

ARCTOS

ACTA PHILOLOGICA FENNICA

NOVA SERIES

VOL. VII

HELSINKI 1972 HELSINGFORS

INDEX

Anders Ahlqvist	Notes on the Silesian Lugi	5
Iiro Kajanto	Women's praenomina reconsidered	13
Saara Lilja	Odour sensations in the Roman novel	31
Bengt Löfstedt	Zu Tatwines Grammatik	47
Martti Nyman	Ma(vo)lo — a generative approach.	67
Teivas Oksala	»Polymythia» in Pindars Aigineten-Oden	93
Tuomo Pekkanen	Tac.Germ. 2,3 and the name Germani	107
Eeva Ruoff-Väänänen	The Roman public prodigia and the ager Romanus	139
Heikki Solin	Analecta epigraphica	163
Jaakko Suolahti	Princeps Senatus	207
Holger Thesleff	Colloquial style and its use in Plato's later works	219

THE ROMAN PUBLIC *PRODIGIA* AND THE *AGER ROMANUS*

Eeva Ruoff-Väänänen

At the beginning of this century the Roman *prodigia* were dealt with in several studies. Thereafter the interest in them seems to have slackened for a while, or perhaps it was believed that the subject had been exhausted. The number of new studies on the *prodigia* and the related problems published in the last few years shows, however, that there is still a lot to be explored in this field. I have, for my part, wanted to investigate the theory suggested by Mommsen that the Roman public *prodigia* might be used as a source in determining the extent of the *ager Romanus* in Italy before the Social War.¹

The ancient literary sources — Greek as well as Roman — abound with references to *prodigia*, which show that they played an important part in the lives and thoughts of people in those days.² It is, however, not my purpose to discuss the *prodigia* phenomena as such, but to study which *prodigia* were actually regarded as public, how and by whom they were dealt with in Rome, and especially how the public *prodigia* known to us correspond with the the *ager Romanus* areas.

There was a number of 'small' ³ *prodigia*, which could be either public or private according to the object on which they fell.⁴ Thus a flash of lightning was a public *prodigium*, if it struck a temple or other public building, town walls, bridges, roads, harbour works, aqueducts, boundary stones or other

¹ Epistula de Romanorum Prodigiiis ad Ottonem Jahnem, *Ges. Schriften*, 7, 168—174. This theory has been accepted e.g. by Hülsen and Radke who maintain on the basis of three *prodigia* recorded by Obsequens that e.g. Faesulae had been incorporated into the *ager Romanus* before the year 90 B.C., *RE* VI 1965, *Kl. Pauly* II 507.

² See F. Luterbacher, *Die Prodigienlaube und Prodigienstil der Römer* (Progr. Burgdorf 1904) 11—18, 60—69, L. Wülker, *Die geschichtliche Entwicklung des Prodigienwesens bei den Römern* (Diss. Leipzig 1903) 76—85.

³ N.B. They were not the less important for that matter.

⁴ Tac. *ann.* 13, 24: *publica fulgura*, Plin. *NH* 11, 18, 55: *Tunc ostenta faciunt [apes] privata ac publica uia dependente in domibus templisque, saepe expiata magnis eventibus*, Obseq. 43: *Examen apium ante aedem Salutis consedit*, cf. Dio 47, 40, 7, Juv. *Sat.* 13, 60—70, Plin. *NH* 8, 82, 221, Liv. 21, 46, 2 f, Obseq. 7. The flashes of lightning were the most common *prodigia* see Wülker *op.cit.* 9 f, Luterbacher *op.cit.* 22.

public property.¹ Large scale upheavals of nature were always public *prodigia*, i.e. earthquakes, eclipses of the sun and the moon,² and other extra-ordinary phenomena observed in the sky, as well as the raining of 'milk', 'blood', 'flesh', 'stones', 'sand', 'oil' and 'wool' and the appearance of 'blood' in lakes and rivers.³ The births of deformed children and animals were also regarded as public *prodigia*:

Natum est monstrum, infans ore gemino cum dentibus binis et barba, quattuorque oculis, et brevissimis duabus auriculis, qui partus ita distortus praemonebat rem publicam in statum verti deformem. Noscuntur huius modi saepe portenta indicantia rerum variarum eventus quod quoniam non expiantur, ut apud veteres publice, inaudita praetereunt et incognita.

Amm. Marc. 19, 12, 20

... mula pariens discordiam civium, bonorum interitum, mutationem legum, turpes matronarum partus significavit.

Obseq. 65

Similarly the discoveries of hermaphrodites were regarded as most dire *prodigia*, and they were always expiated in the same manner:

Liberatas religione mentes turbavit rursus nuntiatum Frusinone natum infantem esse quadrimo parem, nec magnitudine tam mirandum, quam quod is quoque, ut Sinuessae biennio ante, incertus, mas an femina esset, natus erat. Id vero haruspices ex Etruria adciti foedum ac turpe prodigium dicere, extorrem agro Romano, procul terrae contactu, alto mergendum. Vivum in arcam condidere provectumque in mare proiecerunt. Decrevit item pontifices, ut virgines ter novenae per urbem euntes carmen canerent.

Liv. 27, 37, 6—7, cf. 12—15⁴

The *prodigia* which befell Roman soldiers, warships, and camps of Roman army,⁵ as well as officiating Roman magistrates were also considered public.⁶

¹ F. B. Krauss, *An Interpretation of the Omens, Portents, and Prodigies Recorded by Livy, Tacitus, and Suetonius* (Diss. Pennsylvania 1930), 38—43 cf. *Cod. Theod.* 16, 10, 1, (cited in note 13, p. 144).

² See note 8, p. 145 f.

³ For references to these kind of *prodigia* see C. O. Thulin, *Die etruskische Disciplin*, *Göteborgs Högskolas Årsskrift* 15 (1909) 85—116, Krauss, *op.cit.* 35—184, cf. *Cic. de div.* 1, 43, 97 f, *nat. deor.* 2, 5, 14, *Juv. Sat.* 13, 60—70, *Aug. c.d.* 3, 31.

⁴ Cf. 31, 12, 6—10, 39, 22, 5: *... ex Umbria nuntiatum est semimarem duodecim ferme annos natum inventum. Id prodigium abominantes arceri Romano agro necarique quam primum iusserunt*, *Obseq.* 34: *Androgynus in agro Romano annorum octo inventus et in mare deportatus. Virgines ter novenae in urbe cantarunt*, cf. 44 a: *Servus ... Matri Idaeae se praecidit, et trans mare exportatus, ne umquam Romam reverteretur*, see also *Obseq.* 3, 22, 25, 27a, 32, 34, 36, 46 + 47, 48, 50, 53, *Plin. NH* 7, 4, 36.

⁵ See table 1 for references, p. 156, cf. Luterbacher, *op.cit.* 31 f.

⁶ *Obseq.* 24 (a consul and a praetor), 28 (a praetor), cf. 27a (T. Gracchus), *Plin. NH* 2, 52, 137, *Obseq.* 61 (a decurion at Pompei).

In the days of the Second Punic War the military *prodigia* were especially frequent, as the following passage shows:

Augebant metum prodigia ex pluribus simul locis nuntiata: in Sicilia militibus aliquot spicula, in Sardinia autem in muro circumeunti uigilias equiti scipionem quem manu tenuerat arsisse, et litora crebris ignibus fulsisse et scuta duo sanguine sudasse, et milites quosdam ictos fulminibus et solis orbem minui uisum . . . His, sicut erant nuntiata, expositis auctoribusque in curiam introductis consul de religione patres consuluit. Decretum ut ea prodigia partim maioribus hostiis, partim lactentibus procurarentur et supplicatio per triduum ad omnia puluinaria haberetur; cetera . . . Dum consul placandis Romae dis habendoque dilectu dat operam . . .

Liv. 22, 1, 8—2, 1¹

As the public *prodigia* were considered to pertain to the welfare of the whole of the Roman State it was only the Roman Senate that could decide whether a *prodigium* was to be accepted as public or not. It was in the interest of the Senate to accept as few *prodigia* as possible, because they always alarmed the citizens and were easily interpreted as signs of the gods not being favourably disposed toward its policy.² So, for instance, no one outside the colleges of the priests was allowed to have prior knowledge of those *prodigia* which were to be subjected to the Senate's deliberation.³ The *prodigia* were also very carefully scrutinized by the Senate. Such *prodigia*, the truthfulness of which could be vouched for by only one citizen, were not accepted:

Item bello Macedonico P. Vatinius Reatinae praefecturae uir noctu urbem petens existimauit duos iuuenes excellentis formae albis equis residentes obuios sibi factos nuntiare die, qui praeterierat, Persen regem a Paulo captum. quod cum senatui indicasset, tamquam maiestatis eius et amplitudinis uano sermone contemptor in carcerem coniectus, postquam Pauli litteris illo die Persen captum apparuit, et custodia liberatus et insuper agro ac uacatione donatus est.

Val. Max. 1, 8, 1⁴

Prodigia which had taken place in private homes or in *loco peregrino* were not accepted either:

¹ The place where a military *prodigium* took place is often given only as Sicily or Sardinia, as the above passage shows. In some cases the exact site of a military *prodigium* is, however, mentioned, and then it should not be confused with the *prodigia* pertaining to the actual community, see table 1, p. 156.

