποὺς εἰς τὸ τεῖχος, καὶ προσέβαλε τῇ πόλει. καὶ ὁ μὲν ἐνταῦθα τρωθεὶς ἀπέθανε, θαρσήσαντες δ' ἐπὶ τούτῳ ἐπεξῆλθον. καὶ ἡττηθέντες αὖθις ἀνεχώρησαν καὶ ἐπολιορκοῦντο· καὶ εἰς ἀνάγκην λιμοῦ ἐμπεσόντες παρέδωκαν ἑαυτοὺς, ὁ δὲ ὕπατος τοὺς μὲν ἀφελομένους τὰς τῶν κυρίων τιμὰς αἰκισάμενος ἔκτεινε καὶ τὴν πόλιν κατέσκαψε, τοὺς δὲ αὐθιγενεῖς, καὶ εἴ τινες τῶν οἰκετῶν χρηστοὶ περὶ τοὺς δεσπότης ἐγένοντο, ἐν ἑτέρῳ κατώκισε τόπῳ.

“This is why the Romans dispatched Fabius against them. He routed those who opposed him, killing many of those who fled, trapped the survivors inside the city walls, and launched an assault on the city. Fabius was injured and perished, while the enemies rallied and went on the offensive. Defeated, they retreated once again, found themselves

---

<sup>62</sup> Zonaras' sources are discussed in a footnote on page 63.

under siege and, left with no choice because of the prospect of starvation, surrendered. The consul mistreated and executed those who had disgraced their masters and leveled the city to the ground, while the local and those slaves who had kept their loyalty to their masters were moved to another location.”

Despite these accounts sharing an inclination toward moralism and portraying the war with Volsinii as a result of a breakdown of social order, none of them mention that the gods venerated there chose to shift their favor to the Romans, who had put an end to the revolution. The foundation for the hypothesis that Vertumnus could have been brought to Rome with the ritual of evocation is provided by an elegy by Propertius, written from the point of view of an image of the deity (4, 2, 3–4):

Tuscus ego et Tuscis orior, nec paenitet inter  
proelia Volsinios deseruisse focos.

“I am an Etruscan and come from Etruria. I am not ashamed to have left the Volsinian hearths among the battles.”

Another argument in support of this hypothesis is provided by the *Fasti Triumphales*, according to which Fulvius Flaccus was granted a triumph for his victory over Volsinii (CIL I<sup>2</sup> p. 172). A third argument is supplied by a fragment of Festus' dictionary, which states that in the temple of Vertumnus, built, according to G. Wissowa, to fulfill a vow made by the consul during the siege of Volsinii, there was an image of Fulvius Flaccus wearing the triumphator's garb (*Gloss. Lat.* 228 L):

Picta quae nunc toga dicitur, purpurea ante vocitata est, eaque erat sine pictura. Eius rei argumentum est <...> pictum in aede Vertumni, et Consi, quarum in altera M. Fulvius Flaccus, in altera T. Papirius Cursor triumphantes ita picti sunt.

“The toga, which is now called painted, used to be called purple and lacked pictures. This object <...> is depicted in the sanctuaries of Vertumnus<sup>63</sup> and Consus,<sup>64</sup> Marcus Fulvius Flaccus in the former and Titus Papirius Cursor<sup>65</sup> in the latter are depicted celebrating a triumph wearing such clothes.”

However, as remarked by Thomas Suits [Suits 1969: 485–486], later lines of Propertius' elegy give reason to doubt this interpretation (4, 2, 49–54):

Et tu, Roma, meis tribuisti praemia Tuscis  
 (unde hodie Vicus nomina Tuscus habet),  
 tempore quo sociis uenit Lycomedius armis  
 atque Sabina feri contudit arma Tati.  
 uidi ego labentes acies et tela caduca,  
 atque hostes turpi terga dedisse fugae.

“And you, Rome, rewarded my Etruscans (it is why this street is called Etruscan today),<sup>66</sup> when Lucumo's soldier<sup>67</sup> arrived with an allied army and defeated the Sabine

---

<sup>63</sup> The *Fasti Allifani*, *Fasti Vallenses*, and *Fasti Amiternini* indicate that the temple of Vertumnus stood on the Aventine Hill (CIL I<sup>2</sup> pp. 217, 240, 244).

<sup>64</sup> The *Fasti Vallenses* and *Fasti Amiternini* place this temple on the Aventine as well (CIL I<sup>2</sup> pp. 240, 245), but the former date the festival celebrated there to August 21, while the latter date it to December 12. Emil Aust explains this discrepancy by proposing that the temple originally dedicated by Papirius Cursor on August 21, the day of the *Consualia*, underwent a secondary dedication on December 12 during the reign of Augustus [Aust 1889: 14, 43]. This point of view finds support of G. Wissowa [Wissowa 1902: 167].

<sup>65</sup> A commander with this name is unknown. The manuscript reading is likely erroneous and refers to Lucius Papirius Cursor, the consul in 326, 320, 319, 315, and 313 BCE, or to his son, who shared the name Lucius Papirius Cursor and was consul in 293 and 272 BCE. The triumphs received by both of these men during the Samnite Wars are described by Livy (9, 40; 10, 46).

army of the fierce Tattius. I saw how the battle lines were shaken, how the weapons were dropped, and how the enemies shamefully fled.”

Here Vertumnus becomes an eyewitness of legendary events that took place shortly after the founding of Rome: the war between Romulus and the Sabine king Titus Tattius, who desired to take revenge for the abduction of the Sabine women by the Romans. As the elegy's subsequent lines show, Vertumnus not only accompanied the Etruscan army, which took the side of the Romans, but received veneration in Rome soon afterward (4, 2, 59-63):

Stipes acernus eram, properanti falce dolatus,  
ante Numam grata pauper in urbe deus.  
at tibi, Mamurri, formae caelator aenae,  
tellus artifices ne terat Osca manus,  
qui me tam dociles potuisti fundere in usus.

“Before Numa, I used to be a lump of maple wood, hastily carved with a sickle, a pauper god in a grateful city. Mamurrius,<sup>68</sup> the artificer of the bronze image, who was

<sup>66</sup> In one of his speeches against Verres, Cicero uses the statue of Vertumnus and Circus Maximus as reference points delimitating the full extent of Vicus Tuscus (2, 1, 154). Therefore, the god's image was situated near the Roman Forum, which lies next to the end of Vicus Tuscus, opposite from Circus Maximus [Putnam 1967: 177–179]. Livy adds that shops and Scipio Africanus' house were located near the statue (44, 16, 10).

<sup>67</sup> According to Servius, *lucumo* is the title of Etruscan kings (In Aen. 2, 278) rather than a name, which it is often thought to be by Roman (Liv. 1, 34) and Greek (Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 2, 37, 2; 3, 46, 5) authors. Servius is indirectly supported by Varro, who states that the Etruscan king who assisted Romulus was called *Caeles Vibenna* (*Ling.* 5, 46).

<sup>68</sup> Mamurius Veturius is a legendary coppersmith of Numa's times, who, according to Ovid, forged eleven copies of the shield that fell from heavens, which were entrusted to the college of Salii along with the original. As a reward for his work, the artisan wished for his name to be immortal, so the

able to cast me for such diverse use, may the Oscan soil never wear out your skillful hands.”<sup>69</sup>

Propertius dates the Roman cult of Vertumnus to the very beginning of the Roman monarchy: according to the poet, the Etruscan god received the first, wooden statue “before Numa,” that is, during the reign of Romulus. Under the next king, Numa Pompilius, it was replaced with a more luxurious statue made of bronze. If line 4 is interpreted as a reference to a performance of the ritual of evocation during the siege of Volsinii, an internal contradiction emerges in the elegy: Vertumnus is transferred to Rome, even though he has already been there for several centuries.

To resolve this contradiction, E. C. Marquis suggests that two cults of Vertumnus may have existed in Rome. The older one formed around the deity's statue on Vicus

---

words *mamuri veturi* were included in the hymn of the Salii (*Fast.* 3, 379-392). It appears that the story's historicity – assuming it was not invented by Ovid – was already doubted by ancient writers: Varro believes that the Salii's exclamation means *memoria vetus*, “memory of antiquity,” and makes no mention of the smith at all (*Ling.* 6, 49). Mamurius was associated with the festival of Mamuralia, which is dated to March 14 in the Calendar of Filokalus (CIL I<sup>2</sup> p. 260) and to March 15 by John Lydus (*Mens.* 4, 49). The festival is also mentioned in the *menologia rustica* (CIL I<sup>2</sup> p. 280). According to John Lydus, on this day, a man dressed in goatskin was struck with sticks and called Mamurius. Servius writes that to Mamurius was dedicated a day, when a skin was struck with sticks, but he does not mention that it was worn by a person (*In Aen.* 7, 188). In the opinion of Kurt Latte, John Lydus describes a late form of the festival [Latte 1960: 117]. Georges Dumézil [Dumézil 1951: 292] and Hendrik Versnel [Versnel 1993: 297] believe that Mamurius Veturius is “old Mars,” who is banished annually. Roger Woodard interprets his name as “furious [servant of] Mars” (connecting it to the root \*weh<sub>2</sub>t, from which the Latin word *vates*, “prophet”, and the name of the Scandinavian god Odin are derived) and theorizes that during the Mamuralia soldiers who had lost self-control and become a threat to their own society were symbolically expelled from it [Woodard 2013: 83].

<sup>69</sup> As noted by Chris Shea, these lines resemble an epitaph [Shea 1988: 71]. It is possible that the legendary biographies of Mamurius considered the Oscan land to be his final resting place.

Tuscan and served the Etruscan community of Rome. The more recent one had a public character and had as its centre the temple on the Aventine Hill, built in accordance with a vow made by Fulvius Flaccus, who had performed the ritual of evocation near Volsinii [Marquis 1974: 493–494].

The words of Varro, who briefly mentions the appearance of the altar of Vertumnus in Rome in his treatise *De Lingua Latina*, speak against this explanation (*Ling.* 5, 74):

Et arae Sabinum linguam olent, quae Tati regis uoto sunt Romae dedicatae: nam, ut annales dicunt, uouit Opi, Florae, Vedioi Saturnoque, Soli, Lunae, Volcano et Summano, itemque Larundae, Termino, Quirino, Vortumno, Laribus, Dianae Lucinaeque; e quis nonnulla nomina in utraque lingua habent radices, ut arbores quae in confinio natae in utroque agro serpunt: potest enim Saturnus hic de alia causa esse dictus atque in Sabinis, et sic Diana, de quibus supra dictum est.

“The flavor of the Sabine language is also felt in the Roman altars, dedicated to the gods because of a vow made by king Tattius: as stated in the annals, he made

vows to Ops, Flora, Vediovis<sup>70</sup> and Saturn, Sun, Moon, Vulcan and Summanus,<sup>71</sup> as well as Larunda,<sup>72</sup> Terminus, Quirinus, Vortumnus, the Lares, Diana and Lucina. Some of the names listed here have roots in both languages, much like trees growing on a boundary line, [which have roots that] spread out beneath both plots of land: it is possi-

---

<sup>70</sup> Vitruvius (4, 8, 4), Ovid (*Fast.* 3, 429–448), and Aulus Gellius (5, 12) mention the temple of Vediovis situated on the Capitoline Hill, between two groves. According to Ovid and Aulus Gellius, the god was depicted as a young man armed with arrows and accompanied by a she-goat. The name Vediovis is usually derived from Jupiter, but the meaning of the prefix Ve- varies, depending on the function attributed to this deity. Ovid believes that the prefix Ve- has a diminutive meaning, and that Vediovis is a young Jupiter, who is yet to master the lightning and defeat the titans. The she-goat is identified by the poet as Amalthea, Jupiter's nurturer. Festus (*Gloss. Lat.* 519L) follows the same etymology. Aulus Gellius thinks that the prefix Ve- expresses the function of inflicting harm and remarks that Vediovis is identified with Apollo. Georg Wissowa [Wissowa 1902: 190–191], making note of Vediovis' mention in the formula of *devotio*, believes that the prefix Ve- has a contrastive function and sees in Vediovis the deity of the underworld. He suggests that Dionysius of Halicarnassus has Vediovis in mind when he mentions that Romulus established a law, which permitted to kill anyone who betrayed their patron or client, and that such killings were regarded as tribute to the “underground Zeus” (*Ant. Rom.* 2, 10, 3). Kurt Latte believes that the iconography of Vediovis is unsuitable for the ruler of the underworld, and that the prefix Ve- expresses inadequacy: Vediovis is a Jupiter who bring about weather found undesirable by farmers [Latte 1960: 81–83]. According to Arthur Frothingham's suggestion, Vediovis is the god of volcanic activity who controlled the “underground lightning.” [Frothingham 1917: 372–373].

<sup>71</sup> Pliny the Elder (*HN* 2, 138), Festus (*Gloss. Lat.* 254 L), and Augustine (*De civ. D.* 4, 23) call Summanus the god of nocturnal thunderstorms. This is supported by the *Acta Arvalia*, which mention that black rams were sacrificed to Summanus [Henzen 1874: 146], as well as by Cicero, who reports that a clay statue of this god was placed on the roof of Jupiter's temple (*Div.* 1, 16).

<sup>72</sup> Georges Dumézil identifies Larunda with Acca Larentia [Dumézil 1974: 279–280]. As told by Plutarch, there were two competing legendary traditions associated with the name of Larentia: according to one, she was the wife of the shepherd Faustulus who found the infant Romulus and Re-



ble that Saturn is called that both here and by the Sabineans for different reasons, and that the same is true of Diana – they were discussed above.”<sup>73</sup>

In this passage, the Roman cult of Vertumnus is presented as founded by the same Titus Tatius, the retreat of whose troops the god observes at the end of Propertius’s elegy. By attributing the foundation of the Etruscan deity’s cult to the Sabine king, who, according to legend, became Romulus’ co-ruler after the Romans and the Sabines had reconciled, and who had nothing to do with the Etruscan community, the Roman tradition suggests that the cult of Vertumnus associated with the statue on *Vicus Tuscus* had a public rather than a private character.

It remains to be explained why Volsinii is mentioned by Propertius as Vertumnus’ place of origin, and how Fulvius Flaccus distinguished himself before the deity to earn the honor of being depicted in his temple, if he is not the one who brought the worship of Vertumnus to Rome. A possible answer to both of these questions is that Volsinii may have been the site of *fanum Voltumnae*, “shrine of Voltumna,” frequently mentioned by Livy as an important temple used as a meeting place by representatives of Etruscan cities (4, 23, 5; 4, 25, 7; 4, 61, 2; 5, 17, 6; 6, 2, 2).

This shrine is placed near Volsinii by Simonetta Stopponi, conducting excavations at Campo della Fiera to the west of modern Orvieto.<sup>74</sup> The fragments of Attic

---

mus, while in the other, she appears as a courtesan who was visited by Hercules in his temple, married a prosperous old man on his advice, and bequeathed much of his wealth to the Roman people (*Rom.* 4–5).

<sup>73</sup> Varro derives Saturn’s name from the noun *satus*, “sowing” (5, 64). The name Diana, in his opinion, stems from the form Diviana, which he appears to interpret as a combination of the disjunctive prefix *dis-* and the noun *via*, “way.” The moon’s movement across the sky, he explains, has both a horizontal and a vertical dimension (5, 68).

<sup>74</sup> In the opinion of Elfriede Paschinger, the name is derived from the words *urbs vetus*, “the old city,” – that is, Volsinii Veteres – while the name of Volsinii Novi was inherited by modern Bolsena [Paschinger 1986: 59].

vases and votive clay statuettes discovered there allow to date the origin of this religious centre to the beginning of the 6th century BCE, with the century's second half marking the beginning of the shrine's heyday. The sanctuary fell into temporary decline due to the destruction and looting that accompanied the Roman conquest of Volsinii (illustrated, for example, by vacant statue pedestals showing signs of force being applied to them), but a restoration soon followed, evidenced both by the reconstruction of the old structures (the so-called temple A and its surrounding wall) and the emergence of new ones (a treasury for votive offerings) [Stopponi, Leone 2017: 478–481]. Among others, the placement of fanum Voltumnae in Volsinii is supported by Lammert Bouke van der Meer [van der Meer 2013: 105], Ingrid Edlund-Berry [Edlund-Berry 2013: 561], and Claudio Bizzarri [Bizzarri 2016: 117].

The removal of a large number of statues from Volsinii is mentioned by Pliny the Elder, who cites Metrodorus of Scepsis (*HN* 34, 34):

Signa quoque Tuscanica per terras dispersa, quae quin in Etruria factitata sint non est dubium. deorum tantum putarem ea fuisse, ni Metrodorus Scepsius cui cognomen a Romani nominis odio inditum est propter MM statuarum Volsinios expugnatos obiceret.

“Tuscan statues, too, are scattered across the world and were undoubtedly made in Etruria. I would think that only statues of the gods were among their number, were it not for Metrodorus of Scepsius,<sup>75</sup> who was given a nickname for his contempt for the Roman people, and who made the accusation that Volsinii had been conquered for the sake of 2,000 statues.”

---

<sup>75</sup> According to Strabo, Metrodorus was a philosopher, who was particularly learned in rhetoric and managed to win the favor of the king Mithridates VI Eupator and become a judge in Pontus (13, 1, 55). Ovid mentions a native of Scepsius who hated the Roman mores. He does not give his name, but does use judicial vocabulary (*Pont.* 4, 14, 37–40).

Likewise noteworthy is the Hispellum rescript (CIL XI, 5265), a decree of the emperor Constantine, which freed the inhabitants of this Umbrian city from the obligation to send a priest to Volsinii every two years to conduct theatrical performances and gladiatorial fights:

Cum igitur ita uos Tusciae adsereretis esse coniunctos, ut instituto consuetudinis priscae per singulas annorum uices a uobis [a]dque praedictis sacerdotes creentur, qui aput Vulsinius Tusciae ciuitate(m) ludos sc<h>enicos et gladiatorum munus exhibeant, sed propter ardua montium et difficultates itinerum saltuosa(s) inpendio posceritis, ut indulto remedio sacerdoti uestro ob editiones celebrandas Vulsinius pergere necesse non esset, scilicet ut ciuitati, cui nunc Hispellum nomen est quamque Flaminiae uiae confinem adque continuam esse memoratis, de nostro cognomine nomen daremus, in qua templum Flauiae gentis opere magnifico nimirum pro amplitudine<m> nuncupationis exurgere[t] ibidemque <h>is sacerdos, quem anniversaria uice Vmbria dedisset, spectaculum tam scenicorum ludorum, quam gladiatorii muneris exhibere[t], manente per Tuscia(m) ea consuetudine, ut indidem creatus sacerdos aput Vulsinius, ut solebat, editionum antedictarum spectacula frequentare[t], pr<a>ecationi <h>ac desiderio uestro facilis accessit noster adsensus.

“Now, since you have made the claim that you had been bound to Tuscia in that, in accordance with an order established by the established custom, you and the aforementioned [Tuscans], alternating every year, appoint priests to organize stage performances and gladiatorial games in the Tuscan city of Volsinii, but due to the mountain steeps and the difficulty of crossing the wooded slopes you request that your priest would be made exempt from the obligation to come to Volsinii to conduct these performances, that is, that to the city, which is now called Hispellum and, as you mention, borders and adjoins the Flaminian Way, we would grant a name derived from our own,<sup>76</sup>

<sup>76</sup> As the rescript specifies further, the city is given the name Flavia Constans.

so that a magnificent temple of the *gens Flavia* would be constructed there, fully reflecting the majesty of the name, and that the priest, whom Umbria previously appointed in yearly intervals, would conduct there the spectacles, including both theatrical performances and gladiatorial games, while in Tuscia it would remain the custom that the priest appointed there would continue to organize the spectacles consisting of the aforementioned performances in Vulsinii, as it was the case. To your petition and appeal we grant our willing assent.”

