

THE SIBYLLINE BOOKS

by

LANCE WALLACE CAMP

B.A., University of Calgary, 1966

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF  
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF  
MASTER OF ARTS

in the Department  
of  
Classics

We accept this thesis as conforming to the  
required standard

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

May, 1968.

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfilment of the requirements for an advanced degree at the University of British Columbia, I agree that the Library shall make it freely available for reference and Study. I further agree that permission for extensive copying of this thesis for scholarly purposes may be granted by the Head of my Department or by his representatives. It is understood that copying or publication of this thesis for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Lance W. Camp

Department of Classics

The University of British Columbia  
Vancouver 8, Canada

Date May 28th, 1968

## ABSTRACT

The sibylline books, though dismissed by J. G. Frazer\* as a "convenient farrago of nonsense", were nevertheless one of the most significant influences in the political and religious life of Rome during the Republic. This study has, as its objective, a discussion of the history of these books during the Republic between 753 and 12 B. C. It is based, for the most part, on a discussion of all consultations recorded during this period; emphasis is placed on the reasons for consultation, and, in particular, the nature and influence of the sibylline recommendations. Special importance is attached to consultations whose nature and results reveal the sibylline books as a political instrument manipulated by those who controlled them. In addition, there is discussion of any significant innovations ordered by the books, and special attention is paid to any consultations that appear, from the point of view of their results, extraordinary or unusual. A history of the books during this period also necessitates, to a certain extent, a discussion of the religious college that controlled them. It also requires that a certain amount of attention be paid to religious concerns and innovations associated with the books. However, these topics are important to this study only insofar as they have a direct bearing on the republican history of this religious institution.

After an introductory discussion of the origin and nature of the sibylline books, their development and history is divid-

- - - - -  
\*J. G. Frazer, The New Golden Bough, edited by T. Gaster, (New York, 1961), P. 177.

ed into three periods falling between the years 753--204, 203--83, and 83--12. Each of these periods is discussed from two points of view. Firstly, a normal pattern of sibylline operation is established; secondly, those consultations which do not fit this normal pattern receive more detailed attention. Consultations of a normal nature are grouped, for each period, according to their initiation and result, whereas extraordinary consultations are considered chronologically.

It is shown that the sibylline books were a versatile political instrument throughout this period. There is evidence that their manipulation by political groups reached a notable climax during the second Punic War and remained frequent until the end of the Republic. From the point of view of Roman religion, it is seen that the sibylline books were responsible for many important religious innovations, most of which concerned the importation of non-Italic rites and gods into Roman religion. Finally, it is shown that the sibylline tradition, established during the first three centuries of the Republic, declined gradually and steadily between the end of the second Punic War and the second revision of the books, by Augustus, in 12 B. C. This event in particular marked the end of the sibylline tradition at Rome.



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABBREVIATIONS.....	iv
CHAPTERS	
I. ORIGIN AND NATURE OF THE BOOKS.....	1
II. THE PERIOD 753--204.....	26
III. THE PERIOD 204--83.....	100
IV. THE PERIOD 83--12 B. C.....	124
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	149

## ABBREVIATIONS

A. J. Phil. : American Journal of Philology.

C. I. L. : Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum.

D.-S.

Daremberg-Saglio: C. Daremberg and E. Saglio,

Dictionnaire des Antiquités Grecques  
et Romaines.

Pauly-Wissowa: A. Pauly and G. Wissowa, Realencyclopaedie  
der Classischen Altertumswissenschaft.

R. E. A. : Revue des Études Anciennes.

T. A. P. A. : Transactions of the American Philological  
Association.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I am especially indebted to Professor William Dusing for suggesting the topic of this thesis and acting as my supervisor during its preparation.

## CHAPTER ONE

### ORIGIN AND NATURE OF THE BOOKS

An ancient tradition of early Rome deals with certain prophetic books, libri fatales, which were said to contain the destinies of the Roman people. These books were thought to emanate from a typical prophetic institution, of which there were many throughout the ancient world, as any reader of Herodotus must know. The Delphic sibyl was the best known of those in Greece, though the Roman mind tended to give pride of place to that at Ionian Erythrae. It was from this city that the famed Cumaeen sibyl was said to originate; and this sibyl in turn was thought by many to have brought the sibylline books to Rome, finally induced King Tarquin to buy them, and in this way lent her unique assistance to Roman affairs. This most potent of prophetic traditions was thus, at an early date, put at Rome's disposal, ostensibly to help her in all major struggles and problems. And these books, the sole token of this support, were naturally accorded great honour and the reverent care that befitted them; they were carefully consulted and maintained in accordance with the sibylline tradition, and soon came to constitute what Cicero later considered one of the three most important divisions of Roman religion.<sup>1</sup>

Two myths are relevant in determining the traditional origin of the sibylline books. The first of these, associated with one of the Tarquins, connects the books themselves with the Cumaeen sibyl, while the other indicates a connection between the Cumaeen sibyl and that of Erythrae.<sup>2</sup> Both Ovid and

Servius give versions of the Erythraean myth.<sup>3</sup> These versions are substantially the same, though that of Servius is the more detailed:

Sibyllam Apollo pio amore dilexit et ei obtulit poscendi quod vellet arbitrium. Illa hausit harenam manibus et tam longam vitam poposcit. Cui Apollo respondit id posse fieri, si Erythraeam, in qua habitabat, insulam relinqueret et eam numquam videret. Profecta igitur Cumae tenuit et illic defecta corporis viribus vitam in sola voce retinuit. Quod cum cives eius cognovissent, sive invidia, sive miseratione commoti, ei epistolam miserunt creta antiquo more signatam: qua visa, quia erat de eius insula, in mortem soluta est. Unde nonnulli [Varro dixit] hanc esse dicunt, quae Romana fata conscripsit, quod incenso Apollini templo inde Romam adlati sunt libri, unde haec fuerat.

This account is self-explanatory; we need only note the connection of the Cumaeen sibyl with that of Erythrae, and the fact that the Romans of 83 B. C. maintained a Cumaeen-Erythraean origin for their books. This is implied, as Varro suggests above, by their efforts to restore the sibylline books, after they were destroyed in 83, three men being sent to Erythrae for that purpose.<sup>4</sup>

The Erythraean sibyl, according to Varro, was but one of ten such women.<sup>5</sup> He states that the Erythraean sibyl was held to be more renowned and more noble than the others. Indeed, she was the pre-eminent sibyl of the ancient world. Varro also goes on to describe the Cumaeen sibyl; he declares that her name was Amalthea, and that it was she who brought the nine books to King Tarquin.<sup>6</sup> Names of the Cumaeen sibyl are of little importance; she has many indeed, including Heraphile

and Demophile, and Vergil adds to the list, calling her Deiphobe, the daughter of Glaucus.<sup>7</sup> This list of names can be needlessly confusing, but what should be noted is that the term sibyl was categorical, individual names being unimportant. Varro thus defined the term: "...sibylla autem dicitur omnis puella, cuius pectus numen recipit."<sup>8</sup>

The sibylline type was imitated and localized, not only in Greece, but also in Magna Graecia, where colonizing and trade influences would naturally tend to transplant religious institutions, or rather imitations of them, that had developed in the eastern Greek world.<sup>8A</sup> Whether the Cumaean sibyl was in truth an outgrowth of the Erythraean is not a major question, nor is knowledge of the exact time of arrival of a sibylline influence in southern Italy.<sup>9</sup> It is sufficient to realize that this tradition was strong from an early date, that it undoubtedly came from the east, and that it most certainly played some role, directly or indirectly, in the development of this Roman institution.

The myth describing how the books came to King Tarquin is of some importance in approaching that most difficult and obscure problem, their origin. It remains as difficult of solution to present scholars as it did to Servius, and no satisfactorily argued explanation is yet available. Apart from the body of ancient tradition itself, there is little for us to consider except some understandably broad conjectures

resulting from modern research, none of which is wholly convincing.

More or less complete versions of the myth are given by Servius, Dionysius, Zonaras, Gellius, and Varro (in Lactantius).<sup>10</sup> It is mentioned by Ausonius, Pliny, and Appian.<sup>11</sup> These accounts are notably similar, and the differences are not significant, excepting one which will be discussed presently.<sup>12</sup> According to the myth, an old woman from outside the land, a peregrina, came to visit King Tarquin with the intention of selling nine books of oracles. Since she demanded a high price, Tarquin refused; whereupon she burnt three of them, and asked the same price for the remaining six. He again refused, and another three were burnt. Tarquin was finally induced by his augurs, who saw great misfortune in the fact that he had not bought all nine of them, to buy the last three. The woman then advised him to take great care of the books, and disappeared.

This aetiological myth allows of at least two interpretations. It might represent the lack of confidence and trust early Rome had in adopting alien religious customs<sup>13</sup>, or it might be an attempt to explain the scarcity of genuine sibylline oracles during the early republic, thus indicating why they were so zealously guarded and treasured.

Ancient sources dealing with the origin of the books are in agreement except on one point, the identity of the woman whose writings were brought to Rome. Owing to this difference,

these sources may be divided into two groups. The first group comprises those writers who indicate, directly or indirectly, that this woman was a sibyl; they are Vergil, Servius, Lucan, Varro, Lactantius, Zonaras, and Tzetzes. The accounts of these writers may likewise be divided into two sub-categories, those indicating that this sibyl was the sibyl of Cumae, and those maintaining that she was the Erythraean sibyl. Vergil, Lucan, Lactantius, Zonaras, Tzetzes and Servius (in his quotation of the myth) all indicate the Cumaean sibyl. The sixth book of Vergil's Aeneid contains a clear reflection of this tradition; the most relevant statement is Aeneas' promise to the Cumaean sibyl that he will store her prophetic secrets in Rome. This tradition is also preserved in Vergil's Fourth Eclogue, in the Servian quotation of the Tarquin myth, and in a somewhat silly sentence of Lucan.<sup>14</sup> In addition, the later writers Lactantius and Tzetzes indicate clearly that she was the Cumaean sibyl; Zonaras tells us only that the woman was a "sibyl", but Tzetzes affirms that this statement referred to the Cumaean sibyl.<sup>15</sup> Varro and Servius constitute the second sub-category. They are both of the opinion that the oracles were originally written by the Erythraean sibyl. However, neither of them was entirely certain, and their choice of the Erythraean sibyl was in the nature of a suggestion.<sup>16</sup> In connection with their uncertainty, we should also mention the doubt which must have existed in the minds of the Romans in 83 B. C., when they sought to restore



the books after their destruction by sending to all known sibyls in the ancient world. These included not only the Cumaean and Erythraean sibyls, but the others listed by Varro in Lactantius.<sup>17</sup>

The second major group of ancient sources comprises the similar accounts of Gellius and Dionysius. Both writers provide versions of the Tarquin myth which pose a problem, one that does not admit of a satisfactory solution. This problem arises from their failure to identify the woman who came to Tarquin. Gellius refers to her as anus hospita et incognita<sup>18</sup>; Dionysius calls her ὡν Ἑλληνιστῶν.<sup>19</sup> If this woman were known to Dionysius and Gellius as a sibyl, it is logical to assume that they would have mentioned such an important fact in their accounts. The fact that they do not mention this poses a notable problem, since it cannot be said that their versions of the origin of the books agree with the tradition found in Vergil, Servius, Varro, Lucan, and the others mentioned above.<sup>20</sup>

Modern scholars favor two explanations, either an Etruscan origin of the books,<sup>21</sup> or, in accordance with the Erythraean-Cumaean tradition, one that was ultimately Greek.<sup>22</sup> Before we proceed to those whose views coincide with this tradition, and whose views the present writer endorses, it would be best to consider first some of the arguments put forth in favor of an Etruscan origin. These arguments, none of which is

entirely satisfactory, are put forth by scholars who make no convincing attempt to explain the sibylline tradition found in Vergil, Servius, Varro, and the others. It would seem that their insistence on an exclusively Etruscan origin is the chief weakness of their work. Had they made allowance for a blending of Greek and Etruscan influences, their efforts might appear more convincing.<sup>23</sup> On the other hand, while we prefer to accept an origin that was ultimately Greek, there is little to be gained in trying to deny that the Etruscans could have exerted some influence on the early Greek sibylline tradition. It is possible, for example, that the Etruscans of Campania were intermediaries in bringing this tradition to Rome; in addition, the Tarquin myth implies that the first care of the books in Rome was entrusted to a state governed by Etruscan influences.<sup>24</sup> But these factors do not deny the probability that the sibylline tradition was ultimately Greek in origin.

Turning to the arguments put forth in favor of an Etruscan origin, we should consider first the evidence for what J. Hild calls the "vraiesemblance historique", gathered mainly from Diels' little book.<sup>25</sup> It is argued that Greek centres such as Cumae would have strongly protected their oracles, and would never have divulged them to outsiders: "Es erscheint mir daher ganz unglaublich, dass die Cumaner damals irgendwie sich ihrer Orakel entäusserthaben sollen".<sup>26</sup> This argument is untenable, for if true, how would one explain the spreading of sibylline influence to Italy from other Greek cities in the east? If these Greek institutions, for example Erythrae and Delphi,

had guarded their oracles and trade secrets as Diels suggests Cumae did, it is difficult to imagine how such a centre as Cumae could have come into existence in the first place. Obviously influence from Greece itself led to the development of the sibyl of Cumae; and there is little reason why Cumae in turn should not have influenced Rome. The prophetic shrine at Delphi was available to non-Greeks as well as Greeks. This was also true of Cumae, as the myth of Aeneas coming to her sibyl would indicate.

Pausanias tells us that the Cumaean oracle did not have a collection of written oracles.<sup>27</sup> If this were also true of the shrine in the days of King Tarquin, the fact that the oracle operated on a day-to-day basis is not, in itself, sufficient proof that the sibylline influence could not have come thence to Rome. W. Fowler has suggested that the sibylline books did not take the written form known to later Romans until sometime after their arrival in Rome.<sup>28</sup> Nevertheless, it was hardly necessary for Cumae to have a collection of written oracles in order to influence Rome. The early Romans, if by chance they sought an oracle at Cumae, might have carried it back with them in writing, even though the Cumaean sibyl had no written oracles. This possibility in itself could explain, or rather provide a basis for, the Tarquin myth. It is also possible that the oracles were transmitted orally to Rome, afterwards committed to writing, and thus became involved with the myth.

Raymond Bloch has also advanced many arguments in favor of an exclusively Etruscan origin of the books. However, it cannot be said that they constitute satisfactory documentation for an origin that was entirely free of Greek influence. For example, Bloch contends that the three gods honoured with a temple in 496 were Etruscan.<sup>29</sup> Ceres, Liber, and Libera, honoured in this way because of a sibylline recommendation, were obviously Roman equivalents of the Dionysus-Demeter-Kore triad of Greek gods. This cult came from Cumae, the source of Rome's early grain supply, and several scholars have shown how these Greek gods superimposed themselves on older existing Italic deities in 496.<sup>30</sup> It appears that the Roman cult of this Greek triad dates from this time, and that the gods worshipped in 496 were the Greek prototypes, in spite of the Latin names used.<sup>31</sup> Mr. Bloch also argues that the sibylline response in 461 was not Greek, but in the nature of a responsum of the Etruscan haruspices.<sup>32</sup> However, he has failed to realize that Livy's source for this passage, Valerius Antias, was suspect; the sibylline response quoted in Livy is thus, either in part or in whole, a reflection of Sullan attitudes towards the sibylline books, and cannot be considered to have been the actual sibylline recommendation in 461.<sup>33</sup>

In contrast to these arguments, there are many factors and considerations indicating that the sibylline books were Greek in origin. The tradition discussed above, involving the Erythraean and Tarquin myths, has not yet been disproved; it is

thought by the present writer to be a positive indication of Greek origin. This tradition is strong enough, in spite of the uncertainty expressed in the accounts of Gellius and Dionysius, to indicate that it contains at least the essence of the truth.

Greek cities had collections of prophecies; Herodotus tells us that a collection of oracles was kept on the acropolis in Athens.<sup>34</sup> Thus it cannot be claimed that a collection of religious books was an exclusively Etruscan custom.<sup>35</sup> This tradition also developed in the Greek world; it may well have spread to Cumae and thence to Rome.

Of the sibylline oracles that have come down to us, one of the more interesting features is the command: "*Ἀχαιοὶ τῶν ἑρπετῶν*".<sup>36</sup> This expression requires that sacrifices ordered by the sibylline books be made Achivo ritu, in the Greek manner.<sup>37</sup> However, the earliest oracles containing this expression date from the period c. 125 B. C.; it is not certain, therefore, that this expression was a feature of the earliest sibylline oracles in Rome. But if we make that assumption, this command may be considered a further indication that the original sibylline tradition was Greek.<sup>38</sup> It would have represented an effort to assure that the Greek nature of the prescribed sacrifices be respected. And because it would have derived from the Greek tradition reflected in the first oracles, it is a strong indication that these first oracles were Greek.

The oracles were undoubtedly written in Greek. This is indicated by two considerations. Firstly, the oracles discussed by Diels, apparently genuine, are in Greek. Secondly, two Greek assistants were appointed to help the early duumviri with the Greek language and Greek rituals that were unfamiliar to them.<sup>39</sup> This indicates that even the earliest oracles were written in Greek, and that the sibylline tradition itself was Greek.

More factors indicate a Greek origin. Most importantly, one should keep in mind the recommendations of the sibylline books throughout their history. Any new rituals or gods to be brought to Rome, excepting the Phrygian Cybele, were Greek in nature and origin. And when restoration of the books was undertaken, after the fire of 83, duplicate oracles were sought from Greek towns in Italy such as Cumae, and from Greek or Ionian-Greek places in the east, such as Erythrae, Delphi, and Samos. Evidently, Romans who knew the original set of books were convinced of their Greek origin.

Rome had early connections with Cumae.<sup>40</sup> That city was not only the source of her grain supply, but also the centre from which Rome's cult of Apollo had sprung. It was thus possible that Rome, because of one trouble or another during the archaic period, should have sent for, or admitted, an oracle from Cumae. In such a small way, perhaps, the first

sibylline influence could have come to Rome. Conservative Roman religious practices would only resort to such outside help as a last resort; but if it proved efficacious on one occasion, there was no reason why it could not be sought again--no reason, in fact, why a sibylline tradition could not be transplanted from the south and nurtured for local use.

Exactly when this happened is a matter of great doubt. However, it would seem that the books, or at least the influence that produced them, arrived during or before the sixth century. The earliest recorded consultation, mentioned above, was in 496. In view of this date one may logically assume that arrival was sometime before the beginning of the fifth century. The Tarquin myth implies, of course, that this tradition arrived during the period of the kings; there is no negative evidence to contradict this implication.

It is also difficult to determine the early form of the books. We do not know, for example, whether they became a body of formally written documents soon after their introduction, or whether they were loosely maintained on a day-to-day basis. Later, to be sure, they became a well organized and strictly maintained set of documents. There is no proof for the contention of W. Fowler that the books were maintained on a careless temporary basis until 367, when they were suddenly organized into a permanent collection.<sup>40A</sup>

The original sibylline books were placed, according to Dionysius, in a stone chest and kept underground in the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus.<sup>40B</sup> It is important to realize that the

books were only a part, admittedly the most important part, of the sacred material stored here. Servius points out that the sibyl's books were kept along with sacred books of the Roman seer Marcius, the Etruscan nymph Begoe, and Albunea, the nymph-sibyl of Tibur.<sup>41</sup> Oracles kept at Rome thus developed into a collection of writings from at least four different sources, and though the term libri fatales was most often used for the sibylline books themselves, it is well to remember that this term included the others also.<sup>42</sup> The writings of Begoe and Albunea are obscure and unimportant, to judge from attention paid them by ancient writers; but those of Marcius, found during the Second Punic War, are better known and will be considered in the context of that time.

At a very early date, the books were placed under the care of two senators, two men of distinction.<sup>43</sup> These were the duumviri sacris faciundis, a committee of two in charge of consultations until 367, when the decemviral board was established. They held this office for life, and were exempt from military service and from all civil appointments. Whether the two patricians chosen for this purpose may be said to have constituted a religious college as such is a much debated point and not of importance, though it might be more apt to describe them as a commission.<sup>44</sup> This commission perpetuated itself by the process of co-optatio, and was thus in theory perpetually renewable. How difficult this would have been with a board of only two men, and the possibility that this difficulty led to the changes of 367, will be discussed at a later time.



The title duumviri sacris faciundis, because it is vague and broad, suggests the powers of this commission. In contrast to other religious officers, whose duties were more explicit and confined to purely Roman concerns, this title indicates the commission's unlimited power and realm of authority. Because their authority extended to whatever the sibylline books commanded, these two men had a broad power and influence that could not be specified in their title, hence its vagueness. Their authority extended not only to the supervision of Greek rituals and cults advised by the books, but any other alien rituals so recommended. In contrast, then, to the other religious colleges, this commission had an unlimited power and interest in alien religious ritual that were indeed untypical.<sup>45</sup>

Zonaras indicates the reasons for having two assistants help the early duumviri; these men were to read and interpret the books.<sup>46</sup> But these assistants were appointed for several other reasons; apart from helping their duumviri with linguistic and interpretative problems, they appear to have been commissioned to ensure that their masters did not disclose oracles to the public. For it was established that they could not consult the books without these assistants being present.<sup>47</sup> Moreover, the great secrecy with which the oracles were guarded is made clear in the story of M. Atilius, one of the first duumviri.<sup>48</sup> Apparently some Romans wished to know what was revealed in the books, and bribed Atilius to have some parts copied out by Sabinus Petronius. One of his slaves disclosed

this matter, and he was punished in the fashion usually reserved for parricides: sewn up in a leather bag he was cast into the ocean, in order that neither earth, water, nor sun would be polluted by his death. Contents of the verses could be disclosed only on penalty of death. Here we are given a valuable impression of the strict secrecy with which the books were maintained, whether the story be historical or aetiological in origin.<sup>49</sup>

In their earliest form, the sibylline books were thought to consist of leaves. This tradition is best reflected in Vergil:

Insanam vatem aspicias, quae rupe sub ima  
Fata canit, foliisque notas et nomina mandat.  
Quaecumque in foliis descripsit carmina virgo,  
Digerit in numerum, atque antro seclusa relinquit:  
Illa manent immota locis, neque ab ordine cedunt.  
Verum eadem, verso tenuis cum cardine ventus  
Impulit, et teneras turbavit ianua frondes,  
Numquam deinde cavo volitantia prendere saxo,  
Nec revocare situs, aut iungere carmina curat:  
Inconsulti abeunt, sedemque odere Sibyllae.

.....Foliis tantum ne carmina manda,  
Ne turbata volent rapidis ludibria ventis:  
Ipsa canas oro. 50

Varro indicates that these leaves were palm leaves:

In foliis autem palmarum sibyllam scribere solere  
testatur Varro.

In foliis palmae interdum notis, interdum scribebat  
sermonibus .51

He thus suggests that the leaves were marked either with signs or sermones, the latter involving, it would seem, an unabbreviated manner of writing. Regarding the signs, Servius suggests that the sibyl wrote "notis litterarum, ut per unam litteram significet aliquid."<sup>52</sup> Later writers indicate that materials other than leaves were used for writing: Pliny

assumes papyrus<sup>53</sup>, whereas Claudian mentions linen.<sup>54</sup>

Ausonius mentions that there were three books of sibylline oracles, obviously complying with the legend.<sup>55</sup> Apart from this remark, nothing is known about the number of oracles, or of the number of volumes of oracles, that were stored at Rome.<sup>56</sup>

Diels' thorough discussion of the two oracles he assigns to 207 and 125 tells us much about the nature of oracular writing.<sup>57</sup> These oracles were preserved by Phlegon of Tralles,<sup>58</sup> appear to be legitimate<sup>59</sup>, and are invaluable insofar as we can base generalizations on them. The language is Greek; the verse form hexameter.<sup>60</sup> The Greek is of notable difficulty and obscurity: "Es gibt wol wenig griechische Verse, die so schwer zu verstehen sind wie dieses Orakel".<sup>60A</sup> What strikes one most of all is their lack of polish, enigmatic nature, artlessness.

Perhaps the most significant result of Diels' work concerns the problem of acrostics. Both Cicero and Dionysius mention this aspect of sibylline writing; and in spite of the early controversy over their statements, it is now clear that acrostics were a distinguishing feature of Roman sibylline oracles at their most typical, or highly developed, stage.<sup>61</sup> Cicero argues that the sibylline verses were not a product of frenzy and wild inspiration--presumably he is thinking of the Delphic oracle--but the result of much care and patience. This is because they contained a poetic technique "quae *ὑποστιχες* dicitur, cum deinceps ex primis cuiusque versus litteris aliquid connectitur. Atque in Sibyllinis ex primo versu

cuiusque sententiae primis litteris illius sententiae carmen omne praetexitur."<sup>62</sup> Dionysius, albeit vaguely, alludes to the same thing.<sup>63</sup> Diels' research supports and clarifies the statements of these writers.<sup>64</sup> He has ingeniously restored the initial letters of a few missing lines of the extant oracles, and by correlating the first letter of each line, is able to provide a complete hexameter and one incomplete, suitable in meaning to the oracles in question.<sup>65</sup> Apparently these acrostics were meant to frame the oracle into an unalterable and tamper-proof form, and they are the most notable aspect of the sibylline fragments that have come down to us.

The question of acrostics leads to a much more obscure problem, that of consultation and interpretation. The exact processes involved remain unknown, since ancient writers say little about this topic. Only two remarks are relevant. Vopiscus tells us that the priests read the sibylline books with veiled hands.<sup>66</sup> Ammianus Marcellinus is even less informative when he mentions that interpreters of the sibylline oracles assume a solemn expression of severe bearing.<sup>67</sup> On the basis of these rather insignificant remarks, one can only surmise that consultations and interpretations of the oracles constituted a solemn and formal ritual.

Several modern scholars have suggested modes of consultation, but it must be admitted that their solutions are

hypothetical and far from satisfactory. In spite of the attractiveness and fascination of these attempts, we are nevertheless still just as far from certainty. Niebuhr, following the tradition that the books were composed of leaves, suggests that these leaves, having been cut into oblong shapes for writing, were shuffled and drawn.<sup>68</sup> His conjecture is a valuable one since it implies that some method of selection by chance was used in the process of consultation. This method of selection by chance finds support in the word sortes, used in this connection by Vergil, Tibullus, and Lactantius.<sup>69</sup> A passage chosen by a process of shuffling or drawing would be considered the applicable one.

Other scholars believe that acrostics played a role in the consultations.<sup>70</sup> It is true that they were of some importance, as Diels has shown, but to venture an explanation of acrostics as a procedure of consultation, on the basis of what little we know, is to enter the realm of pure hypothesis. In several ways the mystery that enshrouds the consultation of these books resembles our lack of knowledge about the Eleusinian mysteries. Both involved a solemn religious ritual, and the rituals of both were held in such secrecy that their essence has never been disclosed, in spite of several centuries' practice and innumerable people, writers included, who must have come in direct contact with the heart of these rituals.

Even Cicero, though he discusses the Eleusinian mysteries at length, never discloses any relevant details.<sup>71</sup> Nevertheless, what may be surmised about the Eleusinian mysteries may also be suggested for the consultation of the sibylline books: the essence of the ritual could have been deceptively simple, to us non-dramatic and even meaningless; and it is this simplicity that has led scholars astray ever since, inasmuch as they tend to invent complicated hypotheses that are all the more difficult to verify because of their complication.

What remains certain, to judge from the type of information found in ancient authors, is this: only conclusions drawn from the consultations were publicized, not the texts themselves. Perhaps this was to avoid controversy, should the text in question have been unclear; and one would think that the specific senatorial purpose of a particular consultation would be better served in this fashion. For it was the senate, and only the senate, that could ordain a consultation<sup>73</sup>; moreover, the response was reported only to themselves, and they reserved the right of interpreting and implementing it as their purposes dictated.<sup>74</sup> It is certain that a sibylline response could neither be publicized nor enacted without the senate's prior consent. Even the duumviri could not look into the books whenever they wished, but were required to receive senatorial permission in every case.

Specific causes for which the sibylline books were consulted will be a matter left for later discussion. It would not be out of place here, however, to mention the general reasons

for consultation, and to consider what the ancients themselves regarded as their purpose.

