

## 1 *Earliest Rome*

---

What was the character of the religion of the Romans in the period of the kings – from Romulus, the legendary founder in the eighth century B.C., to Tarquin the Proud, whose expulsion was said to have led to the foundation of the Republic at the end of the sixth century B.C.? This chapter sets out some of the evidence that has been used to answer that question. The material raises different, in some ways more difficult, problems than does the rest of the book: for these early phases of Rome's history we have no contemporary literary evidence, only the speculations of Romans living hundreds of years later, combined with the evidence of archaeology and a few early documents that set formidable problems of their own. A few of these survive in their original context (e.g. 1.6b; 1.7b), but most come down to us, quoted, or often misquoted and misunderstood, by later writers.

Modern scholars have sought to plug this gap by bringing into the discussion theories about the development of early societies in general, to try to make sense of the surviving clues. We start this chapter (1.1) by reviewing the evidence for one of the most famous of those theories: that the earliest Roman religion was a form of primitive 'animism', in which divine power was seen as widely diffused through natural phenomena, not located in superhuman beings (gods and goddesses); and that Rome only gained a mythology, with fully anthropomorphic gods and goddesses, by 'borrowing' them from the outside world (particularly Greece). We continue with a Roman account of the origins of their religious organization (1.2), followed by a series of texts which may preserve traces of some of the oldest rituals of Roman religion (1.3 and 4). The next sections explore different contexts of early Roman religion: first (1.5) literary and archaeological evidence for the religion of the early Latins (the inhabitants of the central Italian region of Latium, of which Rome was a part); secondly (1.6) the religious traditions associated with the Roman *gens* (family or clan). The final sections (1.7–9) are concerned with the evidence for the later regal period. Here we are now far better informed than earlier generations of historians, because of a whole series of dramatic archaeological discoveries which have shown that sixth-century Rome was a far more advanced and cosmopolitan society than anybody had suspected; and that the religious developments of this period must be seen in this cosmopolitan context, influenced both by the religion of the Etruscans and of the Greeks.

See further: Vol. 1, 1–18; Warde Fowler (1911) 1–247; Dumézil (1970);

## I EARLIEST ROME

Scullard (1981) 13–22\*; Scheid (1985) 59–94; for the historical tradition of the earliest Rome, Heurgon (1973) 106–55; Cornell and Matthews (1982) 17–30\*; Momigliano (1989); Cornell (1989)\*; specifically for the Latin context, Alföldi (1965), with Momigliano (1967); Cornell (1996) 1–214\*. For an accessible account of the archaeological material presented in this chapter, see Holloway (1994)\*.

### 1.1 Before the gods?

One of the most influential theories of religion, fashionable earlier this century, held that anthropomorphic deities (almost wherever they were found) were a secondary development in the history of religion; the result of the animistic powers, that were once perceived as diffused through the natural world, gradually ‘separating out’ to form individual gods and goddesses, with particular names, genders and (eventually) life-stories. Roman religion, it was argued, represented an exception to this standard pattern; for it became atrophied before reaching the more ‘advanced’, anthropomorphic stage of the evolutionary process, remaining in essence animistic. In other words, the gods and goddesses that we may think of as defining Roman religion (see **chap. 2**) were not a native *Roman* phenomenon, but merely the result of a process of importation (mostly from Greece) still going on well into the Republic; while the original, native Roman tradition must be sought in surviving traces of an animistic conception of divine power.

This idea is to be found even in quite recent books, despite the fact that the evolutionary theories on which it was based were abandoned by anthropologists decades ago; and despite the fact also that the Latin words for ‘god’ and ‘goddess’, as well as the Latin names of at least some of the gods and goddesses, belong to the very earliest stages of the history of the Latin language, and must in fact go back to the Indo-European ancestors of the Romans. The very first Latin speakers in central Italy, that is, must already have had a vocabulary for superhuman beings of some kind, long before Rome itself was founded. The passages that follow have often been used in support of an animistic theory of early Roman religion – but, as we show, can be interpreted in quite different ways.

