

## BETWEEN GEESE AND THE AUGURACULUM: THE ORIGIN OF THE CULT OF JUNO ON THE ARX

ADAM ZIOLKOWSKI

THE IMPORTANCE OF ROME'S TOPOGRAPHY for Roman studies in general is that by reconstructing the urban landscape the topographer recreates the scene on which a major part of Rome's history was played and thus helps to elucidate several aspects of her politics and institutions. One such case of a monument's positioning or dating having far-reaching consequences for understanding ancient Rome is the date of the introduction of the cult of Juno on the Arx. The consequences, which I propose to discuss in this paper, are twofold. One is epistemological. Our sources referring directly to the cult's origin, especially Livy, date it to the middle of the fourth century. However, our sources give a number of hints and allusions, which cumulatively have persuaded the majority of scholars to opt for a much earlier date for the cult's introduction on the hill. And since the rejection of the Livian tradition starts with geese, the saviors of the Capitol, I shall discuss the clash between the ancient evidence and modern reconstructions under the heading "Iuno Moneta and the Geese."

The other consequence of choosing one or another date for the origin of Juno's cult on the Arx emerges when set within the topographic context. The temple of Iuno Moneta was the chief sanctuary of the Arx, but on the hill there was another place even more venerable and religiously important, the Auguraculum. Pushing Juno's presence on the Arx to the archaic age leads almost inexorably to making her copatroness of the *auspicia publica populi Romani*, with all the implications this entails. What is more, in a circular argument the presumed augural connections of Juno are sometimes adduced for locating the Auguraculum or even dating the introduction of the goddess' cult on the Arx. I shall therefore discuss the augural aspects of the question under a separate heading, "Iuno Moneta and the Auguraculum."

### I. IUNO MONETA AND THE GEESE

There are two accounts of the introduction of Juno's cult on the Arx. Livy (7.28.4–6) says that, during the war with the Aurunci in 345, the dictator L. Furius Camillus

aedem Iunoni vovit. . . . Senatus duumviros ad eam aedem pro amplitudine populi Romani faciendam creari iussit; locus in arce destinatus, quae area aedium M. Manlii

[© 1993 by The University of Chicago. All rights reserved]  
0009-837X/93/8803-0002\$01.00

Capitolini fuerat; anno post quam vota erat, aedes Monetae dedicatur C. Marcio Rutilo tertium T. Manlio Torquato iterum consulibus.

Livy's account is echoed in Ovid's *Fasti* (6.183–85) for 1 June:

arce quoque in summa Iunoni templa Monetae  
ex voto memorant facta, Camille, tuo:  
ante domus Manli fuerat.

We thus have a vow to Juno made by L. Furius Camillus and executed by the senate *pro amplitudine populi Romani*. As for the *locus* chosen, all of our literary sources speak of a site previously occupied by a house, which clearly indicates that Juno had not been worshipped there before. The only discrepancy is that whereas one tradition, which eventually became canonical, located the temple on the site of the house of M. Manlius Capitolinus,<sup>1</sup> the other situated it on that of T. Tatius.<sup>2</sup> Direct literary evidence has, however, ever been drowned by the cackling of geese that had saved the Capitol from the Gauls. The tradition of the Gauls' nocturnal assault, thwarted by the geese and M. Manlius Capitolinus, is the starting point of the argument—mistaken, as I shall try to demonstrate—that on the Arx the cult of Juno preceded Camillus' vow.<sup>3</sup> Since the argument is based on archaeological and epigraphic as well as literary evidence, I shall discuss separately all three.

1. Literary evidence.<sup>4</sup> This line of reasoning is simple: our sources report that the Capitoline geese were sacred to Juno, which proves that by 390 the goddess' cult had already been well established on the hill. Whereas in Diodorus and Livy the Gauls simply happened upon the geese,<sup>5</sup> Dionysius places the birds in an unspecified precinct,<sup>6</sup> while Plutarch speaks of Juno's temple.<sup>7</sup>

The point is, however, that the authors mentioned above agree that the Gauls came up against the geese after having climbed the *saxum Carmentis*, the cliff nearest the Tiber.<sup>8</sup> Dionysius' precinct and Plutarch's temple would thus have been situated far enough from the Arx to rule out any connection between the birds and the temple of Iuno Moneta. The same can be said of the earliest version of Manlius' exploits we hear of, which has the Gauls ascend the Capitol through the *cuniculi Gallici*, water-tunnels that

1. Livy 6.20.13, 7.28.6, Plut. *Cam.* 36.9, Diod. 15.35.3, *De Vir. Ill.* 24.6, Ov. *Fast.* 6.185.

2. Plut. *Rom.* 20.5, Solin. 1.21.

3. S. B. Platner and T. Ashby, *A Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome* (Oxford, 1929), p. 289; G. Becatti, "Un rilievo con le oche Capitoline e la Basilica di Ostia," *Bullettino Comunale* 71 (1943–45): 31–46, esp. 31–36; G. Giannelli, "Il tempio di Giunone Moneta e la casa di M. Manlio Capitolino," *Bullettino Comunale* 87 (1980–81): 7–36, esp. 8–10; F. Coarelli, *Il Foro Romano II. Periodo repubblicano e augusteo* (Roma, 1985), p. 82. See also N. Horsfall, "From History to Legend. M. Manlius and the Geese," *CJ* 76 (1980–81): 298–311, who, though sceptical about this tradition, admits that "the geese are at the heart of the matter" (p. 308).

4. For modern discussion of the siege of the Capitol in the extant tradition, see T. P. Wiseman, "Topography and Rhetoric: the Trial of Manlius," *Historia* 28 (1979): 32–50; Horsfall, "History," *passim*.

5. Diod. 14.116.6, Livy 5.47.2–4.

6. Dion. Hal. 13.7.3 ἱεροὶ δὲ τινες Ἦρας χῆνες ἐν τῷ τεμένει.

7. Plut. *Cam.* 27.2 ἀλλὰ χῆνες ἦσαν ἱεροὶ περὶ τὸν νεὼν τῆς Ἦρας.

8. Diod. 14.116.4–6 (without mentioning the name of the cliff), Livy 5.46.8–9, 5.47.2, Plut. *Cam.* 25.3, 26.2. See Gell. *NA* 17.2.24 (= Claud., frag. 4 Peter).

led them directly to the temple of Jupiter.<sup>9</sup> In both these versions Juno's geese make topographic sense only if related to the precinct of the Capitoline Triad, certainly dedicated well before 390, in 508/7.