However, as noted by Noel Lenski [Lenski 2016: 120–122], it would be hasty to conclude that the inhabitants of Umbria participated in ancient Etruscan festivals which dated back to the times that preceded the Roman conquest: the words *consuetudo prisca*, which in a different context would likely be translated as “ancient custom,” in legal language denote the state of affairs that was in force before proposed changes, and which may also be recent. Therefore, it is more likely that the festival mentioned in the inscription was established after Tuscia and Umbria had been unified into one administrative unit, the earliest evidence of which dates to the fourth century CE, like the inscription. Nevertheless, N. Lenski agrees that the *fanum Voltumnae* was located in Volsinii and suggests that the rich religious history of the place was one reason why it was used for the official festival of the newly united province.

Therefore, Propertius’ elegy 4, 2 does not qualify as evidence alluding to the ritual of evocation: it dates the adoption of the state cult of Vertumnus to the age of Romulus and only mentions Volsinii because an important sanctuary of this deity was probably located there, while Marcus Fulvius Flaccus may have earned the honor of being depicted in the Aventine temple of Vertumnus because he enriched the cult of this god, which was already active at the time, with temple treasures obtained during the sacking of Volsinii and the nearby *fanum Voltumnae*, rather than because he was the one to bring the veneration of the deity to Rome.

## CHAPTER 6

### CARTHAGE

As Macrobius quotes the formulas spoken during the rituals of *evocatio* and *devotio*, which Scipio Aemilianus allegedly performed during the siege of Carthage that ended the Third Punic War, he cites the following source (*Sat.* 3, 9, 6):

Nam repperi in libro quinto Rerum reconditarum Sammonici Sereni utrumque carmen, quod ille se in cuiusdam Furii uetustissimo libro repperisse professus est.

“I discovered both formulas in the fifth book of *Res Reconditae* by Sammonicus Serenus, who claimed that he had found them in a very old book by a certain Furius.”

However, literary accounts of the siege of Carthage, preserved in extant works of ancient historians, do not mention that Tanit,<sup>77</sup> the city's patron goddess, known to the Romans as *Iuno Caelestis*, “Heavenly Juno,” was invited to Rome by Scipio. Most noteworthy is the silence of Appian, whose description of the city's capture concerns itself with the relationship between Roman soldiers and the gods on multiple occasions. First, he describes the looting of the temple of Apollo<sup>78</sup> (*Pun.* 127):

---

<sup>77</sup> As pointed out by Dexter Hoyos, among others, Tanit could originally be a subordinate of another Semitic goddess, such as Astarte or Anat, or her aspect. In epigraphic monuments of Carthage, she is usually named together with Baal, with Tanit's name coming first in these cases [Hoyos 2010: 95].

<sup>78</sup> In the opinion of Eve MacDonald, the Greeks and the Romans used Apollo's name to refer to Reshep or Eshmun [MacDonald 2015: 17, 295]. Reshep was the god of the underworld and disease, revered in Palestine, Syria, Cilicia, Egypt and North Africa [Day 2002: 197–199]. Eshmun, a deity of healing, death, and rebirth, was the patron of Sidon [Clifford 1990: 57–58].

Ἀρχομένης δὲ τῆς ἡμέρας ἐτέρους ἀκμῆτας ἐκάλει τετρακισχιλίους, οἱ ἐσιόντες ἱερὸν Ἀπόλλωνος, οὗ τό τε ἄγαλμα κατάχρυσον ἦν καὶ δῶμα αὐτῷ χρυσήλατον ἀπὸ χιλίων ταλάντων σταθμοῦ περιέκειτο, ἐσύλων καὶ ταῖς μαχαίραις ἔκοπτον, ἀμελήσαντες τῶν ἐφεστώτων, ἕως ἐμερίσαντο καὶ ἐπὶ τὸ ἔργον ἐτράποντο.

“When the day began, [Scipio] called for four thousand more fresh soldiers. Entering the temple of Apollo, where a gilded image stood in a golden shrine weighing a thousand talents, they began to pluck and cut off the gold with their swords, ignoring their officers until they divided the loot and returned to their duties.”<sup>79</sup>

Appian further describes how Scipio punished the guilty soldiers, returned to the Sicilians the sacred offerings stolen from them by the Carthaginians, and dedicated weapons and military equipment to Mars and Minerva (*Pun.* 133):

Σκιπίων δ', ἐπεὶ κατέσκαπτο Καρχηδών, ἐπὶ μὲν τινα ἡμερῶν ἀριθμὸν ἐπέτρεψεν τῇ στρατιᾷ διαρπάζειν, ὅσα μὴ χρυσὸς ἢ ἄργυρος ἢ ἀναθήματα ἦν, μετὰ δὲ τοῦτ' ἀριστεῖα πολλὰ διαδοῦς ἅπασι, χωρὶς τῶν ἐς τὸ Ἀπολλώνιον ἀμαρτόντων, ναῦν μὲν ὀξυτάτην κοσμήσας λαφύροις ἄγγελον τῆς νίκης ἔστειλεν ἐς Ῥώμην, ἐς δὲ Σικελίαν περιέπεμπε, ὅσα Καρχηδόνιοι σφῶν ἀναθήματα κοινὰ πολεμοῦντες ἔλαβον, ἐλθόντας ἐπιγινώσκειν καὶ κομίζεσθαι· ὃ καὶ μάλιστα αὐτὸν ἐδημαγώγησεν ὡς μετὰ τοῦ δυνατοῦ φιλάνθρωπον. ἀποδόμενος δὲ τὴν λείαν τὴν περισσὴν ὄπλα καὶ μηχανήματα καὶ ναῦς ἀχρήστους Ἄρει καὶ Ἀθηνᾶ διαζωσάμενος αὐτὸς ἔκαιεν κατὰ τὰ πάτρια.

<sup>79</sup> Valerius Maximus reports that the severed hands of the blasphemer, who removed the golden robes from Apollo's statue during the sacking of Carthage, were found near its broken pieces (1, 1, 18). Plutarch mentions that a statue of Apollo was brought from Carthage to Rome and placed near the Circus (*Flam.* 1) - it is not quite clear whether he speaks of the same statue as Valerius Maximus.

“After Carthage had been destroyed, Scipio gave the army several days to plunder any belongings except for gold, silver, and sacrificial offerings. Follow this, he distributed many awards among everyone, excluding those who committed sacrilege in the temple of Apollo. He furnished the fastest possible ship with loot and sent it as a herald of victory to Rome. He also sent [a messenger] to Sicily, so that [its inhabitants] would come to identify and take back all the public sacred offerings that the Carthaginians stole from them during the wars. By doing this, he greatly endeared himself to the people as a person distinguished by kindness in addition to power. Having sold the abundant loot, he, following the custom of his fathers, girded himself, personally set unneeded armaments, engines, and ships on fire for the glory of Ares and Athena.”

Therefore, Appian paints Scipio as a follower of ancient traditions and a defender of temples – Carthaginian and Sicilian, as well as Roman. Yet he does not find it necessary to mention that the commander showed respect to the supreme goddess of his enemies by promising her opulent veneration in Rome.

Scholars of the late 19th and the early 20th centuries, among whom can be named Alfred von Domaszewski [von Domaszewski 1895: 74] and Georg Wissowa [Wissowa 1902: 312–313], assign the emergence of an official cult of Iuno Caelestis in Rome to the era of emperor Septimius Severus and his sons Caracalla and Geta, as there are several inscriptions dating from this period, which potentially provide the earliest evidence of the existence of such a cult.

The first of these inscriptions is written on a panel found in the Roman fort Carvoran near Hadrian's Wall (CIL VII, 759):

Imminet Leoni Virgo caeles|ti situ  
 spicifera iusti in|uentrix urbium conditrix |  
 ex quis muneribus nosse con|tigit deos:  
 ergo eadem mater diuum | Pax Virtus Ceres

dea Syria | lance uitam et iura pensitans.  
 in caelo uisum Syria sidus edi|dit  
 Libyae colendum: inde | cuncti didicimus. |  
 ita intellexit numine inductus | tuo  
 Marcus Caecilius Do|natianus militans  
 tribunus | in praefecto dono principis.

“In the firmament, above the Lion hangs the Virgin, the bearer of wheat, the law-giver, the founder of cities – these gifts made it possible to know the gods. Therefore, she is the mother of the gods, Peace, Virtue, Ceres, the Syrian goddess, who balances life and law on her scales. Syria produced this star, visible in the sky, so that Libya would venerate her. From there, all of us learned of her. Guided by your divine will, Marcus Caecilius Donatianus, a tribune, who by the emperor's grace serves as a prefect, has grasped this.”

As suggested by Thomas Hodgkin, under the guise of the celestial goddess this inscription presents Julia Domna, wife of Septimius Severus [Hodgkin 1899: 291–292]. A. von Domaszewski supports this point of view, believing that the text of the inscription was a prayer, spoken before a statue of the empress depicted as the goddess [von Domaszewski 1909: 148–149].

This reading is criticized by Ilsemarie Mundle, who notes that the inscription never suggests that the goddess should be identified with any mortal woman. In her opinion, the tribune addresses the goddess as a private person, not as an officer representing his subordinates: he does not name the unit to which he belongs and praises the goddess for facilitating his personal career, so the inscription cannot be taken as evidence that the state-sponsored cult of Iuno Caelestis required to identify the goddess with Julia Domna, or that such a cult already existed at the time it was written [Mundle 1961: 229–230].



A different inscription, carved on a stone found in Mainz and likely originating from a Roman military camp, was restored by Karl Zangemeister (Zangemeister 1892: 296–297) and directly identifies Julia Domna and *Dea Caelestis* (CIL XIII, 6671):

[Iuliae Augustae] Caelesti deae | [matri imperator]is Caesaris | [M. Aureli Anton]ini Pii Felicis | [Augusti Parth]ici maximi | Britannici maxi]mi Germanici | [maximi itemqu]e senatus patri|[ae et castror]um in honorem | [legionis XXII A]ntoninianae pr(imigeniae) | [p(iae) f(idelis)...]us Quirina AN | [...]ANA | [...]

“To Julia Augusta, the Heavenly Goddess, mother of emperor Caesar Marcus Aurelius Antoninus, the Pious, the Fortunate, the August, the Parthian Maximus, the British Maximus, the German Maximus, as well as [mother] of the Senate, the Fatherland, and the military camps, in honor of [Fortuna] Primigenia's 22nd Legion of the Antonines, pious and faithful... Quirina...”

The significance of this discovery is likewise questioned by I. Mundle, who believes that such identification did not necessarily have the support of the empress herself and possibly reflects personal religious views of the inscription's author rather than beliefs endorsed by a state cult [Mundle 1961: 231–233].

There is numismatic evidence potentially indicating that there was an official Roman cult of the Carthaginian goddess. Extant coins depict Septimius Severus or Caracalla on the front side and *Iuno Caelestis*, riding a lion and holding a lightning bolt (or a tympanum) and a sceptre (or a branch), on the back. Beneath her, water can be seen pouring from a rock. The words *Indulgentia Augg. in Carth.* are inscribed on the coins (RIC IV, I, p. 116, №193; p. 125, №266–267; p. 194, №759–760; p. 195, №763–763A, №766–766A; p. 231, №130(a, b); p. 232, №131(a, b); p. 279, №415(a, b, c, d); p. 280, №418A; p. 289, №471).

However, as suggested by I. Mundle [Mundle 1961: 233–235], it is possible that the goddess appears on such coins only as an anthropomorphic representation of Carthage and that they were produced to commemorate the city receiving a legal status equal with that of Italic cities – an event mentioned in the *Digesta* (50, 15, 8, 11):

In Africa Carthago, Utica, Leptis magna a diuis Seuero et Antonino iuris Italici factae sunt.

“In Africa, the *ius Italicum* was extended to Carthage, Utica, and Leptis Magna by the divine Severus and Antoninus.”

I. Mundle proposes to date the adoption of the cult of *Iuno Caelestis* to the reign of Elagabalus (Mundle 1961: 235-237). Herodian describes this emperor's decision to bring to Rome a statue of the goddess, previously located in Carthage, in order to wed her to his own divine patron (5, 6, 3–5):

Ἐπαιξε δὲ γάμους οὐ μόνον ἀνθρωπέους, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῷ θεῷ, ᾧ ἱεράτευε, γυναῖκα ἐζήτει· καὶ τῆς τε Παλλάδος τὸ ἄγαλμα, ὃ κρυπτόν καὶ ἀόρατον σέβουσι Ῥωμαῖοι, ἐς τὸν ἑαυτοῦ θάλαμον μετήγαγε· καὶ μὴ κινήθην ἐξ οὐπερ ἦλθεν ἀπὸ Ἰλίου, εἰ μὴ ὅτε πυρὶ κατεφλέχθη ὁ νεῶς, ἐκίνησεν οὗτος, καὶ πρὸς γάμον δὴ ἐς τὴν βασιλείον αὐλὴν τῷ θεῷ ἀνήγαγε. φήσας δὲ ἀπαρέσκεσθαι αὐτὸν ὡς πάντα ἐν ὅπλοις καὶ πολεμικῇ θεῷ, τῆς Οὐρανίας τὸ ἄγαλμα μετεπέμψατο, σεβόντων αὐτὸ ὑπερφυῶς Καρχηδονίων τε καὶ τῶν κατὰ τὴν Λιβύην ἀνθρώπων. φασὶ δὲ αὐτὸ Διδῶ τὴν Φοίνισσαν ιδρύσασθαι, ὅτε δὴ τὴν ἀρχαίαν Καρχηδόνα πόλιν ἔκτισε, βύρσαν κατατεμοῦσα. Λίβυες μὲν οὖν αὐτὴν Οὐρανίαν καλοῦσι, Φοίνικες δὲ Ἀστροάρχην ὀνομάζουσι, σελήνην εἶναι θέλοντες. ἀρμόζειν τοίνυν λέγων ὁ Ἀντωνῖνος γάμον ἡλίου καὶ σελήνης τὸ τε ἄγαλμα μετεπέμψατο καὶ πάντα τὸν ἐκεῖθεν χρυσόν, χρήματά τε πάμπλειστα τῇ θεῷ ἐς προῖκα δὴ ἐπιδοῦναι ἐκέλευσε. κομισθέν τε τὸ ἄγαλμα συνώκισε δὴ τῷ θεῷ, κελεύσας πάντας

τοὺς κατὰ Ῥώμην καὶ Ἰταλίαν ἀνθρώπους ἐορτάζειν παντοδαπαῖς τε εὐφροσύναις καὶ εὐωχίαις χρῆσθαι δημοσίᾳ τε καὶ ἰδίᾳ ὡς δὴ γαμούντων θεῶν.

“He not only toyed with human marriage, but began to search for a wife for the god he served. He moved to his chambers the image of Pallas, which the Romans venerate in secret, out of sight. Although it was not moved since it had been brought from Ilium, except for the time when the temple was consumed by fire, he moved it and brought it to the imperial palace to be wed to his god. Yet he claimed that the deity was dissatisfied with the fully armored, warlike goddess and sent for the image of Urania, which commanded particular reverence among the Carthaginians and the inhabitants of Libya. It is said to have been set up by Dido the Phoenician when she founded old Carthage by cutting a pelt.<sup>80</sup> The Libyans call this goddess Urania, while the Phoenicians name her Astroarche, identifying her with the moon. As for Antoninus, he proclaimed that he was arranging a marriage between the sun and the moon, sent both for this image and for all the gold that was there and ordered to grant the goddess a vast sum of money as dowry. Once the image arrived, he wedded it to his god, commanding all the inhabitants of Rome and Italy to make merry and indulge in all sorts of festivities and feasts, public and private alike because gods were celebrating their marriage.”

I. Mundle's opinion is shared by other scholars, among which Francesca Ghedini [Ghedini 1984: 144–145] and Achim Lichtenberger [Lichtenberger 2011: 104–107] can be named. While rejecting any connection between *Iuno Caelestis* and Julia Domna in the Carvoran inscription appears to be fully justified, dating the adoption of the goddess' cult to the reign of Elagabalus conflicts with Macrobius' mention of Serenus Sammonicus, cited as the source of the evocation formula, allegedly used during the siege of

---

<sup>80</sup> According to legend, Dido bought as much land as a bull's pelt could cover. She cut the pelt into flaps, which she used to surround a plot of land much larger than the surface area of an undamaged pelt (Verg. *Aen.* 1, 365–368).

Carthage, as the latter scholar did not live to see Elagabalus take power: Caracalla's biography mentions Serenus among Geta's sympathizers killed on the emperor's orders (SHA *Ant. Car.* 4, 3–4):

Iisdem diebus occisi sunt innumeri, qui fratris eius partibus fauerant. occisi etiam liberti, qui Getae administrauerant. caedes deinde in omnibus locis. et in balneis factae caedes, occisique nonnulli etiam cenantes, inter quos etiam Sammonicus Serenus, cuius libri plurimi ad doctrinam exstant.

“In these same days, countless people who favored his brother's faction were killed. Among them were even the freedmen who managed Geta's affairs. The bloodshed then became omnipresent. It even spread to the baths, and many were killed as they were dining, among which was Sammonicus Serenus, who left behind numerous learned books.”

An official cult of *Iuno Caelestis* could not have appeared in Rome later than the time of Serenus' life: even if the idea that the cult Carthage's supreme deity was brought to Rome by Scipio is an aetiological legend, a legend like this could not emerge without such a cult already existing there. Therefore, Elagabalus did not adopt a cult entirely new to Rome, but only brought over a specific statue that had caught his attention because of the legends associated with it.

While Macrobius writes that Serenus named “a very old book by a certain Furius” as the formula's source, G. Wissowa suspects it of being Serenus' own fabrication due to the lack of evidence supporting the existence of a public cult of *Iuno Caelestis* in the centuries between the fall of Carthage and the reign of Septimius Severus [Wissowa 1907: 1153].

John Kloppenborg [Kloppenborg 2005: 435] finds such evidence in Horace's ode addressed to Asinius Pollio, who wrote a lost history of the civil wars (2, 1, 25–28):

Juno et deorum quisquis amicior  
 Afris inulta cesserat impotens  
 tellure victorum nepotes  
 rettulit inferias Iugurthae.

“Juno and every deity, who, despite favoring the Africans, had left, powerless to avenge the land, [now] sacrificed the grandchildren of the victors at Jugurtha's wake.”

However, this verse, despite its short length, contradicts the usual descriptions of the ritual of evocation in several ways. First, Juno is accompanied by other gods as leaves Africa, while the testimonies of the ritual state that the Romans used it to appeal specifically to the tutelary deity of a city. Second, rather than any assurances on the part of the Romans, the gods' own weakness is named as the reason for their departure. Third, the sympathies of the deities remain inconstant even after they leave: following the successes of the Punic and Jugurthine wars, Africa becomes the theatre for several battles between the supporters of Caesar and Pompey, Rome only stands to lose from. As noted by, for example, John Henderson, Quintus Caecilius Metellus, who fought at the Battle of Thapsus on the side of the optimates together with the Numidian king Juba I, was the grandson of Metellus Numidicus, who received his *cognomen* for his part in the Jugurthine War [Henderson 1996: 105–106]. Therefore, it is more likely that Horace, instead of hinting at the ritual of evocation, uses Juno as an embodiment of the inconstancy of military fortune.

It is worth noting that Macrobius was unable to determine what book Serenus spoke of: referring to his own source, he gives the author's *cognomina*, the title of the work, and the book number, but when he describes Serenus' source, he can only provide the author's *nomen* and vaguely assess the book's age. It appears that Serenus, whom this limited information must go back to, chose to mention only such details that would

inspire trust in his source (by appealing to the authority of an ancient family name and of antiquity itself), but would not allow his readers to find this source for themselves.