² Krauss, *op.cit.* 186.

³ Cic. *de leg.* 2, 12, 31.

⁴ Cf. Cic. *nat. deor.* 2, 2, 6, Lactant. 2, 7, Liv. 5, 15, 1: *Prodigia interim multa nuntiari, quorum pleraque, et quia singul iactores erant, parum credita spreataque . . .* See also 8, 32, 2; 22, 1, 14; 27, 11, 3.

Duo non suscepta prodigia sunt, alterum quod in privato loco factum esset, palmam enatam in impluvio suo T. Marcius Figulus nuntiabat — alterum quod in loco peregrino. Fregellis in domo L. Atrai hasta, quam filio militi emerat, interdiu plus duas horas arsisse ita ut nihil eius ambureret ignis dicebatur.

Liv. 43, 13, 6¹

Livy here expresses the general principle according to which the Roman Senate accepted and rejected the *prodigia* reported to it. *Prodigia* from *loco peregrino* were *non suscepta*.² Still, incidentally, both the *prodigia* cited by Livy in the above passage represent the first type of *prodigia* not accepted by the Senate, i.e. the *prodigia* in *loco privato*. Fregellae was, indeed, no *locus peregrinus*, as Livy seems to imply, but a Latin colony founded in 328 B.C.,³ and this *prodigium* reported from Fregellae was, naturally, rejected because it, too, had taken place in *loco privato*, i.e. *in domo L. Atrai*. Overlooking this crucial fact many scholars have been misled to claim that the *prodigia* from the Latin colonies would not have been accepted by the Roman Senate. Some scholars, most recently Miss Rawson, have also claimed that the fact that Livy nevertheless reports *prodigia* from Latin communities — he records two public *prodigia* even from Fregellae in his earlier books⁴ — would show that he — or the annalists used by him — cannot have used the official *prodigia* records of the Roman State.⁵ Now, Fregellae and other Latin colonies belonged not to the *locus [ager] peregrinus*, as Livy at the first glance seems to imply in the above passage, but to *ager Latinus*⁶ and the *prodigia* which had befallen public buildings and public property in them and other Latin towns were always duly accepted and expiated in Rome along with the *prodigia* from Rome, Roman colonies, *municipia*, *praefecturae* and *fora*.⁷ The *prodigia* were, indeed, only one of the several religious activities which the Roman State shared with the Latin communities, the inhabitants of which also enjoyed limited rights of Roman citizenship and could acquire the full citizenship by settling down in Rome. Therefore the public *prodigia* reported from the Latin com-

¹ Cf. Mommsen, *op.cit.* 168.

² Observe, however, the one important exception to this rule: the *prodigia* which befell the Roman army — even if outside the *ager Romanus* — were considered public, as was pointed out above. See table 1, p. 156, cf. Luterbacher, *op.cit.* 32.

³ Liv. 8, 23, 6, D.H. 15, 8, App. *Samn.* 4.

⁴ 26, 23, 5; 28, 11, 3, in addition Obseq. 52.

⁵ E. Rawson, *Prodigy Lists and the Use of the Annales Maximi*, *CQ* 21 (1971) 161—169.

⁶ Cf. Ulp. 5, 4.

⁷ For references see table 2, p. 157.

munities and expiated in Rome cannot be regarded as a violation of the *non suscepta* rule, or as a sign of lasceivity on the Senate's part in checking the origins of the public *prodigia* thoroughly enough.

As implied above, the Romans did not resign to passively expecting the fulfillment of the *ira deorum prodigiis manifestata*. The *pax deorum* could be restored by performing correct expiation rites for the *prodigia*.¹ The public *prodigia* were expiated by the consuls and paid *ex pecunia publica*.² The performing of the expiation rites often caused, however, great inconvenience. On several occasions Livy tells us that the newly elected consuls could leave for their provinces only after having successfully expiated all the public *prodigia* in which they often experienced difficulties.³ On one occasion when the consuls finally left without having successfully expiated the *prodigia*, consequences proved very dire to them:

Praetores in provincias profecti; consules religio tenebat, quod prodigiis aliquot nuntiatis non facile litabant, et ex Campania nuntiata erant, Capuae . . . Cumis . . . Casini . . . et Ostiae . . . Caere vulturium volasse in aedem Iovis, Vulsiniis sanguine lacum manasse. horum prodigiorum causa diem unum supplicatio fuit. per dies aliquot hostiae maiores sine litatione caesae, diuque non impetrata pax deum. in capita consulum re publica incolumi exitiabilis prodigiorum eventus vertit.

Liv. 27, 23, 1—4

In wartime it could naturally be very dangerous for the State, if the new consuls could not immediately leave for their provinces, and this was one more reason for the Senate to accept as few public *prodigia* as possible. Besides the *prodigia* also disturbed normal life in Rome, since no public business could be transacted while the expiation ceremonies were being performed.⁴ So in 193 B.C. the reporting of the public *prodigia* had to be limited by the consuls *ex auctoritate senatus*.⁵

It might also be assumed that the temple to the 'marvel-mongering' Juno Sospita of Lanuvium was dedicated in Rome in 194 B.C. in order to diminish

¹ See Tac. *hist.* 5, 13, he expresses his surprise at the Jews not using this practical method of appeasing the gods, cf. Liv. 27, 37, 1—5 . . . *liberatas religione mentes* . . . Obseq. 13: *Urbe lustrata nihil triste accidit*.

² Exceptionally by the praetor (Liv. 25, 12, 5), or the curule aediles (Liv. 40, 59, 6—8).

³ Cf. 22, 1, 14; 25, 12, 1—5; 27, 11, 1—6; 27, 38, 1; 32, 9, 1; 33, 26, 6—9; 34, 55, 1—5; 36, 37, 1—6; 37, 3, 1; 40, 19, 2.

⁴ Liv. 34, 55, 11. The *prodigia* could also prove a hindrance to the Roman army in the theatre of war, cf. Liv. 21, 46, 1—3; 23, 26, 9 f, 23, 39, 5.

⁵ Liv. 34, 55, 44.

the number of the *prodigia* reported from her temple at Lanuvium.¹ Probably the lengthy expiation rites to be performed for the public *prodigia* were also one reason for the changing of the beginning of the consular year from the 15th of March to the first of January in 153 B.C.²

Cicero claims that the *pontifices maximi* had kept a record of religious events *ab initio rerum Romanarum*.³ The observance and expiation of lightning is said to have been established by Numa Pompilius himself,⁴ and the establishment of *novemdiale sacrum* for expiation of rains of stones is attributed to Tullus Hostilius.⁵

During the Punic and the Civil Wars the numbers of reported *prodigia* were greatest, and obviously Livy quite rightly stated:

Prodigia eo anno [214] multa nuntiata sunt, quae quo magis credebant simplices ac religiosi homines, eo plura nuntiabantur . . .

24, 10, 6⁶

Still, even in more peaceful periods public *prodigia* were reported in such numbers that the lengthy expiations seriously disturbed the normal functioning of public life.⁷

Until the 40's of the first century B.C. the public *prodigia* were still carefully observed,⁸ and the respective *senatus consulta*, engraved on bronze-tablets, were filed in the temple of Saturn.⁹ In the early principate the observance and expiation of — at least public — *prodigia* seems to have been neglected;¹⁰ perhaps because Augustus — as well as Tiberius later on — had a negative attitude towards prophecies and sooth-sayings.¹¹ In the reign of Claudius, however, the custom was again revived,¹² and e.g. flashes of lightning were regarded as public *prodigia* still in the mid 4th century A.D.¹³

¹ Liv. 32, 30, 10; 34, 53, 3, W. Warde-Fowler, *The Religious Experience of the Roman people* (London 1911) 354, note 7, for references to the *prodigia* from Lanuvium see Wülker, *op.cit.* 98.

² *Per.* 47, Warde-Fowler, *op.cit.* 339.

³ *de orat.* 2, 12, 52.

⁴ Liv. 1, 20, 7, Ovid. *fasti* 3, 289—336.

⁵ Liv. 1, 31, 4, Tac. *ann.* 12, 8.

⁶ Cf. 2, 42, 10; 22, 62, 1 ff, 28, 11, 1 f, 29, 14, 2 f, 30, 38, 3, Pol. 3, 112, 8 f, Sall. *Cat.* 30, 2, Cic. *de div.* 2, 27, 58.

⁷ Cf. e.g. Liv. 34, 55, 1—5.

⁸ *Obseq.* 45—70, Gell. 4, 6, 1 f, Dio 47, 40, cf. Wülker, *op.cit.* 70 ff, Händel *RE* 32, 2238.

⁹ Suet. *Aug.* 94, 3, cf. *Iul.* 28, 3, Liv. 39, 4, 8.

¹⁰ Liv. 43, 13, 1, cf. Wülker *op.cit.* 71.

¹¹ Suet. *Aug.* 31, *Tib.* 63.

¹² See Krauss for references to public *prodigia* in the Empire, cf. Juv. *Sat.* 13, 60—70 and Plin. *NH* 2, 92 for the type of *prodigia* that were expiated in their days.

