

Universitatea „Alexandru Ioan Cuza” din Iași
Facultatea de Istorie • Centrul de Studii Clasice și Creștine

Nr. 19-1/2024

CLASSICA & CHRISTIANA



EDITURA UNIVERSITĂȚII „ALEXANDRU IOAN CUZA” DIN IAȘI

Classica et Christiana

Revista Centrului de Studii Clasice și Creștine

Fondator: Nelu ZUGRAVU

19/1, 2024

Classica et Christiana

Periodico del Centro di Studi Classici e Cristiani

Fondatore: Nelu ZUGRAVU

19/1, 2024

ISSN: 1842 – 3043

e-ISSN: 2393 – 2961

Comitetul științific / Comitato scientifico

Moisés ANTIQUEIRA (Universidade Estadual do Oeste do Paraná)
Sabine ARMANI (Université Paris 13-CRESC – PRES Paris Cité Sorbonne)
Immacolata AULISA (Università di Bari Aldo Moro)
Andrea BALBO (Università degli Studi di Torino)
Antonella BRUZZONE (Università degli Studi di Sassari)
Livia BUZOIANU (Muzeul Național de Istorie și Arheologie Constanța)
Marija BUZOV (Institute of Archaeology, Zagreb)
Dan DANA (C.N.R.S. – ANHIMA, Paris)
Maria Pilar GONZÁLEZ-CONDE PUENTE (Universidad de Alicante)
Attila JAKAB (Civitas Europica Centralis, Budapest)
Fred W. JENKINS (University of Dayton)
Domenico LASSANDRO (Università di Bari Aldo Moro)
Carmela LAUDANI (Università della Calabria)
Patrizia MASCOLI (Università di Bari Aldo Moro)
Dominic MOREAU (Université de Lille)
Eduard NEMETH (Universitatea Babeș-Bolyai, Cluj-Napoca)
Evalda PACI (Centro di Studi di Albanologia, Tirana)
Vladimir P. PETROVIĆ (Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts, Belgrade)
Luigi PIACENTE (Università di Bari Aldo Moro)
Sanja PILIPOVIĆ (Institute of Archaeology, Belgrade)
Mihai POPESCU (C.N.R.S. – ANHIMA, Paris)
Julijana VISOČNIK (Archdiocesan Archives of Ljubljana)
Heather WHITE (Classics Research Centre, London)

Comitetul de redacție / Comitato di redazione

Claudia TĂRNĂUCEANU (Universitatea „Alexandru Ioan Cuza” din Iași)
Nelu ZUGRAVU, director al Centrului de Studii Clasice și Creștine
al Facultății de Istorie a Universității „Alexandru Ioan Cuza” din Iași
(*director responsabil / direttore responsabile*)

Correspondența / Corrispondenza:

Prof. univ. dr. Nelu ZUGRAVU
Facultatea de Istorie, Centrul de Studii Clasice și Creștine
Bd. Carol I, nr. 11, 700506 – Iași, România
Tel. ++40 232 201634 / Fax ++40 232 201156
e-mail: nelu@uaic.ro

Toate contribuțiile sunt supuse unei duble analize anonime (*double-blind peer review*), efectuate de specialiști români și străini.

All contributions are subject to a double anonymous analysis (*double blind peer review*), carried out by Romanian and foreign specialists.

La redazione sottopone preliminarmente tutti i contributi pervenuti a un procedimento di doppia lettura anonima (*double-blind peer review*) affidato a specialisti romeni e stranieri.

UNIVERSITATEA „ALEXANDRU IOAN CUZA” din IAȘI
FACULTATEA DE ISTORIE
CENTRUL DE STUDII CLASICE ȘI CREȘTINE

Classica et Christiana

19/1
2024

Tehnoredactor: Nelu ZUGRAVU

ISSN: 1842 – 3043
e-ISSN: 2393 – 2961

Editura Universității „Alexandru Ioan Cuza” din Iași
700511 - Iași, tel./fax ++ 40 0232 314947

SUMAR / INDICE / CONTENTS

SIGLE ȘI ABREVIERI – SIGLE E ABBREVIAZIONI / 7

STUDII – STUDI / 9

Marco ALMANSA FERNÁNDEZ, Religious crimes in the Acts of the *collegium* of the *fratres aruales* / 9

Maria AMBROSETTI, *Historia proxima poetis*: osservazioni sul lessico di Sisenna e Accio [*Historia proxima poetis*: Observations on Sisenna and Accius' Lexicon] / 31

Antonella BRUZZONE, *Il “gran finale” del De consulatu Stilichonis di Claudiano* [*The “gran finale” of Claudian's De consulatu Stilichonis*] / 57

Alessandro CAPONE, Il carcere del corpo e la sanità dell'anima nell'*Apologeticum* di Tertulliano [The prison of the body and the soundness of the soul in Tertullian's *Apologeticum*] / 77

Alenka CEDILNIK, Dominic MOREAU, How Ulfilas became an Arian Bishop? Contribution (I) to the Christian Prosopography of the *Dioecesis Thraciarum* / 95

Alenka CEDILNIK, Dominic MOREAU, Demophilus, the Last Arian Bishop of Constantinople? Contribution (II) to the Christian Prosopography of the *Dioecesis Thraciarum* / 121

Alenka CEDILNIK, Dominic MOREAU, Macedonius of Constantinople, a True Eusebian? Contribution (IV) to the Christian Prosopography of the *Dioecesis Thraciarum* / 149

Agapie CORBU, Formația clasicistă a unui autor patristic: Evagrie Ponticul [The classical education of a Patristic author: Evagrius Ponticus] / 175

Pierre-Jacques DEHON, Poètes latins et zones climatiques : Heurs et malheurs d'un topos [Latin Poets and Climatic Zones : Ups and Downs of a Topos] / 191

Iulia DUMITRACHE, Character, Ridiculousness and Shame in the Latin Satire. The Use of Proper Names at Martial / 227

Lee FRATANTUONO, Herodotus' Artemisia and Virgil's Camilla / 245

Antonio IBBA, Tappi fittili da *Ibida* in *Scythia Minor* (V-VI sec.): riflessioni su una tipologia poco nota dell'*instrumentum inscriptum* [Clay plugs from *Ibida* in *Scythia Minor* (5th-6th century): reflections on a little-known typology of the *instrumentum inscriptum*] / 267

Anca MEIROȘU, Challenges in the Literary Representations of the Self. Case Study: *Accidia (Secretum, Petrarch)* / 297

Daniela SCARDIA, *E uestris codicibus eradendum*. Nota a Hier. *Ep.* 106, 73 [*E uestris codicibus eradendum*. Note about Hier. *Ep.* 106, 73] / 307

RECENZII ȘI NOTE BIBLIOGRAFICE – RECENSIONI E SCHEDE BIBLIOGRAFICHE / 315

M. TULLI CICERONIS *Actionis secundae in C. Verrem: Liber V* = M. TULLIUS CICERO, *A doua acțiune împotriva lui Verres: Cartea a V-a*, editori Luigi PIACENTE și Claudia TĂRNĂUCEANU, Editura Universității din București, 2023 (*Julian-Gabriel HRUȘCĂ*) / 315; AURELIO VITTORE, *De Caesaribus*, traduzione, introduzione e commento a cura di Mario IERARDI, Amazon Fulfillment, Wrocław, 2023 (*Nelu ZUGRAVU*) / 322; Fanny DEL CHICCA, *L'importanza di nascere clarissimus: per l'interpretazione dell'oratio VIII di Simmaco*, Morlacchi Editore U.P., Perugia, 2023 (*George IVAȘCU*) / 323; PAUL N. PEARSON, *The Roman Empire in Crisis, 248-260. When the Gods Abandoned Rome*, Pen & Sword Military, South Yorkshire, 2022 (*Flavian-Pavel CHILCOȘ*) / 327

CRONICA – CRONACA / 341

PUBLIKAȚII – PUBBLICAZIONI / 347

SIGLE ȘI ABREVIERI / SIGLE E ABBREVIAZIONI*

| | |
|--------------------|--|
| ANRW | <i>Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt. Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung</i> , II, <i>Prinzipat</i> , Berlin-New York |
| CSEL | <i>Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum</i> , Turnhout. |
| CCSL | <i>Corpus Christianorum. Series Latina</i> , Turnhout. |
| <i>Cod. Iust.</i> | <i>Codex Iustinianus</i> . |
| <i>Cod. Theod.</i> | <i>Codex Theodosianus</i> . |
| DELL | <i>Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine. Histoire des mots</i> , par Alfred Ernout et Alfred Meillet, tirage de la 4 ^e édition, Paris, 1959. |
| EDR | <i>Epigraphic Database Roma</i> (http://www.edr-edr.it/default/index.php). |
| GCS | <i>Griechische Christliche Schriftsteller</i> , Berlin. |
| MGH | <i>Monumenta Germaniae Historica</i> . |
| OLD | <i>Oxford Latin Dictionary</i> , Oxford, 1968. |
| PG | <i>Patrologiae cursus completus. Series Graeca</i> , Paris. |
| PL | <i>Patrologiae cursus completus. Series Latina</i> , Paris. |
| PLRE I | <i>The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire</i> , I, A. D. 260-395, by A. H. M. Jones, J. R. Martindale, J. Morris, Cambridge, 2006 |
| PSB | <i>Părinți și scriitori bisericești</i> , București |
| SC | <i>Sources Chrésiennes</i> , Lyon. |
| SCIV (SCIVA) | <i>Studii și cercetări de istorie veche (și arheologie)</i> , București. |
| ThLL | <i>Thesaurus linguae Latinae</i> . |

* Cu excepția celor din *L'Année Philologique* și *L'Année Épigraphique* / Escluse quelle segnalate da *L'Année Philologique* e *L'Année Épigraphique*.

