CHAPTER ONE

CONSTITUENT CONCEPTS

1. Space

Since they were conceptualized as human beings, Roman gods had a place in this world, in which they moved freely. This conclusion is unavoidable, if we consider that all Roman gods could be invoked, and that invocation implied spatial proximity to the invocator. Apart from this, at least the major gods were conceptualized as connected to specific locations, normally marked as such by an altar, a temple, or in some other way. These locations I will call ‘spatial foci’. They are mostly represented by archaeological remains. However, by relying on archaeology, we unduly overemphasize the spatiality of major official divine concepts, which were more likely than private cults to be permanently conceptualized by specifically marked space.

The sacred landscape of Rome was complex, time-bound and notoriously anachronistic. It was complex because its parameters were not absolute and necessarily recognizable as such. Rather, it was intrinsically relative and existent only within the full semiotic system of the topography of the city. Furthermore, it was time-bound, because the city itself developed rapidly, especially during the peak of urbanization from ca. 200 B.C.–200 A.D. It was notoriously anachronistic because the semiotic system underlying it was highly conservative and did not keep pace with the actual urban development (for instance, the pomerium was still remembered, when it had long become obsolete in the imperial period in terms of urban development; and the festival of the Septimontium was still celebrated separately by the communities that had long since merged into the city of Rome).

It is not always easy to pin down the relation to space of divine concepts in so inconsistent and fluid a semiotic environment. The allocation of specific space to a divine concept was determined by mutually
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1 Scheid 2003a, 147: “The Romans, like the Greeks, accepted the fundamental principle that the gods lived in the world alongside men and strove with them, in a civic context, to bring about the common good.”
competing factors such as the status and motives of the founder of the cult, the availability of and historical connection with a specific place, the money to be invested, the function of the god, general religious restrictions imposed by parameters such as the pomerium and other regulations of the augural law, etc. This daunting plethora of factors makes it easy to overlook the fact that one element is common to public cults (and is often adopted in the private sphere too): the architectural language of space. For it is scarcely self-evident that the large variety of divine concepts in the city was marked by more or less the same architectural forms, in one way or another already present in the most important spatial focus of pagan divine concepts ever created in Rome, i.e. the temple of Iuppiter Optimus Maximus on the Capitol. One may argue that in the case of altars, the margin for variation was narrow due to the simplicity of the architectural type. However, this explanation cannot hold true of the temple, which was anything but a simple structure. Characterized by a frontal colonnade on a podium to be reached over a stairway and supporting a triangular pediment, which was normally adorned with some sort of sculpture or other decoration, its homogeneous appearance was not intended to express the differences among the various divine concepts worshipped in it, but to set it off from profane architecture. In terms of architectural forms, then, all public cults were essentially equal and clearly marked off from the various building-types of human beings. Given this basic dichotomy, the actual architectural forms in each category could differ, i.e. each architectural detail could be modified or substituted for another, as long as the remaining details sufficed to provide the relevant spatial concept of either profane or divine architecture. The fact that, architecturally speaking, the dividing line did not run between individual gods, but between human beings and gods, explains the public outcry when Caesar erected a pediment, characteristic of divine spatial concepts, over the façade of his private residence. By doing so, he in fact challenged this dichotomy, in order to underpin his super-human claims.

The more important a divine concept was felt to be, the more firmly it was grounded in the sacred landscape of the city. Gods that represented only a slight or no specific local affiliation were notoriously ephemeral
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2 For the general layout of Roman cult places see Scheid 2003a, 66–73; Egelhaaf-Gaiser 2007, 209f., for Roman temples in particular see Stamper 2005.
3 Weinstock 1971, 276–281, esp. 280f.
and specialized. Most striking is the group of ‘functional’ gods, who, as their name indicates, were predominately conceptualized on the basis of function. They rarely received official recognition in urban topography, i.e. a spatial focus, or in the calendar, i.e. a temporal focus. Nor were they characterized by particular rituals or a specific iconography. Another case in point is a number of antiquated deities, kept alive by pontifical tradition, though virtually forgotten by the people due to the fact that they were no longer present in urban topography. One may refer to the goddess Fur(r)ina: Varro mentions the goddess and her priest in connection with the festival of the Fur(r)inalia (July 25). But he also acknowledged that, in his day, the name of the deity was hardly known to anyone. A further case is that of Falacer, of whom virtually nothing is known apart from the existence of his flamen.

It is of specific relevance to the formation of ‘gods’ by spatial foci to note that during the Republican period, augurally constituted space, such as a cela of a public temple, could typically be dedicated to just one deity at a time. The exact process of constituting augural space is thereby somewhat obscure, because the knowledge of the augural discipline was jealously guarded by the augurs themselves and passed on only by oral transmission.

* * *

In the pagan world, the cult statue of a specific god (meaning: the iconographic focus of a specific cult) was directly linked to the spatial focus of the god. In other words, no cult statue could function as such independently of or outside the spatial context in which it was placed.
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1 Varro ling 5.84, 6.19; Degrassi 1963, 487.
2 Varro ling 5.84, 7.45.
3 In 208 B.C. the pontifices prevented M. Claudius Marcellus from dedicating a temple with one cela to two deities (Honos, Virtus) on the grounds that if expiation after lightning or some other portent became necessary, it would be impossible to ascertain to which of the two deities an expiatory sacrifice should be offered (Liv. 27.25.7–10). Dumézil 1970, 399 interpreted the passage in the sense that the reason for the pontifical intervention was the lack of distinctive functional domains of the two gods, though this is not what Livy says. Furthermore, the passage has been explained by the conflict of Marcellus with the Scipiones (D. Palombi, in: LTUR III (1996), 31). But it is highly unlikely that the pontifical line of argument (which, as a matter of fact, only required the erection of a second cela and did not exclude the dedication itself) was therefore unfounded. Perhaps the pontiffs felt scruples about the building of one temple, when Marcellus had actually vowed two (Clark 2007, 68f.). But if so, it is not clear why Livy did not say so.
Sylvia Estienne pointed out after an investigation of such potentially ‘isolated’ cult statues that “it is not so much the statue that makes the cult place, but rather the place itself that marks the statue as a cult object.” The two concepts of place and statue are linked up to form the new concept of ‘cult place’, with ‘place’ being the dominating factor. Its dominance is due to its lack of ambiguity: divine space, normally marked unequivocally by some sort of architecture, could scarcely be taken for something else, whereas a statue could always be seen as mere decoration.

The principle of spatiality is widely applied elsewhere too. The proximity of a statue to the spatial focus of a cult was an indicator of the degree to which it was intended to serve as an iconographic focus of the cult. For instance, Caesar placed an image of Cleopatra next to the cult image of Venus Genetrix, because he wanted to assimilate his mistress to the goddess. In the same vein he placed a statue of himself in the temple of Quirinus (and that meant no doubt next to the cult image), adding the inscription “to the invincible god”. On the other hand, when Agrippa intended to place a statue of Augustus in the newly erected Pantheon in 25 B.C., the emperor rejected the honour. Agrippa, in turn, set up a statue of Caesar instead, while statues of the emperor and himself were erected in the ante-room of the building. The message was plain: while Caesar had already gained divinity and hence was entitled to associate with the gods directly in the “holiest”, innermost part of the sanctuary, Augustus and Agrippa were still human and therefore to be located in the periphery of the “holy” center. Meanwhile, low-profile Tiberius accepted the erection of his statues in temples on the condition that they were placed not among the cult images of the gods, but in the temple decoration (inter ornamenta aedium). Fine examples of the deliberate juxtaposition of representations of historical persons and spatial foci of a god are the two altars of Mercy and Friendship, flanked by statues of Tiberius and Seianus, following a senatorial decision in 28 A.D. According to contemporary sources, it was a mark of restraint that only two bronze
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9 App. B.C. 2.102 with Fishwick I, 79.
10 Dio 43.45.3 with Fishwick I, 58, 60f.
11 Dio 53.27.3; cf. 54.1.1.
14 Tac. ann. 4.74.
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15 The underlying principle of spatiality is ominipresent: the closer to the divine in spatial terms, the more divine in conceptual terms.

* * *

In augural thinking, the border of the city was not the city wall (which was built according to strategic considerations) but rather an augurally defined strip of land which surrounded the city and was referred to as the 

pomerium. It formed the limit of the augural ‘map’ (auspicia urbana).

Essentially, this line did not differ from the border line of any inaugurated place, which means that its exact course had to be clearly visible: in other words, no buildings were supposed to be built on or directly next to it.16 The earliest pomerium included the Palatine and not much more.17 According to tradition, Titus Tatius later added the Forum and the Capitol, while Servius Tullius included the Quirinal, Viminal and Esquiline.18 Sources report further modifications from Sulla’s time onwards.19 Surprisingly, the Aventine was excluded from the pomerium, at least until the first century A.D., when it had in any case lost all religious significance.20

The long-standing view that foreign cults, when introduced to Rome, were given a place outside the pomerium during the Republic has been challenged by Ziolkowski, who has argued that the prime parameter in choosing the location for a temple was the availability of suitable space regardless of the pomerium line. Ziolkowski showed that the traditional ‘Roman’ gods occupied the more central areas in urban topography from prehistoric times, while the lack of space resulting from the increasing urbanization led to the accommodation of new gods in the

---

15 Plin. pan. 52.3.
16 Liv. 1.44.4; Varro ling. 5.143; Gell. 13.14.1; Catalano 1960, 292–304; M. Andreussi, in: LTUR IV (1999), 96–105.
18 Tac. ann. 12.24; Liv. 1.44.3; Gell. 13.14.4.
19 For the Republican period, alterations are attested under Sulla (Sen. dial. 10.13.8; Tac. ann. 12.23; Gell. 13.14.4; Dio Cass. 43.50.1), Caesar (Tac. ann. 12.23; Gell. 13.14.4; Dio Cass. 43.50.1) and Augustus (Tac. ann. 12.23). Later on, changes are recorded under Claudius, Vespasian and Hadrian.
periphery of the existing settlements. On occasion, the actual sphere of competences of a specific deity may have determined the choice of location, as Vitruvius claimed. For instance, the extra-pomerial location of healing gods, such as Apollo in the Campus Martius and Aesculapius on the Island in the Tiber, could be interpreted as an attempt to avert from the old city diseases that had been associated with these deities. Furthermore, the two healing gods were situated not only outside the *pomerium*, but virtually next to each other, with the temple of Aesculapius separated from the temple of Apollo by the Tiber. But again, in his stress on the importance of divine functions concerning the distribution of sanctuaries Vitruvius is at least partly contradicted by Roman evidence.

Interestingly, Vitruvius regards the city wall—not the *pomerium*—as the basic topographical demarcation line. His claim is supported by the fact that cults of some of the oldest and most prominent Roman gods such as Iuppiter Elicius, Ceres, Diana and Iuno Regina were situated outside the *pomerium*, that is to say, on or next to the Aventine hill, though inside the city walls (which included the hill as early as the archaic period). Again, one should not overstress the importance of the city wall in these contexts, but it would seem only natural that cults essential to the religious functioning and well-being of the city (Iuppiter Elicius, Ceres, Diana) should be situated within the walls, if only for reasons of control and protection.

* * *

The most important god of Roman public life over the centuries was undoubtedly Iuppiter. When the Romans conceptualized this divine form, they conceptualized it as locally bound to a number of places in the city. The most important spatial focus of the cult of the god was the temple area on the Capitol. It was not only the size of the area,
but also the architecture of the temple itself and the rich offerings displayed around it that rendered its spatial position paramount, not only among all Jovian temples, but in general among all sacred areas in the city. Besides this, its geographical position—set high above the Forum Romanum to the east and the commercial markets (Forum Holitorium and Forum Boarium) to the south—highlights the spatial focus of Jovian worship in comparison to the spatial foci of other gods. But Jovian worship did not focus only on the sanctuary of the Capitoline triad, but also on the entire Capitoline hill. It is not by chance that we find an impressive number of other Jovian sanctuaries in the area. They were placed as close as possible to their source of power.

While the reason for the location of the oldest form of Iuppiter on the Capitoline, that of Iuppiter Feretrius, is unknown (though well in line with the general tendency to worship Iuppiter on hill tops), it is likely that the location of the temple dedicated to Iuppiter, Iuno and Minerva was a secondary choice. The triad was also worshipped on the Quirinal (Capitolium Vetus). Since the appearance of the same triad at two places cannot be coincidence, one has to conclude that it was deliberately transferred, or better still (since the Capitolium Vetus still appears in the Regional Catalogues of the fourth century A.D.), duplicated on the Capitol or vice versa on the Quirinal. If the Quirinal triad was the earlier one (but there is so far no way to prove this), the reason for this duplication may have been a deliberate act of political instrumentalization of the Quirinal triad. While the various autonomous settlements in the area were gradually synoecizing, a political and economical centre emerged around the Capitoline area in the seventh century. Naturally, the god that came to embody the idea of this centralized urban structure had to be located at its very center. In brief, if my assumption of the priority of the Quirinal triad is correct, the location of the Capitoline triad was dictated by, and resulted from, political conditions.

Indeed, piety played at most a minor role in duplicating a specific cult outside its original spatial setting. We need only refer to the two known spatial foci of the cult of Quirinus. The no doubt older one was situated
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28 See chapter II.3.
on his hill, the Quirinal, while the other, the ‘doublet’, was to be found in the political centre, i.e. in the Forum.\textsuperscript{30} The same may be said of the cult of Isis. Epigraphical evidence suggests that Isis was linked to a specific place on the Capitoline from the middle of the first century B.C. at the latest (see below). This Capitoline cult appears to have been ‘duplicated’ in the so-called Iseum Metellinum.\textsuperscript{31} It is tempting to follow Coarelli in suggesting that this Iseum belonged to the first half of the first century B.C. (rather than to the imperial period, as commonly suggested) and to regard Q. Caecilius Metellus Pius (cos. 80 B.C., died 64/63 B.C.) as its founder. It was erected, according to Coarelli, in order to celebrate the military achievements of Metellus’ father, Metellus Numidicus, in the war against Jugurtha.\textsuperscript{32} Even if this reconstruction of events is hypothetical, the very characterization of the Iseum as Metellinum suggests a political reason, i.e. the (self-) promotion of the family of the Metelli, for its erection. In the same vein, we may point to the countless doublets of the Capitoline temple of Iuppiter Optimus Maximus in the market places of Roman colonies at later times. Their location in the political centre of their cities was clearly a means of political propaganda: were it otherwise, we would wonder why such Capitolia were only very exceptionally situated away from the political centres of the relevant cities.\textsuperscript{33}

Space was also a constituent concept of ‘unofficial’ gods and their cults, such as that of Bacchus at the beginning of the second century B.C. Here, it is the Aventine hill that was particularly connected with the cult of the god, perhaps originally as an unofficial offshoot of the cult of Liber, who was worshipped there as part of the Aventine triad from the beginning of the fifth century B.C. at the latest. It was in the vicinity of the Aventine, i.e. outside the pomerium, that the grove of Stimula (= Semele), with a shrine (sacrarium) dedicated to the goddess or her divine son (or possibly both), was located.\textsuperscript{34} It is telling that contentious divine concepts such as that of Semele could be derived from official gods such as the Aventine triad by the principle of spatiality, i.e. by positioning their cultural centre in close local proximity. In a sense,

\textsuperscript{30} Curti 2000, 88–90.
\textsuperscript{31} Hist. Aug. trig. tyr. 25.
\textsuperscript{33} See Steuernagel 1999, 177–179 for such an off-centered position of the Capitolium in Puteoli (if his identification with the temple of Augustus is correct).
the cult of Semele was just the ‘other’, ‘dark’ side of the Aventine triad, which was located virtually next door to her.

In terms of spatial setting, recently imported deities in Rome, with the exception of the Christian god, followed the same pattern as the traditional gods. Most of all, they were linked to specially established areas. Apparently, the first spatial focus of the cult of the Egyptian Isis was situated on the Capitoline. It is of little significance whether shrines or altars were erected there or, for that matter, a temple in her name. Epigraphic evidence dating from the mid-first century B.C. at the latest attests to the existence of priests of Isis Capitolina. Given that this form of Isis (with the epithet ‘Capitolina’) is locally bound, it is obvious that there was a spatial focus of the cult of the goddess on the Capitol with a priest conducting the cult. Considering the repeated expulsions of the goddess from inside the pomerium and, during the first century B.C., explicitly from the Capitol region, it is also clear that the cult began on the Capitol as a private foundation, i.e. it was situated on private property. This dovetails with the fact that in the middle of the first century B.C., some areas of the Capitol were in private hands. Considering the private nature of the cult, one should note that the location of this precinct—adjacent to the highest state god and situated above the old city centre—is both a rare and an expensive privilege. This suggests that some of its adherents were of financial ease. Perhaps in the wake of repeated expulsions of Isis from the city area, the goddess was eventually relegated to a new precinct in the Campus Martius during the final years of the first century B.C. (Isis Campensis).

If we turn to imperial worship, a slightly different picture emerges. On the one hand, the appearance of the emperor in various spatial settings was modelled on that of the traditional gods; while on the other, due to a certain reluctance to display the emperor’s divinity in
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38 For references see Versluys 2004, 427–430.
the capital, these places functioned only indirectly as spatial foci. The most important indication of such ‘indirect’ focalization is the absence of a temple. This situation changed at the moment of the emperor’s death, when as a rule a temple was erected in his name.

‘Indirect’ spatial focalization can be illustrated by the worship of Augustus at the crossroads: shortly before 7 B.C., Augustus reorganized the administrative map of the metropolis by dividing it into 4 regions (regiones) and 265 residential districts (vici). In each district the emperor established one or more shrines (compita) at which the Lares of the imperial house, that is to say the Lares Augusti, were worshipped (the worship of his own genius is likely, but less certain). In doing so, Augustus spectacularly modified the age-old cult of the Lares Compitales who were traditionally worshipped at the crossroads and had their own festival, the Compitalia or Laralia. Given the numerous districts and the possibility that more than a single shrine was erected in each, there can be little doubt that the Augustan Lares were, from now on, present in this new—divine—context throughout Rome. Nor was it by chance that the emperor himself paid for the expenses of the new cult statues and possibly the altars.

While Augustus and his successors remained fond of such assimilation, they were disinclined towards direct identification with the divine in Rome during their own lifetime. In a passage already mentioned, Augustus rejected the erection of his statue in the main room of the Pantheon and its name Augusteum. Instead, his effigy was set up in the ante-chamber of the building (while a statue of Caesar was placed in the main room). In a similar vein, Augustus dedicated a temple to Apollo next to his Palatine residence in 28 B.C. This location automatically led to a conceptual assimilation of the princeps to the very god he had chosen as his tutelary deity. No wonder then that the temple was to operate as a focal point of Augustan propaganda, both culturally (with a library of Greek and Roman authors attached to it), politically (with its central role during the Secular Games in 17 B.C. and senatorial meetings convened in it) and religiously (with the Sibylline books stored in it). In spatial terms, the temple was connected to Augustus’ residence via private corridors, so that the princeps could approach the
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43 Dio 53.27.2–4, cf. above in this chapter.
god without stepping out in the open. In other words, “the princeps not only lived next to, but close to and together with his tutelary deity.” Spatial proximity here as elsewhere suggested conceptual similarity, fully in line with the principle of spatiality. Even more importantly, the motivation of this assimilation to the divine is apparent: an implicit super-human outlook of the ruler could only serve to underpin his power-position within the state. But Augustus, having learned his lesson from Caesar’s assassination, was cautious enough not to provoke stout Republicans by turning assimilation into identification.

While there was no explicit spatial focus for the divine concept of Augustus in the capital during his lifetime, after his death he was honoured with the erection of two major sanctuaries in Rome. A sacra[rium] on the Palatine was consecrated in the early 30’s A.D. and later transformed into a templum under Claudius. Additionally, the temple of Divus Augustus, vowed by the senate in 14 A.D. on the precedent of the temple of Divus Iulius, was inaugurated as late as 37 A.D. under Caligula. Throughout Italy, a number of similar Augustea are attested, some of them doubtless already erected during the emperor’s lifetime.

* * *

One of the reasons for the paramount importance of spatial foci in conceptualizing a Roman god was their relative continuity and exclusiveness. By continuity, I mean the fact that once a place was consecrated to a deity, it normally remained in its possession; by exclusiveness, that it remained exclusively in its possession. These principles were in force at least as long as the augural discipline was observed.

Earlier in the Republic, however, spatial foci of gods were not always irrevocably fixed. For instance, an existing spatial focus could be cleared by summoning a deity therefrom and relegating it to another location (exauguratio). When the Capitoline temple was built, a number of gods had to be exaugurated. However, Terminus and Iuventus (some sources also include Mars) resisted and were integrated into the new sanctuary
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46 Zanker 1983, 23.
49 Gradel 2002, 80–84.
of Iuppiter. In practical terms, the reluctance to relocate Terminus may well have been due to his functional focus as the god of ‘boundaries’, but function was hardly a reason for preserving the spatial focus of the worship of Iuventus (or Mars, if indeed he was involved) on this spot. Possibly, we have to include Summanus in the group of gods that could not be summoned from the Capitol.

Under certain conditions a god could ‘trespass’ on ground consecrated to another god. One may refer, for instance, to the building of temple B (Temple of Fortuna huiusce diei, built at the end of the second century B.C.) in the same area as temple C (Temple of Iuturna[?], built in the mid-third century B.C.) in the sacred area of Largo Argentina. Furthermore, we know that Cn. Flavius dedicated a temple of Concordia in the Volcanal (in area Vulcani) at the end of the fourth century B.C. Unfortunately, in neither of the above cases is there clear evidence for the exact nature of the ‘overlap’ of spatial foci of the gods in question.

A complete abolition of a spatial focus is possible, though rare (unless the cult was officially banned, as in the case of the Bacchanalia). Cicero did actually achieve the demolition of the sanctuary of Libertas in 57 B.C. It had been erected on his private precincts by Clodius a year earlier, but had been consecrated in violation of pontifical law. The temple of Pietas, built and dedicated to the goddess at the beginning of the second century B.C., was apparently torn down in 44 B.C., when a theatre (the later Theatre of Marcellus) was erected on the same site. Whether these deities received sanctuaries located elsewhere is unknown. However, it is rather unlikely, as they are never mentioned again. Besides this, they had been established on rather flimsy political grounds and for personal reasons in the first place.

* * *

The vast majority of spatial foci of Roman cults were undeniably stable and relatively exclusive. If we concentrate on these, there is an obvious interaction between spatial and functional foci. Indeed, three

50 Cato ap. Fest. 160.10–12 [L] [Terminus]; Varro ant. fr. 40f. [Cardauns; Mars, Iuventus, Terminus] with commentary.
51 See chapter I.4.
52 Ziolkowski 1986, 630.
54 Clark 2007, 209–212.
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categories may be distinguished here: first, gods with related functional foci and worshipped in distinct sanctuaries. Secondly, gods with related functional foci and worshipped in distinct cellae within the same sanctuary or (ignoring the augural discipline) in the same cella but in the form of different cult statues. And thirdly, gods with related functional foci that had merged to such a degree that they were worshipped as a single god in the form of a single cult statue rather than as distinct deities. In this order, the three categories represent an increasing degree of assimilation.

1. Distinct temples would normally suggest a less direct relationship of the gods in question. Such a relationship is therefore often hard to prove. It is obvious in cases where functional foci had led to hypostasization, for instance where a temple dedicated to a hypostasis of a major god was built in the vicinity of a temple of his/her ‘parent’ god (hyperstasis). Turning to the worship of distinct gods, two examples should at least be mentioned: Apollo the ‘healer’ had his temple on the bank of the Tiber. It was situated virtually opposite the temple of Aesculapius (himself a healing god of paramount importance and located on the Island in the Tiber). Also, a sanctuary of Carmenta, a goddess of birth and fertility, was situated next to the temple of Mater Matuta, a goddess of matrons, both buildings being located at the foot of the Capitol. Possibly, the two temples complemented each other also in ritual terms.

2. The second category, i.e. distinct gods with related functional foci and housed in the same cella/temple, is much better attested. It is worth noting that in this category the functional relationship might often be expressed by fictitious links of divine kinship, adopted from—or at least modelled on—Greek concepts. I will restrict myself to the most striking case, the Capitoline triad. The combination of Iuppiter and Iuno is clearly influenced by the functional foci of the Greek couple, Zeus and Hera. Minerva, i.e. Greek Athena (Palias), as daughter of Iuppiter and—according to Greek thinking—protectress of cities par excellence, is
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56 See chapter II.3.
57 The myth as recounted by Ov. fast. 6.529–548 connects the two. Besides this, both temples are located virtually next to each other, despite the fact that the archaic city wall presumably separated the two (as did the later, so-called ‘Servian’ wall; for the topography cf. Champeaux 1982, 316ff.; Coarelli 1988, 241; Carandini 1997, pl. xxxiii with p. 627).
hardly surprising within this group of tutelary gods. This is not to say that the triad as such originated from Greece, but that it was motivated by the interaction of functional foci of Greek gods, whatever the routes from which they arrived in Rome, and whatever the Romans eventually understood these Greek concepts to represent. Wissowa’s argument is still valid: had the triad merely been adopted from a Greek environment, one would expect its cult to be under the control of the *II/X/XVīri sacris faciundis*. However, this was not the case.

A special case of divine groups that were based on complementarity of functional foci, and whose cult statues were housed next or very close to each other, were gods accompanied by their so-called divine ‘consorts’. For where complementary functional foci were sex-related and could not easily be brought into line with the existing sex-related foci of a deity, they could be subsumed under the cult of an ‘auxiliary’ deity of the other sex, which was then normally worshipped as a ‘consort’. It was not unusual for such ‘consorts’ to gain considerable independence over time. For example, Sarapis received increased popularity after the ascent of his even more popular female companion Isis in the first century A.D. He became virtually her match from the second century A.D. on. Similarly, one may cite Attis, the consort of Magna Mater, whose worship boomed in the Middle Empire. Their joint cult dates back to the Republican period, but became conspicuous only from the first century A.D. onwards.

Another noteworthy incident of the influence of functional complementarity on the spatial setting of gods is the joint spatial conceptu-
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58 For this notion of Minerva in the triad as Athena Polias see e.g. Graf 2001, 130–132. DServ. *Aen.* 1.422 claims that according to the Etruscan discipline no city could be founded “legally” (*iustas urbes*), in which there were not three gates, streets and three temples, i.e. temples of Juppiter, Iuno and Minerva. This slightly obscure information may be, at least as far as the temples are concerned, a projection of Roman conditions on to the Etruscan past. However, Etruscan examples of a Capitoline triad are lacking so far, and, at any rate, DServius is speaking of temples in the plural and thus not necessarily suggesting a cult community at all (cf. Banti 1943, 203–210; Pfiffig 1975, 33f.).

59 See Wissowa 1912, 41, who suggested Etruria as the most likely source. The triad is mentioned by Paus. 10.5.2 in a provincial sanctuary in Phokis. The iconography of the group mentioned there is similar to that of the Capitoline group, with Zeus seated and Hera and Athena standing next to him. Pausanias does not give a date for the group or temple. However, given the well-documented impact of the Roman triad on the panthea of other cities as well as the apparent insignificance of the Phocan sanctuary, the influence of Rome on the latter is much more likely than the contrary argument.