The story of Manlius and the geese can support the view that Juno's cult on the Arx preceded L. Camillus' dictatorship only if the scene of the Gauls' assault is located in the neighborhood of the temple of Iuno Moneta. Now, Ennius, our earliest source, actually sends the invaders against the Arx; but in his version the Gauls apparently captured the Capitol, thus leaving no place for Juno's geese and Manlius' miraculous intervention.<sup>10</sup> The geese and the hapless hero appear on the Arx in Vergil's description of Aeneas' shield;<sup>11</sup> until very recently this was the only passage in the literary sources that could legitimately be quoted in support of the view under discussion. Then, in an article published in 1979, T. P. Wiseman demonstrated that the *rupes Tarpeia* was the southeastern cliff of the Arx overlooking the Forum.<sup>12</sup> Since Livy and Plutarch, while describing Manlius' trial and death, have him hurled from the Tarpeian Rock<sup>13</sup> and add: "locusque idem uno homine et eximiae gloriae monumentum et poenae ultimae fuit," and τὸν αὐτὸν τόπον ἔσχε καὶ τὸν εὐτυχιστάτων ἔργων καὶ τῶν μεγίστων ἀτυχημάτων μνημεῖον,<sup>14</sup> the *rupes Tarpeia* variant ostensibly provides the proof for locating Manlius and the geese (and so, an archaic shrine of Juno as well) on the Arx.<sup>15</sup>

However, in the same article Wiseman also demonstrated that, in the web of fabrications that make up the story in question, the Tarpeian Rock as the scene of Manlius' exploit is a very late development;<sup>16</sup> what is more, this location is but a side effect of a drastic revision of the tradition about the hero's trial and death.<sup>17</sup> Sometime in the first half of the first century a new version of the story emerged, in which Manlius met his death by being hurled from the *rupes Tarpeia*. Once this rock appeared in the story, it became the scene of the Gauls' attack as well,<sup>18</sup> making it possible to achieve the dramatic moral of the *locus idem* / αὐτὸς τόπος conclusion of the hero's vicissitudes. It is significant, though, that in Livy and Plutarch the new version imposed itself only in the sections dealing

9. Cic. *Caecin.* 88, *Phil.* 3.20, Serv. *ad Aen.* 8.652, Lydus *Mens.* 4.114, see *Mag.* 1.50.

10. Enn. *Ann.* 7.227–28 Skutsch (5.164 Vahlen [= *Macrob. Sat.* 1.4.17]). See O. Skutsch, "The Fall of the Capitol," *JRS* 43 (1953): 77–78 (= *Studia Enniana* [London, 1968], pp. 138–42); idem, "The Fall of the Capitol Again," *JRS* 68 (1978): 93–94; Horsfall, "History," pp. 298–305. Skutsch upholds this view in his edition of *Annales*; see his *The "Annals" of Q. Ennius* (Oxford, 1985), p. 16 (contra T. J. Cornell, "The *Annals* of Quintus Ennius," *JRS* 76 [1986]: 247–48).

11. Verg. *Aen.* 8.652–58; see Serv. *ad loc.*

12. Wiseman, "Topography," pp. 41–45. The location of the *rupes Tarpeia* is one of the erudite questions apparently doomed to be solved anew by each successive generation of scholars. The correct position of the rock, already indicated by E. Pais, *Ancient Legends of Roman History* (New York, 1905), pp. 109–27, and P. Grimal, "Notes sur Properce. II: César et la légende de Tarpeia," *REL* 29 (1951): 201–14 (= *Rome: La littérature et l'histoire*, vol. 1, Collection EFR 93 [Rome, 1986], pp. 437–49), has now been rediscovered by Wiseman and corroborated, with different evidence, by Coarelli, *Foro II*, pp. 80–87.

13. Livy 6.20.12, 7.10.3, Plut. *Cam.* 36.8.

14. Livy 6.20.12, Plut. *Cam.* 36.8. See also Cass. Dio, frag. 26.2.

15. Thus Giannelli, "Tempio di Moneta," pp. 8–10.

16. Wiseman, "Topography," pp. 37–40.

17. *Ibid.*, pp. 45–49.

18. Livy 6.17.4.

with Manlius' *sedition*. In their accounts of the siege of the Capitol, the Gauls climb the *saxum Carmentis*; only when it comes to Manlius' execution do the two authors have him thrown from the *rupes Tarpeia* and add that the same place witnessed both his magnificent deed and ignoble death. It is precisely this apparent schizophrenia of Livy, our most knowledgeable source, that misled generations of scholars into taking the Tarpeian Rock for a part of Carmentis' Cliff.<sup>19</sup>

Wiseman's brilliant analysis has been of decisive importance to the *Quellenforschung* of the story. It has demonstrated that Vergil's version belongs to the same tradition as the one Livy followed in his account of Manlius' end. One might add the same with regard to the Ostia relief showing agitated geese in front of a temple.<sup>20</sup> This relief has been recognized by some scholars as an independent argument in favor of the story's authenticity in general and its placement on the Arx in particular.<sup>21</sup> But it is difficult to treat the relief (dating from Hadrian's reign) as anything more than an illustration of Vergil. All our literary evidence pointing to the neighborhood of the temple of Iuno Moneta as the scene of the story of Manlius and the geese can thus be traced back to a fabrication by some first-century writer: as such, it is worthless.

2. Archaeological evidence. Even without Wiseman's criticism, the story of the Capitoline geese, that most suspect element of the last quasi-mythical event in Rome's history, always lacked the stature of a decisive piece of evidence. It is archaeology that ostensibly provides objective, solid proof for the antiquity of Juno's cult on the Arx. Excavations of 1876 and 1931 in the Aracoeli garden revealed vestiges of a large structure of Fidenae tufa superimposed on a smaller structure of cappellaccio.<sup>22</sup> The dimensions of the former (29.6 m. × 20 m.) are those of a major temple and its building material provides the year 426—the date of the conquest of Fidenae—as the *terminus post quem* of its construction. Together with the general location of the site these indications suffice to identify the structure with the temple of Iuno Moneta.