RELIGIOUS CRIMES IN THE ACTS OF THE COLLEGIUM OF THE *FRATRES ARVALES**

Marco ALMANSA FERNÁNDEZ**
(Universidad Complutense de Madrid/
Universidad de Cantabria)

Keywords: *sacrifice*, collegium, fratres Arvales, *religious crimes*, A.F.A.

Abstract: *Religious crimes in the acts of the collegium of the fratres Arvales.* Our work consists of the study of two fundamental paths that go hand in hand and are present, even, in other priesthoods and rituals. In the first place, we will study how the sacrifice was and the faults committed in it and secondly, about the Arvales college. The Roman sacrifice had a series of specific operating rules. If these immolations had any anomaly, their interruption would be immediate so that they could be restarted. This return was atoned for with a new sacrifice, generally of a sow, cow or calf that was prepared for that purpose. The existence of numerous priestly collegia was evident in Rome thanks to epigraphic or literary sources. We will discuss in this space the immolative changes, their reasons and what elements could cause the sacrifices in general, and particularly those made by the fratres Arvales, to be interrupted. We want to investigate the different religious crimes¹ that could have occurred in a sacrifice led by the fratres Arvales and their legal consequences around the protagonists who committed it. We begin this study from two complementary paths. On the one hand, we will capture what are the different religious crimes linked to the sacrifice and, on the other, the knowledge of the immolations by the fratres Arvales and what events forced them to perform a series of expiatory rituals.

Cuvinte-cheie: *sacrificiu*, collegium, fratres Arvales, *crime religioase*, A.F.A.

* This article is part of the Postdoctoral Project carried out of the University Complutense de Madrid and University of Cantabria, with a research stay at the University of Bologna (Italy), and which is under the “Margarita Salas” contract, approved by the Ministry of Universities under Royal Decree 289/2021, of April 20 and financed by the European Union-NextGenerationEU.

** marco.almansa@unican.es/malman01@ucm.es

¹ We understand crime as all those acts that were constituent of a fault, an error, an anomaly during the ritual or any act considered sacred or linked to it, which was solvable with atoning or piacular sacrifices and that in some cases implied, in the same way, a fine and / or expulsion from office.

Rezumat: Crimele religioase în actele colegiului fraților arvali.

Lucrarea noastră constă în studiul a două căi fundamentale care merg mână în mână și sunt prezente, de asemenea, în alte preoții și ritualuri. În primul rând, vom studia cum a fost sacrificiul și greșelile comise în el și, în al doilea rând, despre colegiul arvalilor. Sacrificiul roman a avut o serie de reguli de funcționare foarte specifice. Dacă aceste sacrificii ar avea vreo anomalie, întreruperea lor ar fi fost imediată, pentru a putea fi reluate. Această reluare era ispășită printr-un nou sacrificiu, în general al unei scroafe, al unei vaci și al unui vițel care a fost pregătit în acest scop. Existența a numeroase colegii preoțești a fost evidentă la Roma datorită surselor epigrafice sau literare. Vom discuta în acest spațiu schimbările survenite în ritul de imolare, motivele lor și ce elemente ar putea face ca sacrificiile, în general, și cele făcute de frații arvali, în special, să fie întrerupte. Dorim să investigăm diferitele crime religioase care ar fi putut avea loc într-un sacrificiu condus de frații arvali și consecințele lor juridice în jurul protagoniștilor care l-au comis. Începem acest studiu pe două căi complementare. Pe de o parte, vom surprinde care sunt diferitele crime religioase legate de jertfă și, pe de altă parte, cunoașterea imolărilor făcute de către frații Arvales și ce evenimente i-au forțat să îndeplinească o serie de ritualuri expiatorii.

1. Sacrifice and its crimes

The theoretical definition of sacrifice and its origin is perfectly studied by several authors². A first definition of sacrifice was the one coined through the School of Paris, specifically the one transmitted by

² J.-P. Vernant et al., *Théorie générale du sacrifice et mise à mort dans la θυσία grecque*, Génova, Fondation Hardt, 1981, 1-22; J. Scheid, *Le délit religieux dans la Rome tardo-républicaine*, in *Le délit religieux dans la cité antique*, Roma, (Collection de l'École Française, 48), 1981, 117-171; idem, *Romulus et ses frères. Le collège des frères arvales, modèle du culte public dans la Rome des empereurs*, Roma, 1990 (*Bibliothèque des Écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome CCLXXV*); idem, *Lucus, nemus. Q'est-ce qu'un bois sacré ?*, in *Les bois sacrés. Actes du Colloque International organisé par le Centre Jean Bérard et l'École Pratique des Hautes Etudes (V section)*, Naples, 23-25 novembre 1989, préface de O. de Cazanove et J. Scheid, Naples, 1993, 13-20; idem, *Quand faire, c'est croire. Les rites sacrificiels des Romains*, Flammarion, 2005; S. R. F. Price, *Rituals and Power. The Roman imperial cult in Asia Minor*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1984, 28-43; J. Z. Smith, *The Domestication of Sacrifice*, in R. G. Hamerton-Kelly (ed.), *Violent Origins. Ritual Killing and Cultural Formation*, Stanford, 1987, 197-198; C. Bell, *Ritual Theory, Ritual Practice*, Oxford University Press, New York-Oxford, 1992, 173-175; F. Prescendi, *Décrire et comprendre le sacrifice. Les réflexions des Romains sur leur propre religion à partir de la littérature antique*, Franz Steiner Verlag, Stuttgart, 2007; J. Rüpke, *Die Religion der Römer. Eine Einführung*, 2., Überarbeitete Ed., C. H. Beck Verlag, München, 2006.

Mauss and Hubert³, in which it was specified that the ritual should be exclusively with animal death. However, for us, there is certainty of the existence of bloodless sacrifices, where the protagonist was no longer the ritual death of the beast, but of vegetable products⁴. A clear description, with which we agree, is the one provided by Prescendi⁵:

“Sacrifice was the rite of a human community (a city, *collegium*, or a family) represented by the most important hierarchical member (emperor, magistrate, priest/isa, *paterfamilias*), to create a channel of communication between the earthly world and all that is superhuman. [...] The sacrifice consisted of a banquet offered to the divinity, followed by a human one. The offering can be animal or vegetable such as dates, wine, fruits and / or animal derivatives such as honey, milk, cheese, etc. The sacrifice of the animal was more prestigious and spectacular because it included the moment of the death of the animal and the subsequent observation of its internal organs. There were elements of sacrifice that had to be always present, in this case it was fire, which not only served to cook the meat or viscera, as mentioned above, but as an integrating and purifying element of immolation. There was no sacrifice without fire”⁶.

Considering this definition, necessary to introduce our study with it, let us continue with some of the characteristics of *immolatio*. One of them was the marked rigorous nature of its praxis, having a precise regulation based on a series of parameters that had to be met⁷.

An immolation could not be conducted without the main participation of fire. Without this, a sacrifice could not be being made. Thanks to the fire, the entrails could be offered to the deities, as well as the *aromata* of herbs and perfumes that accompanied the sacrifice⁸, serving to provide atmosphere and cover up the bad smells produced by the death of the animal or the cooking of its *exta* (viscera).

³ M. Mauss, H. Hubert, *Essai sur la nature et la fonction du sacrifice*, in M. Mauss, *Les fonctions sociales du sacré*, Paris, 1968, 29-138.

⁴ J. A. Delgado Delgado, *La ritualización del reino vegetal en la Roma antigua: los liba*, in R. Olmos, P. Cabrera, S. Montero Herrero (coords.), *Paraíso cerrado, jardín abierto. El reino vegetal en el imaginario religioso del Mediterráneo*, Madrid, 2005, 191-205.