60 For both Sarapis and Attis see chapter II.1.
alization of divinized emperors. Until the end of the second century A.D., the divinity of the deceased emperor was regularly marked by a temple. But with the number of Divi increasing and available urban space dramatically shrinking, it became expedient to restrict the number of spatial foci of the imperial cult. As a consequence, cult statues of the Divi were more and more placed at existing spatial foci \((aedes, templum, porticus)\) of earlier Divi such as that of Divus Augustus on the Palatine or Divus Titus in the Campus Martius.\(^{61}\)

3. We have a small number of examples of the third category, the complete merger of spatial, functional and other conceptual foci of two gods. A case in point is \textit{Semo Sancus Dius Fidius}.\(^{62}\) The latter is a composite divine name originally representing two independent deities, Semo Sancus and Dius Fidius. It was to Dius Fidius alone that a temple on the Quirinal was initially dedicated in the first half of the fifth century B.C., as borne out by the oldest written evidence.\(^{63}\) Thus one can accommodate more easily the information that the temple was allegedly built by Tarquinius Superbus (and consecrated by Spurius Postumius in 466 B.C.),\(^{64}\) while the transfer of Sancus from Sabine territory to Rome was traditionally associated with the Sabine king Titus Tatius.\(^{65}\) The hypaethral shape of the Quirinal temple,\(^{66}\) too, could well support a dedication to Dius Fidius, the god of oaths \textit{par excellence}, alone, for according to Cato, it was forbidden to take an oath to the god under a roof.\(^{67}\) However, Semo Sancus, a god connected with lightning, would potentially be a strong candidate for a hypaethral temple as well. The fact is that in the classical period it was no longer clear which of the two deities should be addressed on the anniversary of the temple (June 5).\(^{68}\)


\(^{62}\) In inscriptions \textit{Dius} appears as \textit{Deus}; \textit{CIL} VI 30994 \textit{Semoni Sanco Sancto deo Fidio}; cf. ibid. 567 \textit{Semoni Sanco deo Fidio}; 568 \textit{Sanco Sancto Semon (sic) deo Fidio}; 30995 \textit{Sanco Deo Fidio}.

\(^{63}\) Varro \textit{ling} 5.52 (catalogue of the sacrifices of the Argei); Dion. Hal. \textit{ant}. 9.60.8; cf. F. Coarelli, in: \textit{LTUR} IV (1999), 263f.; the calendar entries on June 5, the anniversary of the temple, refer only to Dius Fidius (Degrassi 1963, 465).

\(^{64}\) Dion. Hal. \textit{ant}. 9.60.8.

\(^{65}\) Tert. \textit{adv. nat}. 2.9.23.

\(^{66}\) Varro \textit{ling} 5.66.

\(^{67}\) Cato ap. Non. 793 [L].

Another case of such divine assimilation, albeit much less clear, might be that of Iuppiter Feretrius. Though the god could also be (and is normally) interpreted as an early Jovian hypostasis, his peculiar iconographic focus (a flint-stone) in combination with the fact that he is the only Jovian hypostasis with a clearly distinct temporal and personnel focus (*ludi Capitolini, fetiales*), as well as the obscure etymology of the epithet *Feretrius* suggest that the god is in fact the result of an assimilation of two originally distinct deities, Iuppiter and (an otherwise unknown) Feretrius. The god would then find a perfect parallel in Iuppiter Summanus and other similar cases.69

* * *

Synagogues are attested in Rome at least from the beginning of the first century A.D.70 However, the paramount spatial focus of the Jewish cult was, of course, the temple in Jerusalem with its numerous rituals performed by professional priests. When the temple was destroyed by the Romans in 70 A.D., much of its function and liturgy was transferred to the synagogues of the diaspora, whose significance as spatial foci thus considerably increased. Henceforth, the worship of the Jewish god became focused not on space (i.e. the temple in Jerusalem), but on ritual. An outcome of this spatial ‘defocalization’ of the cult of the Jewish god was the standardization of the synagoga liturgy.71

Early Christianity was initially closely bound up with Judaism, which furnished a considerable percentage of early Christian proselytes. This meant that the temple in Jerusalem must initially have been regarded by many Christian proselytes as a spatial focus of the cult of their god. However, we find already in the gospel of Mark (*ca. 60–75 A.D.*) the notion that the temple was nothing more than a place of prayer, a temporary building of stone, liable to destruction.72 According to the writer of *Acts* (*ca. 80–90 A.D.*), Stephen quoted Isaiah to support his view that god could not be locked up in a building.73 With the destruction of the temple in Jerusalem in 70 A.D., the Christian cult

---

69 For such formations see chapter I.4.
70 The inscriptions mention synagogues involving the names of Augustus and Agrippa (Lichtenberger 1996, 2158–2160), and Philo, writing under Gaius, mentions a number of synagogues in Rome already in the Augustan age, Philo *leg. ad Gaium* 156.
71 Reif 1993, 53–121; Messner 2003, 350f.
lost its spatial focus for the next two hundred years to come. Its new concept was summarized by Minucius Felix (at the end of the second century A.D.): “what temple could I built for him [scil. the Christian god], when this whole world as formed by his hands cannot contain him?”74 In a similar vein we find Justin Martyr (died 165 A.D. in Rome) saying: “The god of the Christians is not constrained by place, but, being invisible, fills heaven and earth, and is worshipped and glorified by believers everywhere.”75

While the important members of the traditional Roman pantheon were conceptualized by spatial foci of their cults, Roman Christianity was deliberately elusive in terms of space. The only possible exception is the tomb, allegedly of Peter, found under the basilica of St Peter (where a form of veneration may possibly have taken place in the second century A.D.).76 Meanwhile, when in the middle of the second century A.D. Justin Martyr was asked by the Roman prefect where the Christians gathered in the capital, his answer was as short as it was telling: “wherever each of us wants to and can. You may think we gather at one specific spot. However, you are wrong.”77 The fact seems to be that the Christian god was initially worshipped in exclusively private settings, at locations temporarily employed for religious observances, either multipurpose buildings or cemeteries. Here, meetings were convened, normally at least once a week on Sunday.78 The first instances of Christian buildings designed for permanent religious use are to be found at the beginning or middle of the third century A.D. not in the capital or Italy, but in the Roman East (Edessa, Dura Europos).79 No house-churches of any kind are so far archaeologically traceable in Rome before the early fourth century.80

This spatial elusiveness of early Christianity was not a disadvantage. In fact, it made the Christian cult virtually immune to any kind of public interference and, at the same time, a very marketable and flexible merchandise that could be ‘traded’ virtually everywhere without capital
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74 Min. Fel. Octavius 32.1: templum quod ei extruam, cum totus hic mundus eius opere fabricatus eum capere non possit?, with RoR II, 58f.
75 Acta SS. Iustini et sociorum 3, for the authenticity see Schmid/Stählin 1924, 1253f.
77 Acta SS. Iustini et sociorum 3.
78 Iust. Apolog. 1.67.3.
80 Holloway 2004, 62–73; pace e.g. Curran 2000, 40f.
investment. I contend (and will support my contention below) that this spatial independence characteristic of the Christian cult is a main reason for the spread of Christianity in the pre-Constantine era.

In Rome—as in the rest of the Roman world—the systematic ‘spatialization’ of Christianity was virtually invented by Constantine the Great, who thus adopted the pagan practice of attributing specific space to divine concepts and applied it to his new god (clearly not only for reasons of piety). The first official Roman church was the *Basilica Constantiniiana* (San Giovanni in Laterano) built shortly after the ruler’s formal conversion in *ca.* 312 A.D. The very dimensions of this building were indicative of a new beginning. With a length of some 100 meters and width of almost 60, it by far surpassed the dimensions of the Republican temple of Iuppiter Optimus Maximus (*ca.* 62 meters × 54 meters). Holloway estimates that it could house 3,000 worshippers. But not only did Constantine allocate specific urban space to his new official cult, he also set a precedent for a new architectural type of building to mark this space, the *basilica*. Inspired by the forms of profane civil buildings and palatial or classical hypostyle architecture, this new edificial type combined pagan traditionalism with Christian innovation. The altar, at the centre of the basilica, was a reminder of the essentially pagan spatial concept that lay behind it. In later years, Constantine built a church of even greater dimensions, Old St. Peter’s, which was finished around 330. It was the first basilica to be built over a tomb of a martyr, soon to be followed by iconographic foci of the cults of the martyrs in Rome. Other basilicas founded by Constantine, situated outside the Aurelian Walls, followed suit. Constantine’s building activities formed the beginning of the large-scale spatialization of the Christian god in the fourth century A.D. and later.

In conceptual terms, it is fair to say that Christianity had long been space-indifferent. This indifference was due to the very doctrine of monotheism, in which any emphasis or focus on a specific space actually constituted a paradox: given the universal existence, power, and pres-
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84 Elsner 2003, 89–97.
ence of the one god, it was neither reasonable nor desirable to single out specific spatial units for worship. The other cause of the Christian indifference to space was money: most early Christians did not have the financial means to make available and embellish a specific spatial area for the worship of their god. It was Constantine who had both the means and the motive for changing this situation. By introducing the notion of spatial focalization for the Christian god, he adopted the heathen attitude towards divine space.

* * *

The development of the spatial conceptualization of the concept of ‘god’ may thus be divided broadly speaking into three stages. First came paganism, characterized by a regular attribution of specific space to specific divine entities. In terms of architectural forms, such space did not differ essentially from one deity to another (if we exempt special cases such as the ‘caves’ of Mithras). The usual constituents of divine space were an altar and a temple, apart from secondary accessories more directly linked to the nature of the individual god, such as a cult statue with a specific iconography or the ‘hearth’ of the temple of Vesta. The normal way to express the gradation of importance within the hierarchy of the various gods was not architectural form, but size, building material and the technical execution of the spatial markers. Still, bulk and craftsmanship did not necessarily reflect the importance of a cult, as is immediately apparent from the inconspicuous buildings of such prodigious cults as that of Iuppiter Feretrius or the temple of Vesta. Generally speaking, it is fair to say that space transformed in order to indicate divinity (most notably also divinity of the emperor) normally remained indistinct with regard to the individuality of the gods concerned. It is this indistinctiveness that makes the work of modern archaeologists so dauntingly difficult, whenever they are called to determine the owner deity of a temple without further evidence. Scores of unidentified temple structures in cities like Ostia or Pompeii, where architectural remains abound while the epigraphical evidence is often lacking, are a case in point.

The second stage is the period from the beginning of Christianity to the reign of Constantine. This period is characterized by two competing concepts of space, the traditional pagan one and the new Christian concept of divinity without any particular reference to space. The latter had three notable advantages over its competitor: it was cheap, it was immune to foreign interference (no temples meant: no temples
could be destroyed), and it was easily transferable from one place to another. On the other hand, the traditional pagan concepts of space as constituents of a ‘god’ had to compete not only with Christianity, but also with the disintegrative forces of the spatial markers of the imperial cult. One may doubt whether Christianity would have managed to eventually triumph over paganism, had it not been assisted by the dissolving forces of the imperial cult.

The last stage is inaugurated by Constantine and characterized by a synthesis of the two competing concepts of ‘spatialization’ and ‘non-spatialization’ of the divine. Constantine realized that the majority of his subjects were still pagans and that the adoption of and the emphasis on the concept of ‘space’ in conceptualizing a divine entity would facilitate a quicker conversion of the masses as well as control of their ritual activities. At the same time, he acknowledged previous Christian indifference or even aversion to spatial fixation by avoiding the traditional architectural form of the temple.

2. **Time**

Roman gods were invariably eternal. This explains why any Roman god, even the antiquated and forgotten ones, could be invoked at any times. Temporality was therefore an indispensable constituent concept of the concept of divinity. But ‘eternity’ was too unspecific a concept to be of any practical consequence in cultic terms. Therefore, it was narrowed down. The outcome was a series of occasions, i.e. temporal foci, on which the relevant deities were expected to be present and particularly benevolent. This cycle of temporal foci of Roman deities was recorded in the pontifical calendar.

Hardly any element of Roman culture has enjoyed such breathtaking success as the Julian calendar, of which Scaliger could justly say that it “marked a victory in the realm of culture more lasting than any Roman victory on land or sea”. Reaching back to the sixth century B.C., it was substantially revised by Caesar and, after a minor adjustment by Pope Gregory XIII at the end of the sixteenth century, commenced its triumphant march all over the globe. At an early stage, perhaps towards the end of the fourth century B.C., festivals, i.e. temporal foci of the
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worship of specific gods, were included. Later on, annual celebrations of public events, such as victories of the Roman armies and the rulers’ anniversaries, were also marked in it. From time immemorial, its redaction lay in the hands of the pontiffs. The first surviving copy belongs to the first half of the first century B.C. (Festi Antiquites Maiiores), a wall painting from a Mediterranean seaside resort south of Rome. The principal importance of this copy lies in the fact that it represents a selection of festivals and ceremonies of the religious calendar as it was before the revisions initiated by Caesar in 46 B.C. Nevertheless, a selection it was, not the whole calendar.

The most important temporal foci of divine concepts in Rome were their ‘holidays’, Latin feriae. Ancient sources divide such ‘holidays’ into two main categories, feriae publicae and privatae. The former were relevant to public cults and are dealt with now, the latter were relevant to private cults and are dealt with below.

The feriae publicae of gods can be divided into those celebrated annually on the same day, and thus marked as such on the calendar (feriae stativae), and those whose specific dates were announced by the magistrates or priests (feriae conceptivae). Besides this, extraordinary feriae were ordered at the discretion of consuls and praetors (feriae imperativing), and later of the emperor.

Initially, all feriae were proclaimed on the fifth or seventh day (Nonae) of each month by the rex sacrorum, i.e. all were initially feriae conceptivae. If so, the question arises why some maintained this status, while others turned into feriae stativae. The explanation is hardly to be found in specific seasonal events marked by the feriae: for not all feriae conceptivae depended on seasonal conditions, and some feriae that did depend on seasonal conditions were no feriae conceptivae. One might guess that those
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38 Cf. Fest. 284.18–21 [L], ibid. 282.14–16; Macr. sat. 1.16.5–8; Cato agr. 140.
39 Cf. Macr. sat. 1.16.5–8 with Michels 1967, 73; Rüpke 1995, 472 n. 177, 488–492. Among the feriae publicae Macrobius counts here also the mundinae, market days. For the festive character of the mundinae cf. Rüpke 1995, 454.
40 Varro ling. 6.13, 28; Macr. sat. 1.15.12, with Rüpke 1995, 213f.
41 Baudy 1998, 117f. and others have argued that feriae conceptivae were linked to agricultural work and thus ultimately depended on weather conditions (i.e. they required flexibility). But the Feriae Latinae, in no way connected with agriculture, were feriae conceptivae. They were linked to the inauguration of new consuls, whose term did not begin at a specific date in the early Republic. However, from 153 B.C. onwards the consuls entered office on January 1 (Rüpke 1995, 194). Nevertheless, despite their fixed
feriae conceptivae that had political connotations, such as the Feriae Latinae or the Saturnalia, were less likely to be changed so as to become feriae stativae. For such a change would have been tantamount to a de facto loss of political control on the part of those responsible for fixing the dates of the feriae conceptivae, most notably the pontiffs. After all, such political ‘holidays’ could always be politically exploited, either to promote one’s own cause or to obstruct the plans of one’s political opponent.

The core of feriae publicae may have been fixed in the sixth century, although the publication of a feriale may have been delayed until the end of the fourth century B.C.92 One cannot verify to what extent information that was self-evident to the target group of the published calendar (ordinary people as opposed to the aristocratic élite with its priestly monopoly?) was deliberately omitted. Interestingly, it appears that the earliest version of the published feriale was not modeled on the ‘earliest’ reconstructable Roman pantheon, as reflected by those gods that were represented by the flamines93 or, for that matter, by the names of months of the earliest Roman calendar.94 Furthermore, it seems that the feriale was not committed to written form immediately after its creation. This
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93 The flamines include priests of gods that are absent in the feriale, either because the relevant deity had been discarded from the pantheon already, or because certain festivals were too insignificant to be mentioned. Flora had a flamen fl oralis and a cult in Rome, despite her absence in the feriale—possibly because her feriae (Floralia) were conceptivae, cf. Bernstein 1998, 207f. By contrast, the flamen falacer (Varro ling. 5.84; 7.45) has left no trace anywhere outside the antiquarian literature in Rome. Therefore, the relevant deity (Falacer) is likely to have disappeared from Rome at a fairly early stage, presumably before the final arrangement of the feriale. The same holds true of Palatia: a flamen palatualis is attested in the sources (Varro 7.45, Fest. 284.2–4 L with Radke 1965, 242), and epigraphically outside Rome (CIL VIII 10500, XI 5031 [pontifex palatualis]), see Latte 1960, 36 n. 4); it may have disappeared from Rome at a fairly early stage, since it is not represented in the feriale (unless the goddess was a later import). For the evidence of the other flamines see Vanggaard 1988, 24–29.

94 The names of the last six months (Quintilis—December) derive from numerals, while the names of the first six months are derived, either from theonyms (e.g. Ianuarius, Martius, Aprilis, Maius, Iunius), or from a characteristic of the relevant month (Februarius, i.e. februare = to purify). For ancient interpretations of the names of the
would explain irregularities in what seems to have been originally conceived as a consistent plan: for example, despite the overall scheme, at least on two occasions we find two feriae on the same day.\footnote{The regifugium naturally had the ring of the expulsion of the last Etruscan king Tarquinius Superbus in 509 B.C. and was interpreted in this way throughout the ages, cf. Fest. 346.22–36 [L] [exact sense irrecoverable]; Ov. fast. 2.685–856; Aulos. ecl. 16.13f. [Green]; Fasti Polum. Silv. in Degrassi 1963, 265. Whatever its actual origin, I cannot imagine that it ever meant anything else to a Roman, despite the fact that modern scholars, perhaps in order to save the purely ‘religious’ character of the feriale, have tried to discard this ‘political’ interpretation, cf. e.g. Warde Fowler 1916, 327–330; Scullard 1981, 81f. Much less clear is its relation to—and the ‘political’ nature of—the popliopena on July 5.} Besides this, despite the purely religious character of the feriale, an additional ‘political’ holiday, i.e. a holiday commemorating a specific historical event, had found its way into the official calendar as early as the first half of the first century B.C., viz. the regifugium.\footnote{It is remarkable that the pantheon of the earliest fixed Roman calendar, as reflected by the names of the months, does not betray a close affinity with the gods, to whom the ‘named days’ of the feriale were devoted. Thus, Iuppiter, who is by far the most prominent god in the feriale, is absent in the nomenclature of Roman months. By contrast, Iuno (= Iunius) is absent in the feriale, while Ianus (= Januarius) is represented by one ‘named day’ only in the feriale, thus figuring behind such deities as Carmenta and Consus (two ‘named days’). Only Mars (= Martius), and perhaps Aphrodite under a different name (= Aprilis?), figure more prominently in the feriale and are honoured with the naming of a month in the calendar simultaneously.} The latter, however, appears to have been an extraneous element anyway, being exceptional in terms of timing: in violation of usual practice, it fell on an even day (March 24) and was immediately preceded by another ‘holiday’ (Terminalia, March 23) without a day intervening between the two feriae.

In practical terms, the feriale reflected a slowly but permanently shifting system of temporal foci. For the speed of this dynamic process one may compare the Calendar of Philocalus, composed in 354 A.D., some 400 years after the oldest preserved calendar, the Fasti Antates Maiores. Of the forty-five festivals of the latter, only twelve are mentioned by name in the former, while other festivals were renamed, replaced by public Games, or simply forgotten.\footnote{Curran 2000, 221–230.}

The feriae publicae of gods did not necessarily denote a homogeneous category. True, most feriae publicae mentioned by the feriale were specifically marked in the preserved epigraphic evidence by the mysterious sign NP, which has caused headaches to the most eminent epigraphists,
starting with Mommsen. However, some *feriae publicae* were marked otherwise. Ninety-eight Even if we cannot decipher the letters NP satisfactorily, the general nature of public holidays is made clear by the sources: *Feriae publicae* were days of promoting divine peace; business transactions and physical labour, especially by slaves, were restricted or completely avoided, while certain priests were not even allowed to see someone working on that day less they should be defiled. Ninety-nine In theory, such regulations applied to all *feriae publicae* alike. In practice, though, there were manifold gradations. First, there were palpable differences in terms of popularity. On the one end of the scale one may mention the exceedingly popular *Saturnalia* (December 17), on the other the completely obscure *Agonalia* on May 21. Strangely, not even their divine patron is known with certainty (Veiovis?). One may also refer to the *Furricularia* on July 25, whose deity by the time of Varro was almost completely forgotten. Second, there were practical needs. It was virtually impossible for the peasant to lay down his tools on any given *dies feriatus*, if weather conditions required otherwise. Hence, according to P. Mucius Scaevola (cos. 133 B.C.), an expert on pontifical law and pontifex maximus, on *feriae* one was allowed to do what could bring harm if left undone. Third, not all public festivals were relevant to both sexes alike: thus, it is a fair guess that men would have been less likely to observe the *Matralia*, the festival of matrons, on June 11, while women would not automatically participate in the *Armillistrium*, the ‘purification of arms’, on October 19. Fourth, many public festivals were specifically linked to a professional group. It is natural, therefore, that the *Vinalia* on August 19 and the *Robigalia* on April 25 were of special importance for the rural peasantry. Similarly, the *Vestalia* on June 9 were especially linked to bakers and millers, and the *Quinquatrus* on March 19 were sacred to Minerva and thus connected to all kinds of arts and crafts. These were mainly observed by urban craftsmen, artisans and skilled labours, but not self-evidently, say, by members of the senatorial order. Fifth,
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98 For NP-days in general see Degrassi 1963, 332–334; Michels 1967, 68–83; Rüpke 1995, 258–260, for *feriae* that were not NP-days see Michels 1967, 69, 76f.
100 For Veiovis see chapter II.3.
there may have been territorial differences concerning observances. Varro reports that the *Septimontium* was celebrated, not by the Roman people as a whole, but by the ‘people of the hills’, while the *Paganalia* were held by the members of a *pagus*.\(^{105}\)

In short, there were a variety of ways in which *feriae* could be celebrated. Further diversity is suggested by the lack of a consistent terminology: in the imperial period, people could no longer distinguish between various forms of religiously relevant days such as *dies nefasti*, *dies religiosi* and *dies atti*,\(^{106}\) and even legal texts assimilated *dies nefasti* and *feriae*.\(^{107}\) The result was that the various, originally distinct concepts of time were assimilated to each other. Even more confusing is the officially sanctioned modification of the character of a number of holidays: Caesar transformed the legal marking of three *feriae* into *NP*-days, thus clearly reacting to changing religious attitudes.\(^ {108}\)

The religious life of the individual was determined not only by the *feriae*, but also—and predominantly—by private holidays (*feriae privatae*).\(^ {109}\) Private holidays were either passed on within major clans (*gentes*), or derived from the personal biography of the celebrant, such as birthdays, anniversaries etc.\(^ {110}\) The *feriae*, celebrated by the leading members of the family (*familia*), especially the *pater familias*, certainly affected other members of the family as well.\(^ {111}\) Despite the fact that the *feriae privatae* were of paramount importance for the religious life of the individual citizens and frequently might have overshadowed
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\(^{105}\) Varro *ling.* 6.24 with Bendlin 2002, 30f.

\(^{106}\) Gell. 4.9.5f.; 5.17.1.

\(^{107}\) Rüpke 1995, 430f.

\(^{108}\) Rüpke 1995, 377f. Also the legal character of non-holidays could, of course, be changed. Thus, the *nundinae* were turned from *dies nefasti* to *dies fasti* by the *Lex Hortensia* in 287 B.C., cf. Rüpke 1995, 274–280, and Caesar again changed October 16 from an *EV*-day to an *F*-day, cf. Rüpke ibid.

\(^{109}\) Fest. 282.14–16 [L].

\(^{110}\) Characteristic is Horace’s *dies festus*, March 1, on which the poet professes to sacrifice a goat annually to Liber for saving him from a falling tree, *Hor. carm.* 3.8.6–8, with 2.13. Macr. *sat.* 1.16.7f.: *Sunt praeterea feriae propriae familialium, ut familiae Claudiae vel Aemiliae seu Iuliae sive Corneliae, et siquas ferias proprias quaeque familia ex usu domesticae celebratis observavit. Sunt singularum, uti natalium fulgurumque susceptiones, item funerum atque expiationum. Apud veteres quoque qui nominasset Salutem, Semoniam, Seiam, Sgeticiam, Tuttilinam ferias observabant.* The context makes clear that Macrobius here uses the term *familia* for *gens*. Such private holidays could receive a more permanent outlook by the establishment and funding of specific cult actions on these days, as attested in inscriptions (often on the occasion of dedications or burials), Rüpke 1995, 525–533.

\(^{111}\) For the exemption from work of domestic servants on the birthday of their master cf. *Hor. carm.* 3.17.14–16.
public holidays, they have left almost no trace in ancient sources.\footnote{For some exceptions cf. Rüpke 1995, 502f.} It is important to note the ambivalent position of the private holidays of the imperial family, which became \textit{feriae publicae} to the extent determined by the emperor.\footnote{Feeney 2007b, 185–189.}

\* \* \*

The way in which divine concepts were formed through the Roman calendar can now be demonstrated by a number of examples. The temporal foci of the most supreme Roman god, Iuppiter, are numerous. To begin with, the days of the full moon (\textit{Idus}) were sacred to him.\footnote{Ov. \textit{fast.} 1.56, 1.587f.; Paul. Fest. 93.3 [L] with Rüpke 1995, 209f.} That explains why the Ides were marked in the calendar as \textit{NP}-days, i.e. why they belonged to the same category as most public holidays.\footnote{For the \textit{NP}-days see above in this chapter.} But, apart from the monthly rhythm, worship of Iuppiter focused on various dates of the annual cycle too. As a matter of fact, no Republican god equalled him in the number of ‘fixed holidays’: the \textit{Poplifugia} (July 5), the \textit{Vinalia} (April 23 and August 19), the \textit{Meditrinalia} (October 11), and possibly also the \textit{Regifugium} (February 24).\footnote{For a convenient survey of the ‘named days’ with their relevant deities cf. Degrassi 1963, 364f. For the connection of the \textit{Regifugium} with Iuppiter cf. Degrassi 1963, 416.}

As to public Games, the \textit{ludi Romani} in September\footnote{Degrassi 1963, 506f.} and the \textit{ludi plebei} in November were sacred to Iuppiter Optimus Maximus,\footnote{Degrassi 1963, 528f.; Bernstein 1998, 157–163.} while the Capitoline Games on October 15 were dedicated to Iuppiter Feretrius.\footnote{Degrassi 1963, 522; Bernstein 1998, 103–106.} The last two, at least, were not only among the oldest Games, but also the most extended religious events of the Republican year. However, the temporal focalization of Iuppiter went further. The anniversaries of Jovian temples fell exclusively on the ‘marked’ days of the month, i.e. the first (\textit{Kalendae}) and fifth (or in March, May, July and October the seventh) day (\textit{Nonae}) of the month, as well as—and unsurprisingly (since dedicated to Iuppiter anyway)—the 13th (or in March, May, July and October the 15th) day of the month (\textit{Ides}).\footnote{Ides: Iuppiter Optimus Maximus (Sept. 13), Iuppiter Victor (April 13; Wissowa 1912, 123), Iuppiter Invictus (June 13; Wissowa 1912, 123); \textit{Kalendae}: Iuppiter Liber (Sept. 1), Iuppiter Tonans (Sept. 1), \textit{Nonae}: Iuppiter Fulgur (October 7).} The only case that
would contradict this rule has been convincingly explained as having originally fallen on the Ides too.\(^{121}\)

To further illustrate the importance of temporal focalization, some short additional notes should be made. For instance, all Republican temples of Iuno were dedicated on the *Kalendae*, with one exception that was dedicated on the *Nonae*.\(^ {122}\) Independent evidence suggests that the *Kalendae* were indeed sacred to Iuno.\(^ {123}\) In the case of Mars, all but two festivals of the war god are found in his month, i.e. March. Furthermore, even the two exceptions to this rule are directly related to festivals celebrated in March.\(^ {124}\)

Naturally, unofficial or even banned cults likewise show temporal focalization. For example, we hear that the ‘calendar’ of the cult of Bacchus, at the beginning of the second century B.C., included regular initiations, which initially were carried out just three times a year. However, after reforms of *ca.* 210 B.C., initiations were performed on five days of every month.\(^ {125}\) It is at least a plausible guess that the *Liberalia* on March 17, initially connected with scenic Games (*ludi*), also served as a temporal focus for the cult of Bacchus, given the general identification of Bacchus with Liber during the Republican period. The merger of the Games with the *ludi Cerialis* has been tentatively, though plausibly, connected with the Bacchanalian affair.\(^ {126}\)

In the same vein, the worship of foreign gods was temporally focused. For example, in the cult of Isis, the *Menologia Rustica* (first century A.D.) mention a festival called *Hecuresis* (i.e. the recovery of Osiris—Sarapis, who had been killed and dismembered by Typhon) on November 15 (while the *Calendar of Philocalus* refers to the same festival on November 1 as the climax of a festival named *Isia*. This festival lasted from October 28 to November 3).\(^ {127}\) Furthermore, the *Menologia* record an *Isidis navigium* on 5 March\(^ {128}\) and two festivals in April, namely the *sacrum Phariae* (*Pharia* being an epithet of Isis), held somewhere between

---

\(^ {121}\) Iuppiter Stator (Jan. 13?, or June 27? See Wissowa 1912, 122f).

