

**War Priests: The *Fetiales* and Dynamic
Conservatism in Roman Religion**

Luke Peloquin, Bachelor of Ancient History

Department of History and Archaeology

15/12/2022

Macquarie University

Table of Contents

Introduction: Page 5

Chapter One: Page 11

Chapter Two: Page 20

Chapter Three: Page 28

Chapter Four: Page 35

Chapter Five: Page 42

Conclusion: Page 53

Appendix A: Page 56

Appendix B: Page 63

Bibliography: Page 77

Abstract

The *fetiales* of ancient Rome were priests responsible for declaring wars and signing peace treaties. They were an elite college, or group of priests, involved with religion, and government. Despite their important role in Roman society, the *fetiales* require more attention, particularly regarding how their college changed throughout its history. Modern scholars have debated the role of the *fetiales* in the Roman Republic (509-44 BC), but this debate revolves around their origins in a mythologised history and sources written hundreds of years after the actions described, for example by Livy, causing some scholars to question the veracity of these sources and to consider the possibilities of political invention after the death of Julius Caesar. It is notable that although the *fetiales* are mentioned in some sixty Latin inscriptions, scholars have hitherto overlooked the epigraphic evidence in studies of the *fetiales*. These inscriptions date from the Imperial period onwards but they do reveal to us who the *fetiales* were. This dissertation considers the Latin epigraphic evidence in conjunction with literary sources such as Livy, Polybius, and Cicero to bring all the ancient source material to bear in a reconsideration of the *fetiales* in the history of both the Roman republic and the Roman empire. The research clarifies our understanding of one of Rome's most important diplomatic, religious, and political institutions. It paves the way for future studies of other Roman priesthoods or political offices, based on a similar methodology, grounded in epigraphic evidence and taking the debate about the role of Roman priests into the imperial period. The dissertation also demonstrates how the *fetiales* as a priesthood adapted to historical change from performing an important function in preserving peace between the cities of Latium to acting as an advisory body during the later Republic, and finally, a segment of the Imperial aristocracy integrated with the court of the Roman emperor. The dissertation also identifies dynamic conservatism as a strategy that maintained and develop the significance of the *fetiales* across a period of one thousand years.

Statement of Originality

This work has not previously been submitted for a degree or diploma in any university. To the best of my knowledge and belief, the thesis contains no material previously published or written by another person except where due reference is made in the thesis itself.

(Signed)_____

Date: 14/02/2023

Introduction

The Roman college of *fetiales* is best known for its role in the declaration of wars, most notably the war waged by Augustus against Cleopatra and Mark Antony declared in 32 BC outside the Temple of Bellona with the rituals of the *fetiales*. Rome's position as a highly militarised state is well known and understood and it means that the *fetiales* must have played an important role in Roman political and religious life.

But throughout Rome's turbulent history of social and political change, what happened to the *fetial* college? Despite arguments to the contrary, a careful study of the evidence reveals that the *fetiales* originated in the mythic past of Rome's monarchical period. They survived a transition to republican and then imperial government yet their role in later imperial Roman history is understudied. By charting a course throughout the entirety of the college's history this paper will answer the question of how the college managed to endure for so long and how it transformed over that long period from its mythic origins in Rome's earliest history.

Additionally, many questions about the college remain uncertain. Discussion and debate surround the college's origin in Rome's mythical past which can only be accessed through much later sources. The *fetiales'* role in the signing of peace treaties has also often been neglected in favour of their role in the declaration of wars. Some scholars have even gone so far as to suggest that the college disappeared for some time during the late republic when at least some of their duties were taken over by senatorial legati. Much controversy surrounds what would seem to be a subsequent revival under Augustus and the proliferation of sources documenting the college's history from this period onwards. However, all such studies have neglected to assess the role played by the *fetiales* in the later decades of Imperial rule which continued even up to the official adoption of state-Christianity. Each of these significant questions has received some scholarly attention and yet no assessment of the *fetiales* has thus far dealt with each one of these issues together. Rather a great many pieces of individual scholarship have considered one or perhaps two of these questions without considering the history of the college as a whole. This paper then takes on the task of comprehensively assessing the *fetiales*. By examining their entire history ranging from their earliest supposed origins amongst the Latin tribes in Monarchical Rome through the Republic and transition to Empire until finally arriving at the last known references to the college in later Imperial sources. It is a history that spans approximately an entire millennium, but the wide scope is critical to put the *fetiales* in context and understand their history as a whole.

Before embarking on that long history, it is necessary to discuss the nature of the available sources on the *fetial* college. While I will argue that the college's history began ostensibly somewhere around the eighth or seventh centuries BC, the earliest surviving source on the college comes from Polybius' *Histories*, written about five centuries after the college's founding. Polybius himself does not even comment on those earliest days of the *fetiales*. Such commentary comes first from Cicero writing a further century after Polybius. This then is the nature of the source material for the *fetial* college. The overwhelming majority date from long after the college's inception casting significant doubt on their veracity and greatly confusing the questions which any scholar might have regarding the college. Some space must necessarily be dedicated then, to disentangling the complex relationships between the history such sources are presenting, their contemporary contexts and the intervening centuries. These difficulties are well known and Santangelo clearly expressed the divide between scholars who take the sources at face value and those who simply discount much of the literary evidence.¹ This paper does indeed do more of the former than the latter. In seeking to reconstruct the history of the college, it is simply not helpful to dismiss the majority of evidence out of hand. By carefully reading those sources which have been cast into suspicion a picture of how the Romans imagined the college to have functioned will emerge.