In the opinion of Elizabeth Rawson [Rawson 1973: 163–170], the original source of the two formulas could have been Lucius Furius Philus, consul in 136 BCE, who belonged to Scipio's circle and, possibly, the college of pontiffs: Livy mentions that a pontiff named Lucius Furius Philus perished in the Third Macedonian War (43, 11, 13), and Furius, a friend of Scipio Aemilianus, could have been his son who inherited his position in the priestly college. Scipio and Furius could have developed an interest in the ritual of evocation because of familial legends: Camillus, the conqueror of Veii, belonged to the *gens Furia*, and, Livy reports, had Publius Cornelius Scipio as his *magister equitum* (5, 19, 2). This identification is made difficult by the absence of other evidence that would, independently of Serenus, show that the adoption of the cult of the Carthaginian goddess really did take place shortly after the capture of the city: Lucius Furius Philus hardly would have written that Scipio Aemilianus had vowed to establish temples and festivals in the honor of *Iuno Caelestis* had the goddess not received them from Scipio, because this contradiction would have been obvious to his contemporaries. The identification of the Furius mentioned by Serenus with Lucius Furius Philus is considered baseless by Jerzy Linderski [Linderski 1985: 234].

At the same time, it is not only the circumstances of his death that connect Serenus Sammonicus to the family of emperor Septimius Severus. *Historia Augusta's* life of Geta reports that some books written by the scholar were addressed to Caracalla (SHA *Ant. Geta* 5, 6):

Sereni Sammonici libros familiarissimos habuit, quos ille ad Antoninum scripsit.

“He was very familiar with the books of Sammonicus Serenus, which he wrote for Antoninus.”

A passage from Sammonicus supports this, cited by the same Macrobius and addressed to *sanctissimi Augusti* (*Sat.* 3, 17, 4):

De hac lege Sammonicus Serenus ita refert: lex Fannia, sanctissimi Augusti, ingenti omnium ordinum consensu peruenit ad populum, neque eam praetores aut tribuni ut plerasque alias, sed ex omnium bonorum consilio et sententia ipsi consules pertulerunt, cum res publica ex luxuria conuiuiorum maiora quam credi potest detrimenta pateretur. siquidem eo res redierat, ut gula inlecti plerique ingenui pueri pudicitiam et libertatem suam uenditarent, plerique ex plebe Romana uino madidi in comitium uenirent et ebrii de rei publicae salute consulerent.

“This is what Sammonicus Serenus has to report on this law: “The *Lex Fannia*, most sacred Augustus, was presented before the people with the full consensus of every estate: it was not introduced by the praetors or tribunes, unlike most others, but by the consuls themselves, guided by the council and opinion of all decent people, because the luxury of feasts was more harmful to the state than could be believed. It reached the point that many young noblemen, corrupted by gluttony, bargained with their own chastity and freedom, and many Roman commoners came to the public assemblies drunk with wine and in this condition deliberated on the state’s well-being.””

Therefore, Serenus really did write edifying works for the emperor's sons, in which the history of Roman laws was intertwined with condemnation of vice. Because of this, Edward Champlin suggests that Serenus was the teacher of Caracalla and Gaeta, reinforcing this point of view by adducing the biography of the Gordians, according to which Serenus Sammonicus' son was the teacher of Gordian II (*SHA Gord. Tres* 18, 2). According to E. Champlin, the younger Serenus is a fictitious character, whom the real occupation of the historical Serenus – that is, the position of a court teacher – was ascribed to [Champlin 1981: 190–191].

As for Septimius Severus, he was born in the Phoenician city of Leptis Magna, situated in the province of Africa (SHA *Sev.* 1, 1). He could have wished to spread the veneration of the patron goddess of his native province's capital city, but simultaneously been wary that such an action, were it done by an emperor who came from Africa himself, would be seen as his personal sympathies influencing the state cult in an inappropriate way and cause resentment. As the aversion to the religious changes introduced by Elagabalus, who ruled only a decade after Septimius Severus, would demonstrate, such weariness would have been entirely justified. To avoid a backlash, the emperor could have presented the cult that he himself brought to Rome not as a new adoption, but as a revival of an older cult, which supposedly had been adopted by Scipio Aemilianus, the conqueror of Carthage, revered as a national hero, but for some reason had fallen into decline, and Serenus Sammonicus, a scholar close to the court, could have been used for this purpose. This would explain why both the earliest signs of recognition of the cult of *Iuno Caelestis* by the Roman state and the formula, which implies that this adoption occurred centuries earlier yet is not supported by any evidence independent of Serenus, belong to the era of Septimius Severus.

A hypothesis proposed by Vsevolod Basanoff should also be considered here. He believes that in addition to the *evocatio* ritual there was a ritual named *exoratio*, used by the Romans to secure the support of foreign deities without inviting them to their city [Basanoff 1947: 63–65]. This supposition is based on a passage from Servius (Serv. *In Aen.* 12, 841):

Sed constat bello Punico secundo exoratum Iunonem, tertio vero bello a Scipione sacris quibusdam etiam Romam esse translata.

“It is likewise known that Juno was mollified (*exorata*) in the Second Punic War, while in the Third, she was brought by Scipio to Rome with certain sacred rites.”



As it was argued in Chapter 2, Servius' belief that the veneration of *Iuno Caelestis* was brought to Rome by Scipio Aemilianus is likely the result of Serenus Samonicus' influence, as he quotes a fragment of the formula that can be traced back to Serenus in his commentary on the second book of the *Aeneid* (*In Aen.* 2, 244) and mentions the scholar explicitly in his commentary on the *Georgics* (*In G.* 1, 30; 1, 102). As for the first half of Servius' claim, it likely refers to the composite Juno, an amalgamation of all regional aspects of the goddess, rather than the Carthaginian *Iuno Caelestis* specifically. In the books describing the events of the Second Punic War, Livy repeatedly mentions that various ill omens were observed across the Italic temples of Juno, particularly in the temple of *Iuno Sospita* located in Lanuvium. First, the goddess' temple is defiled by the appearance of a bird (21, 62, 4):

Et Lanuui hostiam se commouisse et coruum in aedem Iunonis deuolasse atque in ipso puluinari consedissee...

“In Lanuvium, a sacrificial animal moved on its own, and a raven flew into Juno's sanctuary and perched on the goddess' very bed...”

Lavish offerings are made to appease the goddess (21, 62, 8):

Et donum ex auri pondo quadraginta Lanuuium Iunoni portatum est, et signum aeneum matronae Iunoni in Auentino dedicauerunt...

“A golden offering weighing forty pounds was brought to Lanuvium for Juno, while the matrons dedicated a bronze image to Juno on the Aventine Hill...”

Yet the ill omens only grow more miraculous (23, 31, 15):

Signa Lanuuii ad Iunonis Sospitae cruore manauere, lapidibusque circa id templum pluit. Ob quem imbrem nouemdiale, ut adsolet, sacrum fuit, ceteraque prodigia cum cura expiata.

“In Lanuvium, the statues in the sanctuary of *Iuno Sospita* bled, and a hail of stone occurred in this temple's vicinity. In response, as is customary, a sacred ceremony lasting nine days was held, and other omens were diligently expiated.”

Afterward, ravens return to the temple (24, 10, 6):

Lanuui in aede intus Sospitae Iunonis coruos nidum fecisse...

“In Lanuvium, ravens made a nest in *Iuno Sospita*'s sanctuary...”

To address the sequence of omens, to which this one belonged, the Roman turn to the haruspices (24, 10, 13):

Haec prodigia hostiis maioribus procurata sunt ex haruspicum responso, et supplicatio omnibus deis quorum puluinaria Romae essent indicta est.

“On the council given by the haruspices, these omens were expiated with the sacrifice of grown animals, and a command was given for all the gods who had lectisternia in Rome to be appeased.”

Further propitiatory sacrifices are made when lightning strikes the temple of *Iuno Regina* (27, 37, 7–15):

Decreuere item pontifices ut uirgines ter nouenae per urbem euntes carmen canerent. id cum in Iouis Statoris aede discerent conditum ab Liuio poeta carmen, tacta de caelo aedis in Auentino Iunonis Reginae; prodigiumque id ad matronas pertinere haruspices cum respondissent donoque diuam placandam esse, aedilium curulium edicto in Capitolium conuocatae quibus in urbe Romana intraque decimum lapidem ab urbe domicilia essent, ipsae inter se quinque et uiginti delegerunt ad quas ex dotibus stipem conferrent. inde donum peluis aurea facta lataque in Auentinum, pureque et caste a matronis sacrificatum. confestim ad aliud sacrificium eidem diuae ab decemuiris edicta dies, cuius ordo talis fuit. ab aede Apollinis boues feminae albae duae porta Carmentali in urbem ductae; post eas duo signa cupressea Iunonis Reginae portabantur; tum septem et uiginti uirgines, longam indutae uestem, carmen in Iunonem Reginam canentes ibant, illa tempestate forsitan laudabile rudibus ingeniis, nunc abhorrens et inconditum si referatur. uirginum ordinem sequebantur decemuiro coronati laurea praetextatique. a porta Iugario uico in forum uenere. in foro pompa constitit et per manus reste data uirgines sonum uocis pulsu pedum modulantes incesserunt. inde uico Tusco Velabroque per Bouarium forum in clium Publicium atque aedem Iunonis Reginae perrectum. ibi duae hostiae ab decemuiris immolatae et simulacra cupressea in aedem inlata.

“The pontiffs decreed that maidens, split into three groups of nine, should sing a hymn as they passed through the city. As they were memorizing this hymn, composed by the poet Livy,<sup>81</sup> in the sanctuary of *Iuppiter Stator*, a bolt from heaven struck at the sanctuary of *Iuno Regina* on the Aventine. After the haruspices had concluded that the omen had to do with the matrons, and that the goddess had to be mollified with gifts, the curule aediles commanded for the women who lived in Rome or within ten miles

---

<sup>81</sup> That is, by Livius Andronicus. As a reward for composing this hymn, Roman writers and actors were granted the right to hold assemblies in the temple of Minerva on the Aventine Hill (Festus Gloss. Lat. 446–448 L), which was later rebuilt in the reign of the emperor Augustus (see pp. 141–143).

around it to be summoned to the Capitolium, where they chose from among themselves twenty five, and offerings were taken from their dowries. Having produced an offering – a golden basin – and brought it to the Aventine, the matrons then dedicated it in a pure and chaste manner. The decemvirs at once appointed a day for another sacrifice to the same goddess, which unfolded in the following way. Two white cows were led from the sanctuary of Apollo into the city through the Porta Carmentalis. Two cypress images of *Iuno Regina* were carried. Then the twenty seven maidens wearing long vestments passed, singing the hymn in honor of *Iuno Regina*, which in those times must have appeared praiseworthy to unrefined minds, but would now sound horrible and disjointed if reproduced. The procession of maidens was followed by the decemvirs, adorned with laurel wreaths and wearing praetextae. They followed from the gate along the Vicus Jugarius to the Forum, where the procession stopped, and the maidens who had a rope given to them in their hands advanced, striking with their feet to the rhythm of the hymn. Then they followed along the Vicus Tuscus and the Velabrum, through the Forum Bovarium to the Clivus Publicius and the sanctuary of *Iuno Regina*. There the two sacrificial animals were slain, and the cypress images were carried into the sanctuary.”

Finally, concerning omens are once again seen in Lanuvium (29, 14, 3–4):

In aede Iunonis Sospitae Lanuui cum horrendo fragore strepitum editum. eorum procurandorum causa diem unum supplicatio fuit, et nouendiale sacrum, quod de caelo lapidatum esset, factum.

“In Lanuvium, terrifying noise and rumbling were heard in the sanctuary of *Iuno Sospita*. A day-long propitiatory prayer was held to expiate these omens, and a sacred rite was held for nine days because stone had rained from the sky.”

Since there is no reliable evidence indicating that in the Second Punic War the Romans attempted to influence *Iuno Caelestis* by employing a special ritual, it is possible that Servius, who does not use any epithet when he mentions the goddess in the first half of the sentence (*bello Punico secundo exoratam Iunonem*), also refers to the Aventine *Iuno Regina* and the Lanuvian *Iuno Sospita*, while the second half (*tertio vero bello a Scipione sacris quibusdam etiam Romam esse translata*) refers to the Carthaginian *Iuno Caelestis*, implicitly identifying the goddesses with each other, as does Virgil, whose text Servius annotates: throughout the poem, Aeneas is pursued by the same Juno, regardless of his location. It is likely that such identification was the reason why ill omens were sighted so frequently near the temples of the Italic Junos throughout the Second Punic War: the Romans, who considered Juno to be the supreme goddess of Carthage, possibly saw a sign of her displeasure in Hannibal's military successes and anxiously expected other aspects of the goddess to manifest it. Therefore, the words *exoratam (esse)* should be understood in their common sense, “was mollified,” and not in a hypothetical technical one, “became the object of a ritual called *exoratio*.”<sup>82</sup>

---

<sup>82</sup> This chapter is a revision of a previously published article [Isaenko 2019].

## CHAPTER 7

## ISAURA VETUS

Among potential testimonies of the ritual of evocation is a stone inscription discovered in 1970 by archaeologist Alan Hall in Turkey, near the town of Bozkir in the valley of the Çarşamba River. The inscription bears the name of the Roman general Publius Servilius, who states that he has captured the city of Isaura Vetus and fulfilled a vow given to its patron deity (AE 1977, 0816):

Serueilius C(aii) f(ilius) imperator, | hostibus uicteis, Isaura Vetere | capta, captiueis uenum dateis, | sei deus seiue deast, quoius in | tutela oppidum Vetus Isaura | fuit, [...] uotum soluit.

“Servilius, son of Gaius, general, who has defeated the enemies, captured Isaura Vetus, and ransomed the captives, be it god or goddess who had the city of Isaura Vetus under their protection, [...] fulfilled his vow.”

Servilius, the province of Cilicia's proconsul from 78 to 74 BCE, led a war against pirates fought both at sea and on land in Asia Minor, in the regions of Pamphylia, Lycia, and Pisidia. The end of this war was marked by the capture of two cities, Isaura Vetus and Isaura Nova [Abramson 2005: 66–73]. According to Florus, Servilius' victories earned him the *cognomen* Isauricus (Epit. 1: 41).

As pointed out by Adrian Sherwin-White [Sherwin-White 1984: 152–154], the boundaries of the province of Cilicia can be outlined with the help of Cicero's speech against Verres, who served under Publius Servilius' predecessor, Gnaeus Cornelius Dolabella: according to the orator, Lycia, Pamphylia, Pisidia, and Phrygia all fell victim

to Verres' extortion (2, 1, 43; 2, 1, 95; 2, 1, 154). Cilicia proper was not part of the province – in the opinion of A. Sherwin-White, the reason for this is that a province could derive its name from its purpose, rather than the territory it cover, and the purpose of the province of Cilicia was to combat Cilician pirates.

One of the leaders of the pirates was called Zenicetus. His stronghold was located near the Lycian city of Olympus, and his rule extended to Corycus, Phaselis and parts of Pamphylia. After his holdings had been captured by Publius Servilius, the pirate took his own life by giving his house and himself over to the flames (Strabo 14, 5, 7; Cic. *Verr.* 2, 1, 56; 2, 4, 21). Cicero additionally names Attalia and Oroanda Among the territories taken by the proconsul (*Leg. agr.* 1, 5; 2, 50). The city of Side also served as a centre of slave trade for the pirates (Strabo 14, 3, 2).

As theorized by A. Hall, the inscription he discovered in Turkey may be a piece of evidence suggesting that Servilius performed a ceremony similar to the ritual of evocation, while the stone on which it was carved may have been part of a temple dedicated to Isaura Vetus' tutelary deity, possibly built in fulfillment of the vow made by the commander [Hall 1973: 570]. Nevertheless, although there are obvious similarities between the inscription's text and the ancient accounts of *evocatio* (the conqueror of a city makes a vow to its patron deity), certain details may call the significance of this similarity into question.

First of all, notes Clifford Ando, if Servilius had made a vow to establish temples and festivals in honor of Isaura Vetus' deity in Rome, the most appropriate place for an inscription commemorating the fulfillment of this vow would have been Rome [Ando 2009: 132].

A possible response to this objection is offered by Joël Le Gall, who proposes that new temples may have been built in newly conquered territory, which became part of Rome, because the formula transmitted by Macrobius does not specify the place of their construction [Le Gall 1976: 522–524]. However, the authenticity of this formula is

questionable, as was argued above. Additionally, Servius (*In Aen.* 2, 351) and Macrobius (*Sat.* 3, 9, 2) claim that the ritual was performed in order for the deity to leave the besieged city, Festus employs the accusativus loci *Romam*, suggesting movement (*Gloss. Lat.* 268), while Plutarch directly states that the Romans “relocated” (μετωκηκέναι) the gods (*Quaest. Rom.* 61).

The opinion of J. Le Gall is partially shared by Mary Beard, John North, and Simon Price [Beard et al. 1998, 132–134], who suggest that the practice of constructing temples dedicated to the summoned deities on the very territory from which they had just been summoned may have emerged during the late Republic, possibly caused either by religious decline or by an extension of the concept of “Rome,” which may have come to encompass not only the city proper, but the conquered lands as well. Another religious change is cited as a parallel: according to Servius Danielis (*In Aen.* 9, 52), priests of the college of fetials traditionally gave a divine sanction to the beginning of hostilities by throwing a spear into enemy territory, yet during the war against Pyrrhus, when the fetials failed to find a location that could accommodate this ritual, one of his captured soldiers was forced to buy a plot of land near the temple of Bellona, which was then used as a substitute for the enemy territory. However, Servius Danielis mentions that the predicament in which the fetials found themselves was caused by the geographic location of Epirus, which lay on the other side of the Adriatic Sea, complicating the priest’s journey to the enemy borders. Similar considerations could not result in the requirements for the performance of *evocatio* becoming relaxed: the difficulty of constructing a new temple in Rome would not depend on whether the besieged city was in Italy or in Asia Minor, as it would be built by Roman craftsmen and laborers, using materials available in Rome. Furthermore, the ideological value provided by temples of deities summoned from more distant lands would be higher.

To permit that the ritual may have changed over time without any pressing need is difficult, as rituals tend to be static, which is meant to ensure their efficacy. The pre-



cautions taken by Roman magistrates during rituals are described by Pliny the Elder (*HN* 28, 11):

Praeterea alia sunt uerba inpetritis, alia depulsoriis, alia commendationis, uide-  
musque certis precationibus obsecrasse summos magistratus et, ne quod uerborum  
praetereatur aut praeposterum dicatur, de scripto praeire aliquem rursusque alium custo-  
dem dari qui adtendat, alium uero praeponi qui fauere linguis iubeat, tibicinem canere,  
ne quid aliud exaudiatur, utraque memoria insigni, quotiens ipsae dirae obstrepentes  
nocuerint quotiensue precatio errauerit; sic repente extis adimi capita uel corda aut gem-  
inari uictima stante.

“Furthermore, different words are used in orisons for inviting success, for ward-  
ing off evil, and for entrusting something [to the gods],<sup>83</sup> and we can see that the highest  
officials address the gods using established prayers, and so that not a single word would  
be omitted or uttered at a wrong time, one person reads out the written text, another be-  
comes an observer who watches [the magistrate’s recitation of the prayer], a third is ap-  
pointed to demand that reverent silence is maintained, while a flutist plays so that no ex-  
traneous sounds are heard. Both [kinds of mistakes] went down in history: how many  
times evil portents interfered by producing noise, how many times a prayer was mispro-

---

<sup>83</sup> As noted by Jacob Mackey [Mackey 2022: 303], a similar classification is provided by Valerius  
Maximus (1, 1, 1). It gives additional context and helps interpret the terms used by Pliny: *Prisco  
etiam instituto rebus diuinis opera datur, cum aliquid commendandum est, precatione, cum ex-  
poscendum, uoto, cum soluendum, gratulatione, cum inquirendum uel extis uel sortibus, inpetrito,  
cum sollemni ritu peragendum, sacrificio, quo etiam ostentorum ac fulgurum denuntiationes procu-  
rantur* (“As was established in the ancient times, care is given to the divine matters: when some-  
thing is to be entrusted [to the gods], a prayer is used, when something is to be asked for, a vow,  
when [the vow] is to be fulfilled, a thanksgiving, when sacrificial entrails or lots are to be con-  
sulted, an orison for inviting success, when a solemn rite is to be carried out, a sacrifice, which also  
takes care of omens presented by wonders and lightning”).

nounced. In such cases, the lobes [of the liver] or the hearts would suddenly vanish from the entrails or double in number, while the animal was standing [in place].”