Cicero is both comprehensive and to the point when he says: "Valeant [libri sibyllini] ad deponendas potius quam ad suscipiendas religiones".<sup>75</sup> However, the word religio is difficult to define, especially in the context of this statement. It appears to have been derived from the verb religo; its meaning thus developed from the concept of a person being bound or obligated to a higher power.<sup>75A</sup> W. Fowler has traced four stages in the meaning of this word. Of these the first and particularly the second seem applicable to this statement of Cicero. In the first stage, this word indicated a feeling of "fear or awe of the semi-civilized man in the presence of the supernatural". In the second it indicated the "cult by which man strives to propitiate the unseen powers, together with the scruple he feels if the propitiation is in the least degree imperfect".<sup>75B</sup> It seems that Cicero was referring to this type of cult in his present use of religio. These cults, since the senate felt they should be "deponendas potius quam...suscipiendas", must have taken root in excessive religious fear of the unknown. This excessive fear was unacceptable to Roman religious authorities; thus the cults that sprung from it were likewise unacceptable, since the rituals that they involved reflected a desperation deriving from this fear. One of the chief purposes of the sibylline books was to discourage such cults by suggesting, in their place, a more acceptable religious ritual.

The books contained oracles dealing with "remedia Romana".<sup>76</sup>

These included means of placating angry gods, and rites of expiation and purification, all to inspire confidence lost in view of present evils, calamities, prodigies. The books were useful in ascertaining which gods should be worshipped, and in what particular way this worship should be performed. Only thus could superstition be eliminated, and hope inspired for the future.

What, then, were the chief evils necessitating a consultation? Dionysius lists four: party strife and sedition, misfortunes in war, apparitions, and prodigies. He might have included another classification: those evils, however assorted in nature, which posed a severe threat to public well-being, such as plagues, epidemics, and earthquakes. In general, then, one might say that consultations were occasioned only by evils and misfortunes of such consequence that they threatened the state as a whole, its political or mental stability, its health or its safety.

Though associated with Apollo as god of prophecy, the sibylline books were not, generally speaking, a repository of prophecies.<sup>77</sup> They evolved for quite a different purpose than that for which the Delphic oracle, for example, was known to function. Varro indicates that consultations occurred after some misfortune or prodigy, and thus argues that even the earliest sibylline books were not prophetic.<sup>78</sup> We will see at a later time that prophecies play a minor rôle in the results of genuine consultations, since this rôle would have detracted from the value of the books in the long run, and assisted no way in the fulfillment of their main aims.<sup>79</sup>



## NOTES TO CHAPTER ONE

1. Cic., De Nat. Deorum, III, 5
2. It is not clear in the sources to which of the Tarquins the books were brought. The confusion of events occurring in the reigns of the two Tarquins, Priscus and Superbus, is discussed by R. Ogilvie, Commentary on Livy, Books I--V, (Oxford, 1965), P. 145.
3. Ovid, Met. XIV, 130--153; Serv., Ad Aen. VI, 321 f., ed. G. Thilo and H. Hagen (Leipzig, 1881).
4. See also Varro ap. Serv., Ad Aen., VI, 36.
5. Varro ap. Lact., Div. Inst., I, 6.
6. Varro ap. Lact., loc. cit.
7. Verg., Aen., VI, 36
8. Serv., Ad Aen., III, 445
- 8A. Two of the Greek sibyls were the Delphic and the Samian; two sibyls in Magna Graecia were the Cumaeian and the Tiburtine sibyls.
9. For evidence connecting the two sibyls, see Marquardt, Staatsverwaltung, (Leipzig, 1878), P. 352 f. A. Bouché-Leclercq, Histoire de la Divination dans l'Antiquité (Paris, 1882), suggests the 6th century as time of arrival.
10. Serv., Ad Aen., VI, 72; Dion. IV, 62; Zon. VII, 11; Gellius, I, 19; Lact. Div. Inst., I, 6
11. Aus., XVI, 85 f.; Pliny, Nat. Hist., XIII, 27; Appian, Reg., IX.
12. Zonaras and Dionysius say that Tarquin acted on the advice of his augurs; the others say that he gave in of his own accord. Pliny talks of three books instead of nine; he is alone in this respect, though the mathematical proportions remain the same. Only Servius and Lactantius report the price paid for the books.
13. G. Bloch in Daremberg-Saglio, Dict., "duumviri s. f."
14. Vergil, Aen., VI, 72: "Hic ego namque tuas sortes, arcanaque fata dicta meae genti, ponam, lectosque sacrabo, Alma, viros." Verg., Ecl. IV, 4: "Ultima Cumaei venit iam carminis aetas..." Serv., Ad Aen., VI, 72: "...constat regnante Tarquinio quandam mulierem, nomine Amaltheam, obtulisse ei novem libros..."; cf. Lact. Div. Inst., I, 6, for the name Amalthea. Lucan, V, 184: "Qualis in Euboico vates Cumana recessu indignata suum ultis servire furorem gentibus ex tanta fatorum strage superba excerpit Romana manu..."
15. Lact., Div. Inst., I, 6; Tzetzes in Lycophr. Alex 1279; Zonaras VII, 11.
16. Serv., Ad Aen., VI, 36: "Multae autem fuerunt, ... quas omnes Varro commemorat et requirit a qua sint fata Romana conscripta. Et multi, sequentes Vergilium, ab hac Cumana dicunt... Ducitur tamen Varro, et Erythraeam credat scripsisse, quia post incensum Apollinis templum, in quo fuerant, apud Erythram insulam ipsa inventa sunt carmina." VI, 72: "Sibyllina responsa, quae...incertum est cuius Sibyllae fuerint, quamquam Cumanae Vergilius dicat, Varro Erythraeae."

17. Lact., Div. Inst., I, 6. These were the Cimmerian, Ancyran, Libyssan, Hellespontian, Samian, Tiburtine, Persaeon, and Delphic sibyls.

18. Gellius, I, 19.

19. Dion. IV, 62.

20. Very little is told about this "anus incognita". Gellius tells us that she brought "oracles of the gods," "divina oracula"; Dionysius indicates that she brought nine books of sibylline oracles: "βιβλίους... ἑβόλλων ἱερῶν." But these statements alone cannot be used to prove that the incognita of Dionysius and Gellius was the sibyl of the other accounts. If, however, we accept the implication inherent in these statements, and assume that the anus incognita was a sibyl, such an hypothesis calls for a suitable explanation of the adjectives chosen by Dionysius and Gellius to describe her. One might assume that the sibyl was disguised when she came to Rome, or that she was unrecognized by Tarquin for some other reason, perhaps because she seldom (if ever) left Cumae. On the other hand, it is quite possible that the words used by Dionysius and Gellius, if they are referring to a sibyl, reflect Roman doubt as to which of the sibyls came to Rome. This is the doubt described by Servius (Ad Aen., VI 36 and 72), and the doubt that perhaps dictated Roman efforts to restore the sibylline oracles, after their destruction in 83 B. C., from not one but ten cities with sibylline shrines.

21. H. Diels, Sibyllinische Blätter, (Berlin, 1890); J. Hild in Daremberg-Saglio, "sibyllini libri"; R. Bloch, Les Prodiges dans l'Antiquité Classique (Paris, 1963), P. 90 f.

22. G. Bloch in Daremberg-Saglio, "duumviri s. f."; W.W.Fowler, Religious Experience of the Roman People (London, 1911); Marquardt, op. cit., P. 352 f.; F. Altheim, History of Roman Religion, (London, 1938), P. 241; K. Latte, Römische Religionsgeschichte, (Munich, 1960), P. 160.

23. F. Altheim, op. cit., P. 241

24. For the suggestion that the Etruscans of Campania were intermediaries, see F. Altheim, loc. cit. Early connections between Rome and Etruria, which were extensive, are well discussed by R. Bloch, op. cit., P. 95--98.

25. J. Hild in Daremberg-Saglio, "sibyllini libri".

26. H. Diels, op. cit., P. 81

27. Paus. X, 12, 8

28. W.W.Fowler, op. cit., P. 257

29. R. Bloch, op. cit., P. 96

30. J. B. Carter, The Religion of Numa (London, 1906), P. 72 f.

31. Dion. VI, 17

32. Livy, III, 10: "pericula a conventu alienigenarum praedicta, ne qui in loca summa Urbis impetum caedesque inde fierent; inter cetera monitum et seditionibus abstineretur". R. Bloch, op. cit., P. 100-101.

33. See Page 92, n. 136.

34. Herodotus, V, 90, 93.
35. R. Bloch, op. cit., P. 95
36. Diels, op. cit., P. 112, line 16.
37. Varro, Lat. Ling., VII, 88
38. Following Diels, op. cit., P. 75, J. Hild in Daremborg-Saglio, "sibyllini libri", assumes that this expression was characteristic of the earliest oracles, and discusses it in an effort to deny the Greek origin of the books: "Une expression de ce genre exclut que cet oracle soit venu de Cumae, puisqu'elle suppose, chez celui qui l'a employée, la connaissance du ritus Romanus, et de la différence qui existe entre les deux, ce qui, de la part des Cuméens, est absolument invraisemblable." This argument is not convincing. The books could have been written originally by Greeks (perhaps the Cumaeans) and afterwards altered when they came to Rome. This expression could have been added by Roman interpreters of the books in an effort to maintain and clarify the original oracles. Thus, one should not make the dangerous assumption that early Greek writings could never have been edited, elaborated, and adapted to Roman needs and customs after their arrival. In this connection, the same scholar asserts: "Mais l'ingéniosité avec laquelle le college...opéra plus tard, donne à penser qu'antérieurement déjà les interprètes des livres Sibyllins ne se gênaient pas pour y introduire, sous la pression des événements et l'influence des pouvoirs publics, des prescriptions et des idées auxquelles l'inspiration Sibylline était étrangère."
39. Zonaras, VII, 11
40. For a discussion of these, see W.W.Fowler, op. cit., P. 257--8; also J. B. Carter, op. cit., P. 66 and 72.
- 40A. W.W.Fowler, op. cit., P. 259.
- 40B. Dion. IV, 62.
41. Serv., Ad Aen., VI, 72.
42. The many references in Livy show this clearly to be the case.
43. Dion. IV, 62.
44. Bouche-Leclercq, op. cit., IV, P. 291; G. Bloch in Daremborg-Saglio, "duumviri s. f."
45. The books were concerned with "une religion à faire plutôt qu'une religion faite". G. Bloch in Daremborg-Saglio, "duumviri s. f."
46. Zon. VII, 11
47. Dion. IV, 62.
48. Val. Max., I, 1, 13; Zon. VII, 11; Dion., IV, 62.
49. In later times the death penalty was dropped; however, the offence was still a serious one. See A. A. Boyce, TAPA, 1938, P. 162; G. Bloch in Daremborg-Saglio, "duumviri s. f."
50. Verg., Aen., III, 443 f.; VI, 74.
51. Serv., Ad Aen., III, 443; VI, 74.
52. Serv., Ad Aen., III, 443.
53. Pliny, Nat. Hist., XIII, 27. In a passage discussing books made of paper, charta, Pliny mentions the sibylline books.
54. Claudian, B. Get., 232, "carbasus".

55. Aus., XVI, 85 f.

56. It can also be surmised that they numbered less than a thousand verses, since Lactantius tells us (Div. Inst., I, 6) that this was the number of the newly restored collection in 76. He indicates that the new collection was larger than the old.

57. Diels, op. cit., passim

58. Phlegon of Tralles, Mir. X.

59. Their content, concerned entirely with Greek ritual, shows no trace of Jewish-sibylline influence. They are thus markedly different from the volumes of Jewish-sibylline oracles that have come down to us, of which there are fourteen. These are thoroughly discussed by Rzach in Pauly-Wissowa, "Sibyllinische Orakel", 2118--2164. Diels, op. cit., P. 38 and 49, summarized the Greek rituals contained in these oracles.

60. The hexameter verse form is also indicated by Tibullus, II, 5, 16.

60A. Diels, op. cit., P. 64.

61. For example, Bouché-Leclercq, op. cit., IV, P. 295. There is no evidence to refute Cicero's statement. Moreover, Diels' work has proven that acrostics were a main feature of sibylline writing. See also A. S. Pease, Ciceronis de Divinatione, (Darmstadt, 1963), P. 530, n. 6.

62. Cic., De Div., II, 54.

63. Dion. IV, 62.

64. Diels, op. cit., P. 25 f.

65. Ibid.; see also J. Hild in Daremberg-Saglio, "sibyllini libri".

66. Vopiscus, Aur., XIX, 6: "...agite igitur, pontifices ..... templum ascendite, subsellia laureata construite, velatis manibus libros evolvite, fata rei publicae, quae sunt aeterna, perquirite."

67. Amm. Marc., XII, 9: "Hi, velut fata natalicia praemonstrantes, aut sibyllae oracula interpretantes, vultus gravitate ad habitum composita tristiores, ipsum quoque venditant, quod oscitantur."

68. B. G. Niebuhr, History of Rome (translated by J. C. Hare, London, 1842--28), I, P. 504.

69. Verg. Aen., VI, 72; Tib. I, 5, 69; Lactantius Div. Inst., I, 6.

70. Notably Klausen, Aeneas und die Penaten, whose complicated and unconvincing theories are summarized by Bouché-Leclercq, op. cit., IV, P. 295.

71. Cic., De Leg., II, 14, 36.

73. Cic. De Div., II, 54; Dion. IV, 62.

74. This procedure was abandoned only twice, in 87 and 56 B. C. See pages 117 and 134.

75. Cic., De Div., II, 54.

75A. cf. Lactantius, Div. Inst., IV, 28, 3; "hoc vinculo pietatis obstricti deo et religati sumus; unde ipsa religio nomen accepit,..." Also, IV, 28, 12: "diximus nomen religionis a vinculo pietatis esse deductum, quod hominem sibi deus religaverit et pietate constrinxerit, quia servire nos ei ut domino et obsequi ut patri necesse est. eo melius ergo id nomen Lucretius interpretatus est, qui ait religionum se nodos solvere." For the etymology of religio, see A. S. Pease, op. cit., P. 581--2.

75B. W.W.Fowler, Roman Essays and Interpretations, (1920), P. 7--15. See also A. S. Pease, op. cit., P. 582. Cicero, De Invent., II, 66, defines the first meaning of religio: "religionem eam quae in metu et caerimonia deorum sit appellans". His use of this word in the second stage of its meaning, when it referred to cults, is found in De Leg., II, 25, and other places cited by W.W.Fowler, op. cit., P. 11

76. Dion., IV, 62.

77. The college in charge of the sibylline books was also responsible for the Roman cult of Apollo, cf. Livy X, 8. Thus, symbols identified with the decemviri were those associated with Apollo, in particular the tripod and Dolphin. See F. Altheim, op. cit., P. 242. The books had early associations with Apollo, since their tradition and the cult of that god both originated, at an early date, at Cumae. Though this god probably arrived before the books (W.W.Fowler, Religious Experience of the Roman People, P. 268, n. 29), his connection with the sibylline books was confirmed as early as 433, when the books ordered that a temple be dedicated to him (Livy IV, 25).

78. Varro, Re. Rust., II.

79. A. A. Boyce, TAPA, 1938, P. 162 f., discusses the prophetic qualities of the sibylline recommendations. He feels that while outright prophecy played a minor rôle in such recommendations, it nevertheless cannot be declared unconditionally that the books did not prophesy. The books tended towards this rôle during the later republic, though even before this time certain responses had a prophetic quality. This prophetic rôle included not only outright prophecies, but commands that had a direct bearing on future events (for example, that quoted in Livy, III, 10). That the sibylline books were also a repository of historical information and records is made clear by Orosius, IV, 5, and Dionysius, I, 34. But the main purpose of these books, as countless consultations indicate, was the recommendation of suitable sacrifices and rituals to propitiate angry gods and atone for present misfortunes.

J. Hild in Daremberg-Saglio, "sibyllini libri", and G. Bloch in Daremberg-Saglio, "duumviri s. f." maintain that a purely prophetic operation would have been contrary to the aims of the books, and that such an operation was thus not emphasized, in the early republic at least. Prophecies, if they were to be accurate, would have had to be sufficiently vague as to appear correct regardless of the outcome of a situation. Such vagueness and ambiguity, which would have recalled Delphic responses, would have rendered the books ineffective. On the other hand, if they were to prophesy more specifically, they ran the risk of error and consequent loss of their authority.

## CHAPTER TWO

### THE PERIOD 753--204

The history of consecutive consultations from earliest Roman times down to the end of the second Punic War consists of slightly more than forty references in the ancient authors, of which at least twenty-five refer to authentic, specific consultations.<sup>80</sup> These consultations are related, both in initiation and results, to their historical contexts; and it will be seen that proper comprehension of the rôle of these books in religio-political affairs can stem only from a consideration of these contexts. This is the case, at any rate, with those consultations whose importance and difference from the "norm" are striking. We would best, then, discuss first of all these consultations in a general, comprehensive fashion, in this way providing a meaningful context for those which warrant closer attention.

Two logical approaches present themselves: the various reasons for consultation; and the results, insofar as they may be categorized, of consultation. In this way we may draw some broad, but hopefully meaningful, conclusions about the rôle of these books, and then approach the more important consultations with a realization of their distinctive qualities.

Reasons for consultation fall into four groupings, admittedly nebulous and interrelated, yet nevertheless useful: prodigies, portents, and evil omens; social evils such as plagues, epidemics, famines, droughts, and earthquakes; war difficulties or political matters; and superstitious fears

in the public mind that might stem from any of these causes. Sometimes it is difficult to determine, for example, whether a consultation was initiated by the mere occurrence of portents, or by fear and a sense of religio consequent on their announcement. For the purposes of this discussion, these doubtful cases will be classified under the event that led to consultation.

Prodigies, portents, and omens were in ten cases the sole or partial reason for a consultation. These would be only those omens striking because of their strangeness, and thus difficult to interpret, excluding anything of a routine nature.<sup>81</sup> The ancient sources, particularly Livy, yield a highly varied and extensive range of portents that called for a consultation, often occurring, of course, many at a time.<sup>82</sup> It would be out of place here to discuss the historical validity of such phenomena; they are important to us only insofar as they constituted a reason for consultation. Whether these events actually happened, and are thus explicable on a scientific basis, is not a relevant question; rather, it is the certainty that they were considered significant enough to warrant a consultation, or at least used as the pretext for one.<sup>83</sup>

Of the ten occasions mentioned above, all but one follow a consistent tradition.<sup>84</sup> The earliest date from 461, 436, 343, and 295, are well separated in time, and of no particular interest.<sup>85</sup> On the other hand, the five occasions during the Hannibalic War, dating from 218, 217, 216, 216, and 204, are relevant in the context of that war, and will be considered at a later time.<sup>86</sup> Few consultations because of portents are re-

corded for the period 295--218, but this is easily explained by the lacuna in Livy's account.

The second category of reasons for consultation, matters thought to threaten public health and safety, was also one of the most usual. These dangers were items of self-evident importance, and their unusual severity would naturally demand, by way of remedy, the best help that the political and religious mechanisms, working together, could offer. The "last resort" in such a case was a consultation of the books. Foremost among these public evils were plagues and pestilences. In fact, plagues and disease resulted in more consultations during this entire period than any other factor except portents; in all there were nine occasions on which they were either sole or partial reason for a consultation. Most of these are found in the early period, with instances in 436, 433, 399, 364, 349, 295, 293, and 272.<sup>87</sup> No more epidemics are reported until 208, again perhaps because Livy's account is missing; and of all the troubles suffered during the second Punic War, it seems that epidemics were the least troublesome. It is not at all certain that the worst plague, that of 208, even led to a consultation.<sup>88</sup>

Fears and associated superstitions were often the cause of consultations.<sup>89</sup> It was customary for the growth of major religio to cause a consultation before the superstitions became so serious as to displace the traditional religious values of the state, or to destroy the psychological equilibrium of the people. Obviously, the purpose of such consul-



tations was to allay these fears and superstitions by calling into force an institution sanctioned by the Roman senate, one which could suggest effective remedies, but only such as were acceptable to the Roman government and could be comprehended within the body of traditional religious thought.

On seven occasions fears of one type or another were clearly responsible for consultations. That of 496 originated in a fear of famine<sup>90</sup>; that of 226 resulted from the fear of a Gallic invasion.<sup>91</sup> Other occasions all fall in the period of the Hannibalic War. The superstitious fears of this time will be discussed in greater detail when we consider the operation of the books in that period. It will suffice to mention here the consultations of 218 and 216, ostensibly due to the innumerable prodigies of those years.<sup>92</sup> In theory it was the portents themselves that were responsible. But Livy makes clear that alarm and fear played the prime rôle; and motives for consultation are better seen arising from superstition than from the portents themselves. Alarm in some form or other also led to the second consultation of 216, as well as those of 212 and 204.<sup>93</sup> These consultations in particular warrant special consideration.

The last category of motives to be considered stems largely from needs inherent in military or political affairs, and is exemplified by nine consultations. While these too warrant closer attention, they may be listed here for statistical purposes: the law of Terentilius in 461<sup>94</sup>; Camillus' purification of Rome after his defeat of the Gauls;<sup>95</sup> cel-

celebration of the first lectisternium in 399<sup>96</sup>; the introduction of Aesculapius to Rome after 293<sup>97</sup>; the Gallic war in 226<sup>98</sup>; Fabius Maximus' rise to power after Trasimene in 217<sup>99</sup>; alarm after the great defeat at Cannae in 216<sup>100</sup>; celebration of the Ludi Apollinares in 212<sup>101</sup>; and above all the arrival of Cybele after 204<sup>102</sup>.

We may now turn to a comprehensive discussion of the various sibylline recommendations for this same period. For a general statistical discussion, these recommendations may likewise be divided into four categories: recommendations of foreign religious rituals or the importation of foreign gods; the celebration of various types of games; advice political or military in implication; and, lastly, a miscellany of formulae for minor and usual rituals, which would include the customary sacrifices, prayers, vows, purifications, temple dedications, votive offerings, and the like.

The last category may be considered first, inasmuch as it is the least significant, in a broad sense, of the four. Apart from Plutarch's dubious reference to 504, discussed above, the books recommended such formulae on nine occasions. These date from 496, 436, 433, 390, 343, 218, 217, 217, and 216.<sup>103</sup> Such rituals were customary sibylline recommendations; for our purposes they serve to supply a "norm" against which the more extraordinary measures can be clearly seen. On the one hand these customary formulae follow in themselves no consistent path. No trends may be discerned: they constitute an unorganized miscellany, especially for the period 496--343.

However, whatever is of specific interest during the Hannibalic War may be discussed more meaningfully at a later time.<sup>104</sup> It is sufficient here to notice that the recommendations of such rituals were very common. However, they often accompanied significant religious innovations, whose importance easily eclipses that of the usual rites. For example, lectisternia are found amidst the myriad other rituals advised in 218, and on both occasions in 217.

A very good example of this confusing miscellany of ritual is to be found in the recommendations of 218. Here we find formulae and rites desperately heaped one upon another in hope that they would prove efficacious by their very number. The city was purged and purified by almost the entire community; sacrificial victims of the greater sort were offered to the gods specified in the books; a forty-pound gift of gold was dedicated to Juno at Lanuvium; a bronze statue was dedicated by the married women to Juno on the Aventine; there were to be public prayers to Fortune on Mt. Algidus; there were to be prayers at Rome at the shrine of Hercules; five victims of the greater sort were to be sacrificed to Genius, and Gaius Atilius the praetor was commanded to make solemn vows to be duly fulfilled if, during the next ten years, the state should undergo no misfortunes. Livy indicates that the foregoing considerably relieved public fears. If this were completely true on that occasion, it certainly was not in later years, when the mere quantity of ordinary rituals could no longer suffice, and comparatively extraordinary measures were found advantage-

ous if not necessary, for example the Apolline games in 212, of the arrival of Cybele in 204.

The second category of sibylline recommendations comprises the importation of foreign rituals and gods. During this period alien elements introduced were all Greek in origin, excepting Cybele, who represented the arrival of a Phrygian-oriental influence. Before the beginning of the second century, sibylline consultations advised the importation or permanent institution of at least six, and perhaps eleven, cults of gods whose origins were non-Roman. The list includes Dionysius, Demeter, and Persephone, Pluto, Mercury, Neptune, Apollo, Venus Erycina, Aesculapius, Hercules, and Cybele. The entries of two gods, Aesculapius and Cybele, represent extraordinary measures, and as such will be postponed for later discussion.<sup>105</sup>

It was the threat of famine in 496 that led to the introduction of Dionysius, Demeter, and Persephone, the books having been consulted with a view to finding a solution for this problem.<sup>106</sup> These Greek deities did not constitute a startling innovation, as did the introduction of Cybele; they were immediately associated with the parallel Roman deities Ceres, Liber, and Libera; they assumed these names, and made their entry into Roman religion in a comparatively uneventful manner. This seems to have been a case of Greek deities superimposing themselves on their Roman counterparts, in this way rejuvenating and updating the cult of local gods.<sup>107</sup> In all likelihood Mercury and Neptune, in their Greek forms, were first introduced into Roman religion at this time by command of the

sibylline books, though we have no documentation for these events.<sup>108</sup> It is more certain that the books were at a very early date identified with the cult of Apollo, for in 433/2 a temple was dedicated to that god on the basis of a sibylline recommendation.<sup>109</sup> The connection between these oracular books and Apollo as the god of prophecy is an obvious one, and while Apollo's cult probably arrived in advance of the sibylline books<sup>110</sup>, the two were closely associated thereafter.<sup>111</sup> Much debated has been the connection between the gods Dis and Proserpina, and the Ludi Saeculares, the latter being most certainly an order of the sibylline books.<sup>112</sup> If we assume that these games were from the start associated with these chthonic Greek deities, then their introduction into Roman religion may also be attributed to the sibylline books. However, some doubt has been expressed as to their early connection, and it is possible that they were identified with each other only at a later date, the earliest likely being 249.<sup>113</sup> If this were the case, the cult of Dis-Proserpina followed an independent path up till this time, and their introduction cannot be associated directly with the books. The cult of Aphrodite Erycina, which was imported in 217, seems to have been the first instance of that Greek fertility deity imposing itself on the older Italic vegetation deity, Venus. Whether the god Hercules was introduced by the sibylline books is an obscure problem; all we know is that he protected part of the Circus by virtue of the sibylline books.<sup>113A</sup>

The chief non-Roman ritual advised by the books during this

period was the Greek lectisternium, an exotic and novel form of worship introduced in 399.<sup>114</sup> It was the first alien ritual advised by the books, and as such it set a precedent of great importance. And though imported, it flourished well on Roman soil, becoming one of the most frequent sibylline recommendations. It was celebrated on at least seven, and perhaps eight, occasions: 399, 392--90, 364, 349, 218, 217, 217, and 204.<sup>115</sup>

The celebration of public games is the third area in which the sibylline books exerted an innovating influence. In all, they recommended five different sets of games, three of which were renewed subsequently on a permanent basis. These included the Ludi Scaenici in 364;<sup>116</sup> the Ludi Saeculares, possibly first celebrated c. 348, and definitely in 249; games dedicated to Jupiter in 217<sup>117</sup>; the Ludi Apollinares in 212, as a result of the Carmina Marciana<sup>118</sup>; and the Megalenses in 204.<sup>119</sup>

The scenic games were recommended once only, in 364, because of a particularly bad pestilence, one which even the new ritual of the lectisternium did not appear capable of ending. In contrast, the Ludi Saeculares became a permanent feature of Roman religion. They were celebrated to commemorate the end of one saeculum (during the republic considered to be a hundred years, the longest possible life-span), and the beginning of a new one.<sup>120</sup> Few things in the development of Roman religion are so utterly confused and obscure as the history of the Ludi Saeculares.<sup>121</sup> The only two points on which we may be absolutely certain concern the celebration of these games in 249, and the fact that they were ordered by the sibylline books.

Whether this celebration was the first, second, or third in the series<sup>122</sup>, it is quite clear from the ancient sources that they were authentic secular games.<sup>123</sup> It is equally certain that the sibylline books were consulted at this time, either because of a thunderbolt<sup>124</sup>, or because of the hardships of the first Punic War<sup>125</sup>; or perhaps a combination of both. The books then recommended what was, in all probability, a renewal of games that had been celebrated an indefinite number of times before. As to whenever the first celebration took place, we have the unanimous tradition of ancient authors to suggest that it too was ordered by the sibylline books.<sup>126</sup>

The games to Jupiter in 217 need not detain us; this was the only occasion on which the sibylline books advised their celebration. On the other hand, the famous Ludi Apollinares of 212, which were renewed in 209 and established on a permanent annual basis in 208, remain one of the more important innovations of that period; as such they will be discussed at a later time.<sup>127</sup> Inasmuch as Cybele was brought to Rome at the command of the books, in the manner suggested by them, the subsequent games celebrated in honour of her arrival, the Megalenses, may also be regarded as of their creation, directly or indirectly as the case may have been. These games were celebrated annually thereafter, and consisted of scenic plays held to commemorate the dedication of Cybele's sanctuary and the time of her arrival. The elaborate and colorful processions associated with these games are well portrayed in the famous passage of Lucretius, in particular their exotic, orgiastic

qualities in which Romans were prohibited from taking part soon after the cult had been established in Rome.<sup>128</sup> One is led to think, by this action, that Roman authorities were displeased by its non-Roman nature, and consequently did their utmost to prevent it from perverting traditional religious sentiments.