The greatest difficulty lies with the possibility of outright fabrication by Augustus, however as the subsequent chapters will show, the evidence does not support this idea. Indeed, the final reference to the *fetial* college comes from Ammianus Marcellinus, writing at the end of the fourth century AD. To provide some indication of the spread of source material which will be used, consider the following; as already mentioned Polybius and Cicero, but also Diodorus Siculus, Varro, Livy, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Ovid, Valerius Maximus, Velleius Paterculus, Pliny the Elder, Plutarch, Festus, Tacitus, Suetonius, Appian, Aulus Gellius, Apuleius Madaurensis, Cassius Dio, Arnobius, Servius and of course Ammianus. But along with all these literary sources also come many epigraphic sources.

The use of inscriptions relating to the *fetial* college has proved controversial in scholarship up to this point. In some cases, it has been misused in other cases underutilised. Their inclusion here will be the most comprehensive assessment thus far. Drawn from the Latin Epigraphy Scraper developed by Brian Balloun-Stanton, Petra Heřmánková and Ray Laurence, a set of sixty-three Latin inscriptions which include any variation of the word '*fetial*' comprise the

¹ Santangelo (2014: 84)

corpus used in this paper. An appendix includes each of those inscriptions which I contend provide useful evidence for the status and composition of the *fetial* college, particularly into the second century AD.

Such are the primary sources that comprise the majority of this study, but important secondary material has of course shaped its direction too. Often Roman religion has been characterised as highly conservative and upon first glance, the history of the *fetiales* would seem to support that assessment. The survival of a religious group for an entire millennium is remarkable and evidence of some sort of extreme instinct towards preservation and conservatism. However, in truth, a close study of the *fetiales* reveals a distinct dynamism and ability to evolve and adapt to the changing circumstances of Rome and Rome's place in the wider world at the time. Religious conservatism only tells half the story, the full telling must be of a sort of Dynamic Conservatism. A sometimes gradual and sometimes rapid shifting of the *fetiales*' role or place in Roman politics and religion, all the while preserving the core of the institution. This "dynamic conservatism" is best understood through the lens of 'invented traditions' put forth by Hobsbawm and Ranger and brought to the discussion of the *fetiales* by Santangelo.² Hobsbawm and Ranger's formulation allows for invented traditions to develop over long periods, organically. This is the sense in which the *fetiales* traditions were invented, as a conservative response to the changing geopolitical landscape in which Rome found itself. Thus, the *fetiales* are characterised by dynamic conservatism, reinventing their traditions to conserve their core religious functions. As alluded to earlier, much discussion of the *fetial* college has centred around their longevity and the authenticity of the sources which record their history. On the more extreme end, scholars such as Saulnier have posited that the history of the college was entirely fabricated by Augustus to lend legitimacy to his declaration of war in 32 BC.³ The tradition of the college then would have been proliferated through subservient historians notably Livy and this goes some way towards explaining the various gaps in the evidence as well as the shifting roles played by the *fetiales*. However, as Hobsbawm and Ranger argue, an invented tradition need not be fabricated out of nothing. The history of the college can be quite reliably traced and consistently so. To the extent that the traditions and rituals of the *fetiales* were invented, it happened gradually rather than at the sudden whim of an individual politician. The twin concepts of dynamic conservatism and invented traditions thereby provide much of

² Hobsbawm (2012: 1-14) and Santangelo (2014: 83)

³ Saulnier (1980: 191)

the theoretical framework to understand the history of the *fetial* college and its evolution over about a thousand years of history, continuity, and disruption.

Before embarking on this analysis of the college's history, it will be worth spending time establishing some of the key terms and concepts associated with them. To begin with, the simple question of where the name *fetiales* derives from. One answer posited by Varro was that the name derived from "*foedus*" in reference to the peace treaties they officiated or to the "*fides*" or honesty of those treaties.⁴ This conjecture is echoed by Servius.⁵ However, an alternative is posited by Festus who instead links the term with Jupiter Feretrius, the aspect of Jupiter whose temple the *fetiales* were associated with.⁶ But consider in turn the etymology of Feretrius. Plutarch considers that it derives from either the Greek "*pheretron*" in which the spoils dedicated to Jupiter Feretrius were carried, from "*ferire*" or "strike" as Jupiter strikes with the thunderbolt or finally from the exhortation "*feri*" also to strike. This term is used in the wording of the *fetial* ritual to officiate treaties recorded in Livy, specifically calling on Jupiter.⁷ In this way, each of the proposed etymologies returns to the same place, drawing a connection between the *fetiales*, Jupiter Feretrius and peace treaties.⁸ Garani draws a distinction between the violent connotations of a soldier striking at an enemy and Jupiter Feretrius striking with his thunderbolt to make a treaty.⁹ This encapsulates the dual nature of the *fetiales* perfectly. The association with treaty-making will be explored fully in the first chapter. But another important term to establish also relates to Jupiter Feretrius. The aforementioned connection between Jupiter Feretrius and the *fetiales* in Festus also notes the "flint stone" or "*silex*" which the *fetiales* used to establish their treaties by ritual sacrifice.¹⁰ The *silex* along with a sceptre "by which they swore" was kept in the temple of Jupiter Feretrius. According to Livy, at least by the end of the Second Punic War (201 BC), there were multiple "*lapides silices*" that could be used.¹¹ The association of the *fetiales* and this temple will be fully examined in chapter four but it is worth noting the particular term *silex* and its association with the *fetiales* at this juncture. Finally, several specific terms are used particularly and in a certain

⁴ Varro, *Ling.* 5.86

⁵ Ser. *Serv. Dan.* 1.62

⁶ Festus, *Gloss. Lat.* 81L

⁷ Livy, 1.24.8

⁸ Springer (1954: 28)

⁹ Garani (2007: 111-112)

¹⁰ Festus, *Gloss. Lat.* 81L

¹¹ Livy, 30.43.9

case exclusively by modern scholars discussing the activities of the *fetiales*, namely the declaration of war. The two major terms are *rerum repetitio* or *res repetere* and *indictio belli* or *bellum indicere*. The confusion alluded to above arises from the fact that *rerum repetitio* and *indictio belli* are inventions of modern scholarship. They are widely used interchangeably with *res repetere* and *bellum indicere*, yet they are not genuine ancient Roman terms.¹² In any case, *res repetere* refers to the demands presented by the *fetiales* to a potential enemy after they had done some injury to Rome. If those demands were rejected, the *fetiales* would then move on to conduct the *bellum indicere*, the actual declaration of war. Again, the process will be examined properly in the first Chapter, at this point it is simply necessary to establish the proper terms.