See further: Vol. 1, 10–18; Warde Fowler (1911) 1–63; Rose (1926) 43–62; Rose (1948) 9–49; Dumézil (1970) 18–46\*.

#### 1.1a *Gods without images*

In this passage, Augustine (writing in the fifth century A.D.) quotes the words of the Roman antiquarian Varro (first century B.C.), claiming that in the earliest period of their history Romans had no cult-statues or images of the gods and goddesses. This does not, however, prove (as it has sometimes been said to) that Rome originally had no gods; for, as Varro himself shows, it is perfectly

### 1.1 Before the gods?

possible to have the conception of gods but not to have physical representations of them. Besides, interpretation of the passage as ‘evidence’ for early Roman religion is complicated by the nature of arguments that underlie it: Varro himself is using an image of primitive Roman life as part of philosophical theorizing on the nature of the gods; while Augustine is quoting Varro in order to make his own Christian points, interweaving his exposition of pagan philosophy with a Christian critique of it.

See further: Vol. 1, 10–11; Taylor (1931); Dumézil (1970) 25–8\*; Martin (1987) 11–53.

Augustine, *The City of God* IV.31 (= Varro, fr. 13 (56) and 18 (59) Cardauns)

The same acute and learned author <Varro> says also that the only people to understand what god is are those who believe him to be the spirit governing the universe, through motion and reason.<sup>1</sup> In this respect, Varro fell short of the truth, because god is not in fact himself a spirit, but the author and creator of spirit, as of everything else. But even if Varro did not free himself from the bias imposed by tradition, he did at least recognize and recommend that men ought to worship a single god, the governor of the universe through motion and reason. The only issue between us and him concerns his saying that god is a spirit, and not saying the truth – that he is the creator of spirit. Varro also tells us that the Romans worshipped the gods without any images for a hundred and seventy years.<sup>2</sup> ‘Had that custom been retained,’ he says, ‘the worship of the gods would be more reverently performed.’ And among the evidence for this, he quotes the Jewish people.<sup>3</sup>

1. The view here attributed to Varro is that of the Stoics, who identified a single divine entity as the principle behind the working of the universe.
2. Varro dated the foundation of Rome to 753 B.C., so he means approximately 575 B.C. as the year of the introduction of the first image. It is possible that he is referring to some specific dated event; but in any case, this date for the first images (however Varro claimed to know it) corresponds very roughly to the period of the first statues known to us. (See 1.7.)
3. For Varro’s knowledge of the Jews, see Nock (1959) 6 and 12.6a.

#### 1.1b The ‘numina’

The word *numen*, meaning ‘nod’ or ‘divine power’, is used by Roman poets of the early Empire, such as Ovid, to indicate the mysterious presence of godhead in natural or man-made objects, in this case the boundary-stone – the *terminus*. According to animistic theories of Roman religion, Terminus was an example of the earliest form of Roman deity: it was never represented in human style, but always seen as the divine power residing in the boundary-stone. And the word *numen* itself, following these theories, was the standard Latin term for the pre-anthropomorphic ‘divinities’ of the early period. In fact, the word hardly occurs in what survives of early Latin; and it is much more likely that it came to mean ‘divine power’ only in later literature, having had nothing at all to do with early forms of the gods.

## I EARLIEST ROME

See further: Vol. 1, 10–11; Wagenvoort (1947) 73–83; Rose (1948) 9–49; Weinstock (1949); Dumézil (1970) 18–31\*; on Terminus, Piccaluga (1974).

Ovid, *Fasti* II.639–46

When night has ended,<sup>1</sup> the god who by his presence marks the divisions of the fields should receive his traditional reverence. You too, Terminus, have had divine power <*numen*> from ancient times – sometimes in the form of a stone, sometimes a stump buried in the field. The two farmers crown you from their opposite sides, each of them bringing you a garland and each a cake.<sup>2</sup>

1. On the morning of 23 February.
2. Ovid goes on to describe in detail the elaborate ritual involved in honouring Terminus, whose worship, he says, prevents not only neighbourly squabbling, but also the outbreak of wars between cities on boundary-issues.