Pliny gives another example of the consequences that an improper performance of a ritual can result in (*HN* 28, 14):

L. Piso primo annalium auctor est, Tullum Hostilium regem ex Numae libris eodem, quo illum, sacrificio Iouem caelo deuocare conatum, quoniam parum rite quaedam fecisset, fulmine ictum, multi uero magnarum rerum fata et ostenta uerbis permutari.

“In the first book of the *Annals*, Lucius Piso reports that king Tullus Hostilius used Numa’s book in an attempt to summon Jupiter from the heavens by employing the same sacrificial rite as him. Because he did something against the ritual's course, he was struck by lightning. There are many other [reports] that the fates of important events and the signs foretelling them would change completely by the influence of words.”

The paramount importance of form for the magical traditions of antiquity is likewise attested by Origen, who claims that spells lose their power should they be translated into another language (*C. Cels.* 1, 25):

Ἔτι δ' εἰς τὸν περὶ ὀνομάτων τόπον λεκτέον ὅτι οἱ περὶ τὴν χρῆσιν τῶν ἐπωδῶν δεινοὶ ἱστοροῦσιν, ὅτι τὴν αὐτὴν ἐπωδὴν εἰπόντα μὲν τῇ οἰκείᾳ διαλέκτῳ ἔστιν ἐνεργῆσαι ὅπερ ἐπαγγέλλεται ἢ ἐπωδὴ· μεταλαβόντα δὲ εἰς ἄλλην οἰανδηποτοῦν φωνὴν ἔστιν ἰδεῖν ἄτονον καὶ οὐδὲν δυναμένην. Οὕτως οὐ τὰ σημαινόμενα κατὰ τῶν πραγμάτων ἀλλ' αἱ τῶν φωνῶν ποιότητες καὶ ιδιότητες ἔχουσί τι δυνατόν ἐν αὐταῖς πρὸς τάδε τινὰ ἢ τάδε.

“On the subject of names, it should also be told that those who are skilled in the use of spells say that if the same spell is spoken in its original language, it is able to accomplish what is required of it, but if it is translated into any other language, it is rendered powerless and incapable of doing anything. Therefore, it is not the denoted objects, but the qualities and peculiarities of sounds that hold any power over anything.”

A. Hall also notes the good condition of the stone, which, in his opinion, could not have been moved across a long distance, yet he does not mention there being any indications that a temple used to stand at or near the site of the discovery. Since it is difficult to imagine that a past sanctuary could have collapsed in such a way that nothing would remain of it, except for a single stone bearing a votive inscription, the condition of which could be described good, it appears to be more probable that this stone was not a part of any larger structure, but was used independently.

The words *sei deus seiue deast, quoius in tutela oppidum uetus Isaura fuit* also cast doubt on the opinion that the inscription was composed after the ritual of evocation had been performed. The use of this formula is appropriate if the supplicant does not know the name of the deity they address, but if Servilius had already fulfilled his vow, a new temple would have already been dedicated to the deity and would have become a place of permanent worship. The use of this unwieldy formula would be less convenient in these circumstances. By this time, the Romans would have preferred either to learn the name of the deity from the inhabitants of Isaura Vetus or to give it one by themselves, as happened with the deity Aius Locutius or Aius Loquens (whose name was derived from the verbs *aio* and *loquor*, meaning “to speak”), an unknown spirit, who, according to legend, warned the Romans of an imminent Gallic invasion (Cic. *Div.* 2, 69). For this reason, the stone inscription is difficult to use as evidence that the deity addressed by Servilius received a permanent cult as a result of his vow.

As Lawrence Keppie notes in his work on the Latin epigraphy, the variants of the formula *votum solvit laetus libens merito* often conclude dedicatory inscriptions carved on sacrificial stones, and the very appearance of these words on a stone may indicate that it was used as an altar [Keppie 1991: 93]. It is possible that Servilius did not found a new Roman cult of Isaura Vetus' patron, celebrated in a new temple, but merely took on an obligation to perform a sacrifice in this deity's honor if they would provide specific assistance to the Romans.

It is impossible to determine with certainty what this assistance may have been, because the inscription does not give an answer to this question, but grounds for theories are provided by literary accounts of the siege. According to Frontinus' *Strategemata*, Servilius captured Isaura (it is not specified whether it was Isaura Vetus or Isaura Nova) by diverting a river to a new watercourse (3, 7, 1):

P. Seruilius Isauram oppidum, flumine ex quo hostes aquabantur auerso, ad dediti-  
onem siti compulit.

“Publius Servilius, having diverted the river from which the enemies drew water, used thirst to compel the city of Isaura to surrender.”

In turn, a fragment of Sallust's *Histories* mentions that ambassadors dispatched by Isaura Nova visited Servilius after he had accepted the surrender of an unnamed city, which had been caused by thirst (*Hist.* 2, 87 (Maurenbrecher)):

Dein post paucos dies egestate aquae coacta deditio est, oppidum incensum et cultores uenumdati eoque terrore mox Isaura Nova legati pacem orantes uenere ob-  
sidesque et iussa facturos promittebant.

“After a few days had passed, a shortage of water forced a surrender. The city was set on fire, and its inhabitants were sold into slavery. Under the influence of these terrible events, ambassadors soon arrived from Isaura Nova, suing for peace and promising that they would give hostages and fulfill the terms.”<sup>84</sup>

Therefore, Servilius diverted the river to take Isaura Vetus. It is possible that the commander made his vow as he asked the deity guarding the besieged city not to hinder the works that transformed Isaura Vetus’ surrounding territory. The location of the stone, found by A. Hall near the river, may support this suggestion. In any case, there is no reason to think that this deity received permanent worship in Rome – or even in the same territory once it became part of Rome. By extension, there is no reason to think that the vow made by Publius Servilius is an example of the ritual of evocation.<sup>85</sup>

---

<sup>84</sup> A. Hall's discovery also helped to clarify the location of Isaura Vetus. Prior scholars, including Henry Ormerod, placed it on the hill of Zengibar Kalesi. According to H. Ormerod [Ormerod 1922: 45–47], Frontinus refers to Isaura Vetus, but makes a mistake when he claims that Servilius diverted a river, as the settlement located on Zengibar Kalesi did not depend on one: in his opinion, Servilius only cut off the city's access to other water sources. More recent studies – specifically, those by Ronald Syme [Syme 1986: 160] and Noel Lenski [Lenski 1999: 418] – place Isaura Valley in the valley of Çarşamba under the influence of the discovered inscription.

<sup>85</sup> This chapter is a revision of a previously published article [Isaenko 2018].

## CHAPTER 8

### JERUSALEM

In 66 CE, a resident of Caesarea Palaestinae, a city that had been placed under Greek rule by emperor Nero's recent decree, sacrificed a bird in front of a local synagogue. The Roman cavalry garrisoned in the city struggled to contain the growing tensions between the Greeks and the Jews, so the latter chose to seek the assistance of the procurator of Judea, Gessius Florus, who had previously received eight talents from the Jewish community of Caesarea for mediating the conflict. The petitioners were taken into custody, while Florus demanded seventeen talents from the Temple's treasury to meet the emperor's needs. In response to the ensuing protests, the participants of which derided the procurator's greed, he brought Roman soldiers into the city and demanded to surrender those who had insulted him. Having failed to get what he wanted, Florus let the soldiers plunder the upper marketplace, one of Jerusalem's districts. Flavius Josephus estimates that the massacre and executions that followed this order took the lives of 3600 people (*BJ* 2, 284–308). The procurator's cruelty ignited the First Jewish-Roman War, which lasted until 73 CE.

After the rebels took the citadels of Masada (2, 408), Cypros (2, 484), and Machaerus (2, 485–486), the Roman governor of Syria, Gaius Cestius Gallus, set out to suppress the rebellion with the twelfth legion and auxiliary troops under his command (2, 499–501). Initially, the campaign went well for him, and Cestius soon laid siege to Jerusalem, but did not risk continuing the assault, broke off the siege, and suffered heavy casualties as he retreated (2, 527–555).

After Cestius's failure, Nero entrusted command to Titus Flavius Vespasianus – soon-to-be emperor Vespasian, – a commander who had previously distinguished himself in Britain (3, 3–8). He chose a more cautious strategy and preferred to strengthen

Rome's hold on the surrounding towns and citadels before advancing on Jerusalem. By 68 CE, preparations for the offensive had been completed, but it was delayed due to the death of Nero, which ushered in the Year of the Four Emperors (4, 486–502). In 69 CE, Vespasian was proclaimed emperor by the army (4, 588–604) and left for Rome, entrusting the capture of Jerusalem to his son Titus (4, 658). In 70 CE, Titus stationed his troops near the city, and the siege of Jerusalem began (5, 67–70).

As Josephus catalogues various omens that forewarned of the city's fall and the Second Temple's burning, he mentions that on the festival of Shavuot God abandoned Jerusalem (*BJ* 6, 296–300):

Μετὰ δὲ τὴν ἑορτὴν οὐ πολλαῖς ἡμέραις ὕστερον, μιᾷ καὶ εἰκάδι Ἀρτεμισίου μηνός, φάσμα τι δαιμόνιον ὄφθη μείζον πίστεως· τερατεία δὲ ἂν ἔδοξεν οἶμαι τὸ ῥηθησόμενον, εἰ μὴ καὶ παρὰ τοῖς θεασαμένοις ἰστόρητο καὶ τὰ ἐπακολουθήσαντα πάθη τῶν σημείων ἦν ἄξια· πρὸ γὰρ ἡλίου δύσεως ὄφθη μετέωρα περὶ πᾶσαν τὴν χώραν ἄρματα καὶ φάλαγγες ἔνοπλοι διάπτουσαι τῶν νεφῶν καὶ κυκλούμεναι τὰς πόλεις. κατὰ δὲ τὴν ἑορτὴν, ἣ πεντηκοστὴ καλεῖται, νύκτωρ οἱ ἱερεῖς παρελθόντες εἰς τὸ ἔνδον ἱερόν, ὥσπερ αὐτοῖς ἔθος πρὸς τὰς λειτουργίας, πρῶτον μὲν κινήσεως ἔφασαν ἀντιλαβέσθαι καὶ κτύπου, μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα φωνῆς ἀθρόας “μεταβαίνομεν ἐντεῦθεν.”

“Several days after the festival, on the twenty first day of the month of Artemisios, a miraculous sign was observed, defying belief. My story would likely seem a fairy tale, were it not based on eyewitness accounts, and if the suffering that was to come did not warrant such portents. Before sunset, all around the country, chariots and ranks of fully armored soldiers were seen rushing across the sky, among the clouds, surrounding the cities. On the festival called Pentecost, the priests who entered the Temple’s inner chambers at night – as is their custom – to perform a liturgy, reported that first they

sensed movement and noise, followed by a joint voice saying, “We are leaving this place.””

This event is likewise described among other ill omens by Tacitus (*Hist.* 5, 13, 1):

Visae per caelum concurrere acies, rutilantia arma et subito nubium igne conlucere templum. apertae repente delubri fores et audita maior humana vox, excedere deos; simul ingens motus excedentium.

“Combat ranks were seen clashing in the sky, as well as weapons glinting with a crimson glow, and a heavenly fire that suddenly illuminated the Temple. The sanctuary's gates suddenly swung open, and a voice greater than human resounded, claiming that the gods were leaving. At the same time, there was a great commotion produced by the departing.”

John Kloppenborg suggests that the Josephus' and Tacitus' accounts may contain traces of the idea of evocation: they do not name the ritual explicitly, but they do mention that God abandoned Jerusalem during the siege and imply that this departure contributed to its success [Kloppenborg 2005: 442].

As J. Kloppenborg notes, Josephus repeatedly speaks of the favor God shows to the Romans: in one speech, with which Josephus addresses Jerusalem's citizens after the fall of the second wall, this notion reoccurs three times [Kloppenborg 2005: 442–443]. First, Josephus argues that God's favor to Rome is evident due to its successful territorial expansion (5, 366–367):



Τί γὰρ Ῥωμαίους διαπεφευγέναι, πλὴν εἰ μὴ τι διὰ θάλπος ἢ κρύος ἄχρηστον; μεταβῆναι γὰρ πρὸς αὐτοὺς πάντοθεν τὴν τύχην, καὶ κατὰ ἔθνος τὸν θεὸν ἐμπεριάγοντα τὴν ἀρχὴν νῦν ἐπὶ τῆς Ἰταλίας εἶναι.

“What [land] has avoided the Roman rule, other than those that have no value because of heat or cold? Fortune passed on to them from every place, and God, who transfers power from people to people, now resides in Italy.”

Josephus then notes the prudence of the Jews who chose to submit to Rome after the sieges of 63 and 37 BCE carried out by Pompey<sup>86</sup> and the procurator of Syria, Gaius Sosius, who backed Herod the Great<sup>87</sup> (5, 368):

Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ τοὺς προγόνους αὐτῶν καὶ ταῖς ψυχαῖς καὶ τοῖς σώμασιν ἔτι δὲ καὶ ταῖς ἄλλαις ἀφορμαῖς ἀμείνους ὄντας εἶξαι Ῥωμαίοις, οὐκ ἂν εἰ μὴ τὸν θεὸν ἤδεσαν σὺν αὐτοῖς τοῦθ' ὑπομείναντας.

“For this reason, their ancestors, who surpassed them in both soul and body, as well as in other respects, submitted to the Romans and would not have stood for it had they not realized that God was on their side.”

---

<sup>86</sup> Pompey intervened in the civil war between Hyrcanus II and Aristobulus II, sons of queen Salome Alexandra. The Roman general gave his backing to Hyrcanus, took Aristobulus captive, and was let into Jerusalem by Hyrcanus' supporters. Aristobulus' supporters took refuge in the Temple, which Pompey managed to take after a three month siege (*BJ* 1, 120–158).

<sup>87</sup> After Hyrcanus II was deposed by Antigonus II, who secured the support of the Parthians (*BJ* 1, 268–270), the Roman Senate appointed Herod, favored by Antony, king of Judea (1, 281–285). The siege of Jerusalem lasted five months. Having taken the city, the Roman soldiers, exhausted by the siege, began to plunder it, but Herod managed to put an end to the sacking by promising money from his own treasury. Antigonus was surrendered to the Romans (1, 343–357).

Finally, Josephus notes that the Romans have always been successful in their wars with Judea and now appear to have nature's own support (5, 409–413):

Καίτοι Μάγνος μὲν καὶ Σόσσιος πρὸς τῷ μηδὲν παθεῖν καὶ ἀνὰ κράτος ἔλαβον τὴν πόλιν, Οὐεσπασιανὸς δ' ἐκ τοῦ πρὸς ἡμᾶς πολέμου καὶ βασιλείας ἤρξατο, Τίτῳ μὲν γὰρ καὶ πηγαὶ πλουσιώτεροι ῥέουσιν αἱ ξηρανθεῖσαι πρότερον ὑμῖν· πρὸ γοῦν τῆς αὐτοῦ παρουσίας τὴν τε Σιλωὰν ἐπιλείπουσαν ἴστε καὶ τὰς πρὸ τοῦ ἄστεος ἀπάσας, ὥστε πρὸς ἀμφορέας ὠνεῖσθαι τὸ ὕδωρ· τὸ δὲ νῦν οὕτως πληθύνουσι τοῖς πολεμίοις ὑμῶν, ὡς μὴ μόνον αὐτοῖς καὶ κτήνεσιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ κήποις διαρκεῖν. τό γε μὴν τέρας τοῦτο πεπεύραται καὶ πρότερον ἐφ' ἀλώσει τῆς πόλεως γεγενημένον, ὅθ' ὁ προειρημένος Βαβυλώνιος ἐπεστράτευσεν, ὃς τὴν τε πόλιν ἐλὼν ἐνέπρησε καὶ τὸν ναόν, οὐδὲν οἶμαι τῶν τότε ἠσεβηκότων τηλικούτων ἡλίκα ὑμεῖς· ὥστ' ἐγὼ πεφευγέναι μὲν ἐκ τῶν ἀγίων οἶμαι τὸ θεῖον, ἐστάναι δὲ παρ' οἷς πολεμεῖτε νῦν.

“Nevertheless, [Pompey] the Great and Sosius not only suffered no harm, but took the city by force, Vespasian’s imperial authority began with the war against us, and the springs that previously dried up for you have been spouting for Titus, more abundant than before: you know, after all, that before his arrival Siloam and all the springs outside the city had dried up, so that water was bought by the amphoras.<sup>88</sup> But now they are so plentiful for your enemies that there is enough [water] not only for them and for the animals, but for the gardens as well. This wonder was seen before, when the city was captured: when the aforementioned Babylonian, who burned down Jerusalem and the Temple, marched out,<sup>89</sup> it seems to me that the sinners of those times did not commit anything comparable to that you do. For this reason, I believe that the Divine Presence has fled from the Holy of Holies and is with those whom you are fighting.”

<sup>88</sup> A unit of volume, roughly equal to 40 litres.

<sup>89</sup> According to the biblical tradition, the Temple of Solomon was set on fire by Nebuzaradan, who served the Babylonian king Nebuchadnezzar II (2 Kings 25:8–9).

At the same time, Josephus' speech includes statements suggesting that he does not consider any action committed by the Romans to be the cause of God's departure. For example, as he speaks of Pompey's capture of Jerusalem, Josephus paints him an instrument of divine providence (5, 395–396):

Καὶ τί δεῖ τᾶλλα λέγειν; ἀλλὰ Ῥωμαίους τίς ἐστρατολόγησε κατὰ τοῦ ἔθνους; οὐχ ἢ τῶν ἐπιχωρίων ἀσέβεια; πόθεν δ' ἠρξάμεθα δουλείας; ἄρ' οὐχὶ ἐκ στάσεως τῶν προγόνων, ὅτε ἡ Ἀριστοβούλου καὶ Ὑρκανοῦ μανία καὶ πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἔρις Πομπήιον ἐπήγαγεν τῇ πόλει καὶ Ῥωμαίοις ὑπέταξεν ὁ θεὸς τοὺς οὐκ ἀξίους ἐλευθερίας;

“What else is there to say? Who was it that assembled the Roman host against this people? Was it not the impiety of this land's inhabitants? How did we come to be in captivity? Was it not because of the discord between our ancestors, when the madness of Aristobulus and Hyrcanus and their mutual enmity brought Pompey to the city, and God subjected to the Romans those who were unworthy of freedom?”

Josephus gives the same explanation for the success of Herod and Sosius (5, 398):

Τὸ δ' Ἀντιγόνου τέλος τοῦ Ἀριστοβούλου παιδὸς οὐκ ἴσμεν, οὗ βασιλεύοντος ὁ θεὸς ἀλώσει πάλιν τὸν λαὸν ἤλαυνε πλημμελοῦντα, καὶ Ἡρώδης μὲν ὁ Ἀντιπάτρου Σόσσιον, Σόσσιος δὲ Ῥωμαίων στρατιὰν ἤγαγεν, περισχεθέντες δ' ἐπὶ μῆνας ἕξ ἐπολιορκοῦντο, μέχρι δίκας τῶν ἀμαρτιῶν δόντες ἐάλωσαν καὶ διηρπάγη τοῖς πολεμίοις ἡ πόλις;

“Do we not know the end met by Antigonus, son of Aristobulus, in whose reign God once again used the city's capture to deal a blow to the erring people, when Herod,

son of Antipater, brought Sosius, and Sosius brought the Roman host, and those who were surrounded were caught in a six month siege, until they were taken prisoners in retribution for their sins, and the city was plundered by the enemies?”

Therefore, in Josephus’ view, it is not the Romans who summon God out of Jerusalem by performing a ritual of some sort – it is God who brings them to Jerusalem of his own will. God’s departure in *The Jewish War* is not a singular event that happened under specific circumstances, for a specific reason, but a rhetorical image that Josephus employs as he discusses a variety of sieges, separated by decades. Even the failure of Cestius Gallus, who retreats from Jerusalem, is framed as a sign of God’s displeasure with the Jews, as this retreat leads to an increase in the horrors of war (2, 539).

