

ROMAN RELIGION: THREE PROBLEMS OF METHODOLOGY

A discussion of R. E. A. Palmer, *Roman Religion and Roman Empire: Five Essays*, Philadelphia (University of Pennsylvania Press) 1974, The Haney Foundation Series, 291 p. 8 plates.)

H. S. Versnel

What was once announced as a study on the Italic Juno has now appeared as a more comprehensive book with a more ambitious title, in which the investigation into the original Juno constitutes a mere section, albeit a substantial one. Although the book is presented as a united whole, a brief survey will show that the content is extraordinarily varied.

Chapter 1 is devoted to Juno and endeavours primarily to reach a definition of her nature on the basis of the cult epithets. The author upholds the view that Juno <**iuveno* was "a deity of youth," who protected both men and women at the age of puberty and nubility. As such she was also the protectress of the king, the *populus* and the *curiae*, a function which, in its turn, forms the link with her more military function as protectress of the city, situated on fortified hills. Her connection, so prominent in later years, with the woman, marriage and birth, cannot necessarily be projected onto the earliest period. Much is here to be ascribed to modernising tendencies, and to the influence of Etruria. In the course of the chapter various Juno-types are discussed, as well as the *Poplifugia*, the *Nonae Caprotinae*, the *februatio* and the *amiculum Iunonis*, *evocatio*-phenomena (Vei, Carthage), the Pyrgi-tablets and the relationship with Astarte. Many other less important points are also raised.

Chapter 2 contains an extensive discussion of a cult inscription at Tibur. This appears to be based on the *lex Aventinensis* (as the editor Mancini had already noted)—a fact which makes it possible to restore parts of the mutilated text. Palmer makes particular use of Cato, *De agric.* 134, in his endeavours to reconstruct the text and to interpret the content.

Chapter 3, covering almost 100 pages, is the longest and, from the point of view of what it contains, also the most remarkable section of the book. The title "The Gods of the Grove Albunea" will not have the same informative value for everybody, but it is clear from the first sentence that Palmer's research is concentrated on the recently discovered inscriptions of Tor Tignosa (which include the famous "Lare Aineia" inscription). Palmer tries to explain these recent discoveries, in addition to such earlier ones as the "Parca" inscriptions, as belonging to a sacred complex, the "Grove Albunea," where various gods and heroes were established under the primacy of Faunus. The oracular character of Faunus is used as the basis for interpreting the other deities. Together with a discussion of Faunus, therefore, there are also some extensive digressions concerning the Parcae (particularly Parca Maurtia), who, on the one hand, had the same protective function as Faunus, but on the other became oracular goddesses. The Di Novensides also appear to be relevant in this connection. In the treatment of the "Lare Aineia" inscription Palmer comes down on Kolbe's side. Instead of being an imaginary dedication to Aeneas the *cippus* was made for the Lares (*Larebos*), gods who also protected man and had powers of prophecy. The Deus Indiges of the *heroon* found in the same complex was therefore not originally Aeneas but, as Dionysius of Halicarnassus says, a *Theos Patrios*, a local river god. In this case, too, there are suggestions of an oracular function. That Aeneas was later identified with this god is primarily due to the presence of a neighbouring shrine of Aphrodite and her son.

An extensive discussion of the term *indiges* and the *Di Indigetes* brings us to a new theory: they were essentially oracular deities, "inner voices or workers that filled dreams (. . . They) could have embraced Juppiter, Faunus and certain river gods. The Indigetes originated as oracles haunting woods and dreams" (p. 136). This incubatory character leads to a consideration of four Roman divinities who can also be seen in this light: Jupiter (above all as Feretrius), Aesculapius, Faunus and Vediovis. Such incubation gods were concentrated primarily in the Insula Tiberina, where we can trace their settlement, or their cult, above all in the period from 200-190 B.C. under the influence of generals who fought against the Gauls. Finally, we come to a discussion of the Gaulish

gods of the Netherworld, sacrificial rites, acts of suicide, and the burial of the Gauls and the Greeks. Correspondences are revealed with Silvanus and Faunus, all against the background of their oracular functions.

In Chapter 4 Palmer revives an old problem: how did the *versus Saturnius* get its name? After rejecting the existing theories Palmer maintains that the Saturnian verses belonged to the *carmina Saliaria* and that the priests of Mars gave the name of the verses to the oldest kind of metre. In these verses the Salians are also said to have begged Saturn to avert the *lua Saturni*.

Chapter 5 ("begun more *ioco* than *serio*," as Palmer says on p. IX) has the phallus as its theme. Various topics, such as the triumph and the Vestal Virgins, are treated, but the crux of the chapter is the hypothesis that the god Mutunus Titinus is indeed connected with the phallus by way of his first name but not by way of his second. According to Palmer Titinus must be connected with *titus* = dove and also with prophecy—here, incidentally, the book seems to be more consistent than might at first sight appear.

If we take into account the variety of topics and problems concerning Roman religion dealt with in this study, it may be expected that the book will be widely consulted and even be regarded as a textbook. The title itself contributes to this impression. In the words of the author (p. VIII): "The five chapters deal with five subjects, all of which verge on the general topic of Roman Empire." Yet in certain cases we would be well advised to put a question mark. Italic syncretism as in the case of Juno, parts of the third chapter about the relationship between Latin and Roman Indiges-deities, are all subjects which can indeed be fitted under this heading, but the inscription of Tibur, Mutunus Titinus, and above all the *versus Saturnius*, can only be so classified with singular good will and thanks to a particularly vague definition of "empire." However this may be, "Roman Religion" speaks for itself, although we must realise that it is exclusively the religion of the Republic and of early Rome which is under discussion.

For this reason alone the work merits a more exhaustive analysis than is possible in a short review. But there is also another, no less cogent reason. The work raises some specific questions regarding the methods and principles of the science of (Roman) religious

history, questions which I have never encountered in so concentrated and so oppressive a degree as when I read this most learned and ingenious study. For—and I should state this at the outset since I admit that a somewhat negative tone prevails in what follows—there can be no doubt about the fact that this is the book of a great expert in the field of Roman religion and of early Roman society in general, whose scholarship is also fully substantiated by the fifty pages of highly elaborate notes.

The questions of principle which confronted me can be formulated as follows:

1. Where are the limits of what is scientifically acceptable as a restoration of an inscription and a conjecture in a manuscript, and at what moment are these limits transgressed?
2. What is the norm which makes an argument sufficiently satisfactory as to be considered "conclusive," or at least plausible enough to justify a publication in a scientific domain?
3. How far is it desirable on the one hand to go on ignoring (or passing over in silence), and on the other to quote either with agreement or disapprobatively modern theories about the topics one is studying?

I am well aware that the reply to each of these three questions—and above all to the second—would provide the substance of an extensive study, and I have no intention of embarking on such a thing. But these are problems central to our science and Palmer's book raises them once more. I shall therefore take these questions as a point of departure for a critical study of important sections of Palmer's work. However desirable a detailed critique of so rich a book might be, it is impossible in the space I have at my disposal, so I shall limit my more detailed treatment to what I regard as the most suitable "essay"—the study on Juno.

1. *Reconstruction and conjecture*

The regular reader of the epigraphical survey by the great French expert L. Robert in his *Bulletin Épigraphique* can count, almost once a year,¹ on a jibe, a sentence or a tirade against those epi-

¹ See *Index du Bulletin Épigraphique. Troisième Partie: Les Mots Français*, Paris 1975, p. 3: épigrammes; p. 4: parallèles; p. 5: restitutions.

graphists who, under cover of the *exempli gratia* formulation, propose utterly fanciful restorations of heavily mutilated inscriptions. It is particularly the restorers of epigrammatic poetry who are taken to task and often strength is added to the argument by an ancient copy come to light afterwards and showing the arbitrariness of the conjecture.² Apart from the practical proposal to start an independent periodical for lovers of this sport,³ we also find in Robert the conditions which must be satisfied if the completion of inscriptions is to be fertile and, consequently, permissible.⁴ This can actually only be the case when the inscription can convincingly be said to belong to a definite category (such as *proxenia*-decrees, honorific formulas, alliance-inscriptions, etc. etc.) the stereotyped formulation of which guarantees a high degree of predictability. It is therefore implied that a restoration producing a text which deviates from the normal pattern or which is incomprehensible in itself must be rejected. We could say as follows: nonsense created by modern restorers remains nonsense and that is that. Nonsense contained in an entirely undamaged inscription is not nonsense but "sense" which the modern interpreter may unfortunately be unable to understand, unless, as sometimes happens, some joker in ancient or modern times has deliberately distorted parts, or the whole, of it.⁵ Finally it should be agreed that a conjecture which does not satisfy the above requirements, and is therefore a mere guess, can never be used as an argument or as a premise for a broader and more comprehensive theory.

One example out of many tells us more than a long theoretical

² For one of many examples cf. *Bull. Ép.* 1973, 501.

³ *Bull. Ép.* 1973, 291: "... ces tentatives devraient paraître dans des recueils ou périodiques spéciaux; ceux-ci grouperaient des compositions d'épigrammes grecques ou latines originales comportant l'obligation d'y insérer à tel et tel vers certaines syllabes empruntées à un morceau de pierre."

⁴ *loc. cit.* and, above all, in *Encyclopédie de la Pléiade, l'Histoire et ses Méthodes*, Paris 1961, 453-497, translated by H. Engelmann: *Die Epigraphik der klassischen Welt*, Bonn 1970, esp. p. 39-54, whence the quotations below have been taken.

⁵ For a recent example of an extreme distortion which is only partially comprehensible see C. Saumagne and J. Ferron, *CRAI* 1966, 61-76; *id.*, *Africa*, 2, 1968, 75-110; M. Leglay, *Chiron* 4, 1974, 635. Modern completions based on a supposed "joke" by the original author of the inscription must be treated with the utmost caution. Cf. the example in the text.

disquisition. G. Susini⁶ read a grafito found on a former gravestone in the vicinity of Parma in 1947 as follows:

SEPIIUS SABINUS
QUIORGENO
VOTUM FECIT
SEREPERTVRVMLETV
// BENTEM
// ICOPOT / M
// IECISE

His restoration of the text reads: *Seppius Sabinus, | qui Orgeno | votum fecit, | se reperturum letu(m) | [bi]bentem | [f]ico pot[u]m | [co(n)]-ieci(t) se*. This would mean: "Seppius Sabinus, who paid his vow to Orgenus, has conjectured that he would find death (i.e. forgetfulness) drunk on fig juice." Although the main points of this version were supported by A. Degrassi (who preferred to replace *coniecit se* by *[de]ieci(t) se*: "he cast himself down drunk at the foot of a fig-tree"),⁷ C. B. Pascal had little difficulty in proving how untenable such an interpretation was.⁸ He showed rightly that the comic aspect was due solely to the restoration; that *letum* could only mean "death" and never "forgetfulness;" and, most important of all, that the first editor overlooked the basic requirement: he failed to seek a connection with the normal formulas of *votum*-inscriptions. Pascal made the following proposal: *Seppius Sabinus | qui Orgeno, | votum fecit, | se reperturum l(a)etu(m) | [li]bentem | [vo]i co(m)pot[e]m | fecis(s)e*, which would mean: "Seppius Sabinus, known also as Orgeno, paid his vow. He paid it in anticipation of finding himself happily and gladly possessed of his wish." Pascal had clearly scored a number of points: *qui ... votum fecit* is not formulaic, whereas *qui Orgeno* is a very common type of *signum*; *laetum libentem*, on the other hand, is characteristic of the *votum*-formula. Now, although Pascal also looked for further *votum*-formulas in the inscription, it must be admitted that especially the last part of his restoration presents problems of idiom and of content. For

⁶ G. Susini, "Orgenus, nuova divinità celtica, ed una iscrizione burlesca della Cisalpina", in: *Hommages à A. Grenier*, Bruxelles 1962, 1449-1453.