### 1.2 King Numa's reforms

King Numa (reigning, according to tradition, 715–673 B.C.) was the successor of Romulus and was seen as the founder of the religious institutions of Rome. Romans of the late Republic knew of laws and rules attributed to him (see 1.3; 3.1) and various traditional tales concerning his life; but he was above all associated with the priestly colleges, as this passage illustrates (see 5.4a, 8.1a and 8.4a). In fact, by the first century B.C., Roman writers could have had no direct evidence for what King Numa (if he really existed) did or did not do. The reforms that cluster round his name reflect the idea that the city needed a separate religious founder, as opposed to Romulus the first king (although Romulus himself is often made responsible for much of the religion as well; see 4.8a and 5.2a).

See further: Vol. 1, 1–4; Ogilvie (1970) 88–91; on the relationship between Numa and Romulus, Dumézil (1968–73) I.261–84; Belier (1991) 130–8.

Livy, *History* 1.19.6–20.7

First of all he divided the year into twelve months according to the courses of the moon; but because the moon does not complete the thirty days in each month needed to fit with the cycle of the sun, so that six<sup>1</sup> days are missing compared to the full year, he arranged for intercalary months to be inserted so that after twenty years, when the full cycle of all the years had been completed, the days would come to correspond to the same position of the sun from which they had started.<sup>2</sup> He also fixed the days as lawful or unlawful for public business <*fasti* or *nefasti*>, thinking it would be useful to have some days on which no business could be brought before the people.<sup>3</sup>

(20.1) Next he turned his attention to the creating of priests: he himself was in fact conducting most of the rites, particularly those that now belong to the *flamen Dialis*. But because he realized that in such a warlike city more kings would be like Romulus than

### 1.3 The archaic triad

like Numa and that these would go to war themselves, he protected the royal rituals from being thus neglected by creating a *flamen* permanently devoted to Jupiter;<sup>4</sup> he marked the office by the grant of special dress and an official chair of state <*sella curulis*> like the king's. He added two more *flamines*, one for Mars, one for Quirinus and also chose virgin priestesses for Vesta.<sup>5</sup> This priesthood originated at Alba and was not therefore alien to the founder of Rome.<sup>6</sup> So that these priestesses should be able to devote their whole time to temple service, he provided them with an income from public funds; he conferred a special sanctity on them by ritual obligations, including the keeping of their virginity. He also chose twelve *Salii*, to serve Mars Gradivus;<sup>7</sup> these were distinguished by an embroidered tunic with a bronze breastplate worn over it; their duty was to bear the heaven-descended shields, the *ancilia* as they are called, and to process through the city chanting hymns in time to a ritual triple-rhythm dance.

(20.5) Next, Numa appointed as *pontifex* Numa Marcius, son of Marcus, from among the patricians. He gave him full solemn written instructions about the ceremonies, specifying for each sacrifice the proper victims, the proper days and the proper temples and the way in which money should be raised to meet the expenses. He then subordinated all the other public and private religious ceremonies to the decision of the *pontifex* in order that the plebeians should have somewhere to seek advice; so he prevented confusion in the sacred law whether through the neglecting of the inherited rituals or by the adopting of foreign ones. It was the task of the *pontifex* to instruct, not just about the heavenly rites, but also about the forms for burying the dead and for placating the departed spirits, and also for recognizing and dealing with prodigies, whether from the lightning or from other signs.<sup>8</sup>