¹³ *Cod. Theod.* 16, 10, 1: *si quid de palatio nostro aut ceteris operibus publicis degustatum fulgore esse constiterit; retento more veteris observantiae quid portendat ab haruspibus requiratur . . .* Amm. Marc. 23, 5, 13 . . . *et hoc modo contacta loca nec intueri nec calcari debere fulgurales pronuntiant libri.*

Until the end of the 2nd century B.C. the public *prodigia* were also listed in the *tabulae* of the *pontifex maximus* hanging outside the Regia in addition to being preserved in the Treasury along with other *senatus consulta*.¹ The pontifical *tabulae* are said to have contained *res omnes singulorum annorum*,² but the information seems to have been limited to the lists of the magistrates, grain prices, eclipses of the sun and the moon and other such information³ *quibus nihil potest esse ieiunius* — at least in Cicero's opinion.⁴ The custom of putting up the *tabulae* at the Regia was stopped by P. Mucius Scaevola, whose pontificate lasted from 130 to probably 114 B.C. The information of the *tabulae* was gathered and published — it is not known by whom and at what date — and this publication was known as the *Annales Maximi*.⁵ Most scholars are of the opinion that these *Annales Maximi* would have been the ultimate source of the public *prodigia* recorded e.g. by Livy, though he scarcely consulted it directly but copied his *prodigia* references from the works of earlier annalists especially from Valerius Antias.⁶ Miss Rawson has, however, recently suggested that the *Annales Maximi* would have been so awkward to consult and hard to get at that the ancient authors would not have used them at all, neither as a source of the public *prodigia* nor as a source for anything else.⁷ Her arguments in favour of this conjecture are ingenious, but not quite convincing.⁸ Miss Rawson further suggests that instead of using the *Annales Maximi*

¹ Serv. *Aen.* 1, 373, Cic. *de orat.* 2, 12, 52. Cato *ap. Gell.* 2, 28, 6, Gell. 4, 5, 6, cf. 4, 6, 1, Suet. *Aug.* 94, 3 cf. *Iul.* 28, 3, Liv. 39, 4, 8.

² Cic. *de orat.* 2, 12, 52.

³ Cato *ap. Gell.* 2, 28, 6.

⁴ *de leg.* 1, 6.

⁵ Cic. *de orat.* 2, 12, 52, Serv. *Aen.* 1, 373, Macrobian. *Sat.* 3, 2, 17.

⁶ See e.g. Wülker, *op.cit.* 51—70, Luterbacher, *op.cit.* 62—68, E. Wölfflin, Zum Chronicon Livianum von Oxyrhynchus, *Archiv für lat. Lexik.* 14, (1905—6) 221—3, A. Klotz, Über die Stellung des Cassius Dio . . . Quellen zur Geschichte, *Rh.Mus.* 85 (1936) 46—49, 64 f, 86, I. Haug, Der römische Bundesgenossenkrieg, *Würzburger Jhb. für Altertumswiss.* 2:1 and 2 (1947) 112 f, P. G. Walsh, *Livy* (Cambridge 1963) 111 f.

⁷ *Op.cit.* 159—161, 164 f, 168.

⁸ Miss Rawson, *op. cit.* 158, finds it a disturbing peculiarity that famines and eclipses of the sun are so rarely mentioned in the *prodigia* lists, and eclipses of the moon not at all, though they are said to have been recorded on the *tabulae* of the *pontifex maximus*, and should consequently have appeared in the *Annales Maximi*. There are, however, a couple of famines (Obseq. 13, 22), quite a few eclipses of the sun (Dio 47, 40, 2, Zon. 9, 14, Liv. 22, 1, 9 f, 30, 38, 8; 37, 4, 4; Obseq. 14, 43, 51, 62, see also Liv. 30, 2, 9 and 44, 37, 5—9) and at least one eclipse of the moon (Obseq. 51). Besides we are explicitly told that at least on one occasion the eclipse of the moon was forbidden to be considered a *prodigium* (Liv. 44, 37, 5—9, Cic. *rep.* 1, 15, 23, Pol. 29, 16, cf. Plut. *Aem.* 17, see also Cic. *de div.* 2, 17, Plin. *NH* 2, 10, 56 ff, and Plut. *Nic.* 23, 4). If the eclipses of the moon were not *prodigia* we should not indeed be disquieted about not finding them in the *prodigia* lists! The pontifical *tabulae* contained also other information, e.g. the corn prices (Cato *ap. Gell.* 2, 28, 6) which the historians — perhaps already the editors of the *Annales Maximi* — obviously did not find interesting enough to be copied from them.

the historians would have excerpted their *prodigium* information from other official sources e.g. the *commentarii* of the pontifices, Xviri, and haruspices,¹

On page 164, Miss Rawson argues that the historians must have used various collections of special *prodigia* instead of the *Annales Maximi*. She gives as evidence the frequent monstrous births of mules and foals at Reate. Now, there are ten *prodigia* from Reate — not eight as Miss Rawson maintains — (Liv. 25, 7, 8; 26, 23, 5; 30, 2, 11; 37, 3, 3; 40, 2, 4 = Obseq. 1; 40, 2, 4 = Obseq. 5; 40, 45, 4; 43, 13, 4; Obseq. 15, 28, and 59) — four of which were monstrous births of foals and three times *mula peperit*. To me this suggests that the breed of horses at Reate was obviously fertile and perhaps genetically a little degenerated, and, in fact, we know from Varro (*RR* 2, 1, 4 and 2, 8, 3–6) that Reate was a renowned centre of mule and horse breeding. Is it therefore not quite natural that more deformed foals were born at Reate — or people were more prone to observe them there — than elsewhere in Italy? There are, however, cases of foaling mules and a colt *cum quinque pedibus* also from elsewhere in Italy (Varro *RR* 2, 1, 27, Cic. *de div.* 1, 18, 36, Dio 47, 40, 3, App. *b.c.* 1, 83, Obseq. 65, 52, 70, cf. Plin. *NH* 8, 69, 173) of which Miss Rawson does not seem to have been aware. I would also suggest that the appearance of *bubones* in the *prodigia* after the year 135 B.C. — which is Miss Rawson's — *op.cit.* 164 — second piece of evidence for the annalist having used special *prodigia* collections — might have natural — literally natural — reasons. Could we not think that there really were more *bubones* about after the year 135 B.C. — perhaps they had been disturbed in their normal abodes by road- or house-building — rather than conjecture somebody compiling a list of *bubones prodigia* starting in 135 B.C., which the annalists would then have excerpted (cf. Plin. *NH* 8, 69, 173; 10, 13, 17, 36, Varro *RR* 2, 1, 27) ? As to the *corvi* and vultures, Rawson *ibid.*, they appear in the *prodigia* lists since the 3rd century B.C. (cf. e.g. Liv. 27, 11, 4; 21, 62, 4; 24, 10, 6; 27, 11, 4; 27, 23, 3; 30, 2, 9). And might the appearance of the subterranean noises after the year 100 B.C. (Rawson 164) not have natural reasons as well? Let it also be added that there is a human-faced piglet from Tarquinii too (Liv. 27, 4, 14, cf. Obseq. 14: *Caere porcus humanis manibus . . .*) and not only from Sinuessa, Rawson 161.

In Miss Rawson's opinion, *op.cit.* 159, the announcement of the public *prodigia* at the Senate and the consequent *senatus consulta* would not have been important to the pontifices i.e. that Livy's recording these facts show that he/his predecessors cannot have used the *Annales Maximi* as their source. But why would the *senatus consulta* not have been important to the pontifices? It was, after all, they that were responsible for the performing the expiation rites led by the consul, and they were senators themselves. I would, indeed, argue that the *senatus consulta* pertaining to the expiation rites certainly were written down on their *tabulae*.

Concluding her paper Miss Rawson, 168, suggests that something has obviously prevented both annalists and antiquarians from using the *Annales Maximi*. But what about Varro, Cicero, and Verrius whom Miss Rawson, too, 165 f, admits to have read the *Annales Maximi*? In my opinion also Servius, *Aen.* 1, 373, and Aulus Gellius seem to have known them quite well: *NA* 4, 5, 6: *ea historia scripta est in annalibus maximis libro undecimo*, see also 4, 6, 1: *in veteribus memoriis scriptum legimus nuntiatum esse senatui in sacrario in regia «hastas Martias movisse»*. As to the story about Horatius' statue (Gell. 4, 5, 1–6) the reference *aruspices ex Etruria acciti* is a clear indication of a *senatus consultum* (cf. Cic. *de leg.* 2, 21, see below p. 152 f). I agree with Miss Rawson, 166, 168, that this story as such seems, indeed, to have been recast. But by whom? Why not by Gellius — or Verrius Flaccus — rather than by the editors of the *Annales Maximi*?

Miss Rawson's argument *op.cit.*, 161, that the *prodigia* lists contain 'some twenty' *civitates foederatae* will be separately dealt with below, see p. 149 ff. Let it, however, be mentioned that none of those *civitates* except for Lavinium are known to have had a *foedus* with Rome. Besides the *foedus* of Lavinium was of religious character and yearly renewed still the Empire, i.e. it was in no way connected with her political independence. The explanation for the appearing of the Latin colonies in the *prodigia* lists has been given above, p. 142 f.