There remains the question of the structure of cappellaccio. In 1876 two terracottas were found in the Aracoeli garden, an antefix in the form of a female head, probably of a maenad, dated to the turn of the sixth century,<sup>23</sup>

19. Wiseman, "Topography," pp. 41–42.

20. See Becatti, "Rilievo," passim.

21. Becatti, "Rilievo," pp. 35–38, who went so far as to try to reconstruct on its basis the architecture of Moneta's temple; see also Coarelli, *Foro II*, p. 82. Even G. De Sanctis, *Storia dei Romani*<sup>2</sup> (Firenze, 1953–68), who first qualified the whole story of Manlius and the geese as "un mito etiologico" (2:174), changed his mind under the influence of this relief and admitted a possibility of the existence on the Arx of a shrine of Juno preceding Camillus' temple (4.2.1:141, n. 52). According to Horsfall, "History," p. 309, "there is no reason whatsoever to suppose that this [the building shown on the relief] must have been the temple of Iuno Moneta, and no evidence to guide us in establishing what temple the artist may have had in mind." I am pretty sure that the temple the artist had in mind was that of Iuno Moneta, but I fail to see why this should be of any relevance to the question whether five hundred years before there had existed on the Arx a temple of the goddess.

22. See now G. Giannelli, "La leggenda dei 'Mirabilia' e l'antica topografia dell'Arce Capitolina," *StudRom* 26 (1978): 60–71, esp. 63–66.

23. E. Gjerstad, *Early Rome*, AIRRS 4°, vol. 17.3 (Lund, 1960), pp. 204–5, vol. 17.4 (Lund, 1966), pp. 464–65; Giannelli, "Tempio di Moneta," p. 17, n. 54.

and a head of uncertain sex, possibly a part of an acroterial statue somewhat reminiscent of Apollo of Veii, dated to the first half of the fifth century.<sup>24</sup> These finds are sometimes adduced as evidence for identifying the structure of cappellaccio with an archaic temple of Juno.<sup>25</sup>

This argument begs a comment. First, it is based on an unexpressed premiss that terracotta decorations necessarily imply the sacred character of the edifice. Although recent excavations have disproved this old dogma,<sup>26</sup> let us, for the argument's sake, accept it as it stands. The syllogism would then run as follows: architectural terracottas were found, almost certainly belonging to the structure of cappellaccio; terracotta decorations point to sacred edifices; therefore, the structure of cappellaccio was a sacred edifice. Yet in order to identify it with a temple of Juno a further assumption is needed, namely that the building on whose site a shrine of a deity was built had necessarily been dedicated to the same deity. This, however, stands in open contradiction with our literary sources, which unanimously locate the temple of Iuno Moneta on the site of a house, even though they differ on whose house it actually was.

This contradiction has been squarely faced by G. Giannelli, whose argument runs as follows.<sup>27</sup> The archaic temple of Juno on the Arx (the structure of cappellaccio), emptied, like other Roman temples, of its *sacra* in the wake of the Allia disaster, was used, on account of its dominating position, as the post of M. Manlius, the commander of the Capitol.<sup>28</sup> After Manlius' exploit other defenders would have spontaneously agreed to give him as his own the edifice from which he had conducted the defence so felicitously. The senate's decision in 345 would thus have restored to Juno her old sacred precinct that, deconsecrated in 390, had become the house of M. Manlius and after his death in 384 remained unoccupied for forty years.

Giannelli's argument is indefensible. First, he follows the worthless account of *De Viris Illustribus* regarding the manner in which Manlius acquired both his house—*domum etiam in Capitolio publice accepit* (*De Vir. Ill.* 24.5)—and his surname—*Manlius ob defensum Capitolium Capitolinus dictus* (*De Vir. Ill.* 24.1); this *aition* is also hinted at by Livy, though in a way that easily betrays its rhetorical origin: *et quem prope caelestem, cognomine certe Capitolino Iovi parem fecerint*.<sup>29</sup> This version, rightly rated as "aberrante" by J. Bayet,<sup>30</sup> is negated by the simple fact that the surname *Capitolinus*, i.e., someone living on the Capitol, is known to have been used

24. M. A. Lucia, "Una testa fittile arcaica dall'Aracoeli," *BollClass* 86 (1978–79): 7–15.

25. Giannelli, "Tempio di Giunone," p. 17; F. Coarelli, *Il Foro Romano I. Periodo arcaico* (Roma, 1983), p. 104.

26. F. E. Brown, "La protostoria della Regia," *RPAA* 47 (1974–75): 15–36, esp. 35–36; M. Torelli, ed., *Case e palazzi d'Etruria* (Milano, 1985), p. 21. See now M. Menichetti, "Le aristocrazie tirreniche: aspetti iconografici" in *Storia di Roma. I: Roma in Italia* (Torino, 1988), pp. 75–124 (ills. 39–46).

27. Giannelli, "Tempio di Moneta," pp. 24–31.

28. Of all the extant tradition, only Lydus *Mag.* 1.50 and Verg. *Aen.* 8.652 (with Serv. ad loc.) make M. Manlius the commander of the Capitol. See Wiseman, "Topography," pp. 39–40.

29. Livy 6.17.5. See also Plut. *Cam.* 36.2.

30. J. Bayet, *Tite-Live. "Histoire Romaine."* *Livre VI, Les Belles Lettres* (Paris, 1966), ad loc.

by the Manlii since at least 434; both brothers or cousins of M. Manlius bore it, as did their more distant relatives of the Vulso branch of the *gens*.<sup>31</sup>

Further weaknesses of Giannelli's proposal are his failure to account for Manlius' house being shifted around in our literary sources exactly as is the site of the hero's great deed<sup>32</sup> and his inability to explain how, in Republican Rome, a *locus sacer* could ever become private property. But the biggest flaw in Giannelli's reasoning is the very attempt to reconcile two rival, irreconcilable positions. The temple vowed by L. Camillus could have occupied the site of an archaic shrine or that of a house; it could not have occupied both.