⁷ A. Degrassi, "Orgenus nuova divinità celtica?" *Atti Acc. Lincei*, ser. VIII, 11, 1962-65 = *Scritti vari di antichità* III, Venezia-Trieste 1967, 28-31.

⁸ C. B. Pascal, "The *Orgenus Inscription," *Epigraphica* 31, 1969, 73-78.

even if we find parallels of an accusative absolute, the expression "he paid his vow in anticipation of finding himself . . . possessed of his wish" remains unparalleled and unacceptable. It is unacceptable both because the name of the god is lacking in the text, although one would expect it,⁹ and because vows were *not* paid *before* the deity had fulfilled the wish.¹⁰ So we observe that some progress has been made but that research must continue in an endeavour to replace the "unusual" by "the stereotype." We could, for example, search for the name of the missing deity in the last lines and consider whether *se reperturum* does not simply express the altogether prosaic content of the wish "that he should recover (a lost object)."

This simple example is highly illustrative: it shows, amongst other things, that the excessively rigid rules which I mentioned above, may be relaxed. We can indeed go further than suggested with inscriptions which do not fall entirely within a stereotyped series; partial reconstructions have their uses too and it is also one of the duties of the science to restore and to interpret apparently isolated inscriptions (like the very early forum-inscription) as well as possible. But it is true that even here we can only advance by way of "analyse, raisonnements et rapprochements."¹¹ Our example also illustrates the very real danger that the hypothetical and almost definitely incorrect restoration of the last lines by Pascal may henceforth be used as an argument for the view that a *votum* could be an oblation presented to the gods in anticipation, before the fulfilment of the wish. The view exists,¹² but the arguments, as yet, are lacking.

Palmer has shown in the past that he does not shrink from fanciful conjectures and restorations in Latin inscriptions, although he

⁹ Although the name of the deity is missing on more than one occasion, Pascal admits the possibility that *qui Orgeno votum fecit* could be understood according to Susini's interpretation.

¹⁰ Pascal refers to the dedications to *Jupiter Poeninus* on the Great St. Bernard pass *pro itū et reditū*, but even these cannot be regarded as anticipatory: the moment at which the traveller reached this last barrier, after which Italy lay open to him, *was* the moment in which he had "returned," as K. Latte, *Römische Religionsgeschichte*, München 1960, 47 n. 1, rightly maintains against Toutain.

¹¹ L. Robert, *Bull. Ép.* 1946/7, 79, p. 314.

¹² See provisionally my "Two Types of Roman Devotio," *Mnemosyne* 29, 1976, 367 f.

supports his theories with considerable learning. Particularly in *The King and the Comitium*,¹³ but also in the present book, we come across many epigraphical guesses and interpretations which are often used as the premise or as the basic argument for a larger theory. I shall quote the most level-headed and at the same time most comprehensive example a little more extensively and after that test the value of a few other suggestions.

An excellent example of the application of the "mise en série" of a mutilated inscription is the treatment of the *lex Tiburtina*¹⁴ in Chapter 2. Palmer reads it as follows:

- 1 [-----si quis tergere ornare re]
- 2 [ficere volet quod benefici causa fiat, ius]
- 3 faşq[ue esto. ceterae leges huic arae eaedem]
- 4 sunt o q[uae arae Dianae in Aventino monte]
- 5 dictae sunt. *vacat* [Ceres.]
- 6 tibi signum Bona[e Deae hac lege do dico]
- 7 dedicoque uti sies vole[ns propitia populo]
- 8 Romano Quiritibus, *vv* m[ihi, domo municipi]
- 9 oque meo, coniugi, liberiş, [familiae meae]
- 10 conlegaeque meo. *vvvvv* si om[otum exta]
- 11 ad aram redit, Ianum Iovemq[ue et Iuno]
- 12 nem in aram vino praefatus es[to. *vvvv*]

The editor, G. Mancini, had already pointed out the relationship with the *lex Aventinensis* and on that basis had suggested some attractive restorations: lines 3, 4, 6, 7, 11 and 12 are based almost entirely on him. But Palmer pursues the same path further and suggests, very attractively, lines 1 and 2, makes a small correction, and replaces the *Iuppiter optime maxime* suggested by Mancini in line 5 by *Ceres*. To do so he refers not only to the relationship with Bona Dea but above all to Mancini's restoration of line 11, which rests on Cato *De Agric.* 134, a prayer and sacrifice to Ceres, where we read *Iano, Iovi, Iunoni praefato*. This immediately raises an old problem. As early as 1598 J. Meursius removed *Iunoni* from this

¹³ *Historia Einzelschrift* 11, 1969. Cf. also his discovery of a new goddess in Pyrgi: "Cupra, Matuta, and Venilia Pyrgensis," *Illinois Studies in Language and Literature* 58, 1969, 292-309.

¹⁴ G. Mancini, *Inscriptiones Italiae* 4, fasc. 1, 2nd. ed., Rome 1952, n° 73.

formula in Cato for two reasons: in the first place Janus and Jupiter do indeed appear later in the prayer but there is no further mention of Juno; in the second place the formula in the lustration prayer to Mars (Cato, *De Agric.* 141,2) runs: *Ianum Iovemque vino praefamino*. Meursius was followed by a long line of scholars including Latte, who regards the inscription in question as a third-fourth century archaising imitation of the Cato text.¹⁵

We now come to an interesting and, to my mind insoluble, enigma: the arguments in favour of removing Juno from the Cato passage are far more cogent than Palmer concedes.¹⁶ We almost had an inscription which condemns the emendation. Unfortunately, however, the crucial letters are missing. Is *et Iunonem* a wholly acceptable restoration, confirmed by the manuscript tradition of the Cato text, or not? I cannot answer with any certainty. Palmer is convinced that it is, but is he absolutely sure about the uncommon formula *Ianum, Iovemque et Iunonem*? The very least we can conclude is that *Iuno* occupied a somewhat exceptional position as a sort of additional deity and that this could support Latte's view

¹⁵ *Römische Religionsgeschichte*, 206 n. 3.

¹⁶ Palmer has neglected an important piece of evidence just here: Macrobius (*Sat.* I, 16, 25) says: *Fabius Maximus Servilianus* (cos. 142 B.C.) ... *negat oportere atro die parentare quia tunc quoque Ianum Iovemque praefari necesse est, quos nominari atro die non oportet*. It appears here from an independent source that it was indeed customary to honour Janus and Jupiter, but not also Juno, with a *praefatio*. This, together with the other arguments, weakens the case for Juno in the prayer in Cato. Rather than deny this, it is better to refer to the self-evidence of the presence of the two gods Jupiter and Janus alone in prayer formulas in general and in the *praefationes* in particular. Cf. Cicero, *N.D.* II, 27, 67, *principem in sacrificando Ianum esse voluerunt* and Macrobius *Sat.* I, 9, 3, *Ianum ... in sacrificiis praefationem meruisse perpetuam*, theoretical observations confirmed by a series of surviving prayers in which—and this is the second point—Janus is always followed by Jupiter, but Jupiter is not always followed by Juno. Liv. 8, 9 *Iane, Iupiter, Mars Pater, Quirine* ... Acta Fratr. Arv. Henzen p. CXCIV reports sacrifices *Iano patri, Iovi, Marti patri ultori, sive deo sive deae, Iunoni, deae Diae* ... By and large Janus is mentioned first and Vesta last, but there are occasions on which Jupiter comes first; Vell. Pat. II, 131 *Iuppiter Capitoline* ... *Gradive Mars* ... *Vesta*; Juven. *Sat.* VI, 386 *et farre et vino Iovem Vestamque rogabat*. Cf. G. Appel, *De Romanorum precationibus*, RVV VII 1909, 88 ff. However this may be, we can always quote Augustine *Civ. Dei* VII, 9: *penes Ianum prima, penes Iovem summa*: their presence in most prayers is understandable, whereas that of Juno is by no means self-evident. On the *lustratio* prayer in Cato 141 see H. Petersmann, "Zu einem altrömischen Opferitual", *R.M.* 116, 1973, 238-255.

that the inscription was based on the Cato text, which was also thought to be exceptional. Besides, why does Palmer fail to tackle the problem of the date? If the inscription really was very late it cannot be used as an argument in favour of a true religious imperialism, which is what Palmer sees in it.

However this may be, Palmer looks for other conjectural possibilities in the Cato text. This leads him to the restoration in line 10 *si om[motum exta]*. The last sentence would then mean: "If he returns to the altar for offering the vitals, he must address a preliminary prayer with wine to Janus, Juppiter and Juno." Palmer has to admit (p. 70) that "a precise parallel to the restored *si om[motum exta] ad aram redit* does not survive" and indeed, some of the less direct parallels which he cites for *redire* do not hold good at all. More suspicious still, however, is the central *ommotum exta*. Even if we overlook the unusual jargon with use of the supine and assimilation in an archaising text (*tibei, conlegae*), there seems to me to remain an insuperable difficulty regarding the content. In the Cato texts which have hitherto been employed as models (c. 134 and 141) *obmovere* is used to describe a type of sacrificial action, but this action is limited exclusively to the offering of *strues* and *fertum* to the deities Janus and Jupiter—not Juno—who also receive the *praefatio thure et vino* before the actual sacrifice. When, after these preparations, Ceres at last receives her *exta*-sacrifice, we read: *postea Cereri exta et vinum dato*.¹⁷ One would therefore be more inclined, provided that it does not exceed the length of the line, to restore *struem* or *fertum*, but then the actual sacrifice to the goddess Ceres is left out.¹⁸ Furthermore the use of *si* is odd in such a context. In a different connection Palmer mentions a series of formulas with *si* which make it quite clear that *si* announces the potential, and *not* the regular recurrence. A regular, *certain* phase of a ritual is introduced in many ways, for example by *cum* or, above all in Cato, by *ubi*. A constantly recurrent element of a ritual

¹⁷ Palmer probably realises this, since he leaves Cato at this point and cites Festus (222 L.) who shows that *obmovere* is the archaic term for the more recent *admovere*. One single passage in Val. Max. I, 1, 4, *exta ... admota*, provides the desired parallel.

¹⁸ This is not necessarily a decisive objection. Ceres has an image offered to her and, more important still, the text is an obvious hotchpotch of formulaary material which I feel has been misunderstood.

is well illustrated in Cato 141,4: *ubi porcum immolabis agnum vitulumque, sic oportet...*, but in the case of unforeseen circumstances we get (*ibid.*): *si minus in omnis litabit, sic verba concipito...* and *si in uno duobusve dubitabit, sic verba concipito...* After the certainly attested *si om* we would therefore expect an irregular event or action which might just as well not take place: only if it takes place should it be preceded by a *praefatio*.¹⁹

This all strengthens my feeling that Latte was right in regarding the inscription as a late and misunderstood imitation of Cato (and, of course, of the *lex Aventinensis*).