What will follow in the first chapter is an assessment of the *fetiales* in the earliest periods of Roman history under the monarchy. The chapter will consider the origins of the college and its roles in both the declaration of war and the officiation of peace treaties. This will inevitably deal with the difficulties associated with using the much later Imperial sources for this mythical period of Roman history and it will also make use of one particular inscription naming an ancient Aequian king.

In the second chapter, the discussion will move to the role that the *fetiales* played in policing the behaviour of Roman citizens, to avoid religious pollution falling on the state. This covers much of the early and middle republic using many of the same sources as the first chapter.

The third chapter will consider the problem of the *fetiales*' apparent disappearance from the historical record, largely evidenced in their replacement by senatorial *legati* in the declaration of war. However, as the evidence shows, the *fetiales* took up a permanent advisory role given the senate's increasing power in the middle republic.

This will be followed by an assessment of the supposed revival of the *fetial* college under Augustus and their subsequent rise in prominence and therefore proliferation in the source material. It will consider their role under the Julio-Claudians and bring in significant epigraphic material for the first time which begins to accumulate from this point onwards.

Finally, the fifth chapter will discuss the continuation of the college into the very late empire up to its final disappearance shortly after the Christianisation of Rome. The activities of the

¹² Rich (1976: 57)

college in this period are far better recorded in epigraphy which will comprise the majority of this chapter.

Two appendices have also been included; Appendix A catalogues each incidence of *fetial* activity directly reported in the historical sources in chronological order. It specifically deals with incidents where the source specifies the involvement of *fetiales*, it does not deal with occasions where they may have been involved but are not named in the sources. Appendix B deals with the epigraphic sources and records every inscription including the term '*fetial*' organised by date range where possible to assist in convenient reading.

The summary provided above should reinforce two important characteristics of the *fetial* college. First, their longevity ranges from Rome's mythical past to the rise of Christianity and the conversion of the Empire. But this was achieved primarily by a remarkable capacity to adapt and evolve. Together, these two factors combine to make dynamic conservatism. On the one hand, the *fetial* college survived some one thousand years of history. And yet, they did not do so unchanged, quite the contrary. Indeed, it was because of their ability or willingness to meet the circumstances of the era they found themselves in that the college survived for so long.

Chapter One: Origins and Early History of the *Fetiales*

The history of Rome's early regal period is shrouded in myth and obscurity. Yet it is here that the ancient sources point to for the origin of the *fetial* college. And although their claims are highly contested in the modern scholarship, they bear repetition and scrutiny. Furthermore, it will be necessary to establish from the outset, what specific roles modern scholars have seen the *fetiales* occupying and the duties they were tasked with in their earliest conception, to track the changes which the college underwent over their centuries-long history.

The Origin of the *Fetiales*

The precise origin of the college is rather confused in the sources which survive to us. Particularly in Livy's account, there is a blurred distinction between the institution of the college itself and its role in declaring wars. Recounting the reign of King Tullus, Livy includes the *fetiales* in his narrative without any introduction or explanation.¹³ They take on the role of treaty-makers and the specific position '*pater patratus*' is mentioned. It is he who officiates the oath and sacrifice of a pig with the *silex*. This is not an origin story of the *fetial* college and indeed, Livy does not attempt to offer one. But by the time of Ancus' reign, Livy provides an aetiology for the '*ius fetiale*' by which Livy specifically refers to their procedure of demanding restitution before presenting a declaration of war.¹⁴ Evidently, by Livy's account the *fetial* college itself predated what he calls the '*ius fetiale*'; their role in the formal declaration of war, which was specifically adopted by Tullus from the Aequicoli.¹⁵ To reiterate, Livy does not attempt to explain where or when the college itself first originated but claims they were already present by the reign of Tullus. This would indicate that they originated either under Romulus or Numa and as we shall see below, many other sources point to Numa too. Ogilvie however is sceptical that the formula spoken by the *fetial* in Livy was an authentic one.¹⁶ Ogilvie argues that the vocabulary '*accepimus*' is evidence of an archaising reconstruction. Although Ogilvie does grant that they would have been reconstructed and published earlier, then incorporated by later writers such as Livy. This gets to the heart of a significant piece of evidence against the theory of an entirely fabricated *fetial* college. The rituals and traditions surrounding them must have been pre-existing ones to resonate with their intended audience, the Roman people. Reconstruction is quite different from wholesale fabrication. Yet as Penella points out, earlier

¹³ Livy, 1.24.4-9

¹⁴ Livy, 1.32.5-14

¹⁵ Livy, 1.32.5

¹⁶ Ogilvie (1965: 109-110)

passages of Livy pose yet another significant problem.¹⁷ It appears to backdate the ‘*ius fetiale*’ to the reign of Tullus with the term ‘*res repetendas*’, apparently contradicting the earlier attribution to Ancus.¹⁸ One possibility is that the specific incident was not a *fetial* one. Indeed Livy simply ascribes it to ‘*legati*’.¹⁹ The further detail of the thirty-day grace period which typified the ‘*ius fetiale*’ would seem to complicate this, but it is not beyond the realms of possibility that the ‘*ius fetiale*’ granted to the *fetiales* by Tullus was already a well-developed and organised procedure.²⁰

Most significant, however, is the fact that Cicero, writing long before the establishment of any Augustan narrative also dates the establishment of the college to the regal period. Cicero, somewhat similar to Livy, ascribes the introduction of the college to the reign of Tullus. Cicero recognises the ‘*ius fetiale*’ once again as the practice of formally declaring wars in *De Re Publica*.²¹ Indeed in *De Officiis* he also points out that the purpose of the “*fetial code*” is to regulate interactions with enemy nations, however, he also notes that “many other laws that are binding in common between nations” fulfil the same purpose.²² It is, however, important to recognise that Cicero is not writing an account of history here, in the same way that Livy was. Rather, Cicero’s purpose is a didactic one, to expound the proper workings of Rome’s system of government, as he saw it. Cicero’s attestation of this factual practice will become pertinent in chapter four, that a narrative of the *fetial* college as an extremely ancient institution involved in the declaration of war, predated the reign of Augustus.