As for the house variant, the *domus Manlii* is, of course, to be discarded, like the rest of Manlius' legend. There remains the house attributed by the antiquarian tradition to T. Tatius. Whatever the historical reality behind the tradition of separate abodes of individual kings scattered throughout the City may have been, in the last century of the Republic there existed a category of sacred places considered, rightly or wrongly, to be the sites of the houses of the kings. In our case the tradition may even be right considering that the Arx, that most inaccessible place in Rome, was a perfect natural stronghold. The name of T. Tatius, credited with having incorporated the Capitol into the City, is obviously of no consequence, but, for example, the Vulcentan condottieri of the sixth century would no doubt have felt more secure on the Arx than in the open Forum. It may not be a coincidence that our tradition links the very name of the Capitol with one of these usurpers, Aulus Vibenna.<sup>33</sup>

We are thus left with an archaic temple of Juno and a place of the royal abode as possible predecessors of Camillus' temple. Both these possibilities go together well with the structure of cappellaccio and architectural terracottas of the Aracoeli garden. It does not follow, however, that both are equally plausible, considering that whereas the royal domicile option finds some support in literary sources, that of the temple of Juno finds none. Therefore, the burden of the proof lies on the shoulders of the defenders of the latter view. What is more, while making their case they should drop the story of Manlius and the geese altogether and support the inconclusive archaeological evidence with extra arguments of a different nature.

3. Epigraphic evidence. Ostensibly, such an argument is provided by epigraphic evidence. According to some scholars, the existence on the Arx of a shrine of Juno preceding Camillus' temple is implied by two feasts of

31. See relevant entries in *Real-Encyclopädie* and T. R. S. Broughton, *The Magistrates of the Roman Republic* (New York, 1950–51).

32. Cicero apparently located Manlius' house *inter duos lucos*, i.e., on the saddle between the Capitol proper and the Arx (*Dom. 101 eius domum eversam duobus lucis convestitam videtis*); see Lydus, another representative of the *cuniculi Gallici* tradition, who says that Manlius was awakened by the geese because he lived nearby (*Mag. 1.50*). Giannelli's attempt to prove at all costs that the temple's placement by Cicero and by Ovid's *in summa arce* (above, p. 207) referred to one and the same site (Giannelli, "Tempio di Moneta," pp. 8–10) is, needless to say, unacceptable.

33. A. Alföldi, *Early Rome and the Latins* (Ann Arbor, 1965), pp. 217–18; R. Thomsen, *King Servius Tullius* (Copenhagen, 1980), pp. 67–114; F. Coarelli, "Le pitture della Tomba François a Vulci: una proposta di lettura," *DossArch* 3 ser. 1 (1983): 43–69.

Iuno Moneta in the Roman calendar. The finding of the *Fasti Antiates Maiores*, which under 10 October mention a feast *Iunon(i) Mon(etae)*,<sup>34</sup> corroborated the reading *Iunoni M[on(etae)]* in the *Fasti Sabini* for that day<sup>35</sup> and decisively proved that there was a feast to Iuno Moneta distinct from that of 1 June, which is mentioned not only in the calendars but also by Ovid and Macrobius.<sup>36</sup> According to G. Mancini, the first editor of the *Fasti Antiates Maiores*, the 1 June entry is related to an archaic *ara* or *sacellum* of Iuno that, after the synoecism, would have replaced the *regia* of Sabine kings of the Capitol and the Quirinal.<sup>37</sup> This shrine would in turn have been superseded in 345/4 by Camillus' temple, dedicated on 10 October and located on the site of the house of M. Manlius.<sup>38</sup>

This hypothesis is obviously mistaken in that Ovid leaves no doubt that 1 June was the *dies natalis* of Camillus' temple.<sup>39</sup> Secondly, in Mancini's reconstruction Iuno holds the rank of the patron deity of the newly united polity, a sort of Roman Athena Polias,<sup>40</sup> whereas in Rome this role was reserved for Jupiter alone.<sup>41</sup> Last but not least, Mancini treats Camillus' temple and the presumed archaic shrine as distinct edifices, located on different sites though close to one another. Actually, his seems to be the only way to save the double tradition about the predecessor of Camillus' temple, but the price is unacceptably high. Relevant passages in Plutarch, *Vita Romuli* 20.5 (~Ωικει δὲ Τάτιος μὲν ὅπου νῦν ὁ τῆς Μονήτης ναὸς ἔστι) and Solinus 1.21 (*Tatius in arce ubi nunc est Iunonis Monetae*) make it obvious that they and the partisans of the *domus Manlii* tradition speak of the same site and the same sacred edifice. For these reasons, Mancini's proposal failed to elicit favorable response in the scholarly world.

The majority view is that both entries refer to the single temple on the Arx. The two feasts to Iuno Moneta are explained either as an indication that before the end of the Republic Camillus' temple was rededicated on a different day<sup>42</sup> or that his foundation was a restoration followed by a rededication of an archaic temple of Iuno.<sup>43</sup> These explanations, however, raise a truly insurmountable difficulty that Mancini's proposal, for all its defects, managed to avoid: namely, how the original dedication day could be retained in the calendars if superseded by a rededication. Roman temples had only one dedication feast, one *dies natalis*; in the case of temples

34. *Inscr. Ital.* 13.2:20.

35. *Ibid.* 13.2:53.

36. *Ibid.* 13.2:12 (*Fasti Antiates Maiores*), 13.2:58 (*Fasti Venusini*), *Ov. Fast.* 6.1–196, *Macrobius Sat.* 1.12.30.

37. G. Mancini in *NSA* 1921, pp. 97–98, where he adopts the view first put forward by O. Gilbert, *Geschichte und Topographie der Stadt Rom in Altertum*, vol. 1 (Leipzig, 1883), pp. 333–34, which makes Iuno the patroness of the synoecism that had given birth to Rome.

38. Mancini in *NSA* 1921, pp. 98 and 115.

39. A. Degraffi in *Inscr. Ital.* 13.2:463–64.

40. Thus also, K. Latte, *Römische Religionsgeschichte* (München, 1960), p. 168.

41. Iuno only participated in Jupiter's poliadic cult in the capacity of his consort, as Iuno Regina (G. Dury-Moyaers and M. Renard, "Travaux relatifs au culte de Junon," in *ANRW* 2.17.1 [Berlin–New York, 1981], pp. 142–202, esp. 168–76) and not Moneta, whatever the etymology and meaning of the latter surname may have been (see below, n. 51).