\(^ {122}\) Iuno Sospita (February 1), Iuno Lucina (March 1); Iuno Moneta (June 1), Iuno Regina (September 1); *Nonae*: Iuno Curritis (October 7).

\(^ {123}\) Rüpke 1995, 210–212.

\(^ {124}\) March 1, March 14 (*Equirria*), March 17 (*Agonalia*), March 23 (*Tubilustrium*); exceptions: February 27 (*Equirria*), October 19 (*Armilustrium*).

\(^ {125}\) Liv. 39.13.8f.

\(^ {126}\) Naev. com. 113 [R\(^ 3\)] with Wiseman 2000, 113; cf. Wiseman 1998, 42f.

\(^ {127}\) Degrassi 1963, 526f., 531; Malaise 1972a, 221–227.

\(^ {128}\) Degrassi 1963, 419f.
22–24 April, and the *Sarapia* on 25 April. In addition, the *Calendar of Philocalus* mentions the *lychnapsia* on August 12. In the Egyptian calendar, clearly underlying most Roman dates, there may have been patterns of focalization that were lost when the dates were adopted into the Roman calendar. Nevertheless, temporal focalization characterized the cult of *Isis* even in Rome.

Turning to imperial worship, we have to bear in mind that the divinity of the emperor was modelled on that of traditional gods. This included the temporal focalization of his cult. Indeed, the terminology is telling: imperial ‘holidays’ were called *feriae*, just like the ‘holidays’ of traditional gods. More importantly even, ‘ordinary’ days were declared imperial holidays, resulting in their ‘day’ character being changed. They were marked as *NP*-days, as were the vast majority of traditionally ‘fixed’ holidays. Certain days served *eo ipso* as temporal foci, for instance the imperial birthday or the anniversary of the emperor’s enthronement (*dies imperii*). Thus, Augustus’ birthday (September 23) was declared a public holiday in 30 B.C. with Games being added later in 8 B.C. Consider the festival established on the occasion of the victory at Actium in 30 B.C. (September 2), apparently intended to form the beginning of a new era. Circus Games became the rule on either of these occasions and were continued under later emperors too. Many more such imperial ‘holidays’ were established by Augustus and his successors, most of which were of a temporary nature, though all served in varying degrees as temporal foci of the imperial cult.

The distribution of ‘fixed holidays’ in the Republican calendar shows a remarkable consistency. All ‘fixed holidays’ fell after the *Nonae* of a month (for it was then that they were ‘announced’ by the *rex sacrorum*).

---

129 Degrassi 1963, 449; Malaise 1972a, 229.
130 Degrassi 1963, 494; Malaise 1972a, 229f. The introduction of *Heuresis* (and, by extension perhaps, that of some or all other Isiac festivals) in Rome has been convincingly dated to the reigns of Caligula or early Claudius (*CIL* I' pp. 335f.; Degrassi 1963, 526f.; Malaise 1972a, 226f.; *pace* Merkelbach 1963, 50 n. 21). It is at least a plausible guess that, most of the festivals mentioned here were officially introduced in Rome during the middle of the first century or thereabouts. Such a date would well fit the increasing popularity of Egyptian gods in the post-Tiberian period.
132 Degrassi 1963, 368.
133 Degrassi 1963, 512–514.
134 Degrassi 1963, 505; Weinstock 1971, 311f.
135 Degrassi 1963, 374f.
In addition, all fell on uneven days and, as a consequence, no ‘fixed holiday’ ever follows immediately on another.\textsuperscript{138} Where a festival lasted for more than a day, days of non-festive character intervened. Consequently we find the Carmentalia on January 11 and 15, the Lemuria on May 9, 11 and 13 and the Lucaria on July 19 and 21. Exceptions to these rules are few. The Regifugium, dedicated to Iuppiter, fell on February 24, and the Equirria, dedicated to Mars, on March 14 (following the earlier Equirria on February 27). The only festival before the Nonae of a month is the Kalendae of March, while the Poplifugia fall exactly on the Nonae (July 5). These exceptions must be briefly commented on.

The Kalendae of March constitute the beginning of the Roman calendar in its first historical form. The names of the month following June (namely Quinctilis [later July], Sextilis [later August] etc.) are calculated from March onwards. A number of rites underpin the importance of the Kalendae of March as the beginning of the Roman year.\textsuperscript{139} The special festive character of the Kalendae of March is therefore not surprising. Concerning the dates of the Regifugium and the Poplifugia, their similar word-formation, their seeming reference to a specific historical event (otherwise unique among the ‘fixed holidays’), and their peculiar position within the calendar may indicate a close relationship with each other, and a secondary addition to the calendar. Lastly, the celebration of the March Equirria on an even day remains in fact unexplained.\textsuperscript{140}

The final and perhaps most important principle of the Republican ‘fixed holiday’ is the fact that most of them formed a temporal focus for one, and only one god at a time. The parallel to the spatial foci of official cults is obvious.\textsuperscript{141} Still, a few exceptions to this rule must be considered.\textsuperscript{142}

All Ides were sacred to Iuppiter and consequently, no other Republican ‘fixed holidays’ fell on the Ides, with the exception of the Ides of March. These were also sacred to Anna Perenna, who was worshipped

\textsuperscript{138} Degrassi 1963, 366.
\textsuperscript{139} Rüpke 1995, 193–195.
\textsuperscript{140} Warde Fowler 1916, 44f.; Degrassi 1963, 422.
\textsuperscript{141} Dubourdieu/Scheid 2002, 60: “L’espace de la cité et du monde est partagé entre les dieux et les humains, de la même manière que le temps du mois est divisé en jours réservés aux dieux et jours destinés aux activités des mortels”.
\textsuperscript{142} I leave aside here the very dubious case of Dec. 11, on which the Septimontium and a completely obscure Agonium were held. Only the latter seems to have been a ‘fixed holiday’, although the god to whom the day was dedicated is not clear. The Septimontium was not marked as a ‘fixed holiday’ in the calendar, although it was clearly a public event, cf. Wissowa 1912, 439 with n. 6.
then, on the first full moon of the first month of the old calendar (beginning in March), as the goddess of the ‘new year’ (as also suggested by the etymology of her name). Ovid may have preserved old beliefs that linked her to the moon, although as his own uncertainty shows, this tradition had been almost forgotten in his day. Apart from her function, there is no apparent reason why the festival dedicated to Anna Perenna could not have fallen on another day in March. It is clear that March 11, 13, 25 and 27 would have been available, as none of these was a ‘fixed holiday’. In short, Anna Perenna had received her place in the calendar on the basis of function at a time when it still mattered. Even later, when the beginning of the year had been moved to January 1, she successfully defended her place in the calendar. Two conclusions can be drawn from this test case: firstly, function was more important than the avoidance of any overlap of temporal foci of different gods, and secondly, temporal foci in the traditional calendar were as conservative as spatial foci and, once established, were virtually irremovable.

A similar coincidence of temporal foci of different cults is found on March 19. The day called Quinquatrus (= ‘the fifth day after the Ides’) was sacred to both Mars and Minerva, though again independently of each other. As a ‘fixed holiday’ of Mars, the Quinquatrus were connected with the purification of the ancilia, the mythical shields on which the prosperity of Rome allegedly depended. These were kept in the temple of Mars by the Salii. This festival can be seen to parallel the Armilustrium held on October 19, which was also linked to the purification of the ancilia by the Salii and fell on the same day of the month as the Quinquatrus. In other words, the date of the Quinquatrus as a ‘fixed holiday’ of Mars was firmly anchored in the calendar by its parallel ‘holiday’ in October.

The attribution of March 19 to Minerva has been explained by equating Minerva here with Nerio, an otherwise obscure female consort of Mars. One may argue that groups with similar spatial or functional foci such as Ceres, Liber and Libera, could be worshipped jointly at the Cerialia (April 19). If a similar spatial or functional focus existed in the case of Mars and Nerio, one would consider this solution more seriously. However, no such focus is on record, while rituals

---

143 Ov. fast. 3.657.
144 Warde Fowler 1916, 57–59, 250f.
145 Warde Fowler 1916, 60–62.
performed on the Quinquatrus unequivocally mark craftsmen and artists as their target group. These stood under the protection of Minerva, and predominantly the Aventine Minerva, at least from the time of the second Punic War.\footnote{Fest. 446.29–448.4 [L].} In addition, the anniversaries of two ancient temples of Minerva, on the Aventine and the Caelian Hills, fell on the Quinquatrus (another tradition places the anniversary of the Aventine temple on the Quinquatrus Minores, i.e. June 19), and followed the traditional pattern of temple anniversaries celebrated on ‘fixed holidays’ of the relevant gods. In other words, we cannot explain away the fact that the Quinquatrus were dedicated to two independent divine notions, Mars and Minerva. Nor is this the only case of such ‘double’ attribution of a ‘holiday’: into a similar category falls the October horse, sacred to Mars, but sacrificed on the Ides of October, which—like all Ides—were traditionally sacred to Iuppiter; or the Liberalia celebrated on March 17, falling on the same day as the Agonalia of Mars. We may explain such double attribution as mere chance. But it is worth noting that in all three cases, double attribution occurs in connection with Mars. Without proposing an elaborate theory, which would necessarily remain hypothetical, let me remind the reader that the city of Rome was the result of a synoecism of the neighbouring peoples. One should at least grant the possibility that Mars may have played a special role in one of the synoecizing communities (e.g. that on the Palatine, whose priestly college of Salii Palatini was under explicit protection of the war god), and that the double attributions of ‘holidays’ as well as other inconsistencies in an otherwise consistent calendary system are residues of a unification of different calendars, which were employed by the communities in question.\footnote{Cf. Cornell 1995, 74f.}

The coincidence of temporal foci may, on occasion, be due to complementary functional foci, in the same way that spatial foci were, at times, connected to complementary functional foci too.\footnote{See chapter I.1.} I have mentioned the example of Ceres, Liber and Libera, who are honoured jointly on the Cerialia. A further example is the joint worship of Iuppiter and Venus during the two wine-festivals, on April 23 (Vinalia Priora) and August 19 (Vinalia Rustica). Iuppiter was closely linked with viticulture due to his functional focus as a god of the ‘heavens’ and
therefore of ‘weather conditions’. Venus for her part was a goddess of fertility and, more specifically, of gardens and gardening. In this sense, her functional foci amplified those of Iuppiter as a god of the weather. Two ancient sanctuaries devoted to her (in the grove of [Venus] Libitina outside the Esquiline gate,149 the other near the Circus Maximus) had their anniversaries on the Vinalia Rustica, the day celebrated by the kitchen-gardeners as their ‘holiday’.150 The impact of the cult of Venus on the Vinalia Rustica was so marked that even well-informed sources attributed the ‘holiday’ exclusively to Venus.151 In fact, the day may have originally belonged simply to Venus, for it was a female victim (a lamb, agna) that was offered on this occasion. Such an interpretation would, of course, mean disregarding Varro’s explicit statement: “this is a day sacred to Iuppiter, not to Venus”.152

Complementary functional foci may also be the reason for the coincidence on December 23 of the Larentalia, sacred to Larent(i)a or Larentina, to whom a sacrifice for the dead (parentatio) was offered on this occasion, and Iuppiter, in the form of Vediovis, that is as a chthonic deity.153 The specific sacrifice (parentatio) is well attested, inter alia by Cato and by the most eminent scholars of the Augustan age (Verrius Flaccus, Varro).154 In contrast, Latte does not succeed in proving his theory that a sacrifice to Larent(i)a on an altar (ara) by the pontiffs, as attested by Cicero, our earliest witness, excludes worship of the dead: at the very least, worship of chthonic gods (and that would include the worship of the dead, I assume) was conceivable under similar circumstances: Consus’ chthonic character is manifested by the fact that his altar (univocally called ara by the sources) was subterranean, while it was the sacerdotes, i.e. the pontiffs, who offered a sacrifice there on July 7.155

---

149 Cf. Scheid 2004, who has doubts about the existence of an independent deity under the name ‘Libitina’.
150 Cf. Wissowa 1912, 289.
151 Varro ling. 6.20; id. rer. rust. 1.1.6.
152 Varro ling. 6.16.
153 See chapter II.3.
154 Cato apud Macr. sat. 1.10.16 (= fr 16 [Peter]) with Degrassi 1963, 543f. for the remaining sources.
155 Latte 1960, 92f. with Cic. ep. ad Brut. 23.8 [S.-B., = 1.15.8]; followed e.g. by Radke 1965, 165; cf. also chapter I.3. For the altar of Consus see P. Ciancio Rossetto, in: LTUR III (1993), 322, for the sacerdotes ‘Tert. de spect.’ 5 with Wissowa 1912, 202. Acca Larentia is presumably not to be identified with the Mater Larum, cf. Scheid 1990, 590f.
Complementary functional foci of various cults may merge to such a degree that a temporal focus, originally characteristic of one specific cult, is eventually attributed to other cults too. For instance, during the festival of the Lemures (Lemuria, 9th, 11th and 13th of May) beans were offered—according to one source—not to the Lemures, but to the Larvae. According to another source, however, the recipients of the sacrifice were the manes paterni. The reason for this confusion was largely the fact that the different notions of Lemures, Larvae and Manes were confusingly similar. In exact usage, the ordinary word for “ghost” in the sense of terrifying spooks was larvae, which was considered to be a synonym of the antiquated lemures. If, however, one referred to the ghosts as the venerable souls of the past, manes was the correct word to use. Besides this, the difference between Larvae (Lemures) and Manes was local. While Manes were the ghosts of the underworld, Larvae (Lemures) belonged to the upper world; this explains why Larvae figure conspicuously in Plautian daily life and Manes are absent there.

In the case of Ceres, Liber and Libera, spatial foci interacted with temporal foci. Liber and his female counterpart, Libera, had their own ‘fixed holiday’ (Liberalia, March 17), including their own scenic Games. Interestingly, we find the two deities worshipped also during the Cerialia on April 19 (as already laid down by the Fasti Antiates Maiores). Meanwhile, the anniversary of the Aventine temple also fell on the Cerialia. Given these facts, the following scenario seems plausible: originally, Liber and Libera had their own ‘fixed holiday’ on March 17, which may have included scenic Games, while Ceres was honoured on April 19. When the temple of the Aventine triad was dedicated at the beginning of the fifth century B.C., the ‘fixed holiday’ of the most prominent member of the triad, Ceres, was chosen as the consecration day of the temple. Subsequently, Liber and Libera were ‘added’ to the ‘fixed holiday’ of Ceres thanks to their joint worship in the temple. Subsequently, perhaps in the wake of the Bacchanalian affair, the scenic Games of Liber were...
also merged into the fixed holiday of Ceres.\textsuperscript{161} The Aventine triad is, therefore, the only case in the Republican calendar in which a joint cult is evidently reflected as such, by joint spatial and temporal foci.

If we consider the interaction of fixed holidays and public Games in the Republic, it is apparent that until the time of Caesar, care was taken that no fixed holidays of gods intervened other than the ones honoured by the Games. For instance, the months in which the two most important public Games took place, September (\textit{ludi Romani}) and November (\textit{ludi plebei}), were free of all fixed holidays apart from the Ides, which were, as usual, sacred to Iuppiter. Since, however, both Games were devoted to Iuppiter anyway, there was no inconsistency of temporal foci here. Nor do we find an overlap in the case of other Republican Games, viz. the \textit{ludi Megalenses} (April 4–10), \textit{Florales} (April 28–May 3), \textit{Apollinares} (July 6–13) and the victory Games of Sulla, established in 82 B.C. and first held a year later (October 26–November 1). The exception is the \textit{ludi Cereris} (April 12–19). They included the Ides of April, sacred to Iuppiter (April 13), and the \textit{Fordicidia}, sacred to Tellus (April 15). I can offer no explanation, unless we assume that the \textit{ludi Cereris} were very different in nature from the other Games. One may be tempted to consider the strong plebeian link of the cult of Ceres and her Aventine temple as a possible reason. The Games may have been conceived as merely political in the first place and, when they were established (in the fifth century?)\textsuperscript{162} perhaps as ‘opposed’ to the age-old \textit{ludi Romani}. An indication in this direction may be the fact that they were held by the plebeian aediles (whose existence dates back to the beginning of the fifth century B.C.)\textsuperscript{163} and that plebeian families (under explicit exclusion of the patricians) invited each other to dinner during the Games (or possibly on the last day, the \textit{Cerialia} in the strict sense).\textsuperscript{164} One may then speculate that after, or on the occasion of, the eventual compromise achieved by the Orders in the fourth century, the Games changed both date and addressee, and were now celebrated in November by the entire Roman people as \textit{ludi plebei}, sacred to Iuppiter (while the old Games of Ceres were not abolished). One should bear in mind that the \textit{ludi plebei} appear in historical records for the first


\textsuperscript{162} \textit{Pace} e.g. Bernstein 1998, 83, 163–165 who proposes a date late in the third century.

\textsuperscript{163} Bernstein 1998, 82f., 164.

\textsuperscript{164} Gell. 18.2.11: \textit{patricii Megalensibus mutitare soliti sint, plebes Cerealibus.}
time as late as 216 B.C., while the Games of Ceres are attested almost simultaneously, i.e. in 202 B.C., for the first time.\textsuperscript{165}

Most major Republican Games show a remarkable connection with temple anniversaries of the relevant gods. Normally, the last day of the Games coincided with the temple anniversary of the god to whom the Games were dedicated. This is the case with the \textit{ludi Megalenses} (April 10), which was also the anniversary of the temple of Magna Mater, and this may similarly have been the case with the last day of the \textit{ludi Apollinares} (July 13), possibly the original anniversary of the temple of Apollo Medicus.\textsuperscript{166} The last day of the \textit{ludi Ceriales}, a ‘fixed day’ sacred to the goddess (\textit{Cerialia}, April 19) was simultaneously the anniversary of her Aventine temple. By contrast, the anniversary of the temple of Flora fell on the \textit{first day} of the \textit{ludi Florales} (April 28). Games of Hercules Magnus, perhaps officially established by Sulla, are likely to have been connected with the anniversary of the temple in the Circus Maximus (June 4).\textsuperscript{167} Last but not least, the anniversary of the Capitoline temple fell \textit{within} the \textit{ludi Romani} (September 13). This meant that all public Games until the victory Games of Sulla, established in 82 B.C., were directly linked to a specific temple via its anniversary. This tendency may well have continued in the Empire, for there is a reasonable chance that the temple of Mars Ultor was dedicated by Augustus on May 12 in 2 B.C., a day on which \textit{ludi Martiales} are attested.\textsuperscript{168} Temporal foci such as temple anniversaries and Games were thus combined in these cases in order to reinforce each other.

It is not exactly clear to what extent the ‘announced holidays’ (\textit{feriae conceptiveae}) were adjusted to the pattern of the ‘fixed holidays’ (\textit{feriae stativae}). We may tentatively turn to the sacrifice to Dea Dia, whose shifting dates are known from 21 B.C. onward thanks to the survival of the acts of the arval. We find that during the imperial period the sacrifice to Dea Dia was performed either on May 17, 19, 20 or on May 27, 29, 30, i.e. on days that were not occupied by another god according to the Republican \textit{feriale}. Even in the very few cases where the acts mention other dates for the festival, these dates do not as a rule coincide with the ‘fixed holidays’ of the Republican calendar. However, there may be one exception: the sacrifice to Dea Dia in 66 A.D. was

\textsuperscript{165} \textit{Ludi plebei}: Liv. 23.30.17; \textit{ludi Ceriales}: 30.29.8.
\textsuperscript{166} Thus, tentatively, Wissowa 1912, 295 n. 5.
\textsuperscript{167} Wiseman 2000, esp. 112.
\textsuperscript{168} Herz 1996, 275–277.
performed, for whatever reason, on July 17–19–20, even though July 19 according to the *Fasti Antiates Maiores* was a fixed holiday (*Lucaria*).\textsuperscript{169} The obscurity of the deity involved may be the reason for pontifical indifference. However, one should be careful not to draw far-reaching conclusions from this seeming exception. The sacrifice to Dea Dia was a specific ceremony rather than a ‘holiday’ (*feriae*),\textsuperscript{170} and the information afforded by the acts started in or around 21 B.C.; there is therefore no direct link to the pre-Caesarian calendar, as represented by the *Fasti Antiates Maiores*. On the other hand, if the imperial dates of the sacrifice to Dea Dia did indeed take account of the Republican calendar, the manner of calculating them may actually be much older.\textsuperscript{171}

‘Private holidays’ did not follow the pattern of ‘public holidays’. For instance, they could fall on an even day, such as the *Caristia* (or *Cara Cognatio*) on February 22. Or they could coincide with other ‘public holidays’. One may refer to the *Parentalia*, the ‘holidays’ of the *di parentes*, which began on February 13 with a sacrifice by a vestal virgin and ended with the *Feralia* on February 21. The *Parentalia*, therefore, included the Ides (February 13), sacred to Iuppiter, and the *Lupercalia* (February 15), which were sacred to Faunus. One may wish to argue that the participation of the vestals here indicates a public cult. But the very name and nature of the *parentalia* (referring to one’s ancestors) suggest otherwise. Only the last day of the *Parentalia*, the *Feralia*, were *feriae publicae*.\textsuperscript{172}

The number of days in a calendar year was limited. Since the day was the basic unit for temporal foci of Roman gods, an overlap of such foci became inevitable over time. As in other areas, the Caesarian era forms a watershed here. When Caesar’s victory Games (dedicated to *Venus Victrix*) were established from July 20–30 in 46 B.C., they included no less than three ‘fixed holidays’, the second day of the *Lucaria* on July 21, the *Neptunalia* on July 23 and the *Furrinalia* on July 25. The Games were not connected to any temple anniversary, not even to that

\textsuperscript{169} For a list of the exact dates of the sacrifice see Scheid 1990, 453f. The sacrifice to Dea Dia was performed on June 3–4 in 20 B.C. [no ‘fixed holidays’ in the Republican calendar], around June 1 in 40 A.D. [no ‘holidays’], and on May 25–28 in 90 A.D. [again no ‘holidays’].

\textsuperscript{170} Scheid 1990, 457, 475f.

\textsuperscript{171} The archaeological evidence for the priesthood dates back at least to the fourth century B.C., Scheid 1990, 680f.

\textsuperscript{172} Radke 1963, 318–325.
of Venus Genetrix, although her temple was dedicated just two months after the establishment of the Games (September 26).\footnote{173}

Technically speaking, it was Caesar’s authority as \textit{pontifex maximus} that entitled him to interfere with hoary traditions of temporal focalization. He put his powers to good use during his famous calendar reforms.\footnote{174} Similarly, Caesar’s imperial successors were all \textit{pontifices maximi}, and all made similar use of their powers to tamper with the inherited Republican calendar. It is a fact that between 38 B.C. and 17 A.D. at least fourteen temples, which had been restored, had their \textit{dies natalis} changed, some with the clear objective of ‘synchronizing’ their anniversary with an imperial holiday or other important imperial events.\footnote{175} In contrast, temporal foci of the imperial cult, especially of the cult of Augustus, could influence the choice of imperial ‘holidays’. For instance, Caligula accepted the title \textit{pater patriae}, bestowed on him by the senate, on September 21, perhaps having in mind the temporal closeness to Augustus’ official deification on September 17 as well as to Augustus’ birthday on September 23. In the same vein, Caligula dedicated the temple of Divus Augustus on August 30, a day before his own birthday. It was hardly by chance that the posthumous consecration of Livia, Augustus’ spouse, and her wedding anniversary with the princeps, as well as the dedication of the altar of the \textit{numen Augustum} by Tiberius all fall on the same date, January 17.\footnote{176}

However, the emperor had the power not only to add, but also to remove ‘fixed’ holidays. Caligula abolished two Augustan ‘holidays’,\footnote{177} Claudius rescinded even more imperial \textit{feriae}, “for the greater part of the year was given up to them.”\footnote{178} In 70 A.D., a senatorial commission was set up in order to purge the overloaded calendar of unwanted or outdated ‘holidays’.\footnote{179} During the same period, the arvals, no doubt

\footnote{173} Cf. Bernstein 2007, 231f. \footnote{174} Feeney 2007b, 197. \footnote{175} Gros 1976, 32–35; cf. Herz 1996, 278. Feeney 2007b, 154 is wrong when he claims that Augustus’ anniversary coincided with the foundation date of the temple of Apollo Medicus. The latter’s date was July 13, the last day of the \textit{Ludi Apollinares}. The coincidence of the anniversary of a temple of Apollo and Augustus’ birthday, as attested by imperial calendars, is certainly due to deliberate synchronization, either after rededication of the old temple of Apollo Medicus after restoration, or on the occasion of the dedication of a new temple to Apollo Sosianus (cf. Degrassi 1963, 482, 512). \footnote{176} Scheid 1990, 390f., 422. \footnote{177} Suet. \textit{Calig.} 23.1 with Scheid 1990, 420f. \footnote{178} Dio 60.17.1. \footnote{179} Tac. \textit{Hist.} 4.40.
following imperial directives, restricted sacrifices on behalf of the emperor.\footnote{Wissowa 1912, 346; Scheid 1990, 428f.}

Generally speaking, during the imperial period, the clearly defined temporal foci of a number of the most important Republican gods lost their distinctive focal nature thanks to the infiltration of the imperial cult and its disintegrative impact.

* * *

There were no competing modes of time-reckoning in the Republic to any significant degree. Even cults that were considered a threat to society, such as the cult of Bacchus at the beginning of the second century B.C., appear to have adhered to the traditional.fasti,. albeit with some unavoidable modifications in detail due to specific ritual requirements (initiations etc.). During the Augustan period and perhaps earlier, Magna Mater was officially worshipped on March 27 (lavatio), a day still vacant on the festive calendar, apart from her temple anniversary and Games held at the beginning of March (see above).

During the imperial period, this situation changed dramatically. Competing systems of time-reckoning emerged which ignored the temporal foci of traditional gods. For instance, from the first century A.D. the official worship of Magna Mater was gradually extended to a cycle of six days that included March 15, 22, 24–27. The cycle took no longer account of the ‘fixed holidays’ of Iuppiter and Anna Perenna on March 15 or the Tabilustrium of Mars on March 23. One may also refer to the Christian time-reckoning, which was revolutionary in replacing the Republican week consisting of eight days (nundinum) by the hebdomadal week with Sunday as the basic temporal focus, quite apart from the fact that all Christian temporal foci referred more or less to a single annual event, namely Easter Sunday.