1. There is a problem here with Livy's arithmetic. The republican Roman year was in fact 354 days, 11 short of the right number. Livy evidently thought the right number was  $12 \times 30 = 360$  days; he therefore reckoned, wrongly, that it was 6, not 11, days short.
2. Although 'intercalation' (the practice of inserting extra days into the calendar to keep it in line with the solar year) was part of the republican calendrical system (see 3.2 n.7), it is not likely that this goes back to the period of Numa.
3. This explanation for the origin of the days marked *fasti* and *nefasti* must be a later guess. Compare 3.1 (with 3.2 n.5), which offers a more intricate scheme of days.
4. For the *flamines* see Vol. 1, 19, 28–9; 8.1; 8.2d.
5. For the Vestals see Vol. 1, 51–4, 56–8; 8.4.
6. The settlement at Alba Longa was founded, according to Roman tradition, by Iulus, the son of Aeneas – and it was seen as the ultimate origin of a number of later Roman institutions. See 1.5a.
7. For the *Salii* see Vol. 1, 1, 43, 216; 5.4.
8. For the *pontifices* see Vol. 1, 24–6; 8.1a; 8.2a; 8.3. In fact, they have little to do with prodigies in the later Republic: for the usual procedures, Vol. 1, 37–9; 7.3.

### 1.3 The archaic triad: Jupiter, Mars, Quirinus

The three *flamines* created by King Numa (priests of Jupiter, Mars and Quirinus) have suggested that these three gods formed an ancient triad, who

## I EARLIEST ROME

would have been the leading gods of Rome until they were displaced by the, now more familiar, ‘Capitoline’ triad of Jupiter, Juno and Minerva (1.9b). This passage, confused and hard to interpret though it is, specifically links Jupiter (Feretrius), Mars and (Janus) Quirinus, and suggests that in the earliest period of the city’s history these three gods may have been the recipients of the victory spoils, later to be monopolized by the Jupiter of the Capitol. (See, for example, the role of Capitoline Jupiter at the ceremony of triumph, 1.9a; 5.8.)

The information comes from an entry in an ancient dictionary which quotes directly from the records of the priests (the pontifical books) and from a law attributed to King Numa. However, the author of the entry seems to misinterpret the quotation: in part of the passage not given here, he implies a series of dated historical occasions on which Roman generals killed enemy leaders with their own hands and hence won the right to celebrate the special dedication of the spoils (*spolia opima*). But the words he quotes make it clear that this was wrong; they seem to be describing either a single ritual sequence in which a succession of offerings was made; or (more probably) three different rituals to be used in different situations. Whichever is the case, the recipients of the dedications are the three gods of the old triad, Jupiter, Mars and Quirinus, joined together in some specific sequence; and the dedicators those who won the spoils from enemy leaders.

See further: Vol. 1, 14–16; Dumézil (1941–5); Charles-Picard (1957) 131–3; Dumézil (1970) 166–8\*; Rüpke (1990) 217–23; for a similar triad of male gods elsewhere in Italy, see 1.4b; for *flamines* see 8.1 and 8.2d.

Festus p. 204 (Lindsay) s.v. *Opima spolia*

[. . . ?spoils taken from the enemy leader are] not [always] placed at the temple of Jupiter Feretrius<sup>1</sup>: the evidence of this is in the pontifical books, which say that the public sacrifice for the first *spolia* should be an ox; for the second, the *solitaurilia*; for the third, a lamb;<sup>2</sup> there is also a law of King Numa Pompilius on the *spolia opima*, as follows:

The man under whose auspices the *spolia opima* are won in full battle should dedicate them to Jupiter Feretrius; he should sacrifice an ox; let him who took them [give three] hundred in bronze.<sup>3</sup> For the second spoils, let him sacrifice *solitaurilia*, whichever he wishes, at the altar of Mars in the Campus <Martius>. For the third spoils, let him sacrifice to Janus Quirinus a male lamb; let him who took them give one hundred in bronze.<sup>3</sup> Let the man under whose auspices they were taken make the piacular offerings to the gods.<sup>4</sup>

1. There is a break in the manuscript at this point; before the break the subject had been particular occasions of the dedication of the *spolia opima*.
2. The so-called ‘first’, ‘second’ and ‘third’ *spolia* were probably distinguished by the rank of the dedicator (see n. 4), as well as by the identity of the god who received the dedication. The author of this passage seems to be particularly concerned with where the sacrifices took place, although the pontifical books, as quoted, only specify the victims to be sacrificed. (The nature of the *solitaurilia* is not known, but it must be a specific combination of victims – maybe another version of the *suovetaurilia* (the sacrifice of a pig, ram and bull); see 6.3a.)