One further observation with reference to a conjecture. In line 8 Palmer replaces the words suggested by Mancini [*item domui praedi*]oque by *m[ihi domo municipi]*oque. The last term seems almost certainly wrong to me for three reasons. *Municipio* looks particularly infelicitous in the series *populo Romano, Quiritibus, mihi, domo, municipioque meo, coniugi, liberis, familiae meae conlegaeque meo*. Moreover, there is no parallel to such a term in a comparable *votum* or prayer formula. And finally, *meo* has never been found next to a word like *municipio* in similar formulas. In the *Lex Salontana*, which he quotes for purposes of comparison, Palmer reads: *... propitius mihi collegisqu[e], meis decurionibus, colonis, incolis coloniae Martiae [I]uliae Salonae, coniugibus liberisque nostri[s]*. The placing of the comma before *meis* gives the impression that the possessive pronoun refers to all the succeeding words and even to *coloniae*, which can in that case be regarded as a parallel to *municipio meo*, although Palmer does not explicitly cite it as such. It is certain, however, that the comma should be placed behind *meis*, not only because of the position of *meis*, which is situated, as it usually is in suchlike formulas, behind the term to which it refers, but also

¹⁹ The *m* of *om*[*motum*] is altogether uncertain—or at least on the photograph. If we want to preserve the *m* and see a sacrificial term in the missing word we could suggest, hypothetically, *omentum*, which is used repeatedly in the sense of *exta* in connection with sacrifices. Pers. 2, 46 *quo, pessime, pacto, tot tibi cum in flammis tunicum omenta liquescant? Et tamen hic extis et opimo vincere ferto intendit*. Catull. 90, 6, *omentum in flamma pingue liquefaciens*. Juven. 13, 117 ff. *aut cur in carbone tuo charta pia tura soluta ponimus et sectum vituli secur albaque porci omenta*. Auson. Perioch. Od. 18, *proposito praemio caprini ventris omento*. Arnob. 7, 20, *albas esse hostiarum carnes ossa dentes pinguitias omenta*, and cf. *ibid.* 7, 24-25.

because, in comparable series collected by Appel,²⁰ *meus* always seems to refer to a personal "possession:" house, children, family, *milites*, *magistratus* and, as in the text just quoted, *collega*. Finally, is *municipio* not too long a word for the available space? Since the requisite term should be sought in the series "closer to home" we might, if we are reluctant to accept Mancini's *praedio*, think of Cato's *agro* or *fundo*,²¹ both because of the archaising tendencies and the fact that elsewhere, too, Cato has served as a model.

I believed that Palmer was entitled to a somewhat extensive discussion of his serious and, by and large, well-founded attempt at restoration. In this case my criticisms were directed against his endeavours at restoration *within* the framework just described. However, nearly all the other conjectures introduced in this book point to the unfortunate fact that the author trusts more in his phantasy than in rational considerations and more in what suits a theory of his than in a reasoned probability. A few examples will serve to clarify what I mean.

In his discussion of the *Di Indigetes* Palmer mentions an inscription which has recently been studied anew. It dates from 4 B.C. and is to be found at the summit of a mountain which is by no means easily accessible. It contains a dedication: *Iovi A.ra. et Dis Indigetibu[s]*. The letters are far from clear and Mommsen hesitantly suggested *Aer[i]s et. A.* Giannetti scaled the mountain yet again and read AIRAI ET, taken by Degrassi as AERAE²² ET since Giannetti admitted that the second and fifth letters could also be read as E or T.²³ Palmer wishes to read ATRAT(O) (which requires the addition of an O) for two reasons. To start with, this would correspond to the netherworldly character of the *Di Indigetes*. This latter characterization, however, is a *demonstrandum* and not a *demonstratum*. A second argument is a "parallel" in Festus (83 L): *furvum bovem, id est nigrum, immolabant A[e]terno*. "We can be confident that the god Aternus has a name derived from the same root as Jupiter's cognomen Atrat." (p. 130). I cannot share

²⁰ *op. cit.* (note 16), 144 f.

²¹ Cato, *Agric.* 141.

²² There is a very disturbing misprint on p. 130 of Palmer's book. Instead of AEREA read: AERAE.

²³ CIL X, 5779; A. Degrassi, "Iuppiter Aëris?" *Epigraphica* 31, 1969, 59-64, for the reference to Giannetti.

Palmer's confidence since I can find no reasonable proof that either of the two gods existed. Aternus is, and remains, a conjecture, an emendation of Aeternus.²⁴ Since there is no further testimony of this Aternus' existence²⁵ (an argument to be used with the utmost caution but which Palmer himself uses on the same page against Jupiter Aeris) some completely different emendations can be suggested. W. Otto read *Helerno* in agreement with Ovid *Fast.* 2, 67 and Latte identified the deity named by Festus with *Avernus* (Ovid *Fast.* 2, 67) or *Alernus/Helernus* (*ibid.*, 6, 105) to whom sacrifice was made on 1 February and whom he interpreted as "Ort- oder Flussnamen".²⁶ Then there is also the possibility that

²⁴ Aeternus does indeed appear, but only in the imperial period and then principally in Dacia. D. Isac, *Apulum* 9, 1971, 537-546 has collected 16 inscriptions with the name of this deity (there is one more in *AE* 1971, n° 369), and shows that the god represents the Mithraic Aion Chronos and not Jupiter Dolichenus. The question still remains whether one can alter without further ado the name of an unknown deity, or rather of a deity who is not attested anywhere else. In the domain of epigraphy this question has once again come to the fore, after a widespread mania for corrections. Nearly every year, particularly in Asia Minor, new deities come to light and their discovery often contradicts former alterations. Here are two recent examples. In his edition of Hesychius, Latte "corrected" the lemma Εὐλαχία· Ἀπρεμῖς into Εὐλοχία; since the first name was unknown. A Laconian stele published by W. Peek in 1974 (*Mélanges Helléniques offerts à G. Daux*, Paris 1974, 295-302) bears a dedication τᾷ Εὐλαχίᾳ. Cf. the Ἐρμῆ κεδρίτῃ found by G. Daux, *BCH*, 100, 1976, 211 (with thanks to F. T. van Straten). Terminological or technical errors by the authors or manufacturers of inscriptions are now assumed with greater caution. In 1911 J. Keil and A. von Premerstein (Bericht über eine zweite Reise in Lydien, *Denkschrift. Akad. Wien* 54, 1911, 89 n° 178) had some difficulty in understanding Μητρί Ἀνάτιδος as "to the Mother of Anaeitis" in a dedication found in the neighbourhood of Kula, and consequently identified this goddess with the Μητήρ Ἀνά(ε)ιτις who was well-known at that time. It was only in 1976 that G. Petzl (*ZPE* 20, 1976, 224) found the same Μητρί Ἀνάτιδος in an inscription originally discovered in the same area but misread by E. N. Lane, *Anatol. Stud.* 20, 1970, 51-53. Anaeitis, therefore, has a mother who was worshipped in this rôle just as Μῆν has (E. Schwertheim, *Istanb. Mitt.* 25, 1975, 357: Μηνὸς τεκοῦσαν. The same turn of phrase is also to be found elsewhere). For very instructive remarks on the necessity to maintain the *lectio difficilior*, even if this were to imply the maintenance of evident mistakes, I refer to H. Solin, *Analecta epigraphica, Arctos* 7, 1972, 172-77.

²⁵ Palmer could perhaps have strengthened his arguments by referring to E. Vetter, *Handbuch der italischen Dialekte* I, Heidelberg 1953, n° 227 (Vestini, 2nd century B.C.) *mesene / flusare / poimunien / atrno / aunom / hiretum /*

²⁶ W. Otto, *R.M.* 64, 1909, 464-65. So does Wissowa, *R.u.K.*², 236 n. 5; K. Latte, *Römische Religionsgeschichte*, Anhang, "Der römische Festkalender"

we are confronted with the typical *autoschediasma* of a grammarian, all of which justifies Bömer's remark made in this same context: "Doch lassen sich auf solche Ueberlieferung keine Schlüsse bauen."²⁷

And this brings us to the crux of the matter since Palmer uses his no more than hypothetical deities Aternus and Atratus²⁸ as a link in an argument which makes the Di Indigetes oracular gods and in which the black Jupiter naturally appears related to Vediovis.²⁹ The limits of what is admissible are thereby far overstepped and the matter goes from bad to worse when we realise that the premise for the new Indiges interpretation rests on another very personal restoration of an inscription.

It concerns the famous LARE AINEIA inscription, discovered in an archeological context which is described in the most accessible manner by P. Sommella.³⁰ On the first page of his chapter about this complex Palmer writes: "By two separate discoveries we have learned of Parca Maurtia, Neuna, Neuna Fata and the Lares." (p. 79). Whoever may be surprised by the presence of *more than one* Lar in this inscription and looks for further information on the subject must content himself with two footnotes (n. 2 and n. 143) and a very brief discussion on p. 114 in which Palmer prefers Kolbe's interpretation of the *cippus* inscription which, in contrast to Guarducci's LARE AINEIA D(onum), reads: LARE VESUVIA Q. f. This naturally brings him into difficulties since an unqualified Lar is not mentioned anywhere else. Palmer tries to get round the problem by reading: LARE(BOS) VESUVIA Q. f.

under 1 February. In the meantime there has been a new interpretation of (H)elernus by G. Dumézil, *Journ. I-E. Stud.* 1, 1973, 304-308. He is a divinity who supervises the transformation of seed in green plants: < (H)olus "soup greens."

²⁷ *ad* Ovid. *Fast.* 2, 67.

²⁸ Having dismissed the interpretations mentioned by Degraffi "which are neither appropriate nor clarifying." Weinstock's suggestion *Aerae* < Ital. Etr. *aisa* and Drummond's interpretation of *Aerae* as a local name seem no more phantastic to me than *Atrato*.

²⁹ On the recently found inscription with a dedication *Deiveti* mentioned by P. p. 138/9 and n. 255, see now R. Arena, "Dei problemi posti da un'iscrizione latina con dedica a Dite," *Arch. Class.* 25-26, 1973-4, 9-17.

³⁰ "Das Heroon des Aeneas und die Topographie des antiken Lavinium," *Gymn.* 81, 1974, 273-297, where there is a brief mention of the "Lare Aineia" inscription (p. 295) and of the discussion between Guarducci and Kolbe (n. 75).