* * *

Despite the dearth of relevant material for the city of Rome itself, it is a fair guess that the lunar calendar of the Jews was still in use even in profane matters in the Roman period (in religious matters it never lost its importance), and perhaps was instrumentalized as a token of Jewishness in opposition to the Julian solar calendar. At least, such a deliberate instrumentalization can be plausibly postulated in the case...
of the Jews of the eastern Empire, in order to effect and advertise cultural distinctiveness.\textsuperscript{181} Besides, Jews everywhere—and hence also in Rome—observed biblical festivals, most characteristically the Sabbath.\textsuperscript{182} The latter was a common target of pagan mockery,\textsuperscript{183} although it was explicitly tolerated by Augustus and Tiberius.\textsuperscript{184}

Let us turn to the Christians. Sunday was already of special importance for the community in the first century A.D. It became the firmly established date of the weekly celebrated eucharist not later than the second century A.D., perhaps in deliberate contraposition to Judaism.\textsuperscript{185} At the same time the observance of the Sabbath lost its importance among the Christians, especially in the West. The observance of Sunday became all the more a genuine mark of distinction from Judaism and was eagerly advertised by the Christians as such.\textsuperscript{186} It was rendered compulsory by Constantine in 321 A.D.\textsuperscript{187}

Easter was the only annual festival celebrated consistently by Christians during the first three centuries. It developed from the Jewish Pascha, since it was during this period that Jesus had died, according to the canonical scriptures. What remained in doubt was the question how the date of Easter should be calculated. On this question, the Roman see took a position against the Christian communities of Asia and Syria.\textsuperscript{188}

The relative lack of temporal foci in the Christian church during the first three centuries of its existence, apart from the observance of Sunday and Easter, is undeniably impressive. It is only partly compensated for by the veneration of defunct bishops and martyrs which began to develop in the capital from the middle of the third century A.D. onwards.\textsuperscript{189} Such memorial cycles and martyrlogies are first attested by two famous sections of burials (so-called ‘depositions’) of bishops and martyrs in the Calendar of Philocalus, listing the dates of death of

\begin{footnotes}
\item[182] Lightstone 2007, 363–365.
\item[183] Gruen 2002, 48f.
\item[184] Phil. Leg. 155–158 with McKay 1994, 71–73.
\item[187] Cod. Iust. 3.12.2; Cod. Theod. 2.8.1.
\item[189] Heid 2007, 410–412.
\end{footnotes}
the bishops of Rome and Roman martyrs from the mid-third to the mid-fourth century A.D.\textsuperscript{190}

If we want to characterize the conceptualization of the ‘divine’ in relation to the constituent concept of time in more general terms, we have to begin with the observation that there was a clear line between those days in the calendar that served this conceptualization (\textit{feriae}) and those that did not. The relation of the various \textit{feriae publicae} to each other was—generally speaking—well defined and restrictive (e.g. ‘fixed holidays’ on uneven days, no ‘fixed holidays’ on successive days, etc.). These definitions applied to all divine concepts alike and thus reflect the same lack of individuality of temporal foci as was the case in the employment of spatial foci: for instance, just as the formation of ‘Iuppiter’ was spatially marked by the size of his temple rather than its architecture and layout, so too it was temporally marked by the number of ‘holidays’, not the rituals performed on them. As in the case of spatial conceptualization, we find in the calendar a sharp distinction between divine and human concepts, while within the category of ‘divinity’ all gods were treated as essentially being the same. This balance was challenged by the imperial cult, which actually blurred the existing dichotomy between ‘divine’ and ‘human’. By doing so, it became a much more disintegrative force than, say, most foreign divine concepts which arrived in Rome in the imperial period. For the latter did not come anywhere close to challenging the dichotomy between ‘divinity’ and ‘humanity’ in terms of their temporal conceptualization. Christianity, of course, differed, on this as on other points. As indicated by Beard,\textsuperscript{191} while the pagan calendar was ‘polycentric’, i.e. a conglomeration of various temporal foci unrelated to each other, the Christian calendar centered around one single historical event, the crucifixion of Jesus on Nisan 14. Gradually, the whole Christian year was constituted around this date. Both in its ‘monocentric’ outlook and in its emphasis on a specific moment of human history (Jesus’ death), it differed substantially from all modes of temporal conceptualization of the divine known up to then in the Mediterranean.

\textsuperscript{190} Salzman 1990, 42–47.

\textsuperscript{191} Beard 2003.
Roman gods were conceptualized not only by spatial and temporal foci, but also by the people who administered these foci. To speak of ‘personnel foci’ here and not simply of priests has the advantage of moving away from such notions as ‘status’ or ‘profession’ towards ‘concepts’. This is necessary, because in conceptual terms there was no fundamental difference between, say, a *flamen* or any random citizen when offering a sacrifice or reciting a prayer. By repeating cultic actions within specific spatial and temporal settings, both groups ‘recreated’ the same (or at least a very similar) divine concept, though of course in completely different ways.192

As far as the term ‘priest’ is concerned, the discussion among scholars about whether the term can be adequately applied to Roman conditions has, in my view, been both futile and damaging. Futile, because no complex concept, expressed in any language, can fully render the notion of *any* complex concept of another language (for our purpose, one may compare the lack of a Greek equivalent to Latin *divus*). Damaging, because it suggests that this can be done in cases other than the concept of ‘priest’. The term ‘priest’ remains a useful makeshift expression for a personnel focus of a cult that, with the explicit and normally canonized approval of a number of people, acts in specific religious matters as a representative of these people.

Roman priesthoods may be conveniently divided into official and unofficial priesthoods. Official priests served to establish and maintain good relations between the gods and the state. They acted on behalf of the state and were controlled by the senate and later the emperor. In addition, official priesthoods were unpaid, with the position carrying considerable prestige. On the other hand, unofficial priests dealt with relations between the individual and the divine. Their ultimate goal was to satisfy personal needs, and they were paid in kind or in money. Unofficial priests could perform functions from self-appointed magicians and prophets, to respectable specialists in recognized though unofficial cults or observational techniques. The former category was the domain of the Greek “pseudo-priest and fortune-teller” *(sacrificulus et
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192 For the various aspects of the term ‘priest’ in Rome *FS III*, 1405–1418; Scheid 2003a, 129–132.
vates) who introduced the ill-omened cult of Bacchus to Rome which ultimately led to the Bacchanalian affair in 186 B.C.; or Licinius, mentioned in Cicero’s Miloniana, who made a living from performing purificatory rites for families in grief; among the latter category, we may count the Etruscan soothsayers (haruspices), who regularly served both individual magistrates and the state as a whole for the interpretation of portents, although this was of an unofficial nature.

The two most important sacerdotal colleges in the Republic were the pontifical college (collegium pontificale), headed by the pontifex maximus, and the augural college (collegium augurum). Both colleges, whatever their origin, kept their autonomy throughout Roman history. During the Republic, their independence was marked by the existence of separate archives, by the fact that the augurship, once bestowed upon a candidate, could not be taken away from him, even if the incumbent went into exile or was otherwise convicted, as well as by the fact that the augur was not subject to the directives of the pontifex maximus. In other words, the functions of pontifical college and augurate are to be kept strictly apart.

In the Republic, the personnel focalization of official cults is strongest in the case of the flamines, i.e. the official priests, each of whom was in charge of the official cult of a specific god in the city. Later flamines took charge also of the cult of the emperor, thus implying that the flamen was considered to be the individual priest of a deity par excellence (in marked contrast to the priestly colleges). It suffices here to refer to their most important representative in the Republic, the flamen of Iuppiter. Like this god among official gods, his priest ranked highest among the flamines, second only to the rex sacrorum in the oldest known priestly hier-
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193 Liv. 39.8.3.
196 For augural archives see Linderski 1986, 2241–2256; Giovannini 1998; Vaahtera 2002.
198 Wissowa 1912, 523.
199 The involvement of the pontiffs in the augurium canarium does not contradict this statement, for here the pontiffs conducted the sacrifice only, cf. Wissowa 1912, 196f., 524; pace Catalano 1960, 351.
archy.\textsuperscript{200} His wife, the \textit{flaminica}, performed ritual functions and therefore complemented her husband’s role.\textsuperscript{201} The \textit{flaminica} was perhaps priestess of Iuno (who had no \textit{flamen}).\textsuperscript{202} This explains why the \textit{flamen} \textit{Dialis} was not allowed to divorce, why the \textit{flaminica} was permitted to marry only once (\textit{univira}), and why her husband had to lay down his priesthood on her death: for together, \textit{flamen} \textit{Dialis} and \textit{flaminica} represented the divine duality Iuppiter and Iuno. Apart from that, the various, partly abstruse restrictions imposed upon the \textit{flamen} \textit{Dialis} enhanced the focal character of his priesthood, in that they deprived him of the opportunity to lead an ordinary life and to participate in that of others. In other words, his enforced social isolation led to an increase in and emphasis on this personnel focus of the concept of Iuppiter.

Naturally, unofficial cults display the same personnel focalization. Let us take the example of the cult of Bacchus in \textit{ca.} 200 B.C. Initially, this cult was administered by women alone. Matrons were chosen in turn as priestesses (\textit{sacerdotes}).\textsuperscript{203} This status was not affected by the Tiriolo decree, which was issued by the senate against the cult in 186 B.C., for in it both the existence of female followers (\textit{Bacchae}) and that of female priests (\textit{sacerdotes}) were implicitly granted.\textsuperscript{204} After reforms in \textit{ca.} 210 B.C., male initiates had started to participate in the cult\textsuperscript{205} and the office of ‘master’ (\textit{magister}) had presumably been created. By the time of the Tiriolo decree, men were on an equal footing with women, either as priests (\textit{sacerdotes}) or ‘masters’ (\textit{magistri}).\textsuperscript{206} Livy even indicates the existence of a priestly hierarchy (\textit{maximi sacerdotes}), but it is not clear whether this hierarchy was based on personal prestige or distinct sacerdotal competences.\textsuperscript{207} It is reasonable to assume that priests performed initiations and sacrifices in the presence of other cult members.\textsuperscript{208} The ‘masters’ also attended to sacrifices.\textsuperscript{209} However, their main concern was presumably the administration of common funds,

\textsuperscript{200} Fest. 198.29–202.4 [L] with Vanggaard 1988, 27f. But all \textit{flamines} were submitted to the disciplinary authority of the \textit{pontifex maximus}, see Vanggaard 1988, 56–58.
\textsuperscript{201} Cf. in general Schultz 2006, 79–81, 142.
\textsuperscript{202} Plut. \textit{quaeest. Rom.} 86, \textit{pace} e.g. Pötscher 1968, 238f.
\textsuperscript{203} Liv. 39.13.8, 39.15.9.
\textsuperscript{204} \textit{CIL} \textit{F} 581, lines 7, 10.
\textsuperscript{205} Liv. 39.13.9.
\textsuperscript{207} Liv. 39.17.7; priesthoods may not normally have been organised according to age (Rüpke 2002, 59), but corporations were (see below).
\textsuperscript{208} \textit{CIL} \textit{F} 581, lines 15f., 19–21 with Liv. 39.10.7; 39.18.3.9.
\textsuperscript{209} Liv. 39.18.9: \textit{magister sacrorum}.
apparently contributed by adherents of the cult. The whole structure, especially the existence of magistri and the participation of both slaves and freemen in the cult, is strongly reminiscent of corporations (collegia) that often rallied around a specific god.

Any increase in ritual duties may lead to a specialization of duties. This tendency towards specialization is particularly tangible in the case of the personnel foci of the cults of oriental gods in Rome, such as that of Iuppiter Dolichenus or Isis. Let us take the case of Isis. Initially, we hear only of priests in general. A first-century B.C. inscription from the Capitoline region provides proof of the existence of a male or possibly female priest (sacerdos) of Isis Capitolina, possibly in connection with other adherents or even functionaries of the cult. A priest of Isis Capitolina also appears in a later inscription, dating to the end of the first century A.D. at the very latest. Some literary sources imply the presence of male Isiac priests, possibly on the Capitol, in 43 B.C., while others do so for the year 69 A.D. Ovid knows of the appearance of the priests (but he would not necessarily have learnt about them from Rome). The only witness to a possible specialization among the personnel foci of the cult of Isis at this early stage is Apuleius (writing in the second century A.D.). He claims that already under Sulla a congregation of Isiacs, the pastophori, was established in the capital. However, relevant inscriptive evidence is lacking.

It is in the second century A.D. and later, with the rising number of adherents to Isis, and under more favorable political conditions, that manifold specialized priesthoods of the goddesses emerge, which were as a rule modelled on Egyptian conditions. Most important, perhaps, is the existence of a ‘high-priest’ (prophetes) in Rome in the first half of
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210 CIL I 581, lines 10, 12 with Liv. 39.18.9.
211 North 2003, 210f. with chapter IV.2.
212 For Iuppiter Dolichenus see Merlat 1960, 190–197; FS III, 1537–1546.
214 SIRIS no. 378, for the date see Versluys 2004, 427. See also SIRIS no. 408. For the sacerdotes see Malaise 1972a, 127f. Male priests of Isis and other Egyptian gods, with their characteristically shaved head, are attested in Roman portraiture from as early as the first quarter of the first century B.C., but these may possibly be Egyptian imports, cf. Schweitzer 1948, 76f. with fig. 49, 93 = 107, 100 = 104 = 108.
215 Val. Max. 7.3.8; App. B.C. 4.47; Tac. Hist. 3.74; Suet. Dom. 1.2.
216 Ov. met. 1.747; Iuv. 6.533 al.
217 Apul. met. 11.30.
218 SIRIS no. 433 (2nd–3rd century). For the pastophori in general see Malaise 1972a, 128–130.
the second century A.D. He appears epigraphically and is also depicted, for instance, on a relief along with the keeper of the holy books (hierogrammateus) and an unspecified priestess of Isis (sacerdos). The relief was found in the capital and dates from the Hadrianic period.\textsuperscript{219} One may add the ‘astronomer’ (horoskopos), who, as with the keeper of the holy books, is known from Rome only by representations in visual art,\textsuperscript{220} as well as the ‘singers’ (paianistes),\textsuperscript{221} and possibly those ‘who dressed the divine statues’ (stolistai), though there is as yet no direct evidence for the existence of the latter in Italy.\textsuperscript{222} Next, there are the pausaroi, performing pausae, perhaps some ritual ‘stops’ during Isiac processions.\textsuperscript{223}

This increase of priesthoods, i.e. of personnel foci of the cult of Isis, allowed a much larger number of people to actively participate in it. It is thus an indicator both of the increase in popularity and at the same time of the gradual Egyptianization of the cult.

On the other hand, specialization of personnel foci could lead to a secondary connection with the cults of specific gods. Therefore, the augurs, originally clearly without a specific link to any god, became ‘priests’ of Jupiter because of one of the main areas of their expertise, viz. defining space in the heavens.\textsuperscript{224} One may also refer to the III/VII/IViri epulones and the II/X/XViri sacris faciundis. Both priesthoods grew out of special duties of the pontifical college, the former, to organise the two sumptuous feasts held on the occasion of the ludi plebei and the ludi Romani, the latter, to consult the Sibylline Books. Since the Games were connected to Jupiter and the Sibylline books to Apollo, they were later interpreted as personnel foci of the cult of Jupiter and Apollo respectively. But the cult of Apollo was a nonentity until the Augustan

\textsuperscript{219} For the prophetes see Malaise 1972a, 115–117, for the hierogrammateus see Malaise 1972a, 119f., for the sacerdos see above; for the relief, now in the Vatican, see Malaise 1972, 234f. no. 441.

\textsuperscript{220} Malaise 1972a, 120f.

\textsuperscript{221} SIRIS no. 384 with Vidman 1970, 63f., Malaise 1972a, 121f.

\textsuperscript{222} Malaise 1972a, 118f.

\textsuperscript{223} Cf. SIRIS no. 400 (1st–2nd century A.D.) with Malaise 1972a, 105f., 130. A ‘keeper of the temple’ (aedilanus) of Isis may possibly be referred to once in Rome, but both the date and the exact meaning of the inscription are in doubt (SIRIS no. 387). Furthermore, we hear of hierodouloi (SIRIS no. 375) and neokoroi (SIRIS no. 406) in Rome, but both belong to the worship of Sarapis, Malaise 1972a, 131–135, for the neokoroi also Vidman 1970, 58–61. For other depictions of Isiac priests from Rome see the procession on a column of the Iseum Campense with Malaise 1972a, 125f. and in general Malaise 1970, 368 s.v. prêtres et fidèles (statues et reliefs).

\textsuperscript{224} For the augurs cf. Cic. Phil. 13.12 interpretes internuntiique Iovis Optimi Maximi, Cic. leg. 2.20 interpretes Iovis Optimi Maximi.
age and would by no means have justified the existence of an independent priesthood until then. This clearly proves that the II/X/Virī did not begin as personnel foci of the Apollonian cult.

The divinity of the emperor was, as I have repeatedly suggested, modelled on that of the traditional gods. This suggestion is further supported by the aspect of personnel focalization. Augustus, for example, received a flamen after his death in 14 A.D., deliberately avoiding the dire Caesarian precedent of a flamen during his lifetime. Augustus’ flamen was the first in a long series of flamines of divinized emperors in Rome until the third century A.D. At least until the end of the Julio-Claudian era, the imperial flamine in Rome remained the domain of the imperial family. However, not all divi actually received a separate flamen: at least one flamen officiating a joint worship of Divus Iulius and Divus Augustus is on record.

Interestingly, as in the case of other important gods, the cult of the deified Augustus focused on more than one priest. Thus, Livia became Augustus’ priestess in 14 A.D. The circumstances under which this happened clearly indicate competences of the new priestess far beyond a mere private cult. Her priesthood was presumably modelled on the vestal virgins, though its exact status remains obscure. Better known is the association (sodalitas) of Augustales, established by Tiberius in 14 A.D. It consisted of twenty-one Roman aristocrats chosen by lot, to whom members of the imperial family were added. The association was not bound to the individual emperor, but to his gens. In the same vein, comparable associations were linked to other imperial dynasties (sodales Flaviales, Hadrianales, Antoniani). Tiberius had made it crystal-clear that the sodales Augustales were not on an equal footing with other official priesthoods such as the pontiffs. Rather, the former were exclusively priests of the imperial family (proprium eius domus sacerdotium). But the very fact that such an explicit ruling was necessary, apart from

225 Wissowa 1912, 521f.
226 Cic. Phil. 2.110; Dio 44.6.4 with Weinstock 1971, 305–308. For the outward appearance of the imperial flamen see Fishwick II.1, 475–481.
227 Tac. Ann. 2.83 with Lewis 1955, 80.
228 Scheid 1978, 650.
229 Tac. ann. 1.14; Dio 56.46.1; Weber 1936, 92f. [n. 427, referring to p. 97 of the main text]; Fishwick I, 162f.
230 Tac. hist. 2.95; ann. 1.54; Dio 56.46.1 with Scheid 1978, 618, 648f.; Price 1987, 78f.; FS III, 1589–1593; Scheid 2003a, 138–141.
231 Tac. ann. 3.64 with Scheid 1990, 257f.
the reappearance of the *sodalitas* in connection with the four major priesthoods in 31 A.D., sufficiently demonstrates their focal character in the imperial cult.\(^{232}\)

It is more likely than not that the *flamines*, as we know them in the historical period, reflect the individual personnel foci of an early, pre-historical stage of the Roman pantheon. This means that originally they focused on the cult of a single god, as is indicated by their name (e.g. the *flamen Dialis* as the priest of Iuppiter). Conversely, we may postulate that originally, official rites to gods that possessed a *flamen* were performed predominantly or exclusively by this priest.

Entering the historical period, this personnel focalization of a number of cults was somewhat blurred. Members of the pontifical college could stand in for each other. For instance, the pontiffs could replace the *flamen Dialis* apparently in all or most of his functions (and presumably had to do so during the long vacancy of this office from 87 to 11 B.C.).\(^{233}\) Furthermore, Tellus received sacrifices from both the *flamen Cerialis* and the pontiffs,\(^{234}\) and the *flamen Dialis* was perhaps involved in the *Lupercalia*, i.e. the cult of Faunus.\(^{235}\) Similarly, the *flamen Quirinalis* performed rites for Robigus\(^ {236}\) and Consus (along with the vestals).\(^ {237}\) True, most of the deities concerned did not have a specific priest, and therefore priests of other deities had to help out. However, there is reliable information that the *flamen Portunalis* was involved in the cult of Quirinus (who demonstrably had his own *flamen*),\(^ {238}\) that the *flaminica Dialis* was somehow connected to the cult of Mars (who likewise had a *flamen* and presumably also a *flaminica Martialis*)\(^ {239}\) during the ritual of ‘moving the *ancilia*’.\(^ {240}\)

Some scholars may want to argue that this functional diffusion actually indicates that the *flamines* did not form personnel foci of specific gods before the introduction of the imperial *flamines* after Caesar’s death. In their view, the major priests, including the *flamines*, belong to no particular cult, and have no particular responsibility for the rituals
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\(^{228}\) Tac.

\(^{229}\) Tac.
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\(^{226}\) Cic.

\(^{225}\) Wissowa 1912, 521f.
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\(^{234}\) DServ.
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\(^{236}\) Ov. *fast.* 4.910.

\(^{237}\) Tert. *de spect.* 5.7.

\(^{238}\) Fest. 238.7–9 [L].

\(^{239}\) Vanggaard 1988, 30f.

or spaces of any particular cult rather than for those of all the cults. According to this line of reasoning, the colleges are divided by functions (auspicia, sacra, war and peace, prophecy etc.), not deities. They may accuse me of arbitrarily constructing an early Rome or a pre-Roman Rome in which all was rational and consistent, implying a steady process of centuries of decline and confusion, as the élite became either negligent or sceptical or both.

I am ready to concede that the initial degree of focalization of the flamines cannot be determined accurately. Still, I hold that this degree must have been considerable, for a number of reasons. To begin with terminology, all flamines are determined by an adjective indicating the divine concept with which they were connected (flamen Dialis, Martialis etc.). They are the only priestly college endowed with such markers of focalization. Second, some of the flamines thus determined were connected to very central deities of the later pantheon (e.g. Iuppiter, Mars). They ought not therefore to be considered accidental ingredients of an existing pantheon, but constituent elements. Third, some minor flamines, such as the flamen Falacer or the flamen Furrinalis (only Varro ling. 5.84; 7.45 [Ennius]) were connected to gods that had virtually disappeared from the Roman pantheon already in the Republic. The preservation of their names can be explained only on the assumption that these names concealed meanings relevant to the differentiation among the flamines themselves. Fourth, had the flamines been in charge of all or a large number of cults, the subdivisions of this group in flamines maiores (to which the non-patricians never gained access in the Republic) and minores, and the setting aside of the flamen Dialis by taboo regulations, would hardly make sense. It is much more plausible to assume that these subdivisions are based on a latent divine hierarchy, at the top of which stood the triad of Iuppiter, Mars and Quirinus, with Iuppiter heading the ensemble. One should also bear in mind that as their name (‘bridge-builders’) suggests the later sacrificial priests par excellence, the pontiffs, did not start as religious personnel at all. It is fair to conclude that the flamines came into being as the sacrificial priests of specific gods, or groups of gods, which were conceptualized as a unity for some reason. As for inconsistencies, one should bear in mind that in this book we speak of personnel foci, whereby focalization implies emphasis, not exclusiveness.

As to the subsequent ‘decline’ and ‘confusion’, these notions are misleading in so far as they presuppose rigidity and inalterability of concepts. By contrast, this book takes the view that concepts are constantly
derived and developed from each other. This fact offers a precise explanation of some of the inconsistencies. For instance, the fact that Tellus received sacrifices from the *flamen Cerialis* may be explained by the similar functional focus of Ceres and Tellus as chthonic fertility deities. When we hear that the *flamen Quirinalis* officiated rites for Robigus, this statement becomes less surprising if we consider that the Games held at the Robigalia were dedicated to Mars and Robigus and bear in mind the observation that the functions of Mars and Quirinus as martial gods were almost identical. The same common denominator of the concept of ‘war’ may explain the substitution of the *flaminica* of Mars for the *flaminica* of Iuppiter during the martial ritual of ‘moving the ancilia’. Of course, due to the lack of evidence it is rarely possible to trace back the conceptual string with certainty. But the conceptual approach allows for a state of flux.

A particularly enlightening case showing such interaction of a personnel focus of the cult of a god with that of other gods is the *flamen Quirinalis*. The priesthood of the *flamen Quirinalis* was allegedly created by Numa and belonged to the privileged group of three *flamines maiores* (next to the *flamines* of Iuppiter and Mars), i.e. patrician *flamines* who had to be married by *confarreatio*, as opposed to the twelve plebeian *flamines minores*. In fact, the *flamen Quirinalis* was fourth in place in the oldest known priestly hierarchy and ranked ahead of the *pontifex maximus*. The office of the *flamen Quirinalis* must then have been prestigious in the early period of Roman religion, when the god was in the heyday of his powers. At some unknown, but certainly early stage, his fortune changed. The reason was no doubt functional competition with Mars. The latter occupied a paramount place as the god of war *par excellence* (along with other competences) in Rome as well as other parts of central Italy. The early symbiosis of both Quirinus and Mars is
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243 Fest. 198.29–200.4 [L].
244 See also chapter IV.1.
245 This competition, characterized by the lack of a clear demarcation between the competences of the two, was well known in Rome in the first century B.C., cf. Dion. Hal. *ant.* 2.48.2. Later theological systematization made Quirinus the god of the absence of war, Mars the god of its presence. This or a similar distinction seems to lie behind Serv. *Aen.* 1.292 and 6.859.
manifested by the existence of the two colleges of Salii, one belonging to Quirinus and located on the Quirinal (⇒ Salii Collini/Agonenses), the other belonging to Mars and stationed on the Palatine (⇒ Salii Palatini, later located in the temple of Mars Ultor).\textsuperscript{246} Although the institution of Salii itself is not peculiar to Rome,\textsuperscript{247} the parallel existence of two such colleges, with apparently identical cultic functions but completely different cult locations and traditions, is. It finds its most natural explanation in the assumption that, at some stage, the two priestly colleges operated independently. Possibly one was the college of the people of the Quirinal (and Viminal), the other was the college of the other hills. Such a bipartite structure may well reflect the organization of the old city, which appears to have been divided into Quirinal and Viminal on the one hand and the remaining hills on the other (Palatine etc.).\textsuperscript{248}

Being in competition with Mars, the cult of Quirinus gradually declined.\textsuperscript{249} This development affected the institution of the \textit{flamen Quirinalis}. The priest lost power and prestige. We cannot know for certain whether the (unofficial) identification of Quirinus with Romulus was, in fact, fabricated by the priests of Quirinus as a response to this loss. However, once it began to circulate at the beginning of the second century B.C. or slightly later, the priests of Quirinus had more than one reason to promote and advertise it.\textsuperscript{250} For Quirinus thus received a new, well-defined sphere of competences as the founder of Rome and the son rather than competitor of Mars, the god of war. Such an identification with Romulus was all the more suggestive, in that Romulus did not possess a specific priest of his own.