¹ Rawson *op.cit.* 161.

and various collections of special *prodigia*.¹ I, however, doubt very much that such *commentarii* would have been more easily available than the *Annales Maximi*, and the former seem to have contained decrees about the duties and rights of the pontifices rather than records of historical events.² Besides the *commentarii* of the Xviri, and haruspices — if such *commentarii* ever existed? — could not have helped the annalists very far, for the public *prodigia* were very rarely referred to the Xviri and still more rarely to the haruspices.³ Besides, I cannot believe that the annalists would have bothered to seek out and use a special, separate *prodigium* source. Livy, at least, seems to have felt rather awkward about citing the *prodigia* at all and excused himself in the following words:

Non sum nescius ab eadem negligentia qua nihil deos portendere vulgo nunc credant, neque nuntiari admodum ulla prodigia in publicum neque in annales referri. Ceterum nihil vetustas res scribenti nescio quo pacto antiquus fit animus et quaedam religio tenet, quae illi prudentissimi viri publice suscipienda censuerint, ea pro indignis habere, quae in meos annales referam.

43, 13, 1—2

I would, for my part, suggest that the annalists excerpted the *prodigia* from the same source as the names of the new magistrates, the provinces where the consuls were sent, the number of the legions given to them, and information about other such measures which were customarily dealt with at the beginning of the year. The most complete source of such information was, no doubt, the *senatus consulta*, which were being published yearly at least around the year 146 B.C.⁴ Another possible source could have been the plebeian archives of the *senatus consulta* in the Temple of Ceres, which was started in 449 B.C.⁵ We do not, however, know how long this practice was continued and whether all the *senatus consulta* were collected there.⁶ The third possibility was — of course — the *Annales Maximi*.⁷ There is, however, one argument for the

¹ See note 7 p. 146.

² v. Premerstein *RE IV* 729 f.

³ See below p. 152 f.

⁴ Cic. *ad Att.* 13, 33, 3: . . . *reperiet ex eo libro, in quo sunt senatus consulta Cn. Cornelio L. [Mummio] coss.* Cf. Dziatzko *RE* 562, Walsh, *op.cit.* 112, U. Bredehorn, *Senatsakten in der republikanischen Annalistik* (Diss. Marburg 1968) 40.

⁵ Liv. 3, 55, 13, cf. Zon. 7, 15.

⁶ Cf. Bredehorn, *op.cit.* 32, 35.

⁷ They contained exactly such information as we find together with *prodigia* in the opening chapters of each year in *Ab Urbe Condita: praescriptis consulum nominibus et aliorum magistratum digna memoratu notare consueverat domi militiaeque terra marique gesta . . .* (Serv. *Aen.* 1, 373).

annalists' not having used them which I share with Miss Rawson *viz.* the custom of hanging up the *tabulae* outside the Regia was given up in the pontificate of P. Mucius Scaevola. — Yet, we can detect no trace whatever of a change in Obsequens' *prodigium* reports in those years!¹ Perhaps I may, however, be permitted to point out that, though the hanging of the *tabulae* outside the Regia was discontinued it is most unlikely that the *pontifices* would have given up the recording of the main events — especially the religious events — of each year. So the *Annales Maximi*, the publishing date of which is not known, need not have shown a change in the pontificate of P. Mucius Scaevola either. They may, indeed, have recorded the events of quite a few more years.

In regard to the *ager Romanus* question it is, however, not so vitally important for us to know what was the original source of the public *prodigia*. If a *prodigium* is of public character, and we also learn that it was accepted as public by the Roman Senate, it is of minor importance through how many authors this information has filtered to us, and whether it was originally copied from the *Annales Maximi* or from one of the *senatus consulta* collections. Yet, we have — of course — to bear in mind as always when studying the ancient authors that in the course of the various copyings many pieces of information can have been distorted.²

Our main source of the public *prodigia* in the Republic is Livy's *Ab Urbe Condita* and Obsequens' compilation of it. Their information can — in some cases — be added to and checked against the *prodigia* references of Pliny, Plutarch, Valerius Maximus and Livy's compilers as well as Dio Cassius and Zonaras, the works of the latter two being especially important, as they are not dependent on Livy.³ A comparison of Livy's and Dio's/Zonaras' texts show that their information obviously came from a common original source.⁴ The *prodigia* lists of Livy are, naturally, far from complete,⁵ and the same is — alas — even more true in Obsequens' case:

¹ Rawson, *op.cit.* 160.

² Cf. Haug, *op.cit.* 112.

³ Wülker, *op.cit.*, 78—80, 85, Haug, *op.cit.*, 139, 239, Klotz, *op.cit.* 86—89.

⁴ Compare Liv. 21, 62, 2—5 and Zon. 8, 22, 8, note the same sequence of the events, which shows that Livy obviously made no rearrangements, as Miss Rawson, *op.cit.* 159, claims. Compare also Liv. 28, 11, 1—7 and Dio fr. 17, 60.

⁵ There are years from which Livy records no *prodigia* at all, and occasionally he records them very briefly (cf. 22, 36, 9 and 23, 31, 15, unusually brief lists especially when compared with the immediately preceding and following years 22, 1, 8—20 and 24, 10, 6—13). Livy also twice forgets to record the expiation rites, though there is no doubt that the respective *prodigia* were public (32, 29, 2 and 41, 21, 13).

Cumis in arce simulacrum Apollinis sudavit.

Obseq. 54

Neque enim aliunde Apollo ille Cumanus, cum adversus Achaeos regemque Aristonicum bellaretur, quadriduo flevisse nuntiatus est; quo prodigio haruspices territi cum id simulacrum in mare putavissent esse proiciendum, Cumani senes intercesserunt atque rettulerunt tale prodigium et Antiochi et Persis bello in eodem apparuisse figmento, et quia Romanis feliciter provenisset, ex senatus consulto eidem Apollini suo dona esse missa testati sunt. Tunc velut peritiores acciti haruspices responderunt simulacri Apollinis fletum ideo prosperum esse Romanis, quoniam Cumana colonia Graeca esset, suisque terris, unde accitus esset, id est ipsi Graeciae, luctum et cladem Apollinem significasse plorantem. Deinde mox regem Aristonicum victum et captum esse nuntiatum est, quem vinci utique Apollo nolebat et dolebat et hoc sui lapidis etiam lacrimis indicabat.

Aug. c.d. 3, 11¹

It is especially regrettable that Obsequens in many cases omits altogether the expiation rites — the ultimate criterion of a public *prodigium*.²

Really to ascertain the value of the *prodigia* as evidence in *ager Romanus* questions it is necessary to check in relation to Rome the status of all those communities from where public *prodigia* had been recorded before the year 90 B.C. Mommsen already sketched a list of such communities dividing them into seven groups among which the largest were *coloniae Romanae* and *Latinae* and *civitates quae ante bellum sociale civitatem adeptae sunt*.³ My revised and completed list appears at the end of this paper.⁴ On the basis of this list we can draw the following conclusions.

Among the total number of 113 place names⁵ mentioned in the *prodigia* 51 are Roman or Latin colonies, *fora*, or *praefecturae*. The inhabitants of 24 other communities are known to have received the *civitas Romana* — *sine* or *cum*

¹ Augustine is citing Livy here, see S. Angus, *The sources of the First Ten Books of Augustine's de Civitate Dei* (Diss. Princeton 1906) 30, cf. Lactant. *inst.div.* 2, 4.

² The comparison of Obsequens' *prodigia* with those of *Ab Urbe Condita* shows indeed that he — in addition to omitting many *prodigia* — also left out the expiation rites described by Livy, cf. Obseq. 4, 5, 7, 11 with Liv. 39, 46, 3—5; 40, 2, 1—4; 40, 45, 1—6 and 40, 59, 6—8; 45, 16, 5.

³ *Op.cit.* 170—174.

⁴ Table 2, p. 157—162.

⁵ I have excluded the city of Rome and in addition places like Macedonia, Portus Herculis etc. where only military *prodigia* had taken place. See the separate list of them table 1, p. 156.

suffragio — or to have possessed the Latin rights before the date when the first *prodigium* had taken place there.¹

In 23 cases the locality is specified only as *Ager Veiens* or *Umbria*, and it can be assumed that it is the Roman *ager publicus* in those parts that is meant, as in the following example:

Curam expiandae violationis eius templi prodigia etiam sub idem tempus pluribus locis nuntiata accenderunt . . . in Lucanis in agro publico eculeus cum quinque pedibus.

Liv. 31, 12, 5—7²

The original precision *in agro publico* [*Romano*] — can have been lost or omitted by the later authors.³ In all of those 23 Italian districts mentioned in the *prodigia* there existed Roman *ager publicus* before the date when the first *prodigia* were reported from them.

In the cases of *Oppidum Minervium*,⁴ *Urvinum*,⁵ and *Regium*⁶ we have to state that there is more than one community which bears the same name, and it is impossible to find out which one was actually meant. The status of none of these communities is known to us. In 5 cases, four of which appear in *Obsequens' Liber Prodigiorum*, the place names are incomprehensible.⁷

There remain six communities of unknown status from which *prodigia*

¹ Obs. the baby crying 'io triumphe' in *Marrucinis* was among *alia miracula* (Liv. 24, 10, 10) and not included among the *prodigia suscepta*, cf. Mommsen, *op.cit.*, 169.