But who is right? Guarducci has given her counterargument ("very strongly" writes Palmer in n. 2) and, in my opinion less convincingly, has suggested a new reading, AENIA.³¹ The most obvious thing to do is to look at the photographs. They seem to me to argue incontestably in favour of Guarducci and Weinstock and against Kolbe and Palmer. If we are still not satisfied, however, we could resign ourselves to Palmer's remark (n. 143): "From the stone itself and from the photographs one can be certain of the reading LARE and nothing else."³² But whoever accepts this, implicitly denies the necessity of reading *Lare(bos)* in the plural. We could still read another predicate instead of *Aeneia* or *Vesuvia* and besides, *Lar* (singular) + predicate does occur.³³ Furthermore, the completion of *Lare* as *Larebos* has little epigraphical support, at any rate in the republican period. Palmer cites parallel forms in *-ebos* in Degrassi *ILLRP* 2, p. 510, where we find the well-known *Tempestatebos* and *Larebos*, but they are *not* abbreviated. An appeal to Degrassi's restoration of the fiercely controversial *Deiv() No[v]esede* (*CIL* I² 375), where Degrassi, add. no. 20 (*ibid.*, p. 380), reads *Deiv(eis) No[v]esede(bus)*, does not bring us any further but leads us once more into the disagreeable atmosphere of *obscurum per obscurius*.³⁴ Besides, here too Palmer's reading seems to have been influenced by a hypothetical premise: in his opinion the Lares are not ancestral gods, as Weinstock will have it, and he protests

³¹ "Enea e Vesta," *Röm. Mitt.* 78, 1971, 73-89.

³² "After studying the photographs I am very much inclined to agree," writes T. J. Cornell, *PCPS* 201 (= 21), 1975, 14 n. 5, where there is an extensive discussion of the matter.

³³ *Silvano Lari agresti* (*CIL* VI 646), *Lar Victor* (*CIL* XI 2096), both rejected by Palmer as parallels.

³⁴ E. Vetter, *IF* 62, 1955/6, 17, regards the names as nominatives and there are, of course, a quantity of other possibilities. Nor can we neglect Vetter, *Handbuch* I, n° 225 *esos no[v].esede*. As far as I can see Palmer makes no reference to Degrassi, *ILLRP* I, n° 196, who regards a dedication of an *aediculam*, *sigilla ornamentaque omnia Lar fam* as *Lar(ibus) fam(iliarius)*. This would then be the only parallel to be found in Degrassi. Such a restoration remains problematical, however, because the *Lar familiaris* is well attested as a singular god (Plaut. *Merc.* 834; Cato, *Agr.* 2, 1; and 143, 2). The *sigilla* are no more proof of the existence of more than one *Lar* than are the *ornamenta*, and a *Lararium* could contain figurines of various types of deity. That *Lares familiares* have been attested several times (Ruggiero, *Dizion. Epigr.* IV, 398 ff.) is no reason for making *Lar fam* plural with no further discussion.

violently against the suggestion of making of Aeneas Indiges, via Lar Aeneas, the ancestral hero Aeneas—something which would confer on Indiges a significance which Palmer refuses to accept.

It must unfortunately be admitted that arbitrary conjectures prevail in this book, both where epigraphical and where literary texts are concerned. A typical example is the treatment of the *Carmen arvale* where Palmer (p. 92) thinks he has discovered *three different Martes* in Marmar, Mars and Marmor,³⁵ further claims that he is following "Degrassi's lucid commentary" but nevertheless seizes the opportunity of deviating from Degrassi by explaining *advocapit* as a singular (impossible because of *alternei*)³⁶ and interpreting *satur fu fere Mars* as "Be full, fertile Mars." The latter interpretation is probably due to the fact that Norden's well-founded ("Wir müssen Anschluss an die übliche Sprechweise suchen und je mehr dies erreicht wird, je richtiger ist die Auslegung") translation³⁷ "Be satisfied, savage Mars" (taken over thus by Degrassi) does not correspond to the nature of Mars which Palmer wishes to see in this context—Mars as a bringer of blessings and protector from disasters related to the Lares and Parca Maurtia. That *triumpe* should be taken to mean "rejoice" without any further discussion while recent views³⁸ are totally ignored may be allowed to pass, but that Norden's name should not be so much as mentioned in a discussion of the *Carmen arvale* is unforgivable.

It is impossible to go into all the guesses made by Palmer and an extensive quotation of so truly incredible an example of arbitrariness as the restoration of Festus (142 L.) on p. 194 is hardly

³⁵ The most extensive discussion of the three different forms is G. Radke, *Gnomon* 44, 1972, 559.

³⁶ Cf., for example, my discussion of the possibilities and the relevant literature: *Triumphus. An Inquiry into the Origin, Development and Meaning of the Roman Triumph*, Leiden 1970, 38 ff.

³⁷ E. Norden, *Aus altrömischen Priesterbüchern*, Lund 1939. The quotation is a statement by Birt reproduced by Norden (p. 110).

³⁸ At about the same time as G. Radke's assertion, "Eine Deutung des 'io triumpe' ist noch nicht geglückt," *Gymn.* 77, 1970, 44, there appeared two extensive studies on this problem which have a great deal in common although the conclusions are different: L. Bonfante Warren, "Roman Triumphs and Etruscan Kings: the Latin Word *Triumphus*," *Studies in Honor of J. A. Kerns*, Den Haag 1970, 108-120 and H. S. Versnel, *Triumphus*, Chapter 1. I cannot go into these various interpretations or criticise Palmer's views on the Roman triumph (chapter 5 and n. 69) just here.

necessary to establish that in the vast majority of epigraphical and textual completions, emendations and interpretations Palmer's method cannot stand up before the most benevolent criticism. For further remarkable examples I can only refer the reader to the discussion of Juno.

To return again to the question of principle which I asked earlier, I would like to conclude with a few quotations from the above-mentioned essay by L. Robert. "Es gibt eine Grenze; wo sie liegt, das lernt man, indem man die Erfahrungen der Vergangenheit studiert. Man braucht, wie Letronne sagte, 'eine gewisse Mischung von Umsicht und Kühnheit, die genau bis zur Grenze geht, sie aber nicht überschreitet.'" "Beides muss gleichermassen wach sein, das Gefühl für die Grenze und der Wagemut" (p. 53). "Nie soll man sich selbst zum Gefangenen einer Hypothese machen, man soll immer bereit sein, sich zurückzuziehen. Nach und nach wird man einige Möglichkeiten ausscheiden. Die rechten Gelehrten sind, wie Fontenelle von den 'wahren Philosophen' sagte, 'wie Elephanten, die beim gehen das zweite Bein erst dann auf die Erde niedersetzen, wenn das erste ganz festen Boden hat.'" This last principle leads us straight to our second question.

2. *Argumentation and association*

The invocation formula of the *devotio* prayer of P. Decius Mus in Liv. 8, 9, 6 has so far been the corner-stone of two influential theories. When Wissowa, in his *Religion und Kultus der Römer*, divides the Roman deities into ancient indigenous gods and later newcomers this division rests, as he admits, on this particular passage, the only one where the Di Novensiles and the Di Indigetes appear *together* but, in Wissowa's opinion, in opposition to each other. Dumézil directed his attention to another combination from the series *Jane, Juppiter, Mars Pater, Quirine, Bellona, Lares, divi Novensiles, di Indigetes, divi quorum est potestas nostrorum hostium-que dique Manes*... He himself was interested in Juppiter, Mars and Quirinus, whom he regarded as the oldest triad in Rome and as the Roman illustration of his famous tripartite theory. He can, moreover, cite several other relevant texts.³⁹

³⁹ See, for example, in addition to the many other studies: *La religion romaine archaïque*, Paris 1966, 147-153.

Whatever we may think of the two theories, both "associations" were based on solid evidence, whether on the apparent parallel/opposition of two terms (Wissowa) or on the fact that this combination of three deities appears in the same order elsewhere (Dumézil). Such a circumstance justifies further research into other data and arguments in favour of the supposed connection, research which could either confirm the hypothesis or show that the "association" was purely fortuitous. A great deal of research starts with a hypothesis resting on such an association although the researcher may not specify as much or may not even be aware of it. The second question of principle which I initially asked points to the more specific question of how far one is prepared to regard an argument by association as conclusive and to what extent different types of association can be said to strengthen one another. Moreover, we must always ask how ready an author appears to be to give up an erroneous hypothesis on closer investigation or whether he is going to pursue his first impulse at all costs, against every reasonable consideration, by way of further associations, combinations, comparisons, etc.

These questions are particularly relevant to Palmer's book. They come to the fore in almost every paragraph. The terms "association," "connection" and suchlike are used continuously and are frequently advanced as decisive arguments. I shall only give a few examples, starting with the *devotio*-formula, also used by Palmer in the chapter in which he tries to show that the Di Indigetes are chthonic deities whose original function lay in the domain of incubation and prophecy. Let us see what happens (*italics used in such terms as "association" are always mine*).

p. 113. "In the Livian prayer the Divi Novensiles are definitely *connected* with souls of the dead or Di Manes, the goddess of 'Earth' *Tellus*, the goddess of war Bellona, and 'the Gods to whom belongs control over our men and the enemy.'" In the *devotio*-formula in Macrobius we also find gods belonging to the Netherworld and to death.⁴⁰

p. 129 (about the same formula): "the Di Indigetes are *associated* with Jupiter."

⁴⁰ For the connection between these two *devotiones* see my "Two Types of Roman Devotio," *Mnemosyne* 29, 1976, 365-410.

p. 130. Appearance in the *devotio*-formula now seems to Palmer to be the proof of a hypothesis suggested earlier: "the Di Indigetes belong to the realm of curses and the Netherworld."

p. 131. "That Black Jupiter was a god of the Netherworld seems assured by his *association* with the Di Indigetes. . ."

p. 132 contains a survey of literary texts in which the Di Indigetes always appear in combination with one or more of the deities Palmer regards as relevant. They appear, for example, with the same gods as the ones of the *devotio*-formula, Romulus (*Georgica* I, 498) naturally being equated with Quirinus (Ovid. *Metam.* 15, 862) and figuring thus in the formula, and Jupiter, Mars, Vesta and, on one occasion, even the Lares being also present. This leads to the gradually stereotyped formulation:

p. 133. "Here the Indigetes are *coupled* with the Lares, an *association* also met in the Livian prayer." If a deity fits less easily into the desired series we read (p. 133): "Apollo belongs to the mythology and counts not at all." Then, p. 133: "And, finally, Faunus *appears with* the Indigetes (Sil. It. *Punic.* 9, 294)." This closes the circle since both the Indiges—whether he is identified with Aeneas, Anchises, Numicus or with Jupiter—and Faunus belonged to the same complex which Palmer calls "grove Albunea." p. 135: "If Faunus was an *indiges*⁴¹ as well as a *partner* of the Indigetes, the nature of the Indigetes is immediately ascertained." For Faunus was an oracular god, as can be seen from his surnames Incubus, Inuus. "Since the Indigetes are *associated* with Faunus, it is just as likely that their name once clearly indicated a similar notion" (p. 135) (namely the element of incubation, discussed below).

With these passages we have touched only on the central part of Chapter 3. This part is preceded and followed by two sections which are also characterised by the associative method I have just described. It is inevitably accompanied by an unacceptably selective use of sources on the one hand and a repeatedly highly personal interpretation of data which have long been familiar on the other.