⁵ F. Prescendi, *op. cit.*, 21-23.

⁶ Serv., *Aen.* I, 292: *Nullum sacrificium sine igne est.*

⁷ For further development of the topic see M. Almansa Fernández, *El delito religioso en el sacrificio romano. The religious crime in the roman sacrifice*, Tesis Doctoral, Univ. Complutense de Madrid, 2019.

⁸ Serv., *Aen.* V, 238.

This observance was based on the correct functioning of the immolatory ritual, that is, in short, that the animal had no macula (*iniugi*)⁹, no mooing¹⁰ or anomalous noises¹¹ during the journey or when the victim was beaten by the *victimarius*; that the colour¹² and sex of the animal were appropriate for the deity to be sacrificed¹³; the priest recited the prayers correctly; the subordinates realized its functions in an appropriate way and, of course, that the reading of the viscera (*exta*) was clear and favourable¹⁴. What was outside this rigid ritual norm would entail a religious crime that, according to its severity, would have legal consequences ranging from a fine to his expulsion from the priestly office, a subject, on the other hand, little studied¹⁵.

The immolation phase was the moment of the ritual in which it was more likely to obtain more failures than the previous steps. This is because it not only depends on the priest, or his ministers (*victimarii*, *popae*, *cultrarii* or child assistants called *camilli/camillae*, musicians, etc.), but it was in the hands of the behaviour of the animal itself whether the sacrifice was favourable or not. Considering the functioning of this period, in which the stern brought the animal closer to the sacrificial altar, possibility tying it to a ring on the ground, recreating the acceptance of the animal to be sacrificed. The stern would ask if it acted (*agon?*) If he received an affirmative answer (*hoc age!*)¹⁶, he would hit

⁹ Macr., *Sat.* III, 5, 5: *quaedam sunt quae iniuges vocantur, id est quae numquam domitae aut iugo subditae sunt*; see Verg., *Aen.* VI, 38-39.

¹⁰ Serv., *Aen.* II, 118; Verg., *Aen.* II, 220-224. The use of music was a tool precisely to cover up these and other anomalous noises that occurred during certain phases of sacrifice (Luc., *Sacr.* 12).

¹¹ M. Almansa Fernandez, *Errores, silencios y ruidos en el sacrificio romano*, in B. Briones Soto, R. Paz Espinoza, A. Bertolo Díaz (eds.), *El fenómeno religioso meditado al alero de la pandemia*, Chile, 2022, 74-93.

¹² Serv., *Aen.* III, 118; Macr., *Sat.* III, 9, 11; *CFA.* n^o. 105b, 11; n^o. 107, II, 8; *CIL* X, 8259 = *ILS* 8381; *CIL* XI, 1420 = *ILS* 139.

¹³ Read for the variety of animals dedicated to the divinities: E. Lübbert, *Commentationes pontificales*, in G. Berolini y Schade (eds.), Harvard University, 1859, 79-132; J. Marquardt, *Das Privatleben der Römer*, Ed. Hirzel, Leipzig, 1886, 169-189; G. Wissowa, *Religion und Kultus der Römer*, 2^o ed., Munich, 1912, 409-420; J. Scheid, *L'animal mis à mortune interprétation romaine du sacrifice*, *Etudes rurales*, 147-148, 1998, 15-26.

¹⁴ Ovid., *Met.* XV, 573-576; J. Scheid, *Romulus et ses frères...*, 326-330.

¹⁵ M. Almansa Fernandez, *op. cit.*, 94-100.

¹⁶ In texts related to sacrifice we have not found the opposite expression *hoc ne feceris*, although it does appear in Cicero (*Div.* II, 61).

the animal's temple to leave it stunned, while the *cultrarius* would make the precise cut in the neck of the bovine¹⁷, pig, or another animal of equivalent size.

Based on this premise of religious crime, in each ritual act in which it happened, the sacrifice had to be repeated, restarting it through another expiatory, *procuratio prodigi*, and then continuing with the main one. According to the crime committed, *hostia succidanea*, that is, a substitute victim, that was used of the sacrifice in case the fault was the animal (for mooing, for pulling the rope, not obtaining a favourable reading of the viscera, etc.). Or, on the contrary, offer a *piaculum* in case the priest, someone from the public or a member of the ritual team makes a mistake, commits negligence in his duties, is inattentive in the use of the instruments, makes some strange gesture or something happens anomalous noise¹⁸. The *piacula operis faciendi operisque perfecti*, sacrifices of atonement prior to infringements, could also be used to repair any errors in the main sacrifice¹⁹. It was to be repeated as many times as necessary since the favourable result had to be found, *hostiis usque ad litationem*²⁰.

Precisely, these criminal acts and compensations were due to a particularly crucial factor that is in the background of ritual praxis, superstition. And it is that this feeling that the Romans had was what motivated them to repeat, to atone for the sacrifices in favour of maintaining the so-called *pax deorum*. The fear of making mistakes and divine reprisals surfaced precisely in the immolations, whose ritual served mortals as a communicator thread with the divinities²¹.

¹⁷ Sen., *Prov.* I, 6, 8-9. For example, for the Mithraic cult, the bull's throat was cut with a special sword or knife called *harpe*, mentioned in Greek mythology, *vid.* a Greek author of the s. II-III AD Ach. Tat. III, 7, 8-9.

¹⁸ *Ibidem*, 94-97.

¹⁹ J. Scheid, *Roman animal sacrifice and the system of being*, in C. Faraone & F. Naiden (Eds.), *Greek and Roman Animal Sacrifice: Ancient Victims, Modern Observers*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2012, 84-96.

²⁰ S. P. C. Tromp, *De Romanorum piaculis*, Ed. Lugduni Batavorum, Leyde, 1921, 90; J. Scheid, *Sacrifices for Gods and Ancestors*, in J. Rüpke, *A Companion to Roman Religion*, Blackwell Publishing Ltd., Oxford, 2007, 266; Liv. XLI, 15, 2-3.

²¹ F. Diez de Velasco, *Miedo y religión*, Ed. del Orto, Madrid, 2002; J. Rüpke, *Panteón. Una nueva historia de la religión romana*. Ed. Akal, Madrid, 2020, 18-21 and on religious communication: 22-29; C. Schultz, *Roman Sacrifice, Inside and Out*, *JRS*, 106, 2016, 58-76.

Precisely because of this, the way of thinking of Roman society was based on *superstitium*, it is a behaviour of a “gift against gift” or a “I give you to give me” what we call “religious contract by superstition”, based on the *do ut des*²². It is precisely the ability of communication (agency) on the part of each person of Roman society, which has allowed us to know different forms of communication. In the case of the *frates Arvales*, we have it clear, thanks to the sources we have and, above all, to the *Acta Fratrum Arvalium*, where we see that, at least publicly, the immolatory rites were linked to the death of a cow, sow, ox, and some vegetable offerings, such as rolls or pastries, wine, etc.

Within the immolator ritual, as we have seen, numerous errors, crimes or misdemeanours can happen depending on the origin of this. However, these errors, which are, in a certain way, remediable by an atoning sacrifice, only underline the superstitious idea and the fear of the rupture of divine peace.

To establish the existence of a religious offence, legislation must be recognised in accordance with the offence committed. In fact, the texts on the regulation of religious crimes that remain are scarce²³. We carry through in mind that there are very few texts that tell us about dismissals of priests for some mistake committed²⁴. And on most occasions where we have evidence, they only refer to the *flamen Dialis* and his wife because of the importance of their position²⁵. The problem lies with the rest of the priesthoods of which we have no information about the suspension of their office except the vestals and their punishment by stoning. We could think that the laws were similar for all priestly bodies, and, like this, the punishments and penalties could also be extended.

One might think about the possibility that the priesthoods perform all the rituals correctly every day of the year and that, for this reason, they were not collected in the texts. However, this fact seems

²² M. Almansa Fernandez, *op. cit.*, 225; *Dig.* XIX, 5, 5.

²³ Only in the *Corpus Iuris Civilis* of the *Digest* a senate consult related to the errors produced in the Roman sacrifice is collected: *Dig.* XLVIII, 8, 43: *Ex senatus consultum andius legis poena damnari iubetur, qui mala sacrificia fecerit, habuerit.*

²⁴ *Liv.* I, 31, 8; XXVI, 23, 8; *Dion. Hal.* XVI, 3, 1; *Val. Max.* I, 1, 4; 5; *Plut. Marc.* 5, 3-4.