² Cf. 27, 37, 6; 28, 11, 4; 39, 22, 5; 44, 18, 6; and 45, 16, 5, *Obseq.* 11.

³ Cf. Liv. 39, 12, 5 *ex Umbria . . . Romano agro*, *Obseq.* 3, records only *in Umbria* omitting the *ager Romanus*, Mommsen, *op.cit.* 173, Rawson *op.cit.* 162, Wülker 101.

⁴ Liv. 45, 16, 5. Cf. Philipp *RE* XV 1805 f (*Arx Minerviae*) and *ibid.* 1807 (*Minervium*). This *Oppidum Minervium* mentioned by Livy may also be the same *Minervium* where a Roman citizen colony was sent in 122 B.C. (Vell 1, 15, 4) and the territory of which had obviously belonged to the *ager Romanus* since the Second Punic War, for according to T. Frank, *Economic Survey* (Baltimore 1933) 112 f and 215 f, the amount of the Roman *ager publicus* in Italy did not grow after that time, and the colony of *Minervium* was one of the Gracchan colonies which were established on such *ager publicus* which had gradually slipped back to the possession of private citizens — i.e. its actual reduction to *ager publicus* had taken place long before the founding of the colonies.

⁵ *Obseq.* 50. There were *Urvinum Hortense* and *Urvinum Metaurense*, see Radke *RE* IX A 1, 1069 f. Referring to K. J. Beloch, *Römische Geschichte bis zum Beginn der punischen Kriege* (Berlin und Leipzig 1926) 606, he suggests that these communities might have remained *civitates foederatae* until the year 90 B.C. The evidence of the respective *quattuorviri* inscriptions is, however, most dubious. There were *quattuorviri* also in pre-Social War Roman *municipia*, see e.g. Beloch *op.cit.* 504, and A. Degrassi, *Quattuorviri in colonie romane ecc. . . . Lincei Mem. Scienze morali* 1949, ser. VIII vol. 4 (Roma 1950), 288.

⁶ *Obseq.* 54. Cf. Weiss and Philipp *RE* I A, 486—502.

⁷ Liv. 32, 29, 2 (*Aefulae*), *Obseq.* 21 (*Caura*), 14 (*Concium*), 17 (*Consa*) 31 (*Satura*).

were reported to Rome. They are Arpi,¹ Arretium,² Faesulae,³ Mantua,⁴ Tarquinii,⁵ and Volaterrae,⁶ and in addition *ager Perusinus*.⁷ In the case of Mantua we can safely assume that it had been incorporated into the *ager Romanus* before 214 B.C. when the first and only *prodigium* was reported from there to Rome, for a Roman colony existed there at least as early as in Polybios' day.⁸ Perhaps it had been established already before the year 214, or at least the respective territory had been incorporated into the *ager Romanus* by that time.⁹

The *ager Perusinus*, where *lacte pluit* in 106 was obviously Roman *ager publicus* too.¹⁰ In spite of having been reduced to Roman *ager publicus* the respective Italian areas seem to have retained their old names and been commonly called by them for centuries afterwards: *in Romano agro, simul in Veienti*.¹¹ As Perugia is known to have been at war with Rome at least twice in the late 4th — early 3rd century, it may have lost part of its territory to the Romans in those days.¹² Arpi, Arretium, and Tarquinii are also known to have lost at least part of their territories to Rome at some date.¹³ Our authors do not, however, say that the *prodigia* took place in the neighbourhood of those towns, but in the towns proper, as in the cases of Faesulae and Volaterrae.

It is rather striking that four of the five communities are Etruscan. How can this be explained? Could the Etruscan haruspices have had their hand in

¹ Liv. 22, 1, 9, Obseq. 30.

² Liv. 35, 21, 3, Obseq. 49, 52, 53, 54 and Oros. 5, 18, 4.

³ Obseq. 49, 51, 53, cf. Hülsen *RE* VI 1965 and Radke *Kl.Pauly* II 507.

⁴ Liv. 24, 10, 7.

⁵ Liv. 27, 4, 14, Obseq. 45 (*ager Tarquiniensis*), 43.

⁶ Obseq. 53.

⁷ Obseq. 41.

⁸ 16, 40, 7.

⁹ Cf. Hülsen *RE* XIV 1359, see note 4, p. 150.

¹⁰ Obseq. 41.

¹¹ Liv. 44, 18, 6, *i.e.* over 200 years after the conquest of Veii, similarly *ager Pomptinus*, *ager Gallicus* etc.

¹² Liv. 9, 37, 12; 9, 40, 18 ff, Dio. 20, 35, 4 f, cf. *fasti triumph. I. I.* 13, 1 p. 71, see also E. Ruoff-Väänänen, *The Civitas Romana in Etruria, Acta Inst. Rom. Finlandiae V/VI* (Roma 1972), chapter 'Ager Perusinus'.

¹³ Arpi: the colony of Sipontum was founded in its former territory in 194 B.C. (Liv. 34, 45, 3, see also *Lib. Col.* p. 210, 10).

Arretium: the Gracchan commission reclaimed Roman *ager publicus* in its territory in the 120's (*Lib. Col.* p. 215), cf. note 4, p. 150, see also Ruoff-Väänänen, *op.cit.* chapter 'Arretium'.

Tarquinii: the colony of Graviscae was founded in its former territory in 181 B.C. (Liv. 40, 29, 1, Vell. 1, 15, 2) and another citizen colony probably in the 120's (*Lib. Col.* 219), see also Ruoff-Väänänen, *op.cit.* chapters 'Tarquinii' and 'The Colony of Tarquinii'.

it? Would the Roman Senate have accepted *prodigia* from Etruria, although it was *ager peregrinus*? Or should we assume that the respective Etruscan towns had been incorporated into the *ager Romanus*? There is, of course, a third possibility, too, viz. that this 4/5 Etruscan representation would be just a mere coincidence. The laws of statistics are, however, very much against such an explanation. Etruria was, after all, only about 1/6 of the total area of the peninsula, the rest of which is represented only by Arpi. While there is no evidence which would speak against the assumption that Arpi,¹ Arretium, Faesulae, Tarquinii and Volaterrae² had been incorporated into the *ager Romanus* before the dates when the first *prodigia* were reported from them, it is certainly worth our while to study the role of the Etruscan haruspices in the Roman *prodigia* rites.

We are not often informed by whom the public *prodigia* were reported to Rome. In most cases the reporters seem to have been Roman officials.³ As far as the Etrurian *prodigia* are concerned no reporter is ever mentioned. Haruspices never figure as reporters of any *prodigium* from other parts of Italy either — neither before nor after the year 90 B.C. On the basis of the available information the task of the haruspices seems to have been limited wholly to the interpreting of the meaning of the *prodigia*: *quid portendat prodigium*.⁴ Besides, the calling of the haruspices to interpret *prodigia* did not belong to the normal course of the Roman *prodigia* rites either. Most often the Senate simply ordered one of the consuls to expiate the *prodigia* with full-grown victims without consulting any Roman priests let alone Etruscan haruspices.⁵ The help of the haruspices was asked only in cases of extraordinary *prodigia*,⁶ and only if the Senate so desired:⁷

¹ Cf. Hülsen *RE* II, 1217f.

² See Ruoff-Väänänen, *op.cit.*, chapters on the respective Etruscan towns.

³ Liv. 32, 1, 11 (*propraetor*) 32, 1, 12 (*proconsul*), 43, 13, 3 (*aeditus*), 40, 19, 2 (*pontifices*) 43, 13, 4 (*aeditus*), Strabo 6, 2, 11, Gell. 4, 6, 2 (*pontifices*). Note also Cic. *de leg.* 2, 8, 21, it was the especial task of certain priests to observe the *fulgura*.

⁴ *Cod. Theod.* 16, 10, 1, cf. Cic. *de div.* 1, 41, 92, and 2, 63, 130; Liv. 5, 15, 3; 42, 20, 2–4, see Wissowa *RR* 546 f, Bouché-Leclercq, *Histoire de la divination dans l'antiquité* IV (Paris 1882) 109, Wülker, *op.cit.*, 35, Thulin, *op.cit.*, 78–81.

⁵ Cf. e.g. Gell. 4, 6, 1–2, Liv. 28, 11, 5.

⁶ Cf. e.g. Procilius *ap. Varro l.l.* 5, 148, (cf. D.H. 14, 11), Liv. 22, 9, 8; 24, 10, 13; 27, 37, 6; 35, 21, 5; 36, 37, 2; 40, 2, 4; 41, 13, 2 f; 42, 20, 1–5. Tac. *ann.* 11, 15. N.B. In the most extraordinary cases even the lore of the haruspices was not enough, and the oracle at Delphi had to be consulted, Liv. 1, 56, 4 f, 5, 15, 1–4, cf. 5, 15, 12, D.H. 12, 10, 2, Zon. 7, 20, Liv. 22, 57, 5 and 23, 11, 1–6.