We may be able to identify the creator or at least a fervent promotor of the identification of Quirinus with Romulus. Q. Fabius Pictor, son of the historian, was \textit{flamen Quirinalis} from 190 to 167 B.C. and the most famous incumbent of this office. He appears repeatedly in Livy in his capacity as \textit{flamen}, most notably on the occasion of his dispute

\textsuperscript{246} For the Salii at the temple of Mars Ultor see Herz 1996, 266–268.
\textsuperscript{247} Geiger 1920, col. 1893f.
\textsuperscript{248} Cornell 1995, 74f.
\textsuperscript{249} Cf. e.g. the fact that the Salii are mentioned in the Roman calendar exclusively in connection with the festivals of Mars. Koch 1960, 20 suggests that some of these festivals at least must originally have belonged to Quirinus.
\textsuperscript{250} The first, albeit indirect, witness is Enn. \textit{ann.} 110f. [Sk] with Fishwick I, 53f. (with further references), \textit{contra} e.g. Skutsch 1968, 130–137; Skutsch 1985, 245–247; Jocelyn 1989, 45. The first direct witness for the identification is Cicero, so Cic. \textit{rep.} 2.20; \textit{leg.} 1.3, 2.19; \textit{off.} 3.41; \textit{nat. deor.} 2.62.
with the pontifex maximus P. Licinius: Flavius had been appointed to the praetorship in Sardinia but had to resign from the post due to religious constraints after intervention by Licinius (Flavius became praetor peregrinus instead). Still, the impression Flavius made was lasting, so lasting that his grandson, the moneyer N. Fabius Pictor, issued a denarius in 126 B.C., depicting his grandfather as flamen.\footnote{Liv. 37.51.1–6; cf. Liv. 37.47.8, 37.50.8, 45.44.3, for the denarius see RRC I, 291f; in general FS II, 973 no. 1599.} Both the chronological framework and the apparent political ambitions of Q. Fabius Pictor would make him a suitable exponent for the identification of Quirinus with Romulus.

Whatever the case may be, the identification of Quirinus with Romulus remained unofficial, at least until the Augustan age. This is implied by the fact that until then, at least, sacrifices to Romulus continued to be performed by the pontiffs and not by the flamen Quirinalis. Rituals at the ‘hut’ of Romulus were still conducted by the pontiffs in 38 B.C., although the flaminage of Quirinus was occupied until at least 46 B.C. (though a later vacancy cannot be excluded).\footnote{Dio 48.43.4. Sex. Iulius Caesar is attested as flamen Quirinalis in 57 B.C. He died in 46 B.C., FS II, 1062 no. 2009.} In the same vein, Acca Larentia, foster-mother of Romulus and Remus according to widespread beliefs circulating from the first half of the first century B.C.,\footnote{Valerius Antias ap. Gell. 7.7.5–7 (= fr 1 [Peter]); Licinius Macer ap. Macr. sat. 1.10.17 (= fr 1 [Peter]); Liv. 1.4.7; Paul. Fest. 106.1f. [L]; al.} received regular sacrifices by the pontiffs in 43 B.C.\footnote{Cic. ep. ad Brutum 23.8 [S.-B., = 1.15.8]; cf. Varro ling. 6.23 sacerdotes nostri (= pontifeces).} Later, such sacrifices were performed—clearly as a consequence of the identification of Quirinus with Romulus—by the flamen Quirinalis.\footnote{Gell. 7.7.7; cf. Macr. sat. 1.10.15 per flaminem. Plut. Rom. 4.3 [Loeb] connects the cult with the flamen Martialis, but Wissowa 1912, 516 n. 3 affirms convincingly: “falsch”}

Quirinus is not the only instance in which priests deliberately promoted the assimilation of their own vanishing god with another. A case in point is Iuppiter Dolichenus. Two reliefs found in the god’s Aventine sanctuary, and dating from the end of the second and middle of the third century A.D. respectively, show Isis and Sarapis as participants in the divine kingdom of Iuppiter Dolichenus as well as his spouse, Iuno Dolichenia. The earlier of the two reliefs is inscribed: “To Iuppiter Optimus Maximus Dolichenus Serapis and Iis Iuno” \footnote{Liv. 37.51.1–6; cf. Liv. 37.47.8, 37.50.8, 45.44.3, for the denarius see RRC I, 291f; in general FS II, 973 no. 1599.} (I(ovi) a(ptimo) m(aximo) Dolichenos Serapi et [Isi] I(nonis)). Furthermore, antefixes and
statuettes with Egyptian motifs were also found in the sanctuary. It is therefore a qualified guess that Isis and Sarapis were worshipped in the place, either in the form of Iuppiter Dolichenus and Iuno Dolichenena or possibly in their own right (a number of sculptural representations of other gods such as the Dioscuri, Mithras, Minerva, Silvanus, Diana, Hercules and others were also found). In any case, Vidman is clearly right in suggesting that this assimilation (not necessarily identification) with the Egyptian deities (as well as other gods?) was promoted by the priests of Iuppiter Dolichenus in an attempt to render their cult more attractive by embracing more successful divine partners. Nevertheless, the Aventine cult of Iuppiter Dolichenus faded into obscurity not much later than the end of the third century A.D.  

Under the Empire, the focal force of the personnel foci of the traditional Republican cults disappeared. One indicator of this disappearance is the well-known scarcity of references to the traditional flamines in imperial sources. Even if we grant that these flamines, especially the flamines minores, may have been indifferent towards mentioning their priesthood in the inscriptions, or may rather have been interested in mentioning it in a different guise (because the flaminates themselves had no longer ‘communicable prestigious potential’), this would only serve to prove that they had ceased to be significant personnel foci of the deity. This may have happened because the cult itself was in decline, or because the traditional focalization of the cult through the flamines had been abandoned or shifted elsewhere. Those flamines who were attested, may well owe their attestation to a certain popularity of the feriae of the god they represented. But statistics are too limited for further conclusions, although it is a fair guess that some flaminates existed until at least the beginning of the second century A.D. It was predominantly the advent of the imperial cult, among other factors, that led to the abandonment of the focal system of the Republican cults and in the long run, to its complete dissolution. For

---


257 FS III, 1528–1532, esp. 1530 [“vermittelbares Prestigepotential”].

258 Scheid / Cecere 1999, 89f.

259 Scheid 1990a, 145–147; for the whole question in connection with the two highly controversial lists of calatores pontificum et flaminum from 101 and 102 A.D. respectively (CIL VI 31034, 32445), see now FS III, 1517–1536.
by widening the various foci towards the ruler cult, they lost their very focal character and therefore ceased to serve in a capacity that was characteristic of traditional divine concepts. Interestingly, the most important personnel focus of the imperial cult, the imperial flamen, was initially calqued on the personnel focus of the Republican cult par excellence, the flamen Dialis: for both the attire and the privileges of the imperial flamen imitate the Jovian priest.\(^{260}\) Clearly, this happened in order to lend glamour to the personnel focus of the imperial cult. The intentional fusion of the personnel foci of the central Republican and the imperial cult can be demonstrated by another example. Domitian used to attend the quinquennial Games of the Capitoline Iuppiter, wearing a golden crown depicting the Capitoline triad, a clear conceptual assimilation to the functions of the flamen Dialis. By contrast, the same crown, though with an image of the emperor added, was worn by the flamen Dialis on the same occasion, stressing the link of the latter with the imperial cult. Similarly, members of the priestly college of the Flavians (collegium Flavialium) were present wearing crowns identical to that of the flamen Dialis.\(^{261}\) Therefore, in conceptual terms the flamen Dialis was both highest priest of Iuppiter and, it could be argued, guarantor of the cult of the Flavians.

The merger of Republican personnel foci with the imperial cult can also be demonstrated by the development of the arval brethren: this old priesthood of Dea Dia may, in the Republic, at times also have performed the cult of Mars and that of the Lares and Semones, as is apparent from the 'hymn of the arvals.'\(^{262}\) When the cult was restored under Augustus, connections with other Republican cults were largely cut, and this is why we never find the imperial arvals involved in the traditional Republican ceremonies of other gods.\(^{263}\) By contrast, the arvals, to a large extent, became personnel foci of the imperial cult. For example, there are numerous records of their making vows annually for the welfare of the emperor and his family on January 3 and frequently on other dates.\(^{264}\) On these occasions, especially in the Tiberian period, Dea Dia was normally invoked in the fourth position (following the Capitoline triad). However, any reference to the name of the goddess

\(^{260}\) Weinstock 1971, 305–308; Fishwick II.1, 475–481.
\(^{261}\) Suet. Dom. 4.4.
\(^{263}\) Scheid 1990, 427.
disappears completely in vows taken after 38 A.D.\textsuperscript{265} Moreover, from
the second half of the first century A.D., the imperial cult had its own
building, a \textit{Caesareum}, in the grove of Dea Dia.\textsuperscript{266} The frequency of
meetings of the brotherhood in order to worship Dea Dia, as compared
to those gatherings devoted predominantly to the imperial cult, were
heavily biased towards the latter until the Flavians somehow redressed
the balance by cutting back on imperial observances.\textsuperscript{267}

In short, the imperial cult had appropriated the personnel foci of
the cult of Iuppiter and Dea Dia during the imperial period and
essentially invalidated the notion of traditional cultic focalization. This
defocalization of the personnel foci of the cult of Dea Dia under the
Empire is likewise manifested by the fact that, in addition to the annual
sacrifice at the temple of Dea Dia, the arvals used to perform various
rituals in the private residence of their \textit{magister} or at other temples of
the city, especially in the temple of Iuppiter on the Capitoline.\textsuperscript{268} One
may argue that major Republican priesthoods did not have a special
location of their own either.\textsuperscript{269} But there was still a difference between
privately gathering for administrative purposes (as was presumably done
by the arvals as well as other priesthoods in the Republic) and actually
performing public cult (by implication bound to public spatial foci). I
would argue that by integrating the ruler into their regular observances,
the imperial arvals lost their strict focus on the cult of Dea Dia. It is
at least a plausible guess that the same happened to the personnel foci
of the remaining official cults also.

* * *

A long list of potential personnel foci of the Jewish god in the Graeco-
Roman world can be drawn up, but the validity of such a list for
the conditions of urban Rome as well as the actual functions of this
personnel is still heavily disputed. At many places, including Rome,
the position of the archisynagogue may have been the primary per-
sonnel focus, assisted perhaps by a council (\textit{gerousia}). However, neither
such a council nor a superintending council of synagogue councils is
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unequivocally attested for Rome, and its existence cannot unreservedly be postulated on the basis of the situation in Alexandria.270

The earliest sources for personnel foci of the Christian god are the first epistle of Clement, presumably written around 96 A.D. in Rome, and the first epistle of Peter, which is likely to have been written in Rome and certainly belongs to the late first century A.D.271 Though it may not be exactly clear to what extent the facts described in both letters reflect Roman conditions, the two authors appear to visualize a similar and widespread structure of Christian communities. Given the importance of the Christian community in Rome and the likely provenance of both epistles from the capital in particular, it is a fair guess that the evidence afforded by both documents applies also, and predominantly, to Rome. If this is the case, two groups of Christian officials can be identified in the capital at the end of the first century A.D., namely a board of presbyters (presbyteroi, also called episkopoi), and the deacons (diakonoi). The presbyters drew their legitimation from the succession of Jesus via the apostles.272 It was the council of presbyters that collectively managed the affairs of the Christian community in Rome until the middle of the second century A.D.273 However, already at the beginning of the second century A.D. Ignatius of Antioch had laid the theoretical foundation for the monoepiscopate, by assigning a single head, a bishop (episkopos), to each community, supported by an advisory council of presbyters, while the deacons were put in charge of charity work.274 This structure is first attested in Rome during the middle of the second century A.D., beginning perhaps with the popes (= monoepiskopoi) Anicetus (154–166?), Soter (166?–174) and Eleutherius (174–189). It is especially with Victor (ca. 189–199) that the exceptional powers of the popes were stabilized.275

As in the case with other newcomers such as the cult of Isis, we observe an increasing specialization of personnel in the course of the third century. Thus, one of the most successful organizers of the new Church, Pope Fabian (in office 236–250 A.D.), assigned two Augustan

---

270 For the archisynagogue Levine 1998, for the council Williams 1998 (advocating opposing views); for both, Lightstone 2007, 373–376 who sides with Williams in his belief in a council and super-council.
272 1 Clem. 42.1f., 44.1.
regions of Rome to one deacon (out of seven) assisted by a subdeacon in the middle of the century. Apart from the latter, there were 46 presbyters, 42 acolytes, 56 lectors, exorcists and door-keepers in the capital shortly after Fabian’s death.\footnote{Euseb. \textit{HE}, 6.43.11.} If we were to summarize the third-century development of personnel foci of the Christian god, we should mention a growing concentration of power in the hands of the bishop of Rome, and an equally increasing local and hierarchical differentiation of the remaining personnel foci. There does not seem to be any essential difference in terms of power constellation between the personnel foci of the Christian god and those of other oriental gods, most notably Isis.

4. Function

Divine concepts were commonly related to specific functional spheres. I shall use the word ‘functions’ here in the narrow sense of ‘functions within the polytheistic system’. The dissolution of the world into spheres of power and the attribution of these spheres to divine concepts, thus rendering them ‘functions’ of a god, is a fundamental characteristic of all polytheistic systems. Polytheism would be senseless if divine functions were not divided.

Spheres of divine functions were conceptualized according to the principle of functional similarity. By this I mean, for instance, the fact that it hardly mattered whether the Romans campaigned against the Sabines or the Persians: the common denominator of both actions was the functional focus of ‘war’, traditionally attributed to the divine concepts of Mars and Iuppiter. Nor did it matter what specific ailment had to be cured: diseases belonged to the realm of Apollo Medicus and later on to Aesculapius.

Knowledge of the functional foci of the gods was of paramount importance. One of Varro’s objectives in his \textit{Divine Antiquities} is to spell out the functional foci of individual Roman gods, “for it is on the basis of this that we can know which god we ought to call upon or invoke for each purpose, lest we should act like clowns in a mime-play and ask Liber for water and the lymphs for wine.”\footnote{Varro \textit{antiqu.}, fr. 3 [Cardauns]; cf. ibid. fr. 88: \textit{ostendens in omnibus, quod sit cuiusque munus et propter quid cuique debet supplicari.} The concept of Liber
was formed according to a group of similar functions linked by the concept of ‘wine’, while the concept of lymphs was formed according to a group of similar functions linked by the concept of ‘water’. The functional scope of either deity was, however, not invariably fixed, but accommodated to the relevant context. Thus, lymphae (= nymphae), when used alone, might denote both the divine and real aspect of ‘water’, whereas it denoted only the divine aspect (= ‘water deity’) when worshipped in connection with ‘springs’ \((\text{fontes})\).\(^{278}\) By contrast, Liber was not only the god of ‘wine’, but, in a festival on October 15, also more specifically the god of ‘vintage’.\(^{279}\) Given the possibility of developing the functional scope of a divine concept on the principle of functional similarity in various directions, it is more correct to speak of ‘water’ and ‘wine’ here as functional foci than ‘functions’.

Functional foci of divine concepts were determined by four parameters: tradition, readjustment, analogy and etymology. All four parameters contributed to the realm of functions of a deity, and since the former are not static, the latter is not either:

1. By tradition I refer to the (rare) fact that the functional foci of a few gods in the Roman pantheon appear to continue corresponding foci of a tradition that reaches back to prehistorical/Indo-European times. Iuppiter ‘ruled’ over the sky, since he was the direct descendant of the Indo-European sky god. In the same vein, Castor and Pollux were in charge of horse-breeding and rescuing (e.g. as patrons of sailors) just like their Indo-European forefathers. Mithras does not belong here. Though apparently an Indo-European divine concept, he was unknown in Rome until the end of the first century A.D. and was apparently, albeit inspired by Persian influence, created more or less from scratch as a mystery deity by his new western adherents.\(^{280}\)

2. By readjustment I mean that the Roman priestly élite was always keen to readjust the functional foci of a god, in order to better or defend its own cause against an encroachment by other cults or politics in general. Naturally, such readjustments were hardly ever voiced in public, and the process of readjustment is thus scarcely traceable directly in the sources. Two possible cases are the identification of Quirinus with Romulus after the former’s subjugation to Mars and the assimilation

\(^{278}\) \textit{CIL} VI 166. \(^{279}\) Degrassi 1963, 521. \(^{280}\) Mallory/Adams 1997, 231 [sky god], 161–165 [Castor and Pollux]; Gordon 2007, 394f. [Mithras].
of Iuppiter Dolichenus and his spouse, Iuno Dolichena, with Sarapis and Isis, as described above. 281

3. By analogy I mean the fact that functional foci can be modified or created on the analogy of the functional foci of other gods. Normally, this process is linked to the full or partial identification of the gods in question. From the earliest Roman literature, examples abound of identifications of major Roman gods with Greek—later on also with Egyptian, Syrian and Persian—deities. 282 For instance, Iuno’s functional focus as the Roman goddess of marriage par excellence was, no doubt, either created or strongly promoted by her identification with Hera as the spouse of Iuppiter/Zeus. In poetry, Liber became more or less exclusively the wine-god after identification with Greek Dionysos; and Mercury, as his name suggests (merx = commodity), was initially a god of commerce, before the identification with Hermes made him the god of arts (‘inventor of the lyre’) and messenger of the gods. His subsequent identification with the Egyptian Thot added the notions of magic, astrology and writing.

4. By etymology I mean that functional foci were based on real or imagined etymological links between divine proper names and Latin appellatives. 283 Such a link is most apparent in the case of deified abstract nouns. For instance, Tellus’ functional sphere is ‘earth’, for that is what the word means in Latin. But such clear-cut cases are comparatively rare. Normally, divine proper names are not attested as self-contained appellatives in the Latin vocabulary. Nevertheless, ancient scholars such as Varro, or popular wit, never ceased to ‘etymologize’ divine names. Where such etymologies hit the truth, they could, on occasion, recover functions forgotten in the course of time. However, where they did not, a basically irrelevant Latin appellative automatically led to a new functional focus of the deity.

As a rule, it was not only etymology that determined the functional focus or foci of a god. Rather, etymology was supplemented by tradition, readjustment and analogy, as I have mentioned above. Sometimes, though, divine competence was exclusively determined by etymology. Modern scholars have dubbed these divine concepts ‘functional gods’, because they were seemingly named after their functional foci. In a

281 See chapter I.3.
282 For such identifications see Feeney 2007, 130–133.
large number of cases, these etymologies, although widely and willingly accepted by ancient writers, were definitely wrong in historical terms.\textsuperscript{284} However, it is important to note that in conceptual terms a flawed etymology is as important as a correct one, as long as its validity was recognized by the Romans themselves.

Many ‘functional’ gods had a significant role to play in the private sphere. However, some appear in public cult, too. For example, Fabius Pictor, as quoted by Servius,\textsuperscript{285} mentioned a sacrifice to Tellus and Ceres, performed by the \textit{flamen Cerialis}, in the course of which twelve deities were invoked. The deities who were summoned represented deified aspects of agricultural labour: the god ‘that breaks up the soil’ (\textit{Vervactor}), ‘restores’ (\textit{Reparator}), ‘forms land into ridges by ploughing’ (\textit{Imporcitor}), ‘grafts trees’ (\textit{Insitor}) etc. The fact that all these functional deities were male, while the two deities receiving the sacrifice were female, clearly indicates that the former were gods in their own right (and not just functional sub-categories of the two main goddesses Tellus and Ceres).

The observation that all these functional deities conform to the rules of Latin derivatives in ‘-tor’ (\textit{nomina agentis}) also demonstrates how close these divine proper names still were to mere appellatives.\textsuperscript{286} In a similar vein, one may refer to Adolenda, Commolenda, Deferunda and Coinquenda (four ‘functional goddesses’ of the same formative type and, no doubt, derived from actual appellatives), who were worshipped—in the official cult—by the arvals.\textsuperscript{287}

Given the sheer numbers of potential gods with their various functional foci and the fact that some of these gods were important to the public domain too, it does not come as a surprise that the pontiffs tried to catalogue and standardize the various gods along with their specific functions. The result was the so-called \textit{indigitamenta}. These were manuals of some sort for pontifical use, specifying the nature of various gods to be invoked on cultic occasions as well as the sequence in which this had to be done. The one (almost) certain fact about such lists or handbooks is that Varro, in the 14th book of his \textit{Antiquitates Rerum Divinarum}, made

\textsuperscript{284} For a list of flawed Varronian etymologies see F. Richter, \textit{RE} 9.2 (1916), cols. 1359–1361.
\textsuperscript{285} DServ. \textit{georg.} 1.21.
\textsuperscript{286} Radke 1965, 25 tentatively suggests a connection with Cerus.
\textsuperscript{287} Scheid nos 94 II 5, 13; 105b 12 with Scheid 2003, 180–184. I am not persuaded by Scheid that the four names denote four aspects of a single deity, rather than four independent divine entities.
extensive use of them. He thus became the principal, if not the only, mediator of their contents.\footnote{288}

Scheid has recently doubted the priestly authorship of such written documents.\footnote{289} He argued for a twofold oral tradition (ritual calendar/precise instructions for the offices), but granted that there were booklets (\textit{libelli}) “for the recitation of specific prayers and hymns”.\footnote{290} He also admitted that there was a tradition of lay scholars reaching back at least to the fourth century B.C., who “commented” on such oral tradition.\footnote{291} On closer inspection, this distinction between lay scholars and priests is elusive: although it is, of course, impossible to trace back the authorship of documents of religious relevance such as the \textit{indigitamenta} to specific authors, the group most interested in, and most likely responsible for, their composition and subsequent preservation was no doubt the pontifical college. It is irrelevant whether the pontiffs themselves composed these works as pontiffs or as lay scholars, or whether the job was done by someone else. The point is that the existence of such documents allowed in a most unprecedented way for the preservation of anachronistic and complex ritual knowledge, access to which was limited to members of the college and potentially to those few others who possessed the relevant expertise. Following the great French scholar here would mean—to take a similar example—ignoring the enormous impact of the Sibylline oracles on the religious history of Rome on the grounds that their actual composers were most likely Greek poetasters rather than Roman priests.

The fixing in writing of the \textit{indigitamenta} forms a landmark in the history of Roman polytheism, whoever its actual author may have been. The introduction of a ‘fixed’ canon of functionally specified gods led automatically to a fixation of the pantheon in functional terms. The reason for the compilation may have been technical, but ultimately this instrument meant a tremendous increase of power for the pontiffs who were in charge and—what is more—had control of it.\footnote{292} Although it would certainly be wrong to assume that Roman polytheism ever stopped producing (or simply ‘naming’) new gods on

\footnote{288} Varro \textit{antiqua}. fr. 87 [Cardauns] with Cardauns 1976, 184; unfortunately, I learnt too late of Perfigli 2004 on the \textit{indigitamenta} to be able to discuss the work here.\footnote{289} Scheid 2006, 15–20, 33.\footnote{290} Scheid 2006, 18.\footnote{291} Scheid 2006, 33.\footnote{292} For writing in religious contexts as a means of power in the hands of the political (priestly) élite see Beard 1991, 51–58.
functional grounds, the indigitamenta provided the means to preserve the names and functions of gods who had long been forgotten as well as control the inclusion of new gods.

There is no fixed date for the composition of the indigitamenta. However, a passage in Arnobius may possibly help. According to him, Roman scholarly literature explicitly noted the absence of Apollo in the indigitamenta of ‘Numa Pompilius’. Numa, the successor of Romulus, was commonly regarded as the ‘organizer’ of Roman religion par excellence. Therefore, the Arnobian passage can only refer to the oldest indigitamenta known to Roman antiquarians (as known by Arnobius) predate the year 431 B.C. This is in line with North’s fine observation that the bookish nature of Roman religion was shared with Etruria and therefore may date back to the period of their mutual influence, possibly the sixth and fifth centuries B.C. Furthermore, the indigitamenta, and more generally the keeping of written records, may have been the actual cause of the ascent of the pontificate from an association of ‘bridge builders’ (perhaps without any particular religious notion) to that of the highest priestly college in Rome.

---

290 Arnob. adv. nat. 2.73: non doctorum in litteris continetur Apollinis nomen Pompiliana indigitamenta nescire?
291 This is true at least if we assume that Varro antiqu. fr. 157 [Cardauns] is based on the indigitamenta in their late Republic form. For the fragment is taken from Aug. civ. 4.21: cur enim esset invocanda propter fessos diva Fessona, propter hostes depellendos diva Pellonia, propter aegros medicus vel Apollo vel Αἴσχυλος vel ambo simul, quando esset grande periculum? Both the close context and the whole chapter in Augustine seem to be founded entirely on the relevant section of the lost Varronian original.
292 North 1990, 66; cf. id. 2000, 104f.
293 The specialized nature of this office necessitated writing skills (for example, construction plans and tidal calendars), while the building of bridges (or possibly roads) was a community task par excellence and naturally performed by royal officials. It is a fair guess that the pontiffs were employed by the king, not only as construction experts, but as secretaries and archivists in general (the pontifices minores are explicitly said to have been scribae pontificii, Liv. 22.57.3). Following this line of reasoning, regal documents, such as the foundation decree of the Aventine temple of Diana (which served as a model for similar decrees until the imperial period) would be the first evidence for administrative activities of the pontiffs in the religious sphere. After the fall of the kings, the pontiffs would then have arrogated to themselves the administrative func-
Occasionally, the nature of a deity with specific functions was unknown. In this case, the Romans addressed the deity as *sive deus sive dea* vel. sim. Patron deities of foreign cities were evoked with these words and expiatory sacrifices were thus offered to the deities that had caused earthquakes, if their identity could not be determined more accurately. Equally unspecified was the patron deity of trees and groves, which is why, according to Cato, the specific formula had to be employed on trimming trees. In order to avoid dire consequences when omitting the names of gods, the pontiffs addressed the hitherto unnamed divine forces with the general *dique deaeque omnes* at the end of their invocations.

* * *

A god could have very distinct, mutually independent functional foci. For instance, Apollo, the healing god, is functionally distinct from Apollo, the guardian of fine art, and both aspects are entirely separate from the god’s prophetic competences. The three aspects develop independently: as a healing god Apollo remains a cipher in Rome, as protector of the arts he is the cherished subject of all poetry (though virtually without a cult), while as the source of prophecy he bulks large as the inspirer of the Sibylline books. Augustus did not hesitate to build a temple to Apollo next to his Palatine residence, because it was the Greek god of youth, art and culture, as well as his personal divine protector that he was thus honouring, not the old and unpopular healing god (who already possessed a temple in the Campus Martius). In the same vein, a ‘foreign’ deity could be adopted in different functional modes. Thus Venus Erycina was introduced to Rome from Mount Eryx in Sicily.

---

298 Latte 1960, 54 with *TLL* s.v. *deus* 909.14–28. For instance, the gender of Pales was uncertain, Vergil considered it to be feminine, while Varro used it as masculine, see Serv. *georg.* 3.1.  
299 Macr. *sat.* 3.9.7 with chapter II.1 (on *evocatio*).  
300 Varro ap. Gell. 2.28.2f. = *antiqu.* fr. 78 [Cardauns].  
301 Cato *agr.* 139, cf. also the same formula in the acts of the arvals on clipping or cutting trees, e.g. no. 94. II.1, 3, 10, 12; 100a.2 al. [Scheid].  
when Rome was under siege during the Hannibalic wars. As such, i.e. as a tutelary deity, she received a temple on the Capitoll in 215 B.C. Meanwhile, a second temple was built to her as a fertility deity outside the Colline Gate in 181 B.C.\textsuperscript{303}

The divine functional foci of the living ruler were advertised by imperial propaganda (even though there was no actual cult). Such foci sprang from his political functions within the Roman state (\textit{res publica}), his foremost task being its eternal welfare (\textit{salus publica/populi Romani}). As the human incarnation of the \textit{res publica}, his well-being was tantamount to the well-being of the state. Cicero, for instance, established a link between Caesar’s \textit{salus} and the fate of Rome in 46 B.C.\textsuperscript{304} Later, vows were made regularly on behalf of the \textit{salus} of individual rulers (e.g. \textit{pro salute Augusti}), no doubt as guarantors and protectors of the established order.\textsuperscript{305} In doing so, the living emperor appropriated essential functional foci of the Republican Iuppiter Optimus Maximus, irrespective of whether he was actually identified with him or only worshipped like him. Consequently, within the state, the living emperor operated on two different levels, as guarantor of the order of human beings and as a mediator between human beings and gods. From Augustus’ reign onwards, both functions were expressed in the form of address of the emperor, as this is attested innumerable times in epigraphy, the former by the term \textit{imperator}, the latter by the word \textit{augustus}.