²⁵ The few texts we have on the dismissal of the *flamen Dialis*: *Liv.*, XL. 42; *Val. Max.* I, 1, 4-5; *Plut. Marc.* 5; F. Marco Simón, *Flamen Dialis. El sacerdote de Júpiter en la religión romana*, Ed. Clásicas, Madrid, 1996, 254.

unlikely to us since it is strange that everything went correctly the first time. Moreover, the faults committed by the *flamen Dialis* proved to be plausible, so it was likely that the other priesthoods would also commit them. The problem is the loss of such testimonies.

Returning to the previous hypothesis about the types of sentences, such as dismissal and fine, we find, however, with one reservation, that of the augur that Plutarch tells us about²⁶:

“Why, if any priest is condemned and exiled, they dismiss him and choose another, but if it is the augur, even if he is convicted of the greatest crimes, they do not deprive him of his priesthood as long as he lives? They call “omens” those who deal with omens. Do you, some say, do you not want anyone who is not a priest to know the secrets of sacred rites? Or do they not want the augur, bound by oaths to tell no one about sacred matters, to be freed from his oaths by becoming a private man? Or, perhaps, is “foreshadowing” not a title of honour or command, but of knowledge and skill? For to prevent a fortune teller from being a fortune teller is akin to decreeing by vote that the musician is not a musician and that the doctor is not a doctor, for they cannot be deprived of their capacity, even if their name is taken away. They do not appoint any other, logically, because they observe from the beginning the number of augurs”. (Our translation from Greek).

An augur of unquestionable social status²⁷, he was not forced to resign from office. His dignity was for life and, therefore, he could leave his position voluntarily²⁸, as happened in the case of the *salii* or by some interdiction, it happened with the *flamen* and the *flaminica* when his consort died²⁹. We see that the augur was forgiven this pe-

²⁶ Plut., *Q. Rom.* 99; See Plin., *Ep.* IV, 8, 1-2: *Gratularis mihi quod acceperim auguratum: iure, gratularis, primum quod gravissimi principis iudicium in minoribus etiam rebus consequi pulchrum est, deinde quod sacerdotium ipsum cum priscum et religiosum tum hoc quoque sacrum plane et insigne est, quod non adimitur viventi. Nam alia quamquam dignitate propemodum paria ut tribuuntur sic auferuntur; in hoc fortunae hactenus licet ut dari possit.*

²⁷ However, throughout the history of Rome, the condition of priestly belonging on the part of the patricians was reduced in favor of a balance with the other social ordos, such as the *equites*. Thanks to laws such as the *lex Ogulnia* from 300 BC or the *lex Domitia* 104-103 B.C. For example, Livy tells us about the election to occupy the offices of augurs and pontiffs by the plebeian class, Liv. X, 6-9, 2.

²⁸ Dion. Hal. II, 21, 3; Plin., *Ep.* IV, 8, 1-2.

²⁹ Gell. X, 15. Except in the provinces where we observe that some *flaminicae* exercised their priesthood without being united to their male counterparts and integrating and promoting their sons and daughters in the priesthood since they made

nalty, given his political-religious immunity. An allowance that would allow him to establish himself for life in his position, compatible with political magistracies, as happened in the case of Cicero. We know that no public activity was conducted without divinatory consultation, therefore, the augurs could influence for or against the proposed law, for example, exercising a political manipulation that allowed him his religious position³⁰.

Therefore, the augur entered a metaphorical *uroboros* of his own in which he himself could safeguard himself in case of committing a crime of any kind, alluding to divine signs supported by his forbearance. At the same time, he could also act on behalf of one politician or another depending on the faction to which they belonged.

In relation to the oath³¹, on which we are not going to dwell here because it is not our subject of study, we do think it is interesting to cite the one collected by Festus: the *fetiales*³² (priests in charge of the declaration of war and peace). From this it can be deduced that, if he did not comply with the agreement, at the time of making the sacrifice, similar punishments are applied to him as to those of the *flamen*, that is, fine and expulsion from the city and seizure of his property.

Finally, we must mention what is considered “taboo”³³, that is, that which, under Roman religious legislation, was forbidden to touch, say or were forbidden places. Although the Romans did not know this Polynesian term, they did use other concepts of similar meaning, such as *nefas est*³⁴, *fas non est*, that is, if *fas* mean “licit”, these negative expressions accentuate everything that was contrary, that is, the *nefarius*, harmful, illegal, and adverse, to the divine will. This is especially important to keep in mind for when we talk about the prohibitions and

them participants in the rituals as *cammilli/ae*. *CIL* II, 5918, *HEpOL* 12208; *RIT* 347; *RIT* 350; *CIL* II, 4276; *Vid*, M^a. C. Gregorio Navarro, *Flaminicae sive sacerdotes de la Provincia Hispania Citerior: el sacerdocio femenino del culto imperial, Hispania Antiqua*, 37-38, 2013-2014, 137-163.

³⁰ Liv. VI, 27; 41; VIII, 23.

³¹ We recommend reading, for the question of the oath, H. B. Riesco Álvarez, *Iuppiter Lapis y el Lapis silex*, *EHum*, 10, 1988, 19-28.

³² Fest., s.v. *lapidem*: *Si sciens foul, tum me Dispiter salua urbe arceque bonis eiciat ut ego hunc lapidem*. See F. Marco Simón, *op. cit.*, 90-92.

³³ Although this Peloponnesian term does not exist in ancient Rome, we used it to understand and explain the related Latin words.

³⁴ Cic., *Nat. Deo*. III, 22, 56: *nefas est dictu, miseram fuisse talem senectutem*. Cic., *Par.* 25: *quicquid non licet, nefas putare debemus*; see Varr., *L.L.* 6, 4.

why certain types of sacrifice were performed by the *collegium* of the *fratres Arvales*.

2. The *collegium* of the *fratres Arvales*

The *collegium*³⁵ of the *fratres Arvales* has been an attractive subject for many researchers of the subject³⁶. We will review, in summary, what is known about this subject matter to contextualize what we want to show.

The *fratres Arvales* formed a priestly college or *sodalitas* the gentilic type³⁷, located near Rome, known through archives written on marble slabs, called *Acta Fratrum Arvalium* (A.F.A.) compiled by Wilhelm Henzen between 1866-1869. They were in a sacred grove 8 km from Rome, in the area called La Magliana Vecchia, currently in Region XI of the capital. These inscriptions date from 21-20 BC until, certainly, the third century AD³⁸ (which would not indicate the end of the

³⁵ It was through the *lex Julia de collegiis*, the one that formalized this and any other association, both religious (*collegia cultorum*) as a civic. Vid., P. W. Duff, *Personality in roman private law*, Cambridge University Press, 1938; M^a D. Saavedra Guerrero, *Tipología y status social de las patronae collegiorum*, *Polis*, 17, 2005, 153-162; although there was previously another law in this regard, *lex Clodia de collegiis*, L. M. López Román, *Publio Clodio y la lex de collegiis: una aproximación al fenómeno asociativo a finales de la República romana*, *ETF(hist)*, 22, 2010, 117-126.

³⁶ W. Henzen, *Acta fratrum Arvalium quae supersunt*, Berlin, 1874; A. Piganiol, *Observations sur le rituel le plus récent des frères arvales*, *CRAI*, 1946, 241-251; J. Scheid, *Les frères Arvales. Recrutement et origine sociale sous les Julio-Claudiens* (Collection de l'E.P.H.E. Sc. Relig. N° 77), Paris, 1975; idem, *Le bois sacré de Dea Dia et la limite du territoire de la cité de Rome*, *CRAI*, 157/1, 2013, 151-166; Idem, *Les actes des frères arvales de 109, 111 et 112 apr. J.C.*, in *Hommages à R. Schilling*, Paris 1983, 215-230; idem, *Romulus et ses frères. Le college des frères Arvales, modèle du culte public dans la Rome des empereurs*, Rome, 2016 (Ed. orig. 1996); idem, *Commentarii fratrum arvalium qui supersunt. Les copies épigraphiques des protocoles annuels de la Confrérie Arvale (21 av.-304 ap. J. C.)*, Rome, 1998; J. Rüpke, *Fasti sacerdotum. A Prosopography of Pagan, Jewish, and Christian Religious Officials in the City of Rome, 300 BC to AD 499*, Oxford University Press, Oxford-New York, 2008; M. Beard, *Writing and Ritual: A Study of Diversity and Expansion in the Arval Acta*, *PBSR*, 53, 1985, 114-62; I. Chirassi Colombo, *Dea Dia e Fratres Arvales*, *SMSR*, 39, 1968, 191-291; I. Paladino, *Fratres Arvales. Storia di un collegio sacerdotale romano*, L'Erma di Bretschneider (Ed.), Roma, 1988.