⁷ Cic. *de leg.* 2, 9, 21: (he is citing the law) *Prodigia portenta ad Etruscos haruspices si senatus iussit deferunt* . . . Cf. Liv. 42, 20, 1–5.

Ab Suessa nuntiatum est duas portas quodque inter eas muri erat de caelo tactum; et Formiani legati aedem Iovis, item Ostienses aedem Iovis, et Veliterni Apollinis et Sangus aedes, et in Herculis aede capillum enatum; et ex Bruttiis ab Q. Minucio propraetore scriptum eculeum cum quinque pedibus, pullos gallinaceos tris cum ternis pedibus natos esse. A P. Sulpicio proconsule ex Macedonia litterae adlatae, in quibus inter cetera scriptum erat lauream in puppi navis longae enatam. Priorum prodigiorum causa senatus censuerat, ut consules maioribus hostiis, quibus diis videretur, sacrificarent; ob hoc unum prodigium haruspices in senatum vocati, atque ex responso eorum supplicatio populo in diem unum indicta et ad omnia pulvinaria res divinae factae.

Liv. 32, 1, 10—14

The haruspices do not even seem to have resided in Rome, but they had to be especially called from Etruria for each unusual *prodigium*.¹ It is, however, never mentioned from which Etruscan town or community the haruspices were called to Rome.

In general the Romans seem to have greatly trusted the sayings of the haruspices.² Even Cicero praised the accuracy of their prophecies on several occasions.³ As persons, however, they seem to have been treated with suspicion and contempt — mixed perhaps with envy on behalf of the Roman priests.⁴

»Gracchus cum comitia nihilo minus peregisset remque illam in religionem populo venisse sentiret, ad senatum rettulit. Senatus 'quos ad soleret' referendum censuit. Haruspices introducti responderunt non fuisse iustum comitiorum rogatorem. Tum Gracchus, ut e patre audiebam, incensus ira: »Itane vero? ego non iustus, qui et consul rogavi et augur et auspicato? an vos Tusci ac barbari auspicioꝝ populi Romani ius tenetis et interpretes esse comitiorum potestis?» Itaque tum illos exire iussit; . . .

Cic. nat. deor. 2, 4, 10⁵

True enough, the suspicions of the Romans were not quite unfounded, for at least twice the haruspices are known to have betrayed them on purpose.⁶

¹ See e.g. Liv. 27, 37, 6, App. b.c. 4, 4, Cic. de div. 2, 4, 11, har.resp. 2, 5; 12, 15; 25, in Cat. 3, 8, 19, Tac. ann. 11, 15, Lucan 1, 584, Gell. 4, 5, 2.

² E.g. in 152 B.C. all magistrates resigned on the advice of the haruspices, Obseq. 18.

³ De div. 1, 12, 19; 1, 14, 25; 1, 18, 35 f; 1, 41, 92; 1, 42, 93; 1, 43, 97 f; 2, 12, 28; nat.deor. 2, 3, 10; 2, 4, 10; 2, 4, 12, cf. Liv. 39, 16, 7 ff (the *responsa* of the haruspices were regarded as a time-honoured, respectable form of religion) Cic. de div. 1, 43, 97, Stat. Theb. 7, 402—9.

⁴ A. Haury, Une querelle de clocher: augures contre haruspices *Melanges d'archeologie et d'histoire offerts à André Piganiol* (Paris 1966), 1623—1632.

⁵ Cf. de div. 1, 17 and 2, 35, Val. Max. 1, 1, 3.

⁶ Zon. 7, 11, Gell. 4, 5, 1—6. The haruspices were also obviously proud of their abilities and did not stoop to interpret all sorts of *prodigia*, see Cic. de div. 2, 62.

The using of haruspices presented the Roman Senate with a certain dilemma. They were indispensable¹ — the Senate went even so far as to encourage the cultivation of *haruspicina* in Etruria,² and in earlier days Roman youths were sent there to learn it³ — but it would certainly have liked to do without them. It must especially be noted that if the haruspices were asked for advice the Sibylline books were often opened as well.⁴ Was this a discreet warning to the haruspices that their advice was checked against the information of this famous lore? It must further be noted that the haruspices never led the expiation rites nor otherwise took part in them.⁵ Their task was only to interpret the *prodigia*, and sometimes to give advice about an appropriate type of expiation for them.

How are we then to explain the public *prodigia* from the Etruscan towns? As far as we know there were no Roman troops in those parts at the respective dates. Besides the *prodigia* have nothing military about them; they are all normal public *prodigia*. Could the place-names have been forged? In fact, we might, indeed, wonder whether some *prodigia* may not have been invented on purpose by Roman politicians in order to hinder or postpone some legislation by their political enemies.⁶ If so, they, no doubt, took care to invent only such *prodigia* which could be accepted as public, and thus their value as evidence in *ager Romanus* questions is as good as that of the 'genuine' public *prodigia*. We may also rest assured that the place-names of the dreary, uninteresting *prodigia* lists⁷ were certainly never forged in the purpose of pre-dating the incorporation of a certain community into the *ager Romanus*.⁸

We should also ask a few more questions concerning the Etruscan *prodigia*. Would an independent Etruscan city have stooped to ask the Roman Senate

¹ Cf. Cic. *de div.* 2, 63, 130 . . . *vim cognoscentem et videntem et explicantem signa quae a dis hominibus portendantur; officium autem esse eius praenosceri dei erga homines mente qua sint quidque significant, quemadmodumque ea procurentur atque expientur.*

² Cic. *de div.* 1, 41, 92, *de leg.* 2, 9, 21, Val. Max. 1, 1, 1, Tac. *ann.* 11, 15, cf. Luterbacher *op.cit.*, 7.

³ Liv. 9, 36, 2–4.

⁴ E.g. Liv. 42, 20, 1–5, for further references see Wülker, *op.cit.*, 34–37.

⁵ Thulin, *op.cit.*, 124, 129, Luterbacher, *op.cit.*, 35, Bouché-Leclercq, *op.cit.* 184, Wülker, *op.cit.* 36.

⁶ Cf. R. Bloch *Les prodiges dans l'antiquité classique* (Paris 1963) 138 f, see also Liv. 3, 10, 7. While expiation rites were being performed no public business could be transacted, Liv. 34, 55, 1 f.

⁷ Cf. Cic. *de leg.* 1, 6, f, Cato *ap. Gell.* 2, 28, 6.

⁸ Wülker, *op.cit.* 56 f, A. Alföldi *Early Rome and the Latins* (Ann Arbor 1963) 168, and observe that Livy (43, 13, 1–2) for instance, felt somewhat awkward about including the *prodigia* in *Ab Urbe Condita* at all, as was pointed out above, see p. 147.

for advice in religious matters? The answer is — at least in my opinion — plainly no. Could the Etruscans not have had their *prodigia* sooner and more expertly dealt with at home? The Roman Senate can certainly have enjoyed no great reputation among its Etruscan neighbours as far as religious matters were concerned, as it was obliged to resort to the help of their haruspices, as soon as an extra ordinary *prodigium* appeared. As the Etruscan cities, nevertheless, reported their public *prodigia* to Rome, can we but conclude that the Roman Senate must have had the supreme political power over them? In the case of Volaterrae — mentioned only once in the deplorably careless Aldus-edition of Obsequens' *Liber Prodigiorum* — we might plead for a misspelling,¹ but in the cases of the other three Etruscan towns and Arpi we should obviously reconsider the possibility of their having been incorporated into the *ager Romanus* before the dates when the first *prodigia* were reported from them to Rome.²

¹ Cf. Haug, *op.cit.*, 112.

² For further discussion see Ruoff-Väänänen, *op.cit.* chapters on the respective cities.

TABLE 1

THE MILITARY *PRODIGIA* BEFORE THE YEAR 90 B.C.

Place	Year	Reference
—	295	Liv. 10, 31, 8
(soldiers)		
(camp)	218	» 21, 46, 2 f
Gallia	218	» 21, 62, 5, Val. Max. 1, 6, 5
(watchman)		
Sicily	217	» 22, 1, 8
(soldiers)		
Sardinia	217	» 22, 1, 8, Oros. 4, 15, 1
(horseman)		
Suessula	212	» 25, 7, 7
(camp)		
Macedonia	199	» 32, 1, 12
(warship)		
—	179	» 40, 58, 5
(soldiers)		
Cephalenia*	163	Obseq. 14
»	140	» 23
Terracina	137	» 24
(praetor)		
Portus Herculis	137	» 24
(consul)		
—	130	» 28
(praetor)		
Gallia	102	» 44
(camp)		

* There had been a Roman *praesidium* at Cephalenia since 189 B.C. (Liv. 38, 30, 1)

TABLE 2

LIST OF THE PLACES MENTIONED IN THE *PRODIGIUM* LISTS BEFORE THE YEAR 90 B.C.