There are two possible reasons for Josephus’ fondness for this rhetorical device. First, God’s departure from Jerusalem to some extent absolves Titus, whose troops burned down the Second Temple (6, 249–270). Second, Josephus seeks to absolve himself. He gives the following justification for his decision to surrender to Vespasian (3, 352–354):

Ἦν δὲ καὶ περὶ κρίσεις ὀνείρων ἰκανὸς συμβαλεῖν τὰ ἀμφιβόλως ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ λεγόμενα· τῶν γε μὴν ἱερῶν βίβλων οὐκ ἠγνόει τὰς προφητείας ὡς ἂν αὐτός τε ὢν ἱερεὺς καὶ ἱερέων ἔγγονος, ὢν ἐπὶ τῆς τότε ὥρας ἔνθους γενόμενος καὶ τὰ φρικώδη τῶν προσφάτων ὀνείρων σπάσας φαντάσματα προσφέρει τῷ θεῷ λεληθυῖαν εὐχὴν, καὶ “ἐπειδὴ τὸ Ἰουδαίων,” ἔφη, “φῦλον κλάσαι δοκεῖ σοι τῷ κτίσαντι, μετέβη δὲ πρὸς Ῥωμαίους ἢ τύχη πᾶσα, καὶ τὴν ἐμὴν ψυχὴν ἐπελέξω τὰ μέλλοντα εἰπεῖν, δίδωμι μὲν Ῥωμαίοις τὰς χεῖρας ἐκὼν καὶ ζῶ, μαρτύρομαι δὲ ὡς οὐ προδότης, ἀλλὰ σὸς ἅπεμι διάκονος.”

“[Josephus] was well-versed in the interpretation of dreams, in comprehending that which God communicates in an obscure manner. He was not ignorant of the prophecies contained in the holy books either, as he was a priest himself and a descendant of priests. At that hour, as he felt divine inspiration and recalled the terrifying images of recent dreams, he discreetly prayed to God and said, “If you, the creator of the Jewish people, wish to break it, if all fortune has shifted to the Romans, if you chose my soul to announce what is to come, I willingly give my hands to the Romans and will live. I call upon you to be my witness that I do this not as a traitor, but as your servant.””

For Josephus to remain a servant of God after defecting to the Romans, God, too, must defect to the Romans. Only this could support his justification in the eyes of his contemporaries – as well as his own.

J. Kloppenborg also argues that the ritual of evocation was sufficiently well-known to the people of the Roman Empire so that the besieged citizens of Jerusalem could assume that the Temple’s destruction would inevitably follow the city’s fall [Kloppenborg 2005: 434, 442]. However, the legend of God’s departure from the Temple, transmitted by Josephus and Tacitus, is more likely to be a product of eschatological fears rooted in the Jewish culture rather than an example of the commonality of knowledge pertaining to Roman religious rituals. The date that Josephus connects the event to, the 6th of Sivan, speaks in favor of this: the festival of Shavuot commemorates Moses receiving the Torah at Mount Sinai, which means that God leaves the Temple that housed the Tablets of the Law on the same day when the ancestors of Jerusalem’s citizens were given the Ten Commandments. This gives an additional sense of finality and irrevocability to the city’s demise, expressing the feelings it would inspire in the Jews who were caught in the siege or were reflecting on the fall of Jerusalem shortly after. It is noteworthy that Tacitus, a Roman, does not mention the date, as he does not un-

derstand the significance of this detail. Furthermore, the destruction of the principal Jewish sanctum had a historical precedent, which the Romans had no relation to: Solomon's Temple was burned down by Nebuzaradan, who commanded the bodyguards of the Babylonian king Nebuchadnezzar II (*2 Kings* 25:8–9).

In the opinion of J. Kloppenborg [Kloppenborg 2005: 433–434], the knowledge of the rituals of *evocatio* and *devotio* may also be represented in the Gospel of Mark, in Jesus' prediction of the Temple's destruction (13:1–2):

Καὶ ἐκπορευομένου αὐτοῦ ἐκ τοῦ ἱεροῦ λέγει αὐτῷ εἷς τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ, Διδάσκαλε, ἴδε ποταποὶ λίθοι καὶ ποταπαὶ οἰκοδομαί. καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ, Βλέπεις ταύτας τὰς μεγάλας οἰκοδομάς; οὐ μὴ ἀφεθῆ ὧδε λίθος ἐπὶ λίθον ὃς οὐ μὴ καταλυθῆ.

“As Jesus was leaving the Temple, one of his disciples said to him, “Teacher, look, such stones and such buildings!” Jesus answered him, “Can you see these great buildings? There will not be a stone left upon another here that will not be brought down.””

Jesus then foretells that destruction will be accompanied by desecration (13:14–16):

Ὅταν δὲ ἴδητε τὸ βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως ἐστηκότα ὅπου οὐ δεῖ, ὁ ἀναγινώσκων νοεῖτω, τότε οἱ ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ φευγέτωσαν εἰς τὰ ὄρη, ὁ [δὲ] ἐπὶ τοῦ δώματος μὴ καταβάτω μηδὲ εἰσελθάτω ἄραί τι ἐκ τῆς οἰκίας αὐτοῦ, καὶ ὁ εἰς τὸν ἀγρὸν μὴ ἐπιστρεψάτω εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω ἄραι τὸ ἱμάτιον αὐτοῦ.

“When you see an abomination of desolation<sup>90</sup> standing where he must not – may the reader understand,<sup>91</sup> – may the people of Judea flee to the mountains, may he, who finds himself on a rooftop, not come down and go inside to take something from his house, and may he, who finds himself in a field, not turn back to take his cloak.”

However, the Gospel makes no reference to the key element of the ritual of evocation: departure of the deity from their place of veneration and their defection to the side conducting the siege. "The abomination of desolation," whatever the Evangelist may mean by it, is more likely to involve an appearance of something extraneous that causes desolation to follow, rather than a disappearance of something from its rightful place – otherwise, the evasiveness of Mark's language is left unclear. He refuses to explicitly identify what or whom he means, yet lets the reader know that his words refer to something more than the desolation itself. Therefore, it is more probable that the imagery of this prophecy is not a product of awareness of Roman rituals, but has an entirely Judeo-Christian origin: by having Jesus employ the language of Daniel, Mark

<sup>90</sup> The expression originates in the Septuagint, where it or its variant *βδέλυγμα τῶν ἐρημώσεων* is used in the Book of Daniel (9:27, 11:31, 12:11) and in the First Book of Maccabees (1:54). It is also found in the Gospel of Matthew (24:15). In the opinion of Eberhard Nestle, the abomination of desolation mentioned in the books of the Tanakh is a corruption of the name of Baalshamem, whose altar was erected at the Temple by Antiochus IV Epiphanes [Nestle 1884: 248]. According to Jonathan Goldstein, the abomination of desolation is a term used to refer to meteoritic stones used in the creation of this altar [Goldstein 1976: 143–148].

<sup>91</sup> There are various theories explaining the abrupt transition from the neuter noun *τὸ βδέλυγμα* to the participle *ἐστηκότα* (singular masculine or plural neuter) and the Evangelist's remark indicating that this wording is intentional and carries a hidden meaning the reader is invited to deduce by themselves. According to Samuel Brandon, these words refer to Titus, whose legionaries desecrated the Temple with their standards [Brandon 1961: 133–134]. In the opinion of Morna Hooker, Mark speaks of the Antichrist [Hooker 1982: 89–90]. Ed Sanders and Margaret Davies believe that the prophecy represents Caligula's unfinished plans to put his own statue in the Temple [Sanders, Davies 1989: 17].

presents him as a direct successor to the biblical prophetic tradition, legitimizing his aspirations for spiritual leadership.

Thus, there are no significant reasons to see any literary references to the ritual of evocation in the descriptions of the Second Temple's destruction provided by Flavius Josephus, Tacitus, or Mark. The legend of God's departure from the Second Temple, transmitted by Josephus and Tacitus and set on Shavuot, is an expression of a fear that an entire historical era that began when Moses ascended Mount Sinai is coming or has already come to an end, while the prediction found in Mark appeals to the authority of the Tanakh's prophetic literature in order to extend this authority to Jesus. None of these sources contain any elements which could only emerge due to the influence of Roman ceremonial practices.



## CHAPTER 9

### A SECRET RITUAL?

As all potential descriptions of or references to the ritual of evocation were examined, it was shown that there are no indisputable examples of literary or epigraphic accounts that would describe specific instances, historical or legendary, of the ritual being performed in the manner Pliny the Elder, Servius, Macrobius, and Plutarch describe it. In the majority of the examined cases (Volsinii, Carthage, Isaura Vetus, the fall of Troy as depicted by Vergil, Jerusalem), it is likely that the besiegers adopted no cults shortly after the city's capture. In the remaining two cases (Veii, Falerii), religious adoptions did occur, but the extant accounts of the sieges make no mention that they required a special ritual, employed by the Romans for centuries to entice the tutelary deities of other peoples to their side in order to pay them proper respect or to make the city's capture at all possible.

If the ritual of evocation did exist, this state of matters appears unnatural: it is difficult to imagine that the event that should have been the ideological apex of any siege, legitimizing the city's transition under the Roman rule, would have gone entirely unnoticed by Roman and Greek historians describing individual wars and sieges.

One can argue that Macrobius describing the ritual as *arcanum* and *multis ignotum* indicates that it was a secret an ordinary Roman could not know about. However, this characterization appears only in Macrobius, the latest of the extant sources. Pliny the Elder, Servius, and Plutarch all fail to mention this detail – all they mention is that the true name of Rome and the name of its divine patron were kept secret because the Romans feared that their city might also become a target of the same ritual. This implies that the ritual of evocation must have already been known to neighboring peoples, rendering the ban on the divulging of its existence, mentioned only by Macrobius, mean-

ingless. It is possible to hypothesize that he extends the ban on the disclosure from the name of Rome's tutelary deity to the very existence of the ritual in order to rationalize the lack of testimonies describing individual instances of the ritual's performance, something that had already become apparent to him.

The nature of the ritual also speaks against the possibility of its existence remaining secret: in exchange for leaving the besieged city, the summoned deity was to receive at least a comparable cult in Rome. The dedication of temples to the deity and the establishment of new festivals in its name could hardly have been done in secret, as they would have been public buildings and events.

Lastly, nobody would have been interested in the ritual of evocation being a secret. Publicity would have benefited the Roman state as a whole, as every new temple built in such circumstances would have been a monument to its military might and piety, and would have facilitated the integration of the conquered peoples, whose principal gods would have been given representation in their new capital. A reputation for brokering a pact between the Roman people and a deity would have been flattering to the commanders, who would have been able to use it for advancing their political careers in the future.

For example, in the twilight years of the Republic, Pompey the Great and Julius Caesar entered a competition of sorts for the privilege of being regarded as favored by the goddess Venus. Pompey, who received three triumphs, dedicated a temple joint with a theatre to *Venus Victrix*, "Venus the Victorious." The nature of the temple and the circumstances of its opening are given a biting description by Tertullian (*De Spect.* 10, 5):

Itaque Pompeius Magnus, solo theatro suo minor, cum illam arcem omnium turpitudinum extruxisset, ueritus quandoque memoriae suae censoriam animaduersionem Veneris aedem superposuit et ad dedicationem edicto populum

uocans non theatrum, sed Veneris templum nuncupavit, cui subiecimus, inquit, gradus spectaculorum.

“Pompey the Great, whose greatness was second only to his theatre, having built this fortress of all disgraces, came to fear that his monument would draw the attention of the censors. He built a shrine of Venus on top of it and, having issued an edict inviting the people to the dedication, called the structure not a theatre, but a temple of Venus, “to which,” he said, “we have added spectator rows.””

The time of the temple's opening and the aspect of Venus it was dedicated to are mentioned by Pliny the Elder (*HN* 8, 20):

Pompei quoque altero consulatu, dedicatione templi Veneris Victricis, uiginti pugnauere in circo aut, ut quidam tradunt, XVII. Gaetulis ex aduerso iaculantibus, mirabili unius dimicatione, qui pedibus confossis repsit genibus in cateruas, abrepta scuta iaciens in sublime, quae decidentia uoluptati spectantibus erant in orbem circum-acta, uelut arte non furore beluae iacerentur.

“Additionally, in Pompey’s second consulship,<sup>92</sup> during the dedication of the temple of Venus the Victorious, twenty or, as reported by some, seventeen [elephants] fought in the circus. Their opponents were Gaetuli armed with throwing spears, and the resistance displayed by one [of the elephants] was remarkable: since its legs were covered in wounds, it crawled on its knees toward the enemy ranks, launching upward shields torn away [from the hands of the Gaetuli], which rotated in circles as they fell, delighting the spectators, as if the beast was launching them due to its training and not out of rage.”

---

<sup>92</sup> That is, in 55 BCE. Aulus Gellius gives a different date (*Gell. NA* 10, 1, 7): the third consulship, that is, 52 BCE.

Caesar in turn, as reported by Appian, on the eve of the decisive battle with Pompey at Pharsalus in 48 BCE made a vow to dedicate another temple to Venus in Rome in case of his victory (*B Civ* 2, 68):

Θυόμενός τε νυκτὸς μέσης τὸν Ἄρη κατεκάλει καὶ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ πρόγονον Ἀφροδίτην (ἐκ γὰρ Αἰνείου καὶ Ἴλου τοῦ Αἰνείου τὸ τῶν Ἰουλίων γένος παρενεχθέντος τοῦ ὀνόματος ἠγεῖτο εἶναι), νεῶν τε αὐτῇ νικηφόρῳ χαριστήριον ἐν Ῥώμῃ ποιήσῃν εὔχετο κατορθώσας.

“As he was making a sacrifice to Ares at midnight, he also appealed to his progenitor Aphrodite (he believed that the Julii were descendants of Aeneas and his son Iulus, whose name had been distorted) and made a vow as a gift of thanksgiving to build a temple to Aphrodite the Victorious in Rome were he to succeed.”

That the decision to construct a temple of Venus was made by Caesar in these circumstances is questioned by Stefan Weinstock, who believes that these plans are more likely to date back to the time of the Gallic War [Weinstock 1971: 81–84]: he notes that the commander neither reported his victory in the Battle of Pharsalus to the Senate, nor celebrated a triumph because it was achieved over an internal and not an external foe (Cass. Dio 42, 18, 1; Plut. *Caes.* 56, 9). The temple was built in 46 BCE, as Caesar celebrated a series of triumphs for his victories in Gaul, the Black Sea region, and Africa, at the forum that received his name and was dedicated to Venus Genetrix, “Venus the Progenitor,” emphasizing that the goddess not only granted him his victories, but was also related to him by blood (App. *B Civ* 2, 102):

Ἀνέστησε καὶ τῇ Γενετείρᾳ τὸν νεῶν, ὥσπερ εὔξατο μέλλων ἐν Φαρσάλῳ μαχεῖσθαι· καὶ τέμενος τῷ νεῷ περιέθηκεν, ὃ Ῥωμαίοις ἔταξεν ἀγορὰν εἶναι, οὐ τῶν

ὠνίων, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ πράξεσι συνιόντων ἐς ἀλλήλους, καθὰ καὶ Πέρσαις ἦν τις ἀγορὰ ζητοῦσιν ἢ μανθάνουσι τὰ δίκαια.

“He also built a temple to the Progenitor in accordance with the vow he made before the Battle of Pharsalus and delineated a plot of land around it, where he set up a square for the Romans, to be used not as a marketplace, but as a place for business discussions by visitors, as is customary among the Persians, who have special squares for holding court and receiving judgment.”

A generation before, Venus' favor was sought by Lucius Cornelius Sulla, who, according to Plutarch, used the epithet *Ἐπαφρόδιτος* in his dealings with Greece (*Sull.* 34, 2):

Ἦδη δὲ συνηρημένων ἀπάντων, ἀπολογισμὸν ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ τῶν πράξεων ποιούμενος οὐκ ἐλάσσονι σπουδῇ τὰς εὐτυχίας ἢ τὰς ἀνδραγαθίας κατηριθμεῖτο, καὶ πέρας ἐκέλευσεν ἑαυτὸν ἐπὶ τούτοις Εὐτυχῆ προσαγορεύεσθαι· τοῦτο γὰρ ὁ Φῆλιξ μάλιστα βούλεται δηλοῦν· αὐτὸς δὲ τοῖς Ἑλλησι γράφων καὶ χρηματίζων ἑαυτὸν Ἐπαφρόδιτον ἀνηγόρευε, καὶ παρ' ἡμῖν ἐν τοῖς τροπαίοις οὕτως ἀναγέγραπται· ΛΕΥΚΙΟΣ ΚΟΡΝΗΛΙΟΣ ΣΥΛΛΑΣ ΕΠΑΦΡΟΔΙΤΟΣ.

“When everything had been over, he, recounting his accomplishments at the popular assembly, listed strokes of good luck as readily as his good qualities and finally decreed that he should be called Fortunate because of them: this translation of the word *Felix* appears to be the most preferable. In his correspondence and dealings with the

Greeks, he personally proclaimed himself a “Favored of Aphrodite.”<sup>93</sup> And so say his trophies we have: “Lucius Cornelius Sulla Epaphroditus.””

Plutarch also mentions that Sulla had an image of Apollo, which he used in battles as a talisman, and to which he attributed his military successes (*Sull.* 29, 6):<sup>94</sup>

Λέγεται δὲ ἔχων τι χρυσοῦν Ἀπόλλωνος ἀγαλμάτιον ἐκ Δελφῶν ἀεὶ μὲν αὐτὸ κατὰ τὰς μάχας περιφέρειν ἐν τῷ κόλπῳ, ἀλλὰ καὶ τότε τοῦτο καταφιλεῖν οὕτω δὴ λέγων· “ὦ Πύθιε Ἄπολλον, τὸν εὐτυχῆ Σύλλαν Κορνήλιον ἐν τοσοῦτοις ἀγῶσιν ἄρας λαμπρὸν καὶ μέγαν ἐνταῦθα ῥίψεις ἐπὶ θύραις τῆς πατρίδος ἀγαγὼν, αἴσχιστα τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ συναπολούμενον πολίταις;”

“It is said that he had a golden figurine of Apollo from Delphi, which he always wore on his chest during battles, and that at this time, too, he kissed it and said: “Pythian Apollo, having raised the fortunate Cornelius Sulla to the heights of glory and majesty throughout so many battles, will you knock him down after having brought him to his fatherland's doorstep, so that he would perish in the most humiliating manner together with his fellow citizens?””

Successful generals would also become heroes of legends (which often display typological similarities) that portrayed them as beings greater than ordinary mortals. For

---

<sup>93</sup> As Appian recounts (*B Civ.* 1, 97), Sulla was given a prophecy by the Delphic oracle, which told him to be generous to the gods (and not to neglect Delphi in particular), as well as to dedicate an axe in the Carian shrine of Aphrodite.

<sup>94</sup> Valerius Maximus brings up Sulla's fondness of this statue as an example of simulated piety (1, 2, 3). Frontinus is more pragmatic and considers it a useful trick to which a general may resort in order to maintain the morale among the troops (*Str.* 1, 11, 11).

example, the miraculous circumstances of Scipio Africanus' birth are described by Aulus Gellius (*NA* 6, 1, 1-5):

Quod de Olympiade, Philippi regis uxore, Alexandri matre, in historia Graeca scriptum est, id de P. quoque Scipionis matre, qui prior Africanus appellatus est, memoriae datum est. Nam et C. Oppius et Iulius Hyginus aliique, qui de uita et rebus Africani scripserunt, matrem eius diu sterilem existimatam tradunt, P. quoque Scipionem, cum quo nupta erat, liberos desperauisse. Postea in cubiculo atque in lecto mulieris, cum absente marito cubans sola condormisset, uisum repente esse iuxta eam cubare ingentem anguem eumque his, qui uiderant, territis et clamantibus elapsum inueniri non quisse. Id ipsum P. Scipionem ad haruspices retulisse; eos sacrificio facto respondisse fore, ut liberi gignerentur, neque multis diebus, postquam ille anguis in lecto uisus est, mulierem coepisse concepti fetus signa atque sensum pati; exinde mense decimo peperisse natumque esse hunc P. Africanum, qui Hannibalem et Carthaginienses in Africa bello Poenico secundo uicit. Sed et eum inpendio magis ex rebus gestis quam ex illo ostento uirum esse uirtutis diuinae creditum est.