³⁷ J. Scheid, *I sacerdoti «arcai» restaurati da Augusto*, in *L'esempio degli arvali, sacerdos. Figure del sacro nella società romana*, *Civildale del Friuli*, 26-28 settembre 2012, a cura di Gianpaolo Urso, Ed. ETS, Pisa, 2014, 179.

³⁸ M. Beard, *op. cit.*, 114-115.

brotherhood, which occurred with Theodosius in 391 AD with the prohibition of cults and temples considered pagan in favour of Christianity)³⁹. In these acts were recorded year after year, although not all are preserved, the ritual acts of this brotherhood.

Precisely in the year 218 AD coinciding with the government of Emperor Elagabalus, the *carmen Arvalium* is preserved, which refers to various songs written in archaic Latin⁴⁰. The only reference to the Republican era is that of Varro⁴¹, although it seems that this brotherhood could be traced back to the time of *Romulus*⁴² and revived in the time of *Augustus* in 27-29 BC., previously very forgotten⁴³. The priestly college was composed of twelve members elected from among the senatorial families by cooptation, the *Princeps* being the president or *magister* while the other members were considered *flamines Arvales* elected annually.

The *Arvales* were elected by *cooptatio*, that is, the election of new candidates chosen by the memberships of the brotherhood themselves, as recorded in the following text (*CIL VI*, 2023):

[Is]dem co(n)s(ulibus) pridie eidus Maias in regia
 10 [Cn. Cornélius] Cn. [f.J Lentulus augur mag(ister) in locum L.
 [Aemili] Paulli Drusum Caesarem Ti. f. Augusti n.
 [fratrem] arualem cooptauit et ad sacra uocauit.
 [Adfuerunt] Cn. Pompeius Q. f. L. Domitius Ahenobarbus,
 [L. Calpurnius] Piso pontif(ex), [T.] Quinctius Crispinus
 15 [Valerianus] per tabellas cooptarunt

³⁹ *Cod. Theod.* XVI, 10, 9-10, being February 24, 391 A.D. the time of prohibition of cults considered pagan in favour of Christianity. While it is true, 405 A.D. was the year in which we have verified the last pagan priest, the *Pontifex Vestae* occupied by *Publilius Caeionius Cecina Albinus* (J. Rüpke, *Fasti sacerdotum...*, 436). This would indicate that the transition was slow (approximately 14 years).

⁴⁰ A. García Calvo, *Nueva interpretación del Carmen Arval*, *Emérita*, 25, 1957, 387-448.

⁴¹ Varro., *L.L.* V, 85, 3-5: *Fratres aruales dicti qui sacra publica faciunt propea ut fruges fera arua: a ferendo et aruis fratres aruales dicti. Sunt qui a fratria dixerunt. Fratria est Graecum uocabulum pa(rt)is hominum, ut (Ne)apoli etiam nunc.*

⁴² Gell. VI, 7. A question also repeated by Pliny (*HN.* 18, 6) in addition to describing, briefly, the crown of spikes they wore with white strips. *Aulus Gellius*, for his part, also cites the Romulean origin of this *collegium* (VII, 7, 8).

⁴³ Appears in *RG* 20, 4. Vid. J. Gage, *Les Sacerdotes d'Auguste et ses reformes religieuses*, *MEFR*, 48, 1931, 75-108.

[*imp(erator) Caesar*] Augustus, *Ti. Caesar Augusti f., Germanicus*
 [*Caesar Ti. f. J. Paullus Fabius Maximus.*
 [*Isdem consul*][*b*]us XVIII *k(alendas) Ianuarias in regia*
 [*Cn. Cornelijus Cn. f. Lentulus augur mag(ister) in locum Cn.*
 20 [*Pompeii Q. f. Pompeium augurent et in locum imp(eratoris)*
 [*Caesaris*] Augusti [...] *fratres aruales*
 [*cooptavit et*] *ad sacra uocauit.*
 [*Adfuerunt Drusus*] *Caesar Ti. f., L. Piso pontifex, T. Quinctius*
 [*Crispinus Valerianus,*] *M. Cornutus; per tabellas cooptavit*
 25 [*Ti. Caesar divi Aug(usti) f.*] *Augustus*

Or this other interesting period text by *Sulla* (*CIL VI*, 2023):

Mam(erco) Aemfilio Scauro,
Cn. Trem[ellio co(n)s(ulibus)]
III k(alendas) Iun(ias) [in regia(?)]
quod T. Qui[nctius Crispinus]
 20 *Valeria[nus magister fratrum]*
arualium [ad fratres aruales ret-J
tulit in [locum Sullae Felicis].
demortui [alium(?) a fratrib(us) arual-J
ibus ad sa[cra deae Diae uocari de-]
 25 [*b*]ere soli[*to more C. Pomponium*]
Graecin[um fratr(em) arual(em) cooptarunt. Ad-]
fuerunt [T. Quinctius Crispi-]
[nus] Valer [ianus mag(ister)].

The election of the *flamines Aruales* was like those who were *magister Aruales* or *promagister*, although we have no direct record of their election, we do know that certain people were chosen to occupy *flaminate* positions. Keep in mind that the *flaminate Arual* would not be equal to the already known twelve *flamines* dedicated to the cult of certain divinities more, for us, other type of *flaminate*, the *flamen augustalis*⁴⁴ in the imperial period. The *flaminate* would correspond to a specialization of the cult or way of naming the priest or a specific type dedicated to the worship of certain divinities, in addition to that of *dea Dia*.

Annus 84 (?): (illum) [ex Saturnali]bus primis ad Sa[turnalia secunda
mag(istrum) et (illum) flam(inem)] fecerunt.

⁴⁴ M. Almansa Fernández, *El flaminado en la provincia de Cuenca*, in J. A. Jara Fuente, J. F. Ruíz López (Coords.), *Cuenca: su historia y sus tierras*, Ed. Univ. de Castilla la Mancha, 2023, 323-344.

*Annus 87: (illum) ex Saturnalibus primis ad Saturnalia secunda annum gistrum fecer(unt), item(illum) flaminent*⁴⁵.

Although they had the religious prestige that was granted to other *collegia*, such as the augurs, pontiffs, *quindecimviri sacris faciundi* or the *septemviri epulorum*, they were not classified within the *quattuor amplissima collegia*⁴⁶. Although it is true that during the Republican period this *Arvales* brotherhood was, little by little, forgotten, until the arrival of Augustus to power, who revitalized it by incorporating senators into its ranks, such as *Cn. Domitius Calvinus* and *M. Cecilius Cornutus*. This action, surely, was the product of the desire to install in influential positions his greatest collaborators to obtain support for the imperial government. One of the possible reasons why Augustus revitalized this school and no other (for example, the *salii*) could be because he wanted to recover the Roman cults themselves, which were abandoned, such as that of Apollo or *Mars Ultor* at the same time as the *Arvales*⁴⁷.

They wore a crown of ears of wheat⁴⁸ with white bands and were dressed in *toga praetexta*. One of its annual functions was to hold a three-day festival honouring *dea Dia*, perhaps Ceres, held on May 17, 19 and 20, or May 27, 29 and 30. Strabo⁴⁹, in fact, informs us that, under *Tiberius*, these priests (*ἱερομνήμονες*) participated in the feast of *Ambarvalia* in various places on the borders of the *ager romanus*.

The *Ambarvalia* was so called because it required a specific victim, usually a white cow, a sow or pig, called *ambarvales hostiae*⁵⁰,

⁴⁵ J. Scheid, *op. cit.*, 215, table 3.

⁴⁶ *Aug. Anc.* 9.

⁴⁷ R. M. Ogilvie, *The Romans and their Gods in the Age of Augustus*, Ed. W. W. Norton & Company, New York, 1969, 114; Cfr. R. Syme, *The Roman Revolution*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1939, 447; K. Galinsky, *Augustan Culture: an interpretive introduction*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1996, 291; M. Beard, J. North, S. Price, *Religions of Rome*, Vol. I, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1998, 132. Hor., *Od.* III, 6 where the idea is narrated that you can only have one *pax deorum*, if the temples are restored and ancient Roman cults that were in decline are restored.

⁴⁸ Plin., *HN.* XVIII, 2. At banquets, on the other hand, they wore a crown of roses and changed to put on their banquet clothes, surely, without the toga.

⁴⁹ *Estr.* V, 3, 2.