Abbreviations:

aG = *ager Gabinus*

appR = *ager publicus populi Romani*

ccs = *civitas (Romana) cum suffragio*

cL = *colonia Latina*

cR = *colonia Romana*

css = *civitas (Romana) sine suffragio*

f = *forum*

K = in the period of the Kings

L = Latin rights

pappR = part of the area reduced to *ager publicus populi Romani*, obs. only the earliest reduction is recorded in the references.

pr = *praefectura*

prCC = *praefectura Capuam Cumas*

—ooo = before the year ooo

ooo = in and since the year ooo

TABLE 2

I	2	3	4	5	6	7
Place	Status	Year B.C.	Reference	First prodigium in the year B.C.	Reference (three numbers Livy, one number Obsequens)	Further mentions of <i>prodigia</i>
Aefulae?	<i>ccs</i>	273	See above p. 150, note 7, see also under Sabini	198	32, 29, 2	—
Aenaria	<i>appR</i>	326	Suet. <i>Aug.</i> , about the interpreta- tion see Hülsen <i>RE</i> I 594. i.e. ager Pomptinus, see below.	91	54	—
Ager Compsanus,						
» Ferentinus	<i>L</i>	—195	Liv. 34, 42, 5 cf. 7, 9, 1	133	27 a	—
» Gallicus	<i>appR</i>	284	Pol. 2, 19, 7 ff, 2, 21, 7 Cic. <i>Cato</i> 11, <i>Brut.</i> 57 cf. <i>Per.</i> 11.	218	21, 62, 5	+
» Perusinus	<i>appR</i>	—295?	see above p. 151 and note 12	106	41	—
» Pomptinus	<i>appR</i>	387	Liv. 6, 5, 1—4, cf. 6, 6, 1; 6, 21, 4; 7, 15, 12, Fest. 263, 6 L	213	24, 44, 9	+
» Stellatinus	<i>appR</i>	—387	Liv. 6, 5, 8 cf. Fest. 464, 14 ff L	163/	14	—
» Tarquiniensis	<i>appR?</i>	—181	Liv. 40, 29, 1, Vell. 1, 15, 2, cf <i>Lib. Col.</i> p. 219	104/3	43	—
» Veiens	<i>appR</i>	396	Liv. 5, 21 and 22, cf. D.H. 12, 13, 4, Diod. 14, 93, 2	174	41, 21, 12	+
» Volsiniensis	<i>css?</i>	264	Zon. 8, 7, Flor. 1, 16, cf. Ruoff— Väänänen, <i>op. cit.</i> , chapter on Volsinii	104/3	43	—
Alba	<i>cL</i>	303	Liv. 10, 1, 1, Vell. 1, 14, 5.	206	28, 11, 3	—
Amiternum	<i>ccs</i>	273	See under Sabini	218	21, 62, 5	+
Anagnia	<i>css</i>	306	Liv. 9, 43, 24, Diod. 20, 80	211	26, 23, 5	+
	<i>pr</i>	?	Fest. 262, 14 L			
	<i>ccs</i>	—225?	Fest. 115, 15 L, cf. Toynbee, A. J. <i>Hannibal's Legacy</i> (Edinburgh 1965) I 403—410			
Antium	<i>cR</i>	338	Liv. 8, 14, 8	217	22, 1, 19	+
Apulia	<i>pappR</i>	—314	Diod. 19, 72, 8, Vell. 1, 14, 4 (Luceria), cf. Liv. 31, 4, 2	214	24, 10, 7	+
Ardea	<i>cL</i>	442/ 435	Diod. 12, 34, 5, Liv. 4, 9—11; 4, 7, cf. 8, 13, 14	198	32, 9, 2	+
Aricia	<i>ccs</i>	338	Liv. 8, 14, 3, cf. Cic. <i>Phil.</i> 3, 15, Fest. 155, 15 L	216	22, 36, 7	+
Ariminum	<i>cL</i>	268	<i>Per.</i> 15, Vell. 1, 14, 6, Eutrop. 2, 16	194	34, 45, 7	+
Arpi	<i>appR</i>	—194	Liv. 34, 45, 3 (Sipontum), cf. <i>Lib.</i> <i>Col.</i> 210, 10, see above p. 151,	217	22, 1, 9	+

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
			and note 13, p. 152, note 1, and p. 155			
Arpinum	<i>css</i>	303	Liv. 10, 1, 3	203	30, 2, 12	—
	<i>ccs</i>	188	Liv. 38, 36, 7			
Arretium	<i>css</i>	—218	Liv. 27, 21, 6 f; 27, 24, 1—9, for further references and interpretation see Ruoff—Väänänen, <i>op. cit.</i> , chapter on Arretium	198	32, 9, 3	+
	<i>ccs</i>					
Atella	<i>prCC</i>	211	See under Capua	207	27, 37, 2	+
Auximum	<i>f?/cR?</i>	—174	Liv. 41, 27, 10, cf. Toynbee <i>op. cit.</i> II 208 and note 2. According to Vell. 15, 3 the colony was founded only in 157 B.C., but the building activities conducted at the orders of the Roman censors in 174 B.c. show that A. had been incorporated into the <i>ager Romanus</i> before that date.	175	41, 21, 12	+
Bononia	<i>cR</i>	189	Liv. 37, 57, 7, Vell. 1, 15, 2	135	26	—
Bruttii	<i>pappR</i>	270	D.H. 20, 15 (part of the Sila area),	199	32, 1, 11	—
Caere	<i>css</i>	390?	Gell. 16, 13, 7, Strabo 5, 2, 3, Porph. and Pseudoacr. <i>Hor.Ep.</i> 1, 6, 62	218	21, 62, 5	—
Caieta	<i>css</i>	338	See under Formiae	213	24, 44, 8	+
	<i>ccs</i>	188				
Calatia	<i>prCC</i>	211	See under Capua, cf. Liv. 41, 27, 10 and above my comment on Auximum	172	42, 20, 5	+
Cales	<i>cL</i>	334	Liv. 8, 16, 13 f, Vell. 1, 14, 3	214	24, 10, 7	—
Campania	<i>pappR</i>	339	Liv. 8, 11, 13 (<i>ager Falernus</i>) cf. 9, 20, 6, Diod. 19, 10, 2	177	41, 13, 2	+
Capena	<i>css/ccs</i>	—367	Liv. 6, 5, 8, cf. 5, 24, 2 f, and Fest. 464, 14 ff (<i>Stellatina</i>), <i>Lib. Col.</i> 216 and 255, Cic. <i>Flacco</i> 71, <i>leg. agr.</i> 2, 66	217	22, 1, 9	+
Capua	<i>pappR</i>	340	Liv. 8, 11, 13; 9, 20, 6, Diod. 19, 10, cf. Cic. <i>leg. agr.</i> 2, 66	217	22, 1, 12	+
	<i>prCC</i>	211	Liv. 26, 16, Fest. 262, 2—11, cf. Liv. 26, 33, 1—14; 27, 3, 7; 38, 36, 6			—
Carsioli	<i>cL</i>	302/298	Liv. 10, 3, 2 cf. 10, 13, 1, Vell. 1, 14, 5	95	52	—
Casinum	<i>pr</i>	—260	<i>CIL</i> X 5193 f, Beloch <i>op. cit.</i> 472, Toynbee <i>op. cit.</i> I 238 f	208	27, 23, 1	+

I	2	3	4	5	6	7
Caura†			i.e. Caere?, see above p. 150, note 7	143	21	—
Cephalenia			See table 1			
Compsa			i.e. ager Pomptinus, see above under this (cf. Wülker <i>op. cit.</i> 99)	173	42, 2, 4	—
Concium†			i.e. Antium?, cf. Hülsen <i>RE</i> 4, 830, see above p. 150, note 7	163	14	—
Consa†			See above p. 150, note 7	154	17	—
Croton	<i>cR</i>	194	Liv. 34, 45, 4 f	124	31	—
Crustumerium	<i>appR</i>	c. 500	Consult the references of Hülsen <i>RE</i> 4, 1727 f	177	41, 9, 5	+
Cumae	<i>css</i>	340	Liv. 8, 14, 11	213	25, 7, 8	+
	<i>prCC</i>	211	See under Capua			
Eretum	<i>css</i>	273	See under Sabini	211	26, 23, 5	—
Forum Esii			See under Forum			
Etruria	<i>pappR</i>	396	Liv. 5, 22, D.H. 12, 13, 4, Diod. 14, 93, 2 (Veii)	102	44	—
Faesulae	<i>css</i>	—96?	See above p. 151 note 3, p. 152, note 2.	96	49	—
Falerii	<i>css?</i>	241	<i>Fast. triumph. II</i> 13, 1 p. 77, Pol. 1, 65, <i>Per.</i> 19, Eutrop. 2, 28, Oros. 4, 11, 10, Val. Max. 6, 5, 1, Zon. 8, 18, Strabo 5, 2, 9, cf. Ruoff—Väänänen, <i>op. cit.</i> chapter on Falerii	217	22, 1, 10	—
Ferentinum			See under ager Ferentinus			
Formiae	<i>css</i>	338	Liv. 8, 14, 10, cf. Vell. 1, 14, 4	199	32, 1, 10	+
	<i>css</i>	188	Liv. 38, 36, 7 ff, Cic. <i>ad Att.</i> 2, 14, 2			
	<i>pr</i>	?	Fest. 262, 13 L			
Forum Esii	<i>f</i>	—163	Obseq. 14, otherwise unknown	163	14	—
» Subertanum	<i>f</i>	—211	Liv. 26, 23, 5, cf. Plin. <i>NH</i> 3, 52, otherwise unknown	211	26, 23, 5	—
» Vessanum	<i>f</i>	—122	Obseq. 32, otherwise unknown	122	32	—
Fregellae	<i>cL</i>	328	Liv. 8, 23, 6	211	26, 23, 5	+
Fregenae	<i>cR</i>	245	<i>Per.</i> 19, Vell. 1, 14, 8	198	32, 29, 1	—
Frusino	<i>appR</i>	306/3	Diod. 20, 80, 4, Liv. 10, 1, 3	207	27, 37, 5	+
	<i>pr</i>	—260?	Fest. 262, 14 L, cf. Beloch, <i>op. cit.</i> 417, Toynbee, <i>op. cit.</i> I 238 f			
Gabii	<i>aG</i>	K	Liv. 1, 54, 10; 1, 60, 2, D.H. 4, 58, Varro <i>l. l.</i> 5, 33	214	24, 10, 9	+
Gallia			See table 1			
Ager Gallicus			See under Ager			
Graviscac	<i>cR</i>	181	Liv. 40, 29, 1, Vell. 1, 15, 2	176	41, 15, 6	—
Hadria	<i>cL</i>	289	<i>Per.</i> 11	214	24, 10, 10	+