Perhaps the most detailed and coherent account of the *fetiales*’ origins survives in Dionysius of Halicarnassus who asserts that Numa instituted the college.²³ But where Livy credits the Latin precursor of the *fetiales* conclusively to the Aequicoli, Dionysius also proposes an alternate possibility, that the city of Ardea initially provided the template for the Roman college. Most interestingly of all, Dionysius cites his source, Gnaeus Gellius although the reference does not survive to us. Thus, we find the earliest reference to the college so far, in second-hand form since Gnaeus Gellius was writing in the latter half of the second century BC, around a century earlier than Cicero. Interestingly, Dionysius also provides some context for Numa’s supposed adoption of the college. Dionysius claims that Numa sought restitution from

¹⁷ Livy, 1.22 and Penella (1987: 234)

¹⁸ Ogilvie (1965: 108)

¹⁹ Livy, 1.22

²⁰ Livy, 1.32

²¹ Cic. *Rep.* 2.17.31

²² Cic. *Off.* 3.107

²³ Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 2.72

Fidenae but did not want to become involved in a war and so, sent the newly appointed *fetiales* to demand that restitution instead.²⁴ Here we see that in the earliest instance, Rome characterised the *fetial* college as one dedicated to the avoidance of war, rather than its propagation.

Plutarch's account adds little more than the ones previously mentioned, once again attributing the college to Numa. What does differ subtly from the aforementioned accounts is the authority which Plutarch ascribes to the priests. Where Livy wrote that the *fetiales* were given orders by the king, Plutarch instead infers that the *fetiales* gave their independent judgement to the King to follow.²⁵ This shade of difference is an important one since it places responsibility for decision-making in entirely different places. Considering the context of Plutarch's time living under an autocratic monarchy, this difference is quite curious. Consider that in Livy's time Augustus was himself a *fetial* priest but not officially a monarch, simply *princeps*. Thus, we might expect him to place power in the hands of the college rather than the king. Conversely, Plutarch writing around the time of Trajan lived under a clear monarchy, where power would be expected to reside with the king or emperor. Instead, we see the exact opposite. This says relatively little about Plutarch or Trajan but is quite revealing of the dynamics under Augustus. Again, there is little evidence of a propaganda campaign by Augustus to co-opt the '*ius fetiale*' to support his power.

Much later and quite unusually Servius provides two contradictory accounts. Early on he states that ten Romans went to the Faliscans and adopted the *ius fetiale* from them along with additions to the Twelve Tables.²⁶ This apparently came from Virgil, but later Servius contradicts it with his own opinion that Ancus adopted the rite from the Aequicoli.²⁷

Each of these sources indicates that the Roman understanding of the origin of the *fetiales* was distinctly confused. Although internally coherent each of the individual accounts contradicts the other. This is not the sort of confusion that we should expect if we are to imagine that Augustus invented the history of the college out of whole cloth. For instance, we receive three possible neighbours of Rome from whom they might have adopted the college, the Aequi, Ardeans or Faliscans with only two of them being a Latin tribe. But from Livy we do get a clear definition of what constitutes the '*ius fetiale*' and it simply refers to the process by which

²⁴ Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 2.72

²⁵ Plut. *Vit. Num.* 12.3

²⁶ Serv. *Ad Aen.* 7.695

²⁷ Serv. *Ad Aen.* 10.14

the *fetiales* were supposed to declare wars. First the demand for redress, ‘*res repetere*’ followed by the actual declaration ‘*indictio belli*’.

The *Fetiales* Amongst the Tribes of Latium

It is important to remember that the *fetiales* were not an exclusively Roman institution, indeed the evidence points to them being a feature of the tribes of Latium and Italy. Livy for one is clear on the matter when he claims that Numa copied the ‘*ius fetiale*’ from the Aequicoli, a claim which is repeated in epigraphic evidence. CIL 6.1302=EDCS-17800460 credits Fictor Resius, king of the Aequicoli with bringing the ‘*ius fetiale*’ to the Roman people.²⁸ The inscription was placed in the Forum of Augustus, completed in 2 BC and thus could have been among the sources Livy used to authenticate his account of the college’s origin. What is important to note, is the readiness of Augustus and his regime to acknowledge the non-Roman pedigree of a college which, as chapter four will show, played such an important political role in his reign. Additionally, of note, is the strong association that occurs in Dionysius’ history between the *fetiales* and the Aequi or Aequicoli. As has been pointed out by Wiedemann, the Latins shared a common religion despite being separate peoples.²⁹ This meant that the *fetiales*; a priesthood of the god Jupiter who was recognised as an authority by Rome as well as the city’s neighbours, provided a common point of arbitration.³⁰ Disputes between the Latin tribes could be peaceably navigated with the intervention of the Tribes’ respective *fetiales*. Dionysius reports two such incidents which were not successfully negotiated but the *fetiales* had to be sent “To declare war against the Aequians unless they expelled the Antiate fugitives from the city and promised satisfaction to the injured”.³¹ And again upon conflict with the Aequians, the *fetiales* were tasked with “calling the gods and lesser divinities to witness that if they were unable to obtain satisfaction, they should be obliged to wage a holy war”. There is a strong association in Dionysius between the Aequians and the *fetiales*. This is both because we can be confident the Aequians had their own *fetial* priests and also because of the later narrative that Rome had adopted the institution from them. Thus, a total of three Augustan sources, Livy, Dionysius and CIL 6.1302=EDCS-17800460 at least make a strong connection between the Aequi and the *fetiales*, while only Dionysius falls short of outright crediting them with the