## 1.4 Early rituals

3. This clause seems to refer to a gift of bronze, but it is not clear who is being said to 'take', or what he 'took'.
4. This law suggests that only the first spoils – the *opima* – were won and dedicated by the commander under his own auspices; the other two ought then to be those of lesser officers or common soldiers, fighting under the auspices of a superior officer: but the piacular offerings (that is those made to compensate for an error or mistake) are to be made by the commander, whatever the rank of the dedicator.

### 1.4 Early rituals

The ritual practice of early Roman religion is for the most part completely obscure. But occasionally a later writer (as in 1.4a) quotes the words of a ceremony, claiming that they reflect the words used at a much earlier date. Or occasionally (as in 1.4b) the chance discovery of an inscription may throw some light – directly or indirectly – on the rituals of the early city.

#### 1.4a *Ritual of the 'fetiales'*

The fetial priests were concerned with rituals that marked the declaration of wars and the making of treaties. In this passage, Livy supplies a specific context for the origin of some of their priestly duties and law (the *ius fetiale*), by making King Ancus (Rome's fourth king; reigning, according to tradition, 642–617 B.C.) the inventor of their rituals for the declaration of war, and associating the invention with an ancient war against Rome's Latin neighbours. In fact, the text of the formula given here is very unlikely to go back to early times and is probably reconstructed by an antiquarian writer on the basis of the later ritual. But, with its set formulae to be performed at fixed points (boundary, town-gate etc.) it strongly recalls the ritual programme of (e.g.) 1.4b; and the antiquity of the procedure in general (as opposed to the details of this account) seems to be confirmed by its similarity to the procedures of early Roman civil law. (Livy ascribes the origin of the fetial rituals for treaties to the reign of Tullus Hostilius (the third king); Livy, *History* I.24.)

See further: Bayet (1935); Latte (1960) 124; Ogilvie (1970) 127–36; Brunt (1978) 175–8\*; Rüpke (1990) 97–117; Watson (1993); for the later history of the fetial rituals, 5.5d.

Livy, *History* I.32.6–14

When the legate arrives at the frontier of those from whom restitution is demanded, he covers his head with a fillet (the covering is of wool) and says: 'Hear thou, Jupiter, hear ye, boundaries of – naming whatever nation they belong to – let divine law hear! I am the official herald of the Roman people; I come lawfully and piously commissioned, let there be trust in my words.' Then he sets forth his demands, after which he takes Jupiter to witness: 'If I unjustly and impiously demand that these men and these goods be surrendered to me, then never let me be a full citizen of my fatherland.' He recites these

## I EARLIEST ROME

words when he crosses the boundary-line, again to the first person he encounters, again when proceeding through the town-gate, and again when he enters the market-place, with only slight modification to the form and wording of the oath. If his demands are not met, at the end of 33 days – for such is the customary number – he declares war as follows: ‘Hear thou, Jupiter, and thou, Janus Quirinus,<sup>1</sup> and all ye heavenly gods, and ye terrestrial gods, and ye infernal gods, hear! I call you to witness that this people – naming whatever people it is – is unjust and does not render just reparation. But regarding these matters we will consult the elders in our fatherland, how we may acquire our due.’ Then the legate returns to Rome for the consultation. Without delay the king would consult the senators with words approximating these: ‘having regard to those goods, disputes and causes of which the *pater patratus*<sup>2</sup> of the Roman people gave due notice to the *pater patratus* of the Ancient Latins,<sup>3</sup> and to the men of the Ancient Latins, having regard to those things which they have neither rendered, nor fulfilled, nor discharged, speak’ – turning to the man whose opinion he would ask first – ‘What think you?’ Then he would reply: ‘I hold that these things ought to be sought by a war of justice and sacred duty. So I agree and with my vote approve.’ The others were then, in order of rank, asked the question; and when the majority of those present voted for the same opinion, war had been agreed upon. The usual procedure was for the *fetialis* to carry to the boundary of the other nation a spear of iron or fire-hardened cornel-wood, and in the presence of not fewer than three adult males, to say: ‘Forasmuch as the tribes of the Ancient Latins and men of the Ancient Latins have committed act and offence against the Roman people, and forasmuch as the Roman people have ordained that war be declared on the Ancient Latins, and the senate of the Roman people has affirmed, agreed, and with their votes approved that there be war with the ancient Latins, I, therefore, and the Roman people, declare and make war on the tribes of the Ancient Latins and the men of the Ancient Latins.’ Having said this, he would hurl the spear across their boundary. This is the manner in which at that time redress was demanded of the Latins and war was declared, and it has been accepted by subsequent generations.