On only two occasions during this period did the sibylline books advise human sacrifice. Firstly, in 226, it was recommended that two Gauls and two Greeks be buried alive in the Forum Boarium in Rome. A similar rite was also recommended in 216.<sup>129</sup> Both occasions were extraordinary not only because of the rite itself, but because of the desperate political situation responsible in each case for the consultation.

The sole instance of a sibylline recommendation concerned directly with political values was that of 461.<sup>130</sup> It seems that the sibylline books usually operated in a more subtle fashion; and consultations held because of political motives, for example those of 399 or 217, accomplished their ends in a less obvious fashion.<sup>131</sup>

Finally, it should be mentioned that at least three genuine recommendations for this period were prophetic or oracular in nature, the above-mentioned instance of 461, the consultation of 496, and that of 293.<sup>132</sup> Because of a concern for the future shown in such recommendations, it cannot be maintained unconditionally that the books were directive and corrective rather than prophetic in nature. However, even on these occasions, the chief concern was to re-establish the pax deorum, to assuage divine wrath that had been aroused in the past. Thus it remains clear that the general operation of the books during



this period was a directive one, since most of the responses lacked prophetic qualities. The few that possess these qualities in part at least still conform sufficiently to the operative tradition of the books as to cause no doubt that such recommendations are authentic.<sup>133</sup>

For the period 753--204, then, the sibylline books were consulted partly or solely because of prodigies and portents in nine instances, for plagues on nine occasions, for fears and religio on seven occasions, and for political or military needs on nine occasions. And the books recommended, either singly or in combination, customary religious formulae dealing with usual rituals and sacrifices on nine occasions; the importation of foreign gods in at least six, and perhaps eleven instances; the celebration of a lectisternium on at least seven occasions; the celebration of various games on five occasions; and on one occasion only gave outright political advice.

The most notable correspondances between reasons for consultation and the ensuing recommendations are the following. New gods were imported during times of political expansion and strife associated therewith. Lectisternia were used as remedies for plagues exclusively during the period 399--293; but in the time of the second Punic War they were relegated to the propitiation of portents. The celebration of games was associated in particular with Rome's efforts to consolidate the support of her allies, especially in the time of war. This was particularly true of the Ludi Saeculares, c. 348.<sup>134</sup>

Routine rituals and sacrifices were used throughout this period for the propitiation of prodigies, though on many occasions they were employed in connection with other rites. For example, lectisternia were used freely with them throughout the war with Hannibal. And, finally, the two occasions of human sacrifice were necessitated by crises of the most desperate and extraordinary nature in the history of the Roman people, the threat of a second Gallic invasion in 226, and the threat of Hannibal to Rome shortly after the disaster at Cannae.

Consideration of those consultations or events which reveal most about the political significance of the sibylline books, and for that reason deserve more detailed discussion, concerns the years 461, 399, 367, 293, 225, 217, 216, 212, and 204. The importance of these examples is determined either on the basis of political circumstances attendant to a consultation, or in the light of extraordinary recommendations, whose significance is readily apparent in that they differ startlingly from routine sibylline responses.

The events of 462 and after are described in detail by Livy, and in a broader fashion by Dionysius.<sup>134A</sup> Apparently the city became embroiled in a political dispute that threatened on several occasions to break into civil war. One of the tribunes for 462, Gaius Terentilius Arsa, took advantage of the consuls' absence from Rome on a campaign against the Volscians and the Aequians, and for several days in succession did his best to excite the plebs, criticizing the arrogance of the patricians

in general, and the excessive powers of the consuls in particular. He then proposed to end this tyranny by appointing five commissioners to codify laws that would limit and define consular powers; in that way the consuls could use only authority given to them by popular consent, and could no longer govern on the basis of *ἀπαρρητοσύνη*. This proposal was naturally disturbing to the patricians, as indicated by their violent attacks on the measure itself. These attacks were supported by the other tribunes and in effect postponed enactment of the law. During the next year this proposal was again brought forth, but on this occasion it received support from the whole college of tribunes.

The year was marked by ominous signs: fires blazed in the sky, there was an earthquake, a cow talked, and it rained lumps of meat. The books were consulted, and in them were found both a prediction that a band of foreign men would attack the high places of the city, and the warning to avoid factious politics. According to Dionysius, the prediction and warning were connected in this fashion: unless civil strife were banished from the city in its infancy, foreign enemies would attack and invade Rome, enslaving its citizens. In any case, the tribunes were infuriated, and insisted that these prophecies were contrived, deliberately invented by the patricians to prevent passage of Terentilius' law.<sup>135</sup> A dangerous clash was imminent, and at this very moment the Hernici reported that the Volscians and Aequians, who had been conquered just the year before, were again marching on Rome. The tribunes then asser-

ted that this war-scare was also invented by the senate; they even implied that the Hernici had been hired to play a part in it. In this way the senate had created a false enemy so as to conceal its real foe, the people of Rome. But the tribunes were not deceived. Because patrician forces wanted to suppress the proposed legislation, they had not only contrived a sibylline recommendation which was favorable to their purposes, but also were doing their utmost to prove its validity. This was the first major episode leading to the institution of the decemviri legibus scribendis (451), a body of ten appointed to prepare a written code of laws that had been unwritten up to that time. This resulted in the twelve tables of law (449), which were completed by a second, similar college appointed in 450.

It appears that many of the details in Livy's account are untrustworthy, and that only its broad implications are true. We can only be certain that there was a clearly-defined struggle between patrician sentiments on the one hand, and, on the other, the plebs as represented by their college of tribunes. Many incorrect details appear to have originated with Livy's sources, in particular the response of the sibylline books, and the inference that they were a political instrument wielded by the patricians.

Livy's prime source for this passage was the Sullan annalist, Valerius Antias, whose accounts were not always reliable

or unbiased. We should not ignore the important fact that Antias' version dated from the relatively late time of Sulla. To a certain extent, Livy's account contains the thought of this epoch; and as far as the sibylline books are concerned, it at least gives us an impression of what Antias considered might have happened in 461. Sullan attitudes towards the books appear to have been superimposed on the real events of 461; these attitudes consisted, for the most part, in regarding the sibylline books as a senatorial source of power, one used by that body for its own ends.<sup>136</sup>

We cannot be certain that the sibylline books were actually wielded, by the senate, as a source of power as early as 461. It is more likely, however, that this was the case with the notable consultation of 399. Though the political context relevant to this consultation is rich with political nuances and overtones, scholars without exception have overlooked these aspects and given their attention to the great religious innovation which resulted from it. It was the first occasion of a lectisternium, and as such the first occasion when the sibylline books recommended the institution of a completely foreign religious ritual. Of course, this consultation was very important for its religious results, and especially so because this recommendation set a precedent which the books were to follow later when they advised that other foreign elements be introduced into Roman religion.

Our sources are again Livy and Dionysius.<sup>137</sup> There are no

notable discrepancies, and since Livy's account is more useful because of the more detailed context in which this consultation is described, it is the one summarized here.<sup>138</sup> In the year 400, when Rome was involved in her prolonged difficulties with Etruscan Veii, plebeian sentiments were angered by the patrician military tribunes, who, they said, were showing limited vigor in this campaign and thus were responsible for their defeats. As a result, Publius Licinius Calvus, a plebeian, was elected to the military tribuneship along with five patricians. The people, no less than Licinius himself, were surprised and pleased, considering this an important success. Thereupon followed a winter of great severity; roads were blocked with snow and the river closed to traffic. During the forthcoming elections, popular ambition succeeded in electing five plebeians to the military tribuneship. Thus only one patrician was admitted. The harsh winter gave way to a summer of excessive heat; unhealthy conditions due to a rapid change resulted in a pestilence of extraordinary severity. Neither humans nor animals were immune. Since the disease was incurable and its ravages appalling, in despair of ascertaining its reason or of foretelling its end, the senate ordered a consultation of the books.<sup>139</sup> This was the result:

Duumviri sacris faciundis lectisternio tunc primum in urbe Romana facto per dies octo Apollinem Latonamque et Dianam, Herculem Mercurium atque Neptunum tribusquam amplissime tum apparari poterat stratis lectis placavere. Privatum quoque id sacrum celebratum est. Tota urbe patentibus ianuis promiscuoque usu rerum omnium in propatulo posito, notos ignotosque passim advenas in hospitium ductos ferunt et cum inimicis quoque benigne ac comiter sermones habitos, iurgiis ac libitus temperatum; vinctis quoque dempta in eos dies vincula; religioni deinde fuisse quibus eam opem di tulissent vinciri.<sup>140</sup>

At the next elections, presumably the next spring, the patricians were naturally anxious to do better than last time, and launched a campaign notable for its cleverness and thoroughness. Firstly, they put up their most distinguished men as candidates, people whom the p̄bebs would hardly have the nerve to reject. Secondly, they launched a great campaign of canvassing and left no stone unturned in their efforts. Thirdly, they recalled to the people the severe winter the year before, the plague that summer, and, we can suppose, basing their assertion on the authority of the sibylline books, declared these to have been indicative of divine wrath. Why were the gods angered? They had an answer ready at hand. Clearly, the presiding gods of Rome were insulted because at elections held under their auspices, high offices of the government had been vulgarized, and family distinctions had been ignored. As a result of these sundry manoeuvres, the patricians scored a high success, for at the next elections only their candidates were admitted.

Obviously the direct cause for this consultation was the plague, and the immediate result was the celebration of the first lectisternium. But it should be clear from the foregoing that there were some subtle political motives for this consultation, concerned, to be sure, with the patrician cause, inasmuch as it was the senate who ordered the consultation. Without mention of these, the full import of this consultation cannot be appreciated. The result itself had a political value. It is important to notice that while there were many severe

plagues during the republic, none of the others caused a consultation leading to such an innovation. Why were lectisternia held because of this particular plague?

Our answer lies in the old plebeian-patrician struggle for power. By the end of the fifth century, this dispute had started to gather in momentum and significance. Thus, the election of Licinius to the military tribuneship in 400, though a small achievement in itself, was a sign of things to come; and the patricians must have been surprised and infuriated indeed to find that the very next year would see the entry of five plebeians. It is unlikely that they could have foreseen such a rapid development of plebeian power. Their consequent anger and desperation are proven by their intensive efforts to ensure that the next election would admit only people of their rank.

Apart from the obvious means for success, they used the more subtle and infinitely more effective means, the sibylline books. The line of reasoning they might have presented to the people would have been thus: firstly, an election at which a plebeian had been elected (400) had angered the gods and resulted in the severe winter which followed; secondly, the shocking entry of five more plebeians that spring had angered the gods still further, and resulted in the plague, which was appropriately more severe. Because of this divine rage, the books had to be consulted. The subsequent recommendation, the lectisternium, was intentionally extraordinary so as to show the people just how angered the gods really were, and



how much they demanded for appeasement. Thus the patrician-oriented senate, using the sibylline books, cleverly turned the fortuitous occurrences of the bad winter and following plague to its own advantage. By this means the people were made fully aware of how they had angered the gods by electing plebeians, and they were thus subtly advised not to do so in the future.

The lectisternium itself must have made a great psychological impression. For the first time people were allowed to play a prominent role in a state religious ritual, and for the first time an appeal was made, via the pageantry of this ritual, to stimulate an emotional response.<sup>141</sup> Its effectiveness cannot be doubted, and the subsequent success of the patricians at elections was a measure of their remarkable ability at this time to control the plebs. In particular, it showed just how useful an instrument the sibylline books could be.<sup>142</sup>

The next event of importance during this period was the enactment of the Licinian laws in 367, by one of which the commission of the duoviri was altered into a college of ten men, the decemviri, five of whom were plebeian, and five patrician. Livy is our only source for this period.<sup>143</sup> His account may be summarized here. Gaius Licinius Stolo and Lucius Sextius Lateranus, plebeian tribunes from 376 to 367, agitated during that period for several laws extending the powers of the plebs, enacting in particular that one consul might be a plebeian, and also that the duoviri be increased

to a body of ten men, in which patricians and plebeians were to secure equal representation. After a long struggle they finally succeeded in having these laws passed in 367. To judge from Livy, all of the laws were passed; Licinius himself became the first plebeian consul a year later.

However, many details of the long struggle before these laws were passed are suspect; even two of the laws themselves, one on debts and usury, and one which limited tenancies of public land, are of dubious historicity, since they seem to anticipate events of the Gracchan age. Livy's most likely source for this section was Licinius Macer, who may well have falsified or invented much of this account in order to glorify his own ancestry. Thus we must discard most of the details given by Livy, though there remains little doubt that the decemviral board dates from this time.

It is clear from the composition of this new college that at least partial reason for its formation may be found in the plebeian-patrician struggle which had grown in intensity throughout the preceding century. Of special interest is the fact that this was the first religious body into which the plebeians gained admittance; they had to wait sixty-seven more years until they were eligible to be counted among the augures or the pontifices. Why did the plebs gain entry into this body at such an early date? Whereas the other religious colleges were intimately associated with the patricians from earliest times, and became in the end their last refuge<sup>144</sup>, the sibylline college was relatively independent of other official religious

bodies, and because of this less bound to receive the support of the patricians.<sup>145</sup>

At any rate, this event became important in political disputes of the time, for it established a precedent in favor of the plebs, and became in effect a powerful instrument in their agitation for entry into other offices. It is unlikely, for example, that they could have entered the colleges of the augures or pontifices in 300, had they not been armed with this precedent.

But it should not be claimed that this class struggle was the sole influence in the formation of this new body. If this were so, there would have been no reason to transform the duoviri into a body five times its original size. It would have been a simple matter to require that one of the duoviri be a plebeian. There was a two-fold motivation for the increase in number. Firstly, a committee of two men, which cannot be said to constitute a numerous college, was perhaps found inadequate for the scope and increasing importance of this work.<sup>146</sup> Tending to the sibylline books and foreign rites was a function that evolved with the state itself; whereas a committee of two men was adequate for this purpose during the early days of the republic, by 367 a change might have been found advantageous, if not necessary. Interpretation of the sibylline books had been found very useful to the senatorial-patrician ranks in the consultation of 399. There was no reason why this instrument, which appears on the basis of this example alone to have operated in the interest of its controlling powers,

could not be expanded into something even more important and useful.<sup>147</sup>

A second reason for increase may have been associated with the process of co-optatio, the right of self-perpetuation customarily held by religious colleges, which would have been ill-suited and problematical to a committee of merely two men, had it been used.<sup>148</sup> If one of them were to die, the survivor would then have sole power of electing both members of the new committee; and should both die at the same time, admittedly less likely, the predicament would have been all the more difficult.

In addition, another motive may be considered, one which was fully in keeping with the nature of rites recommended by the books, and the usual political purposes for their consultation. As mentioned above, most of the religious rituals advised by the decemviri or their early counterparts were of a type in which the plebs played an essential part. Indeed their purposes could not have been accomplished unless this were the case. And rather than alienate the plebs from these rites by having them ordered by an all-patrician body, it might have seemed advantageous for the advisory board to contain a reasonable portion of their element. In this way, the decemviri would be closer to the plebs; rites advised by them would be taken on good faith, and become all the more efficacious because of assured support.

The college of the decemviri had the right of co-optatio, and the two social orders of which it was comprised do not

appear, at first, to have mixed. Though we cannot be certain how this college operated as a body, it is known that each half had its annually chosen president, a magister; and when the college had grown to fifteen members, there were as many as five presidents at once.<sup>149</sup>

Powers of the decemviri were identical to those of the older duoviri. These had been steadily increasing over the years in proportion to the importance of that body. The decemviri had jurisdiction with regards consulting and interpreting the books, if the senate so permitted; moreover, any new rites therein recommended remained under their control, and they gained in power proportionately. Indeed, it was profitable for them to order new rites. Anything which did not pertain to state religion, in particular Greek rites and gods, became their province, and it was only natural that their powers grew astronomically.

Insofar as the creation of the decemviri affected the sibylline books themselves, it is not likely that the admittance of plebeian elements could destroy the secrecy and obscurity with which the books operated.<sup>150</sup> Plebeians so chosen would tend to be the very best elements of their class, and in any case would have to work with, and agree with, an equal number of patricians. Patricians had always been entrusted with care of the books, were fully acquainted with the ritual of consultation, and must surely have been, originally at least, the more influential part of the board. To maintain that suddenly, in 367, all secrecy disappeared with the admittance of plebeians, is to ignore the tradition of severe

punishment for divulgation that had existed in earlier times.<sup>151</sup> It is unreasonable to suppose that by 367 there was no longer any form of punishment, and therefore no restrictions, for divulging contents of the books. We can be sure that this secrecy was maintained at least until the end of the second Punic War, and indeed there is no substantial evidence for the contention that oracles were well known, until the last century of the republic.<sup>152</sup> Most of our evidence is from the period after 83, when the original set of books was destroyed. The possible change that occurred after this time, and the concomitant loss of the genuine sibylline tradition, will be discussed at a later time. Of course, it was always possible for the senate to disclose their interpretation of a consultation. It would have been contrary to their purpose not to. But it seems that the actual process of consultation and the specific texts interpreted were kept in secret long after the changes of 367.

The consultation of 293 was notable in that it set a precedent even more remarkable than that of 399, the importation of a new god and his cult in its original form. The significance of Aesculapius' entry to Rome is perhaps more religious than political in implication. It nevertheless represents an important innovation, paving the way for the extraordinary recommendation of the importation of Cybele and her cult in 204, and indeed originating in a political atmosphere notably similar to the later example.

Sources for this episode are Livy, Valerius Maximus, and

Orosius.<sup>153</sup> Livy remains the most useful in that he gives more details of the political context, and concentrates less on the mythological details of Aesculapius' journey to Rome. And since it is the political atmosphere that most interests us, he is in effect our only source. Many details of his account for years preceding this consultation are untrustworthy. He is relying again on annalists whose inclinations were more patriotic than historical.<sup>154</sup> We may be certain only of the major trends and events portrayed in his account.

Rome's second great battle against the Samnites, her chief enemy since 343, terminated in her favor in 304. At the outbreak of the third war, the Samnites marched against Rome (296), but on this occasion were assisted by the northern Gauls. In spite of this formidable foe, Rome secured a notable victory at Sentinum in 295, and was able to break the coalition. However, the Samnites were far from crushed, and in 294 they defeated L. Postumius near Luceria. The next year, 293, Roman forces achieved two significant victories. Sp. Carvilius captured Amiternum, and his colleague L. Papirius won a great battle at Aquilonia. It must have been obvious at this point that the Samnites would soon be completely crushed, and this was indeed the case after a few minor battles in 292/1. Peace was effectively re-established by 290. This was the end of a great struggle of nearly fifty years' duration, and it sealed the fate of central Italy. Rome emerged the first state of the peninsula, having acquired by this time the territories of the Samnites and Sabines, and having set up col-

onies at Venusia, Hadria, and on the Adriatic; and in this way she achieved the status of a Mediterranean power.

The victories of 293, which may be regarded as turning points in this war just as the Metaurus decided the Hannibalic War, were marred, Livy tells us, by a severe plague. Though it lasted for two or three years<sup>155</sup>, this plague was evidently thought portentous enough to call for a consultation in its first year. The decemviri declared that Aesculapius must be brought to Rome from Epidaurus. However, nothing could be done about this recommendation at that time, as the consuls were still very much occupied with the war. A supplication for one day was held, and the matter postponed. Since this plague was still raging three years later, and it was clear that the god would not help unless actually brought to Rome, as the books demanded, a committee was sent to Epidaurus. There a serpent crawled into their ship, and was thought to be the god himself. This serpent was brought back to Rome, and swam onto the island in the Tiber; a temple to Aesculapius was subsequently erected there.

The immediate reason for this consultation was, of course, the plague. Originally, Apollo as god of healing had been the one to which Romans turned during seasons of plague.<sup>156</sup> Then, in 399, something more efficacious was required, and lectisternia were instituted. Though found adequate for pestilences of the preceding century, the lectisternium was for some reason inadequate for the plague of 293. Former healers of plagues, Apollo and the lectisternia, must have



been considered no longer effective; people would now best turn to the prime god of healing, Aesculapius, who could provide a remedy to their problem if anyone could.

This cult was brought to Rome in its original form.<sup>158</sup> Two aspects of its arrival are noteworthy. First was the length of time it took to carry out the original order of the sibylline books. This could have been due to the campaigns of 293; but one wonders why it would have been so difficult, nonetheless, to send a few men and one boat to Epidaurus at that time. One also wonders why the Romans waited, not until the next year, but two or three years before bringing in the god.<sup>159</sup> Was there considerable reluctance in religious circles to import a new and foreign deity? In any case, the plague's persistence finally caused the god to be brought in.

The second point of interest is the fact that this new cult was placed on the island in the Tiber. The myth about the snake swimming there of his own accord strikes one as an aetiological cover-up for the real reason in settling a cult in this strange place, for the island had always been avoided and cursed from earliest times.<sup>160</sup> The answer which suggests itself is the following. Roman authorities were finally persuaded to obey the sibylline books; they imported this strange god, but made certain that his cult could neither influence nor interfere with state religion by placing it in the most obscure place possible, on that useless island in the Tiber. This reception of Aesculapius may be considered indicative of Rome's initial defensive attitude towards new

cults.

It has been suggested by W. Fowler that the reception of this cult had no deep significance for Roman religious history.<sup>161</sup> We are nevertheless safe in asserting that this was a religious event highly unusual for its time, and as such one of the most significant of sibylline recommendations. Regarding political motives for this consultation, it must be pointed out that while nothing definite can be ascertained, there are many unusual details whose raison d'être would be well worth knowing. Firstly, why did this plague not call for a lectisternium? While this remedy had been used for all plagues after 399, it is found only on four subsequent occasions.<sup>162</sup> This suggests that the lectisternium could not have yet lost the novelty and effectiveness for which it had been instituted in 399. The importation of Aesculapius cannot be fully explained, therefore, by the plague, or even religious needs of that year. We thus pass into the realm of conjecture. It is in the field of Roman politics that the answer must lie; and since the true nature of controlling interests in the state at this time remains so obscure, one can only suggest what might have been involved.

By 293 Rome had reached the final stages of a prolonged war. The end was in sight, and victory was certain. It might have been clear to controlling powers of the Roman state that Rome was entering a new epoch, a period in which she would be the first power of Italy, and as such an influence in the Mediterranean. While it is not likely that the cult of Aes-

culapius could have helped her in any practical way to fortify her position<sup>163</sup>, or even increase her influence over her allies<sup>164</sup>, one can discern in the introduction of this god a broadening and sophistication of Rome's religious tastes that corresponded closely to her increased political powers. Perhaps the entry of Aesculapius was meant as a prediction of things to come, an intentional effort to start things moving in a new direction. One notices that in her subsequent expansion Rome was soon occupying relatively alien soil, and confronting enemies of non-Italian origin. Firstly, after 282, it was the struggle with Tarentum and King Pyrrhus; and, soon after, came the war with Carthage in 264.

In the second half of this century one of the most extraordinary consultations took place, c. 226. Apart from the fact that it too set an important precedent, its significance lies specifically in the rite advised. This is a subject about which we know frustratingly little, chiefly because Livy is no longer with us, leaving only the cursory information in Plutarch, Dio, Zonaras, and Orosius.<sup>165</sup> It should be admitted at the outset that no overall conclusions can be reached; indeed, more questions can be asked than answered.

Not even a decade after the first Punic War, Rome again found herself threatened by invaders. Gallic clans were gathering in the north. In the area of the Po, the Boii, Lingones and Insubres decided to move south, and they were soon joined by the Taurini and Gaesati from beyond the Alps. The prospect of this war aroused the deepest fears

of the Romans, who remembered well the battle of Allia and the sack of Rome the same year, c. 390. Afterwards they had passed allia w that even otherwise exempt priests would be pressed into military service in the event of another invasion by the Gauls.<sup>166</sup> By 226 Roman fears must have reached a state of near panic. According to Plutarch, they feared the Gauls more than any other enemy. The fear in this case was ostensibly augmented by the fact that this enemy lived so near their frontiers, and had a great prestige in war. The fright of the Romans was indicated by the armed forces assembled at this time; nearly the entire state took up weapons.

In this year one or more oracles, purported to be sibylline, circulated in Rome and greatly added to the alarm, for they warned that Gauls would occupy the city.<sup>167</sup> It is doubtful that such an oracle was a direct issue of the sibylline books. In view of the fact that there would have been no purpose for the sibylline books to increase what was already an extraordinary fear, the falseness of this oracle may be assumed. Though Plutarch does not mention the fact, it was probably this false oracle, along with the panic of the time, that led to the consultation.

The books advised that two Greeks, a man and a woman, and likewise two Gauls, should be buried alive in the Forum Boarium.<sup>168</sup> Zonaras implies that the purpose of this sacrifice was to make it seem that destiny, as expressed in the circulating oracle, had fulfilled itself. These alien people, because they were buried in the city, would be regarded as

possessing a part of it.

We can be certain, then, that the motivation for this consultation was simply that of settling the panic, which had been raised to an even higher temperature by a counterfeited sibylline oracle. Rome had never before experienced such fear; it is likely, if we read between the lines of Plutarch, that even the priests were armed. Thus the sibylline books were consulted with a view to finding the quickest and most effective means of putting down the panic, to give the people a mass "tranquillizer" as it were, and in this way induce a psychological state more capable of military victory. It must have been clear to Roman authorities that the Gauls had already achieved a psychological victory, and one that could easily become a reality, even if they attacked with a smaller force. Hence the extraordinary recommendation of human sacrifice, intended to produce a profound effect on the people.

Though we cannot doubt that this sacrifice was recommended by the books, some of its details are not at all clear.<sup>169</sup> Livy and Plutarch insist that human sacrifice was not a Roman rite<sup>170</sup>; Plutarch in addition implies that it was not Greek either.<sup>171</sup> He is correct insofar as the classical Greek period is concerned; we are thus left without an explanation of its origin. It has been suggested by R. Bloch that this sacrifice was an Etruscan rite, though the documentation for this interesting assertion is tenuous to say the least.<sup>172</sup>

Because of the imminent war with the Gauls, it is easy enough to understand why two Gauls would be sacrificed.

But why was it necessary to include two Greeks? The affair of 216 sheds no light on this problem, since it remains just as obscure.<sup>173</sup> No Greek nations were hostile to Rome at this time; we are thus unable to explain their inclusion in the same way as that of the Gauls. Perhaps this rite stems from a recollection of the Tarentine-Pyrrhic war more than half a century earlier.

During the Hannibalic War, the activity and influence of the sibylline books reached a notable climax after which their history seems but a prolonged dénouement. Intense activity of the books at this time corresponded closely with the resurgence of religious fervor caused by the war, though it cannot be understood properly unless evaluated in the context of contemporary military-political developments.

Religious scholars, with a certain amount of justification, find reason for the seven war consultations in religious needs of the time, and are inclined to assign the significance of the results exclusively to that field.<sup>175</sup> Their work remains valid, though perhaps short-sighted because they do not consider simultaneous political developments; indeed many of the problems which they must leave unsolved are difficult only because they confine their research to the field of religion. The validity of their conclusions is thus restricted to that field. However, before proceeding to a discussion of political manoeuvres connected with these consultations, we might summarize here the nature of religious development which characterized this period, and to which scholars have given a good deal of attention.

This war caused a great increase in the religious appetite of the Roman people. The chief factor involved was, of course, the threat of Hannibal; first of all they felt his presence, like a dark storm cloud, in northern Italy; and then they fared badly in the subsequent campaigns, each of which turned to defeat and brought him closer and closer to Rome. The climax of this threat was Hannibal's appearance before the gates of Rome, in 211, in an effort to relieve the Roman siege of Capua. Public fear and psychological agitation during this period must have been extraordinary. This in turn led to notable outbreaks of superstition, religio, increased all the more by scores of prodigies reported from time to time, especially in the first few years of the war. In truth it became a vicious circle; terror and superstition made the people more sensitive to prodigies and military defeat, and at the same time these prodigies and losses tended to increase already great fears. Reports of prodigies came in from all over Italy; the listings in Livy are more extensive for this period than any other. Accordingly, demands on the power of religion to re-establish the pax deorum were great, and it is in this context that the religious fervor of this era is usually explained. There were continuous efforts, one after another as each rite failed, to find some way of calming the people, appeasing the gods, and removing the terrible threat of destruction. This apparent failure of old rites led to a progressive development in the need for more exotic rituals; as Carter has pointed out, the psychological workings

of the ancient mind are best understood if it is seen that strange events, such as prodigies, can only be propitiated by strange and unusual rites. A strange disease demands a strange cure.<sup>176</sup> And it is also characteristic of such semi-magical rites that they lose their effects quickly, and must then be replaced by rites even more complicated and strange.