²⁸ Livy, 1.32

²⁹ Wiedemann (1986: 487)

³⁰ Frank (1912: 342)

³¹ Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. 9.60.6

college's adoption by the Romans. What we do not know for certain is how many *fetiales* each of the different tribes had. Assuming they functioned in the same manner as their Roman counterparts, there must have been at least two, one to play the role of *pater patratus* and another to anoint them in the manner that Livy describes.³² According to Varro, the Romans had twenty *fetiales* available to judge cases of the abuse of foreign envoys.³³ Ogilvie accepts this number too, and the number in each Italic tribe then would likely be somewhere in this range but could have depended on the size of the community.³⁴

Based on these accounts of the origin of the *fetial* college, it is obvious that several different explanations existed by the time of the first centuries BC and AD. Many of them, such as Livy and Cicero's dating of the college to Tullus, share similarities but also differences without explicit contradictions. The suggestion that the college was not formally organised until the reign of Augustus then, is unsupported by this evidence. Clearly, references to the college itself predate the Augustan era and no single clear narrative of the college's origin exists in the sources. We should expect such a narrative if indeed as Saulnier suggests, Augustus invented and propagated a narrative about the college in his reign, however, it is not to be found.³⁵

Functions of the *Fetiales*

Apart from the shrouded origins of the college, it is important to establish exactly what the *fetiales* did at this early stage of their history. Over such a long period, significant changes in the role of the college are to be expected as they adapted to the changing circumstances of Roman society.

Most obviously, the *fetiales* were tasked with declaring wars and it is this aspect of their duties that Cicero dwells upon. As one of our earliest sources for the activities of the college, Cicero closely ties the *fetiales* to the concept of a 'just' war as opposed to an 'unjust' one. Accordingly, it was the responsibility of the *fetiales* to ensure that any wars embarked upon by Rome were formally declared.³⁶ Later in *De Re Publica*, Cicero expanded on this view, adding that a provocation of some sort is also necessary for a just war and that an initial demand of reparation

³² Livy, 1.24.4-9

³³ Non. 850L.

³⁴ Ogilvie (1965: 110)

³⁵ Saulnier (1980: 191)

³⁶ Cic. *Rep.* 17.31

should be offered.³⁷ Thus, Cicero implicitly connects the *fetiales* with the '*ius fetiale*' described above. The fundamentals of their role in demanding reparations and then declaring a just war are reported as we might expect by Cicero.

Writing not very long afterwards, Varro goes on to introduce the *fetiales*' role as peacemakers in addition to their responsibility for just wars. Without providing a specific time frame, Varro wrote that the *fetiales* stopped wars through the establishment of a '*foedus*' which he claimed they also did in his own time.³⁸ Writing as an etymologist, Varro has quite a different purpose than most ancient authors and his association of '*foedus*' with '*fetial*' may be a fanciful one, despite the obvious link between the two words. Regardless, as established in the introduction, his association could only have worked if the *fetiales* were indeed connected with the '*foedus*' and therefore, the conclusion that they were associated with making peace as well as war is a sound one.

As mentioned earlier, Livy provides the earliest detailed account of the activities of the *fetiales*. In Livy's formulation, the *fetial* priest asks the king for permission to make a treaty with his Alban counterpart. Next, the 'sacred herb' is procured from the citadel and used by the *fetial* to anoint another Roman *fetial* '*pater patratus*'. The *pater patratus* then meets with his foreign counterpart, pronounces a long oath which Livy claims is not worth quoting and then officiates the signing of the treaty with the sacrifice of a pig using a *silex*. All of this is repeated in turn by the *fetiales* of the foreign power and indeed, an inscription does exist to a *pater patratus* of the people of Laurentium.³⁹ As noted earlier, Livy's first reference to the *fetiales* ascribes only the conclusion of treaties to their sphere of authority. It is later, during the reign of Numa that Livy claims the '*ius fetiale*' or formal declaration of war was granted to them. Describing the classic '*fetial* rite' Livy says that the *fetial* travels to the enemy border covers his head with a woollen bonnet and recites his demands in the name of Jupiter.⁴⁰ This is repeated when he crosses the border, upon meeting the first man he finds, when he enters the city and again in its marketplace. Livy then recounts a waiting period of thirty-three days before the *fetial* returns to Rome if his demands are not fulfilled. This waiting period as I shall return to has been a matter of some debate. But suffice it to say that according to Livy, the *pater patratus* would then return to Rome and deliver a formulaic address to the King and Fathers who would take a vote on whether or not to go to finally go to war. At last, the *fetial* would return to the enemy's

³⁷ Cic. *Rep.* 17.35

³⁸ Varro, *Ling.* 5.86

³⁹ Livy, 1.24.4-9 and CIL 10.797=EDCS-11400881

⁴⁰ Livy, 1.32.6-14

border with the iconic spear and in front of at least three adult men, he would recite the final official declaration of war, casting the spear into enemy territory. And while Livy recounts the entire ordeal in the past tense clearly in the context of a ritual that was performed in Rome's ancient past, he also maintains that "later generations" also followed the same custom. In contrast, Pliny with an emphasis on Natural History emphasised the role of the "sacred herb" which he called "*verbena*", "a green turf torn up from the citadel with the earth attached to it" in turn he names the *fetial* envoy carrying the *verbena* a "*verbenarius*" counterpart to the more senior *pater patratus* whom the *verbenarius* anoints.⁴¹