“That which the Greek historiography says about Olympias, the spouse of king Philip and the mother of Alexander,<sup>95</sup> has also become a part of the tale of the mother of that Publius Scipio, who was first to be called Africanus. Gaius Oppius,<sup>96</sup> Julius Hyginus,<sup>97</sup> and others who wrote on the life and deeds of Scipio Africanus, all relate that his

<sup>95</sup> Plut. *Alex.* 2, 4. In the *Alexander Romance*, the serpent is sent to Olympias by pharaoh Nectanebo II, who then takes its form himself (Rec. α 1, 6-7; 1, 10).

<sup>96</sup> A friend of Julius Caesar, whom Suetonius attributes books on his Spanish, Egyptian, and African campaigns to, alongside a text refuting that Caesar was the father of Cleopatra's son Caesarion (*Iul.* 52, 56).

<sup>97</sup> A freedman of Augustus who managed the Palatine library (Suet. *Gram. et rhet.* 20). The biography of Scipio attributed to him may have been part of a larger work titled *De vita rebusque inlustrium virorum* (“On the life and deeds of brilliant men”) or *De uiris claris* (“On famous men”),

mother had long been thought to be barren, and the Publius Scipio whom she was married to, despaired ever to have children. After this, when she had fallen asleep, as she laid alone in the absence of her husband, in her bedroom, in her very bed a huge serpent was suddenly seen lying next to her, and when it slipped away among the fear and cries of those who had seen it, it could not be found. Publius Scipio personally brought the matter to the haruspices. They, having performed a sacrifice, responded that children would be born, and several days after this serpent had been seen in her bed, Scipio's wife began to show signs and experience sensations indicating that a fetus had been conceived. Finally, on the tenth month she gave birth, and her son was that Publius Africanus, who defeated Hannibal and the Carthaginians in Africa in the Second Punic War. And yet it is much more likely that his valor was considered divine not because of this miracle, but due to his deeds.”

Continuing his story, Gellius relays the rumors that Scipio personally communed with Jupiter and inspired an uncanny obedience in animals (*NA* 6, 1, 6):

Id etiam dicere haut piget, quod idem illi, quos supra nominaui, litteris mandauerint Scipionem hunc Africanum solitauisse noctis extremo, priusquam diluculet, in Capitolium uentitare ac iubere aperiri cellam Iouis atque ibi solum diu demorari quasi consultantem de republica cum Ioue, aeditumosque eius templi saepe esse demiratos, quod solum id temporis in Capitolium ingredientem canes semper in alios saeuientes neque latrarent eum neque incurrerent.

“There is nothing shameful about mentioning that the same people that I have named above wrote that the same Scipio Africanus had a habit of going to the Capitoline Hill at night, before dawn, requesting for the sanctuary of Jupiter to be opened to him, and staying there alone for a long time, as if taking the god’s counsel on the mat-

---

mentioned by Aulus Gellius and Asconius (Gell. *NA* 1, 14, 1; Asc. *Pis.* 13C).



ters of state, and the temple's attendants would often be amazed that when he came alone at such an hour to the Capitol, the dogs, who were always hostile others, neither barked, nor pounced on him."

Even the commander's bravado is framed by Gellius as something resembling a prophetic gift (*NA* 6, 1, 7–11):

Has uolgi de Scipione opiniones confirmare atque approbare uidebantur dicta factaque eius pleraque admiranda. Ex quibus est unum huiuscemodi. Assidebat obpugnabatque oppidum in Hispania situ, moenibus, defensoribus ualidum et munitum, re etiam cibaria copiosum, nullaque eius potiundi spes erat, et quodam die ius in castris sedens dicebat, atque ex eo loco id oppidum procul uisebatur. Tum e militibus, qui in iure apud eum stabant, interrogauit quispiam ex more, in quem diem locumque uadimonium promitti iuberet, et Scipio manum ad ipsam oppidi, quod obsidebatur, arcem protendens: 'perendie' inquit 'sese sistant illo in loco'. Atque ita factum: die tertio, in quem uadari iusserat, oppidum captum est, eodemque die in arce eius oppidi ius dixit.

"It appeared that these popular rumors about Scipio were confirmed and validated by his words and deeds, most of which are worthy of astonishment. Among them is one of this sort: in Spain, Scipio encircled and besieged a fortified city, protected by its location, walls, and defenders. It also possessed an abundance of food supplies, so there was no hope of taking it. One day, Scipio was administering justice when he was in camp, and from this place the city could be seen in the distance. Then one of the soldiers who were present at his court, in accordance with the protocol asked, on what day and at what place he would require of them to come for trial, and Scipio extended his hand toward the most fortified spot of the besieged city and said: "The day after tomorrow may

they come there”. So it came to pass: on the third day, when Scipio had ordered them to appear, the city was taken, and on the same day he held court in its fortress.”

Therefore, successful Roman generals developed the reputation of the gods’ chosen and sometimes cultivated it themselves. Meanwhile, the only general explicitly connected by the ancient sources to the ritual of evocation, which would have a commander negotiate with the gods in order to secure victory, is Scipio Aemilianus, and the historicity of this connection appears doubtful.

In addition, as noted by Georges Dumézil [Dumézil 1974: 427–428], there are passages in Roman literature indicating that as the terms of surrender were being negotiated, the conquerors were free to ask for temple property, just as any other, from the conquered, without taking the will of the gods into account. Livy gives the following description to the procedure of Collatia's capitulation to king Tarquin the Elder (1, 38, 1–2):

Collatia et quidquid citra Collatiam agri erat Sabinis ademptum, Egerius – fratris hic filius erat regis – Collatiae in praesidio relictus. deditosque Collatinos ita accipio eamque deditiois formulam esse: rex interrogavit “estisne uos legati oratoresque missi a populo Conlatino, ut uos populumque Conlatinum dederetis?” “sumus”. “estne populus Conlatinus in sua potestate?” “est”. “deditisne uos populumque Conlatinum, urbem agros aquam terminos delubra utensilia diuina humanaque omnia in meam populi Romani dicionem?” “dedimus.” “at ego recipio”.

“Collatia and all the land this side of it was taken from the Sabines. Egerius – he was the son of the king's brother – stayed to defend it. According to my sources, the surrender of the Collatines played out in the following way, using the following capitulation formula. The king asked: “Are you the ambassadors and negotiators dispatched by

the Conlatine people to negotiate your own surrender and the surrender of the Conlatine people?” “We are.” “Is the Conlatine people its own sovereign?” “It is.” “Do you surrender the Conlatine people, the city, the land, the water, the boundary stones, the shrines, the utensils, all divine and human possessions under my power and the power of the Roman people?” “We do.” “And I receive.””

In 343 BCE, a similar formula is used by the Campanian ambassadors who surrender Capua under the Roman rule to secure protection from the Samnites (Liv. 7, 31, 3–4):<sup>98</sup>

Ad ea princeps legationis – sic enim domo mandatum attulerant – “quando quidem” inquit “nostra tueri aduersus uim atque iniuriam iusta ui non uultis, uestra certe defendetis: itaque populum Campanum urbemque Capuam, agros, delubra deum, diuina humanaque omnia in uestram, patres conscripti, populique Romani dicionem dedimus, quidquid deinde patiemur dediticii uestri passuri”.

“In response, the embassy's leader – as he had been instructed in his homeland – said: “If you are unwilling to defend our holdings from violence and lawlessness with lawful use of force, you are certain to defend your own. Therefore, we surrender the Campanian people and the city of Capua, the land, the shrines of the gods, all divine and

---

<sup>98</sup> According to Livy, the conflict between the Samnites and the Campanians began after the Samnites attacked the Sidicini, who asked the Campanians for protection. The Campanians allied with them, but were defeated in battles with the Samnites, causing them to seek Roman patronage. Initially, Campanian ambassadors asked the Romans for an alliance, but they refused them because Rome already had a treaty with the Samnites, forcing the Campanians to surrender (7, 29–31). Gary Forsythe considers this episode fictitious and names two goal that this legend could pursue: to justify Rome's entry into the war against the Samnites, despite the existing treaty, and to justify the cruelty the Romans showed to the Campanians when they defected to Hannibal's side in the Second Punic War [Forsythe 2005: 287].

human possessions under your power, esteemed senators, and the power of the Roman people. Anything that we are to endure from now on, we shall endure having surrendered to you.””

Two centuries before Livy, using the same expressions (*deduntque... divina humanaque omnia, urbem... in dicionem... Thebano poplo*), the surrender of the Teleboans to Thebes is described by Plautus in *Amphitryon* (256–259), proving that the formula was not a literary invention of Livy, unlike many first-person speeches that can be found in the ancient historiography:

Postridie in castra ex urbe ad nos ueniunt flentes principes:  
 uelatis manibus orant ignoscamus peccatum suom,  
 deduntque se, divina humanaque omnia, urbem et liberos  
 in dicionem atque in arbitratum cuncti Thebano poplo.

“On the next day, weeping noblemen come to our camp from the city: with veiled hands, they beg of us to forgive them their fault and surrender themselves, all divine and human possessions, the city, and the children entirely under the power and judgment of the Theban people.”

## CONCLUSIONS

In order to put the historicity of the ritual of evocation into question, it remains to explain why the descriptions of this ritual exist, if the ritual itself did not. To accomplish this, it is necessary to establish when these descriptions first appeared in the Roman literature. The earliest source known by name is mentioned by Pliny the Elder (*HN* 28, 18) – Verrius Flaccus, a scholar of the age of Augustus. His biography is told in brief by Suetonius (*Gram. et rhet.* 17):

<M.> Verrius Flaccus libertinus docendi genere maxime inclaruit. namque ad exercitanda discentium ingenia aequales inter se committere solebat, proposita non solum materia quam scriberent sed et praemio quod uictor auferret: id erat liber aliquis antiquus pulcher aut rarior. quare ab Augusto quoque nepotibus eius praeceptor electus transiit in Palatium cum tota schola, uerum ut ne quem amplius posthac discipulum reciperet docuitque in atrio Catulinae domus quae pars Palatii tunc erat et centena sestertia in annum accepit. decessit aetatis exactae sub Tiberio. statuam habet Praeneste in superiore fori parte circa hemicyclium in quo fastos a se ordinatos et marmoreo parieti incisos publicarat.

“Marcus Verrius Flaccus, a freedman, became most famous for his teaching method: to exercise the minds of his students, he would often hold contest between peers, offering them not only a subject for essays, but also a prize, which would go to the victor. The prize would be a book notable for its age, beauty, or rarity. For this reason, Augustus chose him to be a mentor to his grandchildren, and he moved with his entire school to the Palatine on the condition that he would not take another student after that. He taught in the atrium of of Catulus’<sup>99</sup> house which at the time was part of the

<sup>99</sup> Quintus Lutatius Catulus, a statesman during the late republic, consul in 78 BCE. In 65 BCE, he was elected censor together with Crassus, but resigned because of disagreements with his colleague

palace, and received 100,000 sesterces a year. He passed away at an advanced age during the reign of Tiberius. In Praeneste, there is a statue of him in the upper part of the forum, near the semicircular bench, where he gave to the public the calendar that he compiled and carved on a marble wall.”<sup>100</sup>

Like Serenus Sammonicus, who became a teacher of the sons of emperor Septimius Severus, Verrius Flaccus found recognition at the court of Augustus, who entrusted the education of his grandchildren to him. According to Pliny, Flaccus made use of earlier sources that had his trust (*Verrius Flaccus auctores ponit, quibus credat*).<sup>101</sup> Pliny does not name these sources, but the way he presents them, and the information ultimately attributed to them, allow to make several observations.

First, like Macrobius, who introduces the ancient book of the mysterious Furius via a reference to Serenus, Pliny appeals to Flaccus’ authority most of all. Despite the assurance of the primary sources’ reliability, he does not see it fit to name them, suggesting that he does not expect them to be known to the reader.

Second, Flaccus’ sources were likely connected to the college of pontiffs – Pliny’s description of evocation concludes with the claim that it is the priests of this college who hold the knowledge of performing this ritual: *et durat in pontificum disciplina id sacrum*. It is noteworthy that this detail – the only detail in Pliny’s account of evocation that relates not only to the past, but to the present as well – disappears from the later sources: neither Servius, nor Macrobius mention it. It is also noteworthy that in the age of Augustus, when Verrius Flaccus wrote on evocation, referencing, as it appears,

---

(Plut. *Crass.* 13). He lost to Caesar, whom he competed with for the office of *pontifex maximus* (Sall. *Cat.* 49, 2).

<sup>100</sup> Fragments of this calendar, known as the *Fasti Praenestini*, pertaining to January, February, March, April, and December have survived (CIL I<sup>2</sup> pp. 231–239).

<sup>101</sup> The manuscript reading. Erik Warmington proposes the reading *credatur*, adjusting the meaning to “Verrius Flaccus cites authors who are worthy of trust” [Jones 1963: 12].

certain pontifical books, the great pontiff's office was held by Augustus himself, who combined this position with membership in six other priestly colleges, as the princeps mentions in his political autobiography *Res Gestae Divi Augusti* (7, 3):

[Pon]tifex [maximus, augur, XVvir]um [sac]ris fac[iundis, VIIvirum ep]ulon[um, frater arualis, sodalis Titius], fetialis fui.

“I was the supreme pontiff, an augur, a quindecimvir, one of the seven Epulones,<sup>102</sup> an Arval Brother,<sup>103</sup> a Titius,<sup>104</sup> and a fetial.”

There are reasons to think that Augustus amended the events of Rome's religious history to serve his political interests. The case of Marcus Licinius Crassus, the triumvir's grandson, provides an example of this. In 29 BCE, Crassus, who held the office of Macedonia's proconsul, personally defeated in combat the king of the Bastarnae, a people who lived in the vicinity of the Carpathian Mountains (Cass. Dio 51, 24, 4):

---

<sup>102</sup> The duties of the priests of this college consisted of holding sacrificial feasts to honor Jupiter and other gods (Festus *Gloss. Lat.* 68 L). Initially, these functions used to be performed by the pontiffs (Cic. *De or.* 3, 19). At first, the college of Epulones had three members (Liv. 33, 42, 1), but in time this number was expanded to seven (Luc. *BCiv.* 1, 602, Gell. *NA* 1, 12). Cassius Dio mentions that under Caesar the number of Epulones reached ten (43, 51), but, as the *Res Gestae* shows, by the end of Augustus' reign this change had been reverted.

<sup>103</sup> According to Varro (*Ling.* 5, 85), the priests of this college performed ceremonies meant to ensure the soil's fecundity, a function, from which they derived their name (from the noun *arvum*, “arable field”). Aulus Gellius names Romulus and the eleven sons of Acca Larentia, who adopted him, as the first Arval Brethren (*NA* 7, 7).

<sup>104</sup> According to Varro (*Ling.* 5, 85), this college was connected to auspices, and its name, if Andreas Spengel's conjecture is to be accepted [Spengel 1885: 35], comes from the chirping of birds (*ab avibus titiantibus*). According to Tacitus, the college was founded by king Titus Tadius to preserve Sabine religious traditions (*Ann.* 1, 54, 1).

Καὶ τὸν γε βασιλέα αὐτῶν Δέλδωνα αὐτὸς ὁ Κράσσοσ ἀπέκτεινε· κἄν τὰ σκῦλα αὐτοῦ τῷ Φερετριῷ Διὶ ὡς καὶ ὀπίμα ἀνέθηκεν, εἶπερ αὐτοκράτωρ στρατηγὸς ἐγεγόνει.

“Crassus slew their king Deldo with his own hands and would have dedicated his armor to Jupiter Feretrius as *spolia opima*, had he had independent command.”

*Spolia opima* (“rich spoils”), according to most accounts, was the name given to the armor belonging to an enemy commander killed by the hand of a Roman general. It was customary to dedicate these spoils to the temple of Jupiter Feretrius situated on the Capitoline Hill.<sup>105</sup> According to legends, in the entire history of Rome, only three commanders were granted this honor. The first was Romulus, who slew Acron, the king of the city of Caenina, who attacked Rome after the abduction of the Sabine women (Liv. 1, 10; Prop. 4, 10, 5–16; Plut. *Rom.* 16). The second was Aulus Cornelius Cossus, who took the life of Lars Tolumnius, the king of Veii (Liv. 4, 19–20; Prop. 4, 10, 23–38), the war with which started when citizens of Fideni killed four Roman ambassadors and defected to Veii’s side (Liv. 4, 17, 1–6). The third *spolia opima* were dedicated by the consul Marcus Claudius Marcellus,<sup>106</sup> who killed Vertomarus, the chief of the Celtic tribe of Insubres (Liv. *Per.* 20; Prop. 4, 10, 39–44; Plut. *Marc.* 7–8).<sup>107</sup>

---

<sup>105</sup> Propertius offers two competing etymologies of this epithet: from the verb *ferire* (“to strike”) and from the verb *ferre* (“to carry”) (4, 10, 45–48). Lawrence Springer believes that it derives from *ferire* in the technical sense of *foedus ferire*, “to strike a deal” [Springer 1954: 27–28]. Harriet Flower also supports the etymology from *ferire*, but does not rule out the possibility that the meaning it carries is “to strike with lightning” [Flower 2000: 42]. The temple of Jupiter Feretrius housed a sceptre and a flint, which were used in the rituals performed by the fetials (Festus *Gloss. Lat.* 81 L).

<sup>106</sup> H. Flower suspects that Marcellus was the first and only person to dedicate *spolia opima*, and that the legends of Romulus and Cossus were reworked to provide a pair of worthy precedents for this act [Flower 2000: 41].



An obstacle potentially responsible for preventing Crassus from joining this number of Roman heroes is mentioned by Livy: Augustus saw the dedicatory inscription on the armor presented by Aulus Cornelius Cossus in the temple of Jupiter Feretrius (4, 20, 5–8):

Omnis ante me auctores secutus, A. Cornelium Cossum tribunum militum secunda spolia opima Iouis Feretrii templo intulisse exposui. ceterum, praeterquam quod ea rite opima spolia habentur quae dux duci detraxit, nec ducem nouimus nisi cuius auspicio bellum geritur, titulus ipse spoliis inscriptus illos meque arguit consulem ea Cossus cepisse. hoc ego cum Augustum Caesarem, templorum omnium conditorem ac restitutorem, ingressum aedem Feretrii Iouis, quam uetustate dilapsam refecit, se ipsum in thorace linteo scriptum legisse audissem, prope sacrilegium ratus sum Cossus spoliis suorum Caesarem, ipsius templi auctorem, subtrahere testem. qui si ea in re sit error, quod tam ueteres annales quodque magistratum libri, quos lintheos in aede repositos Monetae Macer Licinius citat identidem auctores, decimo post demum anno cum T. Quintio Poeno A. Cornelium Cossum consulem habeant, existimatio communis omnibus est.

“Following all those who had written before me, I depicted Aulus Cornelius Cossus, who had brought the second *spolia opima* to the temple of Jupiter Feretrius, as a military tribune. However – disregarding that, by custom, only the armor taken by a

---

<sup>107</sup> Some authors give additional details that do not quite fit into this canonical depiction. Festus, citing Varro, claims that *spolia opima* could be earned by an ordinary soldier (*Gloss. Lat.* 204 L). Festus additionally mentions that there were three varieties of *spolia opima*, the first of which was dedicated to Jupiter, the second to Mars, and the third to Quirinus. He is supported by Plutarch (*Marc.* 8). In a peculiar way, Servius conflates the tradition defining these three varieties with the chronological sequence of the dedications of armor to Jupiter Feretrius and claims that *spolia opima* were dedicated to Jupiter by Romulus, to Mars by Cossus, and to Quirinus by Marcellus (*In Aen.* 6, 859).

military commander from a military commander is considered to be *spolia opima*, and we recognize only the one under whose command a war is waged as a military commander – my predecessors and I are contradicted by the inscription found on the armor itself, according to which Cossus won it when he was consul. When I heard that Caesar Augustus, the founder and restorer of all temples, had entered the sanctuary of Jupiter Feretrius, which he had repaired when time had destroyed it, and had personally read this inscription there on the linen breastplate, I thought it would almost be a sacrilege to deprive Cossus' armor of a witness like Caesar, the temple's benefactor. Where lies the error – should there be one – because of which the most ancient chronicles and books of magistrates, written on linen and kept at the sanctuary of [Juno] Moneta, on many occasions used by Macer Licinius as evidence that Aulus Cornelius Cossus and Titus Quinctius Poenus would not become consuls until ten years later, – may everyone decide for themselves.”