42. Degraffi in *Inscr. Ital.* 13.2:463–64, 519. See also De Sanctis, *Storia*, 4.2.1:141, nn. 52, 53.

43. Becatti, "Rilievo," pp. 31–36. See also Coarelli, *Foro I*, p. 101.

dedicated more than once, the calendars record, obviously enough, the anniversary of the last dedication. The feast of 10 October, mentioned in the calendar that also records that of 1 June (*Fasti Antiates Maiores*), simply could not refer to the temple on the Arx.<sup>44</sup> And since 10 October as such was of no importance for the cult of Juno, that day's entries in the *Fasti Antiates Maiores* and the *Fasti Sabini* can only be interpreted as the *dies natalis* of another temple of Iuno Moneta elsewhere in Rome.<sup>45</sup> The possible objection that we do not hear of any temple of this particular manifestation of Juno except Camillus' foundation on the Arx would be of little weight considering how scarce our evidence is. For example, the temples of Iuno Curritis and Tiberinus are also known exclusively from the calendars; one might add that the *dies natales* of all these temples fell in the second half of the year, not covered by Ovid's *Fasti*. The existence of two temples of Iuno Moneta in Rome is not disturbing in the least either: we know of several other pairs of this kind, all founded during the Republic, dedicated to Iuppiter Stator, Iuno Regina, Venus Erycina, Fortuna Publica, Hercules Victor, etc.

This last question is, however, marginal to this paper. What matters is that the view that the two feasts of Iuno Moneta in the calendars refer to two dedications of the single shrine is impossible *per se* and, as an argument for the antiquity of Juno's cult on the Arx, desperate and fanciful.

## II. IUNO MONETA AND THE AUGURACULUM

As mentioned earlier, the consequence of pushing Juno's worship on the Arx back to the Archaic age—making her copatroness of the *auspicia publica* and so of the Auguraculum as well—can reappear as evidence both for early dating of her cult and locating the Auguraculum.<sup>46</sup> The literary basis for this is a passage in Servius Auctus: "Iuno . . . in libris augurum praeesse dicitur auspiciis" (*ad Aen.* 4.45). Archaeologically, the claim is based on the identification of the Auguraculum with the rectangular space southeast of the presumed temple of Iuno Moneta, bounded on the north-west by the temple's wall and on other sides by an enclosure of cappellaccio, still partly visible in the Aracoeli garden.<sup>47</sup> In this proposal, the Auguraculum would thus have been an extension of the temple of Iuno

44. Considering that in the *Fasti Antiates Maiores* the 1 June entry is almost fully restored one might argue that it named a feast to a different deity, which would leave us with the 10 October entry as the *dies natalis* of Camillus' temple of Iuno Moneta. The 1 June entry in the *Fasti Venusini* would then stand for an early Augustan rededication, otherwise unattested; as for the contemporary *Fasti Sabini*, which mention the feast to Iuno Moneta under 10 October, they would not have been up-to-date. This, however, is impossible. First, the temple of Iuno Moneta, if rededicated by Augustus, would have been mentioned in the *Res gestae*, which it is not. Secondly, Ovid unequivocally states that 1 June was the dedication day of Camillus' temple. Thirdly, even without Ovid's testimony, the Kalends of June, Juno's day of Juno's month, were clearly the *dies natalis* of Camillus' temple of Iuno Moneta (Degrassi in *Inscr. Ital.* 13.2:463–64); it is worth noticing that the other two great fourth-century temples of Juno were dedicated on Kalends, too, one indisputably (that of Iuno Lucina in 375, see Degrassi in *Inscr. Ital.* 13.2:418) and the other almost certainly (that of Iuno Regina in 392, see Degrassi in *Inscr. Ital.* 13.2:505).

45. See A. Ziolkowski, *The Temples of Mid-Republican Rome and Their Historical and Topographical Context* (Roma, 1992), pp. 73–75.

46. Giannelli, "Tempio di Moneta," pp. 19–23; Coarelli, *Foro I*, p. 101.

47. On that structure, see A. M. Colini, "Il Colle Capitolino nell'antichità," *Capitolium* 40 (1965): 175–85; Giannelli, "Leggenda," pp. 63–66; Coarelli, *Foro I*, pp. 104–7.



Moneta, orientated like the temple itself, to the southeast,<sup>48</sup> i.e., in the direction of the *mons Albanus*. As observed by L. Richardson, the longest view from the Arx is to the southeast and it is precisely Monte Cavo that closes it.<sup>49</sup> This led him to recognize the axis of the augurs' *prospectus* in the line that runs from the Arx along the course of the Sacra Via through the Forum and the saddle between the Velia and the Palatine, then rises to the summit of the Caelian, beyond which looms the *mons Albanus*, the seat of Jupiter, the god of the augurs.<sup>50</sup> The position of the temple of Iuno Moneta at the very beginning of that axis would not, then, be fortuitous; A. Grandazzi explains the surname *Moneta* as "celle qui avertit l'augure."<sup>51</sup> This would indicate that Iuno had been on the Arx as long as the augurs, certainly long before 345.<sup>52</sup>

All this reasoning is not convincing. Richardson's observation, though interesting, is not really relevant. First, we do not hear of any links between Roman augural science and Iuppiter Latiaris. Secondly, Richardson and his followers think that in Roman ritual the augur's field of vision and the *partes* thereof were determined not by cardinal points but by topography.<sup>53</sup> Yet Livy implies that the augur looked east and not towards any particular topographic point.<sup>54</sup> This is supported by the few fragments of the augural lore that have come down to us<sup>55</sup> and by the rigorously astronomical orientation of the only securely identified *templum augurale*, discovered by M. Torelli at Bantia.<sup>56</sup>

Two arguments ostensibly favor Richardson's proposal. One is an event from the beginning of the first century: the demolition on the Caelian, by

48. Giannelli, "Tempio di Moneta," p. 19; Coarelli, *Foro I*, pp. 106–7; A. Grandazzi, "Le roi et l'augure: 'auguracula' de Rome," in *La divination étrusco-italique, Caesarodunum* 3 (1986), pp. 122–50, esp. pp. 125, 137–38.