Just as he provided the most comprehensive assessment of the college's origins, Dionysius also laid out the fullest and clearest explanation of what the *fetiales* did. However, where Livy recounted in the past tense, Dionysius instead takes the present. It is quite openly an accounting of the *fetiales*' activities in his own time and does not make a claim to be about the distant past. Regardless, Dionysius adds significant duties and detail to their roster which Livy left out. Dionysius specifies for instance, that the *fetiales* concern for just wars only extends to those with whom Rome shared an alliance or treaty. Once again, we see that the ancient sources writing on the *fetial* college are often confused, with little evidence of a clear narrative uniting them. Additionally, Dionysius ascribes the college with the responsibility of extraditing citizens, being aware of crimes committed against ambassadors, observing the religious formalities of treaties, making peace, and ensuring that peace is in accordance with religious laws as well as holding the behaviour of generals to account. This goes beyond the scope of the duties outlined by Livy; however, it should be remembered that at no point does Livy home in on an exhaustive list of the *fetiales*' duties in the way Dionysius does. However, following that list, Dionysius goes on to recount the ritual of declaring war which follows Livy's account rather closely. However, one significant point of difference, as alluded to earlier is found in the timing which Dionysius ascribes to the grace period between the demand of restitution and the return to Rome for a war vote. Where Livy claimed that the *pater patratus* waited thirty-three days, Dionysius instead reports three separate visits and a wait of only thirty days. This has caused some consternation among modern scholars; however, the discrepancy can be resolved.⁴² If Livy is simplifying his account and neglecting to mention the two extra visits by the *pater patratus*, he might reach a total of thirty-three days. Dionysius on the other hand is not counting inclusively when he reaches the number thirty. In short, each of the three times

⁴¹ Plin. *HN* 22.3.10-12

⁴² Weidemann (1986: 479)

that the *fetial* returns and demands restitution is an extra day on top of the ten allocated. In this way, Livy counting inclusively reaches the number thirty-three, but Dionysius counting exclusively only reaches thirty. In actuality, they are both reporting a thirty-three-day wait. One additional point of difference is in the specific recitation used by the *fetiales* to declare war; Dionysius records the following.

“If the Roman commonwealth, having suffered wrongs at the hands of the Samnites and being unable to settle the differences by argument and a decision, should proceed to deeds, may the gods and lesser divinities not only inspire her mind with good counsels but also grant that her undertakings in all her wars may prove successful; but if she herself is guilty of any violation of the oaths of friendship and is trumping up false grounds for hostility, may they prosper neither her counsels nor her undertakings.”⁴³

Whereas from Livy the formula was this.

“Whereas the tribes of the Ancient Latins and men of the Ancient Latins have been guilty of acts and offences against the Roman People of the Quirites; and whereas the Roman People of the Quirites has commanded that war be made on the Ancient Latins, and the Senate of the Roman People has approved, agreed, and voted a war with the Ancient Latins; I therefore and the Roman People declare and make war on the tribes of the Ancient Latins and the men of the Ancient Latins.”⁴⁴

And finally, from Cincius quoted by Aulus Gellius, the formula was rendered as this.

“Whereas the Hermundulan people and the men of the Hermundulan people have made war against the Roman people and have transgressed against them, and whereas the Roman people has ordered war with the Hermundulan people and the men of the Hermundulans, therefore I and the Roman people declare and make war with the Hermundulan people and with the men of the Hermundulans.”⁴⁵

To reiterate, Ogilvie finds Livy’s formula as an exemplar of later reconstruction based on existing legal texts. The pseudo-archaic language such as “*imperitare*” rather than “*imperare*”, but as this paper is establishing, the point is that significant differences in that reconstruction

⁴³ Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 15.9

⁴⁴ Livy, 1.32.13

⁴⁵ Gell. *NA* 16.4

existed.⁴⁶ If we are to imagine that the construction was the work of Augustus, a single man, such differences should not exist. As a much later author, Plutarch presents a view of the *fetiales* not too dissimilar from those above. Plutarch particularly follows Dionysius' lead in emphasising the *fetiales*' role as peacemakers, placing their declaration of war as an afterthought to their part in ensuring that peace is maintained.⁴⁷ There is also yet more insistence on the role played by *fetiales* in extraditing Roman citizens, indeed Plutarch's primary anecdote involving them casts them in that role.⁴⁸

Many of the sources presented thus far date from around or just before the time of Augustus and clearly show that there was no single official narrative about the history of the college. Writers such as Cicero also prove that the college predated Augustus' reign. This is not to say that the rituals of the *fetiales* weren't expanded or appropriated by the first emperor and a discussion of such issues will follow in chapter four. But the sources do agree on certain key points. That the *fetiales* were not formed with all their typical duties ascribed to them at once. Instead, we can see a gradual accrual of increasing responsibility. First for treaty-making and then for the declaration of war. As the subsequent chapters will show, this process of evolution characterised the institution throughout its entire history, coming to represent what I will call dynamic conservatism. The *fetial* college needs no further explanation in a world in which the various tribes of Italy shared a common religion and priesthood. But as will be shown, this did not remain the case.