The prior historiographical tradition, which attributed relatively modest offices<sup>108</sup> to Cossus at the time of his feat, allowed even field commanders to earn the right of dedication *spolia opima*. Augustus' timely discovery, which declared Cossus consul, potentially narrowed down the circle of possible candidates to kings, consuls, and dictators. L. Springer [Springer 1954: 29–30], R. Ogilvie [Ogilvie 1965: 563], and H. Flower [Flower 2000: 53] agree that Augustus' claim is implausible: Cornelius Nepos reports that by the time of the renovation, the temple of Jupiter Feretrius had been neglected to such a degree that it had no roof (Att. 20, 3), making it difficult to imagine that an inscription on a linen breastplate could have survived such conditions. Furthermore, Livy's account implies that for some reason it was impossible to verify the accuracy of

---

<sup>108</sup> Diodorus (12, 80, 7), Valerius Maximus (3, 2, 4), Frontinus (*Str.* 2, 8, 9), and Aurelius Victor (*De vir. ill.* 25) consider him a master of the cavalry, while Dionysius (*Ant. Rom.* 12, 5, 1) and Servius (*In Aen.* 6, 841) call him a military tribune (Servius Danielis names him a military tribune with consular authority, in an apparent attempt to reconcile conflicting information).

Augustus' words, leading one to suspect that Cossus' breastplate or the inscription it bore was either lost or damaged after the princeps had made his discovery, but before he announced it.

Hermann Dessau [Dessau 1906: 144–146], who was first to connect Augustus' sudden archaeological discovery to Crassus' failure to dedicate the *spolia opima*, writes that the princeps likely did not want another commander to overshadow him by recreating Romulus' feat and dedicating the taken armor in the temple that he had rebuilt himself, and so Crassus must have asked for a permission from the Senate, but was denied. This stance is partly disputed by John Rich: in his opinion, it would have been difficult for the Senate to deny Crassus his request without a scandal (not a trace of which can be found in the sources), because as a proconsul, he was an independent military leader, supported by the fact that he was granted a triumph. Therefore, it is more likely that Crassus either set aside his ambitions himself (despite his prior support of Sextus Pompey and Mark Antony, in 30 BC, he shared the consulship with Augustus, and so must have had a degree of political tact (Cass. Dio 51, 4, 3), or was convinced by the princeps or one of his associates in a private meeting [Rich 1996: 93, 99, 106–108].

It is more difficult to agree with J. Rich's suggestion that Augustus announced his discovery only due to a personal interest in antiquity [Rich 1996: 112]. The timing of the inscription's discovery, its good condition after the centuries spent in a crumbling building, the absence of other witnesses who would have seen the breastplate stored in a public building – all of this makes one doubt the princeps' sincerity, and Crassus' accomplishment gives a clear motive. Even if the proconsul was never formally forbidden from dedicating the *spolia opima*, Augustus' statement may have been the signal that dissuaded him from approaching the Senate. The breastplate of Cossus may have been a precautionary measure as well, a safeguard in case Crassus proved reluctant, or a way of avoiding similar situations in the future.

Did the age of Augustus face a political problem that could be solved by the appearance of descriptions of the ritual of evocation? The answer to this question may lie in the religious policy advanced by the princeps. As Kurt Latte notes [Latte 1960: 294], the policy was a response to the demands of his contemporaries: the protracted civil wars created a sense of hopelessness and a feeling that the gods had turned away from Rome because of its disregard for ancient customs and traditions. The hazy boundaries between a priest and a magistrate in the Roman society made the connection between the religious decline and the political crisis only more certain. The pessimistic mood of this age is represented, for example, in Horace's lines (*Carm.* 3, 6, 1–4):

Delicta maiorum immeritus lues,  
Romane, donec templa refeceris  
          aedesque labentis deorum et  
          foeda nigro simulacra fumo.

“Roman, you will undeservedly seek atonement for your ancestors’ transgressions until you rebuild the trembling temples, shrines of the gods, and images tainted with black smoke.”

Augustus’ response to this challenge was a large-scale reconstruction plan for damaged shrines. By the princeps’ own counts in the *Res Gestae*, he rebuilt 82 temples in 28 BCE alone (20, 4):

Duo et octoginta templa deum in urbe consul sex[tu]m ex [auctori]tate senatus refeci, nullo praetermisso, quod e[o] tempore [refici] debeba[t].

“Having become consul for the sixth time by the will of the Senate, I rebuilt 82 temples in Rome and did not miss a single one that required rebuilding at the time.”

The scale of Augustus’ reconstruction of dilapidated shrines is given honeyed praise by Ovid (*Fast.* 2, 59–64):

Cetera ne simili caderent labefacta ruina,  
                   cauit sacrati prouida cura ducis,  
 sub quo delubris sentitur nulla senectus;  
                   nec satis est homines, obligat ille deos.  
 templorum positor, templorum sancte repostor,  
                   sit superis, opto, mutua cura tui!

“The prudent stewardship of the leader, who had attained divinity, and under whose rule shrines do not notice their old age, took care that other weakened [temples] would not fall into the same ruin. To please humans is not enough – he pleases the gods. Blessed founder and restorer of the temples, my wish is for your care for the deities to be reciprocated!”

Generous donations, given to the Roman temples by Augustus, are described by Suetonius (*Aug.* 30, 2):

Aedes sacras uetustate conlapsas aut incendio absumptas refecit easque et ceteras opulentissimis donis adornauit, ut qui in cellam Capitolini Iouis sedecim milia pondo auri gemmasque ac margaritas quingenties sestertium una donatione contulerit.

“He rebuilt sacred temples that had collapsed from old age or had been destroyed by fire and adorned them and other [shrines] with the most luxurious gifts: for example, he granted 16,000 pounds<sup>109</sup> of gold to the sanctuary of Jupiter Capitolinus he donated 16,000 pounds<sup>1</sup> of gold, alongside 50,000,000 sesterces worth of gems and pearls in a single offering.”

Cassius Dio note that Augustus’ care extended to private temples as well as public ones (53, 2, 4):

Καὶ τὰ μὲν ἱερὰ τὰ Αἰγύπτια οὐκ ἐσεδέξατο εἶσω τοῦ πωμηρίου, τῶν δὲ δὴ ναῶν πρόνοιαν ἐποίησατο· τοὺς μὲν γὰρ ὑπ’ ἰδιωτῶν τινῶν γεγενημένους τοῖς τε παισὶν αὐτῶν καὶ τοῖς ἐγγόνοις, εἶγε τινὲς περιῆσαν, ἐπισκευάσαι ἐκέλευσε, τοὺς δὲ λοιποὺς αὐτὸς ἀνεκτήσατο.

“He did not allow for Egyptian rites to be performed within the *pomerium*, but showed prudence toward the temples: those that had been founded by private individuals he ordered to be restored by their children and descendants, if there were any, and restored the rest by himself.”

What kind of temples caught the princeps’ attention and was of particular importance to him? In the *Res Gestae*, Augustus gives a partial list of buildings that were of public significance and had been built or repaired by him and mentions several temples among them (19):

Curiam et continens ei Chalcidicum templumque Apollinis in Palatio cum portibus, aedem diui Iuli, Iupercal, porticum ad circum Flaminium, quam sum appellari passus ex nomine eius, qui priorem eodem in solo fecerat, Octauiam, puluinar ad circum

<sup>109</sup> Roughly 5,262.4 kilograms.

maximum, aedes in Capitolio Iouis Feretri et Iouis Tonantis, aedem Quirini, aedes Mineruae et Iunonis reginae et Iouis Libertatis in Auentino, aedem Larum in summa sacra uia, aedem Deum Penatium in Velia, aedem Iuuentatis, aedem Matris Magnae in Palatio feci.

“I built out the Curia<sup>110</sup> and the adjacent Chalcidicum,<sup>111</sup> the temple of Apollo on the Palatine along with the porticoes,<sup>112</sup> the shrine of the divine Julius,<sup>113</sup> the Lupercal,<sup>114</sup> the portico near the Circus Flaminius, which I permitted to be named Octavian after him, who had built the previous one on the same spot,<sup>115</sup> the seat near the Circus Maximus, the temples of Jupiter Feretrius and Jupiter Tonans on the Capitoline,<sup>116</sup> the temple of Quirinus,<sup>117</sup> the temples of Minerva,<sup>118</sup> Juno Regina, and Jupiter Libertas on the

---

<sup>110</sup> The Curia Julia, which succeeded the Curia Hostilia. Its construction began in 44 BCE under Caesar (Cass. Dio 44, 5, 1–2). In 29 BC, the completed building was dedicated by Augustus (51, 22, 1).

<sup>111</sup> A portico dedicated to Minerva, adjacent to the Curia Julia (Cass. Dio 51, 22, 1).

<sup>112</sup> The plot where the temple would stand had originally been bought by Augustus to build a house, but was dedicated to Apollo after a lightning bolt had struck it (Suet. *Aug.* 29, 3; Cass. Dio 49, 15, 5). Augustus vowed to build a temple in 36 BCE (Vell. Pat. 2, 81, 3). It was dedicated in 28 BCE (Cass. Dio 53, 1, 3). Having become the supreme pontiff in 12 BCE, Augustus ordered the Sibylline Books to be moved to this temple (Suet. *Aug.* 31, 1).

<sup>113</sup> The shrine, built on the site where Caesar had been cremated (App. *B Civ.* 148; Cass. Dio 47, 18, 4), was dedicated in 29 BCE (Cass. Dio 51, 22, 2).

<sup>114</sup> The cave, where, as the legends claim, Romulus and Remus were brought up by a she-wolf (Ov. *Fast.* 2, 413–422).

<sup>115</sup> The original was built to honor the naval victory won by Gnaeus Octavius, consul of 165 BCE, over the Macedonian king Perseus (Festus *Gloss. Lat.* 188 L).

<sup>116</sup> This temple, dedicated in 22 BCE, was built by Augustus to remunerate his salvation: during the Cantabrian Wars, a lightning bolt killed a slave who was carrying a torch ahead of his litter (Suet. *Aug.* 29, 3; Cass. Dio 54, 4, 2–4).

Aventine, the shrine of the Lares at the end of the Via Sacra,<sup>119</sup> the temple of the Penates on Velia,<sup>120</sup> the temple of Youth,<sup>121</sup> and the temple of the Great Mother on the Palatine.”<sup>122</sup>

One of the temples mentioned in this list was dedicated to Juno Regina, the patron goddess of Veii, who was the principal subject of Chapter 3. That Augustus chose to mention this specific temple on this short list, despite the tens – perhaps hundreds – of other possibilities he had at his disposal, is likely not accidental.

---

<sup>117</sup> The temple of Quirinus, according to the tradition, was built to fulfill a vow made in 325 BCE by the dictator Lucius Papirius Cursor and dedicated by his son in 293 BCE (Liv. 10, 46, 7; Plin. *HN* 7, 213). It burned down in 49 BCE (Cass. Dio 41, 14, 3). Augustus had it rebuilt in 16 BCE (54, 19, 4).

<sup>118</sup> According to Festus, this temple already existed during the Second Punic War: as a reward for a religious hymn composed by Livy Andronicus, actors and writers were granted the right to hold assemblies there (446–448 L).

<sup>119</sup> According to legends, the house of king Ancus Marcius used to stand on the site of this temple (Solin. 1, 23).

<sup>120</sup> This sanctuary is described by Dionysius of Halicarnassus: it housed images of two young men armed with spears, brought to Italy, according to the tradition, by Aeneas (*Ant. Rom.* 1, 68–69). Solinus reports that it was built on the site of the house of king Tullus Hostilius (1, 22). In 167 BCE, this temple was struck by a lightning bolt (Liv. 45, 16, 5).

<sup>121</sup> The temple was built in accordance with a vow made in 207 BCE by the consul Marcus Livius Salinator, who had won a victory over Hasdrubal at the Battle of the Metaurus. In 191 BCE, the completed sanctuary was dedicated by the duumvir Gaius Licinius Lucullus (Liv. 36, 36, 5–6). The temple burned down in 16 BCE (Cass. Dio 54, 19, 7).

<sup>122</sup> The shrine of the Mother of the Gods, the construction of which dates back to the age of the Punic Wars, burned twice: in 111 BCE and in 3 CE. After the first fire, it was rebuilt by a Metellus (Caecilii Metelli held the consular office in 109, 98, 80, 79, 69, 68, 60, 57 and 52 BCE) (Ov. *Fast.* 4, 347–348; Val. Max. 1, 8, 11; *Obseq.* 39).



The princeps' main political accomplishment was ending the protracted civil wars. In the *Res Gestae*, Augustus wishes to present his reign as unprecedentedly peaceful for Rome (13):

[I]anum] Quirin[um, quem cl]aussum ess[e maiores nostri uoluer]unt, cum [p]er totum i[mperium po]puli Roma[ni terra marique es]set parta uictoriis pax, cum pr[iusquam] nascerer [a condita] u[rb]e bis omnino clausum [f]uisse prodatur m[emoriae], ter me princi[pe senat]us claudendum esse censui[t].

“Our ancestors decided to close [the temple of] Janus Quirinus should a peace won through victories be established in the entire domain of the Roman people, on land and sea. Although from the founding of the city to my birth, it had only been closed twice,<sup>123</sup> according to the tradition, during my principate, the Senate decreed to close it on three occasions.”<sup>124</sup>

In the light of this, the restoration of the temple of Juno Regina gained a special meaning: the reconstruction of the Roman shrine to the originally Etruscan goddess embodied the end of the internal conflicts in the Roman state. It appears probable that among the temples restored by Augustus were other shrines dedicated to the gods, who had originally been borrowed by the Romans from their Italic neighbors, – the monuments mentioned in the *Res Gestae* must be typical or representative in some way.

---

<sup>123</sup> During Numa's reign and in the consulship of Titus Manlius Torquatus (235 BCE) (Varro *Ling.* 5, 165; Liv. 1, 19, 3–4; Vell. Pat. 2, 38, 3; Flor. 23, 34).

<sup>124</sup> The temple gates were closed after the victory at Actium (Liv. 1, 19, 3; Plut. *De Fort. Rom.* 19; Cass. Dio 51, 20, 4; Oros. 6, 20, 8) and after the Cantabrian War (Cass. Dio 53, 26, 5; Oros. 6, 21, 11). The time of the third closing is unknown. In the opinion of Inez Ryberg, it occurred in 13 BCE, when the Altar of Peace was dedicated [Ryberg 1949: 92–93].

However, such temples would be unable to serve as unambiguous symbols of the restored unity and peace that Augustus would want them to be: Italy had been united by the sword, and every temple to an Italic deity could be seen as a monument to the war between the Romans and one of the peoples who now shared the state with them – a state that sought to recover from debilitating civil wars.

The associations with the wars of the past made it more difficult to communicate the idea that the princeps would want to communicate, but, as the case of Crassus shows, Augustus was willing to amend the inconvenient elements of the religious past he restored. This allows to hypothesize that the ritual of evocation may be an invention of the earliest writer, whom its descriptions can be traced back to, – Verrius Flaccus, the princeps' court scholar and the instructor of his grandchildren.

Flaccus may have extended to other sieges conducted by the Romans the legend of the vow given by Camillus and of the miraculous transfer of the statue of Juno that followed it – a legend which, as was argued in Chapter 3, was understood by the ancient historiographical tradition as a singular, isolated episode, and which shows a number of typological similarities with other legends that involve sculptures of the gods, including those that do not have anything to do with Rome or warfare, – turning its events into a ritual, which supposedly was an unchanging, climactic part of Roman wars, yet at the same time left no trace of irrefutable evidence in the works of ancient historians, despite the interest it would have inevitably drawn. By framing the military victories of the past as diplomatic victories, the depiction of the ritual of evocation would have allowed Augustus to soften the memories of past wars between the Italic peoples and to present the restored temples of Italic deities as symbols of what his generation desired most of all – a recovered domestic peace.

In his commentary on Livy's fifth book, Robert Ogilvie suggests that the ancient historian's description of the siege of Veii, disconnects the constituent elements of the ritual of evocation into separate scenes for stylistic purposes: "Instead of detailing the

ritual as a ritual, L. made it part of the narrative, incorporating the different acts as historical episodes (21. 8 n., 22. 3 n.) and recasting the prayer in literary language which conveys the atmosphere but not the uncouthness of actual devotion” (Ogilvie 1965, 675). The present dissertation argues that the exact opposite took place: in order to manufacture a patriotic myth, an antiquary, contemporary with Livy, ascribed a deeper unity to the legend’s individual episodes.

## REFERENCES

### PRIMARY SOURCES

1. Aeschylus, West M. L. (ed.) *Tragoediae cum incerti poetae Prometheus*. Stuttgart – Leipzig: 1998.
2. Aland K., Black M., Martini C. M., Metzger B. M., Wikgren A., Aland B., Karavidopoulos J. (edd.) *The Greek New Testament*. Stuttgart: 1998.
3. Appianus, Viereck P., Roos A. G. (edd.) *Historia Romana*. Vol. I. Leipzig: 1962.
4. Appianus, White H. (ed.) *Roman History*. Vol. III. Cambridge – London: 1964.
5. Athenaeus, Douglas Olson S. (ed., tr.) *The Learned Banqueters*. Vol. VIII: Books 13.594b–14. Cambridge: 2012.
6. Augustus, Scheid J. (ed., tr.) *Res Gestae Divi Augusti*. Paris: 2007.
7. Aulus Gellius, Marshall P. K. (ed.) *Noctes Atticae* Vol. I: Libri I–X. Oxford: 1968.
8. Cassius Dio, Cary E. (ed., tr.) *Roman History*. Vol. I. London – New York: 1914.
9. Cassius Dio, Cary E. (ed., tr.) *Roman History*. Vol. VI. London – Cambridge: 1955.
10. Curtius Rufus, Hedicke E. (ed.) *Historiarum Alexandri Magni Macedonis libri qui supersunt*. Leipzig: 1998.
11. Diodorus, Fischer C. Th. (ed.) *Bibliotheca Historica*. Vol. IV. Stuttgart: 1985.
12. Euripides, Biehl W. (ed.) *Troades*. Leipzig: 1970.
13. Dionysius, Jacoby C. (ed.) *Antiquitates Romanae quae supersunt*. Vol. I. Leipzig: 1885.
14. Dionysius, Kiessling A. (ed.) *Antiquitates Romanae quae supersunt*. Vol. IV. Leipzig: 1870.