49. L. Richardson, Jr., "Honos et Virtus and the Sacra Via," *AJA* 82 (1978): 240–46, esp. 241.

50. Richardson, "Honos et Virtus," p. 241; Coarelli, *Foro I*, pp. 100–103; Grandazzi, "Roi et augure," pp. 122–23.

51. Grandazzi, "Roi et augure," p. 138. On the meaning of *Moneta*, see esp. A. Ernout and A. Meillet, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine*<sup>3</sup> (Paris, 1951), pp. 731–32; Dury-Moyaers and Renard, "Travaux," pp. 165–67; J. Linderski, "The 'Libri Reconditi,'" *HSCP* 89 (1985): 207–34, esp. p. 213 and n. 34.

52. Another presumed link between the Auguraculum and Iuno (and her geese as well) is a bizarre suggestion by R. M. Ogilvie, *A Commentary on Livy: Books 1–5* (Oxford, 1965), p. 734, followed by Giannelli, "Tempio di Moneta," p. 23, that geese were kept in the Auguraculum for *auspicia ex tripudiis*, though we do not hear of any auspices held in the Auguraculum except those *ex avibus*, see J. Linderski, "The Augural Law," *ANRW* 2.16.3 (Berlin–New York, 1986), pp. 2146–312, esp. pp. 2269–71. J. Gagé, *Matronalia: Essai sur les dévotions et les organisations culturelles des femmes dans l'ancienne Rome*, Coll. Latomus 60 (Bruxelles, 1963), p. 207–9, having satisfied himself that it is Livy who informs us that the salutary geese were dedicated to Iuno Moneta (!), ponders the significance of the birds' presence close to the Auguraculum and ends up fancying a hitherto unknown technique of *auguria* from the geese's *clangor* and *alarum crepitus*. Against all these oddities it is well to cite Servius: "Manlius . . . clangore anseris excitatus, quem privatus quidam dono Iunoni dederat" (*ad Aen.* 8.652).

53. Richardson, "Honos et Virtus," pp. 240–41; Coarelli, *Foro I*, pp. 100–101.

54. Livy 1.18.6–8. See I. M. Valeyton, "De modis auspicandi Romanorum," *Mnemosyne* 17 (1889): 275–325, 418–52, esp. 282–83. See also A. Magdelain, "L' 'auguraculum' de l' 'arx' à Rome et dans d'autres villes," *REL* 47 (1969): 253–69, esp. 260–62; Linderski, "Augural Law," pp. 2280–87.

55. The relevant texts have been collected and discussed by Valeyton and Linderski, see the preceding note. Richardson, "Honos et Virtus," pp. 240–41, concludes his discussion of the crucial passages in Livy 1.18.6–8 and Varro *Ling.* 7.8 with the following surprising inference: "So that the half field to the south might be 'right' and to the north 'left' the augur must have faced . . . south east." The same inconsistency can be found in Coarelli, *Foro I*, pp. 100–101.

56. M. Torelli, "Un 'templum augurale' d'età repubblicana a Bantia," *RAL* 21 (1966): 293–315; idem, "Contributi al supplemento del *CIL* IX," *RAL* 24 (1969): 39–48.

the order of the augurs, of the upper part of the house of Ti. Claudius Centumalus, which obstructed the taking of auspices.<sup>57</sup> This has been interpreted as Centumalus' house standing on the axis of the augurs' *prospectus*, which would then have passed over the Caelian, as proposed by Richardson.<sup>58</sup> But this inference is unwarranted as well. The *signum contra*, with which the augur divided his field of vision into *laeva* (northern) and *dextra* (southern) parts, lay as far as his eyes could reach—*quoad longissime conspectum oculi ferebant* (Livy 1.18.8)—i.e., on the horizon. Even had the axis of the *prospectus* been orientated to Monte Cavo, Centumalus' house would have never hidden that mountain from the augurs' sight.<sup>59</sup> But what is really important is that the *signum contra* was not a particular topographic point: on a clear day it would have been more distant than on a cloudy or misty one. What was fixed was the border line between the *templum* and the *tescum* in Varro's terminology, identical with the line of pomerium, as shown by Livy's wording: *prospectu in urbem agrumque capto*.<sup>60</sup> It seems that the offending part of Centumalus' house screened one of the markers with which the augurs demarcated the *prospectus in urbem* (*templum*) and the *prospectus in agrum* (*tescum*). If so, then all we know about the place hidden by Centumalus' house is that it lay on the line of pomerium within the augurs' field of vision. But the apparently exceptional nature of the case (we hear of no other occurrence of this kind) suggests a slightly different explanation. As pointed out by Richardson, the augur's field of vision, his head covered by the toga, must have been very limited;<sup>61</sup> but there is another indication to that effect as well. Servius reports that during the ceremony the augur sat motionless (*ad Aen.* 6.197). Considering that he divided both the *templum* and the *tescum* into *laeva* and *dextra* halves (placing the *signum contra* on the horizon served exactly that purpose),<sup>62</sup> the motionless augur had to be able to ascertain whether the observed *avis auguralis* was flying over the *urbs* or the *ager*. This requisite effectively limited his *prospectus* to the relatively narrow cone (no more than eighty degrees in azimuth) over which acuity of vision in depth and in sensitivity to movement remain high enough. A landmark delimiting the southern *regio* of the augurs' field of vision would have lain somewhere on the Caelian: this might explain their resolve to have the upper part of Centumalus' house demolished, since it would have obstructed a marker of highest importance.

The other argument is the position of the presumed *templum augurale* at Cosa, supposedly orientated not to cardinal points but to significant natural features on the horizon.<sup>63</sup> But R. Scott draws my attention to the fact that the so-called "square" of the Cosan citadel, identified by its finders with an

57. Cic. *Off.* 3.66, Val. Max. 8.2.1.

58. Richardson, "Honos et Virtus," p. 241; Coarelli, *Foro I*, p. 103.

59. As admitted by Richardson, "Honos et Virtus," p. 241.

60. Varro *Ling.* 7.8, Livy 1.18.7. On technical questions of *auspicia ex avibus* taken by the augurs, see Linderski, "Augural Law," pp. 2256–96.

61. Richardson, "Honos et Virtus," pp. 240–41.

62. Magdelain, "Auguraculum à Rome," p. 262.

63. F. E. Brown, *Cosa II. The Temples of the Arx. Part I: Architecture*, MAAR 26 (Rome, 1960), pp. 7–147, esp. 9–14, quoted by Richardson, "Honos et Virtus," p. 241, n. 3.