⁴⁶ Ogilvie (1965: 109)

⁴⁷ Plut. *Vit. Num.* 12.3-6

⁴⁸ Plut. *Vit. Cam.* 18.1

Chapter Two: The Policing of Roman Citizens

Having considered the *fetiales* origin and duties in the Archaic period, this chapter will turn to their activities in the early Republic. Already established in their role as declarants of war and upholders of peace between Latin tribes, the *fetiales* took on new duties to fulfil their religious mandate. While the change to republican government coincided with a change to the *fetiales*, those changes were not a direct result of the new form of government. Following defeats at Caudium (321 BC) and Numantia (136 BC) the *fetiales* were entrusted with surrendering shamed Roman generals to the enemy, highlighting their role in maintaining an accord between the Romans and their gods as well as foreign nations. This gradual adoption of extra responsibilities is indicative of the way that Roman religion evolved slowly rather than maintaining a fossilised version of antique practices as is often imagined. Thus, this chapter will argue that as the *fetiales* met the changing circumstances of the times, they made significant adaptations to Roman religion. With the change of Roman government from a monarchy to a republic, the *fetial* college began to take on several different roles than they had in previous centuries. The ancient sources begin to report the surrender of Roman generals in the early centuries of the Republic. However once again, these sources date from much a later period towards the end of the Republic and at the time of the emergence of the *principate*. Thus, it will be necessary again to untangle the different narrative layers which they weave. A society that distinguishes between just and unjust wars as Cicero delineated them, must come to some procedure that deals with individuals who wage wars unjustly to avoid divine retribution.⁴⁹ Noteworthy is the fact that most of our references to the concept of an unruly and warlike Roman past needing to be remedied by the temperance of the *ius fetiale* come from the Augustan era and onwards, Moskalew draws particular attention to the ambiguities around Caesar's campaigns in Gaul which eventually led to his march on Rome.⁵⁰ And the later references are likely a reflection of the violence of those earlier decades of civil war.⁵¹ For the Romans, this was a religious matter, and it came to be that the *fetiales* were charged with determining the guilt and punishing Roman citizens who violated treaties or otherwise acted dishonourably in dealings with foreign tribes or nations. Another duty that is alluded to by Cicero.⁵²

⁴⁹ Cic. *Rep.* 3.35

⁵⁰ Moskalew (1990: 105)

⁵¹ Livy, 1.32.2 and CIL 6.1302=EDCS-17800460

⁵² Cic. *Verr.* 2.5.49

The Surrender of Roman Generals and Citizens

Consider what Cicero reports in *De officiis*, That only a Roman legally classified as a soldier may fight Roman enemies, “the man who is not legally a soldier has no right to be fighting the foe”.⁵³ What then would happen to a Roman who fought illegally? In Livy’s earliest references to the college, he establishes the formula the *fetiales* used to ratify treaties which calls on Jupiter to “smite the Roman people as I shall here to-day smite this pig”.⁵⁴ But again, how does this accommodate individual Romans acting of their own volition rather than the state as a whole? In the reverse situation, the Romans would send the *fetiales* to demand reparations from an enemy whose citizen violated a treaty or transgressed against Rome. This was established earlier by Livy and discussed in chapter one.⁵⁵ Thus, the Romans eventually came to establish a procedure whereby an individual Roman could be surrendered to the enemy to avoid Jupiter’s retribution falling upon the whole nation. Of course, it was the *fetiales* who were tasked with carrying out and supervising that procedure. Once again, in Livy, we might find the seeds of this idea, since he records that the Samnites were faced with precisely the quandary outlined above.⁵⁶ They resolved to surrender Papius Brutulus who they established was the individual responsible for breaking the truce in addition to the ordinary reparations demanded by the Romans. It was a fairly elegant solution although an unsuccessful one since Livy reports that “the Romans would accept none but the prisoners and such articles of booty as they recognised as theirs; the surrender of all the rest was of no effect.” Contrast this with the report given by Appian wherein the Samnite commander Pontius claims that the Romans often take the arms and money of defeated foes as well as hostages to guarantee peace.⁵⁷ Regardless, the reluctance ascribed by Livy did not stop the Romans from attempting to do the same thing soon after. The incident of the Caudine Forks (321 BC) is of course a notorious one but it is worth pointing out that Livy’s report of it comes a mere six chapters after the incident involving Papius Brutulus. It is a deliberate narrative choice to place these two incidents in such close connection and highlight the progression of Roman custom. Thus, when Postumius is surrendered to the Samnites it is the *fetiales* who lead him to be handed over to the enemy.⁵⁸ Whether this was a

⁵³ Cic. *Off.* 1.37

⁵⁴ Livy, 1.24.8

⁵⁵ Livy, 1.22

⁵⁶ Livy, 8.39.11

⁵⁷ App. *Sam.* 1.8

⁵⁸ Livy, 9.10.2

pre-established practice or the emergence of a new one is unclear, but certainly, it is the first explicit mention of it that can be found.

Returning to Appian's account of the Caudine Forks, another significant detail stands out. As established in the previous chapter, the *fetial* college added a divine guarantee to treaties made between different nations. The Romans adopted this practice in the monarchical period and yet, according to Appian via the speech of the Samnite general Pontius, the Romans explicitly disregarded that oath which was made to Jupiter.⁵⁹ In Livy also, Pontius emphasises that the behaviour of the Romans before the disaster at Caudium would have invoked the wrath of the gods.⁶⁰ Thus we can draw a very clear sequence of events in how the later Romans such as Livy and Appian viewed the '*ius fetiale*'. First, peace existed between Rome and Samnium, when the Romans broke that peace, they incurred the wrath of the gods. The defeat suffered at the Caudine Forks is that wrath coming due, the just retribution the Romans faced for breaking the established treaty. Then, after having been humiliated by passing under the yoke and repaying their divinely incurred debt, Postumius cunningly finds a way to spare Rome from any further judgement by making the peace unilaterally, explicitly without a *fetialis* according to Livy and Appian.⁶¹ Thus, the state is spared any further divinely ordained punishment and only Postumius needs to suffer as an individual for his treachery. This is an example of the '*ius fetiale*' working as the Romans imagined and claimed it would.