Never before had the sibylline books been so often consulted, or seen to recommend such religious innovations. At the same time, there was a tremendous growth in private religions, for the people took to heeding their own priests and prophecies, imported, perhaps, or unacceptable at any rate to the traditions of Roman state religion.<sup>177</sup> Owing to these factors, it has been maintained that traditional Roman religion never really survived this epoch.<sup>178</sup> It was no longer distinguished from alien influences. Greek and even oriental practices pervaded the very heart of Roman religion, mixing freely with it, usurping its sacred rights and places, and invading even the Pomerium. There was no longer any effort at separation between Roman and alien religious values, and the fact that this distinction was no longer made is proven in at least two instances. Firstly, the great lectisternium of 217 consisted of rituals performed for twelve gods in all, Greek and Roman, treated as equals. Secondly, we might mention that Latin oracles, the Carmina Marciana, were admitted without hesitation into the Greek sibylline collection. In addition, there was extensive mixing of old and new elements in religion; a good example of this was the revival of the ver



sacrum in 217, an old Italic rite, and then, during the same war, the startling introduction of orgiastic, oriental influence with the entry of Cybele's cult.<sup>179</sup> Rome had, in fact, reached a fourth stage in her religious development, one which was distinguished primarily by the introduction of this orgiastic element.<sup>180</sup> In most of these changes the sibylline books were an important influence; as such they were in part responsible for the destruction of traditional religious values. This religious metamorphosis was closely connected with Rome's shedding of her city-state status, and her concomitant emergence as an international Mediterranean power. In this process, it has been said, she gained the world but lost her soul.<sup>181</sup>

An interrelation between Rome's religious and political activities at this time is thus evident; and at least one scholar, A. A. Boyce, has pointed out that Rome's great outburst of ritual activity after 219 cannot be explained by the extreme conditions of war terror alone.<sup>182</sup> Indeed, there are many problems which cannot be explained this way. Firstly, the prodigies between 218 and 205 are all much the same, yet the methods of expiation differ widely. Secondly, compared with the first years of the war, there is a notable lack of prodigy lists after 216. For this period only three such listings are to be found, and it is even more strange that none of them called for a consultation.<sup>183</sup> On the other hand, the five instances of 218--216 consistently resulted in consultations; most religious activity insofar as the books are concerned, excepting 212 and 204, dates from this period. It

is difficult to understand, on purely religious grounds, why the period 216--213 contains only one prodigy list, and no consultations at all, inasmuch as the extreme terror of these times would have made the Roman people most sensitive to prodigies, and open to superstition. One might argue that after 216 prodigies became less and less disturbing because they had been so common. They were no longer able to inspire the same intensity of fear, and thus the few examples on record were treated in a fairly normal fashion, without consultations. But how can one account for the result of the insignificant portents in 204, which led to an extraordinary consultation and ultimately to the momentous arrival of Cybele?

These problems cannot be solved by restricting our frame of reference to Roman religion. Their solutions may best be found in the area of contemporary politics, and we hope to make clear in this discussion that the operation of the sibylline books, and thus most religious activities, were influenced to a great extent by political motives. These motives were connected with the manoeuvres of various factions of the time, and we would best turn our attention at this point to the two family groupings discernable in internal Roman politics during the war, the Corneliï-Aemiliï, and the group which supported Fabius Maximus.

The Corneliï-Aemiliï held chief power in Roman politics between 222 and 216.<sup>184</sup> During this time they held seven patrician consulships, one patrician censorship, two or three plebeian consulships, and one-half of the known praetorships.

It was under the influence of this faction that the war with Hannibal was declared, and its generally aggressive policy (exemplified, for example, by the Scipionic manoeuvres in Spain) appears to have allied it to popular sentiments. As Scullard has pointed out, the people in this war consistently supported such a policy.<sup>185</sup> This is indicated by their clamors for an outright battle which led to Cannae, and also the support they gave to more progressive nobles, such as Scipio Africanus. In the Cornelian faction we may thus include popular leaders who supported aggressive policies, such as C. Flaminius, C. Terentius Varro, and M. Minucius Rufus.<sup>186</sup>

The career of C. Flaminius is of special interest, since he and the Scipios were most active during the first years of the war, and more particularly since Fabius rose to power in 217 at his expense. Before this time, Flaminius had enjoyed a long career of championing the people's cause against the nobility; and he had acquired an impressive list of military accomplishments.<sup>187</sup> This brilliant career led to his election to the consulship in 217. He was soon entrusted with leadership of the campaign in northern Italy, his colleague and ally being Cn. Servilius of the Cornelian faction.

The Fabian faction, linked to the families of the Atilii, Manlii, Marcii, Fulii, Mamilii, Otacilii, and Ogulnii, was not nearly as powerful as the Cornelii at the beginning of this war. Fabius Maximus himself, who was soon to become dictator after Flaminius' defeat at Trasimene, had few allies in power before 217.<sup>188</sup> His preference for a defensive military policy

coincided with that of the more conservative factions, and it is possible that he did not favor the declaration of war from the beginning, but rather advised caution and negotiation with Carthage. However, since his faction was weak at this time, he was little able to control such developments.

What is of special interest to this discussion is the manner in which Fabius, though lacking political support, was able to rise to the position of dictator in 217. It is clear that he did not achieve this by political means; the answer must be found elsewhere. Münzer was the first to suggest that Fabius' rise to power was linked with his religious campaigns and a great influence over the people that he derived from them.<sup>189</sup> If we look at Fabius' political career before this time, it appears limited and uneventful. He was consul in 233 and 228, censor in 230, and held a first dictatorship, probably comitiorum habendorum causa, between 221 and 219.<sup>190</sup> However, he was an augur of long standing, having been appointed to that priesthood in 265; and we would like to suggest here that he made use of this office, along with religious devices known to him, in particular the sibylline books, in his campaign for power.

Before considering Fabius' influence in the three consultations of 218-217, it would be best to recall briefly Rome's political and military position at that time. In opposition to Fabian wishes, war had been declared against Carthage at the prompting of the Cornelian faction, in all likelihood with the intention of destroying Carthage.<sup>191</sup> However, the aggres-

sive policy of this faction was a failure from the beginning: Hannibal quickly made his way to northern Italy; then followed the Cornelian defeats at Ticinus and Trebia. The latter in particular caused a great deal of panic at Rome.

In spite of this the Cornelian faction did well at the elections for 217, since C. Flaminius and Cn. Servilius Geminus were elected consuls.<sup>192</sup> Fabius Maximus was opposed to both of these men. Servilius Geminus had Cornelian affiliations; and Flaminius had been an enemy of the Fabians ever since the lex agraria of 232. In addition, he had done much since that time to alienate conservative factions. In his first consulship, in 223, he left Rome on a military campaign, and though he had neglected some religious duties before setting out, refused to obey an order of the senate to return. Moreover, there is a strong tradition that he again neglected the proper religious duties in 217, and slunk off to Ariminum to enter his consulship there, so that the senate could not hinder him.<sup>193</sup> This aristocratic tradition, used by Livy as a source, was not favorable to popular leaders. Thus some of the details, such as Flaminius' retirement to Ariminum, are of dubious historicity.<sup>193A</sup> There seems little doubt, however, that Flaminius did neglect his religious duties before setting out, since the tradition is a strong one and there is no proof against it.

If we remember that Fabius was also out of sympathy with the Cornelian declaration of war, and equally opposed to the way in which it was being handled, we can understand the extent

of his opposition to Cornelian policies and C. Flaminius in particular.

Apparently, Fabius started a religious campaign in Rome at this time. He was at an advantage because all who would have been in a position to oppose him politically were away from the city. We should look first to a great number of prodigies reported at this time from all over Italy, and, according to Livy, believed on small evidence.<sup>194</sup> The Livian implication is interesting for it casts doubt on the historicity of many of these prodigies. At any rate, these prodigies were reported to the senate and Atilius Serranus, an ally of Fabius, who was then praetor urbanus. At the same time Fabius, secure in his reputation as a respectable augur, using these prodigies as a pretext, did his best to arouse popular religio, pointing out, perhaps, the disastrous defeats in the north, and the irreligious people responsible for them. In his hands, these prodigies became a tool for indicating the extent of divine wrath at the war and the way it was being handled. According to Livy, these prodigies led to a consultation of the sibylline books.<sup>194</sup> We would like to suggest that Fabius was directly responsible for this manoeuvre, relying on the support of his good friend Atilius Serranus, and the state of public opinion which called for such a remedy. In addition, the senator Fabius Pictor, a Fabian ally, may have been a decemvir at this time, and thus in a position to help Fabius.<sup>195</sup> However, the fact that Fabius Maximus had some influence in this consultation is insinuated, if nowhere else, in its results.

Apart from the normal purifications, lectisternium, and sacrifices, two elements of the recommendation are unusual. Firstly, prayers were to be offered at the shrine of Hercules. In 209 Fabius brought a statue of Hercules from Tarentum and installed it on the Capitol next to his own statue;<sup>196</sup> this action has been interpreted as an indication that Fabius claimed, for his gens, descent from this demi-god.<sup>197</sup> It has also been argued that the cult of Hercules was still private in this century, associated only with private families and not publicly instituted. Thus, the appearance of Hercules in this list of rituals becomes significant.

The second recommendation of note is that advising G. Atilius Serranus to make certain solemn vows to be fulfilled if the state should suffer no misfortunes during the next ten years. Beyond doubt this man was an ally of Fabius; he appears here in the office of one effecting sibylline recommendations for which his faction was responsible in the first place. We should also point out that these remedies were clearly meant to apply to as large a portion of the people as possible, and to convince all as to the divine wrath. Livy tells us that the public mind was considerably relieved; these measures "magna ex parte levaverant religione animos".<sup>198</sup>

The next consultation took place in the early part of 217, very soon after the first. The books had never before been consulted in such close succession, and it seems that Fabius was again responsible, carrying on his campaign against the war and its present leaders with unrelenting intensity.

The political context of this consultation, if we can rely on the order of events in Livy, was Cn. Servilius' entrance on his consulship in Rome, and the report he made to the senate at this time concerning the plans and conduct of Flaminius.<sup>199</sup>

The fact that Flaminius had neglected auspicia on entering his office, and did so away from Rome so as to avoid senatorial opposition, together with this description of his military policies--all these considerations aroused a new wave of anger in the senate and more conservative factions. Exactly at this time a tremendous wave of prodigies was reported from all over Italy<sup>200</sup>; the sibylline books were again consulted, and they advised rituals similar to those recommended before. Once again these rites were meant to apply to as many people as possible, showing them that the pax deorum had been destroyed.<sup>201</sup>

Fabius' campaign to remove the opposing faction from power received great impetus from the disaster at Trasimene. Because of the first two consultations, he probably had a great deal of popular support even before this defeat occurred. And though he could not have foreseen Trasimene or counted on it in any way, it nevertheless was a lucky stroke in his favor and a tremendous blow to the Cornelian-popular faction. Trasimene made it possible for Fabius to assume powers without delay, since it demonstrated to the people that he had been right all along. The gods were indeed outraged at Flaminius' neglect of his religious duties; and this defeat came as the last and worst of a series of warnings. Accordingly,



Fabius was elected by the comitia centuriata to the office of dictator rei gerundae cause.<sup>202</sup>

Several aspects of this election point to the fact that Fabius' ascension to power was through the religious campaign we have been discussing. Firstly, he had little military experience, whereas his chief claim to distinction lay in the respectability he gained as an augur of long standing. Secondly, there were other men in Rome at this time with more distinguished military records, and thus more eligible for office.<sup>203</sup> Thirdly, it was not customary for a dictator to be chosen in this fashion, since that choice was a consular responsibility.<sup>204</sup> But C. Flaminius was dead, and the other consul, Cn. Servilius, away from Rome. Election was necessarily placed in the hands of the people, perhaps at Fabius' suggestion, since he had previously won them over to his side in his religious campaign against the Cornelii.<sup>205</sup>

Once in power, Fabius first of all attended to the needs of religion:

Q. Fabius Maximus dictator iterum quo die magistratum iniit vocato senatu, ab dis orsus cum edocuisset patres plus neglegentia caerimoniarum auspiciorumque quam temeritate atque inscitia peccatum a C. Flaminio consule esse, quaeque piacula irae deum essent ipsos deos consulendos esse, pervicit ut, quod non ferme decernitur, nisi cum taetra prodigia nuntiata sunt, decemviri libros Sibyllinos adire iuberentur.<sup>206</sup>

A consultation of this type was not without precedent, for Camillus had also ordered a consultation to purify the city after a previous military defeat, the occupation of Rome by the Gauls, c. 390. In Livy's account it is quite clear

as to Fabius' reason in consulting the books; and this confirms what we suggested for the other consultations. Opposition to Flaminius and Servilius, more than the prodigies themselves, was behind these religious manoeuvres.

Several motives are apparent in Fabius' thinking at this time. He wished to convince the public, once more, that Cornelian policy was incorrect, whereas his own was favored by the gods; and in this way he hoped to consolidate his position. Moreover, he wished to regain the people's confidence by showing that the cause for previous defeats was not the Roman people or soldiers themselves, but rather the irresponsible and irreligious generals who had been elected in their charge.<sup>207</sup>

Without doubt Fabius himself controlled this consultation and had a certain amount of influence in the announcement of the sibylline recommendations. The very fact that he ordered it suggests this. Amongst routine rituals, recommendations of note were for the celebration of great games in honour of Jupiter; a great lectisternium, the biggest ever celebrated, in honour of twelve gods; the dedication of shrines to Mens and Venus Erycina; and the institution of a ver sacrum. Of special interest are the dedications to Mens and Venus Erycina, and the ver sacrum. According to instructions found in the sibylline books, Fabius himself dedicated the shrine to Venus.<sup>208</sup> This fact would indicate that he attached some special importance to the cult of this goddess, though his motives for this dedication remain unknown.<sup>209</sup> The dedication to Mens is not nearly so problematic<sup>210</sup>, since this deified abstraction el-

evated to divine stature the process of right thinking, a combination of prudence and knowledge, which Fabius wished to associate with his faction and its policies.<sup>211</sup>

The ver sacrum, recommended on this occasion only by the sibylline books, appears to have been another religious device by which Fabius wished to obligate, and thus appeal to, as many people as possible. This remedy, though not a religious innovation, because of its rarity nevertheless assumed great importance under the circumstances.<sup>212</sup> We may assume that this precedent was set by Fabius, as the first lectisternium had been in 399, as a means of indicating divine wrath. The very fact that such an extraordinary remedy was necessary demonstrated, to the people, just how enraged the gods were.

In 216 the sibylline books were consulted on two occasions. The first is comparatively unimportant. Since it derived from prodigies, as had the first consultations during this war, and since it is found in a similar political context, we can with justification suspect that Fabius was again responsible. The fact that he played a rôle in previous consultations also points to this.

Fabius' dictatorship was terminated, according to law, in the latter part of 217. This was accompanied by a noticeable decline in his popularity, which was due in part to military policies that soon appeared futile to the people. In addition, Fabius did not have the complete co-operation of M. Rufus, and this made it even more difficult for him to make

a convincing display of his policies. Rufus secured a victory over Hannibal, having attacked against Fabius' orders, and this, together with Fabius' inability to prevent Hannibal from moving into Apulia for the winter, conspired to rob him of his imperium maius. Rufus was granted aequum imperium, and Fabius subsequently forfeited all powers when forced to resign before consular elections for the next year.

The newly elected consuls for 216 were M. Terentius Varro and Aemilius Paullus. Fabius had again brandished his religious powers before their election, this time relying on his influence in the augural college.<sup>213</sup> One of his motives was to prevent the election of Varro, for this man was a popular demagogue and much opposed to the Fabian faction.<sup>214</sup> In common with the people, he favored an aggressive policy, and wanted to end the war as quickly as possible.<sup>215</sup> However, Fabius' efforts were unsuccessful. Varro was elected consul, along with Aemilius Paullus, an unwilling candidate of the Aemilian-Cornelian faction.<sup>216</sup> The election at this time of two consuls opposed to the Fabian faction signified the latter's complete loss of power.

Yielding to popular demands, the senate decided to risk an open battle, and prepared to send its forces into the field under the new generals. Shortly before they left Rome, a new wave of prodigies was reported, and these in turn led to the consultation mentioned above.<sup>217</sup> The prodigies were customary, and the routine formulae advised for their propitiation contain nothing unusual. The interesting point here is that this

set of prodigies and consultation occurred just after the consulships had been gained by a Cornelian and a man from the popular faction. Exactly the same thing had happened after the election of Flaminius and Servilius in 217. It is also significant that these portents called for a consultation, while those of 214, which were every bit as alarming, did not. But Fabius was in power in 214, and had no need of the sibylline books, whereas in 216 he was not. We can be sure, then, that he was again continuing his religious campaign, warning the people that they had aroused divine wrath by electing men unfit to direct the war.

The battle of Cannae and its political implications are too well known to require discussion here. We need only point out that the terror and psychological state of the Roman people after this battle were comparable only to the feelings at Rome when the Gauls were threatening to invade, a decade before. Yet this battle, just like that of Trasimene, was a stroke of good fortune for the Fabian faction; it ensured once again Fabius' rise to power, necessitated the re-adoption of his policies, and indicated clearly that these policies had been correct all along. Indeed, they should never have been abandoned. On the other hand, this battle was a severe blow to the Cornelian faction, in that it deprived them of political control during the next few years.

It is true that Varro returned to Rome and lost little of his personal distinction. He was even thanked for not despairing of the republic. Though his faction was defeated,

he still wielded a certain amount of influence, and may have been responsible for the nomination of M. Junius Pera to the dictatorship after Cannae.<sup>218</sup> Thus, though Fabius was once more in a position to secure power, his return was still hindered by the remnants of Cornelian influence; and it was necessary for him to overcome these before he could procede to the consulship.

Most factors, of course, were in his favor, and we can be certain that he turned these to his greatest advantage. Firstly, a lectio senatus was held, and 177 new members were added. This was supervised by a member of the Fabian faction, Fabius Buteo. It is likely that the newly-formed body was predisposed to favor the nobility, the Fabians in particular.<sup>219</sup> Secondly, we know that Fabius had many other amici in influential positions at the moment. For example, there was Fabius Pictor, senator and perhaps decemvir, who was sent, after Cannae, to inquire at Delphi the proper forms of propitiation for appeasing the angry gods. Thirdly, it must have been obvious to the entire state that Fabian policies were not only advantageous, but necessary if Rome were to survive. Fabius could profit from the disgrace into which other policies had fallen.

The second consultation of 216, which took place shortly after Cannae, was associated with a series of evilomens. The worst of these was the stuprum of two Vestal virgins.<sup>220</sup> Certain scholars have seen the prime reason for this consultation in the psychological needs of the people, aggravated by great terror after Cannae.<sup>221</sup> This is undoubtedly true, in a broad

sense; but we would like to suggest that Fabius again was the direct force behind this consultation. His manipulation of the sibylline books, as well as a mission to Delphi because of the same problems, constituted a two-pronged attack against the Cornelli, in particular against the election of Varro and Paullus, whose policies had resulted in Cannae. The modus operandi of Fabius is becoming very familiar to us by now. He was again using the books to increase public concern over military errors, and, more importantly, to show the people the necessity of avoiding such policies in future. In this way he was able to consolidate his power and win over their sympathies.

Though it is not certain that Fabius Pictor took part in this consultation, the fact that he was head of the mission to Delphi is beyond doubt. This fact, taken with the possibility that he was a decemvir, makes that assumption a reasonable one. In addition, we have already seen that Fabius himself had ordered a consultation after the defeat at Trasimene. We are justified in assuming, then, that he was responsible in this case also.

The books advised the human sacrifice of two Greeks and two Gauls, a ritual identical with that of 226,<sup>222</sup> when similar people were immured in a subterranean dungeon in the Forum Boarium, and left to perish there of suffocation and hunger. The choice of victims remains a problem, and the rite was obviously drawn from instructions similar to those followed in 226. It is futile to look for Greek and Gallic troubles

at this time to justify such a sacrifice, which clearly dates from an earlier time.<sup>223</sup> The chief importance and value of this rite surely lay in the simple fact that it entailed human sacrifice. Probably the nationality of those sacrificed, which was at most a secondary consideration, mattered little by this time.<sup>224</sup>

With this extraordinary rite, then, Fabius allayed popular fears and convinced all that Rome's religious obligations and political policies were best left in the hands of his faction. Only a year later he was elected consul for the third time, and even on this occasion we can see his religious trickery at work. M. Claudius Marcellus, a plebeian, was elected to the consulship, but "thunder was conveniently heard, and the augurs declared that he was vitio creatus".<sup>225</sup> The patricians spread a rumor that the gods were displeased at the election of a plebeian consul; Marcellus soon resigned, and the augur Fabius was elected in his place.

Thus, using the sibylline books and his office as augur, Fabius again rose to power. These instruments were used to forge a personality cult that had a great effect on the people. To sum up: it was not through military talent or distinction that Fabius rose to power in 217 and 215, for his means depended strictly on religious institutions. With the sibylline books he had controlled popular sentiments; the office of augur helped him control elections; and, finally, we should add that his position as Pontifex Maximus (216) might have proven helpful in increasing the sphere of his influence.



The Fabian faction was predominant between 216 and 213. In addition to other offices they held six consulships; even Fabius' son, an undistinguished individual, received this honor. The fact that there were no consultations during this period, even though prodigies were still reported, is explained by the realization that Fabius' power was secure.<sup>226</sup>

However, once again Fabian policies produced no significant military results. Though there were no defeats, this unspectacular policy wearied the people after a few years, and they came to desire a more efficacious manner of handling the war. This situation was identical to that before Cannae, when popular factions pressed for an open battle. Thus the war dragged on, popularity of the Fabian faction waned, and the balance of power began to shift. Desires for a new policy became evident by 212, when no Fabians were admitted to office. All commands changed in 212; and this year seems to have witnessed a resurgence of the Cornelian faction, discontent after a long silence, and beginning now, with victory imminent in Spain and the seige of Capua undertaken, to renew its strength.

The sibylline books were consulted for the sixth time in that year. Because of the war's slow progress, in desperation and impatience the people of Rome had abandoned traditional religion and taken to private forms of worship that were unacceptable to the state.<sup>227</sup> This superstition had developed to such an extent that the praetor Aemilius Lepidus was instructed by the senate to collect all books of prophecies, prayers, or rituals that were unorthodox in the eyes of Roman

religion.<sup>228</sup> The next year, as a result of this search, two prophecies of the Roman seer Marcius came to light, and the content of one of these led to a consultation of the sibylline books.<sup>229</sup> The first prophecy was a correct prediction of the battle at Cannae<sup>230</sup>; the other promised victory over Hannibal if annual games were celebrated in honour of Apollo. The former was clear and correct, whereas the latter caused a great deal of consternation, and Livy tells us that the senate spent a whole day disentangling its meaning. On the day after a decree was passed authorizing the decemviri to consult the books for verification and interpretation of this oracle. The books reiterated the Marcian prophecy and likewise suggested that games be celebrated in honour of Apollo. Accordingly, these games were vowed and held, victoriae causa.

Many aspects of this affair lead one to think that it was contrived beforehand.<sup>231</sup> Firstly, it was a member of the Cornelian faction, Aemilius Lepidus, who organized the search for prophecies; and having found the Marcian oracles, he turned them over to another Cornelian man, Cornelius Sulla. Secondly, these oracles appear to be fabrications. It was no difficult matter to invent an oracle predicting Cannae after the battle had occurred. By creating this oracle, whose accuracy was obvious, the Cornelians were able to lend credence to the second oracle, which was relevant to their present purposes. If we look at the text of this second oracle, which is quoted in Livy, two things catch the eye.<sup>231A</sup> The games to be celebrated in honour of Apollo were to be under the jurisdiction

of the best praetor, undoubtedly a reference to Cornelius Sulla who had received these oracles in the first place. Secondly, the rites associated with these games were to be performed by the decemvirs in the Grecian manner. The former command was obviously meant to keep control of the games in the Cornelian faction, ostensibly since they were the promoters of these games in the first place. The second command seems to have been inserted as a pretext for consulting the sibylline books, since in matters such as these that concerned the ritus Graecus, the decemvirs usually depended upon sibylline advice. In addition, the prophecy that Ludi Apollinares would lead to victory is important. The Cornelii, in all likelihood responsible for these oracles, wished to associate these games with a new period in the war, one involving a new and more successful policy, and, we can sure, under their control.

The Cornelian faction could not hope to gain popular support by means of the two Marcian oracles alone. This explains the clever provision therein for a consultation of the sibylline books. Support from the latter would lend respectability and weight to the suggestion for Ludi Apollinares, and thus would be an invaluable assistance in carrying out the Cornelian purpose. We notice that the books conveniently agreed with everything contained in the Marcian oracle. But this is not surprising if we note that at least half of the decemviral board at this time was drawn from the Cornelian faction.<sup>232</sup>

From the foregoing it should be clear that the Cornel-

ian faction was responsible for this consultation and its results. Their political motives must thus be considered an important force behind this consultation. What were these motives? By wielding the same tool Fabius himself had employed in his rise to power, they hoped to prevent him from using it against themselves; at the same time, following his example perhaps, they were using it to increase their own power and bring themselves into the public eye. It is even possible that they made efforts, during the period of Fabian supremacy (216--213), to secure this means for their own use, since Fabius no longer needed or used it.

A second motive was made apparent in the recommendation of games for Apollo.<sup>233</sup> These represent a return to the Mos maiorum, since they were associated with a state cult that was respectable in the eyes of traditional Roman religion, and divorced from any of the subversive influences that had lately been making their way into religious life. Indeed, these games indicate a reaction against the personal and private rituals which had been advised by the books when they were in the control of Fabius Maximus. These rituals had, in fact, paved way for the uncontrolled superstition of 213.

However, like the recommendations of Fabius, these games were meant to appeal to a great number of people. From a psychological point of view we can see that their purpose was to allay superstition, providing a more healthy way for the people to amuse themselves and occupy their minds.<sup>234</sup>

By way of a fourth purpose, it should be pointed out that

these games, because of their vast appeal and overall freshness, were surely meant to be associated with the emergence of a new Cornelian policy. The people had again become dissatisfied with Fabian tactics; all they could do was turn, once more, to another faction for help. Thus it is clear why these games were celebrated victoriae causa, and identified by both the Marcian and sibylline writings with the expulsion of Hannibal.

If one assumes that these games were also celebrated locally by Rome's allies, a further motive, a highly practical one, may be seen in their institution. L. R. Taylor has already suggested that the Ludi Saeculares. 348 were held with a view to maintaining the good will of Rome's Latin allies, who were discontent and threatening to break away.<sup>235</sup> Prior to 212, Rome had lost many of her allies to Hannibal, and in 213 in particular many of the Greek cities had deserted to his side. Hannibal's main plan was to win over as many of Rome's allies as possible, and in this way surround her with enemies. Rome realized this, and it certainly would have been in the best interests of the newly emerging Cornelian policy to secure the good will of as many of these allies as possible. These games, therefore, could have played a rôle in that campaign.

The sibylline books were consulted on only one more occasion before the end of this war.<sup>236</sup> This occurred in 205, and is closely associated with the political ascendancy of Scipio Africanus.<sup>237</sup> The military policy with which he hoped to end the war was antipathetic to the Fabian faction; we thus find, even at this late date, the same factional struggle as in the earlier

years of the war. In fact, differences of opinion reached their maximum intensity at this time. In this context, we should mention two speeches quoted in Livy. Firstly, that of Fabius, attacking the proposed African campaign,<sup>238</sup> and secondly, that of Scipio, arguing in favor of it.<sup>239</sup> While the details or even the historicity of the occasion of these speeches cannot be trusted, the mental outlook of these speakers, hence that of their factions, may be taken as correct in a broad sense.

Scipio wished to assume an offensive policy, carry the war to Africa, and thereby force Hannibal's return home. He felt that a purely Italian policy was now obsolete; his faction was in favor of increasing Rome's status to that of an international power. Correspondingly, this faction was also Hellenic in outlook.<sup>240</sup> In part this stemmed from the family tradition, which was liberal and aggressive; and Scipio's recent campaign in Spain may also have played a significant<sup>241</sup> part.

On the other hand, Fabius favored an antithetical policy: inclining more towards a defensive approach, he wished to end the war at home, and his interests were confined to the expulsion of Hannibal from Italy. Destruction of Carthage was not important to his faction; its provincial interests, ostensibly opposed to Hellenism or internationalism, did not extend beyond the borders of Italy.

Scipio's rise to power after 212 is well known. His faction gained much influence over these years; the victory over Hasdrubal at the Metaurus in 207 and the destruction of Mago's plans undoubtedly gave their reputation a new lustre.

The victory at the Metaurus is interesting for us because it represented a victory of the Claudian and Cornelian factions working in co-operation; in connection with the religious manoeuvres of 205/04 we will again see the Claudii assisting the Cornelii. However, Cornelian policies were the prime factor in the campaigns of these years, and these resulted, by 205, in Hannibal's retirement to Bruttium.