*auguraculum*, deviated only ten degrees from cardinal points. Since so small a deviation falls within the margin of error, the “square” may, after all, have been orientated astronomically.<sup>64</sup> At least as significant, says Scott, is the fact that the north-south axis of the “square” divided the town into two nearly equal parts. Yet even if we emphasize this to the detriment of astronomical orientation, there remains the fundamental question whether the Cosan “square” was an *auguraculum*, i.e., a place from which the augurs regularly took auspices. In the earliest phase of the colony we find a natural crevasse filled with carbonized organic material, most probably remains of a sacrifice of the “first fruit” kind, and, on the same axis, a square, altar-like structure, 7.4 meters to a side.<sup>65</sup> F. E. Brown identified the “square” as both the *auguraculum* and *Cosa quadrata*,<sup>66</sup> but since no structure could at the same time be a *templum augurale* and an altar of the *Roma quadrata* type, we have to choose between the two.<sup>67</sup> F. Castagnoli supported the former possibility<sup>68</sup> but, judging by Bantia, one does not see how technically a sacrifice could be made in an *auguraculum*.<sup>69</sup> What is more important still, the presumed *templum augurale* of Cosa had already disappeared by the middle of the second century, when a big temple—the so-called *Capitolium*—was built on its site, the central cella occupying the exact place of the crevasse.<sup>70</sup> It is extremely unlikely that *auguracula* could be shifted from one place to another. The functions of the original “square” seem to have been taken over by a small structure (3.1 meters to a side), no doubt an altar, in the forecourt of the temple.<sup>71</sup> The orientation of the new altar differed by some 45 degrees from the temple’s axis but followed neither the alignment of the ancient “square” nor the astronomical orientation, as it deviated 23 degrees from cardinal points. In Brown’s words, the orientation of the new altar “simulated that of the buried high place and confronted the auspex with his familiar landmarks.”<sup>72</sup> I think that “simulated” renders marvelously the purpose of the new altar’s builders: they roughly preserved the orientation of the old “square” without,

64. See also F. Castagnoli, “Il tempio romano: questioni di terminologia e di tipologia,” *PBSR* 52 (1984): 3–20, esp. 14.

65. Brown, *Cosa II*, pp. 10–13; idem, *Cosa: the Making of a Roman Town* (Ann Arbor, 1980), pp. 47–48.

66. Brown, *Cosa II*, pp. 13–14.

67. It seems that this point was overlooked by Linderski, “Augural Law,” p. 2260, n. 447, where he first writes of “the ‘square’ on the Arx in Cosa which Brown . . . very felicitously interpreted as the *auguraculum*,” and then adds: “it was a real stroke of genius when Brown recognized the ‘square’ as *Cosa quadrata*. This observation throws more light on the question of *Roma quadrata* than most previous or subsequent discussions.” I wholeheartedly agree with the latter view, I only think that the two opinions quoted above are mutually exclusive. Whatever, and wherever, *Roma quadrata* really was (F. Castagnoli, “Il ‘mundus’ e il rituale della fondazione di Roma,” in *Beiträge zur altitalischen Geistgeschichte. Festschrift Gerhard Radke*, ed. R. Altheim-Stiehl and M. Rosenbach [Münster, 1984], pp. 32–36, seems decisive), it could not be identical with the *templum augurale* on the Arx; the same would have held true in Cosa. As for the slightly less improbable identification of *Roma quadrata* with the enigmatic Auguratorium on the Palatine, the latter could in no case be defined in Brown’s words as “the *templum in terris* established on the bare *tescum* of the height, from which the *templum in caelo* was defined” (Brown, *Cosa II*, p. 14).

68. Castagnoli, “Tempio romano,” p. 14, n. 67.

69. On the *arcanae caerimoniae* performed by the augurs on the Arx (Festus *Gloss. Lat.* 14–15), see Linderski, “Augural Law,” pp. 2254–55.

70. Brown, *Cosa II*, pp. 49–109; idem, *Cosa: Roman Town*, p. 54.

71. Brown, *Cosa II*, p. 48, fig. 28, see for comparison p. 8, fig. 2.

72. *Ibid.*, p. 54.

however, bothering too much about accuracy. This implies ritual continuity between the old place and the new, but rules out augural functions for both. Besides, in the next restoration the altar's orientation was brought into line with the axis of the temple.<sup>73</sup>

Thus there is no reason to identify the "square," and even less so the altar that supplanted it, with the Cosan *auguraculum*. On the other hand, as acutely perceived by Brown, the "square" displays characteristics attributed by our tradition to *Roma quadrata*: the original sacrifice in a crevasse, no doubt connected with the founding of the colony, and the altar-like structure watching over it.<sup>74</sup> Be that as it may, for *auguracula* we are left with literary sources and Bantia, and these imply an eastward orientation of the augurs' *prospectus*. This precludes identifying the enclosure southeast of the temple of Iuno Moneta with the Auguraculum, the latter's most probable position being anyway the highest point on the Arx, somewhere in the eastern part of S. Maria in Aracoeli.<sup>75</sup>

There remains the passage of Servius (*ad Aen.* 4.45), quoted above, that apparently makes Juno the deity presiding over the auspices. It is precisely on this basis that M. Torelli tentatively inferred from one of the *cippi* of the Bantian *templum augurale*, with the name of Flusa inscribed on it, that among the Oscans, whose pantheon had no exact equivalent of Juno, the latter was identified in augural context with Flusa.<sup>76</sup> This view, however, is highly doubtful considering the artificial character of the Bantian *auguraculum*, almost certainly set up after Bantia had become a Roman *municipium*, and as such slavishly imitating Roman augural doctrine of the beginning of the first century.<sup>77</sup> The founders of the Bantian *auguraculum* would never have risked such an innovation as replacing one goddess with another, markedly different in character; they would have imported auspices as a package, including the form of the *templum augurale*, the ritual, and the deities involved in it.<sup>78</sup> Furthermore, the context of the quoted passage makes it obvious that Servius had in mind Juno's role, as Iuno Pronuba, as the patroness of *auspicia matrimonii*.<sup>79</sup> As for the *auspicia publica*, the extant tradition is unequivocal in placing them in the charge of Jupiter alone.<sup>80</sup> What is more, Jupiter is unanimously cited as the sole patron deity

73. *Ibid.*, p. 126, fig. 93.