1. Janus was the god of doorways and beginnings, and Janus Quirinus, in this context (cf. 1.3), is the god of the beginning of war. Augustus in his *Achievements* (13) boasts that the doors of the temple of Janus Quirinus were closed three times during his Principate, meaning that peace was three times established in the empire.
2. A senator appointed as ‘father’ (*pater*) of a deputation to a foreign power.
3. The Ancient Latins (*Prisci Latini*) were the ancient peoples of the plain of Latium, who were believed to have attacked Rome shortly after the beginning of Ancus Marcius’ reign. Their name is included here merely as the original example of Rome’s enemies; when the formula was used on other occasions the appropriate name would be inserted. For Rome’s relations with the Latins in general, see 1.5.

1.4b *The Rituals of Gubbio*

The Romans shared much of their ritual (as they did their language) with their immediate neighbours, the Latins (see 1.5); but we also have knowledge of



#### 1.4 Early rituals

more remote communities in other parts of Italy who had similar religious traditions. The rituals translated here are recorded on bronze tablets of late republican date from Iguvium (now Gubbio) in Umbria about 150 km. north of Rome. They are written in the Umbrian language which is distinct from Latin, but close to the language (Oscan) of Rome's southern neighbours, the Samnites. All the same, the rituals described in such detail seem to show strong similarities with the accounts of early Roman practice (compare, for example, these formulae for establishing a *templum* with those in 4.4; and, more generally, the structure of the prayers with 1.4a, 5.7b and 6.5). Moreover, the Jupiter to whom this ritual is addressed formed part of a triad (Jupiter, Mars, Vofonius – all three with the additional title 'Grabovius') which is reminiscent of the Roman triad, Jupiter, Mars, Quirinus (1.3). Our knowledge of Umbrian is far from perfect and much of the translation, including, for instance, the names of the various birds mentioned, is uncertain. The possibility cannot therefore be ruled out that modern interpretations of the texts have been influenced by knowledge of Roman practices; that these interpretations do not, in other words, provide *independent* evidence for early Rome.

See further: Poultney (1959); Wilkins (1995); for the triad of gods, Dumézil (1970) 148–51; the officials mentioned, R. E. A. Palmer (1970) 48–56; the augural parallels, Linderski (1986) 2293–4.

#### *Iguvine Tables* VIa.1–31

The *arsfertur*<sup>1</sup> shall begin this ritual with observation of the birds – a green woodpecker and a crow on the right, a woodpecker and a magpie on the left. He who shall go to observe the calling birds<sup>2</sup> shall, seated, command the *arsfertur* from the hut as follows: 'Demand that I observe a green woodpecker on the right, a crow on the right, a woodpecker on the left, a magpie on the left, birds on the left, sacred calling birds on the left.' The *arsfertur* shall make the demand in these words: 'There observe a green woodpecker on the right, a crow on the right, a woodpecker on the left, a magpie on the left, birds on the left, sacred calling birds on the left, for me, for the city of Iguvium, for this station which has been established.' While the one who goes to observe the calling birds is seated in the chair, no one is to make a sound and no one else is to sit in the way until he who has gone to observe the calling birds has returned. If there is a noise or if anyone else sits in the way, he shall make the ceremony null and void.