The Cornelii secured both consulships in 206 and 205. Scipio Africanus himself received a consulship in 205, and naturally wished to seize this opportunity to carry out his African policy. The institution of this new policy was the prime aim of his supporters, and we would like to suggest that they even used the sibylline books in their efforts to achieve this. We know from Livy that Fabian opposition was extreme; though this faction had done little during recent years, its influence in the state was still felt. This is indicated by Fabius' speech, and even more so by the unrelenting efforts of his faction to limit Scipio's Sicilian preparations for the invasion of Africa. Indeed, Scipio was given only two legions, consisting mainly of the survivors of Cannae, and because of this he resorted to an appeal for volunteers. Thus, though the Cornelii were predominant at this time, they were still harassed by Fabian opposition. Fabius must have relied in particular on the authority and influence of his position as princeps senatus, which he had held since 209.<sup>242</sup>

Scipio was very confident of victory, inexplicably so, according to Livy.<sup>243</sup> Doubtless he had no hesitations about

his military policy; his only problem at this point was that of convincing the entire state as to the validity of his plans, crushing, in particular, his Fabian opponents. Since it is reasonably clear that the sibylline books were used to accomplish this, we would best turn our attention now to events associated with the consultation of 205, and see how they relate to Cornelian purposes.

According to Livy, a sudden wave of superstition and an unusual outburst of stone-rain led the senate to consult the books. The fact that such an unimportant prodigy could lead to a wave of superstition and in turn to a consultation, shows clearly that these items were but pretexts for a consultation.<sup>244</sup> In all likelihood the Cornelian faction was responsible.

In any case, the books said that if a foreign enemy should ever invade Italy, he could be defeated if Cybele, the Magna Mater, were brought from Pessinus to Rome. We note with interest that a delegation had been sent to Delphi some time before, consisting of C. Pomponius Matho and Q. Catius, the purpose being to dedicate gifts from the booty of Hasdrubal. It returned, conveniently enough, at this very time, bringing a Delphic prophecy which declared that Rome was about to win a great victory. The senate was thus all the more encouraged to import Cybele, nor could it have been blind to the great confidence of Scipio.

The Cornelii exerted great influence both with respect to this consultation and the prophecy brought back from Delphi. They had majority control in the consultation, since at least



five members of the decemviral college were Corneli, at least one a Claudian, while we cannot be sure that the Fabii were represented at all.<sup>245</sup> And, since the Claudii had been favoring the Corneli since their victory at the Metaurus, we can assume that they also worked together in this college. Thus the Corneli exerted a controlling influence in the process of this consultation; it can thus be claimed, on that basis, that they were responsible for the consultation in the first place, and that its results were predetermined in accordance with their purposes.

Also, of the two-man delegation sent to Delphi, C. Pomponius Matho was both a Cornelian and a decemvir. Since the result of this expedition so closely and conveniently corresponded with the sibylline recommendation, we may assume that Cornelian influence was active there also.

The senate decided to import Cybele, and appointed a five man commission to fetch her from Phrygia.<sup>246</sup> Four of the five men on this commission belonged to the Cornelian-Claudian coalition. Another factor indicates that Cornelian influence prevailed in this delegation, for it was suggested, when they visited the Delphic oracle on the way to Phrygia, that the goddess should be welcomed, on her arrival in Rome, by the best man in the city. The man thus chosen was Scipio Nasica, cousin of Scipio Africanus. Livy was unable to explain this choice; but if we see that the whole affair was a Cornelian manoeuvre, this difficulty is removed. In this way the Corneli chose a man of their own faction to complete an elaborate

religious campaign which they directed throughout.

The importation of this oriental cult represents the most extraordinary innovation of the sibylline books, and as such the climax in the development of these books as a political-religious instrument. What were Cornelian motives in importing this goddess? Firstly, in importing a religious symbol which both the sibylline books and the Delphic oracle associated with final victory, the Cornelii wished to convince people and senate alike that their policy was instrumental in achieving this victory. The fact that this victory-goddess was foreign and exotic perhaps implied that a successful military campaign would have to be carried out on foreign soil, not at home. Secondly, this goddess foretold a destruction of Rome's provinciality and her emergence as an international power. This enlargement of Rome's horizons, to which the Fabii were so opposed, was closely connected with the other attributes of Cornelian policy: Hellenism, internationalism, and offensive military campaigns carried out on foreign soil.

This rather involved discussion of important consultations between 753 and 204 leads to some over-all conclusions which should be mentioned at this point. Apart from their value and influence in the field of Roman religion, the sibylline books appear to have been used consistently and frequently by various political factions. They were manipulated from time to time in accordance with the interests of those who controlled them, becoming, by the time of the second Punic War, a subtle but valuable source of power. The use made of these books recalls

Fabius Maximus' manipulation of the auspices, and the remark of Cicero in this connection:

"augurque cum esset, dicere ausus est optimis auspiciis ea geri, quae pro rei publicae salute gererentur; quae contra rem publicam ferrentur, contra auspicia ferri".<sup>247</sup>

In the source Livy used for events concerning 461, Valerius Antias, we find confirmation of an attitude, prevalent during the time of Sulla, that the sibylline books were an instrument open to the manipulation of various political factions. We also find the unproveable suggestion that this was the case as early as 461. However, the consultations of 399 and 293 reveal signs of political manipulation; and there seems little doubt that by the time of the second Punic War manipulation of the books was a certainty. Indeed, political manoeuvres involving the sibylline books reached a climax of notable intensity at this time. Each of the seven recorded consultations seems to have been related to the ascendancy or decline of various family factions which were competing for control of the war. Whereas the first five consultations, those of 218--216, appear to have been influenced by Fabian policy in an effort to develop the personality cult of Fabius himself, the consultations of 212 and 205 promoted the ascendancy of the Cornelii, and seem to have had, as their aim, the institution of an offensive military policy favored by that faction.

## NOTES FOR CHAPTER TWO

80. The instances of 214, (Livy XXIV, 10), 209 (Livy XXVII, 11), 208 (Livy XXVII, 23), and 207 (Livy XXVII, 37) are debateable. Livy makes no reference to sibylline consultations for these years, yet he is usually explicit, especially during the war years, about consultations, for example those of 218, 217, 216, 212, and 204. It is because the decemviri conducted various sacrifices and rituals in these years that one might think that the sibylline books had been consulted. However, this cannot be documented; if there were consultations in each case, we feel that Livy would certainly have mentioned the fact. He never misses an opportunity to use a sibylline consultation to heighten the dramatic effect of his narrative, nor would his close scrutiny of the Annales Maximi for these years allow him to ignore the pontifical records. Even the year 207, to which Diels (op. cit., P. 90, 103) assigns the oracular fragments found in Phlegon, Mir. 10, is now considered very unlikely. See A. A. Boyce, TAPA, 1937, P. 170 f., who assigns these oracles to 125 B. C.; and Rzach in Pauly--Wissowa, "sibyllinische orakel", 2111, 2112.

81. Bouche-Leclercq, op. cit., IV, P. 294, distinguishes between abnormal and normal prodigies. Normal prodigies, that is those which fitted a traditional pattern, would be tended by the pontifices. Another classification, prodigies that were somewhat irregular, would be interpreted by the haruspices. Only the most irregular and shocking portents would call for a consultation of the sibylline books.

82. In this listing, portents are given in order of frequency:

1. Lightning striking various objects, buildings, or people
2. Rains of stones, earth, chalk, milk, lumps of meat
3. Flying objects appearing in the sky
4. Eclipses and other astronomical phenomena
5. Blood appearing on various objects, or in rivers and lakes
6. Earthquakes and tremors
7. Fire appearing in the sky, ocean, or on ordinary objects
8. Animals that talk, or infants that talk shortly after birth
9. Objects moving of their own accord.
10. Animals whose movements or actions are strange.
11. Sexual incontinence of the Vestal Virgins

Sexual incontinence of the Vestals was considered an evil omen of the worst type. See W.W. Fowler, Op. Cit., P. 330.

83. A good example of this is the rain of stones in 204, which of itself supposedly led to the importation of Cybele.

84. The consultation described by Plutarch, Pub. XXI, is questionable for several reasons. Firstly, many events assigned to the time of Valerius Publicola are of doubtful historicity. Plutarch's main source, Valerius Antias, is therefore suspect, and the account of this consultation correspondingly loses in authenticity. See L. R. Taylor, A. J. Phil., 1934, P. 111. Secondly, this consultation, if we place it in 504, the year of Valerius' fourth consulship, is the earliest on record, since the first consultation that

seem to fit into the genuine tradition was in 496 (Dion. VI, 17). Many details of Plutarch's consultation are suspect; the prodigies are not customary, and the recommendation of the books that certain games, having been recommended by Apollo, be renewed, is unlikely, since the first Ludi Apollinares were held no earlier than 212 (Livy XXV, 12).

Another disputable consultation is associated with the affair of 362, when near the middle of the forum a great cleft appeared in the earth, according to Dionysius (XIV, 10) of fathomless depth, and remaining for several days. This portent led to some unusual rites including voluntary human sacrifice. A sibylline consultation in connection with these rites is mentioned by Dionysius, but Livy's account (VII, 6), which is the more detailed, omits all mention of the sibylline books. It was suggested, at any rate, that if things of greatest value were thrown down into the hole, the earth would again close up and become correspondingly more productive in the future. A certain Marcus Curtius interpreted this to mean that the best of human beings should also be thrown in, and accordingly threw himself in. Both sources treat this episode as if it were a legendary story, with little basis in historic fact. Livy's version, omitting mention of the consultation, appears to be the more reliable, making that of Dionysius seem fabled and mythological in comparison. We may justifiably discount this as a genuine consultation, especially since Livy indicates that it was the soothsayers, the vates, who induced people to throw valuable things into the chasm. Livy is usually prompt at mentioning consultations, paying great attention to such things, and not overlooking a single proveable consultation for this period. Dionysius appears to have used very suspect sources, or perhaps added a bit of his own to the story.

85. Livy III, 10; Livy IV, 21; Livy VII, 28; Livy X, 31

86. Livy XXI, 62; Livy XXII, 1; Livy XXV, 37, Livy XXII, 57; Livy XXIX, 10.

87. Livy IV, 21; IV, 24; V, 13; VII, 2; VII, 27; X, 31; X, 47; Orosius III, 21; Val. Max. I, 8; Orosius IV, 5.

88. See page 88, n. 80.

89. Fears of this type did not always result in consultations. On at least two occasions, in 428 (Livy IV, 30) and 212 (Livy XXV, 1), people abandoned traditional religious rites and took to imported remedies that were not acceptable within the bounds of state religion. This pre-occupation with non-Roman rites grew to such an extent the immediate use of brute force by the authorities was the only remedy. Effective immediately, all foreign religious rituals were outlawed, and all prophecies in current circulation were collected and destroyed. The books were not consulted, perhaps, because the situation demanded a quicker remedy.

90. Dion. VI, 17

91. Plut., Marc., III

92. Livy XXI, 62; XXII, 37

93. Livy XXII, 57; XXV, 1; XXV, 12; XXIX, 10

94. Livy III, 10
95. Livy X, 50
96. Livy V, 13.
97. Livy X, 47
98. Plut. Marc., III; Dio XXII, 50; Zon. VIII, 19
99. Livy XXII, 9 f.
100. Livy XXII, 57
101. Livy XXV, 12
102. Livy XXIX, 10
103. Dion. VI, 17; Livy IV, 21; IV, 25; V, 50; VII, 28; XXI, 62; XXI, 1; XXII, 9; XXII, 37.
104. A good example is the only recommendation of a ver sacrum, Held in 217.
105. We are concerned with these and the other gods only insofar as their traits shed light on the political and religious motives of the sibylline books in ordering their importation. It would be superfluous, indeed pretentious, to try to give here an adequate discussion of their origins, rituals, and subsequent adaptation to Roman religion. These are religious studies, and for the most part divorced from political perspectives relevant to this discussion. For Cybele the reader is referred to J. G. Frazer, The Golden Bough, ed. T. H. Gaster, P. 177--180, F. Cumont, Oriental Religions in Roman Paganism (New York, 1911), p. 47 f., and K. Latte, Römische Religionsgeschichte, (Munich, 1960), P. 258. For Aesculapius, Jane Harrison, Prolegomena to the Study of Ancient Religion (New York, 1903), P. 340 f; J. B. Carter, op. cit., P. 72 f; W.W.Fowler, op. cit., P. 260, and K. Latte, op. cit., P. 225.
106. Dion. VI, 17
107. Carter, op. cit., P. 72 f., draws an interesting parallel between the probable Cumaean source of the sibylline books and the fact that Rome was already, at this time, beginning to obtain her imported grain supply from Cumae. In effect Rome's grain and the chief Greek cult associated with grain came from the same place. Carter's extensive discussion of the links between Dionysius and Liber, Ceres and Demeter, Kore and Libera, is valuable; Bouché-Leclercq, op. cit., IV, P. 297, also discusses this. Carter's argument and the obvious Greek origin of this divine trio may be used to discount the theory of R. Bloch, op. cit., P. 99, that the books and gods in question were exclusively Etruscan at this time, and that no Greek influence was yet operative.
108. J. B. Carter, op. cit., P. 77 and 79
109. Livy IV, 25
110. For the evidence, see W.W.Fowler, op. cit., P. 268, n.29
111. This tradition is best summarized in the sixth book of Vergil's Aeneid, 65 ff. It is represented in historical fact by the celebration, in 212, of the Ludi Apollinares. Livy XXV, 12.
112. See Page 34
113. L. R. Taylor, A. J. Phil., 1934, P. 111 f.
- 113A. Ovid, Fasti, VI, 210:  
 "Altera pars Circi Custode sub Hercule tuta est;  
 quod deus Euboico carmine munus habet.

114. The lectisternium took its origins in the Greek rituals of *κλίσιν* and *θεοσεύειν*, and after its arrival in Rome became closely associated with the ritual of supplicatio, the only process in Roman religion in which all people could take part. The lectisternium allowed people to become personally and emotionally involved in a rite which was highly extraordinary for its time. Its Greek origin has been affirmed by many scholars, for example G. Bloch in D.-S., "duumviri s. f.", and W.W.Fowler, op. cit., P. 264. This ritual involved placing statues of various gods on couches, reclining as if at a banquet. This procedure possessed an extraordinary psychological value. It stimulated an emotional response and a sense of personal participation which were in marked contrast to customary Roman rituals. The extent to which all people, even slaves foreigners, and prisoners, took part is indicated in Livy's first discussion of this rite, V, 13, f. Best discussion of the lectisternia may be found in W.W.Fowler, op. cit., P. 263 f; Bouché-LeClerq, op. cit., IV, P. 298 f.; G. Bloch in D.-S., "duumviri s. f.", and K. Latte, op. cit., P. 242.

115. Livy V, 13; VII, 2; VII, 27; XXI, 62; XXII, 1; XXII, 9 f., and XXIX, 14. Concerning the second lectisternium, it should be mentioned that Livy indicates a third in 364, yet nowhere makes mention of the second. According to A. A. Boyce, TAPA, 1938, P. 171, the second probably took place c. 390, and may well have been part of the city's purification after the Gallic invasion. B. O. Foster, Livy (Loeb Classical Library), III, suggests that the occasion was in 392, Livy V, 31, 5. Concerning the lectisternium of 204, it is only known that this was held in celebration of Cybele's arrival in Rome; since the sibylline books had dictated the manner of her entry, it is likely that this lectisternium was also advised by them. However, there were several other lectisternia celebrated during this period which cannot be linked with consultations, for example those of 214 and 209; and this suggestion remains a conjecture.

116. Livy VII, 2

117. Livy XXII, 9

118. Livy XXV, 12

119. Livy XXIX, 14

120. For discussion of the rituals and organization of these games, see W.W.Fowler, op. cit., P. 438 f., Bouché-Leclercq, op. cit., IV, P. 300 f., and K. Latte, op. cit., P.

121. For discussion of these problems, the reader is referred in particular to L. R. Taylor, New Light on the History of the Secular Games, A. J. Phil., 1934. This scholar's persuasive reasoning places the first Ludi Saeculares sometime between 364 and 338, and for various reasons clarified in that article, chooses 348 as the most likely year for the first celebration of these games. The year 249 thus was the second celebration; the third was c. 149, and the fourth would have been c. 49, had not internal politics interfered. However, this argument does not agree with Livy's statement (Per. 49), which indicates that the games of 149 were the fourth in the

series; nor does it agree with the ancient tradition (Val. Max. II, 4, 5, and Cen. 17) that these games had been celebrated since the beginning of the republic. Taylor's work is convincing to this extent only: Ludi Saeculares were celebrated sometime c. 348. But it cannot be maintained with so little documentation that the games of this year were first in the series.

122. Some scholars, such as Diels, maintain that the early Ludi Tarentini merged into the Ludi Saeculares in this year; thus 249 was the date of the first authentic secular games.

123. Livy, Per. 49; Augustine, Civ. Dei, III, 18; Cen. 17

124. Varro, ap. Cen. 17

125. Aug., Civ. Dei, III, 18

126. Sources connecting the two institutions, in addition to those listed above, are Zos. II, 1; Verrius Flaccus in the Pseudo-Arco Scholia on Horace, Car. Sec. 8; and CIL VI, 32323.

127. Livy XXVII, 23; XXVII, 11

128. Lucr., De Re. Nat., II, 600 f.; Dion. II, 19

129. Plut., Marc., III; Zon. VIII, 19; Livy XXII, 57.

130. Livy III, 10. This was a warning against factional strife.

131. Livy XXII, 9

132. A. A. Boyce, TAPA, 1938, P. 163

133. However, the four references to oracles that were entirely prophetic in nature for this period (Dio, XII, 50; Zon. VIII, 19; Zon. IX, 1; Appian, Mac., II) may be discounted. None of these is mentioned by Livy, and they do not conform to the traditional nature of sibylline recommendations. Since they are mainly prophetic in implication, they appear to be false sibylline oracles that were in circulation; or perhaps they were conveniently invented after the events predicted had happened. This seems true especially of the oracles mentioned by Zonaras (IX, 1) and Appian (Mac., II), which predicted Cannae and Rome's victory over Philip of Macedon respectively. The false oracles of 226 and 228, rather than being the result of a consultation, were perhaps the reason for one, that of 226 which advised human sacrifice.

134. The possibility that the Ludi Saeculares c. 348 were held as an effort to consolidate the wavering loyalty of Rome's Latin allies, before the league dissolved in 338, is well supported by L. R. Taylor, loc. cit. Apart from internal evidence in the oracle that has come down to us (Zos. II, 1; also reproduced by Phlegon in Jacoby, Fragmente der Griechischen Historiker, IIB, P. 1189), her argument is based on Phlegon's preface to his citation of the oracle, loc. cit., which refers explicitly to the disaffection of the allies.

134A. Livy III, 9, f.; Dion. X, 1, f.

135. Livy III, 10, 7: "Id factum ad impediendam legem tribuni criminabantur..... coram in foro personare fabulam compositam Volsci belli, Hernicos ad partes paratos".

136. In several aspects the historicity of Antias' account, which Livy used here, is suspect. He is wrong in stating that Terentilius' proposal was for quinque viri



legibus de imperio consulari scribendis, which should have been quinque viri consulari imperio de legibus scribendis. See R. M. Ogilvie, op. cit., P. 412 f. The issue at this time was not that of limiting powers of the consuls in particular, but rather the codification and publication of a set of laws to supersede the *ἄρπαφος νόμος* by which patrician powers governed. Evidence indicates that Antias made this change for reasons of contemporary propaganda. He supported the political reforms of Sulla, whose prime aim was to prevent the possibility of a single person acquiring great military support, and thus being able to blackmail the senate. This fear of a military magnate is reflected in Livy's immoderata, infinita potestate (III, 9). In addition to Ogilvie, see Mommsen, Staatsrecht II, 702, n. 2; and A. Klotz, Livius (Amsterdam, 1964), P. 257--59. We can see, then, that Livy's source for this account was written in terms of Sullan attitudes; and this distortion extends even to his treatment of this consultation of the sibylline books. It seems that the portents in question (Klotz, op. cit., P. 258) originally led only to a warning concerning pericula a conventu alienigenarum; thus Antias has added the warning against factious politics, and inferred that the portents also had a bearing on internal politics. Because of these factors, this account is a more valuable indication of Sullan outlook than it is of what actually happened in 461.

137. Livy V, 11, f.; Dion. XII, 9.

138. The sources for both accounts seem reliable, and it appears that Piso was used. See Ogilvie, op. cit., P. 655. However, his accusation that the "bank holiday" atmosphere of the lectisternium is a false addition to the account cannot be documented. We know that this was a trait of the Greek counterpart of this ritual, the theoxenia; and there is little reason to suppose that the first lectisternium held at Rome was not a duplication of the Greek ritual in every way possible. For the Greek rite, see Pfister in Pauly--Wissowa, "Theoxenia".

139. Livy V, 13.

140. Livy V, 13.

141. For a good discussion of this particular lectisternium, see Ogilvie, op. cit., P. 656-7. He deals with reasons for the choice of each of the six gods worshipped, though his conclusions and documentation are hardly conclusive.

142. The religious significance of the introduction of this ritual, the religious need which was satisfied by its introduction, and the contrast between this rite and traditional Roman rituals, are well discussed by Bouché-Leclercq, op. cit., IV, P. 299 f.; and also by W.W. Fowler, Op. Cit., P. 263 f.

143. Livy VI, 37 f.

144. A good example of the patricians claiming religious duties as a traditional right may be found in Livy, IV, 2. During the dispute about the proposed Lex Canuleia, the consuls indicated that the passage of this law would pollute both public and private auspices, since it would permit intermarriage between the plebs and the patricians. Thus it is clear that the taking of the auspices was a patrician duty, one of long standing.

145. G. Bloch in D.-S., "duumviri s. f." New rites introduced by this body were identified with the plebs since many of them admitted lower classes actively into religious rituals for the first time. Rituals advised by this board were always open to all. See A. A. Boyce, TAPA, 1938, P. 170.

146. Bouché-Leclercq, op. cit., IV, P. 292; B. Bloch in D.-S., "duumviri s. f."; Carter, op. cit., P. 66. According to Carter, the form of the title duoviri sacris faciundis is peculiar, as it bears no resemblance to the proper names of other religious colleges. It is, rather, based on the plan of the titles of special committees appointed by the senate for administrative purposes.

147. W.W.Fowler, op. cit., P. 259, suggests that keepers of the sibylline books did not become a permanent body until this time. In other words, the committee of the duoviri were always used on a temporary basis, then disbanded until next needed. But there is no support for a conjecture of this type, and it is unreasonable to argue that a temporary two-man board suddenly was found inadequate and had to be altered, in 367, into a permanent body of ten men. One would think instead that the process of development before 367 had been that of slow evolution, and that the duoviri, though they might originally have been a temporary committee, had become permanent long before.

148. This is very likely, as it was the case with all other religious bodies. Bouché-Leclercq, op. cit., IV, P. 291; B. Bloch, in D.-S., "duumviri s. f."

149. There is no evidence for the suggestion of Radke, 1140, in Pauly-Wissowa, "Quindecimviri", that the decemviral board had one magister, who alone was responsible for consultation and interpretation. There is, however, some evidence that the decemviral board, during the republic, had two magistri, one of which was presumably patrician, the other plebeian. This arrangement would reflect the plebeian-patrician struggle and the constitution of the newly-formed body in 367. One of the five patricians would be magister over his faction; likewise one of the five plebeians would head his group. Our only evidence for this tradition is Augustan (the Fasti Capitolini, CIL I, ed. 2, P. 29); but there is little reason to suppose that it is not a correct reflection of republican tradition. The evidence in question is an entry in the Fasti Capitolini pertaining to the celebration of the Ludi Saeculares in 236, and listing the names of the two magistri. The date is fictitious, devised to agree with Augustus' calculation of dates for the secular games; but this should not prevent us from realizing that, in Augustan times, there was a strong tradition of two decemviral magistri in earlier republican times. See also Bouché-Leclercq, op. cit., IV, P. 292; and L. R. Taylor, A. J. Phil., 1934, P. 105

150. J. Hild in D.-S., "sibyllini libri", misinterpreting H. Diels, op. cit., P. 16--17

151. This is exemplified in the story of Atilius, Dion. IV, 62.

152. Cic. De Div., II, 54; Dio XXXIX, 15.
153. Livy X, 47, Per. XI; Val. Max. I, 8, 2; Orosius III, 21.
154. Fabius Pictor and Claudius Quadrigarius, as he tells us in X, 37. See Klotz, op. cit., P. 206.
155. Val. Max. I, 8, 2.
156. J. B. Carter, op. cit., P. 83 f.
157. For example, Livy VII, 2 and VII, 28
158. J. Harrison, op. cit., P. 349--49; Bouché-Leclercq, op. cit., III, 296 f.; J. B. Carter, op. cit., P. 83 f.
159. Val. Max. I, 8, 2: triennio
160. J. B. Carter, op. cit., P. 86
161. W.W.Fowler, op. cit., P. 260
162. There was a second between 399 and 364, a third in 349, and a fifth in 327.
163. This was perhaps the case with the Ludi Saeculares of 348. See L. R. Taylor, A. J. Phil., 1934, P. 109 f.
164. It is not certain whether Aesculapius was worshipped exclusively at Rome, or whether smaller cults were also established amongst the allies.
165. Plut., Marc. III; Dio XII, 50; Zonaras VIII, 19; Orosius IV, 13.
166. Plut., Marc. III
167. Dio XII 50; Zon. VIII, 19.
168. There has been some doubt and confusion because this sacrifice was very similar to that of 216 after Cannae; and some scholars, such as W.W.Fowler, op. cit., P. 320, speak of the two sacrifices as being one and the same. However, this is to ignore the accounts of Dio, Plutarch, and Orosius (see above), and especially the important statement in Livy, XXII, 57, who when speaking of 216, tells us that this sacrifice was done in a walled enclosure that had been stained before with the blood of human sacrifice: "in locum...iam hostiis humanis....imbutum."
169. Plut. Marc. III and the similar rite described by Livy, XXII, 57.
170. Livy, XXII, 57: "minime Romano ritu"
171. A few remnants of propitiatory human sacrifice in Greece are to be found in the myth of Iphigenia, in Homer (Il. XXIII, 171 f), and in the Bacchae of Euripides. The latter refers to a very early form of human sacrifice, at a time when a human victim was part of the Dionysiac cult.
172. R. Bloch, op. cit., P. 102
173. W.W.Fowler, op. cit., P. 320; H. Diels, Op. Cit., P. 86; R. Bloch, op. cit., P. 102. The last suggests, as proof for his contention that the ritual was Etruscan, that both Greeks and Gauls were sacrificed because these had been the traditional enemies of the Etruscans long before. But this too is impossible to verify, and the matter remains unsettled. In any case, the late date of this sacrifice, and the fact that the sibylline books recommended only Greek rites before this time, render this unlikely.

175. W.W.Fowler, op. cit., P. 316 f.; J. B. Carter, op. cit., P. 92 f.
176. J. B. Carter, op. cit., P. 71 f; P. 82 f.
177. Livy XXV, 1
178. W.W.Fowler, op. cit., P. 331; J. Carter, op. cit., P. 100
179. This great mélange of old and new, foreign and indigenous rites has received a great deal of attention from A. A. Boyce, TAPA, 1938, 179 f.
180. Concerning this development, see J. B. Carter, op. cit., P. 96. The first stage was that prior to 496, when traditional Roman religion was free from extra-Italian influences. The second stage, 496--399, saw the introduction of various Greek deities whose influences was not extensive, because they were identified with existing Roman prototypes. The third, from 399 to the second Punic War, saw the introduction of rituals and deities, again Greek, whose exotic and alien natures were maintained even at Rome. And the fourth, launched by the arrival of the Magna Mater in 204, is associated with the entry of orgiastic elements into Roman religion.
181. W.W.Fowler, op. cit., P. 331
182. A. A. Boyce, TAPA, 1938, P. 176
183. In 214, 209, and 207.
184. H. H. Scullard, Roman Politics 220--150 B. C., (Oxford, 1951), P. 39; F. Munzer, Römische Adelsparteien und Adelsfamilien, (Stuttgart, 1963), *passim*.
185. Scullard, op. cit., P. 29-30
186. Ibid., P. 53-55
187. Ibid., P. 44
188. The most recent had been Claudius Marcellus, consul in 222. There was also T. Otacilius Crassus, who held several praetorships at this time.
189. Munzer, op. cit., P. 78 f.
190. For evidence concerning Fabius' first dictatorship, see Scullard, op. cit., P. 274; Livy XXII, 9, 7.
191. According to Zon. VIII, 22, speeches were made in the senate at this time by the various factions, each supporting its own point of view. Scullard, op. cit., P. 41, accepts the historicity of these speeches in spite of their denial by Polybius, III, 20.
192. Scullard, op. cit., P. 35
193. Ibid., P. 44
- 193A. Polybius (III, 77, 1) says that Flaminius retired to Arretium, not Ariminum.
194. Livy XXI, 62, 1: "prodigia...temere credita sunt". This consultation is described XXI, 62, 6 f.
195. Munzer in Pauly--Wissowa, "Fabius Pictor"
196. Plut. Fabius 22
197. If this were the case, this was the first instance of such an identification. A. Lippold, Consules (Bonn, 1963), P. 351 f.
198. Livy XXI, 62, 11

199. Livy XXII, 1, f.

200. For the possibility that some of these were contrived, see W.W.Fowler, op. cit., P. 317

201. An appeal was made to most women in the society. All married women were asked to contribute to a collection for Juno on the Aventine. Also, all freedwomen were asked to contribute for an offering to Feronia.