By contrast, a deceased emperor, though considered divine, was virtually void of functions.\textsuperscript{306} Rather, his \textit{raison d’être} was to legitimate the rule of his successor. In other words, his successor’s claim to power was the major and, in principle, sole motivation for his own \textit{post-mortem} deification. The pomp with which his deification was celebrated may be exemplified by the case of Pertinax: after the latter’s murder and burial in 193 A.D., one of his successors, Septimius Severus, eager to justify his claim to power, made himself an avenger of Pertinax’s killers and provided for ‘heroic honours’ in his name (\textit{heroikai timai}).\textsuperscript{307} After
his enthronement, Severus “erected a shrine to Pertinax, and commanded that his name be mentioned at the close of all prayers and oaths. Severus also ordered that a golden image of Pertinax be carried into the Circus on a cart drawn by elephants, and that three gilded thrones be borne into the amphitheatres in his honour.”\(^{308}\) Severus pompously staged Pertinax’s deification (employing a wax effigy of the dead)\(^ {309}\) and elevated him as a god in the usual manner (spatial/temporal/personnel foci).\(^ {310}\)

* * *

Sometimes, the functional foci of two or more divine concepts coincide more or less totally. In this case, two solutions were conceivable. The competing parties might differentiate their functional foci, with the result of a redefinition and clarification of their spheres of competences. Or one of the two competitors might lose his or her identity in part or entirely. Where the latter case did not lead to a full extinction of the succumbing party, the relationship with its superior was highlighted in Latin in two fashions. Either the name of the inferior deity was simply added to that of its competitor (formally indicating a balance of powers), as this is attested in the cases of Iuppiter Summanus\(^ {311}\) and Iuno Matuta\(^ {312}\) and according to my earlier argument possibly Iuppiter Feretrius.\(^ {313}\) Or else it was accompanied by the name of the latter in the partitive genitive (indicating partial functions within a larger functional whole), as in the case of Lua Saturni, Salacia Neptunis, Nerio Martis, for example (‘Lua in the sphere of Saturn’).\(^ {314}\) In the case of the ‘god of the beginning of war’ both types are attested: Ianus Quirinus and Ianus Quirini.\(^ {315}\) Similar, but not identical, is the addition of Augustus/Augusti to traditional gods, as is frequently found on imperial inscriptions: Hercules Augustus/Augusti is ‘Hercules in the sphere of Augustus’, i.e. Hercules in his capacity as protector of the ruling emperor. In the

---

\(^{308}\) Dio 75.4.1 [transl. E. Cary, Loeb].

\(^{309}\) Dio 75.4.2–75.5.5; Hist. Aug. Pert. 15.1; Hist. Sev. 7.8.

\(^{310}\) Space: Dio 75.4.1 [shrine]; time: Herz 1978, 1181 [anniversary of accession, birthday]; personnel: Hist. Aug. Pert. 15.3f.; Hist. Aug. Sev. 7.8 [flamen, sodales].

\(^{311}\) See below in this chapter.

\(^{312}\) See below in this chapter.

\(^{313}\) See chapter I.1.

\(^{314}\) Gell. 13.23.2.

\(^{315}\) Radke 1965, 31–33; Fears 1981a, 886f.; Scheid 2003, 172f. For Ianus Quirinus see Fest. 204.13–19 [L]; Lucil. 22 [M] (with Koch 1953, 6); Aug. res gestae 13; Suet. Aug. 22; Macr. sat. 1.9.15f.; Lyd. de mens. 4.1; for Ianus Quirini Hor. Carm. 4.15.9.
same vein, we find, for instance, a Silvanus Flaviorum, who receives a dedication by a Flavian freedman. The difference to the former cases of succumbing gods is that the ruling emperor was presumably not normally felt to be a divine entity in these contexts.

* * *

I shall now discuss some alternatives of functional interaction by means of three test cases, Apollo—Aesculapius, Summanus—Juppiter, and Mater Matuta—Carmenta—Iuno.

1. Suppression of functional foci could go hand in hand with the reinforcement of other functional foci and therefore lead to an overall redefinition of the god’s sphere of competences. A case in point is Apollo, who may have had similar functions as his Greek pendant in early Rome, but whose functional focus of ‘healing’ was particularly emphasized by the dedication of a temple to Apollo the Healer (medicus) in the mid-fifth century B.C. Over time, this functional focus faded into oblivion, and Apollo increasingly became the Roman god of Greek art and culture par excellence, while ceding his healing competences to Aesculapius, another Greek import. To illustrate this development, I will recapitulate briefly the history of the two cults.

In 449 B.C., Livy mentions a precinct of Apollo (Apollinare) outside the city walls, close to the Porta Carmentalis. After an epidemic, a temple to Apollo the Healer (medicus) was erected on the site in 431. The location can be explained by the fact that illness, like death, had no place inside the city walls. Apollo’s epithet, the occasion on which his temple was built, and its extramural location, make it unmistakably clear that the cult focused on the god’s ‘healing’ competences. On the other hand, there is no indication that the god was in any way connected with other aspects dominant in the corresponding Greek cult, most notably oracular functions. Indeed, quite the opposite is the case, as the Sibyline books were kept in the Capitoline sanctuary of Juppiter rather than in the temple of Apollo, as would be expected. Even when the old books were destroyed in the fire of 83 B.C., the newly compiled collection was again stored in the Capitoline temple when it

---

316 CIL VI 644.
318 Liv. 3.63.7; 4.25.3f.; 4.29.7. For the epithet Medicus see Liv. 40.51.6. For the location of the temple A. Viscogliosi, in: LTUR 1 (1993), 49.
was rebuilt.\footnote{A. Rzach, in: \textit{RE} 2A.2 (1923), cols. 2112f.} It was not until the time of Augustus that the collection was possibly transferred, not to the old sanctuary of Apollo the Healer at the foot of the Capitol, but to the new Palatine temple of Apollo.\footnote{Suet. \textit{Aug.} 31.1 with Kienast 1999, 235f. and n. 103 [suggesting that the part of the collection that had been compiled after 83 B.C. remained in the Capitoline temple].} Not before 37 B.C. and under Augustan patronage did the god find his way on to Roman coinage, but this time in his capacity as the Greek oracular god (in fact, only his tripod was depicted).\footnote{RRC II, 744.}

The Palatine temple was dedicated by Augustus in 28 B.C. It was built of white Luna marble and lavishly decorated with pieces of Greek sculpture, executed with “unique munificence”.\footnote{Vel. 2.81.4 \textit{singulari munificentia}.} The group of cult statues venerated there (Apollo, Diana and Latona) were the work of famous Greek artists.\footnote{Martin 1988, 254. But also the cult statue of Apollo the Healer may have been the work of a Greek artist, Flashar 1992, 138–142.} It had a library attached to it, and played a dominant role in the Secular Games of 17 B.C. It was also a place of assembly for the senate.\footnote{P. Gros, in: \textit{LTUR} I (1993), 54–57.} Architecturally, it was connected to Augustus’ residence via corridors. In short, it was designed to be what the old temple of Apollo was not: a spatial focus of an exclusively Greek god, who happened to be also the guarantor of the well-being of the emperor and the Empire.

This is not to say that the Romans were ignorant of major functional foci of Greek Apollo before the Augustan period. In fact, the god’s functional position in the Greek pantheon had always been known and partly adopted in Rome. For instance, it was Greek myth that established a kinship link between Apollo, Latona (his mother), and Diana (his sister) and it is therefore no coincidence that the triad was worshipped (along with Hercules, Mercury and Neptune) at the first \textit{lectisternium} in 399 B.C.\footnote{Liv. 25.12.10, 13. For the Games cf. Bernstein 1998, 171–186, for the cult \textit{Graeco ritu} see Scheid 1995.} The Games of Apollo (\textit{ludi Apollinares}) in 212 B.C. and later were held according to “Greek custom” (\textit{Graeco ritu})\footnote{Liv. 5.13.6; D.H. 12.9.2.} and involved scenic performances according to similar Greek practice.\footnote{Bernstein 1998, 183–185.} By the middle of the first century B.C., the Sibylline books became linked with Apollo, evidently under Greek influence. However,
as I have mentioned above, they had no verifiable impact upon the Roman cult of Apollo until their transference to the Palatine temple under Augustus.\textsuperscript{328} The old temple of Apollo was adorned with various famous pieces of Greek art, set up on completion of restoration work in the thirties or twenties B.C.\textsuperscript{329}

Despite his undoubtedly central and well-defined functional focus as healing god, Apollo never became popular in Rome.\textsuperscript{330} In marked contrast, Aesculapius, whose temple like that of Apollo was also dedicated after an epidemic in 290 B.C. and outside the city wall (i.e. on the Island in the Tiber) enjoyed private worship from an early date. This is attested by a number of dedicatory inscriptions, the earliest of which belong to the third or second century B.C.,\textsuperscript{331} as well as an impressive number of votive terracottas.\textsuperscript{332} The temple could provide funds for long-term building projects.\textsuperscript{333} It was frequented not only by the poor, but also by the well-off. For example, Cicero’s wife Terentia seems to have been a regular visitor.\textsuperscript{334} This is even more astonishing, given that the cult did not command attention in other parts of central Italy, with the notable exception of Fregellae, where, however, it may have continued an indigenous cult.\textsuperscript{335} Nor did it receive particular support from the Julio-Claudian emperors.\textsuperscript{336} Only from the Flavian period onwards was the cult of Aesculapius increasingly instrumentalized for political ends.\textsuperscript{337}

\textsuperscript{328} Cic. \textit{de har. resp.} 18; \textit{fatorum veteres praedictiones Apollinis}; Cic. \textit{div.} 1.115, 2.113; \textit{Apollinis operta}. At Liv. 10.8.2 the Veii appear as \textit{anistites Apollinaris sacrì caerimoniarumque aliarum}, but Livy here projects an Apollonian connection back to the end of the fourth century B.C., cf. Radke 1987, 55.


\textsuperscript{330} No dedicatory inscriptions to Apollo from Republican Rome have been unearthed so far. For limited evidence from elsewhere in Italy, cf. Latte 1960, 223 n. 2.

\textsuperscript{331} For the Republican period cf. \textit{ILLRP} 35–39, for their dating Degrassi 1986, 148. For later dedicatory inscriptions cf. \textit{CIL} VI 8–20; 30844.

\textsuperscript{332} \textit{Terracotte votive} 17–20; Degrassi 1986, 148; for the wider context of such terracotta ex-votos see Cazanove 2000, 75f.

\textsuperscript{333} \textit{ILLRP} 39 = \textit{CIL} I 1800 with Guarducci 1971, 275f.

\textsuperscript{334} For the participation of the poor in the cult cf. Guarducci 1971, 274f.; Winkler 1995, 145f. For Terentia see Cic. \textit{fam.} 14.7.1 (= S.-B. 155.1). The healing god is not mentioned here by name, but his character as a protector of private health makes Aesculapius a more likely choice than Apollo.

\textsuperscript{335} Degrassi 1986, 149–152.

\textsuperscript{336} Winkler 1995, 148.

\textsuperscript{337} Winkler 1995, 150–153.
The success of Aesculapius as a healing god in Rome no doubt accelerated the process of ‘hellenization’ of Apollo, i.e. the shifting and extension of the functional foci of the Roman god towards the corresponding foci of his Greek counterpart. At the conclusion of this process of redefinition stands the Palatine Apollo. This ‘Augustan’ Apollo apparently possessed all functional foci of the Greek Apollo, with one exception—his healing competences. Ovid seems to have been aware of the competition between Aesculapius and Apollo, since he tries to reconcile both, making Aesculapius not arrive from Epiđauros until he had secured the explicit approval of Apollo, his “father”.

2. Varro, referring to ancient sources (annales), represents Titus Tatius, the Sabine king, as the founder of an altar to Summanus. Although no such altar is archaeologically attested in Rome, during the Republican period we do find a terracotta statue of the god on the roof of the Capitoline temple. It is a qualified guess that the supposed altar stood in the precincts of the Capitoline temple, and that its cult was integrated into the complex in a manner similar to the cults of Iuventus and Terminus. A decision to dedicate the original altar on the Capitol, one of the highest spots in the city, can be explained by Summanus’ functional focus as a god of lightning, which is also reflected in his very name, “the highest”. However, in the Roman pantheon this functional focus was already occupied by Iuppiter. A solution to this dilemma was to subordinate Summanus to Iuppiter and to refer to him simply by means of an epithet, as is done on two inscriptions from northern Italy, where he appears as Iuppiter summanus, and by the epitomes of Livy’s book XIV (reflecting Livian word usage?), which refer to Summanus simply as Iuppiter. The other, more widely accepted, solution was to adopt Summanus as an independent entity into the Roman pantheon, though with limited and specified functional foci. He became, perhaps under Etruscan influence, the god of nocturnal lightning, handing over

\[338\] Ov. met. 15.628–640. Other sources report that the cult was introduced after the consultation of the Sibylline books, cf. Schmidt 1909, 31–38 for a sober discussion of the sources and their differences.

\[339\] Varro ling. 5.74.

\[340\] However, there seems to be little comparative material from Sabine territory, cf. Evans 1939, 206f. Plin. nat. 2.138 regards Summanus an Etruscan god.

\[341\] Cf. Cic. div. 1.16 with Pease ad loc.

\[342\] See chapter I.1.

\[343\] Cf. Walde / Hofmann, s.v. summus; Radke 1965, 295.

\[344\] CIL V 3256, 5660. Summanus was a proper name at all times, as is shown by the existence of the adjective Summanus in CIL VI 30880.
his métier of diurnal lightning to Iuppiter. Even a new etymology was invented, which made him the god “before morning” (*sub-manus) in accordance with his new nocturnal competences. In the course of time, the original aspect of a god of “height” was lost too, with the result that in the third century B.C. a temple to him was erected, not on a hill-top, but somewhere in the valley between the Palatine and Aventine, “not far away from the carceres of the Circus Maximus”. Finally, after his relegation to night-time and darkness, Summanus eventually appears as a god of the underworld from the third century A.D. on. A truly remarkable career.

To some extent, a parallel is offered by the antagonism between Apollo and Sol. In its form of Sol Indiges, the latter was apparently an age-old Roman deity, whose functional sphere came to overlap with that of Greek Apollo as an identification of the ‘sun’, when the latter identification became prominent in Rome in the Augustan period. As Summanus adorned the roof of the temple of Iuppiter but lost most of its functions, so Sol’s chariot was exhibited on top of Apollo’s Palatine temple built by Augustus, paying homage to the older and waning deity. Befittingly, Horace did not fail to turn to Sol in his Carmen Saeculare, which was actually a hymn to Apollo and his sister performed on the occasion of the Secular Games in 17 B.C. in front of the god’s Palatine temple (see chapter III below).

My notion of Summanus as an originally independent god who was eventually suppressed by Iuppiter is not uncontroversial. Thus, Wissowa and others considered Summanus to be a Jovian hypostasis, denoting a god of night-time lightning who had become emancipated from Iuppiter in his shape as the sky god. However, such a course of

---

341 Plin. nat. 2.138; Paul. Fest. 66.15f. [L]; Fest. 254.1–4 [L]; Aug. civ. 4.23; Philo ap. Stob. Eel. 1.29.3. It is not clear whether CIL VI 30879 and 30880, which mention a fulgur Summani and a Summanium fulgur respectively, simply refer to nocturnal lightning. The deliberate specification “of Summanus”, however, renders such an interpretation highly likely.
342 Walde / Hofmann s.v. summus.
344 In the acta Arvalia of 224 A.D. a sacrifice to Summanus of two black wethers is mentioned, cf. Scheid, no. 105.11. Arnob. adv. nat. 5.37, 6.3 identifies Summanus with Dis Pater. Mart. Cap. 2.161 equates Summanus with Pluto and etymologizes the former as sumnus Manium. Finally, the not. urb. reg. XI mentions a temple of Dis Pater, which presumably belonged to Summanus, cf. Ziołkowski 1992, 154f.; F. Coarelli, in: LTUR IV (1999), 386.
345 Prop. 2.31.11.
reasoning runs into serious difficulties. The third-century B.C. temple of the god was erected in the vicinity of the Circus Maximus, which was a fair distance from both the Capitoline sanctuary (where most Jovian hypostases had their temples) and the temple of Iuppiter Fulgur in the Campus Martius, the direct functional counterpart to Summanus. The anniversary of the temple (June 20) was not linked to any specific Jovian day, nor to the foundation of the temple of Iuppiter Fulgur (October 7) for that matter. Besides, its closeness to the summer solstice would be surprising in the case of a god who operated exclusively at night. Furthermore, a terracotta statue on top of a temple would be as unparalleled a beginning for a future hypostasis, as would be the distinction of various forms of lightning outside the Etruscan discipline. Last but not least, Varro points to Summanus’ popularity before the installation of the Capitoline triad, suggesting a subsequent decline in popularity rather than an increase. However, only rising popularity would justify an emancipation. On balance, it is safer to claim that, in historical times, Summanus was an independent god in decline, not an increasingly powerful aspect of Iuppiter that eventually became emancipated from the old sky god.

3. The cult of Mater Matuta in the Forum Boarium dates back to the archaic period, as is evidenced by a seventh-century votive deposit and a sixth-century temple discovered in the region as well as the annual festival of Matralia, already mentioned in the earliest known feriale. It had its pendant in the archaic cult of the same goddess in Satricum, some 60 kilometers or so south of Rome. Regarding the question of functional foci of Roman Mater Matuta, it is irrelevant whether matuta can be linked etymologically to matutinus (“belonging the morning”) or manus (“good”) or both. Neither etymology would have been self-
evident to an ordinary Roman. Indeed, neither is markedly present in the actual rites of the cult, as far as we can reconstruct them. It is however important to note that in the old calendar, the festival of the goddess is simply called Matralia, i.e. “festival of mothers”, without further specification. Despite various fanciful interpretations, the most straightforward solution would seem that the underlying word mater here was used in a general sense for matrona. In other words, the Matralia were the old festival of the free, Roman housewife, in charge of the children as well as the household, and all things connected with the family, including childbirth. Such an approach explains the little we know about the ritual from later sources, viz. the fact that only women who had been married once (univirae) could perform the cult, while slave-women were excluded. Once a year a slave-woman was symbolically driven out of the temple while receiving a beating. A strange rite of embracing one’s nephews and nieces and praying for them, instead of one’s own children, was presumably a remnant of an originally much larger ritual context. Whatever its nature, it appears to have been strongly connected with the notion of family and blood-kinship. The reason why Mater Matuta eventually attained only a marginal position in the pantheon of Republican Rome appears to have been the very similar functional foci of Iuno, who rose unchallenged as the female goddess par excellence after the inauguration of the Capitoline triad towards the end of the sixth century. Whatever her prior position in the Roman pantheon, Iuno’s importance can only have been considerably strengthened by this event. It was not only as a member of the most powerful divine triad that Iuno superseded other female patron goddesses. Later, the festival of Matronalia on March 1 was dedicated to her, which therefore competed with the Matralia of Mater Matuta. The merger of both deities is attested by Livy, who mentions Iuno Matuta on one occasion (perhaps actually referring to Iuno Sospita).

356 Cf. e.g. the sacrifices of foetuses and, hence, of pregnant animals, Champeaux 1992, 264f.
357 Tert. monog. 17.3.
358 Ov. fast. 6.551–558; Plut. Cam. 5.2; mor. 267D with Schultz 2006, 147.
359 Ov. fast. 6.559–562; Plut. Cam. 5.2; mor. 267E.
360 The Matronalia do not belong to the oldest calendar, for details see St. Weinstock, in: RE 14.2 (1930), cols. 2306–2309.
361 Liv. 34.53.3 with Radke 1963, 329–331.
A similar ‘victim’ superseded by the spread of Iuno’s cult was Carmenta (also referred to as Carmentis), whose temple was located virtually next to the temple of Mater Matuta and possibly complemented it in ritual terms.\textsuperscript{362} According to Varro, Carmenta was an old goddess of childbirth.\textsuperscript{363} If so, she must have been subordinated to Iuno (Lucina) at an early stage.\textsuperscript{364} Her antiquity and importance are guaranteed by her ancient sanctuary and by the fact that she had her own \textit{flamen} and a festival (\textit{Carmentalia}).\textsuperscript{365} The age of the sanctuary is vouched for, not only by the supposed connection of the cult with Euander,\textsuperscript{366} but also by the existence of the Porta Carmentalis, which took its name from the sanctuary nearby.

The three test cases, Apollo—Aesculapius, Summanus—Iuppiter and Mater Matuta—Carmenta—Iuno show some general characteristics of functional interaction. To begin with, in all three instances functional foci shifted. The moving force of this vibrating system of functional foci was the attempt to avoid functional overlaps. Although the whole system was highly fluid, there was a clear tendency to have each functional focus occupied by one, and one only, divine concept at a time. While it is thus fair to say that functional foci were oscillating according to historic circumstances, the overarching principle of economy is omnipresent: ideally, each functional focus belonged to one god only.

Second, the expansion of the functional focus of a divine concept necessarily led to restriction of the functional foci of another, if a functional overlap was to be avoided. On the part of the divine concept under attack, this led to either extinction or modification. Modification meant dissolution of a functional focus into a number of constituent functional foci and the ceding of part of these new constituent foci

\textsuperscript{362} The myth as recounted by Ov. \textit{fast.} 6.529–548 connects the two. Besides this, both temples are located virtually next to each other, despite the fact that the archaic city wall presumably separated the two (like the later Servian wall, for the topography cf. Champeaux 1982, 316f.; Coarelli 1988, 241; Carandini 1997, pl. xxxiii with p. 627).

\textsuperscript{363} Varro ap. Gell. 16.16.4 = \textit{antiqu. fr.} 103 [Cardauns]. The foundation myth of the \textit{Carmentalia}, as recounted by Ov. \textit{fast.} 1.617–636 (historically confirmed by Liv. 5.25.9; 34.3.9), clearly implies the exclusive involvement of women (\textit{matronae}) in the cult and the nature of Carmentis as goddess of childbirth. Her function as a prophesying deity (Macr. \textit{sat.} 1.7.20) is secondary: in Ovid (\textit{loc. cit.}) Carmenta is only accompanied by (not identified with) two divining deities.

\textsuperscript{364} Suggested already by Wissowa 1912, 53.
\textsuperscript{365} Cic. \textit{Brut.} 56, \textit{CIL} VI 31032.10.
\textsuperscript{366} Coarelli 1988, 245.
to the expanding deity. Thus, when encroached upon by Iuppiter, the functional focus of ‘lightning’ of Summanus was dissolved into ‘day lightning’ and ‘night lightning’ and the former was ceded to Iuppiter. On the other hand, the expansion of the functional foci of Iuppiter was again based on the principle of functional similarity, for both ‘blue sky’ and ‘lightning’ resembled each other in that both were meteorological phenomena. Both expansion and restriction of functional foci were actually governed by the same principle of similarity.

Third, old concepts died hard. Since the privileged nature of divine concepts was normally neatly tied up with patterns of power within society, it was expedient to abandon these concepts only in the very specific case of revolution, i.e. a violent redistribution of power within society. But this case was exceedingly rare, and normally divine concepts did not serve to propagate the new, but to cement and corroborate the old. This is why divine concepts such as Summanus, Mater Matuta or Carmenta were not abolished but redefined or left untouched, even at the cost of violating the principle of functional economy described above.

* * *

The welter of innumerable gods, with practically innumerable functional foci, made Roman polytheism in its entirety a cumbersome instrument for fulfilling the religious needs of the ordinary people. The answer to such a problem was selectivity. Selectivity meant that the whole range of potential functions was projected on to a very limited number of gods. Selectivity was the precondition that would make private cult work, although it stood in stark ideological contrast to the official pontifical religion. Selectivity meant ascribing privilege to a few gods as opposed to the many, and significantly expanding the functional foci of the privileged deities at the cost of those gods excluded. The climax of this development was the adherence to virtually one single god among the many. This phenomenon is now widely known as ‘henotheism’, a term introduced by Versnel’s classic study ‘Ter Unus’ less than two decades ago.367

Selectivity was no doubt inherent in Roman polytheism from time immemorial. The first example on record is the cult of Bacchus, eventually banned by the senate in 186 B.C. Livy and the Tiriolo decree

---

367 Versnel 1990 in general and 35–38 in particular.
testify to the degree of exclusivity which this cult implied by imposing a specific life style, as well as to the exceptional devotion of its followers. They suggest that Bacchus was considered, if not the only god, at least the only god that mattered, and the indisputable head of the pantheon at least in the mind of those who followed him.

It was selectivity that opened the door to foreign cults and ensured their success. A prime example is the cult of Isis. In Rome she appears in two forms, as goddess of the sea (Isis Pelagia, Pharia) with a specific festival, the *Isidis navigium*, on March 5, and as goddess of fertility and agriculture (Isis Frugifera). But in the eyes of her adherents, her competences were much wider. Apuleius lets her describe herself as “mother of the universe, mistress of all the elements, first offspring of the ages, mightiest of deities, queen of the dead, foremost of heavenly beings, uniform manifestation of all gods and goddesses etc.” Elsewhere he speaks of her as the one “that gives birth to all”, “that rules over everything”, or “the mother of all time”. A Greek inscription from imperial Rome refers to her as the goddess “that surveys everything”. In other inscriptions from Rome she carries the title “queen” (*regina*), and she is identified with Iuno in Rome in the late second century A.D.