⁵⁰ *Macr., Sat.* III, 5, 7: *Ambarvalis hostia est, ut ait Pompeius Festus, quae rei divinae causa circum arva ducitur ab his qui pro frugibus faciunt*; *Paul.-Fest.*, p. 5: *ambarvales hostiae appellabantur, quae pro aruis a duobus fratribus sacrifi-*

sacrificed for the occasion, previously driven three times around the fields, thus creating a mantle of protection over them. This procession was accompanied, not only by the twelve *Aruales*, but also by choirs and the farmers themselves (*chorus et socii*) who praised Ceres, asking for his favour while offering him libations of honey, wine, and milk⁵¹. It's possible that these *Aruales* was participated as judges of the frontiers of the fields, due to its link with agriculture and its demarcation space⁵².

The type of sacrifice of the *hostiae praecidaneae* as it was, in the case of the *Aruales*, the sow was before the new harvest to purify it, performing the ritual of sprinkling pure water made with three cakes of milk and wine with honey (Paul., 223 M.; 250 L.), being immolated in honour of Ceres.

They also participated in other important events such as the coming to power of an emperor⁵³ or his victory after a war or some extraordinary event that is in favour of the emperor, such as the clear example of Caracalla on his return to Nicomedia in 214 AD who escaped the shipwreck of his ship in a storm:

Fratres Aruales convenerunt [quod domjinus n(oster) imp(erator) Caes(ar) M. Aurellius Antoninus Pius [Felix Aug(ustus) Parth(icus) max(imus) Brit(annicus) max(imus) Germ(anicus) ma]x(imus) p(ontifex) m(aximus) t(ribunicia) p(otestate) XVII, imp(erator) III co(n)s(ul) IIII p(ater) p(atriciae) proco(n)s(ul) salv[us atque incolumis

cabantur. See J. Scheid, *op. cit.*, 180-181 for the definition of the *ambarvalis hostia* and the *fruges*.

⁵¹ Virg., *Georg.* I, 338.

⁵² *CGL*, II, 19, 1 = M. Laistner, *Philoxeni Glossarium*, in W. H. Lindsay, R. G. Austin, M. Laistner, J. F. Mountford (Eds.), *Glossarla latina*, II, Paris, 1926, 149: *Arbares s[c]jodales oi peri oron diaginwskontes dikastai Liber de officio proconsulis*; See J. Scheid, *Les sanctuaires de confins dans la Rome antique. Réalité et permanence d'une représentation idéale de l'espace romain*, in *L'Urbs: espace urbain et histoire (Ier siècle av. J.-C. - IIIe siècle ap. J.-C.)*. Actes du colloque international de Rome (8-12 mai 1985), Rome, 1987, 583-595; idem, *I sacerdozi «arcaici»...*, 182; idem, *Romulus et ses frères...*, 35-39.

⁵³ We can observe this at various times, when they sacrifice in honour of the *genius* of the emperor of the moment and other atonements in the forest, In addition to other gods: *CIL* VI, 2099, I, 1. 20-24; II, 1. 1-14 (183); 2104, a, 1. 1-4 (218); 2107, 1. 2-20 (224); 37164, II, 1. 1-9 (237?); I, 1. 7-17 (240). Question that was also realized for temporary purposes: *CIL* VI, 2107, 1. 8; II, 37164, 1. 5: *item ad ar(as) tempor(ales)*, as attested in the years 183, 218, 224, 237 or 240.

*pro securitate provin]ciar(um) felicissime ad [h]iberna Nicomediae ing[ressus sit]*⁵⁴.

There was a plethora of subordinates in this priestly college, finding us minor servants of the Arval cult. For example, we have four boys from senatorial families who attended the sacrifices and joined the communal banquets of the priests, as *camilli/ae*⁵⁵. There were also other helpers, *kalatores*⁵⁶, who were freedmen of the *Arvales* priests who, together with other *servi publici* linked to the priesthood, in turn performed other sacrifices in the name of the brotherhood⁵⁷. Other servants assumed other types of roles that we know better, such as one or more *aedituus* who oversaw the daily care of the temple of *dea Dia* and probably of the sacred grove; it is also known the existence of a notary (*commentariensis* or *publicus a commentariis*) who kept a record of the ritual and administrative activities of the brotherhood⁵⁸.

The main temple was called *aedes deae Diae*⁵⁹, located next to the *lucus* or sacred grove to the divinity (*clivus*)⁶⁰. Around May 19 and 29 they moved in the morning to the top to collect the sacred wood of the forest (*lucum ascenderunt*), then descending to the tetrastyle area to celebrate the rituals and the subsequent banquet. However, this ceremony is mentioned from the year 84 AD, this does not mean that before it was not presented, since as we see in the *A.F.A.* the meticulousness of the data was sparser⁶¹.

We know that the *Arvales* were not only dedicated to the cult of *dea Dia*, but that in their vows there were also other gods who

⁵⁴ Year 214 (b, 2-6); *H. A., Caracalla*, V, 8; Dio., 78, 16. Although events such as the arrival in Rome of Nero and his wife Poppaea with their newborn daughter are also recorded (April 10, 63 AD); Hadrian's arrival in Rome after his appointment in 118 AD; again, Caracalla after his victory in *Germany* on October 6, 213 A.D.

⁵⁵ May 30, 80 A.D.; May 20, 213 A.D.; May 27, A.D. 218 (a. d., 11-12).

⁵⁶ On the figure of the *calator/kalator* it is interesting to read M. A. Marcos Casquero, *Kalator: su significado, Helmantica*, 27/82, 1979, 77-89. In the *A.F.A.* appear this word with the letter "k".

⁵⁷ As, for example, that of April 25, of the year 92; May 29, 218, (a, 30) and with *kalatores* performing piacular sacrifices (April 12, 89; April 7, 121).

⁵⁸ M. Beard, *op. cit.*, 119.

⁵⁹ *CIL VI*, 2099, I, 1. 22: *in fastigio aedis deae Diae*; 1. 23: *ad aedem deae Diae*; II, 1. 8: *ad aedem deae Diae* (183 D.C.).

⁶⁰ *CIL VI*, 2071, I, 1. 7: *lucum deae/[Diae ad summitum . . .]* (84 AD), see R. Syme, *The Augustan Aristocracy*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1989, 315.

⁶¹ H. Broise; J. Scheid, *Deux nouveaux fragments des Actes des frères arvales de l'année 38 après J. Chr.*, *MEFRA*, 92, 1980, 215-248.

participated in ritual. For example, in the years 58-60 the following were cited: *Iuppiter*, Juno, Minerva and *Salus publica*; to which were added the names of the divine *Augustus*, the divine *Augusta* and the divine *Claudius* (CIL VI, 32350). Successive years continued to cite these gods and the epithets of the Augustan emperors and that of *Claudius* until 81 AD. From this date the emperors ceased to be cited, leaving only the exhortation of the gods themselves (Jupiter, Juno, Minerva and *public Salus*) until the last year that we have evidence of the A.F.A. of 239 A.D. Which leads us to think that the classical Capitoline Triad, which did not include Mars or *Quirinus*, and was of Etruscan origin was the one that prevailed, in this priestly college, considering it the most appropriate due to the origins in the time of *Romulus* and Etruscans of Rome.

However, in extraordinary moments, such as periods of conflict, war deities such as *Mars* did participate, as happened between January 11 and May 17, 66 AD where *Iupiter*, *Iuno*, *Minerva*, *Mars*, *Providentia*, are cited through a series of sacrifices. Also, with Trajan emperor in 101 AD (*Mars pater/Mars victor cet. ut de Iunione nisi quod tauro aurato immolator*). Precisely in 66AD under the principality of Nero, there were mass riots of Jews in Jerusalem according to *Flavius Josephus* (*Bell. Iud.* II, 307-308), initiating the First Jewish-Roman War (66-73 A.D.). In this context of war uncertainty, we could understand the extraordinary promises of the *Arvales* that are cited in this case.

3. Piacular sacrifices

In this section we will see the crimes committed by the *Arvales* or by some subordinate that would imply the purification of the place, person, or situation. As we indicated at the beginning, anomalies did not have to come only from an error during a ritual or sacrifice, but any event could occur that broke the *pax deorum* or affected a place considered sacred. The events considered nefarious prodigies or *omina mala* could be for several reasons that we classify as follows. We add an example of each so that you can read the structure of the text and exemplify the event:

- Fall of a branch of the sacred forest of *dea Dia*⁶². It could be caused by lightning, by an old branch, or by a storm⁶³.

*Prisco co(n)s(ulibus) IIII idus Sept(embres) mag(isterio) C. Iuli/ [Sila]ni in luco deae Diae, quod ramus ex arbore ilicana ob/ [vetustatem deciderit, piaculum factum est per calatorem et/ [p]ublicos /*⁶⁴.

- Downfall of a tree in the same sacral forest⁶⁵.