74. Plut. *Rom.* 11.3, *Ov. Fast.* 4.821–24. See P. Catalano, "Aspetti spaziali del sistema giuridico-religioso romano: Mundus, templum, urbs, ager, Latium, Italia," *ANRW* 2.16.1 (Berlin–New York, 1978), pp. 440–553, esp. 466–68; Castagnoli, "Mundus," *passim*.

75. Castagnoli, "Tempio romano," pp. 14–16 and fig. 6. On the exact position of the summit of the Arx, see Giannelli, "Leggenda," pp. 68–70; *idem*, "Tempio di Moneta," p. 15, n. 47, p. 16, n. 51.

76. Torelli, "Contributi," p. 42, n. 89.

77. Rightly emphasized by Torelli, "Contributi," p. 48; see also Linderski, "Augural Law," p. 2283.

78. I think Torelli hits the mark with his alternative suggestion, when he says that Flusa, identified with Tellus, "rappresenta l'antitesi di Iuppiter sempre in rapporto al percorso dell'astro solare" ("Contributi," p. 42, n. 89).

79. Linderski, "Libri Reconditi," p. 214, n. 36. For an unconvincing attempt to defend the opposite view, see P. Noailles, "Junon, déesse matrimoniale des Romains," in *Festschrift Paul Koschaker*, vol. 1 (Weimar, 1939), pp. 386–400, esp. 393–94.

80. Livy 1.12.4, 18.9, Cic. *Leg.* 2.20, *Div.* 2.72, 78. See I. M. Vaeleton, "De inaugurationibus Romanis caerimoniarum et sacerdotum," *Mnemosyne* 19 (1891): 405–60, esp. 407–9; *idem*, "De templis Romanis," *Mnemosyne* 20 (1892): 338–90, esp. 357–58; Linderski, "Augural Law," p. 2291.

of the Arx,<sup>81</sup> though for a long time the only temple located there was that of Iuno Moneta.<sup>82</sup> This paradox clearly indicates that on the Arx Iuno was a late intruder, settled there no earlier than in 345/4.

If the attempts to push Iuno's presence on the Arx to the times before 345 run into insurmountable difficulties, both the vow made by L. Camillus during the war with the Aurunci and the senate's initiative tally very well with what we know of Roman politics of the day: Camillus' vow, carrying on his family tradition;<sup>83</sup> the deity to whom the vow was addressed;<sup>84</sup> and the great importance the *patres* attached to this foundation, witness the choice of the site right above the Comitium, the directive to build it *pro amplitudine populi Romani*, and the remarkable speed with which the construction was achieved.<sup>85</sup> The Ausonian war was the first step towards the Roman intervention in Campania, but at the same time the internal struggle in the City was gathering momentum with every year. With a foundation to Iuno, whose goodwill had helped Rome destroy her Veientine arch-enemy and miraculously recover from the Gallic disaster, the senate would have sought divine blessing for external expansion; but most of all, the senate would have hoped to rally the mutinous fellow-citizens, who were soon to march on the City sword in hand, around the patrician clique then in power and its plebeian allies.<sup>86</sup> Hence Iuno the Warner.

A final remark. Gainsaying Livy in matters such as temple founding is a very risky proceeding. Not that he is always above reproach, but his errors are more or less obvious lapses, due to inattention, his or his copyists'.<sup>87</sup> Granted, his authority has often been challenged with regard to temples dating from the fourth century. But his silence about the founding of a temple to Concordia in 367 by M. Camillus has been vindicated by A. Momigliano, who demonstrated that this temple originated as an ancient fabrication and was revived through modern misinterpretation of archaeological data and reading into written sources what they do not say.<sup>88</sup> As for Livy's other omission, this time concerning the most authentic

81. Ov. *Fast.* 2.70, 4.635, Serv. *Ad Aen.* 3.20. It is worth noticing that Ovid, when talking of Iuno Moneta, only once omits to mention Jupiter alongside (see above, p. 207); in other cases he emphasizes the goddess' presence on the Arx in the company of her brother consort (*Fast.* 6.18, 33–34, 73–74).

82. The other temple of the Arx, founded in 216, was dedicated to Concordia; see Platner-Ashby, *Dictionary*, pp. 137–38.

83. M. Furius Camillus dict. 396, the conqueror of Veii, had founded through *evocatio* the temple of Iuno Regina; see Platner-Ashby, *Dictionary*, p. 290.

84. Apart from M. Camillus' foundation, in the first half of the fourth century (375), Roman matrons founded the temple of Iuno Lucina, which in the third century became *aedes publica*. See Ziolkowski, *Temples*, pp. 67–71.

85. As far as we know, no Roman temple matched the speed of our temple's construction: dedication the year after the vow.

86. On the near-revolution of 342, see J. Heurgon, *Recherches sur l'histoire et la civilisation de Capoue préromaine des origines à la deuxième guerre punique*, Bibliothèques des Ecoles Françaises d'Athènes et de Rome 154 (Paris, 1942), pp. 245–58.

87. P. Sempronius Sophus as the founder of the temple of Fortuna Primigenia instead of P. Sempronius Tuditanus (Livy 34.53.5, see 29.36.8); muddled account of the founding of two temples of Veiovis (Livy 31.21.12, 34.53.7, 35.41.8).

88. A. Momigliano, "Camillus and Concord," *CQ* 36 (1942): 111–20 (= *Secondo contributo alla storia degli studi classici* [Roma, 1960], pp. 89–104).

temple of Iuno Lucina, whose dedication in 375 is attested in the Varroian tradition,<sup>89</sup> the annalist's silence, substantiated by Verrius Flaccus' report that this temple began as a *sacrum privatum* of Roman matrons,<sup>90</sup> actually confirms his reliability in the matter of temple founding.<sup>91</sup> If Livy's alleged omissions thus turn out to be justified, it would be unsound to reject his evidence for shaky constructs attested by no other sources.

*University of Warsaw*

89. Pliny *HN* 16.235.

90. *Inscr. Ital.* 13.2:121.

91. The only temples known to have been dedicated (or rededicated) under the Republic, in the years covered by Livy's extant text, whose founding is not mentioned by the annalist, were early fifth-century temples of Ceres (493) and Semo Sancus (466).