From the time of Franz Cumont, scholars have been in the habit of connecting Christianity with the cults of other oriental deities such as Isis and Mithras to explain the decline of the traditional Roman pantheon. However, Christianity differed fundamentally from these oriental religions in one particular point: its functional exclusiveness. For other oriental gods never precluded the existence of competing divine forces. At most, the latter were considered emanations of the central divine power. One may refer to Isis again: as we have just seen, in her most extreme form the goddess was conceptualized as embodying competences of all the members of the Roman pantheon, of which

---

368 *SIRIS* no. 396 [1st–2nd century A.D., Pelagia]; for Isis Pharia see Bricault 1996, 89. The goddess had a special affinity with the sea from the Hellenistic period onwards, Malaise 1972a, 186f.
369 *SIRIS* no. 379 with Malaise 1972a, 187 with chapter I.5 for representations of Isis Frugifera.
370 Apul. *met.* 11.5.
371 Apul. *met.* 11.7 [*pares temporum*]; 11.11 [*omnipares dea*]; 11.16 [*omnipotens dea*].
372 *IGUR* 176.7–9 [*panepiskopos*].
however she remained an integral part. Her inclusive functional force is documented, for instance, by a Roman dedicatory inscription from 1 A.D., where she appears between Ops and Pietas following a series of ten or eleven traditional Roman gods.\(^{375}\) In representational art, her functions are manifest in manifold syncretistic iconographic forms (see below on iconography)\(^{376}\) and in peculiar bronze figurines from the second century A.D. In these figurines, major gods of the Roman pantheon (including Isis) are represented by their characteristic attributes \((\textit{signa panthea})\).\(^{377}\) Finally, one may point to an aedicula (lararium/shrine?), discovered on the Esquiline in a domestic context dating from the era of Constantine: a statue of Isis of considerable size (height 1.50 m) was placed in the central niche of the aedicula. Isis appeared here as Isis-Fortuna, combining iconographic requisites of both the Egyptian deity (uraei, basileion) and the Roman goddess (steering oar, cornucopia). Although she clearly occupied the central position, marked by both the central place and size of the statue, she was also flanked by statuettes and busts of other Roman and Egyptian deities (figs. 1 a, b).\(^{378}\) Even more, the aedicula was placed next to a door which led to a Mithraeum. It has been argued convincingly that both sanctuaries were functionally connected. Perhaps the Mithraeum was destined for the male, the Iseum for the female occupants of the house.\(^{379}\)

The reason why no other oriental deity (apart from the Jewish and Christian gods) ever detached itself from the notion of functional plurality is, of course, historical: all other oriental gods that played any significant role in the Roman pantheon hailed from polytheistic systems. There was, then, neither need nor opportunity to change their polytheistic profile in terms of functions, when they entered the Roman pantheon. Once more, the case of Isis affords a classic example of the importance of the historical dimension. Emerging from the multifarious Egyptian pantheon, Isis became part and parcel of various local Greek panthea and as such entered Rome as one constituent of a larger polytheistic whole. By contrast, the exclusive nature of the Christian god is manifest by its very namelessness: while all other gods of the pagan pantheon, including the so-called oriental deities, were addressed with

\(^{375}\) \textit{CIL} VI 30975 = \textit{ILS} 3090 = \textit{SIRIS} 401 = Malaise 1972, 130 [no. 61].
\(^{376}\) See chapter I.5.
\(^{377}\) Weisshäupl 1910 with Eichler 1952.
\(^{378}\) Vitozzi 1993 with chapter I.5.
\(^{379}\) Vitozzi 1993, 235f. and 242 n. 66.
their name or, at least, a substitute for it (e.g. Bona Dea), the Christian god, like his Jewish precedent, was referred to simply as ‘god’ by his worshippers.

The exclusive attribution of all functions to a single divine concept had another side to it, which was to eventually favor the spread of Christianity quite significantly. The Christian and Jewish gods could easily be transferred from one place to another without any modification of functional foci. While it was always possible to export a god of any polytheistic system in the same way, such a move could not be completed without assimilating the migrant deity to its new polytheistic environment, because the functional foci of the latter were not self-sufficient, but dependent on the divine ‘constellations’ of the polytheistic system surrounding it. Theoretically, it was a comparatively easy task to introduce, for instance, the cult of Iuppiter Optimus Maximus to the market places of Roman colonies. However, the outcome of this transfer was not the Roman Iuppiter Optimus Maximus. Rather, the migrant Iuppiter was normally either assimilated to prominent local deities or remained an outsider, constituting an additional functional

---

Fig. 1a: Aedicula of Isis-Fortuna at S. Martino ai Monti, reconstruction

---
Their name or, at least, a substitute for it (e.g. Bona Dea), the Christian god, like his Jewish precedent, was referred to simply as 'god' by his worshippers.

The exclusive attribution of all functions to a single divine concept had another side to it, which was to eventually favor the spread of Christianity significantly. The Christian and Jewish gods could easily be transferred from one place to another without any modification of functional foci. While it was always possible to export a god of any polytheistic system in the same way, such a move could not be completed without assimilating the migrant deity to its new polytheistic environment, because the functional foci of the latter were not self-sufficient, but dependent on the divine 'constellations' of the polytheistic system surrounding it. Theoretically, it was a comparatively easy task to introduce, for instance, the cult of Iuppiter Optimus Maximus to the market places of Roman colonies. However, the outcome of this transfer was not the Roman Iuppiter Optimus Maximus. Rather, the migrant Iuppiter was normally either assimilated to prominent local deities or remained an outsider, constituting an additional functional

Fig. 1a: Aedicula of Isis-Fortuna at S. Martino ai Monti, reconstruction

Fig. 1b: Statue of Isis-Fortuna from the aedicula at S. Martino ai Monti
focus, i.e. that of ‘Romanity’. The homogeneity of functional foci of the Christian and Jewish gods throughout the ancient world could thus never be achieved by any god hailing from a polytheistic system. In short, the Christian and Jewish gods were basically the only truly international divine concepts in the ancient world in functional terms.

5. Iconography

Theoretically speaking, the number of visual forms of divine concepts is infinite. As with all concepts, though, Roman culture is highly selective in its choice of dominant visual forms connected with the divine. These were often labeled, and thus became, ‘types’ or, as I shall call them, ‘iconographic foci’. The totality of such forms shall be called ‘iconography’.

The iconography of pagan Roman gods may be conveniently divided into human-shaped and non-human-shaped representations. Human-shaped representations form the vast majority of official Roman cult images. Non-anthropomorphic cult objects are few. To begin with, we must mention the spear of Mars (apparently displayed in the Regia together with other fetishes such as two lances [hastae Martis] and two shields [ancilia]). Other cases are the boundary stone (terminus) of Terminus, the flint-stone (silex) of Iuppiter Feretrius, the baetysts of Magna Mater and Elagabal, and the flame of Vesta. Some further remarks are in place, however.

With regard to the spear of Mars, a number of sources attest explicitly to its divine nature. But apart from the fact that the worship of such an object would be unique among the official cults of Rome, the spear was displayed not in a temple, but a profane building, viz. the Regia. I have already argued above that it was predominantly the connection with divine space that turned a statue into a cult statue. If I am right, it is legitimate to conclude by analogy that the spear was in fact not an equivalent to the cult statue of Mars, but originally a symbol of the martial powers of the king (and not the god) residing in or close to the Regia.

As for the remaining aniconic representations, their exceptional character can be briefly surveyed. Terminus was not only aniconic, but also
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380 Varro antiqu. fr. 254* [Cardauns]; Plut. Rom. 29.1; Arn. adv. nat. 6.11.
381 See chapter I.1.
immovable, i.e. exempted from exauguration, and worshipped under the open sky, i.e. explicitly not in a temple. In his divine form, he was thus truly indistinguishable from the thousands of actual boundary stones in and outside the city. It was this indistinctiveness which gave every boundary stone in the landscape a strongly divine aura as a potential ‘cult statue’ of the god. In other words, the aniconic appearance of Terminus served very practical ends. Iuppiter Feretrius appears to be the only hypostasis of an otherwise anthropomorphic Roman god that was simultaneously worshipped in non-human form (that is, of course, if we exclude the case of the spear of Mars). This can be explained if we assume that the epithet Feretrius did not originally denote a specific Iuppiter-type, but an independent deity that was worshipped in the particular form of a sacred stone (just like Terminus), before merging with Iuppiter. Even gods that were originally worshipped in an aniconic form soon received a human iconography. Thus, Magna Mater was transferred from Asia Minor (where she was normally worshipped in human form) in the shape of a baetyl, but appears in Roman art as a female figure, recognisable by a turreted crown on her head and/or lions accompanying her. In the same vein, the meteorite of the god Elagabal soon assumed human iconography. Vesta is represented in anthropomorphic form during a lectisternium performed in 217 B.C. Statues of her are also attested earlier on the Forum, on the Palatine and elsewhere in Rome.

In short, official iconographic foci in Rome were, or soon became, anthropomorphic. By contrast, private cult practice showed its usual flexibility in this respect. It is sufficient to refer to the worship of a coin by the gens Servilia, which allegedly presaged the vicissitudes of the family. The cult of Vesta in the Forum Romanum may have been a residue of such private worship, possibly from a royal context.

Another indication of the tendency towards personification is the fact that human-shaped cult images of abstracta are attested from very early on: for instance, the cult image of Fortuna in the Forum Boarium (sixth century B.C.) and other extant Republican cult images of
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382 See chapter I.1.
383 For the iconography of both Magna Mater and Elagabal see also chapter II.1.
384 Liv. 22.10.9.
385 Enn. ann. 240 [Sk]; Varro agr. 1.1.4; Degrassi 1963, 452; T. Fischer-Hansen, in: LIMC V.1 (1990), 412.
386 Plin. nat. 34.137.
abstract notions from Rome (Fortuna Huiusce Diei, Fides, Mens [?]) are all anthropomorphic.\textsuperscript{388} The same tendency towards personification is further supported by divine nomenclature. In order to create divine ‘personal’ names from abstract nouns, the latter are often slightly modified in order to mark their ‘personal’, non-abstract aspect. For example, the river was Tiber, while the river-god appeared as Tiberinus; robigo denoted the mildew that befell the grain, while Robigus was the god who averts it; flos was the ‘flower’, Flora the patron goddess of vegetation; Portunus the god of harbours (portus), Ianus the protector of entrances (ianua) etc. One should also remember that many so-called ‘functional’ gods were similar to, but not identical with, the Latin word denoting their competences.\textsuperscript{389} On a psychological level, there can be little doubt that such a creation of ‘proper names’ from appellatives served to transform the appellative notion into a more familiar, ‘god-type’ person with an individual name.

Often, iconographic aspects of Roman gods were adopted from outside. Most obviously, the identification of Roman gods with their Greek counterparts was omnipresent in Roman iconography from early on. For instance, we find Volcan iconographically identified with Hephaisstos in Rome from at least the beginning of the sixth century B.C.\textsuperscript{390} Being foreign did not imply a lack of focal potential in terms of iconography. Greek cult statues were transferred to Rome and served there as cult statues in the second century B.C.;\textsuperscript{391} indeed, Augustus chose works of famous Greek artists as cult statues for his new Palatine temple of Apollo.\textsuperscript{392} On the other hand, it would seem that a new iconographic type was created for the cult statue of Mars Ultor (see below). Accordingly, it was not the provenance of the iconographic type but the spatial setting in which it was displayed that mattered.\textsuperscript{393}

Iconography was, on occasion, directly linked to its particular spatial setting. One may refer to the case of Terminus, who, apart from his non-anthropomorphic appearance, had special spatial demands, i.e. a

\textsuperscript{389} For example ‘Segetia’ = ‘goddess of standing crops’, cf. seges, -etis f. = ‘standing crop’. A similar observation is made already by Varro ap. Aug. civ. 4.24 = Varro antiqu. fr. 189 [Cardauns].
\textsuperscript{390} North 1989, 579f.; Cornell 1995, 162f.
\textsuperscript{391} Vermeule 1987, 19; Edwards 2003, 50.
\textsuperscript{392} See chapter I.4.
\textsuperscript{393} See chapter I.1.
hymnaethral cult place. Another case in point might have been Vesta in her Forum temple, whose aniconic cult (if there has ever been such thing) related perhaps to the fact that she was worshipped in a circular sanctuary. Gods connected with lightning, such as Iuppiter Fulgur or Semo Sancus, may generally have been worshipped in an aniconic form, given their distinct functional foci. Therefore, it may be no coincidence that according to reliable sources their temples were hymnaethral.

The vast majority of Roman gods, for example the ‘functional gods’ or many deified abstract notions, had no iconography at all. Normally, it was only the more popular deities who were fixed by iconographic focalization. This meant that the worship of major Roman gods focused where it did, on a limited number of types from a vast pool of potential visual representations of the god. Even among those types that were actually realized in Roman art, only a small number—i.e. the actual cult images—served as iconographic foci. For instance, Iuppiter could be represented in many different ways. However, his Capitoline cult image, the iconographic focus of the cult of Iuppiter Optimus Maximus, was fixed, viz. the god was represented seated and bare-breasted, with a cloak around his waist and legs. By contrast, the cult statue of Iuppiter Tonans represented the god naked, stepping forward and holding a sceptre in his right hand and a thunderbolt in his left. Similarly, the cult effigy of Mars Ultor is seen standing upright in martial pose, wearing a cuirass and helmet and leaning on a lance with his right hand. In his left hand he holds a shield.

In other words, while countless different representations of divine concepts were conceivable, the number of actual iconographic foci was extremely limited. For a modern observer it is not always easy to distinguish both categories. A case in point is the findings from the Iseum Metellinum, where five or six marble heads from statues of Isis were unearthed in 1887. They clearly confirm that Isis was conceptualized within the same sanctuary in many different ways: all the

91 See chapter I.1.
92 See chapter I.4.
95 The vast majority of Roman gods, for example the ‘functional gods’ or many deified abstract notions, had no iconography at all. Normally, it was only the more popular deities who were fixed by iconographic focalization. This meant that the worship of major Roman gods focused where it did, on a limited number of types from a vast pool of potential visual representations of the god. Even among those types that were actually realized in Roman art, only a small number—i.e. the actual cult images—served as iconographic foci. For instance, Iuppiter could be represented in many different ways. However, his Capitoline cult image, the iconographic focus of the cult of Iuppiter Optimus Maximus, was fixed, viz. the god was represented seated and bare-breasted, with a cloak around his waist and legs. By contrast, the cult statue of Iuppiter Tonans represented the god naked, stepping forward and holding a sceptre in his right hand and a thunderbolt in his left. Similarly, the cult effigy of Mars Ultor is seen standing upright in martial pose, wearing a cuirass and helmet and leaning on a lance with his right hand. In his left hand he holds a shield.

In other words, while countless different representations of divine concepts were conceivable, the number of actual iconographic foci was extremely limited. For a modern observer it is not always easy to distinguish both categories. A case in point is the findings from the Iseum Metellinum, where five or six marble heads from statues of Isis were unearthed in 1887. They clearly confirm that Isis was conceptualized within the same sanctuary in many different ways: all the

94 However, the causal connection did not work in reverse: for instance, the temples of Fortuna Huiusce Diei, of Hercules in the Forum Boarium and of Hercules Musarum in the Circus Flaminius were round, though their cult images were apparently of an ordinary type (P. Gros, in: LTUR II (1995), 269f.; F. Coarelli, in: LTUR III (1996), 11f.; A. Viscoglosi, in: LTUR III (1996), 17–19).
heads belong to different types. But iconography was not necessarily tantamount to cultic focalization. It is quite possible that none of the heads actually represented the iconography of the cult statue of the Iseum Metellinum.

In fact, Isis is a good example of the arbitrary selection of actual iconographic foci. Despite the wealth of archaeological material, only three iconographic types of the Egyptian goddess have hitherto been identified with types of cult statues of the goddess. Isis Panthea is found on coins (see below), and it has been suggested that Isis Frugifera may be represented in a mutilated relief, found close to the theatre of Marcellus, in the second century A.D., though the work may be a Roman copy of a Hellenistic prototype. However, the identification of this Isis-type with Isis Frugifera is based solely on the millet stalks seen to the right of the goddess. Unfortunately, the relief is damaged on either side. One may wonder, then, whether Isis Frugifera would not better be identified with the well-documented Isis-Demeter type, conventionally depicted standing upright, with a torch in her right hand, an ear of corn in her left and a modius on her head. This form of the goddess is also attested in Rome. By contrast, at least one iconographic type of Isis Pelagia or Pharia is well known. Here she is represented as striding to the left or right and holding, with her two hands and one foot, a sail that appears to be bellied out by the wind. Some of these representations belong to the first century A.D. or even earlier. However, the vast majority is found in the second century, with many on eastern coins. The first archaeologically attested Roman examples apparently belong to the second century A.D. Despite the good documentation of this type, it has been questioned whether this was the iconography of the actual cult statue of Isis Pelagia. Other Isis-types may have replaced it. The only certain fact is that there was a temple or shrine to Isis Pelagia in the city, for which we have epigraphical evidence.

* * *

398 Malaise 1972, 172f. [no. 315] [mentioning five heads of Isis, but M. de Vos, in: *LTUR* III (1996), 111 speaks of 6].
399 Malaise 1972, 214 [no. 392].
400 Malaise 1972, 224 [no. 409]; Malaise 1972a, 180; Tran Tam Tinh, in: *LIMC* V.1 (1990), 781 [nos 262–265, esp. no. 262], 793f.
401 Tran Tam Tinh, in: *LIMC* V.1 (1990) 782–784, esp. 783 [no. 293].
402 Tran Tam Tinh in: *LIMC* V.1 (1990), 794.
The emperor had no specific divine iconography of his own. Rather, his divine nature had to be conceptualized artificially through assimilation with traditional gods, most notably Iuppiter (but also through other deities according to imperial taste). This meant a double similarity: the iconography of the emperor had to reflect both the individual features of the monarch and those of a specific god to such an extent that each was separately recognizable. There were essentially two ways to achieve these ends, physical assimilation and divine attributes. Both were often combined.

To begin with physical assimilation, statuary types of Augustus and other rulers were frequently modelled on Iuppiter types, most notably the cult statue of Iuppiter Optimus Maximus. Indeed, the latter was the first Jovian type to be assimilated into the imperial image, and is already attested from the early imperial period onward.\(^{404}\) It is more than likely that the cult statue of Augustus, erected after his posthumous deification in his new temple, imitated this type. Indeed, the layout of his temple itself may well have imitated that of Iuppiter Optimus Maximus.\(^{405}\) Other cases of physical assimilation of Augustus to a god are generally ambiguous, unless supported by specific attributes. A relatively clear case is a cameo from Vienna, on which the victorious princeps is depicted upright in a quadriga drawn by four Tritons, clearly imitating a well-known posture of Neptune. A slightly earlier cameo from Boston shows the princeps, again in a quadriga, this time drawn over the waters by horses. Augustus is clearly identified with Neptune through the trident in his left hand.\(^{406}\) A number of coin issues, some of which (though hitherto ascribed to eastern mints) may be of western or even Roman origin, depict Augustus in the shape of Iuppiter, Apollo, Neptune or Mars.\(^{407}\)

Another way to assimilate the emperor to divine concepts was through the addition of divine attributes. Many imperial attributes were more or less reminiscent of specific traditional deities, especially Iuppiter. For instance, Augustus was represented on coins struck in Rome during
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401 Maderna 1988, 18–55; for the iconographic types of the various cult statues of Iuppiter Optimus Maximus during the course of the history of the temple see Krause 1981, 1–177.
406 Zanker 1990, 102f. with figs. 81f.
his lifetime as carrying the Jovian sceptre.\textsuperscript{408} It is with this attribute of the highest god that the princeps appears on a cameo possibly of the Augustan age or slightly later,\textsuperscript{409} and on the Gemma Augustea.\textsuperscript{410} The Jovian eagle is depicted next to Augustus on the same gem, and also on a coin issue from the East dating from 27 B.C.\textsuperscript{411} Similarly, the thunderbolt appears next to the head of Augustus on a coin issued in Rome under Tiberius,\textsuperscript{412} while the same symbol is depicted on coins from the East even during Augustus’ lifetime.\textsuperscript{413} In sculpture, the princeps is represented in a famous bronze statue from Herculaneum with a thunderbolt. The piece is presumably of Augustan date and may have been manufactured in Rome.\textsuperscript{414} The princeps also appears with the aegis in the Cameo Strozzi from the Augustan period.\textsuperscript{415} Apart from such Jovian symbolism, we find the monarch with the characteristic staff of Mercury (\textit{caduceus}), e.g. on a terracotta plaque from the Horti Sallustiani,\textsuperscript{416} on an engraved gem from the Marlborough collection,\textsuperscript{417} and on a wall decoration of a Roman villa.\textsuperscript{418} A denarius of 39 B.C. shows the head of Octavian on the obverse and a \textit{caduceus} on the reverse side. However, the legend on the reverse reads \textit{Antonius Imperator}.\textsuperscript{419} One may also refer to the trident, a requisite of Neptune, in the hand of the princeps on a cameo from Boston, referred to above.\textsuperscript{420} Capricorn, Augustus’ zodiac sign, is frequently depicted in connection with the head of Augustus on eastern coins.\textsuperscript{421} The laurel, originally an Apollonian requisite, was reinstrumentalized as a sign of Augustan triumph in the form of two laurel trees planted at the entrance of the

\textsuperscript{408} HCC I, 3f., 6.
\textsuperscript{409} Eichler / Kris 1927, 51 no. 6.
\textsuperscript{410} Eichler / Kris 1927, 52–56 no. 7 with Meyer 2000, 59–80 [who favours a Claudian date].
\textsuperscript{411} Albert 1981, 139.
\textsuperscript{412} HCC I, 59 no. 1.
\textsuperscript{413} HCC I, 52 no. 268.
\textsuperscript{414} West 1933, 149–151, pl. 38 no. 162.
\textsuperscript{416} Chittenden 1945, 50–52.
\textsuperscript{417} E. Simon, in: LIMC VI.1 (1992), 516 [no. 187].
\textsuperscript{418} Brendel 1935.
\textsuperscript{419} RRC I, 532.
\textsuperscript{420} Zanker 1990, 102f. with fig. 82.
monarch’s Palatine residence. It is documented elsewhere in Augustan art, for example on the Augustan compital altars.\textsuperscript{422} Apart from all this detailed evidence, it is important to keep in mind the general principle of similarity that binds it together: while the actual realization of the imperial iconography lay in the hands of artists and differed according to their means, talent and time invested, the actual principle under which these artists endeavored to establish the divinity of the emperor was not time-bound. By compiling corpora of ancient imagery such as \textit{LIMC} and other reference works, modern scholars easily overlook the fact that not only the preservation in time, but also the actual realization of an iconographic type was a matter of chance. The emperor could be represented in the posture of Iuppiter, or with an eagle or a thunderbolt or the aegis, or a combination of these; the principle of similarity allowed for countless substitutions and omissions as long as recognizability was guaranteed. Even if all images of the divine emperor that had ever been manufactured in the ancient world were preserved, this collection would remain a rather arbitrary set. A Roman artist could have easily added to this corpus on the principle of visual similarity, even if he eventually decided not to.

* * *

Iconographic foci interacted, especially in the imperial period. For instance, Valetudo, goddess of personal health, borrowed her iconography and the snake as a requisite from her nearest Greek correspondent, Hygieia. She appeared thus on the reverse of a Roman coin struck by Mn. Acilius in 49 B.C. (the head of Salus is depicted on the obverse).\textsuperscript{423} Meanwhile, the old Roman goddess of ‘public welfare’, Salus (Publica), whose cult in Rome was certainly much older than the dedication of her temple in 302 B.C.,\textsuperscript{424} eventually adopted the snake from Hygieia/Valetudo in the second half of the first century A.D. in her new shape as Salus Augusti: the reason being that in the meantime the emperor’s personal health had become tantamount to public welfare.\textsuperscript{425}
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\textsuperscript{423} \textit{RRC} I, 461; F. Croissant, in: \textit{LIMC} V.1 (1990), 558 [no. 39], 570 (cf. V. Saladino, in: \textit{LIMC} VIII.1 [1997], 172 [no. 1]); Clark 2007, 153f., 158f.
\textsuperscript{424} Wissowa 1912, 132.
\textsuperscript{425} Winkler 1995, 90–92; cf. V. Saladino, in: \textit{LIMC} VII.1 (1994), 657 [no. 22], 658f. [nos 42–51] al. For possible consequences of this identification for the cult of Aesculapius see Winkler 1995, 150–155 (Hygieia and Aesculapius were depicted in the pediment of Domitian’s temple of the Capitoline triad).
The interaction of iconographic foci can best be demonstrated by the example of Isis. The gradual expansion of her functional foci led to an usurpation of various symbols and iconographic types of other traditional gods. In her most extreme form, she appeared as all-goddess (*panthea*), perhaps as early as the first half of the first century B.C., on a Roman coin type struck by the moneyer M. Plaetorius Cestianus (figs. 2 a, b). This early date for a pantheistic Isis type has been called into question, but it is beyond reasonable doubt that the coin represents a pantheistic deity, whether under the name of Isis or that of another deity.\(^{426}\) Alföldi, the first to recognize Isis Panthea on the Cestianus issue, gives further evidence of coins and gems for such pantheistic deities in the first century B.C.\(^{427}\) Later, Isis Panthea is also represented on bronze dedications via the various attributes of traditional gods (*signa panthea*), dating perhaps to the second century A.D. Similar bronzes have been found representing Venus.\(^{428}\)

Apart from the pantheistic Isis, a number of types of the Egyptian goddess reflect iconographic foci of traditional Roman deities. Isis-


\(^{427}\) Alföldi 1954, 31.

Fortuna, the most popular syncretistic Isis type, may have had her origin in Hellenistic Delos. The best known example of this type is the Isis-Fortuna from Herculaneum, dating to the first century A.D., now in the Museum of Naples (fig. 3). Characteristic is the ‘Isis knot’ on the chest and the horns with the plumed disc on the head of the goddess. Meanwhile, requisites of Fortuna are the steering oar in the left and the cornucopia in the right hand. As far as Rome is concerned, there is a marble statuette from the Vatican Museums (fig. 4) and another, now in Florence, but perhaps originally from Rome. Both date to the second century A.D. A special case is a marble statue of Isis-Fortuna, found in an aedicula (shrine/lararium?) on the Esquiline and dating to the era of Constantine. The statue was apparently found in situ, together with other furnishings of the aedicula. Isis’ syncretistic iconography was ‘framed’ by marble sculptures of other gods (though decidedly smaller in size), which include both traditional Roman deities such as Juppiter and Apollo, and Egyptian deities such as Sarapis and Harpocrates (figs. 1 a, b).

Isis was assimilated not only to Fortuna, but also to Demeter. This syncretistic Isis-Demeter type is attested on a relief (fig. 5) found in the Via della Conciliazione in Rome in 1941 and now in the Capitoline Museums. The relief is attributed to the first half of the second century A.D. It shows four figures standing, (from left to right) the dedicant (head missing), Isis-Demeter, Sarapis and Persephone (?). Cerberus is represented between Isis-Demeter and Sarapis, Harpocrates between Sarapis and Persephone, both approximately half the size of the other figures. Isis is characterized by the ‘Isis knot’, while she holds a torch in her right arm, wears a calathus and perhaps carries (the stone is broken) ears of corn in her left hand. The two former elements, at least, are clear requisites of Demeter. If the figure on the right is indeed to be identified with Persephone, she again has adopted foreign iconographic foci, namely the sceptre and the sistrum in her lowered left hand. It has been suggested that, despite the location of

429 Tran Tam Tinh, in: *LIMC* V.1 (1990), 784–786, 794f.
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431 Vittozzi 1993, 224 with 238f. n. 11.
433 Tran Tam Tinh, in: *LIMC* V.1 (1990), 781, 793f.
434 Malaise 1972, 229f.; Tran Tam Tinh, in: *LIMC* V.1 (1990), 781 [no. 262].
Fig. 3: Isis-Fortuna from Herculaneum
Fig. 4: Isis-Fortuna, marble statue from Rome, Vatican Museums
the find, the piece was manufactured in Alexandria. Another representation of Isis–Demeter is found in a wall-painting discovered in a house under the Baths of Caracalla in 1867 (now in the Antiquarium of the Palatine). Unfortunately, the painting is in a poor condition. It appears that Isis is depicted wearing the basileion and holding a torch in her right hand, and perhaps ears of corn in her left. The painting may be dated approximately to the second half of the second century A.D. (fig. 6).

There is no need to further elaborate on iconographic foci of various forms of Isis. It is clear that even if no pieces of art had been lost over the centuries, completeness in conceptual terms would be beyond reach. For a conceptual catalogue of such pieces, in marked contrast to a historical positivistic catalogue, would also have to include those works that could have been manufactured, but never were. For a conceptual approach, then, the historical boundaries of execution and preservation are much more artificial.

435 E. Simon, in: Helbig II, 34 [no. 1185].
Although Christian art is in evidence in Rome from the second century A.D., the Christian god had no iconographic foci in the capital until the age of Constantine. In a magisterial study, the Christians’ rejection of idolatry throughout the Mediterranean was thrown into relief by N. H. Baynes more than fifty years ago. Numerous passages from Justin, Origen, Eusebius and other early Christian authors demonstrate beyond doubt that the early Christians steadfastly abided by the third commandment with uncompromising austerity: “You shall not make for yourself a graven image…” Despite the occasional scorn poured
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437 Elsner 2003, 73f.
438 Baynes 1955, especially 116–125.
439 Exodus 20.4.
by educated pagans on the adherence to idolatry, it was, in fact, their great opponent, i.e. the early Christians (following the Jewish precedent), who enforced, with a rare perfection, a complete ban on idolatry.