*[isdem consulibus (deficiunt dies et lociis)quod [Cn. Corneliu]s Cn. f. Lentulus augur mag(ister) in locum [factus, ad] fratres Arvales rettulit arborem [in luco d]e[ae] Diae vetustate cecidisse, q(uid) d(e) e(a) r(e) f(ieri) p(laceret), d(e) e(a) r(e) i(ta) c(ensuerunt) : [cum arbo]r vetustate in luco deae Diae cecidisset, ut [in luc]o ad sacrificium consumeretur, neve quid [lign]i exportaretur) [adfuerunt fratres illi]*⁶⁶.

- Use of inappropriate instruments or considered nefarious⁶⁷.

*L. Vettio Paullo, T. Iunio Montano c(on)s(ulibus) k(alendis) Mais in luco deae Diae piaculum factum per calatorem et publicos eius sacerdoti ob ferrum inlatum in aedem scrip(fur)ae*⁶⁸.

Let us keep in mind that a sacred grove was necessary to maintain it as if it were a temple, since it was a *locus sacrum*. There were several helpers or *c/kalatores* in charge of cleaning, of keeping the forest of *dea Dia* in order. To do this, very surely, they were responsible for the fact that there were no anomalous elements in the forest and that it looked adequate. These actions of cleaning and care were noted to keep a record of everything that was anomalous, in what we call the *A. F. A.* Therefore, the fall of a branch by intense winds, storm by its own weight or some other phenomenon inexplicable at that time, was considered a rupture of the sacredness of the locus and should be purified or atoned for. For this, like any other sacrifice for similar circum-

⁶² Giving some examples of this type: (day / month unknowns) year 38; September 10, 87; November 7, 224; January 15, 80.

⁶³ W. Henzen, *op. cit.*, 136-137.

⁶⁴ September 10, year 87. W. Henzen, *op. cit.*, 120.

⁶⁵ As an example, April 18, year 38; January 15, 81; March 29, year 81.

⁶⁶ W. Henzen, *op. cit.*, 136.

⁶⁷ Examples we would have: May 1, 80; May 1 and 13, 81; April 25, 92; April 7 and May (date not visible) of the year 121; April 18 and May 5, 225.

⁶⁸ May 1, 81. W. Henzen, *op. cit.*, 106.

stances belonging to other priesthoods or rituals, a sow or *pork* was offered⁶⁹, although in this case a cow or sheep was also added, performed by the *calatores*.

In the *A.F.A.* We are summoned to four unknown or *indigitamenta* divinities, these must be appealed for a *piaculum*, a propitiation performed before destroying a tree. They are *Adolenda* (in connection with the burning of the tree), *Commolenda* (reduction to chips), *Deferunda* and *Coinquenda* (the felling of the tree).

For this, the ceremony of the *lucum conlucare* was conducted in which an expiatory offering was made before the potential damage that was going to be undertaken to the grove. It must be borne in mind that these names are written in a gerundive and/or passive way, that is, that the female tree *numina* were the ones who received the *piacular* action. The following words (*verba concipito*) were to be formulated for the action at the site:

“Whether you are god or goddess (*si Deus, si Dea*) to whom this forest is dedicated, for you have the right to receive the sacrifice of a pig for the thinning of this sacred grove, and with this intention, whether it is me or someone in my name, do it, let it be done correctly. To this end, in offering you this pig, I humbly beseech you to be gracious and merciful to me, to my house and my home, and to my children. Deign to receive this pig that I offer you for this purpose?”⁷⁰

Servius defines the *lucus* as “a large number of trees with religious significance”⁷¹. *Non luceat*, “it is not illuminated”, that is, no torches are needed to illuminate, since in the sacred forest of *dea Dia* there was a danger of fire, so we can determine that the rituals were, surely, during the day or during certain hours of sun⁷².

There is, on the other hand, a brief legislation preserved for the general protection of forests and that, surely, the sacred grove of *dea Dia* did not escape this regulation⁷³. For example, we have the *lex spo-*

⁶⁹ To cite some of the *A.F.A.*: 26[101]143a; W. Henzen, *op. cit.*, 69 corresponding to the year 58 A.D. where two are immolated *porcas piaculares*, accompanist of a cow; On May 29, 59, a similar sacrifice was made.

⁷⁰ Cat., *Agric.* 139.

⁷¹ Serv., *Aen.* I, 310: *lucus est arborum multitudo cum religione.*

⁷² Idem. I, 441: *Non quod sint ibi lumina causa religionis.*

⁷³ We know that, not only in Rome there was evidence of this protection of the forests, but we find in Martial the protection of the sacred grove near *Bilbilis* (Spain): Mart., *Epigr.* IV, 55, 23 y ss: *sanctum Buradonis ilicetum/ per quod uel*

letina, from s. III-II B.C. specific for the mountain of Monteluco, near Spoleto:

*Honce loucum neque violatod neque exvehito neque exferito quod louci siet neque cedito nesei quo die res dei anua fiet eod die quod rei dinai causa fiat sine dolo cedere licetod sei quis scies violasid dolo malo iovei bovid piaculum datod a CCC moltai suntod eius piacli moltai dicatori exsactio estod*⁷⁴.

“No one shall desecrate this sacred grove, nor shall he take away in cart or through arms that which belongs to the sacred grove, nor cut it down, except on the day when the annual sacrifice has been gave; On that day it will be permissible to cut it without committing an illegal action such as for sacrifice. If anyone [against these provisions] desecrates him, he will have an atonement by offering an ox to Jupiter and pay a fine of 300 ases. The task of enforcing the obligation of both the atonement and the fine is performed by the dictator”.

It is particularly noteworthy that this type of piacular sacrifices were performed by the *kalatores* and not by the *flamines Arvales* who only supervised or directed them. This was because the former played a subordinate role to the latter, since as in other priesthoods, it was the subordinates who sacrificed the animal while the arvales led and read the ritual prayers. However, another of the fundamental reasons why the *kalatores* oversaw this type of rituals, was because they were not considered priests (*sacerdos*)⁷⁵, since they were freedmen with some privileged consideration to be under religious public service. Consequently, they assumed those sacrifices considered polluting by their nature, that is, by the fall of a tree, a branch or handling iron. Religious crimes committed voluntarily and involuntarily fell on the helpers since they were committed in the *lucus* itself and not in the temple.

piger ambulat uiator. Prohibition of carts drawn by horses or oxen, in the sacred holm oak of Buradón (*Bilbilis*, in *Hispania* (Spain)), other than a chariot made entirely of wood of the divinity without the use of iron (Tac., *Germ.* XL, 2-5).

⁷⁴ CIL XI, 4766; See S. Panciera, *La lex luci Spoletina e la legislazione sui Boschi sacri in età romana*, in *Monteluco e i monti sacri*, Spoleto, 1994, 25-46 for this legislation.

⁷⁵ Remember that *sacerdos* comes from *sacer*, sacred, someone who cannot be in direct contact with death. For example, the *aruspex* himself, as a priest, could not touch the viscera; his assistant did so, who was not a priest and, therefore, could manipulate the *exta*, while the *aruspex* directed the reading and observed the organ.

This would mean that the wonders or events that occurred in the forest would not affect the temple of *dea Dia*⁷⁶.

The priests in ancient Rome could not touch anything that was lifeless or related to it (a fallen tree was something already lifeless, the organs of sacrificial victims, a fallen branch or, for example, the *ferrum* of the tools that was considered harmful and impure⁷⁷ with which they cut the wheat to make the *mola salsa*⁷⁸).

On the nefarious related to the forest, as we pointed out before, we could add that it was possible that the entry of certain animals was also prohibited, as happened in the forest of *Diana Nemorensis*⁷⁹ with horses. In this way, the surveillance of the entire sacred precinct had to be scrupulously supervised by those in charge.

We find, therefore, different elements that made the *collegium* or *sodalitas* of the *fratres Aruales* had to make constant atoning sacrifices, to safeguard the *pax deorum*. As a result of precisely this type of data offered by the texts, especially those relating to the use of iron, we can infer that the *Aruales* would write their minutes of the previous year around the months of April-May. This allows us to think that what happened some time before was recorded in papyrus documentation or wax tablets, not preserved today, that was later transferred to the stone, having a public symbolic function.⁸⁰

⁷⁶ J. Scheid, *Romulus et ses frères...*, 69-70.

⁷⁷ Let us remember the interdiction of the *flamen Dialis* of playing the iron instruments (Plin., *HN*. XIX, 177; XXIII, 123; XXIV, 68) We also have evidence in our own *A.F.A.* of the need to perform a rite of atonement by sacrificing a sheep or pig on the grave of a *Arval* after the use of an iron chisel to carve the inscription stone (W. Henzel, *op. cit.* 81; 128-135). F. Marco Simon, *op. cit.*, 120-122. As an example, the following text of the *A.F.A.* of the year 222: [*Ferru/m inferendi scripturae et sca[l]ptur[ae mar]m(oris) [ferrum efferendi scripturae et scalpturae] magisteri peracti*]. It is quite possible to extrapolate this prohibition of touching iron to the rest of the priesthoods of Rome.