Let us take an example from the first section of the chapter: Faunus is one of the central deities in the Albunea-complex where

⁴¹ Palmer seems to have derived this from the *Fauni Indigenae* who appear once in Censorinus (p. 135), although he still writes on p. 134: "*indiges*, which cannot equal *indigena*."

the *cippi* were found. Faunus is a preventer of sickness, a protector and above all an oracular god. Well, in that case the other deities locally associated with him must have the same nature—Parca Maurtia and Neuna Fata, for example. Unlike the scarcely quoted Walde-Hofmann Palmer does not regard Parca as a "Geburts-göttin" (<par(i)ca), but as a goddess who "checked" or "saved" (<parcere). Maurtia is derived from Mars and that fits perfectly because Mars, like Faunus, is a tutelary deity (cf. *Carmen arvale supra*). Furthermore Faunus' father is a woodpecker (*picus*) and the *picus Martius* delivered oracles. Although nothing is known of Parca Maurtia in this connection "the later Parcae were in a sense prophetic" (p. 94). Neuna Fata is not the goddess of the ninth day after birth, the *dies lustricus*,⁴² but the ninth of a group of nine deities, viz. the nine Fata. Thus we read (p. 110): "The nine Goddesses of Albunea have a parallel in the Nine Gods of Ardea and the Di Novenses." These last are "the Nine who sit in." After the Lares have also been given a similar "tutelary" function the ground is ready for the above-mentioned Indiges interpretation. Rather than go into the flights of fancy in the last section of the chapter I shall give a very brief sketch of the remaining chapters 4 and 5 where the question of method comes as distinctly to the fore at it does in Chapter 3.

Chapter 4. How did the *versus Saturnius* get its name? The key is to be found in Festus (432 L.) who (following Varro) says: *Versus quoque antiquissimi, quibus Faunus fata cecinisse hominibus videtur, Saturnii appellantur (...)* *Qui deus in Saliaribus Sa(e)turnus*⁴³ *nominatur*. Festus may well have obtained this last piece of information from Aelius Stilo and this same Stilo may have handed the name *versus Saturnius* on to Varro. Now, the "association" of the *versus Saturnius* on the one hand and the Salian verses on the other

⁴² See now L. et P. Brind'Amour, "La deuxième satire de Perse et le *dies lustricus*," *Latom.* 30, 1971, 999-1024; id., "Le *dies lustricus*, les oiseaux de l'aurore et l'amphidromie," *Latom.* 34, 1975, 17-58.

⁴³ The manuscript of Paul. ex Festo gives *Sateurnus*, which is generally regarded as a misspelling of *Saeturnus* and is inserted thus in Festus *per coniecturam*. On this question see the recent study by Ch. Guittard, "Recherches sur la nature de Saturne des origines à la réforme de 217 avant J.C." in R. Bloch et al., *Recherches sur les religions de l'Italie antique*, Genève-Paris 1976, 43-71, esp. 51. On p. 179 of Palmer we should read Sa <e> turnus instead of Sa <e> ternus.

in a lemma of Festus gives Palmer an idea. Suddenly the possibility emerges that in the *carmina Saliaria* the *versus Saturnii* appeared together with the *versus Ianuli*, *Iunonii*, *Minervii*. Stilo knew these verses and gave the same name to the oldest known epic metre. The question of course remains (at least for those who are prepared to go so far with Palmer in his deviation from the current explanation of the term *saturnii versus* as the oldest sort of verse and therefore, just as Festus says, *versus antiquissimi*) of why Stilo should have chosen, of all Salian verse forms, the still hypothetical *versus Saturnius* to serve as the generic term for the oldest known form of epic metre. Let us leave the explanation to Palmer: "He chose to name the meter of the earliest epic after the Salians' *versus Saturnii*. In all probability, relatively little of the Salian Hymns was devoted to Saturn. For all we know, only the *versus Saturnii* of all the *Salian versus* represented the same measure as was found in the early epic. . . ." (p. 181). More is still to come,⁴⁴ but there is no point in continuing to attack so fragile a construction. It is built on sand. A series of hypotheses, including the idea that every god in the *carmina Saliaria* should have a *metrum* of his own (!), are supposed to support a new explanation of the name *versus Saturnius*. The *origo malorum* is clearly again an "association." S.v. *Saturno*, as we would expect in a *glossarium*, Festus tells us all he knows about this deity (that is to say what he has learnt from Verrius Flaccus or Varro): the god has a festival in December; he is connected with agriculture; there are verses which bear his name and this god is called Saeturnus in the *carmina* of the Salians *videlicet a sationibus*. These are all scattered pieces of information without any direct connection. The "connection" is Palmer's, not Festus'.

Chapter 5. Mutunus Titinus is the god, related to Priapus, whose two names indicate in two different manners the *penis*, the fertility symbol on which women had to sit before their marriage. This is the current theory. As far as the first name is concerned Palmer follows the generally accepted etymology connecting the name with *mutto*, *mutunium*, *moetinus*. Titinus, on the other hand, is not,

⁴⁴ *Lua Saturni*, for example, is the disaster which Saturn should avert. In the *Carmen arvale* we also come across a *lues* which must be averted by Mars. "Thus we can safely assume that Saeturnus was addressed by the Martial Salians to keep Roman welfare during the ceremonies of the month of Mars" (p. 183).

according to Palmer, to be connected with *titus* = penis,⁴⁵ following the scholiast on Pers. *Sat.* 1, 19-21: *a membri magnitudine dicti titi*, but with *titus* = dove (*ibid.*: *titi columbae sunt agrestes*). For (p. 192) "the name of the bird precedes the name of the penis." The dove is an ominous animal, especially in connection with matrimonial fertility. And all this fits exactly because (p. 189) "Tutinus is associated by Lactantius with a cradle deity against the evil eye (*fascinum*) and Stercutus." There follows a breathtaking series of hypotheses ("speculation comes easy" (p. 199)) with the Vestal Virgins as the worshippers of Mutunus Titinus, connections with the phallus of the triumphal car, Caesar's sacrifice to Mutunus Titinus on the Ides of March 44 B.C. (!!!), etc., etc., formulated in staccato-like paratactical sentences, whose parataxis is intended to suggest a connection where none has been hitherto perceived. But I have emphasised the principal assumption. This can be just as easily disposed of as the previous hypotheses.

Mutinus Titinus belongs to those combinations which are particularly characteristic of Roman religious forms: two related terms, often with the same root, are joined together in the name of a single god. Aius Locutius is the best known, but there are many others, such as Anna Perenna and the Salisubsilis mentioned in Catullus.⁴⁶ A remarkable parallel can be found in the emphatic and varied duplication in magic formulas. Here are a few examples. A *defixio*-tablet⁴⁷ has: *oro bos ex(h)anc die ut taceant muti mutuli si[n]t*. In

⁴⁵ F. M. Muller, *Altitalisches Wörterbuch*, 1926, s.v.; Walde-Hofmann, *LEW*, s.v. From a different angle (Tutunus) see also Radke, *Götter Altitaliens* s.v. Mutunus and s.v. Tutunus and the literature quoted there. Cf. S. Ferri, *op. cit.*, (*infra* n. 46) 58.

⁴⁶ Catull. 17, 6. This is usually overlooked. *Salisubsili* does certainly not mean "dancing priests of Mars," as Lewis and Short translate it, cf. Norden, *Priesterbücher*, 273, n. 2. Cf. also the three deities in a *defixio* from Hadrumetum (Audollent n° 265): Alimbeu, Columbeu, Peralimbeu. For a fundamental discussion of the double names of divinities giving many examples see G. Radke, *Götter Altitaliens*, 24-36. For another approach see S. Ferri, "Osservazioni ai nomi di alcuni dei 'indigetes,'" *Rendic. Atti. Pontif. Acc. Rom. Arch.* ser. III, 37, 1964-5 (1966), 49-62.

⁴⁷ *AE* 1968, n° 620 from Hadrumetum. This discovery renders superfluous Audollent's remark (n° 219) about a *defixio*: *facias illos mutuos muturungallos mutulos*: "dum vult dicere *facias illos mutos mutos mutos* nescio quo scribentis lapsu quae supra habes dedit." Cf. *Mutae Tacitae* in a *defixio* tablet: R. Egger, *Römische Antike und frühes Christentum* II, 247-253. There are countless examples of double names with variations in the *defixiones* in

Marcell. *de medicam.* XV, 11 (Helmreich) we read: *exi <si> hodie nata, si ante nata, si hodie creata, si ante creata, hanc pestem, hanc pestilentiam, hunc dolorem, hunc tumorem, hunc ruborem, has toles, has tosillas, hunc panum, has paniculas, hanc strumam, hanc strumellam, hanc religionem, evoco, educo, excanto de istis membris, medullis.* We are immediately reminded of the *lustratio* prayer in Cato *de agric.* 141: *viduertatem vastitudinemque, calamitates intemperiasque ... fruges frumenta vineta virgultaque ... bonam salutem valetudinemque ...* Even if we admit that those double names of divinities do not always consist of two components which agree in meaning,⁴⁸ it would be unduly daring to take a *phallic* deity, one of whose names certainly means *penis*, and to give a different meaning, based on one single different piece of evidence, to the other name in spite of a convincing etymological explanation which shows that it too means *penis*. And what is certainly going too far is to project the hypothetically ominous significance of this new term onto the entire function of the deity. The main complaint comes again to the fore when we examine the text of Lactantius (and others) marshalled in support of Palmer's argument. When Lactantius *DI* 1. 20. 30, mocks three gods, viz. *Cunina, quae infantes tuetur in cunis ac fascinum submovet et Stercutus qui stercoreandi agri rationem primus induxit, et Titinus in cuius sinu pudendo nubentes praesident ut illarum pudicitia prior deus delibasse videatur*, we are not entitled to deduce a "connection of the god (Titinus) to infant's danger from the evil eye" (p. 189 and further on the same page). The simple fact that Stercutus is also named implies that if there is a "connection" or an "association" here, the connecting element for Lactantius (as for Arnobius⁴⁹) does not reside in a

Audolent, as also in the Greek material such as ὀλλῶν ἐξωλῶν, *Bull. Ep.* 1972, 584, and of special relevance: Ἀθήνη Μυχία in: F. K. Dörner, *Wien. Jahresh.* 32, 1940, Beiblatt, 65 ff.

⁴⁸ The *polarity* of the component elements suggested by Bickel, *Alt-römische Gottesbegriff*, 80, is not present, as Radke pointed out, *op. cit.* 24. This does not mean, however, that two polar *indigitamenta* can never be fused in one deity.

⁴⁹ Arnob. 4, 7-9, names Tutunus after Venus, Perfica and Pertunda and before Puta, Peta, Patellana, Patella and Noduterensis. Arnobius wants to show that the latter group have in common with the former the childish transparency of their names and their ridiculous functions as deities. Pertunda may have been a goddess of the "wedding-night" but Venus is connected by Arnobius in this very place with *castrensisibus flagitiis et puerorum stupris*!

common relationship with "the protection of children" or "the wedding night," with which Stercutus has nothing to do. The *tertium comparationis* resides elsewhere—obviously, that is, in the obscene character of the gods in question. There is thus indeed an association, but of a *very different sort to the one postulated by Palmer*. And this observation brings us back to our point of departure and the question of principle formulated earlier. After my experience of Palmer's use of associative argumentation I would like to suggest the following:

1. An author ought to clarify, either once explicitly or repeatedly implicitly, what he means by such terms as "association." Above all we must keep in mind that:

2. there are various types of "connection," and one does not automatically prove the existence of the other.