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Lanuvium	<i>ccs</i>	338	Liv. 8, 14, 2, cf Cic. <i>Balbo</i> 31, <i>Mur.</i> 90, Fest. 155, 12 L	218	21, 62, 4	+
Lavinium	<i>L/ccs?</i>	K	Consult the references of Philipp <i>RE</i> 23, 1007—1012	137	24	—
Lipari	<i>appR</i>	252	Pol. 1, 39, 13, Diod. 23, 20, cf. 14, 93, 5, Zon. 8, 14	126	29	—
Lucani	<i>pappR</i>	—273	<i>Per.</i> 14, Vell. 1, 14, 7 (Paestum), cf. <i>ILLRP</i> 309, <i>fast. triumph. CIL</i> I ² p. 46	200	31, 12, 5	+
Lucus Feroniae			See under Capena			
Luna	<i>cR</i>	177	Liv. 41, 13, 4	142	22	+
Macedonia			See table 1			
Mantua			See above p. 151 and notes 8 and 9.	214	24, 10, 7	—
Oppidum Minervium			See above p. 150 and note 4	167	45, 16, 5	—
Minturnae	<i>cR</i>	295	Vell. 1, 14, 6, cf. Liv. 10, 21, 8	207	27, 37, 2	+
Nuceria	<i>ccs?</i>	—90	Cf. App. <i>b.c.</i> 1, 42, Flor. 2, 6, 11 (the insurgent Italians devastated it in 90 B.C.)	104	43	—
Nursia	<i>ccs</i>	273	See under Sabini	190	37, 3, 3	+
Ostia	<i>cR</i>	K	Liv. 1, 33, 9, D.H. 3, 44, 3, Flor. 1, 1, 4, Cic. <i>rep.</i> 2, 33, Fest. 214, 20; 304, 20 L	208	27, 37, 3	+
Perusia			See under ager Perusinus			
Picenum	<i>pappR</i>	—264	<i>Per.</i> 15, Oros. 4, 4, 5—7 Eutrop. 2, 16, Flor. 1, 14 (colonies like Firmum, Potentia, Auximum, and several <i>praefecturae</i> , Caesar <i>b.c.</i> 1, 15, 1)	218	21, 62, 5	+
Pisaurum	<i>cR</i>	185	Liv. 39, 44, 10, Vell. 1, 15, 2	163	14	+
Praeneste	<i>L/cL?</i>	338	Consult the references of Radke <i>RE</i> 22, 2, 1553	217,	22, 1, 9	+
Privernum	<i>ccs</i> <i>pr</i>	329 ?	Liv. 8, 21, 10 Fest. 262, 14 L	209	27, 11, 4	+
Portus Herculis			See table 1			
Ager Pomptinus			See under Ager			
Puteoli	<i>cR</i>	194	Liv. 32, 9; 34, 45, Vell. 1, 15, 3	190	37, 3, 2	+
Reate	<i>ccs</i> <i>pr</i>	273 ?	See under Sabini Fest. 262, 15 L, Val. Max. 1, 18, 1	213	25, 7, 8	+
Regium			See above p. 150, note 6	136	25	—
Sabini	<i>pappR</i>	290	<i>Per.</i> 11, Flor. 1, 10, 1—3, Oros. 3, 22, 1, cf. Plin. <i>NH</i> 18, 18, Cic. <i>leg. agr.</i> 2, 66, Strabo 5, 228	216	22, 36, 6	+
	<i>css</i>	290	Vell. 1, 14, 6			

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	<i>ccs</i>	273	Vell. 1, 14, 7, cf. Liv. 40, 46, 12. Cic. <i>de off.</i> 1, 35, <i>Balbo</i> 31			
Sardinia			See table 1			
Satricum	<i>ccs</i>	-319	Liv. 9, 16, 2 and 10	206	28, 11, 2	-
Satura†			I.e. Saturnia?, see p. 150, note 7.	124	31	-
Saturnia	<i>cR</i>	183	Liv. 39, 55, 9	172	42, 20, 5	-
Sicilia	<i>pappR</i>	260	Diod. 23, 1-13, Dio Cass. 11, 43, Zon. 8, 8, 12, for military <i>prodigia</i> from Sicily see table 1	214	24, 10, 10	+
Sinuessa	<i>cR</i>	296	Liv. 10, 21, 8 f, Vell. 1, 14, 6	215	23, 31, 15	+
Spoletium	<i>cL</i>	241	<i>Per.</i> 20, Vell. 1, 14, 8, Cic. <i>Balbo</i> 21, 48	214	24, 10, 10	+
Ager Stellatinus			See under Ager			
Forum Subertanum			See under Forum			
Suessa Aurunca	<i>cL</i>	312	Liv. 9, 28, 7	199	32, 1, 10	-
Suessula			See table 1			
Syracusae	<i>pappR</i>	212	Diod. 26, 20, Cic. <i>Verr.</i> 2, 5, 98, Liv. 25, 31; 26, 61, cf. Luterbacher, <i>op. cit.</i> 31	177	41, 13, 2	-
Tarquinius	<i>pappR</i>	-181	Liv. 40, 29, 1	210	27, 4, 14	+
	<i>css?</i>	-210	See above p. 151 and notes 5, 13, and p. 152			
Tarracina	<i>cR</i>	329	Diod. 14, 16, Liv. 8, 21, 11, Vell. 1, 14, 4	213	24, 44, 8	+
Teanum Sidicinum	<i>css</i>	344	Vell. 1, 14, 3	166	12	-
Trebula Mutuesca	<i>ccs</i>	273	See under Sabini	105	42	+
Tusculum	<i>ccs</i>	381	Liv. 6, 26, 8, D.H. 14, 6-9, Dio Cass. 7, 28, Plut. <i>Cam.</i> 38, Val. Max. 7, 3, 9, Fest. 155, 12 L	210	27, 4, 11	+
Umbria	<i>pappR</i>	295-	<i>Fast. triumph.</i> II 13, 1, p. 77 Liv. 10, 10, 1-5 (colonies like Aesium, Ariminum, Castrum Novum, Narnia, Sena Gallica	186	39, 22, 5	-
Urvinum			See above p. 150 and note 5	95	50	-
Veii	<i>appR</i>	396	Liv. 5, 21 and 22, cf D.H. 12, 13, 4 Diod. 14, 93, 2	207	27, 37, 1	+
Velitrae	<i>cR</i>	494	Liv. 2, 31, 4, cf 2, 34, 6; 7, 14, 5, D.H. 6, 42, 3; 7, 12, Plut. <i>Coriol.</i> 12	202	30, 38, 8	+
Venafrum	<i>pr</i>	-260	Fest. 262, 14 L, <i>CIL</i> X 4876, cf. App. <i>b.c.</i> 1, 41, see Beloch <i>op. cit.</i> 472, 238 f.	94	51	-
Forum Vessanum			See under Forum			

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Vestini	<i>pappR</i>	290—	Flor. 1, 10 (<i>praefecturae</i> like Aveia and Peltuinum), cf. Beloch, <i>op. cit.</i> 597 f, Toynbee, <i>op. cit.</i> , I 238	94	51	+
Volaterrae			See above pp. 151 f, 155 and note 3	92	53	—
Volsci	<i>pappR</i>	c. 500—	Liv. 1, 55, D.H. 4, 63 (colonies like Circei, Norba, Signia, Velitrae)	94	51	—
Volsinii	<i>css?</i>	264	Flor. 1, 16, Zon. 8, 7, Val. Max. 9, 1 Ext. 2, Oros. 4, 5, 3—5, <i>vir. ill.</i> 36, <i>fast. triumph. II</i> , 13, 1, p. 73, cf. <i>Per.</i> 16	208	27, 23, 5	+
Vulturnum	<i>cR</i> <i>pr</i>	194 ?	Liv. 34, 45, 1 Fest. 262, 10 L	191	36, 37, 3	—