202. Livy XXII, 8

203. For example, Claudius Marcellus, who triumphed in 222, or Aemilius Paullus, who conquered the Illyrians in 219.

204. According to Livy, XXII, 31, because of this formality, he was selected "pro-dictator".

205. Various interpretations of the election of M. Rufus as Master of the Horse are discussed by Scullard, op. cit., P. 46. He suggests that the appointment of this man represents a slight intrusion of Cornelian power, since Rufus could be identified with that faction. Thus, though the Cornelii had suffered a great eclipse with the defeat of Flaminius and the disgrace of Servilius, their influence still made itself felt in the person of Rufus.

206. Livy XXII, 9

207. Plut., Fabius Maximus, IV.

208. Livy XXII, 10

209. A. Lippold, op. cit., P. 344. W. Dusing has suggested to me that this was an effort, on the part of Fabius, to associate his gens with the Aeneas-Romulus myth. The patron Venus, closely associated with this myth, could have been his means of establishing this connection.

210. Mens usually has the epithet Bona, Propertius III, 24, 19. See also K. Latte, op. cit., P. 240; and J. G. Frazer, The Fasti of Ovid, IV, P. 171

211. For the enshrinement of deified abstractions, see K. Latte, op. cit., P. 233; Lippold, op. cit., P. 323 f.

212. Livy XXII, 10. A vow was made to hold a ver sacrum if the country were able to remain in the same state as before the war, and if the war went well during the next five years. This entailed vowing as a gift to Jupiter whatever offspring swine, sheep, goats and oxen produced the following spring. Livy gives the complete vow taken. This rite was Italic in origin, and thus not imported. Festus, ed. W. Lindsay, P. 379; J. Harrison, op. cit., P. 521; W.W.Fowler, op. cit., P. 204 f. and 318; K. Latte, op. cit., P. 124

213. Livy XXII, 34; Scullard, op. cit., P. 49-51. Apparently Fabius used his position as head of the college of augurs (which he held for 62 years, Livy XXX, 26) to prevent the election of Veturius and Pomponius. For Fabius' position as augur, see Munzer, op. cit., P. 54; P. 83.

214. For Fabius' motives in this respect, see Scullard, op. cit., P. 50--51

215. Livy XXII, 38

216. Aemilius Paullus, one of the nobiles and very much opposed to popular sentiments (Livy XXII, 35), appears to have been allied to the Aemilii-Cornelii, and thus opposed to Fabius.

See Scullard, op. cit., P. 51 and 275.

217. Livy XXII, 36; Polybius III, 112
218. Scullard, op. cit., P. 56
219. Ibid., P. 51
220. Livy XXII, 57
221. For example, W.W.Fowler, op. cit., P. 319
222. Livy XXII, 57
223. H. Diels, op. cit., P. 86
224. P. Fabre, Revue des Etudes Anciennes, 1940, discusses previous history of this type of sacrifice at Rome.
225. Scullard, op. cit., P. 57. He indicates Fabius' control over the augural board at this time elsewhere (P. 49, n. 6)
226. Livy XXIV, 10
227. Livy XXVI
228. T. R. S. Broughton, Magistrates of the Roman Republic, (New York, 1952), I, P. 226, n. 2
229. Livy XXV, 12. There are two traditions about the Carmina Marciana. The first, shown in Livy, holds that they were written by one man. The second holds that they were written by two brothers, the fratres Marci (Cic., De Div., I, 40 and 50). According to Pliny, VII, 33, Marcius was an example of a male prophet. However, the historicity of this person is dubious; he is either mythological in origin (G. Bloch in Daremberg-Saglio, "duumviri s. f."), or he is a clever fabrication, as will be seen here.
230. See also Zon. IX, 1
231. W.W.Fowler, op. cit., P. 326
- 231A. Livy XXV, 12, 8: "Tum alterum carmen recitatum, non eo tantum obscurius quia incertiora futura praeteritis sunt, sed perplexius etiam scripturae genere. 'Hostis, Romani, si expellere vultis, vomicae quae gentium venit longe, Apollini vovendos censeo ludos, qui quotannis comiter Apollini fiant; cum populus dederit ex publico partem, privati uti conferant pro se atque suis; iis ludis faciendis praeerit praetor is qui ius populo plebeique dabit summum; decemviri Graeco ritu hostiis sacra faciant. Hoc si recte facietis, gaudebitis semper fietque res vestra melior; nam is deus extinguet perduellis vestros qui vestros campos pascit placide.'"
  232. The following listing is drawn from Broughton, op. cit.; M. Aemilius, M. Livius, L. Cornelius Lentulus, P. Cornelius Sulla, and M. Pomponius Matho, all of whom were Corneli. In addition we know that Titus Sempronius Longus and Q. Mucius Scaevola were members, neither of whom were Fabii. Thus the Fabii could have held at most three places on the board, and perhaps not even that.
  233. These games were celebrated again in 209 (Livy XXVII, 11), and made an annual event in 208 (Livy XXVII, 23).
  234. W.W.Fowler, op. cit., P. 236
  235. L. R. Taylor, A. J. Phil., 1934, P. 111
  236. The prodigies of 207 were propitiated by the decemviral college, though Livy makes no mention of a consultation (Livy XXVII, 37). Similar prodigies in 200 did result in a

consultation, and rites identical with those performed on this occasion (Livy XXXI, 12). However, we cannot be certain on this basis alone that there was a consultation in 207; and even the oracle preserved by Phlegon, X, which Diels related to 207, is now considered relevant only to the last quarter of the second century. See A. A. Boyce, TAPA, 1937, P. 170--71. In any case, the period after 212 saw the rise to power of Scipio Africanus, a Cornelian, and the propitiation of these prodigies in 207 may have been a last effort of the alienated Fabii to win popular support.

237. Livy XXIX, 10 f.

238. Livy XXVIII, 40

239. Livy XXVIII, 43

240. Scullard, op. cit., P. 76

241. Ibid., P. 76

242. Livy XXVII, 11

243. Livy XXIX, 10

244. W.W.Fowler, op. cit., P. 329

245. This listing is drawn from Broughton, op. cit.: M. Aemilius, M. Livius, L. Cornelius Lentulus, P. Cornelius Sulla, and M. Pomponius Matho, all of whom were Cornelii. In addition, it is known that T. Sempronius Longus was a decemvir, and also Q. Mucius Scaevola. T. Sempronius Longus was a member of the Claudian faction.

246. Livy XXIX, 11; 14; Appian, Hann., LVI; Ovid, Fasti, IV, 257 f.

247. Cic. De Sen., IV, 11

## CHAPTER THREE.

### THE PERIOD 204--83

After the conclusion of the second Punic War, the sibylline books entered upon a long period of gradual, but steady, decline. This was even more apparent after their destruction, in 83, in the Capitoline fire. But during the intervening period, from 204 to 83, there was a notable lessening of their influence.

This period of decline was distinguished by a lack of significant religious innovations; and this is especially noticeable if the period prior to 204 is kept in mind. Rather, this was a period of reaction against new gods and cults, one that was marked by a certain amount of censorship. The first instance of this reaction is found in the attitude towards Cybele's cult after it had arrived in Rome. It was unlikely, when the Roman government admitted her cult, that its precise nature was known. Its wild and mystic rites, its fanatical and ecstatic elements, its appeal to the senses and emotions, were all new and not fully realized until the cult had taken root in Rome.<sup>248</sup> But Roman authorities were quick to restrain this new religion, and by a senatus consultum prevented all citizens from taking part in the rites, or from joining the priesthood.<sup>249</sup> Only Phrygians could attend to these matters.

This effort, which seems to have been a successful one, was aimed at isolating the new cult and thereby preventing it from contaminating traditional religious values. The sibyl-



line books were not directly involved in this restriction, though the senatus consultum was important in that it indicated religious trends of the next century, and, to a certain extent, the operation of the sibylline books. A further example of this censorship was the famous senatus consultum of 186, De Bacchanalibus, and the concomitant attempts at this time to restrict and control foreign religious influences coming to Rome. The cult attacked in 186 was that of Dionysus; but we may be certain that any other orgiastic religions making their way to Rome would have been equally forbidden.

Sibylline recommendations in the second century reflect this attitude of reaction. Apart from the glaring absence of religious innovations, we notice that these recommendations were concerned mostly with routine matters: dona, supplicationes, hostiae maiores, lustrationes, and the like. This reversion to older, traditional rites is distinguished only by an increase in their scale; for example, we often find that hostiae in excess of twenty were sacrificed, whereas during the second Punic War only four or five were offered.<sup>250</sup> Reasons for this emphasis on routine rituals are twofold. Firstly, there were no longer any military or political crises comparable with those of the third or fourth centuries; thus there was no need for more efficacious rites. Secondly, the government attitude of reaction and censorship, mentioned above, would also have been an operative influence.

Thus the twenty-two consultations between 204 and 83 were associated neither with great calamities nor important polit-

ical manoeuvres. Prodigies and portents were the most common reason for consultation, since fifteen occasions of the twenty-two were due to this cause. On a few occasions, the books were consulted from purely political motives, using prodigies as a pretext for consultation; these occasions, because they are of special interest, will be reserved for later discussion. But in general there seems to have been a decline in the value of these books as a political influence. We should also mention, as another symptom of this decline, the first occurrence of what W. Fowler has called the "prostitution of religion", something which became very common after 83. Rather than concentrate on the books themselves as a political instrument, politicians took to inventing false oracles and circulating them about the city so as to further their purposes. It is usually clear from the sources when such oracles were being used; and these, of course, had nothing to do with the books, since they did not emanate from official consultations. The best example of a false oracle before 83 occurred in 187, and this, because of its political overtones, will also be saved for later discussion.<sup>251</sup>

Decemviral powers also declined during this period. Of particular interest in this connection was the law of 104, which deprived this board of the right of co-optatio, putting their election in the hands of the people.<sup>252</sup> The only positive development, perhaps, was the increased sphere of sibylline influence, since decemviral recommendations came to be applicable throughout all areas under Rome's control. Thus, while

sacrifices and rituals advised by the books before 204 pertained mostly to Rome herself, we now find recommendations that apply to Italy as a whole, and even Gaul and Sicily.<sup>253</sup>

Before proceeding to the comparatively important consultations for this period, it would be best, once again, to consider all consultations from a general statistical point of view. As before, these consultations may be classified according to cause and result. There are twenty-two consultations of which we can be reasonably certain, and six additional instances on which the books may have been consulted, though the sources do not indicate this.<sup>254</sup>

Prodigies and portents were the most usual reason for consultation, in fifteen instances the sole or partial reason. These prodigies are almost identical with those mentioned in connection with the period 753--204, and do not require discussion here.<sup>255</sup> The great numbers of portents which characterized the religious life of this century have already attracted the attention of religious scholars; and insofar as they seem to have been the normal basis for sibylline operations, we need not concern ourselves with them except as a norm against which extraordinary consultations may be measured.<sup>256</sup>

Public evils and calamities were responsible for consultations on six occasions: earthquakes in 193, floods and a mass invasion of wasps in 193, and plagues in 180, 174, and 165.<sup>257</sup> We may also include in this category another shocking event, the temple robbery of 200.<sup>258</sup>

Political manoeuvres were behind at least three authentic consultations, all of which deserve closer attention: the

Agua Marcia episode of 143<sup>259</sup>; the consultation after Gracchus' death in 133<sup>260</sup>; and the expulsion of Cinna from Rome in 87.<sup>261</sup> While the episode of 187 does not seem to have involved a genuine consultation, it is significant because the oracle in question, however false it may have been, was associated with political manoeuvres.

Turning our attention to a comprehensive discussion of the results of these consultations, we again notice that they are nearly all routine in nature. Sixteen consultations advised the expected purifications, sacrifices, supplications, and vows.<sup>262</sup> The dates for these recommendations were 193, 193, 191, 190, 181, 180, 179, 174, 173, 172, 169, 167, 165, 143, 118, and 108. As before, these recommendations do not require special attention; it is sufficient to note their great number, and the fact that the sibylline books were concerned mainly with this type of recommendation during the second century.

Lectisternia were advised on only two occasions, in 193 and 181.<sup>263</sup> This was due, perhaps, to the current reaction against foreign rituals, though it would seem that the lectisternium had become sufficiently Romanized by this time as to cause no consternation because of its Greek origins. Games also declined in importance, and were likewise recommended on only two occasions: great games to Jupiter in 172, and Ludi Saeculares c. 149.<sup>264</sup>

Consultations which resulted in recommendations purely political in implication numbered only two, and were concerned

with the Agua Marcia affair in 143, and the expulsion of Cinna in 87. The few other consultations with comparatively interesting results may also be listed here. The colorful rituals advised in 200 are interesting because they were duplications of the rites held in 207.<sup>265</sup> Also, an unusual amount of attention was given to Cere's, both in 191, and in 133, the latter occasion in particular requiring special discussion. The only completely new god introduced during this period was perhaps the Greek Hygieia, though this innovation is not a certainty, since we cannot be sure that this minor deity did not accompany Aesculapius on his arrival in 290.<sup>267</sup>

The remaining consultation whose results were noteworthy was that of 114.<sup>268</sup> The human sacrifice of two Greeks and two Gauls was advised, a rite identical with that of 226 and 216. This same consultation resulted in what was the only genuine and incontestable religious innovation of the century, the introduction of the worship of Venus Verticordia. However, even the significance of this innovation was limited, because the Greek Aphrodite had been received in the form of Venus Erycina in 217.

Of those consultations during this period which require special attention, the first dates from 187. But, as we mentioned above, the importance of this episode lies in the fact that there seems to have been no genuine consultation of the books. The false oracle in question was the first example of the "prostitution of religion", and set a precedent to be

followed on many subsequent occasions, especially after 83.

This oracle, if the affair actually took place and Livy's account may be trusted, can in no way be said to stem from the traditional process of sibylline consultations; thus it must have originated with other sources.<sup>269</sup> Perhaps it was a foreign oracle brought to Rome; or it might have been fabricated domestically in accordance with various political motives. At any rate, this was the first occasion when the the unquestioned authority of the state books was undermined by certain oracle-circulators who wished to lend this authority to oracles of their own creation.

The political context relevant to this oracle may be summarized thus. Rome had succeeded, through the efforts of the Scipionic faction, in restraining the imperial policies of Antiochus III. He had been defeated at the battles of Thermopylae and Magnesia; and by the treaty of Apamea (188) he agreed to submit to certain conditions, one of these being that his realm of influence would not extend beyond the Taurus mountains. Gn. Manlius Vulso had succeeded L. Scipio as consul in 189, and became the man chiefly responsible for the establishment of an eastern peace and the institution of this treaty. He passed most of the years 189--88 in the east, subduing the Galatians, and returned to Rome in 187 with a great deal of booty. But when he appeared before the senate and demanded a triumph, he was opposed by L. Furius Purpurio and L. Aemilius Paulus, both of whom had served on a ten-man commission that had accompanied him on his peace-making cam-

paigns in the east. Both were members of the Scipionic circle, and the relevant section in Livy makes clear their reasons for opposition:

Legatos sese Cn. Manlio datos pacis cum Antiocho faciendae causa foederisque legum quae cum L. Scipione inchoatae fuissent perficiendarum. Cn. Manlium summa ope tetendisse ut eam pacem turbaret, et Antiochum, si sui potestatem fecisset, insidiis exciperet; sed illum cognita fraude consulis, cum saepe colloquiis petitis captatus esset, non congressum modo sed conspectum etiam eius vitasse. Cupientem transire Taurum aegre omnium legatorum precibus, ne carminibus Sibyllae praedictam superantibus terminos fatales cladem experiri vellet, retentum admosse tamen exercitum et prope in ipsis iugis ad divortia aquarum castra posuisse.<sup>270</sup>

Two interpretations of this episode are justifiable. The first holds that Livy's sources were pro-Scipionic, and that both the oracle and Scipionic opposition to Manlius' triumph were fabricated by those sources.<sup>271</sup> However, since it is not really proveable that this opposition did not exist, we may assume its truth in a general sense. In the subsequent necessity of explaining the oracle, we notice that Livy makes no mention of a consultation, nor any mention of the decemviri. We are justified in assuming, then, that its origin was either foreign or domestic; but if it were local, it was unrelated to the genuine sibylline books.<sup>272</sup>

The second interpretation of this oracle is that it was invented by the Scipionic faction and called "sibylline" to increase its authority. It was then used by that faction, especially by L. Furius Purpurio and L. Aemilius Paulus, in its effort to oppose Manlius' triumph. The fact that this

oracle mentions the Taurus specifically is in itself an indication that it was contrived with Manlius' aggressive aims in mind.

The consultation of 149, or more properly of 146, is not of political interest, though it should be considered here because it led to one of the rare celebrations of the secular games. According to ancient tradition, this celebration was the fourth of the series, though there is a possibility that it was only the third.<sup>273</sup> In any case, it is clear from Livy's statement that the books were consulted and a new celebration of the games ordered. The reasons why it was thought necessary to consult the books at this time are not given, though the fact that a hundred years had lapsed since the last celebration may have been sufficient cause for a consultation.

Little is known about this particular set of games; even the date remains in doubt. According to Censorinus, several historians who lived at the time gave the date of 146, and this has been seen to be the more likely.<sup>274</sup> Though the previous celebration had taken place in 249<sup>275</sup>, and a saeculum was considered during republican times to be a hundred years, these games were not always celebrated punctually. We know that the games which should have been held c. 49 were postponed until the Augustan celebration of 17 B.C. The fact that Valerius Antias, and thus Varro and Livy, chose 149 rather than 146 indicates, perhaps, an attempt to adhere to a theoretical saeculum of 100 years, perhaps even



to the point of ignoring historical truth.

More is known about the consultation of 143, which was associated with the campaign of Appius Claudius Pulcher against an Alpine tribe, the Salassi.<sup>276</sup> Consuls for the year 143 were Quintus Metellus and Appius Claudius. Metellus, an ally of the Scipionic circle, obtained a military command in Spain, one that presented various opportunities for securing military victories, whereas Claudius received relatively limited opportunities in Italy. According to Dio, Claudius was so eager to secure a triumph out his jealousy for Metellus, that he attacked the Salassi though there was little pretext for such a move. Apparently he had been sent to settle a dispute between this people and their neighbors; but he soon attacked them and overran their entire territory. However, he suffered a serious defeat, and this, along with certain prodigies, led to a consultation of the sibylline books at Rome. In the books it was found that "quotiens bellum Gallis illaturi essent, sacrificari in eorum finibus oportere".<sup>276A</sup>

Perhaps the charges against Claudius' conduct of this war, especially his efforts to start it, are exaggerated by unsympathetic sources.<sup>277</sup> In any case, his great defeat was criticized by enemies at Rome, and it appears that this opposition, along with the prodigies mentioned by Julius Obsequens, led to the consultation. But the decemviri favored Claudius, for the results of this consultation did not imply that he should be recalled, which would have been expected should his enemies have been in control.<sup>278</sup> Instead,

the sibylline books removed all blame for defeat from Claudius, and implied that the fault had originated in questions of religious lore.

We know from Dio that two of the decemviri were sent to Gaul to help with the necessary sacrifices. A. E. Astin has seen in this action another sign that the decemviri were sympathetic to Claudius.<sup>278A</sup> They were sent to Gaul, or rather a part of their number, to explain matters to him, and to assume all responsibility for the sacrifices to be performed there. In this way they could be assured that these sacrifices would be properly attended to, and that no blame could come to Claudius for having performed them improperly. And, of course, this manoeuvre was meant to indicate that Claudius himself was not to blame for the defeat, since he was not required to take part in the religious duties recommended by the books. The plan seems to have succeeded well, for the troops were encouraged and victory came soon after.

In close connection with this affair was a dispute about the Marcian Aqueduct. It had started a year before, in 144, and did not finally resolve itself until 140. Sources for this episode are again Livy, and, to a greater extent, Frontinus.<sup>279</sup> It seems that by 144 the Appian and Anian aqueducts were in very bad condition; they were in a state of ill repair, and we are told that certain people were taking water from them illegally. In this year the praetor urbanus, Marcius Rex, was commissioned to reclaim the waters, repair the aqueducts, and to increase the water supply by whatever means he saw fit.

As a result, construction was either started or renewed on a large aqueduct which came to take his name, the Aqua Marcia. It seems likely that this aqueduct was the same one which had been started by the censors in 179.<sup>280</sup> At any rate, Marcius' work was not finished in that year, and his praetorship was extended another year so as to enable him to finish the project. But in the same year, 143, a consultation of the sibylline books took place, and it was reported that water by these means could not be brought to the Capitol. Frontinus does not indicate the reason for this consultation, except to say "aliis ex causis", which may safely be taken as a reference to the consultation, in the same year, that was associated with Claudius' defeat in Gaul.<sup>281</sup> It would appear, then, that the same consultation resulted in the recommendation for sacrifice in Gaul, and the warning against Marcius' plans for bringing water to the Capitol. Reasons for the latter were primarily religious, it would seem;<sup>282</sup> perhaps it was maintained that one of the older aqueducts should be used instead of the new one being constructed.<sup>283</sup>

Soon afterwards, this matter was debated in the senate. Marcius Rex, with the help of his colleague M. Aemilius Lepidus, succeeded in overcoming this opposition, and thus continued with construction of the aqueduct.<sup>284</sup> But three years later, in 140, a certain L. Cornelius Lentulus Lupus again brought up the matter; once again Marcius carried the day, and he was able to finish his work. Of these two men we know that the latter, L. Lentulus Lupus, was never an ally of the Scipionic circle.<sup>285</sup>

From the account of Frontinus, he appears to have been one of the decemviri who opposed building of the aqueduct.

Of M. Aemilius Lepidus, though he was a powerful opponent of the Scipionic circle, we know from the reading pro collega in Frontinus that he supported Marcius; thus we know that he was opposed to the decemviral board.<sup>286</sup> Because the decemviral board supported Claudius, we may assume that he was opposed to that man also. His support of Marcius may also have been due to the fact that his family had been responsible, in part, for the beginning of this aqueduct in 179.

Political manoeuvres behind this affair are best understood if political factions of the time are kept in mind. The Scipionic circle, headed by Scipio Aemilianus, was steadily gaining in power, and naturally opposed to such people as did not belong to its faction, and whose efforts were competitive.<sup>287</sup> Appius Claudius, as his jealousy and emulation of Metellus in 143 indicated, was one of these; and most of the decemviral board, who supported him, must have been of similar outlook.

A. E. Astin has suggested that the entire affair of the Marcian Aqueduct was stirred up by the decemviri in an effort to aid Claudius further by creating a diversion.<sup>288</sup> Such confusion at home could draw attention from his misfortunes; and at the same time this provided an opportunity to attack his enemies. However, the decemviral board had been steadily losing power and influence up to this time. This is made evident by their failure, on two occasions, to enforce the

sibylline recommendation against the Marcian aqueduct. Two factors accounted for this. Firstly, there was a genuine need in Rome for an improved water supply. Secondly, the growing strength of the Scipionic circle and their allies must have had no difficulty in subduing the comparatively weak decemviri, who had chosen an inopportune moment to exercise the political influence of their office.

The next consultation of note occurred in 133, shortly after the murder of Tiberius Gracchus. The political context relevant to this murder is too well known to require discussion here; we need only mention that Gracchus' campaign in general, and his agrarian reforms in particular, constituted a great assault on the optimates and at the same time allied him with the underprivileged. While some of the optimates supported and even advised Gracchus, we can nevertheless be certain that most of them resented the attack.<sup>289</sup> The murder of Gracchus and the swift chain of events that led up to it are an indication of this.

According to Cicero and Valerius Maximus, a series of portents shortly after Gracchus' death led to this consultation.<sup>290</sup> These portents were associated with great public dangers; in other words, they were associated with divine wrath. It is not known who prompted this consultation, nor who the decemviri were at this time. In any case, the books were found to order "ut vetustissimam Cerem placerent"; all of the decemviri were sent to Henna in Sicily, the site of an ancient shrine of Ceres, which was thought to be the origin of the Roman cult.

These recommendations did not set a precedent, since some of the decemviri had been previously sent from Rome to perform sacrifices in Gaul.<sup>291</sup> Also, Ceres had been propitiated before on sibylline advice.<sup>292</sup> The most significant aspects of this recommendation are the following. Firstly, all of the decemviri were sent to Henna, perhaps an indication of the great importance of their mission; and secondly, the very fact that these rites were not held in Rome suggests that they might have been inflammatory.<sup>293</sup>

An obvious interpretation of this consultation presents itself. As had happened frequently during the early republic, the optimates seem to be again employing signs of divine wrath, in this case prodigies, and a convenient instrument of Roman state religion to indicate, to the populares, that they had destroyed the pax deorum, and that they should avoid doing so in the future. How had they done this? The pax deorum had been destroyed when they supported the agrarian reforms of Gracchus and allied themselves with his unprecedented attacks on the mos maiorum. The sibylline order to propitiate "vetustissimam Cerem" is thus easy to understand. Ceres, goddess of grain and agriculture, must be worshipped for the century-old virtues of the agricultural way of life that she personified, for the traditional forms of Roman agriculture that had been attacked when Gracchus initiated his reforms. Thus, both aspects of the goddess worshipped were significant. The fact that she was Ceres associated her with agriculture; the fact that she was "vetustissimam" associated her with the tra-

ditional dispensation of agricultural land.

In 114, the books were again consulted with interesting results. Many details of this consultation, in particular its political background, remain in obscurity. This is due chiefly to the sources, which are fragmentary and not entirely in agreement. Because of this, no political or factional motives can be discerned, if there were any. Again we cannot claim to know who ordered this consultation, or who the decemviri in question were. Moreover, the sources seem to disagree on the recommendations made. However, the sibylline books often recommended more than one ritual at a time; and we are perhaps justified in considering these disparate rituals to have originated with the same consultation.

Prior to 114, Roman politics were distinguished by the turmoil of the Gracchi, and, after that, by the senatorial restoration presided over by the Metelli. A certain amount of popular unrest remaining from the Gracchan period was brought to the fore by the domestic events of 114, as well as by the threat of Jugurtha. Thus, when several Vestal virgins were found guilty of sexual incontinence in 115/114, such a terrifying portent was regarded all the more suspiciously.<sup>295</sup> Three vestals were tried for incontinence by the pontifices in 115, but of them only one was found guilty. However, public opinion demanded a trial before the people; when this was held in 114, the other two were also condemned.

Because of this evil omen the sibylline books were consulted, and from the extant sources it appears that two re--

commendations were made. Firstly, they advised the human sacrifice of two Greeks and two Gauls.<sup>296</sup> Secondly, it was decreed that a statue be dedicated to Venus Verticordia, ostensibly to raise the standard of female morals.<sup>297</sup> This was to be done by the woman chosen sanctissima femina by a vote of the matrons, in this case Sulpicia, daughter of Servus Paternulus and wife of Q. Fulvius Flaccus.

There is little difficulty in understanding the raison d'être of these recommendations. Human sacrifice was to atone for the broken vows of the Vestals, a horrifying rite for a portent of the worst type; and since the incontinence of these vestals must have been considered an indication of general moral decline, a statue was also dedicated to Venus Verticordia by the chastest woman in the state in an effort to improve moral standards. A great deal of emphasis was put on chastity, since attention was not only given to Sulpicia, but to the hundred women from which she was chosen. The dedication to Venus as Verticordia is thus obvious in implication; hopefully, this goddess would turn female minds from less respectable thoughts to those of moderation and chastity.

Apart from political manoeuvres of which we are perhaps unaware, the origin and results of this consultation can be explained satisfactorily in terms of religious values alone. Its significance lies not so much in the recommendation of human sacrifice, which had been offered before, but in the recognition of Venus Verticordia, the only authentic religious innovation, albeit a minor one, for which the books were res-



possible during the second century.