3. The first question we would have to ask ourselves is whether the supposed association is not altogether fortuitous. It would be so in a case like the one I have already mentioned, when a dictionary simply lists all there is to say about a particular subject. There is indeed a common denominator but this "association" contains no conclusive evidence concerning the *mutual* connection between the various statements. Exactly the same can be said about another sort of *local* association, viz. the presence of various deities in the same sacred complex (e.g. in the Grove Albunea). Although we can state that on the sacred territory of a god of healing it is more likely than not that other gods of healing will also be represented, we would have no difficulty, if we would pursue the lines of association followed by Palmer, in claiming that more than half the gods in the Greek and Roman Pantheon are entitled to be called "gods of healing." Polytheism makes it possible to expect an act of healing from, or to ascribe one to, every god in certain circumstances. The fact that a number of gods were worshipped in the temple complex of the "grove Albunea," one or two of whom were oracular gods, proves *nothing* about the character of the other deities. Were the twelve or thirteen deities whose altars were erected in the immediate neighbourhood of the Heroon of the Indiges-god Numicus all oracular gods simply because of their proximity?

4. The second question must be: if a series of names of deities has been encountered in a formula or a passage in an ancient writer,

what is the function of the mutual connection in the context, or, in other words, what is the common factor? If, as we saw in the cases of Lactantius and Arnobius, the function of the "association" is to be found in the obscene and ridiculous character of the *indigentamenta*, the conclusiveness of the passage in favour of other types of associative function vanishes, or is seriously diminished. An extreme illustration is the *devotio*-formula. Here we find a considerable quantity of deities listed. What does this series mean? The context alone can tell us: the gods are being begged for aid at the coming encounter from which the life and death of Rome will depend; at the same time it is a sort of oath formula. Well, an appeal is made to those very deities who are particularly necessary at that moment and in that situation: Janus must always be named; in this particular situation so must Jupiter; it comes as no surprise to find Mars and Bellona in time of war; and the Manes always figure in prayers to the gods of the Netherworld. What the Novensiles and Indigetes are doing in this formula is something we do not know since we do not know who or what they are, but the common factor of all these gods must be that they appear in such a situation as the protectors of the Romans. Once we have established this, it is no longer permissible to select arbitrary gods from this series (Lares, Manes, Novensiles and Indigetes) and to deduce a *specific relationship in character* because of their presence. And this is just what Palmer so frequently does.

To sum up: *post hoc* is not always *propter hoc*; when it is, we must search for the nature of the causal or functional connection. Once we have found it we must stick to it with a certain consistency under pain of being termed "unscientific."

3. *To quote or not to quote . . .*

Everybody knows the two extremes: on the one hand we have the university dissertation in which the author tries to reach an ideal completeness and is not satisfied unless he has collected, reported and criticised everything that has so far appeared on his subject; and, on the other hand, we have the essay by the scholar who, being above the vulgar squabbles of his profession, goes *ad fontes* on principle and will only allow those *fontes* to flow, albeit along canals which he himself has dug. The ideal surely lies between

these two extremes and one can only welcome those authors who, together with the ancient sources, also report the important modern literature in their field. By "important" I mean everything that has contributed to the furtherance or stimulation of research, even when the author himself reaches different conclusions.

Leafing through Palmer's extensive bibliography and abundant footnotes we might, at first sight, be so impressed by his precision and his copiousness as to feel that he could hardly be considered disappointing in this respect. The insider, however, is immediately struck by the fact that Dumézil, to give just one name, is not mentioned in the bibliography or in the notes. There are more surprising omissions. My main concern, however, is not that Palmer either passes over in silence, or mentions briefly and without a proper confutation, those theories which do not fit in with his own—and these, in view of Palmer's longing for originality, are a great many. An extensive discussion of earlier theses can make a book unreadable, as anybody who has written such a book should know. What I object to is Palmer's reticence when he announces his own theory as being "new" but fails to point out that predecessors have gone far—sometimes just as far as he—along the path that he has chosen. Here are a few examples.

In his opening article Palmer rejects the interpretations of Otto, Wissowa and Rose, who regard Juno, even etymologically, as "the young woman" and therefore as "the protectress of young women." Palmer sees in **iuveno* "merely a deity of youth(fulness), without assigning that physical state to men or women" (p. 4). Now, I feel that this should not be done without saying that various other scholars have suggested as much. M. E. Benveniste⁵⁰ connected the root **iuven-* with *aevum* and attributed to it a basic meaning of "force vitale." M. Renard⁵¹ added that Juno is therefore the numen of the "force vitale" in so far as she represents fertility and permanence, and he puts it elsewhere as follows: "Juno est donc la déesse 'jeune' et la protectrice des 'jeunes.'" ⁵² He certainly did not only mean young women, any more than did G. Dumézil, who asks:⁵³

⁵⁰ "L'expression indo-européenne de l'éternité," *BSL*, 38, 1937, 103-112.

⁵¹ "Le nom de Junon," *Phoibos* 5, 1950-1, 141.

⁵² "Aspects anciens de Ianus et de Junon," *Rev. Belge Phil. Hist.* 31, 1953, 5-21.

⁵³ *RRA*, 1966, 289, and on Juno's polyvalence see above all: "Juno S.M.R.," *Eranos* 52, 1954, 105-119.

"Qu'est-ce alors que Juno met, ou a d'abord mis en évidence: la simple notion abstraite de jeunesse? la force vitale ou le moral pétulant des jeunes? Les jeunes comme classe d'âge, comme division sociale?" and later refers to a parallel with Ner-o.⁵⁴ It is difficult to account for the lack of these references at this point, but it is still more surprising to establish that Renard, who has half a dozen articles on Juno to his name,⁵⁵ including discussions of Juno Covella and Juno in relation to Fortuna and Eileithuia, is not so much as mentioned. If Palmer had consulted these authors he would have seen that Dumézil (*l.c.*) marshalled a series of arguments against the unilaterally *female* function of the original Juno, some of which are strikingly close to his own arguments. Besides, Dumézil has already pointed emphatically to the political-military function of the goddess, which is also underlined by Palmer. Moreover, since Palmer has raised the question of Juno's earliest function, and her function as protectress of the city is dealt with in connection with the character of the Italic Juno and the specific rôle which she plays in the *evocatio*, a word should have been said about the fact that R. Bloch has made some important advances in this domain in a series of articles.⁵⁶

Another example concerns Palmer's central thesis about the nature of the *Indigetes*. On p. 128 "alternative etymologies" of the word *indiges* are announced, "linguistically unimpeachable and

⁵⁴ There is also an interesting suggestion by H. Wagenvoort, *Roman Dynamism*, Oxford 1947, who does not believe that Juno was originally connected solely with women and who refers to the *amiculum Iunonis* borne by the Luperi which he regards as "the 'cover of youth'" (p. 193). Cf. also Th. Köves, *Hermes* 90, 1962, 236.

⁵⁵ In addition to the above-mentioned titles see also the list in R. Schilling, *ANRW* I, 2, 1972, 344.

⁵⁶ R. Bloch, "Ilithye, Leucothée et Thesan," *CRAI* 1968, 366-375; "Un mode d' "interpretatio" à deux degrés: de l'Uni de Pyrgi à Ilithye et Leucothée," *Arch. Class.* 21, 1969, 58-65 (the latter is indeed mentioned in n. 288 but has not been assimilated). Still more important are some articles which may have appeared too late for Palmer to be able to use them: "Héra, Uni, Junon en Italie centrale," *CRAI* 1972, 384-395; and in *REL* 51, 1973, 55-61. Bloch also discusses the connection with the *evocatio* emphasised by Palmer. Résumés of Bloch's views are to be found in "Processus d'assimilations divines dans l'Italie des premiers siècles" in: F. Dunand et P. Lévêque, *Les syncrétismes dans les religions de l'antiquité*, *EPRO* 1975, 112-122 and in: R. Bloch et al., *Recherches sur les religions de l'Italie antique*, Genève-Paris 1976, 1-19.

religiously consonant with the newly uncovered evidence from Tor Tignosa" (read: "in agreement with *Palmer's interpretation* of this new material"). On p. 135 we have the new suggestions:

1. *indiges ind-* (= *in*) and **ag-* "the god who does within" or
2. *indiges ind-* (= *in*) and **agy* "the god who speaks within."

It cannot have escaped Palmer's notice that H. Wagenvoort, in his *Roman Dynamism*,⁵⁷ which is mentioned in the bibliography, dedicated a number of pages to the etymology of *indiges* and made the very same suggestions, although, unlike Palmer, he rejected the second meaning. In so doing Wagenvoort referred to such distant predecessors as Corssen, and the theory is so far from being new or alternative that J. H. Waszink, in *Gnomon* 34, 1964, 444, with reference to Latte *RRG* 43 n. 3, expressed the wish: "... womit die Spekulationen über Ableitung von *aio* und *ago* hoffentlich für immer erledigt sind!"⁵⁸ Wagenvoort has also written some fundamental things on another subject central to Palmer, the origin of the *Ludi Saeculares*,⁵⁹ although Palmer, who follows the same line of reasoning, has chosen to ignore them. As for the connection between *Parca*, *Fata* and *Ludi Saeculares*, cf. W. Pötscher in *Gräzer Beitr.* 2, 1974, 171 ff., where, incidentally, there is no more mention than in Palmer of the particularly useful thesis by L. L. Tels-de Jong, *Sur quelques divinités romaines de la naissance et de la prophétie*, Diss. Leiden, Delft, 1959, in which we find an interpretation of *Parca* and *Fata* which differs radically from Palmer.

It is not my intention to fill in all the omissions in Palmer's book but simply to point out what, in my opinion, is the principal

⁵⁷ *Roman Dynamism*, 96 ff.

⁵⁸ In the chapter on the etymology of *indiges* Palmer writes (p. 134): "since Wissowa's time much ink has been spilt over the etymon of *indiges* ..." The reader must content himself with this since there is not a single reference. It is not for me to give a full survey of the literature on this subject. I wish only to refer to I. Cazzaniga, "Il frammento 61 degli Annali di Ennio: Quirinus Indiges," *P.P.* 29, 1974, 362-381, who makes an interesting attempt to reinstate the meaning of "forefather" for *genarches* suggested by Koch. Cf. S. Ferri, *op. cit.*, (n. 46).

⁵⁹ "The Origin of the *Ludi Saeculares*" in: *Studies in Roman Literature, Culture and Religion*, Leiden 1956, 193-232. In note 91 on p. 249 Palmer twice reproaches others for not being sufficiently informed about the subject.

weakness in his treatment of secondary sources. The fateful consequences will be illustrated in the brief critique of sections of the first essay which now follows.

4. *Juno*

Palmer's theory that Juno, in addition to her function as protectress of the woman, also had other aspects, such as that of goddess of the city, tutelary deity of the man and particularly of the man in a military capacity, is unlikely to arouse any opposition. Palmer, however, asks: what is the *original* nature of the goddess? In his attempt to present her even in her earliest stages as goddess of youth in general, and therefore also as protectress of the youthful warrior, he endeavours consistently to eliminate as many "female" elements as possible or to explain them as subsequent developments and does his best to underline the military, masculine element. In so doing he makes excessive use of the methods I have described, and the combination between what he would like to find and how he sets about finding it makes even this, the "calmest" and most systematic chapter, a disappointing collection of chaotic theories which are often palpably incorrect.