For our task, it is important to note that the absence of idolatry (and hence of iconography and iconographical focalization) was intrinsically connected to a lack of spatial focalization of the early cult of the Christian god. For spatial and iconographic focalization went hand in hand: an iconographic focus implied a spatial focus, i.e. the place where the icon was erected. It is hardly a coincidence that it was only with the emergence of the first spatial foci of the Christian cult that the veneration of images can also be traced among the Christians. The watershed was the era of Constantine. Our first reliable witness, Eusebius, mentions for instance icons of Peter, Paul, and Jesus.

Of course, the lack of iconographic foci in the early Christian and Jewish traditions was not only the result of blind and unselfish obedience to the third commandment. Any iconographic focalization would have implied an exclusion of other iconographic concepts. However, such an exclusion could scarcely be reconciled with the postulated omnipotence and omnipresence of the Jewish and Christian concepts of the divine. If god had a shape, this shape had to be located somewhere. In other words, the presence of god, and as a result his powers, would have been limited. Besides, the avoidance of iconographic focalization made a reinterpretation and adaptation of the Jewish and Christian gods into an existing iconographic environment an easy task. For instance, in its iconographic indistinctiveness the Christian god could be easily interpreted as Iuppiter, Mars, Isis or other gods. This avoidance of focalization was one reason for the conviction, harbored by many pagan proselytes, that the Christian god was not just an addition to the existing pagan pantheon, but its abstract synthesis. Furthermore, in promotional terms, in their lack of iconographic fixation the Jewish and Christian gods were much more versatile and marketable than their divine competitors. In fact, in terms of iconography (as in other respects) these two forms constituted the only truly international divine concepts in the ancient world.

441 See chapter I.1.
442 Eus. hist. ecl. 7.18 al., with Baynes 1955, 125–143.
6. Ritual

Human actions may be divided into those that follow a specific pattern and those that do not. Actional patterns, in turn, can be analyzed in various ways. In our context, we are interested in those actional patterns that are directed towards, i.e. presuppose the direct and unmediated participation by, divine concepts. We shall call these cult actions.

Cult actions can be spontaneous, improvised and therefore unsystematic, or conversely, they can follow a pattern of periodical repetition, sanctioned by tradition. Henceforth, I refer to cult actions that are conducted according to such a pattern as ‘ritual’. I refer to the act of selecting certain rituals and relating them to a specific deity as ritual focalization. Virtually any human action can become a cultic action, and any cultic action in turn can be submitted to a specific repetitive pattern and therefore be ritualized.

It must be noted that some of the most important Roman rituals such as the sacrifice, considered on their own, were rather unspecific. They mark the difference between the divine and the human, but not the specific, individual nature of the divine concept thus conceptualized. It was most notably the spatial and temporal focus within which the ritual focus was contextualized that made the latter a constituent of a specific god. Vice versa, a ritual focus reinforced significantly and partly determined the spatial and temporal focus in which it operated. For instance, the focal character of a temple was to a large extent determined by the rituals, especially sacrifices, performed in it. On the other hand, a sacrifice of a ram in, or at, the temple of Juppiter, was by implication a Jovian ritual (here: ovis Idulis). The same interaction can also be observed between rituals and temporal foci. For instance, various unspecific rituals such as the offering of wine, incense, and sacred meals, were performed repeatedly by the arvals during the celebrations of Dea Dia for three days in May (temporal focus). However, it was only on the second day that these were actually performed in, or at, the sanctuary of the goddess. Consequently, the various rituals performed outside the sanctuary reinforced not the spatial, but the temporal focus of the cult of Dea Dia. The fact that the rituals were performed during the period in question and by specific personnel (the
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arvales) made them ritual foci of the cult of Dea Dia. A prime example of a spatial and temporal focus together, interacting with various, essentially independent ritual foci, were the Capitoline temple and the Ides of September (September 13). The anniversary of the temple fell on that day. The above-mentioned ram (ovis Idulis) was sacrificed on the Capitol on this day, as was normal on the Ides. A meal was offered to honor Iuppiter on the Capitol (epulum Iovis). A nail was driven into a wall of the Capitoline temple in a ceremonial context obscure to us. Not only spatial and temporal, but also personnel foci of a cult were related to its rituals. Thus the flamines defined, and were defined predominantly by, the performance of rituals to their specific gods. For instance, it was the flamen Dialis who offered the ovis Idulis and a lamb (?) to Iuppiter at the beginning of the vintage season, while his wife, the flaminica, sacrificed a ram to Iuppiter in the Regia each month on the Nonae.

Furthermore, functional foci were related to rituals. It suffices here to recall Iuppiter’s competence as a wine god, as supported by the ritual foci of the god’s cult during the two wine festivals (Vinalia, April 23 and August 19) or by the sacrifice conducted by the flamen Dialis at the beginning of the vintage season, referred to above. Similarly, one may point to rituals targeting Apollo during his Games (ludi Apollinares, July 6–13). These were characterized by theatrical performances, to such an extent that later associations of actors dubbed themselves parasiti Apollinis. The Games, therefore, clearly highlighted the functional focus of the god of letters and culture, not the unpopular healing god. In the same vein, sacrificial animals were on occasion chosen for the functional foci of the gods in question. For instance, gods of the underworld received dark-colored victims, and Mars, as the god of war, received the sacrificial horse. Finally, rituals interacted with iconographic foci. For it was not any representation of the god, but the specific cult image that was targeted by the ritual. One could add further evidence, but it is already clear that ritual foci blended in with all the other constituent concepts of the divine.

The rituals employed to venerate traditional Roman gods were relatively few in number and kind. They included sacrifices, meals,
Games, processions, theatrical or musical performances and quite often a combination of these. Foreign ritual foci were admissible, an example being those of Isis: apart from the daily observances, which were no doubt idiosyncratic to Roman taste, two annual festivals are prominent. The first was concerned with the recovery and revival of the dismembered Osiris-Sarapis (Heuresis). Details of the ritual are given by later sources, mainly Minucius Felix (ca. 200 A.D.) and Firmicus Maternus (fourth century). What becomes clear is the fact that the entire ritual resembled a theatrical performance, staging Isis, the jackal-headed Anubis, Isis’ sister Nephtys (cult statues? actors?) and the shaved (i.e. male) priests searching for the remains of the dismembered Osiris-Sarapis, while the Isiac worshippers retired into mourning. After the resurrection of the god, a day of rejoicing followed (Hilaria). Both the date and the details of the festivals changed between the Menologia Rustica of the first century A.D., which mention only the Heuresis in mid-November and the Calendar of Philocalus, belonging to the mid-fourth century A.D., which mentions the Isia (apparently the same as the festival of Heuresis) from October 28 onwards. Later at least, the festival may have included a chorus of 27 participants on November 2, and a day of rejoicing, the Hilaria, on November 3. The rituals were most likely connected with the sacrifice of goose livers, already attested for the cult of Isis by Ovid and attributable to the month of November, thanks to the depiction of a goose in conjunction with Isis on the Calendar of Philocalus under this month.

The second festival, the Isidis navigium on March 5, inaugurated the new navigation season. This festival too is attested from the first century A.D. We do not have information about its nature in Rome. However, Apuleius provides a long description of the celebrations in Cenchreae. In the presence of the cult statues (Isis, Osiris), the high priest purified a ship which had been decorated with Egyptian scenes, using a burning torch, an egg and sulphur. The ship was then named and dedicated to the goddess. On its sail a prayer was inscribed, asking for safe navigation during the new season. Various offerings were loaded
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on to the ship and others poured into the sea, before the vessel was despatched. A fresco from an Iseum, presumably dating to the second (first?) century A.D. and found under the church of S. Sabina on the Aventine, may depict the ritual.\textsuperscript{454} An ex-voto marble ship, which lends its name to the church of S. Maria in Navicella has likewise been connected to the ritual.\textsuperscript{455}

Other Isiac rituals in Rome are less known. At the end of the second century A.D., we hear of \textit{pausae} in Rome performed by \textit{pausarii}. These were apparently some kind of Isiac processions with regular ‘stops’ on the way.\textsuperscript{456} Besides, the \textit{lychnapsia} (if these belonged to Isis) on August 12 denoted (as can be gauged from the meaning of the word) the lighting of lamps, and followed an age-old Egyptian tradition.\textsuperscript{457} Finally, a \textit{sacrum Phariae} is attested in the first century A.D. (\textit{Pharia} is a frequent epithet of Isis by Roman writers from the Augustan period onwards).\textsuperscript{458} However, no details are known. It should also be noted that there seems to be no evidence for ritual meals for any Egyptian god in Italy.\textsuperscript{459} In short, then, fundamentally different ritual foci could and did co-exist in Rome. A new cult could, by and large, maintain its ritual identity and still be considered Roman, as was the case with the cult of Isis at least from the first century A.D. onwards.

\* \* \*

From information offered by the acts of the arvals we can glean the most important ritual foci of the imperial cult, namely the sacrifice. It appears that they were composite forms, whose components (but not the whole architecture) were mostly drawn from the cult of the Republican gods.\textsuperscript{460} An example is the offering of incense and wine (\textit{ture et vino}), made before a sacrifice for the well-being of the emperor. This act was modelled on the ritual offering of the same substances in the Republican \textit{supplicationes}.\textsuperscript{461} In the same vein, the conventional sacrifice
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of a steer (bos mas) to the divi can, in fact, be interpreted as modelled on the standard sacrifice of the same animal to Iuppiter. Furthermore, it is noteworthy that the genius of the emperor received the sacrifice of a bull, taurus, which elsewhere is especially connected with Mars.462

But sacrifice was only one mode of cultic action. There is evidence that a special dinner (epulum) was set up in honour of Augustus on his birthday.463 Circus Games are attested both on his birthday and on the Augustalia (October 12). Furthermore, Livia, his spouse, established annual Games on the Palatine to honour her deified husband (January 17–22).464 An image of the deified princeps was carried among the gods in the pompa circensis, i.e. the procession held on the occasion of major Games leading from the Capitol to the Circus Maximus.465 We know of annual supplications held on Sept. 3, to commemorate the victory of Octavius/Augustus over Sextus Pompeius in 36 B.C.466 In brief, the ritual foci of the cult of the emperor were generally modelled on the ritual foci of the cults of the traditional gods.

Ritual foci of official cults of various deities could interact at all times. A prime example during the Republican period involves some of the oldest Roman rituals on record: the congealed blood of the October Horse (sacrificed to Mars on October 15) was mixed by the vestals with the ashes of unborn calves, sacrificed and burnt in the process of the Fordicidia (sacred to Tellus, April 15), to be distributed to the people from the sanctuary of Vesta during the Parilia (presumably sacred to Pales, April 21).467 To cite a later example, the taurobolium, the notorious splashing of the neophyte with the blood of a bull, as attested for the cult of Mithras, became an integral part of the cult of Magna Mater from the middle of the second century A.D.468 Later, it was also connected with the imperial cult.469 These cases serve to illustrate the unique susceptibility of ritual foci to reinterpretation and reinstrumentalization.
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Most ritual foci of official cults were related to corresponding spatial foci of the same cults. To put it simply, a ritual connected with the cult of Iuppiter was normally performed in a sanctuary of Iuppiter. But exceptions occur. For instance, the arvals conducted sacrifices for the well-being of the emperor on the Capitoline hill, although gods other than the Capitoline triad (with an individual temple elsewhere in the city) were also revered on that occasion. Furthermore, the three-day sacrificial ceremony to Dea Dia started and ended in the house of the magister of the college. Only on the second day, when the blood sacrifice to Dea Dia was performed, do we find the arvals actually in or in front of the grove of the goddess. However, the rituals of the first day ‘anticipate’ the ritual sequence of the second in exactly the same order, as highlighted by Scheid following a suggestion by Oldenberg. It is, at least, a plausible guess that historically speaking, the former were modelled on the latter (the primary ritual focus of the cult of Dea Dia). The ceremony was performed on the first day independently of the spatial focus, i.e. the temple, of the goddess. Nevertheless, a cult statue of her was present in the house of the magister, where it was dressed, anointed and set up as a participant in the ritual meals. As regards rituals performed outside the habitual spatial setting of a cult, we may also compare the nocturnal rites of Bona Dea. This was a public ceremony celebrated annually by the noble married women in the private residence of the acting consul under the guidance of the vestals. During the ceremony an image of the goddess, perhaps borrowed from the temple of the goddess, was set up.

The acceptance of the supreme pontificate in 12 B.C. empowered Augustus to formally intervene in ritual matters. He used his new authority to ‘redirect’ a number of ritual foci of the cult of Capitoline Iuppiter to Mars Ultor, when the temple of the latter was eventually completed in 2 B.C. For example, during the Republic we find the dictator clavi fugendi causa driving a nail into the wall of the Capitoline temple. Under Augustus, this ceremony was transferred to the new temple of Mars, and was to be performed by the censor. Furthermore, in the
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Republic consuls and praetors who started on a campaign pronounced vows at the Capitoline temple and, on their return, dedicated the spoils of war there. By contrast, after 2 B.C. magistrates who campaigned abroad took official leave from the temple of Mars Ultor, and, on their return, dedicated the standards of defeated enemies, along with the triumphal insignia (sceptre and wreath) there. Indeed, Servius, possibly referring to a Republican custom, notes that after the assumption of the toga virilis, young men also used to “go to the Capitoline (scil. in order to sacrifice)”. The same is said of the temple of Mars. In the old days, the triumph was granted to the successful general by a senatorial assembly, perhaps convened in the Capitoline temple on that occasion. At any rate, from 2 B.C. the location of the senatorial meeting for that purpose was the temple of Mars. Other rituals performed there (but not demonstrably derived from the Jovian cult) marked out Mars Ultor as of outstanding importance for Augustan propaganda. This may have included the relocation of such age-old rituals as the procession of the Salii Palatini and perhaps rituals connected with Vesta. Furthermore, two other deities intimately connected with Augustus appear to have been worshipped in Mars’ temple, viz. Venus Genetrix and Divus Iulius. It is interesting to note that the temple had been founded as a private foundation of Augustus and remained a “private stage of the domus Augusta” (for instance in terms of the statuary programme) despite the manifold ritual foci of the public cult of Mars mentioned above.

The transference of ritual foci of a cult devoted to a specific deity to that of spatial foci of the cult of another god is not only in evidence in the case of the Capitoline temple and the sanctuary of Mars. The
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transfer by Augustus of the Sibylline books, which were moved from the Capitol to the Palatine temple of Apollo, was very similar.487 Some two hundred years later, Elagabal is said to have transferred, from their ancestral sanctuaries, major symbols of traditional Roman polytheism such as the stone of Magna Mater, the fire of Vesta, the Palladium of Minerva, the ancilia of Mars and other objects, and to have placed them in the temple of his new Syrian god.488 The transfer of such religious artefacts naturally implied a transfer of the relevant rituals to the cult of the recipient god.

An official ritual order was established at a relatively early stage in the Republic, presumably on the authority of the indigitamenta. Details of this order are vague, but it is clear that Ianus and Iuppiter stood at the top and Vesta at the end of the list.489 It is impossible to estimate how binding this order actually was. Inconsistencies emerge when we compare this order with the hierarchy of Roman priests, starting with the rex sacrorum and/or the flamen of Iuppiter (incidentally, Ianus had no priest) and ending with the flamen Pomonalis (and not, say, the vestals).490 However, there is no need to harmonize both hierarchies. They may belong to different periods, different occasions, and possibly even different places.

Whatever the case with early Rome, in the historical period, and most conspicuously under the Empire, the spatial setting of religious rites had an impact on ritual sequence. Scheid has recently offered a fine analysis of the expiatory sacrifices performed by the arvalists at the sanctuary of Dea Dia, based on information of the acts for the period from 183–240 A.D. After the offering of the suovetaurilia to Mars in front of the grove of Dea Dia (to define the space to which the actual expiatory ritual applied), sacrifices to more than a dozen gods are mentioned. They begin with a major sacrifice (a cow for each expiation) to Dea Dia, and minor sacrifices (a sheep) to Ianus, Iuppiter, Mars and the remaining gods. The list ends with Vesta, followed by a group of ‘functional gods’.491 Broadly speaking, the fixed ritual hierarchy of traditional gods (Ianus—Vesta) was retained, but
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with important adjustments due to the specific spatial setting. The most important modification was that Dea Dia was first in line, for it was at her temple that the sacrifice was performed. It was she alone who, among the traditional gods, received a major victim slaughtered on the permanent altar (ara), while the other gods received minor victims offered on temporary altars of turf or other perishable materials (arae temporales).\textsuperscript{492} We can run a cross-check: during the sacrifices offered by the arvals at the beginning of each year, the acts mention the invocation of Dea Dia after the Capitoline triad, for this ritual was traditionally performed in, or at, the Capitoline temple.\textsuperscript{493}

During the expiation of the grove of Dea Dia, expiatory rituals were performed, not only to traditional gods in front of the temple, but also to the emperor and his predecessors at the nearby Caesareum, beginning with a major sacrifice (a bull) to the genius of the emperor and followed by minor sacrifices (sheep) to the Divi. Scheid has convincingly explained the ritual significance of the imperial genius here by referring to the specific location, which was essentially a sanctuary of the domus Augusta, whose representative was (apparently) the living ruler. By contrast, when the imperial cult was performed in the temple of the divine Augustus, priority was given to the Divi and, first of all, of course, to Divus Augustus. If Scheid’s reconstructions are correct, in 66 A.D. the Arvals offered sacrifices in the following order: to Divus Augustus, Diva Augusta, Divus Claudius, Diva Claudia, Diva Poppaea Augusta, the genius of the emperor and the iuno of his wife, Messalina. The place where the sacrifice was performed is explicitly said to have been the new temple of Augustus.\textsuperscript{494} A further note of importance is that on the Augustalia (October 12) a number of Divi and divinized members of the imperial family received sacrifices from the arvals (and presumably also other priesthoods) in the temple of Augustus. It comes as no surprise that on this occasion all rituals (i.e. primarily sacrifices) started with Augustus (followed by Diva Augusta, Divus Claudius etc.).\textsuperscript{495}

Lastly, on various imperial ‘holidays’ the arvals would offer a sacrifice in the Forum of Augustus, and that meant, apparently, at the temple of Mars Ultor. As a consequence, Mars Ultor was the first to receive
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a sacrifice and was followed by the genius of the emperor, although it was clearly the latter who provided the cause for the occasion.\footnote{Scheid no. 28 a–c, lines 29f. [59–60 A.D.]; no. 40 I 1–7, lines 84–89 and II 1–5, lines 2–5 [69 A.D.]. At Scheid no. 28 a–c 37 [59–60 A.D.], mentioning only a sacrifice to the genius in the Forum Augusti, the sacrifice to Mars has dropped out through inadvertence.}

To summarize, the old ritual order of the Republican gods, whatever its actual applicability, was later significantly modified and accommodated into the ritual environment, especially in relation to new rituals which emerged as a result of the ascent of the imperial cult. An important parameter in this process of accommodation was the spatial setting of the rituals. The performance of a ritual at a spatial focus of a specific deity meant automatically a privileged (normally the first) position of the relevant deity in the ritual sequence.

* * *

Among the various constituent concepts of the divine, it was rituals that led to restrictive measures by public authorities, if these rituals were felt to threaten law and order. For example, the rituals of the cult of Bacchus were responsible for the famous intervention by public authorities in 186 B.C. Although Livy, our material witness, is biased and largely uninformed on points of detail, he offers valuable evidence concerning the religious attitude of an educated representative of the Augustan age towards such ‘exotic’ rituals.

In Livy’s view, one of the most striking features of the cult is its secrecy.\footnote{Cf. e.g. Liv. 39.8.5 occultorum et nocturnorum…sacrorum, 39.10.5 silenda, 39.13.5 occulta initia; Turcan 2003, 13f.} This observation is partly confirmed by the Tiriolo decree, which was issued by the Senate in 186 B.C. to contain the cult. It pronounced a ban on sacrifices performed ‘in occulto’.\footnote{CIL I² 581, line 15; Liv. 39.14.9: ‘in operto’.} Livy did not stop there. He decided to flesh out his informational gaps and thus to draw an exemplary picture of an ‘anti-Roman’ cult. For instance, customary meals set up to honour the gods were turned by him into exuberant banquets of the Bacchants; furthermore, in his account, mixed religious gatherings of pietists became sexual orgies; conventional animal sacrifices were transformed into murders of the dissenters; the accompanying flutes of official religious ceremonies was replaced by the dazzling noise of tambourines and kettledrums; the age-old processions of maidens were pictured as the frenzy of matron bacchants, descending
to the bank of the Tiber and plunging their blazing torches into the fluvial water. 499 However, it is worth noting that the Augustan writer, as well as the Tiriolo decree, do in fact suggest that some ‘Bacchan’ rituals may be considered necessary (at least by the adherents of the cult of Bacchus) in order to maintain the *pax deorum*. They were therefore permitted by the authorities, if approved by a reasonably large number of senators. 500

Not only Bacchus, but every deity could be conceptualized by means of unofficial and dangerous ritual foci. For instance, Dis pater, who was officially brought to Rome in the middle of the third century B.C., appears in Roman magic too. 501 Literary evidence confirms that Diana could be invoked in connection with unofficial and illicit religious practices in Rome. 502 Furthermore, the official character of the god of crop rust (Robigus) is warranted by the fact that his festival on 25 April belonged to the oldest calendar 503 and that the accompanying sacrifice to the god consisting of a dog and a sheep was performed by an official priest, the *flamen Quirinalis*. 504 On the other hand, the very act of protecting the crops by offering a sacrifice is reminiscent of the prohibition of the Twelve Tables against charming another’s crops into one’s own possessions. 505 One could add more evidence, but it suffices to state that beyond reasonable doubt virtually any god, even the Capitoline Jupiter, could be worshipped by way of illicit rituals. 506

The basic parameter for the decision whether a ritual focus was “right” (i.e. “rightfully referred to”: *fās*) or wrong (*nefās*) was ‘Roman custom’ (*mos Romanus*). This is spelled out by Livy on the occasion of the *Bacchanalia*: he predicts that neglect of Roman custom (*more Romano*)
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and adoption of foreign rites (\textit{externo ritu}) would plunge society into chaos.\textsuperscript{507} It was ‘Romanity’ that counted, not the actual nature of the ritual focus in question. This attitude can be supported by further evidence. For instance, the inspection of entrails (performed by \textit{haruspices}) and the observation of birds, lightning, and similar ominous events (performed by \textit{auspices, augures}) constituted an integral part of official Roman religion. However, there would be essentially no difference in divining the future from, say, the constellation of stars (as done by the Chaldaeans) or from flashes of lightning (as done by the augurs), were it not for ‘Roman custom’, which incidentally sanctioned only the latter (despite its well-known foreign [Etruscan] origin).\textsuperscript{508} One may also point to the \textit{prayers (preces)} of the vestals which, in Pliny’s day, were thought to possess the power to bind to the spot runaway slaves, while the same words would have been labeled—and officially banned as—\textit{spells (incitamenta)}, if spoken in private.\textsuperscript{509}

The considerable amount of uncertainty about right and wrong in religious terms manifests itself also in the assertion—frequently attested—that a speaker would do or say something only if it was right in religious terms (\textit{fas}): accordingly, gods were invoked under different names provided that these were “right”\textsuperscript{510}; they were approached for a favour only as long as the latter was \textit{fas}.\textsuperscript{511} These precautions show how arbitrarily \textit{fas} was felt to cut across very similar grounds. They also demonstrate how important it was to act within its limits. Ultimately, the yardstick by which \textit{fas} and \textit{nefas} were measured was, once again, ‘Roman custom’.

* * *

The ritual foci of Christianity were deliberately distinct and plain. Ritual distinctiveness can be seen first of all in its rejection or transformation of common pagan rituals. For instance, Christianity replaced sacrifices, processions, Games and other, often sumptuous cult practices with something as simple and affordable as private prayer, bread and wine. This is well illustrated by Pliny’s description of the Bithynian Christians at the beginning of the second century A.D. These Christians confessed
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that “the sum total of their guilt or error amounted to no more than this: they had met regularly before dawn on a fixed day to chant verses alternately among themselves in honor of Christ as if to a god…”.\textsuperscript{512} The Christian doctrine transformed the public sacrificial feast of the city into the sublime and private eucharist.

Another fundamental difference is historical referentiality of the Christian eucharist. It referred to Jesus’ last supper and thus celebrated an event conceived of as historical by the Christians. This historical anchoring of ritual foci is alien to the corresponding pagan ritual foci. As Scheid has pointed out, a pagan sacrifice was in fact conceptualized as a banquet of members of Roman society (whether mortals or gods) without any historical reference.\textsuperscript{513}

A similar historical referentiality is found in other sets of ritual foci introduced by Christianity, such as baptism and the Easter liturgy. The whole process of the establishment of these distinct ritual foci is largely shrouded in darkness, due to the exclusively private setting in which they developed.\textsuperscript{514} But we have a longer passage in the first Apology of Justin which gives a rather detailed account of the ceremony of baptism and the Sunday liturgy, dating to the mid-second century. Whether or not the pieces of information offered are Rome-specific, it is clear from Justin that ritual foci were well established in the Christian world by then, and that must have included Rome.\textsuperscript{515}

Besides this, there may have been certain rituals connected with the worship of martyrs, at least from the third century on. These included commemoration of the dead, a religious (often sumptuous) meal and other ceremonies (refrigerium).\textsuperscript{516} It should be also noted that ritual simplicity was a major difference between Christianity and Judaism. While the gods of both cults were conceptualized in essentially very similar ways (no spatial or iconographic focalization; homogeneity of their functional foci anywhere in the ancient world), they differed markedly in the complexity of their ritual foci. Judaism looked back upon a millennium or more of a chequered history, in the course of which it had developed various ritual foci, for instance (and most notably) circumcision, food laws and various rituals performed on religious holidays.
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such as the Day of Atonement or Succoth. By contrast, Christianity began as a new cult, abandoning almost from the outset Jewish ritual foci (clearly in competition and self-demarcation from the latter) and replacing them, mostly with simple prayer, baptism and the common meal.  

Its ritual simplicity made Christianity more marketable than its Jewish ‘competitor’ (and other divine concepts for that matter). It was easily learnable, and its knowledge could be spread from place to place by the most uneducated and least well-off. Besides, early Christian rituals were not the domain of a specific priestly group, but were based on the consensus of its lay performers.

But there was another, negative side, that Christianity was destined to witness due to its peculiar notion of rituals. Pagan polytheism could easily accommodate ritual differences as long as the latter moved inside the loosely defined borders of *fas*. In stark contrast to this pluralistic approach, Christian monotheism, calling upon one god and one truth, could not permit freedom of action, much less of ritual. The fierce controversies fought over issues such as the ritual importance of baptism, Easter and the veneration of icons bear witness to its intrinsic inability to compromise. The rigid ritual dogmatism of Christian monotheism soon led to scores of ‘heresies’, which took ritual foci of Christian ‘orthodoxy’ and developed these in ‘illicit’ directions, for the wheel of new conceptualizations was not brought to a standstill by the mere fact that the suspicious theologians had agreed upon an armistice—all such armistices were temporary. These ‘heresies’ could not be ousted by theological argument, but only by the sword of the worldly élite. In the end, Christianity turned out to be uniquely incapable of accommodating ritual differences within its own ranks, its inability led to a fragmentation of the Christian world unthinkable in the age of heathendom.
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