15. Festus, Lindsay W. M. (ed.) *De verborum significatu quae supersunt cum Pauli epitome*. Stuttgart – Leipzig: 1997.
16. Florus, Rossbach O. (ed.) *Epitomae libri II et Fragmentum de Vergilio oratore an poeta*. Leipzig: 1896.
17. Frontinus, Bennett C. E. (ed., tr.), Herschel C. (tr.), McElwain M. B. (ed.) *The Stratagems and the Aqueducts of Rome*. London – New York: 1925.
18. Herodianus, Whittaker C. R. (ed., tr.) *Herodian*. Vol. II: Books V–VIII. Cambridge – London: 1970.
19. Herodotus, Godley A. D. (ed., tr.) *Herodotus*. Vol. III: Books V–VII. London – Cambridge: 1938.
20. Horatius, Rudd N. (ed., tr.) *Odes and Epodes*. Cambridge – London: 2004.
21. Ioannes Zonaras, Dindorf L. (ed.) *Epitome historiarum*. Vol. II. Leipzig: 1869.
22. Josephus, Thackeray H. St. J. (ed., tr.) *The Jewish War, Books I–III*. London – Cambridge: 1956.
23. Josephus, Thackeray H. St. J. (ed., tr.) *The Jewish War, Books IV–VII*. London – Cambridge: 1961.
24. Livius, Foster B. O. (ed., tr.) *History of Rome, Books XXI–XXII*. Cambridge – London: 1996.
25. Livius, Moore F. G. (ed., tr.) *History of Rome, Books XXIII–XXV*. Cambridge – London: 1984.
26. Livius, Moore F. G. (ed., tr.) *History of Rome, Books XXVI–XXVII*. Cambridge – London: 1995.
27. Livius, Moore F. G. (ed., tr.) *History of Rome, Books XXVIII–XXX*. Cambridge – London: 1995.
28. Livius, Weissenborn W. (ed.) *Ab urbe condita libri*. Pars I: Libri I–VI. Leipzig: 1875.

29. Livius, Weissenborn W. (ed.) *Ab urbe condita libri. Pars II: Libri VII–XXIII.* Leipzig: 1876.
30. Macrobius, Kaster R. A. (ed., tr.) *Saturnalia. Books 3–5.* Cambridge – London: 2011.
31. Macrobius, Willis J. (ed.) *Saturnalia.* Stuttgart – Leipzig: 1994.
32. Magie D. (ed., tr.) *Historia Augusta. Vol. II.* Cambridge – London: 1993.
33. Mommsen Th., Krueger P. (edd.) *Digesta Iustiniani Augusti. Vol. I.* Berlin: 1870.
34. Mommsen Th., Krueger P. (edd.) *Digesta Iustiniani Augusti. Vol. II.* Berlin: 1870.
35. Origenes, Borret M. (ed., tr.) *Contre Celse. Tome I: Livres I et II.* Paris: 1967.
36. Ovidius, Showerman G. (ed., tr.) *Heroides and Amores.* London – New York: 1914.
37. Ovidius, Frazer J. G. (tr.), Goold G. P. (ed.) *Ovid. Vol. V: Fasti.* Cambridge – London: 1989.
38. Plautus, de Melo (ed., tr.) *Amphitryon. The Comedy of Asses. The Pot of Gold. Two Bacchises. The Captives.* Cambridge: 2011.
39. Plinius, Jones W. H. S. (ed., tr.) *Natural History, Volume VIII: Books 28–32.* Cambridge: 1963.
40. Plinius, von Jan L. (ed.) *Naturalis Historiae libri XXXVII. Vol. II: Libri VII–XV.* Leipzig: 1856.
41. Plinius, von Jan L. (ed.) *Naturalis Historiae libri XXXVII. Vol. V: Libri XXXIII–XXXVII.* Leipzig: 1878.
42. Plinius, von Jan L., Mayhoff K. (edd.) *Naturalis Historiae libri XXXVII. Vol. IV: Libri XXIII–XXX.* Leipzig: 1897.
43. Plutarchus, Bernardakis G. (ed.) *Moralia. Vol. II.* Leipzig: 1889.
44. Plutarchus, Perrin B. (ed., tr.) *Lives. Vol. II.* London – Cambridge: 1968.
45. Plutarchus, Perrin B. (ed., tr.) *Lives. Vol. IV.* London – Cambridge: 1959.

46. Plutarchus, Perrin B. (ed., tr.) *Lives*. Vol. VII. London – Cambridge: 1967.
47. Plutarchus, Perrin B. (ed., tr.) *Lives*. Vol. IX. London – Cambridge: 1959.
48. Propertius, Butler H. E. (ed., tr.) *Propertius*. London – New York: 1912.
49. Radt S., Kannicht R. (edd.) *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*. Vol. 4: Sophocles. Göttingen: 1999.
50. Sallutius, Maurenbrecher (ed.) *Historiarum reliquae*. Fasc. II: *Fragmenta*. Leipzig: 1893.
51. Servius, Thilo G. (ed.) *Qui feruntur in Vergilii carmina commentarii*. Vol. I: *Aeneidos librorum I–V commentarii*. Leipzig: 1881.
52. Servius, Thilo G. (ed.) *Qui feruntur in Vergilii carmina commentarii*. Vol. II: *Aeneidos librorum VI–XII commentarii*. Leipzig: 1884.
53. Smith O. L. (ed.) *Scholia Graeca in Aeschylum quae exstant omnia*. Pars II, Fasc. 2. Leipzig: 1982.
54. Suetonius, Brugnoli G. (ed.) *Praeter Caesarum libros reliquiae*. Pars I: *De grammaticis et rhetoribus*. Leipzig: 1972.
55. Suetonius, Rolfe J. C. (ed., tr.) *Suetonius*. Vol. I. Cambridge – London: 1979.
56. Tacitus, Wellesley K. (ed.) *Libri qui supersunt*. Tomus II, Pars Prima: *Historiarum libri*. Leipzig: 1989.
57. Tertullianus, Dekkers E., Borleffs J. G. P., Willems R., Refoulé R. F., Diercks G. F., Kroymann A. (edd.) *Opera*. Pars I. Turnhout: 1954.
58. Valerius Maximus, Halm C. (ed.) *Factorum et dictorum memorabilium libri novem*. Leipzig: 1865.
59. Varro, Goetz G., Schoell F. (edd.) *De lingua Latina quae supersunt*. Leipzig: 1910.
60. Vergilius, Mynors R. A. B. (ed.) *Opera*. Oxford: 1969.

## STUDIES

*In Russian*

1. Abramson M. G. The Roman Dominion in the East: Rome and Cilicia (2nd Century BCE – 74 CE). St. Petersburg: 2005.
2. Isaenko R. A. The Vow of Publius Servilius // *Indo-European Linguistics and Classical Philology*. 2018. 22 (1). P. 583–591.

*In other languages*

3. Ando C. The Matter of the Gods: Religion and the Roman Empire. Berkley – Los Angeles: 2009.
4. Aust E. De aedibus sacris populi Romani inde a primis liberae rei publicae temporibus usque ad Augusti imperatoris aetatem Romae conditis. Marburg: 1889.
5. Austin R. G. P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Secundus. London: 1973.
6. Bakum G. C. L. M. The Latin Dialect of the Ager Faliscus: 150 Years of Scholarship. Part I. Amsterdam: 2009.
7. Basanoff V. Evocatio. Étude d'un Rituel Militaire Romain. Paris: 1947.
8. Baum P. F. The Young Man Betrothed to a Statue // *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*. 1919. 34 (4). P. 523–579.
9. Beard M., North J., Price S. Religions of Rome, Volume 1: A History. Cambridge: 1998.
10. Bizzarri C. Southern and Inner Etruria: Benchmark Sites and Current Excavations // Bell S., Carpino A. A. (ed.) *A Companion to the Etruscans*. Chichester, 2016. P. 117–128.
11. Bloch R. Héra, Uni, Junon en Italie centrale // *Comptes rendus des séances de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres*. 1972. 116 (2). P. 384–396.
12. Brandon S. G. F. The Date of the Markan Gospel // *New Testament Studies*. 1961. 7 (2). P. 126–141.



13. Casali S. *The Bellum Civile as an Anti-Aeneid* // *Asso P. Brill's Companion to Lucan*. Leiden – Boston, 2011. P. 81–110.
14. Champlin E. *Serenus Sammonicus* // *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*. 1981. 85. P. 189–212.
15. Cichorius C. *Zur Lebensgeschichte des Valerius Soranus* // *Hermes*. 1906. 41 (1). P. 59–68.
16. Clifford R. J. *Phoenician Religion* // *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*. 1990. 279. P. 55–64.
17. Day J. *Yahweh and the Gods and Goddesses of Canaan*. London – New York: 2002.
18. Dessau H. *Livius und Augustus* // *Hermes*. 1906. 41 (1). P. 142–151.
19. de Grummond N. T. *Prophets and Priests* // de Grummond, N. T., Simon E. (edd.) *The Religion of the Etruscans*. Austin, 2006. P. 27–44.
20. Dumézil G. *La religion romaine archaïque*. Paris: 1974.
21. Dumézil G. *Propertiana* // *Latomus*. 1951. 10 (3). P. 289–302.
22. Edlund-Berry I. *The Gods and the Places* // Turfa J. M. (ed.) *The Etruscan World*. Abingdon – New York, 2013. P. 557–565.
23. Euripides, Shapiro A. (tr.), Burian P. (ed.) *Trojan Women*. Oxford – New York: 2009.
24. Farney G. D., Masci G. *The Sabines* // Farney G. D., Bradley G. (edd.) *The Peoples of Ancient Italy*. Boston – Berlin, 2017. P. 543–557.
25. Flower H. I. *The Tradition of the Spolia Opima: M. Claudius Marcellus and Augustus* // *Classical Antiquity*. 2000. 19 (1). P. 34–64.
26. Forsythe G. *A Critical History of Early Rome: From Prehistory to the First Punic War*. Berkley – Los Angeles – London: 2005.
27. Frank T. *The Bacchanalian Cult of 186 B. C.* // *The Classical Quarterly*. 1927. 21 (3/4). P. 128–132.

28. Frothingham A. L. Vediovis, the Volcanic God. A Reconstruction // *The American Journal of Philology*. 1917. 38 (4). P. 370–391.
29. Ganiban R. T. *Aeneid 2* // Vergil, Ganiban R. T., Farrel J., Johnston P. A., O’Hara J. J., Perkell C. G. (edd.) *Aeneid. Books 1–6*. 2012. P. 167–219.
30. Ghedini F. *Giulia Domna tra oriente e occidente. Le fonti archeologiche*. Roma: 1984.
31. Goldmann E. *Di Novensides and Di Indigetes* // *The Classical Quarterly*. 1942. 36 (1/2). P. 43–53.
32. Goldstein J. A. (ed., tr.) *I Maccabees*. Garden City: 1976.
33. Grebe S. *Augustus’ Divine Authority and Vergil’s Aeneid* // *Vergilius*. 2004. 50. P. 35–62.
34. Greenough J. B. *Livy. Books I & II*. Boston: 1891.
35. Gustafsson G. *Evocatio Deorum. Historical and Mythical Interpretations of Ritualised Conquests in the Expansion of Ancient Rome*. Uppsala: 2000.
36. Hahn F. H. *Performing the Sacred: Prayers and Hymns* // Rüpke, J. (ed.) *A Companion to Roman Religion*. 2007. P. 235–248.
37. Hall A. *New Light on the Capture of Isaura Vetus by P. Servilius Vatia* // *Akten des VI. Internationalen Kongresses für Griechische und Lateinische Epigraphik, München 1972*. 1973. P. 569–571.
38. Henderson J. *Polishing off the Politics: Horace’s Ode to Pollio, 2, 1* // *Materiali e discussioni per l’analisi dei testi classici*. 1996. 37. P. 59–136.
39. Henzen W. *Acta fratrum Arvalium quae supersunt*. Berlin: 1874.
40. Hodgkin T. *The Caervoran Inscription in Praise of the Syrian Goddess* // *Archaeologia Aeliana*. 1899. 21. P. 289–292.
41. Hooker M. D. *Trial and Tribulation in Mark XIII* // *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*. 1982. 65 (1). P. 78–99.
42. Horsfall N. (ed., tr.) *Virgil, Aeneid 2: A Commentary*. Leiden: 2008.

43. Hoyos D. *The Carthaginians*. London – New York: 2010.
44. Huschke P. E. (ed.) *Iurisprudentiae anteiustinianae quae supersunt*. Leipzig: 1886.
45. Isaenko R. A. *Evocatio and the Transfer of Juno Regina from Veii* // *Philologia Classica*. 2017. 12 (1). P. 23–28.
46. Isaenko R. A. *Macrobius, Saturnalia 3.9 and the Roman Cult of Iuno Caelestis* // *Philologia Classica*. 2019. 14 (2). P. 208–215.
47. Isaenko R. A. *Verg. Aen. 2. 351–352: Evocatio under Troy?* // *Philologia Classica*. 2017. 12 (2). P. 234–239.
48. Jordan R. H. (ed.), *Virgil, Aeneid II*. Eastbourne: 2002.
49. Kaster R. A. *Studies on the Text of Macrobius' Saturnalia*. Oxford – New York: 2010.
50. Keppie L. *Understanding Roman Inscriptions*. Baltimore: 1991.
51. Kirk G. S. (ed.), Janko R. *The Iliad: A Commentary. Volume IV: Books 13–16*. Cambridge: 1994.
52. Köves-Zulauf T. *Minerva Capta – Eine gefangene Göttin?* // *Grazer Beiträge*. 1993. S5. P. 159–176.
53. Latte K. *Römische Religionsgeschichte*. Munich: 1960.
54. Le Gall J. *Evocatio* // *Mélanges offerts à Jacques Heurgon: L'Italie préromaine et la Rome républicaine I*. 1976. P. 519–524.
55. Lenski N. *Assimilation and Revolt in the Territory of Isauria, from the 1 Century BC to the 6 Century AD* // *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient*. 1999. 42 (4). P. 413–465.
56. Lenski N. *Constantine and the Cities: Imperial Authority and Civic Policies*. Philadelphia: 2016.

57. Lichtenberger A. *Severus Pius Augustus. Studien zur sakralen Repräsentation und Rezeption der Herrschaft des Septimius Severus und seiner Familie (193–211 n. Chr.)*. Leiden – Boston: 2011.
58. Linderski J. *The Libri Reconditi // Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*. 1985. 89. P. 207–234.
59. Littlewood R. J. *A Commentary on Ovid's Fasti, Book 6*. New York: 2006.
60. Littlewood R. J. *Poetic Artistry and Dynastic Politics: Ovid at the Ludi Megalenses (Fasti 4. 179–372) // The Classical Quarterly*. 1981. 31 (2). P. 381–395.
61. MacDonald E. *Hannibal: A Hellenistic Life*. New Haven – London: 2015.
62. Mackey J. L. *Belief and Cult: Rethinking Roman Religion*. Princeton – Oxford: 2022.
63. Marquis E. C. *Vertumnus in Propertius 4, 2 // Hermes*. 1974. 102 (3). P. 491–500.
64. Mundle I. *Dea Caelestis in der Religionspolitik des Septimius Severus und der Julia Domna // Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte*. 1961. 10 (2). P. 228–237.
65. Nestle E. *Zu Daniel // Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*. 1884. 4. P. 247–248.
66. Ogilvie R. M. *A Commentary on Livy, Books 1–5*. Oxford: 1965.
67. Orlin E. M. *Foreign Cults in Rome. Creating a Roman Empire*. Oxford – New York: 2010.
68. Ormerod H. A. *The Campaigns of Servilius Isauricus against the Pirates // The Journal of Roman Studies*. 1922. 12. P. 35–56, 288.
69. Page T. E. *The Aeneid of Virgil. Books I–VI*. New York: 1967.
70. Paschinger E. *Das Fanum Voltumnae // Antike Welt*. 1986. 17 (4). P. 57–60.
71. Poznanski L. *Sequimur te, sancte deorum quisquis es (Aen. IV, 575-576) // Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire*. 1981. 59 (1). P. 85–90.
72. Preller L. *Römische Mythologie*. Berlin: 1858.

73. Putnam M. C. J. The Shrine of Vortumnus // *American Journal of Archaeology*. 1967. 71 (2). P. 177–179.
74. Rawson E. Scipio, Laelius, Furius, and the Ancestral Religion // *The Journal of Roman Studies*. 1973. 63. P. 161–174.
75. Reifferscheid A. (ed.) *C. Suetoni Tranquilli praeter Caesarum libros reliquiae*. Leipzig: 1860.
76. Rich J. W. Augustus and the Spolia Opima // *Chiron*. 1996. 26. P. 85–127.
77. Rousselle R. Liber-Dionysus in Early Roman Drama // *The Classical Journal*. 1987. 82 (3). P. 193–198.
78. Rutledge S. H. The Roman Destruction of Sacred Sites // *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte*. 2007. 56 (2). P. 179–195.
79. Ryberg I. S. The Procession of the Ara Pacis // *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome*. 1949. 19. P. 79–101.
80. Sanders E. P., Davies M. *Studying the Synoptic Gospels*. London – Philadelphia: 1989.
81. Scheid J. The Religious Roles of Roman Women // Schmitt Pantel P. (ed.) *A History of Women in the West. Volume I*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: 1994.
82. Schilling R. Religions de Rome // *École pratique des hautes études. Section des sciences religieuses. Annuaire 1967-1968*. 1966. 75. P. 149–150.
83. Shea C. The Vertumnus Eligy and Propertius Book IV // *Illinois Classical Studies*. 1988. 13 (1). P. 63–71.
84. Sherwin-White A. N. *Roman Foreign Policy in the East. 168 B.C. to A.D. 1*. London: 1984.
85. Simon E. Gods in Harmony: The Etruscan Pantheon // de Grummond, N. T., Simon E. (edd.) *The Religion of the Etruscans*. Austin, 2006. P. 45–65.
86. Smith O. L. (ed.) *Scholia Graeca in Aeschylum quae exstant omnia. Pars II*. Berlin – New York: 2009.

87. Spengel, L., Spengel A. (edd.) *M. Terenti Varronis De Lingua Latina Libri*. Berlin: 1885.
88. Springer L. A. *The Cult and Temple of Jupiter Feretrius* // *The Classical Journal*. 1954. 50 (1). P. 27–32.
89. Stek T. *Cult Places and Cultural Change in Republican Italy: A Contextual Approach to Religious Aspects of Rural Society after the Roman Conquest*. Amsterdam: 2010.
90. Stopponi S., Leone D. *Dal Fanum Voltumnae a San Pietro in Vetera: Continuità Culturali e Insediative a Campo della Fiera, Orvieto* // Santoro S. (ed.) *Emptor et Mercator: Spazi e Rappresentazioni del Commercio Romano*. Bari, 2017. P. 477–499.
91. Suits T. A. *The Vertumnus Elegy of Propertius* // *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*. 1969. 100. P. 475–486.
92. Syme R. *Isauria in Pliny* // *Anatolian Studies*. 1986. 36. P. 159–164.
93. van der Meer L. B. *Campo della Fiera at Orvieto and Fanum Voltumnae: Identical Places?* // *Babesch*. 2013. 88. P. 99–108.
94. Takács S. A. *Politics and Religion in the Bacchanalian Affair of 186 B.C.E.* // *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*. 2000. 100 (2000). P. 301–310.
95. Taylor L. R. *Local Cults in Etruria*. Roma: 1923.
96. Versnel H. S. *Inconsistencies in Greek and Roman Religion, Vol. II*. Leiden: 1993.
97. Versnel H. S. *Two Types of Roman Devotio* // *Mnemosyne*. 1976. 29 (4). P. 365–410.
98. von Domaszewski A. *Abhandlungen zur römischen Religion*. Leipzig – Berlin: 1909.
99. von Domaszewski A. *Die Religion des römischen Heeres*. Trier: 1895.

100. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff U. Hephaistos // Nachrichten von der Königl. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Philologisch-historische Klasse. 1895. P. 217–245.
101. Weinstock S. Die Geheime Schutzgottheit von Rom by Angelo Brelich // The Journal of Roman Studies. 1950. 40 (1–2). P. 149–150.
102. Weinstock S. Divus Julius. Oxford: 1971.
103. Welcker F. G. Die griechischen Tragödien mit Rücksicht auf den epischen Cyclus. Vol. I. Bonn: 1839.
104. Wissowa G. Evocatio (deorum) // RE. 1907. 6 (1). P. 1152–1153.
105. Wissowa G. Religion und Kultus der Römer. München: 1902.
106. Woodard R. D. Myth, Ritual, and the Warrior in Roman and Indo-European Antiquity. Cambridge: 2013.
107. Zangemeister K. Rheinische Corpusstudien // Westdeutsche Zeitschrift für Geschichte und Kunst. 1892. 11. P. 267–311.