JUNO QUIRITIS presents Palmer with little difficulty in this respect, although the reader would be well-advised to consult W. Eisenhuth's *RE* article "Quiris."⁶⁰

JUNO POPULONA, interpreted by Wissowa as "Beschützerin der Volksvermehrung" and by G. Radke as goddess "des weiblichen Geschlechtslebens" after the analogy with Fluonia, seems indeed more attractive as the goddess of the *populus*.⁶¹

JUNO CAPROTINA raises a problem for Palmer, however. She was once connected with the *Nonae Caprotinae*, which, according to all

⁶⁰ *RE* XXIV, 1963, 1327 ff. *s.v.* *Quiris*, where the view is upheld that the "urban" and "martial" aspect of the Italic Juno was taken from Hera and came thus to Rome.

⁶¹ I do not believe—but this is a minor point—that in *CIL* III, 1074-76 = *ILS* 3085-87, *deae patriae* can be translated as "goddess of the fatherland." It comes, rather, from *patrius* "(fore)faterly," a common epithet which appears for instance frequently amongst the African deities as a parallel to *genius*. See, for example, M. Le Glay in F. Dunand et P. Lévêque, *op. cit.* (n. 56) 125; 128 and n. 25; 131. As a cognomen of Heliogabalus, see A. Radnoti, *Germania* 39, 1961, 385, n. 4. Cf. also R. Dussaud, "Les Dii patrii de Lepcis" in *Hommages à W. Deonna*, Bruxelles 1957, 203-209.

ancient sources, were a typical female festival in which branches and the milk of the *caprificus* = "fig-tree" played a part. Even more recent interpretations, which Palmer could not have known about, such as that of D. Porte, *Le devin, son bouc et Iunon*,⁶² who sees *caprificus* as a contraction of *capere* and Sab. *fircus*⁶³ and regards it as a typical feast of female fertility, and that of P. Drossart, *Nonae Caprotinae. La fausse capture des Aurores*,⁶⁴ who connects it with the moon, do not put this in doubt. Against all the evidence Palmer tries to weaken the relationship between Juno Caprotina and the rites around the *caprificus* and ultimately explains Caprotina primarily as an epithet referring to place. Juno's connection with the fig, however, finds support in a datum which Palmer overlooks: *CIL* I 2², 2439: *Iuno Palos+caria*, which Whatmough⁶⁵ has convincingly connected with the type of fig named *palusca* in Macrobius, *Sat.* 3, 20, 1. According to Palmer she is also a goddess "of war and diplomacy," evoked from Fidenae whose *populus* she protected. The *Poplifugia* associated with the *Nonae Caprotinae* are not the flight or rout of the *populus Romanus*, a mysterious but evident pendant of the *Regifugium*, but the rout of hostile *populi*. Not one single valid argument can be advanced in support of these theses. *Poplifugia* (plural) certainly does not imply, as Palmer will have it, the celebration of more than one festival so that more than one people should have been routed ("at least two flights or routs" p. 10). For opposite the 2 *Equirria* stands the non-recurring *Fordicidia* and all non-recurring feasts in

⁶² *REL* 51, 1973, 171-189.

⁶³ Almost certainly wrongly. The goat and the fig-tree were often associated as symbols of fertility in antiquity, as for example in the foundation-oracles of Tarentum and Rhegium, Parke-Wormell, *The Delphic Oracle*, 1956, n° 46 and n° 366; cf. J. Ducat, "Les thèmes des récits de la fondation de Rhégion," *Mélanges G. Daux*, Paris 1974, 93-115. Pausanias IV, 20, 1 f. clarifies the apparent contradiction between the "goat" of Tarentum and the "fig-tree" of Rhegium by telling us that the Messenians call the fig-tree τράγος. Cf. *Faunus Ficarius* in Palmer, 86 ff.

⁶⁴ *RHR* 185, 1974, 129-139. For more on the mysterious *Nonae Caprotinae* cf. W. Burkert, *Historia* 11, 1962, 369 and V. L. Johnson, "Natalis Urbis ad principium anni," *TAPA* 91, 1960, 109-120, who places the rites of the N.C. in March and deals extensively with the relationship between Juno Caprotina and Juno Rumina, which has also been defended by Palmer and already by U. Pestalozza, "Iuno Caprotina," *SMSR* 9, 1933, 38-71, esp. 65 ff.

⁶⁵ J. Whatmough, *C.Q.* 16, 1922, 190. Cf., however, Degraffi *ILLRP* I, n° 167 and note.

-*alia*, while it is precisely the *Tubilustrium* which is a recurrent festival. It is against all the rules of the *evocatio* that the god(dess) evoked should be served by erstwhile priests or priestesses *who have been enslaved*⁶⁶ (yet such is Palmer's interpretation of the female slaves in the *Nonae Caprotinae*, p. 15). Female slaves "who perform the rites," in other words as a permanent staff, would be totally unprecedented in this context. But what beats everything is Palmer's theory that this goddess wore a *toga praetexta*, a fact which, he believes, confirms his thesis. For in the first place, he maintains, the *praetexta* is a male garment and in the second, a "foreign garment;" therefore, he concludes, the goddess also came from abroad. These last two assumptions are extremely doubtful: even Fortuna wore a *toga praetexta* (Plin. *N.H.* 8, 197), as Palmer himself admits, and the *toga praetexta* is by no means an exclusively male garment.⁶⁷ But in fact all this is irrelevant since there is never any question of Juno's having worn a *toga praetexta*. Palmer thinks he can deduce as much from Varro *L.L.* 6, 18, whom he only quotes in translation. Although he lays such strong emphasis elsewhere on textual tradition, he here incautiously follows a reading which has indeed been accepted here and there but which, as P. Drossart recently showed once more,⁶⁸ is almost certainly incorrect. And of this reading—this is far more serious—Palmer gives a totally unacceptable interpretation. At the end of a passage about the rites of the *caprificus* Varro writes the sentence: *Cur hoc, togata praetexta data eis Apollinaribus ludis docuit populum. Togata* has been changed into *toga* and, in connection with another fact, that the women gave their clothes to the female slaves on this same day, it has been deduced that the *toga praetexta* was the garment given to women at this particular festival. Without any commentary Palmer

⁶⁶ To avoid all misunderstandings we should keep in mind the following: the Magna Mater was not evoked and her priests may well have been servants of the goddess, but they were not slaves of the Romans.

⁶⁷ On the *toga praetexta* in general see L. Bonfante Warren, "Roman Costumes," *ANRW* I, 4, 1973, 584-614; for that of Fortuna see p. 600 n. 68. Girls wore the *toga praetexta* and courtesans a *toga* which is not further defined (Daremberg-Saglio V, 348). Paul. ex Festo, 143 L., says: *Mutini Titini sacellum Romae fuit. cui mulieres velatae togis praetextis solebant sacrificare.*

⁶⁸ P. Drossart, "Le théâtre aux Nones Caprotines. Varro, *L.L.* 6, 18," *Rev. Phil.* 48, 1974, 54-64.

gives the following "translation" of the sentence (of which he makes the goddess the subject): "Garbed in the *toga praetexta* she taught them at the Ludi Apollinares why this [is done]." (p. 7). I need hardly demonstrate that this is linguistically impossible. The trouble is that Palmer falls back repeatedly on this translation since he sees the *Juno praetextata* as a very important argument. Worse still—not only is the matter linguistically untenable: there is also a far more obvious explanation. Drossart maintains the reading *togata praetexta* and demonstrates its correctness. We are here clearly confronted, as we can already see in Wissowa and Latte,⁶⁹ with a *fabula* which is given *eis* (*dare fabulam* is a technical term) in honour of the women and which instructs the people about the origin of the rites. There is therefore no sign of *Juno* with a *toga praetexta*. And everything that Palmer deduces from this—and he deduces a great deal—collapses completely.

JUNO OF FEBRUARY. The *februatio* during the Lupercalia applied, according to Palmer, to the *populus* and the Palatine (so not primarily to the women, but rather to the men). *Dies februatus* (Varro *L.L.* VI, 13 and 34) means, in spite of Varro himself: *quod tum februatur populus*, "cleansed day." "Thus *Juno februata* can and should mean nothing more than a cleansed *Juno*" (p. 18). This "translation," and all the fancies based on it concerning the washing and anointing of a *Juno* image as well as the connected interpretation of *Juno fluonia*, repose on a misunderstanding. The suffix *-tos* expresses no more than a "Zugehörigkeit" (Radke) and does not only develop in a passive, but also in an active sense.⁷⁰ *Dies februatus* means, as we can read in the dictionary, "day of cleansing," *Juno februata* the goddess "concerned with purification," as her other surnames *Februalis* and *Februlis* help to prove.

JUNO LUCINA, the birth goddess par excellence, is robbed of her

⁶⁹ Latte *RRG*, 106 n. 2: "Das Aition . . . stammt wie Varro l.l. 6, 18 ausdrücklich angibt aus einer *Praetexta* die an Ludi Apollinares . . . gegeben worden war," for which he can cite Wissowa *RE* III, 1552, who had already supported the reading *togata praetexta* and who interpreted this as a *fabula praetexta*.

⁷⁰ Radke, *Götter Altitaliens* 18, with many examples. Cf. Leumann, *Lateinische Laut- und Formenlehre*, München 1963 (= 1926), 227. In this case I would prefer a derivation from *februa* to a derivation from *februare*. Besides the god *Februus* (Macrobian *Sat.* I, 13, 3) there is also a goddess *Februa* ἑφορον καὶ καθαρτικὴν τῶν πραγμάτων (Lyd. *De Mens.* IV, 5, p. 83 W).

rights by Palmer. One by one items of evidence are refuted or explained in a different way. The dedication of a temple to her because of a birth actually points to Matronalia and not to Lucina, a name formed, incidentally, on *lucus*. That men should sacrifice *castud* to Juno proves nothing about sexual abstinence. The habit of presenting coins to the goddess at every birth cannot be an ancient one since no coins existed in ancient times—"the custom was thus not archaic" (p. 20), etc., etc. For Palmer's discussion of the Juppiter Imperator of Praeneste (as for Juppiter Rex) R. Combès's *Imperator* should have been consulted.⁷¹ But a Juppiter Rex (whom Palmer certainly knows about [p. 23 and n. 142]) is not attractive to him. We only have to see what he makes of:

JUNO REGINA. This goddess is not, as everyone has hitherto thought, the queen-goddess beside the king-Jupiter; she is actually the Juno of the king. "The king and the curias and the *populus* have each their own deity of youth" (p. 22). Here again we must dismiss this as being linguistically impossible, or at best most unlikely. *Reginus* does not appear as an adjective in Latin. In order to circumvent this unfortunate circumstance Palmer gives a highly misleading note on the subject.⁷² He cites Charisius, *Ars gramm.* p. 61 B, as proof that the word does indeed exist. The reader who might wonder, not unnaturally, why the word does not figure in any dictionary and who checks the text itself, immediately gets an answer: it is a hypothetical word, coined by Charisius himself *pour besoin de la cause*, but which does not

⁷¹ R. Combès, *Imperator. Recherches sur l'emploi et la signification du titre d'Imperator dans la Rome républicaine*, Paris 1966, 38-43 and cf. index s.v. *Iuppiter imperator* and *Iupiter rex*.