⁷⁸ The vestals were also unable to make *mola salsa* directly (*contra Serv.*, *Ecl.* VIII, 82) since the cut wheat was considered something dead. Therefore, the vestals only looked after their good creation and it was the cooks, *fictores*, who really carried them out. *Vid.* M. Almansa Fernández, *op. cit.*, 46; Cic., *Domo*. LIV, 139; *CIL* V, 3352; Varro., *LL*. VII, 44; *CIL* VI, 2136; *CIL* VI, 2136; *CIL* VI, 32413; *CIL* VI, 32419 (*fictor v(irginum) V(estalium)*).

⁷⁹ M. P. Françoise-Hélène, *Diana Nemorensis, déesse latine, déesse hellénisée*, in *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire*, 81/2, 1969, 425-471. See for this ban on chariots and horses in the Nemi Forest: Prud., *C. Symm.* II, 53-56; Ov., *Fast.* III, 265-266; Verg., *Aen.* VII, 778-780.

⁸⁰ M. Beard, *op. cit.*, 137-144.

Given the legendary nature of its foundation in the time of *Romulus*, at which time the Roman calendar began in March, it can be deduced that the *Arvales* continued to use, centuries later, this same calendar. Otherwise, it does not explain why the atoning sacrifices, by use of iron tools, are around these months and not in December-January (which is when the calendar would end and begin respectively in later centuries). Another alternative could be to make these recordings in stone to leave it captured before the festival of the *Ambarvalia* of May 29, a celebration dedicated to the field and, surely, to Ceres⁸¹.

There is a particular case, within the religious crime related to the *Arvales* that we believe it is necessary to collect. It refers precisely to a situation related to the absence of the people in charge of bringing the fruits or green wheat to offer them in the slaughter to *dea Dia*. This event does not seem to focus on a specific chronological moment, given the confusion of the registered consul, *Crassus*, so the epigraph is dated between 14 BC and 64 AD when this name coincides as consul⁸²:

[---]m
 [--- in luc]o dea[e Diae---]
 [---(ille)] mag(ister) fra[trum arvalium ad collegium]
 [fratrum arvalium] rettulit de [---]
 [---f]ratrum arual[ium---]
 [---] n ad fuissent qui fr[uges---]
 [collegium]Pontificum decreuit (uacat)[---?]
 [Pisone o Basso et] Crasso. co(n)s(ulibus). sacrificium q[uod ---?]
 [a collegio fratrum]m arualium factum. Esset et fr[uges]
 [---]s acceptae essen placer piacul[---]
 [---fra]tri[bus] [ar]ualibus ad ferren [t---]⁸³.

From this fragmentary text we can deduce several issues. The first, and most important, is that it is the pontiffs who oversee decreeing only the repetition of the sacrifices, since it is they who dictated that the sacrifice be repeated. In this case, the people in charge of car-

⁸¹ Virg., *Georg.* I, 343.

⁸² R. Paribeni, *Di un nuovo frammento degli Atti degli Arvali*, NSA, 18, 1921, 49-51, he dated it to 27 AD. Based on the surname of a consul preserved in verse 8 (*Crassus*), which he attributed to *Mr. Licinius Crassus Frugi* (son of another consul of the same name), ordinary consul at 27 D.C. with *L. Calpurnius Piso*; this dating was accepted by his successors (E. Pasoli, *Acta fratrum Arvalium quae post annum MDCCCLXXIV reperta sunt*, Bologna, 1950, 52; J. Scheid, *Les frères Arvales...*, 133).

⁸³ *CIL* VI, 2024.

rying the offerings, *fruges*, did not appear at the time of sacrifice⁸⁴, so they had to go to get the wheat of the offering to be able to correctly carry out the sacrifice to *dea Dia* somewhere nearby (*fruges petere / fruges accipi a collegio*), causing delays in the sacrificial execution. This event would go unnoticed, even for the Romans⁸⁵, if it were not for two possible causes: the first that one of the pontiffs was extant and took note of the event, given his function of certifying the ritual and resolution of this; and second, that all incidence should be communicated, by the president (*magister*) of the *Arvales* to the *collegium* of the pontiffs to recognize the contingency and decree the piacular sacrifice. In both cases, the pontiffs appointed to this task would ratify the result and dictate the atoning sacrifice to avoid conflicts with the gods.

This piacular sacrifice, according to the fragment collected, was of a cow [*collegium*] *Pontificum decreuit (uacat) [---?]*, the type of animal would be registered as *vacca honoraria*, for this case. The text also tells us that the main sacrifice has not been accepted, we reiterate the absence of the *fruges*. Nevertheless, this was not the only case about the absence of personnel in charge of bearing the fruits, since we find that in the year 145 A.D.⁸⁶ *a [---]a frugium repetit [---]* is noted, whose text more fragmentary than the previous one cited, seems to refer to the rites *in luco* of the banquet of the *Arvales* and to the games. According to this epigraph, they also had to repeat the entire ritual the next day, which was mandatory by pontifical decree (which we do not know except for these brief lines)⁸⁷.

Most likely, on the people who did not come to leave their fruits for the ritual would fall an imposition of some kind, which we can not specify, but which we assume would be the payment of a fine in spices, *fruges*, and / or the veto to be able to participate in future rituals.

4. Conclusions

We can end our study by commenting that the *Arvales*, like any priestly body in ancient Rome, was subject to strict rules of obligatory

⁸⁴ J. Scheid, *Romulus et ses frères...*, 608-609 makes a hypothetical reconstruction of this fragment.

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, 607-608.

⁸⁶ *CIL* VI, 32379.

⁸⁷ E. Pasoli, *op. cit.*, 70 and ff.

ritual compliance. Any error, voluntary or involuntary, paralysed the ritual to correct it, likewise, the noises produced by sacrificial personnel and the public had to be disguised in some way with the music.

The piacular sacrifices also had to be made to cure phenomena such as falling trees, branches, or the use of iron. This meant that reasons as common as a fallen branch in the forest caused by a blow of wind, rain, or the weight of snow, were considered anomalous. Since the soil would require that it be clean and that the growth of trees and plants be natural. The use of iron would cause a contamination that would have to be purified with a piacular sacrifice, since the plates of the *Arval* annals were going to be placed in a sacred precinct that should not be stained using iron.

The *Arvales* did not escape this situation and, as we have seen, it was necessary to conduct healing sacrifices since, for example, part of the staff sometimes made a resignation in their functions at the time of the main sacrifice. However, as we have already pointed out above, sacred crimes extended beyond the sacrificial moment. Proof of this were the basic principles cited that made them make piacular sacrifices to maintain the *pax deorum* due to the prodigies occurred in the forest.

A deduction, in which the control of the forest, as a timber and food resource, at a primitive time, remained in the hands of this brotherhood. But, due to the historical evolution, its safeguarding remained residual (since access to wood was something normal and widespread)⁸⁸. At first, they could have control of the agroforestry resources of the city so that, little by little, during the Republic, the control vanished and remained only as an honorary position and caretakers, not only of the agricultural field, but of the grove as a symbolic element of what in the past was one of its possible main functions.

⁸⁸ Something similar would happen in the Middle Ages, where we can observe, at first, that the management of forest resources was communal. Vid. J. Bolòs, *Els orígens medievals del paisatge català. L'arqueologia del paisatge com a font per a conèixer la història de Catalunya*, Barcelona, Institut d'Estudis Catalans, 2004, 342-343; M. Sancho Planas, *Aprovechamiento de recursos forestales en la Edad Media: una apuesta interdisciplinar para su estudio en zonas de media montaña mediterránea*, *Anales de la Universidad de Alicante. Historia Medieval*, 22, 2021, 191-217; M. Villagra, L. Di Pasquantonio, *Forestación y deforestación en las edades antigua y media, con especial atención al derecho romano y su influencia*, *Revista De Derecho Romano*, 2, 2020, 52-90.

Universitatea „Alexandru Ioan Cuza” din Iași
Facultatea de Istorie • Centrul de Studii Clasice și Creștine

Bd. Carol I, Nr. 11, 700506, Iași, România
Tel.: 040/0232/201634, Fax: 040/0232/201156



ISSN: 1842-3043
e-ISSN: 2393-2961

EDITURA UNIVERSITĂȚII „ALEXANDRU IOAN CUZA” DIN IAȘI