(8) The *templum*<sup>3</sup> where the *arsfertur* remains for the sake of purifying the Mount<sup>4</sup>, when established, is defined as follows: from the lowest corner, which is closest to the altar of the gods, to the topmost corner which is closest to the stones of augury, then from the topmost corner at the stones of augury to the city boundary, from the bottom corner at the altar of the gods to the city boundary. Then he shall make observations on both sides of the city boundaries.

(12) The city boundaries: from the stones of augury to the exits, to the observation post, to the fore-area of Nurpius, to the Vale, to the temple of Smurcia, to the house of

## I EARLIEST ROME

Miletina, to the third tower of the rampart; from the stones of augury to the avenue of Vesticius, to the garden of Rufer, to the house of Nonia, to the house of Salius, to the avenue of Hoius, to the gate of Padella.<sup>5</sup>

(15) Below these boundaries which have been written down above, he shall watch for a green woodpecker on the right, a crow on the right. Above these boundaries, he shall observe a woodpecker on the left, a magpie on the left. If the calling birds sing forth, he shall make the following announcement seated in the hut, and he shall call the *arsfertur* by name: 'A green woodpecker on the right, a crow on the right, a woodpecker on the left, a magpie on the left, birds on the left, sacred calling birds on the left, for you, for the city of Iguvium, for this station which has been established.' In all these rites for the lustration<sup>6</sup> of the people and for the purification of the Mount,<sup>4</sup> he shall hold the ritual rod. The vessels at the Trebulan Gates which shall be shown for the sake of purifying the Mount, he shall show them in such a way that fire be given to be kindled from fire. Likewise at the Tesenacan Gates, likewise at the Veian Gates.

(22) Before the Trebulan Gates he shall sacrifice three oxen to Jupiter Grabovius. He shall speak these words as he presents the sacrificial cake: 'Thee I invoke in invocation, Jupiter Grabovius, for the Fisian Mount,<sup>4</sup> for the city of Iguvium, for the name of the mount, for the name of the city. Be favourable, be propitious to the Fisian Mount, to the city of Iguvium, to the name of the mount, to the name of the city. In the sacred rite, I invoke thee in invocation, Jupiter Grabovius, in reliance on the sacred rite I invoke thee in invocation, Jupiter Grabovius. Jupiter Grabovius, thee <I invoke> with this yearling ox as a propitiatory offering for the Fisian Mount, for the city of Iguvium, for the name of the mount, for the name of the city. Jupiter Grabovius, by the effect of the <ox>, if fire has arisen on the Fisian Mount or in the city of Iguvium due rites have been neglected, <let it count> as not intended. Jupiter Grabovius, whatever of your ritual has been omitted or sinned against or transgressed or injured or ignored, <if> in your ritual there is a failing seen or unseen, Jupiter Grabovius, if it be right that with this yearling ox purification be accomplished,<sup>7</sup> Jupiter Grabovius, purify the Fisian Mount, purify the city of Iguvium, purify the elders, the priests, Jupiter Grabovius, the lives of men and beasts, the crops. Be favourable <and> propitious with your peace to the Fisian Mount, to the city of Iguvium, to the name of the mount, to the name of the city. Jupiter Grabovius, keep safe the Fisian Mount, keep safe the city of Iguvium.'

1. The *arsfertur* (the Latin equivalent would be *adfertor*) is acting for the state and people of Iguvium and may be a magistrate, like the Roman consul or *praetor*, rather than a priest.
2. A second official, acting on demand from the *arsfertur*; his role seems to correspond to that of the Roman *augur* (see 4.4), but he is not referred to by a title, but by a description of his role.
3. For the *templum*, see 4.4.
4. The Fisian Mount is probably named after the local god, Fisis (who may have been concerned with the protection of oaths and pledges). Compare the role of the Alban Mount in the rituals of the Latins, 1.5a.
5. These places (whose precise location is now unknown) are being used to define the city boundary.