⁷² P. 224 n. 132. Palmer also refers to the cognomen *Reginus*. This has nothing to do with *rex*, but comes from the town Regium! In Leumann, *Laut- und Formenl.* 204, 224, 269, to whom Palmer refers us, we do not find the adjective, but we simply find that *regina*, like *gallina* (noted everywhere as the only parallel), is a feminine substantival pendant formation of *rex*, "Fem. als Subst. zur Motion" (224). Walde-Hofmann, to whom Palmer does not refer, cite parallels in other I.E. languages of terms designating "queen." This proves, at any rate, that they did not have an Italo-Latin derivation from an adjective in mind. Only Ernout-Meillet, *Diction. Et. s.v. gallina*, say: "*gallina*: poule cf. *rex, regina*. Sans doute féminin substantivé d'un adjectif en -inus." They are alone in maintaining this. For a language lesson concerning the true significance of "sans doute," which is often incorrectly translated as "certainly" by scholars who are not French, see L. Robert, *Bull. Épig.* 1958, 85 p. 201; 1959, 5, p. 151 and elsewhere.

in fact appear elsewhere. References to Leumann and Ernout-Meillet are also very misleading. Everywhere we read the same thing: *reginus* does not exist and the formation of *regina* is problematical. The word was almost certainly a feminine substantive from the outset. Palmer's theory therefore seems most improbable.

JUNO COVELLA is not given a paragraph to herself by Palmer because he believes that she does not exist.⁷³ Varro's quotation (*L.L.* VI, 27) of the words pronounced by the *rex* on the *kalendae*: *calo Juno Covella*, is a corruption: *calo lunam novellam*, suggested by Palmer, was doubly corrupted: 1. *novellam* > *covellam*, due to a "manuscript-error." (This is unlikely not only because *covellam* is a *lectio difficilior*, but also because it is to be found twice running in rapid succession); 2. *lunam* > *Iuno*, which rests on Varro's own speculation.

It is particularly the latter which is unacceptable, *inter alia* because it leads Palmer to contradict himself. Earlier, on p. 24, he speaks of the "grammatical nonsense" of the expression *calo Iuna Covella*, which Varro only admitted because "Varro considers the custom on the basis of its terms (my italics) a foreign borrowing." Later on the same page it suddenly appears that Varro himself was responsible for the "grammatical nonsense" since it was he who changed *lunam* into *Iuno* ("*Iuno* for *lunam* is owed to Varro alone...").

In such a manner it is possible to prove anything, e.g. that Juno Iuga or Iugis has nothing to do with marriage; that Juno is a goddess of the *iuvenes* because *iuvenes* carried her image from Vei to Rome; that, in this same connection, Livy made a *iocus* of what was really a ritual formula; that *visne Romam ire, Iuno?* in the same writer is a modernisation of the ancient indigitamentum *heries Iunonis* and that this *heries* "was explained as her identification with the Greek Hera" (p. 28).

JUNO MONETA is not the "warner" goddess, but the name comes from *mons*; it applies to a goddess of the mountain, i.e. of the *arx*. This naturally brings Juno into the desired "martial" sphere, but Palmer calls the "suffix of the noun" "troublesome." This is an

⁷³ M. Renard, "Iuno Covella," *Ann. Inst. Phil. Or. Sl.*, 12, 1952 (1953) 401-408, gives an etymology which I regard as improbable (~ βούς; *bos* cf. *iunx*, *iuvenus*) but also provides the most extensive survey of earlier explanations of the name.

understatement. There is not one single parallel to a formation of a substantive of the third declension in *-etus*. Later Palmer points to the fact that her temple was consecrated in a war. Elsewhere (p. 225 n. 155) he says rightly: "it is a great mistake to assert that the sex of a victim reflected the sex of a divinity." Well, it is just as great a mistake to deduce from the warlike context of a *votum* anything concerning the character (*i.e.* the "martial" character) of a deity. We need only look at the lists of temple foundations in Wissowa *R.u.K.* 594 ff. Although I believe that M. van den Bruwaene⁷⁴ (whom Palmer does not mention) goes too far with his theory that Moneta was a sort of double of Minerva, a relationship between the two names must be taken into consideration and besides, the connection with the root *mon-* (*monēre*, etc.) is far preferable to the connection with the etymon of *mons*.⁷⁵

JUNO SISPEs is called, in full, Juno Sispes Mater Regina. Palmer, of course, despite his hesitations about the etymology of Sispes, has no difficulty—and here he is right—in demonstrating the martial character of this shield- and spear-bearing goddess. But the matter is less simple than is here suggested. Suffice it to say that Dumézil⁷⁶ used this very same goddess to demonstrate the polyvalence of Juno. So it is remarkable to see that Palmer makes no mention of the curious custom in Lanuvium⁷⁷ according to

⁷⁴ M. van den Bruwaene, "L'Epithète de Iuno Monéta", in: *Hommages M. Niedermann*, Bruxelles 1956, 329-332.

⁷⁵ M. Guarducci's revival of the discussion of a Greek inscription from Cumae ("Un antichissimo responso dell'oracolo di Cuma," *Bul. Com.* 72, 1946-8 (1949), 129-141) deserves more attention in this connection than it has hitherto received (it is mentioned neither in the manuals by Latte and Dumézil, nor in Palmer). It concerns a bronze discus of the seventh century B.C. bearing the text *ἡέρα οὐκ ἔξι ἐπιμαντεύεσθαι*. "Hera does not permit that an oracle should be questioned for the second time (about the same thing)." This text proves conclusively that in the Italic Cumae Apollo as the oracular godd of the Sibylline complex was preceded by the goddess Hera. Guarducci has formulated an attractive hypothesis—that it is this same oracular Hera who reappears in Rome as Juno Moneta—and has thereby offered the first plausible explanation of the origins and function of this enigmatic deity who puzzled even the Romans.

⁷⁶ G. Dumézil, "Iuno S.M.R.," *Eranos* 52, 1954, 105-119, sees the three familiar functions in the three epithets. Even if we do not share this view we are not entitled to overlook such an important article. The polyvalence of the goddess seems basically correct.

⁷⁷ Aelian, *H.A.* 11, 16; Prop. 4, 8. See E. Rein, "Die Schlangenhöhle von Lanuvium," *Annales Ac. sc. Fenn.* XI, 1919-21; E. Douglas, *JRS* 3, 1913,

which, once a year, a virgin had to nurse a serpent living under the earth. If she was not a virgin the serpent did not accept nourishment—a bad omen—and the girl was punished. This serpent-cult certainly belongs to the cult of Juno Sispes and I feel that it is also possible to connect a Faliscan legend about Valeria Luperca⁷⁸ with the custom. When a plague was raging an oracle said that a girl should be sacrificed to Juno every year. Valeria Luperca was the first and, like Iphigenia, was miraculously rescued—an episode which certainly has a Greek prototype. The point is that here too we see a virgin being sacrificed to Juno, just as we see a virgin playing an important rôle in Lanuvium: the cult therefore has a Vesta-like aspect, which Palmer would find inconvenient.

This last case is yet another illustration of the fact that there are indeed indications that Juno protected the city and the warriors (Palmer sees some also in the Italic and Etruscan Junones whom it is impossible to go into here): one further example is the last Juno of the series: IUNO MARTIALIS PERUSINA. But these qualities always exist *next to* the aspects of womanhood (*matrona* and *virgo*, a combination with which Kerényi might have had less trouble than Palmer), marriage and childbearing, which Palmer does his best to eliminate.

And so, starting with Juno as the tutelary deity of the political and military community, Palmer finally comes up against the problem: "the peculiarly female cult of Juno remains to be explained." His solution has already been quoted: "The sense of *iuno* that fits all circumstances is the deity or spirit of youthfulness..."

66-72; A. Galiati, "Intorno al culto di 'Iuno Sispita Mater Regina' in Lanuvium," *Bullett. Comun.* 44, 1916, 3-36; A. E. Gordon, *The Cults of Lanuvium*, 1938, esp. 37-41, for the coins with the serpent, which are also reproduced in Palmer, fig. 7. All we find in the text is (p. 31): "Sometimes the serpent belonging to her cult is pictured with her" and in n. 202 a reference to another reproduction. For a more extensive discussion of the *corvus* of Valerius mentioned in this note see R. Bloch, "Traditions celtiques dans l'histoire des premiers siècles de Rome," in: *Mélanges J. Carcopino*, Paris 1966, 125-139; *id.*, "Un casque celtique au corbeau et le combat mythique de Valerius Corvus," in: *Mélanges M. Durrv*, REL XVII bis., 1969, 166-172. Now *id.*, in *Recherches sur les religions de l'Italie antique*, 19-32.

⁷⁸ Plut. *Parall. Min.* 35 (*Moral.* 314 B-F). More extensively Th. Köves, "Valeria Luperca," *Hermes* 90, 1962, 214-238. Cf. G. Dumézil, *RR*, 344. A. Alföldi, *Die Struktur des voretruskischen Römerstaates*, Heidelberg 1974, 94. It seems to me that the Faliscan legend can best be explained as a combination between a Greek mythological motif and a local rite which really existed and which could be compared to what we know about Lanuvium.

"At war, Juno protected the man eligible to bear arms, the *iuuenis*, ... thence she assumed the function of the tutelary deity of sovereign peoples. For the woman capable of bearing children, Juno from the time of puberty oversaw childbirth and marriage" (p. 39).

Although, when I think of comparable goddesses also identified with Juno (like Ishtar/Astarte and Hera), I can imagine a completely different development; although the fact that Juno was (or had become?) an entirely *female* deity has not been fully appreciated by Palmer; although I differ from Palmer about the relevance of such female elements as *eiuno*, *paelex aram Iunonis ne tangito*, *cinxia*, *pronuba* and many others, I am quite prepared to subscribe to the *possibility* of Palmer's solution. It cannot be regarded as a conclusion, however, but simply as a working hypothesis. Or if, since we are now at the end, we wish to use the term conclusion, we can accept it at the most in the meaning of what J. Collart says about Varro,⁷⁹ the author so frequently quoted by Palmer: "Il arrive parfois que le résultat soit juste, quoique le raisonnement soit faux." But then someone must come along who, with cogent arguments, will remove the word *non* from *lucus a non lucendo*.

There is room for a monograph on Juno, a study in which use would be made of what others have thought and written about Juno, in which all the data, and not a selection, would be exploited, and in which an author with a critical attitude towards the value and the significance of the ancient sources could start with the hypotheses I have described. But the preliminary condition must be to give up or set aside these hypotheses when the material argues against them. Such a study has yet to be written. Palmer's chapter, like the rest of his book, simply demonstrates what happens when superior learning is not permitted to act as superior but becomes the willless and powerless slave of whimsical and wayward masters: phantasy, prejudice and an excessive desire for originality.⁸⁰

⁷⁹ J. Collart, *Varron grammairien latin*, Paris 1954, 292.

⁸⁰ I must emphasize once more that I have only been able to deal with a very small selection of the many questionable matters in this book. This is perhaps most evident from the fact that the critical reviews which I have seen so far contain complaints similar to my own. On the whole, however, the examples given are different to the ones which I have selected in this article. Cf. particularly G. Piccaluga, *Riv. Fil. Istr. Cl.* 104, 1976, 86-89.