The last recorded consultation of the books, before they were destroyed in 83, took place in 87. Our only source for this event is a mutilated statement of Granius Licinianus, an annalistic historian of the second century A. D., whose work was based on that of Livy:

....placuit, id quod numquam alias ac pro collegio, quid in libris fatalibus scriptum esset, palam recitare. Constabat notare carmine Cinna sexque tribunis patria pulsus tranquillum otium et securitatem futuram. 298

It is clear that this consultation was purely political in aim and result, and as such it is typical of the attitude of the sibylline books, or of counterfeited oracles alleging to originate with the sibylline books, throughout the last years of the republic, when they were quite openly exploited by politicians, and traditional religious values were ignored.

The political context for this consultation may be summarized thus. Sulla, after he had expelled Marius from Rome, arranged the political administration in his own interests so that he could maintain power at Rome while tending to his Mithridatic command in the east. However, while one of the consuls for this year (87) was Cn. Octavius, a strong ally, the other elected was L. Cornelius Cinna, whom he could hardly trust. He therefore made Cinna swear an oath not to interfere with his political arrangements. But he had hardly left Rome when Cinna proposed to recall Marius and his supporters, and introduce certain laws which were antipathetic to the Sullan faction. After a certain amount of violence in the

Forum, Octavius was able to defeat this proposal and depose Cinna from the consulship. The latter was driven from Rome and declared a public enemy.

The passage in Granius Licinius seems to refer to a consultation shortly before Cinna was driven from Rome. This connection is affirmed by a statement in Livy:

L. Cornelius Cinna consul cum perniciosas leges  
per vim atque arma ferret, pulsus urbe a Cn. Octavio  
collega cum sex tribunis plebis imperioque ei abrog-  
ato.... 299

From the sibylline recommendation that Cinna be driven from Rome, it is certain that the decemviri at this time were sympathetic to Sullan policies; indeed they appear to have wielded the books as a political instrument. Before Cn. Octavius deposed Cinna by force, he may have tried to set public opinion against him, and thus secure his peaceful abandonment of such policies, with this rather unsubtle use of the books. The fact that the recommendation was read publicly, an unusual event, can be understood in the context of such a manoeuvre.

From the statement of Licinianus it appears that we are dealing with a genuine consultation, rather than the circulation of a false oracle. Thus is indicated the great extent to which the sibylline books had been reduced, by this time, to a plaything in the hands of political acrobats. Their significance as an influential religious authority had almost entirely disappeared.

Mention has already been made of the first of two blows which damaged the authority and influence of the decemviral

college, the law of 104 by which the decemviri forfeited their right of co-optatio, and became a body elected by the people. It is obvious that the strength and influence of the sibylline books depended on the authority of the body which consulted them; and the change of 104, which probably reduced aristocratic control of the books, was a significant indication of their decline.

The second great blow came in the early summer of 83, when the Capitoline temple burned to the ground, and the entire original collection of sibylline writings perished with it. The destruction of this temple is normally associated with the civil war instigated by Sulla's return to Rome. However, it burned down at least a year before Sulla's victory at the Colline gate, probably while Carbo the proconsul and the two consuls of that year were preparing their defence. It cannot, then, be claimed that the temple perished in the clamour of the civil war itself. Why it was destroyed will always be, perhaps, a mystery. Dionysius increases this uncertainty by stating that it was set afire either by accident, or purposely.<sup>300</sup> Tacitus tells us that it was burnt because of private treachery, fraude privata; but the Byzantine writer Maximus Planudes suggests that a thunderbolt struck the temple.<sup>301</sup> In any case, destruction of the sibylline books was swift and complete.

This fire bears both a metaphorical and a real significance. Metaphorically, it symbolized the end of the authentic sibylline tradition, which, as we have pointed out, had been dec-

lining in importance since the second Punic War. After this catastrophe, attitudes towards the sibylline books were never the same, in spite of energetic efforts to restore them. And the real significance of this fire lay in the fact that it was a great blow to the decemviral college. It presented an opportunity for the books to be restored in a fashion outside the control of this college, which was nevertheless subservient to the product of the restoration. In addition to the irreparable loss of the original books, the fire of 83 thus caused a further decline in the authority of their guardians.

### NOTES TO CHAPTER THREE

248. F. Cumont, Oriental Religions in Roman Paganism (New York, 1911), P. 28 f., discusses the appeal of such cults.

249. Dion. II, 19

250. A. A. Boyce, TAPA, 1938, P. 183

251. Livy XXXVIII, 45

252. Suet., Nero, II; Vell. Pat. II, 12; Dio XXXVII, 37

253. Livy XL, 19; Jul. Obs. 21; Val. Max. I, 1, 1

254. Livy XXXVIII, 36; XXXVIII, 44; XXXIX, 22; XXXIX, 46; Jul. Obs. 44; 47.

255. The most dreadful omen was again the sexual incontinence of the Vestal virgins in 115. Dio, XXVI, 87; Livy Per. 63; Jul. Obs. 37; Plut., Quaest. Rom., 283, 84. Other omens and prodigies were recorded in 200 (Livy XXXI, 12); 193 (Livy XXXV, 9); 191 (Livy XXXVI, 36); 190 (Livy XXXVII, 3); 181 (Livy XL, 18); 179 (Livy XL, 45); 173 (Livy XLII, 1); 172 (Livy XLII, 19); 169 (Livy XLIII, 13); 167 (Livy XLV, 16); 143 (Jul. Obs. 21); 118 (Jul. Obs. 35); 108 (Jul. Obs. 40), and 133 (Cic., Verr., II, 4, 49).

256. Livy pays a great deal of attention to prodigies, and because of this their routine nature is clearly established. His attitude towards the importance of prodigies is described in XLIII, 13: "Non sum nescius ab eadem negligentia qua nihil deos portendere vulgo nunc credant, neque nuntiari admodum ulla prodigia in publicum neque in annales referri. Ceterum et mihi vetustas res scribenti nescio quo pacto antiquus fit animus et quaedam religio tenet, quae illi prudentissimi viri publice suscipienda censuerint, ea pro indignis habere, quae in meos annales referam."

257. Livy XXXIV, 55; Livy XXXV, 9; Livy XL, 36; Livy XLI, 21; Jul. Obs. 13.

258. Livy XXXI, 12.

259. Livy, Per., 54; Frontinus, I, 7; Jul. Obs. 21

260. Cic., Verr., II, 4, 49; Val. Max. I, 1, 1

261. Granius Licinianus, ed. M. Flemisch, 15, 4

262. Livy XXXIV, 55; XXXV, 9; XXXVI, 36; XXXVII, 3; XL, 18; XL, 36; XL, 45; XLI, 21; XLII, 1; XLII, 19; XLIII, 13; XLV, 16; Jul. Obs. 13; Jul. Obs. 21; Jul. Obs. 35; Jul. Obs.

40. In addition we have two sibylline oracles recorded by Phlegon, Mirabilia, X, which are summarized and well discussed by Diels, op. cit., P. 38 f. and 49 f. These oracles are interesting for the detailed attention they give to the required rites; they seem to be established lists of formulae for sacrifices, rather than the response of a single consultation. Diels (P. 90 and 103) felt that these oracles applied to the years 207 and 125; but more recent opinion places them both in the last quarter of the second century, in agreement with Phlegon himself. See A. A. Boyce, TAPA, 1937, P. 171; and for recent work on these oracles, Rzach in Pauly-Wissowa, "Sibyllinische Orakel", 2111-2112.

263. Livy XXXIV, 55; XL, 18

264. Livy XLII, 19; Per. 49; Censorinus 17.

265. For a detailed discussion of the rites of 207,

- see A. A. Boyce, TAPA, 1937, P. 157
266. Livy XXXVI, 36; Cic., Verr., II, 4, 49
267. In 280, as a result of a prolonged plague, the sibylline books recommended gifts and statues both for Aesculapius and Salus (Livy XL, 36). Salus, the Roman god, had possessed a shrine in Rome since 302. However, it is clear that Salus in this instance was a Romanization of the Greek Hygieia. See E. T. Sage, Livy, (Loeb), XII, P. 115, n. 3
268. Plut., Quaest. Rom., 283, 84; Jul. Obs. 37; Pliny VII, 35; Val. Max. VIII, 15, 12.
269. Livy XXXVIII, 45
270. Livy, loc. cit.
271. Scullard, op. cit., P. 142; G. De Sanctis, Storia Dei Romani (Firenze, 1953), IV, i, 225, n. 182.
272. Niebuhr, op. cit., I, P. 505
273. Livy, Per., 49; Censorinus 17. L. R. Taylor, A. J. Phil., 1934, New Light on the History of the Secular Games, suggests that this celebration was third in the series.
274. Piso Censorius, Gn. Gellius, and Cassius Hemina. L. R. Taylor, loc. cit., supports the year 146.
275. Livy, Per., 49; August., Civ. Dei, III, 18.
276. Jul. Obs. 21; Dio XXII, frag. 74.1; Orosius, V, 4.
- 276A. Jul. Obs., loc. cit.
277. A. E. Astin, Scipio Aemilianus, (Oxford, 1967), P. 106
278. We can be certain of only five of the decemviri at this time. But none of these was an ally of the Scipionic faction, or opposed to Claudius: L. Cornelius Lentulus Lupus, C. Sempronius Longus, A. Postumius Albinus, M. Valerius Messalla, and Gn. Octavius. These names are drawn from Broughton, op. cit., I, passim. That L. Cornelius Lentulus Lupus was never an ally of the Scipionic circle is discussed by Astin, op. cit., P. 92
- 278A. Astin, op. cit., P. 107
279. Livy, Per., 54; Frontinus, De Aquaed., I, 7
280. Astin, op. cit., P. 179
281. Ibid., P. 106, 110
282. Rzach in Pauly--Wissowa, "sibyllinische orakel", 1124
283. Astin, op. cit., P. 109
284. In Frontinus, the reading pro collega (MS) seems preferable to the emendation of Schöne, pro collegio (Zu Frontinus, Hermes, 1872, p. 248 f.). See Astin, op. cit., P. 109; and Munzer, op. cit., P. 239 f. The MS reading makes Lepidus a colleague and ally of Marcius; Schöne's reading would make Lepidus a representative of the decemviral board, and thus his enemy.
285. Astin, op. cit., P. 92
286. Ibid., P. 94
287. Astin, op. cit., P. 97 f. discusses the slow rise to power of the Scipionic circle after 146. The control of this faction was consolidated by the years 142--140, when associates of Scipio held five or six out of eight major magistracies.

288. Astin, op. cit., P. 106, 110
289. For example, Scaevola
290. Cic., Verr., II, 4, 49; Val. Max. I, 1, 1
291. In the year 143. See Dio, XXII, Frag. 74
292. Dion. VI, 17; Livy XXXVI, 36.
293. Astin, op. cit., P. 227
294. For example, in 399 (Livy, V, 13); in 293 (Livy X, 47).
295. Dio XXVI, Frag. 87; Livy, Per. 63; Jul. Obs. 37
296. Orosius V, 15; Macrobius, Sat., I, 10, 5; Plut., Quaest. Rom. 283, 84.
297. Pliny VII, 35; Val. Max. VIII, 15, 12. Both mention this consultation; see also Jul. Obs. 37 and Ovid, Fasti, IV, 157--9.
298. Granius Licinianus, ed. Flemisch, 15, 4
299. Livy, Per., 79
300. Dion. IV, 62
301. Tac., Hist., III, 72; if there was some movement to destroy the sibylline oracles at this time, the motives are lost in obscurity. For Maximus Planudes, see A. A. Boyce, TAPA, 1938, P. 187

## CHAPTER FOUR

### THE PERIOD 83--12

The final period in this history of the sibylline books falls between their destruction and restoration, 83--76, and the final revision of Augustus in 12 B. C. The latter event in particular was a death-blow to the genuine sibylline tradition, though this entire period had been distinguished by a great decline in the number of authentic consultations. Instead, we find a continuing increase in the manipulation of the books and falsification of oracles by prominent political factions. In spite of many references in the sources to sibylline oracles, only three of these may be traced to authentic consultations in the traditional manner, consultations ordered by the senate and carried out by the college in charge. All other oracles mentioned seem to have been invented by politicians for their own benefit, or circulated by their opponents in an effort to secure their downfall. Thus this period of sibylline operation was distinguished, more than any other period, by what W. Fowler aptly called the "prostitution of religion", first noticeable in the preceding century.<sup>302</sup>

This final weakening of the sibylline books as a respected religious authority was due, to a greater or lesser extent, to political movements associated with the downfall of the republic. The chief political trends were, of course, the prolonged weakening of the Roman senate, and the concomitant growth in the power of individuals whose political influence corresponded to their military position. The sibylline books, like the senate itself which had long controlled them, were



forced into a position of increasing subservience to these men. They fell prey to power-seekers, whose desire to possess corrupt sibylline oracles ceased only when the power-struggles of the republic yielded to the principate of Augustus.

We cannot, therefore, explain the end of the authentic tradition of consultation in 83 in terms of the fire alone. It is true that the books could never be the same in spite of great efforts, however, energetic, to restore them. But even if this original collection had survived, one suspects that its decline throughout the last century of the republic would have been much the same, the cause being the political metamorphosis mentioned above. In all probability, this change would have produced the same effects, loss of respect and increased subservience, on the original collection as it did on the products of the restoration in 76.

Restoration of the oracles after the fire was absolutely essential for the maintenance of this important religious tradition. The important religious college whose prime authority and duty derived from these books could not function properly if the collection did not exist. At this time, the decemviri were increased to a body of fifteen men, the quindecimviri. Thus this loss of the sibylline books, the foundation of all that college's powers, could not be sustained, and made their replacement mandatory.

According to the historian Fenestella, in 76 the consul Gaius Scribonius Curio made a motion in the senate that envoys

be sent abroad, in particular to Erythrae, in order to bring back copies of the sibylline books.<sup>303</sup> Accordingly, three members of the college were sent: P. Gabinus, M. Otacilius, and L. Valerius. Though these men appear to have been sent only to Erythrae, another statement by the same writer affirms that copies of the oracles were gathered all over the ancient world. He tells us that oracles were sought from all cities, both Italian and Greek, that were connected with any sibyl. It is not difficult to understand the emphasis on Erythrae, since all ancient traditions, as we have seen, assigned the origins of sibylline prophecy to the sibyl of that city. However, since the Romans were determined to assemble a comprehensive collection that resembled as much as possible the first, they also collected oracles from Greek, Italian, Sicilian, and even African cities. This is implied by Fenestella's statement in Lactantius, mentioned above; when he speaks of any sibyl he is without doubt referring to the ten sibyls of the ancient world discussed earlier in the same passage.<sup>304</sup>

Lactantius is not clear when he tells us that the three priests returned to Rome from Erythrae with about a thousand verses written down by private citizens.<sup>305</sup> Varro makes a distinction in the origins of these copies; whereas the three priests brought back relevant oracles from Erythrae, it was private citizens who brought oracles to Rome from the other cities, having transcribed these themselves.<sup>306</sup> The verses brought from Erythrae, together with the contributions of

private citizens, thus formed a new collection of sibylline books, the thousand verses of which Lactantius speaks. This collection, apparently larger than the old one, was placed the same year in the newly restored Capitoline temple by the consuls Curio and Octavius.<sup>307</sup>

At first glance, the lengthy seven year interval between the destruction of the books and their restoration poses a problem. One would think that their importance necessitated a quicker restoration. However, this restoration was a long and difficult process, and may well have started before 76; and in any case it would have been timed to coincide with completion of the new temple. In all likelihood, work had started on the building soon after the fire, and we may assume that its completion date of 76 was the soonest possible.

As little is known about this new collection as about the old. Save that it represented an increase in size, it is not certain to what extent this new "edition" was an accurate duplication, or, were it different, what its new characteristics were. In spite of energetic efforts, it is unlikely that an exact duplication was possible, though it should be pointed out that the Romans themselves believed that they succeeded in this. They even thought themselves able to distinguish, when assembling their new collection, between authentic and false oracles by means of the acrostics.<sup>308</sup> Since authentic consultation of the books in following years was reduced to a minimum, we can only assume that a near-complete loss of the old tradition was reflected in the new collection.

Of the three priests sent to Erythrae, little is known.

However, Gaius Scribonius Curio, the consul who had recommended that they be sent, was an ally of Sulla, a man generally sympathetic to the senate and the optimates. Thus, though Sulla was dead at the time of their restoration, the sibylline books in their second "edition" likely reflected a similar political outlook. This close connection with the senate, together with the subsequent weakening of that body, were undoubtedly chief factors in the decline of sibylline influence that characterized this era.

Mention has been made of the increase of the decemviral college into a body of fifteen men, the quindecimviri. We cannot fix a certain date for this change. Julius Obsequens was the last to refer to this college as the decemviri in a reference that pertains to the year 98; on the other hand, we first hear of the quindecimviri in a letter of Cicero from the year 51.<sup>309</sup> This change is usually attributed to the reforms of Sulla.<sup>310</sup> Inasmuch as that dictator increased the other priesthoods, the augures and the pontifices, to fifteen men, it is reasonable to assume that he also increased the decemviral college.<sup>311</sup> Also, one may logically relate this increase to restoration of the books after their destruction. The new collection, more extensive than the old, may have required a larger body of priests for its care. In addition, motivation may be seen in a desire to make this body conform in dignity and organization to the other priestly colleges. This desire itself may have been responsible for such a change. In any case, the quindecimviral college underwent

no other major changes throughout its subsequent history.<sup>312</sup>

Since there are only eight references to the sibylline books or sibylline oracles between 83 and their second revision by Augustus, an over-all discussion of these need not long detain us.<sup>313</sup> There was only one instance of a consultation whose reason and results were routine.<sup>314</sup> In 38, the year of this consultation, a series of portents was reported. A statue of Virtus, which had fallen on its face, was taken into the ocean, left there a considerable length of time, and after this purification brought back to Rome. In addition, there are two other references pertaining to proveable consultations. Both of these were associated with unusual political contexts, and since their recommendations were likewise departures from the norm, will be reserved for later discussion. The first was associated with Pompey's desire to restore King Ptolemy Auletes in 56; the second with the Ludi Saeculares celebrated by Augustus in 17.

Of the four remaining references, it can only be said that all of them point to the circulation of sibylline oracles that were not proveably derived from the books, and thus appear false. However, they are interesting to us for that reason alone; their existence constitutes incontestable proof of decline in the sibylline tradition, and of a concomitant increase in the use, by politicians, of conveniently invented false oracles. The most interesting and significant of these were related to the Catilinarian conspiracy in 63 and Caesar's plans for the conquest of the Parthians in 44. Though both

oracles were ostensibly fabricated, they warrant closer attention because they were alleged to have come from the sibylline books, and because of political motivations involved.

Details of the Catilinarian conspiracy are too well known to require extensive discussion here. It will suffice to mention that after his second defeat in an attempt to gain the consulship, Catiline formed a far-reaching conspiracy which Cicero strongly opposed. The latter's extensive campaigns against Catiline forced him to leave Rome; he subsequently went to Etruria to collect forces that were sympathetic to his cause. Then Cicero did his utmost to expose and execute those ring-leaders of the conspiracy who remained at Rome; he was thus soon able to secure the downfall of Catiline himself.

Catiline's chief ring-leader in Rome was Cornelius Lentulus Sura, whose personal ambitions had led him to join the conspiracy sometime before. After the departure of Catiline, he formulated plans for the complete destruction of Rome and the senate, hoping to achieve this in part by encouraging a revolt amongst the Allobroges, a Gallic tribe.<sup>315</sup>

Two ambassadors of the Allobroges were in Rome at this time. Their nation had been in great difficulty, and because of this it was disaffected towards the Roman government. Lentulus and his aides, with the intention of encouraging this revolt, tried to take these men into their conspiracy, promising them independence from Rome and relief from their debts. Accordingly, letters to the senate of the Allobroges promis-

ing freedom from Roman control, as well as one urging Catiline to march on Rome, were sent back with these legates. A Roman in Lentulus' pay was sent to bear the letters.

Cicero was aware of these arrangements, obtained the secret co-operation of the Allobroges, and in an ambush at the Mulvian bridge arrested the man carrying the letters. They were subsequently used in the senate, together with testimonies of the Gallic ambassadors, to secure the condemnation of Lentulus, and, soon after, his execution and that of four colleagues.

Our chief interest in this affair concerns a sibylline oracle that was related directly to Lentulus' career, and appears to have been of considerable importance in his attempt to rise to power through the conspiracy. The oracle in circulation declared that three Cornelii were destined to possess absolute power in Rome, and implied that Cornelius Lentulus himself would soon achieve this destiny, since Cinna and Sulla had already done so.<sup>316</sup> Plutarch tells us that this oracle, purported to be sibylline, was forged by false prophets. Both he and Quintilian indicate that it led Lentulus to seek power, and that it was thus responsible for his downfall.

However, this interpretation, apart from the indication that the oracle was false, does not agree with that of any of the other ancient sources. Sallust, Cicero, and Florus imply that this oracle was invented by Lentulus himself, in his efforts to secure power, and that it played an important

role in those efforts. He employed it to convince both his local supporters<sup>317</sup> and the Allobroges.<sup>318</sup> In fact, this might have been Lentulus' chief means of convincing the Allobroges to support his cause.<sup>319</sup>

There is little doubt, then, that Lentulus contrived this oracle in an effort to win support. The nature of its prediction is a clear indication of its falseness.<sup>320</sup> And there is further proof. When Lentulus was brought to trial and could not be induced to admit his guilt, the Gauls finally asked him about his repeated references to a sibylline oracle. This alone caused Lentulus' near-collapse and confession. Such a reaction clearly indicated that he had invented the oracle, which was perhaps unknown by authorities presiding at the trial. But when it came to light, they were no doubt aware that the sibylline books had never given forth such a prophecy. Thus Lentulus' fabrication, and his entire manoeuvre, must have been obvious, and his guilt no longer concealable.

Lentulus' failure is not over-significant. Rather, it is important to note that a false oracle was contrived for political ends and thought capable of achieving them. Thus this affair epitomized not only a lack of respect, on the part of some people, for the sibylline tradition, but also an ever-increasing reluctance on the part of the government to employ an institution so open to manipulation.

The next mention of a sibylline oracle concerns the Pompey-Ptolemy episode of 56.<sup>321</sup> In contrast to the oracle



of Lentulus, this prophecy originated with an authentic consultation. However, political motives were equally in evidence, and in order to understand these motives, it is necessary to review the entangled political context relevant to this consultation.

After Pompey's defeat of Mithridates (63) and the military distinction he attained in that campaign, his return to Rome was marred by the reception of a jealous and unsympathetic senate. He was able to secure neither ratification of his eastern acta, nor land for his veterans, until Julius Caesar assisted him. Throughout this period, despite the fact that Cicero secured for him control of the grain supply, Pompey possessed little military power. It was therefore much in Pompey's interest to secure any military commissions which could augment his power and help him regain his former position. However, he faced a great opposition. The senate was wary of his desire for military control and remained unsympathetic to his desires. Crassus, whose great desire for power and jealousy of the victorious general were well known, likewise opposed Pompey. In addition, we know that Clodius and C. Porcius Cato, both of whom may have been allies of Crassus, were also opposed to Pompey.<sup>322</sup>

In 58 King Ptolemy Auletes of Egypt paid Caesar a bribe of 6,000 talents for recognition. In order to pay this debt Ptolemy was obliged to raise his taxes; and this increase so angered his subjects that he was dethroned and fled to Rome (57) in hopes of finding support for his restoration. He was

determined to achieve this regardless of means, and brought a fair amount of money to buy influence if necessary. At first, the senate was sympathetic to his cause, and Lentulus Spinther, the friend of Cicero, was appointed to assist in his restoration during the forthcoming year.<sup>323</sup>

Regarding his restoration there seem to have been three attitudes current at Rome.<sup>324</sup> Firstly, there was Pompey himself, anxious for such a commission. He affected to support Spinther, though much of this episode indicates that he really desired the commission for himself. We know that he favored Ptolemy and even entertained him as a guest. Secondly, there was a more "moderate" party, including Spinther and Cicero, which wished to restore Ptolemy using arms, but without placing too much importance on the act. Thirdly, there were others completely opposed to intervention. This group included Cato, M. Favonius, Crassus, and in general all those opposed to the use of military force if it were to be wielded by Pompey or Spinther.<sup>325</sup>

About this time a thunderbolt conveniently struck the temple of Jupiter, and this portent led to a consultation of the sibylline books. They were found to contain the following advice<sup>326</sup>:

*ἂν ὁ τῆς Αἰγύπτου βασιλεὺς βοηθείας τινὸς δεόμενος  
ἔλθῃ, τὴν μὲν φιλέαν οἱ μὴ ἀπερνῆσθαι, μὴ μῆντοι  
καὶ πλῆθει τινὲς ἐπικουρήσῃτε. ἐς δὲ μὴ κανδύλους ἔξετε"*  
According to Dio, Cato, because *ἔδειξε μὴ δοῦναι φεῖν*, forced the quindecimviri to read the oracle publicly before it had been discussed in the senate. He then advised the sen-

ate to drop all action in the case of Ptolemy; they did this, acting not only because of Cato's advice, but because they were startled at the coincidence of the sibylline recommendation.

It seems clear that this oracle was invented by those opposed to putting military power in the hands of Pompey or Spinther. Either pressure from some people in the senate, or the political outlook of the quindecimviral college itself, must have influenced this reading of the books.<sup>327</sup> We suspect that Crassus in particular was the motivating force behind this recommendation. This is implied by the action of his ally, Cato, in having it read publicly. Crassus' manoeuvre must have thus included, in the first place, the use of his influence to have the decemviri formulate such an oracle; and, in the second place, having one of his supporters, Cato, force a public reading before it could be suppressed by opposing factions.

The majority of senatorial feeling was in favor of either Pompey or Spinther.<sup>328</sup> Only a minority element in the senate would have supported Crassus and Cato. This explains their haste in proclaiming an oracle which they had invented in the first place. Once this oracle had been proclaimed publicly, it could not be altered or suppressed. But if it had to be endorsed by a senate largely opposed to such a recommendation, its publication and enforcement were not certain.

Cato's plan bore fruit; the oracle was not suppressed. Because this oracle had become well known all over Rome, and

on that account could not be changed, the senate was forced to comply.<sup>329</sup> However, the ruse was an obvious one. Cicero was not deceived, and frequently mocked, in his letters, the religious scruples causing so much confusion.<sup>330</sup>

Regarding the restoration of Ptolemy, it only remains to mention that the king later bribed Gabinius to restore him in 55. Gabinius demonstrated the ineffectuality of the invented oracle, for when he was brought to trial over this episode and accused of acting contrary to the sibylline books, a good case could not be made against him. Even though the books were re-read in hopes of finding a suitable punishment, nothing was found; and it was finally decided that a different time and different king were meant by the sibyl.<sup>331</sup>

The next mention of a sibylline oracle falls in the year 44, at a time shortly before the death of Caesar. That general had reached the zenith of his career, and while his powers were comfortably consolidated in his office of dictator, it was unclear to most people, perhaps even to Caesar himself, the heights to which his authority in the state could go. This was especially true of the kingship, an office abhorrent to the Roman people, but nevertheless on the minds of many at this time. In spite of Caesar's outright rejection of the title, we cannot be sure that he was not aspiring to this office.<sup>332</sup> The fact that he rejected the title on one occasion may have been but a postponement, and as such a means of exciting the people who favored it, and leading them to demand ever more insistently. It is likely that this matter will

always remain in doubt. Caesar's astute politics and his untimely assassination make a decision very difficult. However, the sibylline oracle mentioned before his death alluded to the kingship, and if nothing else it proved that such thoughts were in the minds of some people, some faction.

This oracle was directly associated with Caesar's plans for an extensive campaign against the Dacians and Parthians.<sup>333</sup> Parthia had been threatening the eastern bounds of the empire; and in addition to achieving some security on that frontier, Caesar's thoughts were also turned towards the revenge of Crassus, who had been defeated and murdered at Carrhae in 53.

The oracle which came into circulation during the preparations for this campaign is best described by Suetonius:

Quin etiam varia fama percrebruit...proximo senatu  
Lucium Cottam quindecimvirum sententiam dicturum,  
ut, quoniam fatalibus libris contineretur, Parthos  
nisi a rege non posse vinci, Caesar rex appellaretur.  
Quae causa coniuratis maturandi fuit destinata  
negotia, ne assentiri necesse esset. 334

Apart from this blatantly obvious reference to Caesar and the Parthian campaign, all sources mentioning this oracle imply that it was neither genuine, nor associated with an authentic consultation of the books.<sup>335</sup> It was born of a rumour, spread by an unknown party. The mention of the quindecimvir Lucius Cotta, who was to bring up the question of this oracle in the next meeting of the senate, does not really shed any light on the problem. Though we know that this man was an associate of Caesar's and thus would probably have acted on his behalf, his connection with this oracle may have been invented as was the oracle itself, and to that extent intended.<sup>336</sup> Thus we

cannot logically claim that this man was responsible for the oracle, or regard the mention of his name as a key to its correct interpretation.

It is, in fact, nearly impossible to unravel the mystery of this oracle's origin. As is the case with all other events of 44 that pertained to Caesar's kingship, there are two contradictory interpretations.<sup>337</sup> Firstly, it could have been invented by Caesar himself, or his supporters, in an effort to convince people and government alike that his authority should be elevated to the highest position possible, that of the kingship.<sup>338</sup> This interpretation would hold that Lucius Cotta was an active member in such a campaign, a respected *quindecimvir* creating an oracle, implying that it originated with the sibylline books, and intending to bring it up in the senate for discussion. Thus this oracle was part of an astute manoeuvre of Caesar. Though wishing to attain the title *rex*, he planned to achieve this indirectly by implying, by various means, such as this oracle, to the people that he should be made a king. At the same time he refused the title, albeit without much conviction, so as to excite them to ever more insistent demands.

The second interpretation, which is perhaps slightly more convincing, holds that this oracle was contrived by Caesar's enemies. This would include the senate in general and the conspirators in particular.<sup>339</sup> By creating the rumour that Caesar intended to become, or should become, a king, they thus gained a valid pretext for his assassination.<sup>340</sup> In

this light the mention of Lucius Cotta may be interpreted as an effort by those opposed to Caesar to imply that not only Caesar himself, but his various supporters were assisting him in his quest for the kingship. If this oracle was thus part of a campaign to secure Caesar's downfall, those behind it achieved an unqualified success. Because of this success, one is inclined, perhaps, to prefer the second interpretation.

Our only certainty regarding this affair is the falseness of the oracle itself, and the fact that it gained a fair amount of attention. It is also clear that this rumour, regardless of its origin, actually hastened the plot for Caesar's assassination.<sup>341</sup>

The sibylline books are not mentioned again in a significant context until Augustus' famous celebration, assisted by Agrippa, of the Ludi Saeculares in 17 B. C.<sup>342</sup> This celebration was closely connected with Augustan attempts to revive traditional religious values; and this religious campaign was, of course, an integral part of Augustus' reconstruction of the Roman state. Apart from this revival of the Ludi Saeculares in 17, Augustan religious revival was epitomized also by a new edition of the sibylline books, which will be considered shortly. Both events are of great importance in any study of Augustan religious reforms; they are even more significant to us because of their direct association with the sibylline books.

Augustus had several reasons for holding the secular games at this time. In the first place, games which should

have been held c. 49 had been postponed indefinitely because of the civil wars. Thus a celebration was long overdue, and Augustus naturally took this opportunity, as part of his religious restoration, to pay obeisance to a religious tradition of long standing. However, the tradition of holding these games every century coincided ill with his plans to hold games in 17, and we note with amusement the efforts of the celebrated jurist Ateius Capito, chief planner of this celebration, to establish a new system of dating that would justify a celebration at this time.<sup>343</sup> Apparently he was forced to abandon the traditional saeculum of 100 years and adopt a new one of 110 years in accordance with the Pythagorean doctrine of *ἡλικυρεβία*.<sup>344</sup>

The second purpose of Augustus in holding these games was also connected with the Pythagorean *ἡλικυρεβία*. This doctrine of rebirth after four saecula had an obvious appeal, since he wished to associate his rule with a rebirth of the Roman state. Celebration of these games thus became synonymous with regeneration, the end of an older age and the birth of a new golden age.<sup>345</sup> The Parthians had been brought under Roman control; the civil wars were over; Augustus' principate was firmly established and generally accepted.

A third purpose is discernible if these games are seen in the light of an atonement for Rome's recent political past. They were part of an effort to restore the pax deorum disturbed by the civil wars and Caesar's death. The fact that Augustus



himself made some of the vows and prayers must have been intended to signify that he was atoning for the old age, and thus personally responsible for the beginning of the new one.

In connection with this effort to mark the beginning of a new age, some attention should be paid to the gods worshipped at these games.<sup>346</sup> Rather than the chthonic deities *Die* and *Proserpina*, who were traditionally associated with the secular games, we find that sacrifices were made to *Apollo*, *Diana*, *Juno*, *Jupiter*, the *Parcae*, the *Ilithyae*, and *Mother Earth*. Only the place and time of celebration remained as in the past. This change is significant, for the gods worshipped seem to have been chosen for their individual significance. For example, *Augustus* emphasized birth and fertility in his choice of the *Parcae*, *Ilithyae*, and *Mother Earth*. The choice of *Apollo* is also important. This god, whose important relationship to *Augustus* as his tutelary deity will be considered shortly, was undoubtedly chosen because he was god of peaceful arts, prosperity, balance, and order.<sup>347</sup>

In accordance with tradition, the sibylline books recommended the celebration of these games. The specific occasion for consultation seems to have been a reappearance of *Caesar's* comet in 17 that was thought to indicate the end of one saeculum and the beginning of another.<sup>348</sup> There is no doubt that *Augustus* controlled the sibylline college at this time, or that he was indirectly responsible for this recommendation.<sup>349</sup> The oracle made public and containing relevant instructions clearly represented his wishes both as to the time and the

nature of the celebration. Thus its invention by the quindecimviri at the command of Augustus cannot really be disputed.

Augustus' revision of the sibylline books in 12 B. C. is the last matter requiring discussion here. This final death-blow to the tradition provides a suitable terminating point for this study, since the subsequent history of the books down to their destruction by Stilicho is negligible.

Previously, in 18 B. C., Augustus had the quindecimviri make a new copy of the books because they had become indistinct through the lapse of time.<sup>350</sup> We cannot be certain of the extent of this earlier revision, though it was likely that Augustus took this opportunity to prepare the books for their recommendation of the secular games in the following year.

With the death of Lepidus in 12 B. C., Augustus himself assumed the office of Pontifex Maximus. Suetonius tells us that he had not been able to bring himself to divest his former colleague of this office, even though he was an exile.<sup>351</sup> However, his death left the office vacant and Augustus' acceptance of it was inevitable. Shortly after taking on these duties he undertook a complete revision of the sibylline books, and brought out what may justifiably be called their third "edition".

Apart from Augustus' wish to reword the oracles in accordance with his plans for political and religious reconstruction, we should also mention that he might have been dissatisfied, for political reasons, with the restoration of 76.<sup>352</sup> He found a convenient pretext for this revision in the great number of

false oracles in circulation prior to 12 B. C.; the collection and appraisal of these provided him with the opportunity of re-writing the sibylline books themselves:

...quidquid fatidicorum librorum Graeci Latinique generis nullis vel parum idoneis auctoribus vulgo ferebatur, supra duo milia contracta undique cremavit ac solos retinuit Sibyllinos, hos quoque dilectu habito; condiditque duobus forulis auratis sub Palatini Apollinis basi. 353

It is significant that Augustus chose to install this new collection in the Palatine temple of Apollo, which neighbored his palace, rather than in the temple of Jupiter on the Capitol.<sup>354</sup> We have already mentioned the emphasis placed on Apollo in the Ludi Saeculares; in this action one can see an even more outright identification of Augustus' policies with that deity.<sup>355</sup>

Why did Augustus wish to associate himself, and therefore his policies, with Apollo? Firstly, Apollo was his tutelary deity, since his adopted ancestors, the Julii, were also associated with this god. Secondly, because a temple of Apollo had overlooked the sight of his victory at Actium, Augustus claimed that this god had assisted him in the battle. Thirdly, Augustus wished to secure special identification with Apollo because that god best typified the desired attributes of his reconstruction of the state: civilization, peace, balance, and artistic creation.

This removal of the sibylline books to a temple of Apollo thus has great significance. Jupiter was no longer a suitable guardian, since this god was protector of the entire Roman state, and thus could not provide the personal identification

desired by Augustus. But Apollo could lend his personal support, and since he was conveniently the god of prophecy, the books could be deposited in his shrine without affront to tradition:

....Le chef nouveau de la religion romaine faisait montre de sa science théologique en accusant le lien qui unissait la Sibylle à Apollon. Le fils et l'héritier du divin Jules payait une dette de famille en abritant sous son patronage immédiate l'oracle, artisan de la légende qui avait consacré la grandeur de sa maison. Enfin l'empereur, en installant dans sa demeure même, c'est-à-dire dans le temple qui en était une annexe, le recueil dépositaire des destinées de Rome, proclamait hautement que désormais elles étaient identiques à ses destinées propres et à celles de sa dynastie. 356

This astute manoeuvre, the revision of the sibylline books, led to their complete subordination in the vast complex of Augustan reconstruction. The process was one of absorption rather than destruction; though this revision of the books was in fact a final death blow to a long-ailing tradition, we can still admire the way in which they were subtly interwoven in the fabric of new Augustan religion. What was in fact their end was enshrouded by the atmosphere of respectful restoration and grandiose ceremony that characterized much of Augustan reconstruction; and it was, to that extent, the less obvious.

Nothing is known about the precise nature, or extent, of this revision. If we wish to judge this in the light of the books' subsequent history, the only conclusion tenable is that they were reduced to a state of complete uselessness and ineffectiveness. It is characteristic of the sibylline books that we should know so little about their second revision;

much about them--their exact origin, their mode of consultation, their first revision--has also remained in obscurity. But neither their importance, nor our fascination, is lessened on that account.

## NOTES TO CHAPTER FOUR

302. W.W.Fowler, op. cit., P. 339
303. Fenestella ap. Lact., Inst. Div., I, 6
304. These were the Persaeon, Libyssan, Delphic, Cimmerian, Erythraean, Samian, Cumaeon, Hellespontian, Ancyran, and Tiburtine sibyls.
305. Lact., Inst. Div., loc. cit.
306. Varro ap. Dionysius IV, 62
307. Lact., De Ira Dei, XXII, 6
308. Dion. IV, 62. See G. Bloch in Daremberg-Saglio, "duumviri s. f."
309. Jul. Obs. 47; Cic. Ad Fam. VIII, 4, 1
310. For example, G. Bloch in Daremberg-Saglio, loc. cit.
311. Livy, Per., 89
312. Caesar temporarily increased the board to sixteen members so as to favor more members of his party with priest-hoods. He added one member not only to the quindecimviri, but to the augural and pontifical colleges as well (Dio, XLII, 51). Also, it appears that in the time of Augustus there were as many as twenty-one quindecimviri. See H. Dessau, Inscriptiones Latinae Selectae, (Berlin, 1896--1916), 5050, n. 60.
313. Pliny's reference (XVII, 38) to a consultation prior to the civil wars of Pompey leaves much in doubt, especially regarding the authenticity of the consultation. If one accepts this as referring to a genuine consultation, the insignificance of the resulting prophecy and the nebulousness of the account still render further discussion fruitless.
314. Dio XLVII, 43
315. Plut., Cic., 17 f.
316. Plut., loc. cit.; Sall., Cat., 47; Cic., Cat., III, 4; Quintilian, V, 10, 30.
317. Florus II, 12
318. Sall., Cat., 47: "sermonibus, quos ille habere solitus erat: ex libris Sibyllinis, regnum Romae tribus Corneliis portendi; Cinna atque Sullam antea, se tertium esse, cui fatum foret urbis potiri." The Gauls "Lentulum dissimulantem coarguunt" with these sermones. See also Cic., Cat., III, 4
319. He also appears to have used a prediction of the soothsayers, who foretold destruction of the Capitol twenty years after the fire of 83 (Cic., Cat., III, 4; Sall., Cat., 47) This convenient reference to 63 must have been more than mere coincidence. The portents which prompted the soothsayers to make such a prediction were, perhaps, little more than a pretext.
320. Münzer, op. cit., P. 100
321. P. Willems, Le Sénat de la République Romaine, (Paris, 1883) II, p. 313 f., L.R. Taylor, Party Politics, (Berkeley, 1949), P. 84 f.
322. It is not certain that Clodius was an ally of Crassus; see Scullard, From the Gracchi to Nero, p. 121. However, his great opposition to Pompey in 58/57 suggests an intrigue. Cato was almost certainly under the influence

of Crassus; and when tribune in 56 he was perhaps in the latter's pay. See Gelzer in Pauly--Wissowa, s. v. Porcius Cato (6); Gelzer, Pompeius, (Munich, 1949), P. 159 f.; and E. Meyer, Caesars Monarchie und das Principat des Pompeius, (Stuttgart, 1919), P. 129; L. R. Taylor, op. cit., P. 85

323. At that time, Spinther would be pro-consul of Cilicia.

324. W. E. Heitland, The Roman Republic, (Cambridge, 1909), III, P. 179

325. The following statement of Cicero (Ad Fam., I, 4, 2) indicates that there was opposition not only to Spinther, but to any other, such as Pompey, who wished the command: "Haec tamen opinio est populi Romani, a tuis invidis atque obtrectatoribus nomen inductum fictae religionis, non tam ut te impedirent, quam ut ne quis propter exercitus cupiditatem Alexandriam ire."

326. Dio, XXXIX, 15. To this consultation we should also assign, perhaps, the rather inaccurate version of Lucan, VIII, 824.

327. We cannot be certain of the identity of a single quindecimvir at this time, according to the magistrate lists compiled by Broughton, op. cit., II, passim.

328. See Meyer, op. cit., P. 130; Willems, op. cit., II, P. 314. From debates in the senate subsequent to the publication of this oracle, it seems that Hortensius, Cicero and Lucullus were in favor of Spinther; Volcatius and Afranius favored Pompey. Only Crassus, Bibulus and Servilius opposed a commission headed by either Spinther or Pompey. Crassus and Bibulus suggested that three senators be sent to restore Ptolemy, whereas Servilius was completely opposed to his restoration.

329. Willems, op. cit., II, P. 314.

330. Cic., Ad Fam., I, 4 and 7

331. Dio, XXXIX, 59 f.

332. L. R. Taylor, The Divinity of the Roman Emperor, (Middletown, Conn., 1931), P. 67 f., is of the opinion that Caesar wanted to become king, yet refused when attitudes of the people about the kingship became clear to him.

333. Appian, B. Civ., II, 110; Plut., Caes., 58

334. Suet., Caes., 79; see also Dio, XLIV, 15; Appian, loc. cit.; Cic., De Div., II, 54; Plut., Caes., 60

335. Both Plutarch and Appian indicate that it was proposed that Caesar be made king only of subject nations outside of Italy (Plut., Caes., 64 ; Appian, loc. cit.). L. R. Taylor, op. cit., P. 73, feels that this distinction was due to pamphlets spread abroad at a later time by Antony in an effort to justify his position in Egypt.

336. Münzer, op. cit., P. 325. For example, we know that Caesar's mother was his kinswoman.

337. G. Dobesch, Caesars Apotheose zu Lebzeiten und sein Ringen um den Königstitel, (1966), P. 104; Scullard, op. cit., P. 154.

338. For this point of view, see Plut., Caes., 60; and Heitland, op. cit., III, P. 360

339. Meyer, op. cit., P. 529
340. In this connection, see Plut., Caes., 57 and 60, who indicates that Caesar's enemies joined his flatterers in supporting such titles. They did this, he says, so as to gain every possible pretext for his murder.
341. Dio, XLIV, 15; Suet., Caes., 79
342. Res Gestae Divi Augusti, ed. Shipley, IV, 22.
343. Zos., II, 4, 2
344. The complications of this new method of dating are well discussed by L. R. Taylor, A. J. Phil., 1934, P. 104 f., and P. 119 f. See also W.W.Fowler, op. cit., P. 441. Apparently Varro claimed, in accordance with Pythagorean doctrine, that a generation, a saeculum, consisted of 110 years. After four such saecula, a period of 440 years, the world underwent a complete rebirth, a ἡλικυγενεσία. According to this system a series of purely fictitious dates for past celebrations was invented--456, 346, 236, and 126--in order to justify the new celebration in 17 B. C. It would have been more logical to have chosen the series 457, 347, 237, and 127; but L. R. Taylor points out that the first series better coincided with the early political careers of the Valerii, who were traditionally associated with these games, and still prominent in the time of Augustus.
345. Vergil, Ecl. IV; Aen. VI, 792: "...aurea condet saecula qui rursus Latio, regnata per arva Saturno quondam"
346. Documents relevant to these games, containing details of their celebration, are the following: CIL VI, 32323; Dessau, op. cit., 5050, commentary; the oracle, whose original circumstances belong to 348, quoted by Phlegon, (Jacoby, Die Fragmente der Griechischen Historiker (Leiden, 1962), IIB, P. 1189 f.), and Zosimus (II, 6); finally, the Carmen Saeculare of Horace, a sapphic hymn written for the event, to be sung by twenty-seven boys and an equal number of maidens.
347. Horace, Car. Saec. 1, 62; CIL VI, 32323, 141 f.
348. For a discussion of these comets, see A. Grenier, The Roman Spirit, (London, 1926), P. 315 f.
349. Names of quindecimviri at this time are listed in CIL VI, 32323, ed. Dessau, op. cit., 150.
350. Dio, LIV, 17
351. Suet., Aug., 31
352. A. A. Boyce, TAPA, 1938, P. 187
353. Suet., Aug., 31; see also Tac., Ann., VI, 12
354. The Palatine temple of Apollo had been started by Augustus in 36, after a lightning bolt struck the spot; it was subsequently dedicated in 28. Vell. Pat. II, 81
355. C. G. Starr, Civilization and the Caesars, (New York, 1954), P. 58; H. T. Rowell, Rome in the Augustan Age, (University of Oklahoma, 1962), P. 188 f.
356. G. Bloch in Daremberg-Saglio, "duumviri s. f. "



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### Part I. Ancient Authors and Texts

- Appian. Edited and translated by H. White. 4 volumes. Loeb Classical Library. London and Cambridge, Mass. 1912.
- Ammianus Marcellinus. Edited and translated by J. C. Rolfe. Loeb Classical Library. 3 volumes. London and Cambridge, Mass. 1935.
- St. Augustine. Edited and translated by G. E. McCracken. 7 volumes. Loeb Classical Library. London and Cambridge, Mass. 1957
- Ausonius. Edited and translated by H. G. E. White. 2 volumes. Loeb Classical Library. London and Cambridge, Mass. 1919.
- Censorinus. De Die Natali Liber. Edited by O. Jahn. Hildesheim, 1965.
- Cicero. In Catilinam. Edited by A. C. Clark. Oxford, 1905.
- \_\_\_\_\_. De Divinatione. Edited and translated by W. A. Falconer. Loeb Classical Library. London and Cambridge, Mass. 1923. Edited by A. S. Pease. Darmstadt, 1963.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Epistulae ad Atticum. Edited and translated by E. O. Winstedt. Loeb Classical Library. London and Cambridge, Mass. 1912. 3 volumes.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Epistulae ad Familiares. Edited and translated by W. G. Williams. 3 volumes. Loeb Classical Library. London and Cambridge, Mass. 1927.
- \_\_\_\_\_. De Legibus. Edited by F. Zieger. Heidelberg, 1950.

- \_\_\_\_\_. De Natura Deorum. Edited and translated by H. Rackham.  
Loeb Classical Library. London and Cambridge, Mass. 1933.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Pro Rabirio Postumo. Edited and translated by H. G.  
Hodge. Loeb Classical Library. London and Cambridge,  
Mass. 1927.
- \_\_\_\_\_. De Senectute. Edited and translated by W.A. Falconer.  
Loeb Classical Library. London and Cambridge, Mass.  
1923.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Pro Sestio. Edited and translated by R. Gardner.  
Loeb Classical Library. London and Cambridge, Mass.  
1958.
- \_\_\_\_\_. In Verrem. Edited and translated by L. H. G. Greenwood.  
2 volumes. Loeb Classical Library. London and Cambridge,  
Mass. 1928.
- Claudian. Edited and translated by M. Platnauer. 2 volumes.  
Loeb Classical Library. London and Cambridge, Mass.  
1922.
- Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum. 16 volumes. Berlin. 1863--
- Dio Cassius. Edited and translated by E. Cary. 9 volumes.  
Loeb Classical Library. London and Cambridge, Mass.  
1914.
- Dionysius of Halicarnassus. Edited and translated by E. Cary.  
7 volumes. Loeb Classical Library. London and Cambridge,  
Mass. 1937.
- Festus. Glossaria Latina. Edited by W. M. Lindsay. Stuttgart,  
1965.
- Florus. Edited and translated by E. S. Forster. Loeb Classical  
Library. London and Cambridge, Mass. 1929

Die Fragmente der Griechischen Historiker. Edited by F. Jacoby.

Leiden, 1962.

Frontinus. Aquaeductae. Edited and translated by C. E. Bennett.

Loeb Classical Library. London and Cambridge, Mass.,  
1925.

Aulus Gellius. Noctes Atticae. Edited and translated by

J. C. Rolfe. 3 volumes. Loeb Classical Library.

London and Cambridge, Mass., 1927.

Granius Licinianus. Edited by M. Flemisch. Stuttgart, 1967.

Herodotus. Edited by C. Hude. Oxford, 1908.

Horace. Carmen Saeculare. Edited and translated by C. E.

Bennett. Loeb Classical Library. London and Cambridge,  
Mass., 1914.

Julian. Edited and translated by W. Wright. 3 volumes. Loeb

Classical Library. London and Cambridge, Mass., 1913.

Lactantius. Divinae Institutiones. Translated by M. F. Mc-

Donald. Washington, 1964.

\_\_\_\_\_. De Ira Dei. Translated by M. F. McDonald. Washington,  
1964.

Livy. Edited and translated by B. Foster, R. Geer, F. Moore,

E. Sage, and A. Schlesinger. 14 volumes. Loeb Class-  
ical Library. London and Cambridge, Mass., 1922--59

\_\_\_\_\_. Edited by R. S. Conway, S. K. Johnson, A. N. MacDonald,  
and C. F. Walters. Oxford, 1914--65

Lucan. Edited by A. E. Housman. Oxford, 1950.

Lucretius. De Rerum Natura. Edited by C. Bailey. Oxford, 1900.

Macrobius. Saturnalia. Edited by F. Eyssenhardt. Leipzig,

1893.

Orosius. Translated by I. W. Raymond. New York, 1936.

- Ovid. Fasti. Edited and translated by J. G. Fraser. Loeb Classical Library. London and Cambridge, Mass., 1931.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Metamorphoses. Edited and translated by F. J. Miller. 2 volumes. Loeb Classical Library. London and Cambridge, Mass., 1916.
- Pausanias. Edited and translated by W. H. S. Jones. 4 volumes. Loeb Classical Library. London and Cambridge, Mass. 1918.
- Phlegon of Tralles. Mirabilia. Edited by A. Westermann. Amsterdam, 1963.
- Pliny. Naturalis Historia. Edited and translated by H. Rackham. 10 volumes. Loeb Classical Library. London and Cambridge, Mass., 1938.
- Plutarch. Moralia. Edited and translated by F. C. Babbitt. 15 volumes. Loeb Classical Library. London and Cambridge, Mass., 1927.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Vitae Parallelae. Edited and translated by B. Perrin. 11 volumes. Loeb Classical Library. London and Cambridge, Mass., 1914.
- Polybius. Edited and translated by W. Taton. 6 volumes. Loeb Classical Library. London and Cambridge, Mass., 1923.
- Quintilian. Institutio Oratoria. Edited and translated by H. E. Butler. Loeb Classical Library. London and Cambridge, Mass., 1921.
- Res Gestae Divi Augusti. Edited and translated by F. W. Shipley. Loeb Classical Library. London and Cambridge,

ridge, Mass., 1924.

Sallust. De Catilinae Coniuratione. Edited and translated by J. C. Rolfe. Loeb Classical Library. London and Cambridge, Mass., 1921

Scriptores Historiae Augustae. Edited and translated by D. Magie. 3 volumes. Loeb Classical Library. London and Cambridge, Mass., 1921.

Servius. Edited by G. Thilo and H. Hagen. 3 volumes. Leipzig, 1881.

Suetonius. Edited and translated by J.C. Rolfe. 2 volumes. Loeb Classical Library. London and Cambridge, Mass. 1913.

Tacitus. Annales. Edited and translated by J. Jackson. Loeb Classical Library. London and Cambridge, Mass., 1931

\_\_\_\_\_. Historiae. Edited and translated by C. H. Moore. Loeb Classical Library. London and Cambridge, Mass., 1925.

Valerius Maximus. Edited by L. Kempf. Berlin, 1854.

Varro. De Lingua Latina. Edited and translated by R. G. Kent. Loeb Classical Library. London and Cambridge, Mass., 1938.

\_\_\_\_\_. De Re Rustica. Edited and translated by W. H. Hooper. Loeb Classical Library. London and Cambridge, Mass., 1934

Vergil. Aeneid. Edited and translated by H. R. Fairclough. Loeb Classical Library. London and Cambridge, Mass.,

1918.

\_\_\_\_\_. Eclogae. Edited and translated by H. R. Fairclough.  
Loeb Classical Library. London and Cambridge, Mass.,  
1916.

Zozimus. Edited by L. Mendelssohn. Leipzig, 1887.

## Part II: Modern Authors

Altheim, F. A History of Roman Religion. Translated by H.  
Mattingly. London, 1938.

Bailey, C. Phases in the Religion of Ancient Rome. Berkeley,  
1932.

Bloch, R. Les Prodiges dans L'Antiquité Classique. Paris,  
1963.

Boyce, A. A. "Development of the Decemviri Sacris Faciundis",  
TAPA 69 (1938).

\_\_\_\_\_. "The Expiatory Rites of 207 B. C." TAPA 68 (1937).

Broughton, T. R. S. Magistrates of the Roman Republic.  
2 volumes. New York, 1951.

Bouché-Leclercq, A. Histoire de la Divination dans L'Antiquité  
Classique. 4 Volumes. Paris, 1882

Carter, J. B. The Religion of Numa. London, 1906

Cumont, F. Oriental Religions in Roman Paganism. New York,  
1911.

De Sanctis, G. Storia Dei Romani. Firenze, 1953. 4 volumes.

Dessau, H. Inscriptiones Latinae Selectae. Berlin, 1896--1916  
Dictionnaire des Antiquités Grecques et Romaines. Edited by  
C. Daremberg, E. Saglio, E. Pottier, and G. Fafaye.

Paris, 1887.

Diels, H. Sibyllinische Blätter. Berlin, 1890

Dobesch, G. Caesars Apotheose zu Lebzeiten und sein Ringen um den Königstitel. Vienna , 1966.

Fabre, P. "Minime Romano Sacro". REA 42 (1940).

Fowler, W. Religious Experience of the Roman People.

London, 1911

Frazer, J. G. The Fasti of Ovid. 5 volumes. London, 1929.

\_\_\_\_\_. The Golden Bough. Edited by T. H. Gaster. New York, 1961.

Gelzer, M. Pompeius. Munich, 1949

Grenier, A. The Roman Spirit. London, 1926

Hahm, D. E. "Roman Nobility and the Three Major Priesthoods 218--167". TAPA 94 (1963).

Harrison, J. Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion.

New York, 1903.

Heitland, W. E. The Roman Republic. 3 volumes. Cambridge, 1909.

Klotz, A. Livius. Amsterdam, 1964.

Latte, K. Römische Religionsgeschichte. Munich, 1960.

Lippold, A. Consules. Bonn, 1963.

Marquardt, J., and T. Mommsen. Handbuch der Römische Altertümer. 7 volumes. Leipzig, 1878.

Meyer, E. Caesars Monarchie und das Principat des Pompeius. Stuttgart, 1919.

Munzer, F. Römische Adelsparteien und Adelsfamilien. Stuttgart, 1963.

Niebuhr, B. G. History of Rome. Translated by J. C. Hare.

3 volumes. London, 1842--8.

Ogilvie, R. M. Commentary on Livy, Books I--V. Oxford, 1965.

Oxford Classical Dictionary. Edited by M. Cary, J. Denniston, J. W. Duff, A. Nock, W. Ross, and H. Scullard. Oxford, 1949.

Realencyclopaedie der Classischen Altertumswissenschaft. Edited by Pauly, G. Wissowa, W. Kroll, and K. Mittelhaus. Stuttgart, 1893--

Rose. H. J. Ancient Roman Religion. London, 1948.

Rowell, H. T. Rome in the Augustan Age. University of Oklahoma, 1962.

Scullard, H. H. From the Gracchi to Nero. London, 1959

\_\_\_\_\_. History of the Roman World, 753--146 B. C. London, 1935.

\_\_\_\_\_. Roman Politics 220--150 B. C. Oxford, 1951.

Starr, C. G. Civilization and the Caesars. New York, 1954.

Taylor, L. R. Divinity of the Roman Emperor. Middletown, Conn., 1931.

\_\_\_\_\_. "New Light on the History of the Secular Games".

A. J. Phil., 55 (1934).

\_\_\_\_\_. Party Politics in the Age of Caesar. Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1949.

Walsh, P. G. Livy: His Historical Aims and Methods. Cambridge, 1963.

Willems, P. Le Sénat de la République Romaine. 2 volumes. Paris, 1883.