Contrast these events with the Numantine episode. Although Livy's account of it exists only in the epitome of book 55, there still exists a contrast in the reporting of the events. In Livy, the *fetiales* are not explicitly mentioned but the peace agreed to by Mancinus is described as "disgraceful".⁶² By ignoring the omens warning him away from waging the war he has personally ignored the will of the gods and therefore suffers for it, although the state as a whole does not. Interestingly, when Velleius Paterculus reports the incident, he makes an explicit connection to the Caudium incident and goes a long way towards excusing Mancinus' actions, contrasting his honourable sense of shame in defeat and subsequent attempt to deliver himself unto the Numantines with Pompey's successful dodging of responsibility.⁶³ These two accounts are separated only by a few decades and yet provide completely different perspectives of the same event. However, writing over a century later, Appian gives the most detailed

⁵⁹ App. *Sam.* 1.9

⁶⁰ Livy, 9.1.11

⁶¹ Livy, 9.5.4-6 and App. *Sam.* 1.9

⁶² Livy, *Epit.* 55

⁶³ Vell. Pat. 2.1.1

account of the incident which survives.⁶⁴ Concurring largely with Livy, Appian too casts Mancinus as a hopeless commander and his conduct as shameful. Interestingly, both Livy and Appian neglect to point out the role played by the *fetiales* in surrendering Mancinus, Appian in particular claims that Furius delivered the shamed general over to the Numantines. Once again it is evident that a central narrative about the *fetiales*' role in Roman history simply did not exist. Rather, we find slightly different accounts which are difficult to reconcile but which point towards an organic development of the college's history and the later memory of it. Had Augustus fabricated the history of the *fetial* college, it would be highly unlikely that only one author mentioned them by name in connection with the events of Numantia which refer to activities that should have been ascribed to them, namely the surrender of Mancinus. From Livy, the omission might be explained due to the relevant passage's survival in epitome, however, from Appian who mentioned the *fetiales* earlier, the omission would be inexplicable if a central narrative was fabricated.⁶⁵ This strongly indicates that no such narrative existed. Valerius Maximus reports an additional incident in which Lucius Minucius and Lucius Manlius were surrendered to the Carthaginian envoys they had "used violence against".⁶⁶ They were surrendered "by Praetor Marcus Claudius through *fetiales*" suggesting the joint action of a magistrate as well as the *fetiales*.⁶⁷ This is echoed by the surrender of Quintus Fabius and Gnaeus Apronius who had assaulted Apollonian envoys leading the senate to "immediately surrendered them through *fetiales* to the envoys and ordered a Quaestor to accompany the latter to Brundisium."⁶⁸ Dio reported on the same incident and doesn't mention the *fetiales* but does indicate that the Apollonians "did him no injury, but actually sent him home".⁶⁹

The Protection of Foreign Envoys

The surrender of Roman generals was not the only additional role the *fetiales* took up in the early years of the Republic. The protection of foreign envoys also became a particular focus of their attention, as Rome engaged in increasingly complex diplomacy with overseas nations. In the previous chapter, Dionysius' elaboration of the *fetiales*' duty to protect foreign envoys was briefly mentioned. Obviously, at this point, it becomes necessary to spend more time with those

⁶⁴ App. *Hisp.* 16.80

⁶⁵ App. *Sam.* 1.9

⁶⁶ Val. Max. 6.6.5

⁶⁷ Val. Max. 6.6.5

⁶⁸ Val. Max. 6.6.3

⁶⁹ Cass. Dio. 10.42.1

remarks. One question for instance which might remain unclear after the previous exploration of the *fetiales* role in surrendering shamed generals is the capacity of the *fetiales* to judge whether a serious transgression had occurred. For although the sources are relatively clear that the *fetiales* were responsible for actually delivering shamed generals, it is less clear who is responsible for passing judgement on particular cases. Just as it was worth establishing who made decisions between the *fetiales* and the monarch, it will also be useful to ask the same question of the republican *fetiales*.

Dionysius is quite clear in his account that the *fetiales* themselves were tasked with determining guilt and innocence on the part of Roman citizens who violated foreign envoys. Significant work in this area has been done by Broughton who carefully elaborated three cases in which the *fetiales* were involved.⁷⁰ Particularly looking at the situation in which Saturninus found himself, having violated the envoys of King Mithridates, there is enough evidence to make some conclusions. Diodorus Siculus who reports the incident in the greatest detail simply states that “He was brought to trial in public,” and names “the senate, his proper judges in such cases” as the group responsible for carrying out the trial.⁷¹ However, much discussion has circulated about the particulars of this body of senatorial judges. Broughton points out that it is generally accepted the senate as a whole did not function as a court until the *principate*.⁷² Suggestions to reconcile this problem have ranged from Gruen hypothesising “an attempt was made to set up a *quaestio extraordinaria* staffed entirely by senators”.⁷³ To Mommsen who believes that the individual senators were probably just *fetiales* themselves acting as the magistrate’s *consilium*.⁷⁴ Based on a collection of sources including Varro, Dionysius and Cicero, Broughton hesitantly comes to agree with Mommsen on a balance of probability.⁷⁵ As will be expounded in the next paragraph, it seems most likely that the senate controlled the decisions of the *fetial* college by restricting their meaningful decision-making to their members who also were senators.

From Cicero we learn that in his ideal conception, the *fetiales* should not only serve as envoys or messengers of war but also “be judges... they shall make the decisions”.⁷⁶ Of course, Cicero is not simply explaining how the Roman state *did* function but rather how he believed it *should*.

⁷⁰ Broughton (1987: 50)

⁷¹ Diod. Sic. 36.15

⁷² Broughton (1987: 56)

⁷³ Gruen (1968: 168-169)

⁷⁴ Mommsen (1871: 2.112)

⁷⁵ Non. 850L and Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 2.72.5 and Broughton (1987: 57)

⁷⁶ Cic. *Leg.* 2.21

However, it is highly unlikely that Cicero would make such a proclamation without some precedent, indicating that the *fetiales* did indeed hold the authority to judge at some point, if not in his own time. This supports Mommsen's notion that the senatorial *fetiales* were acting as a *consilium*. Likewise, Varro quoted by Nonius Marcellus stated that in cases of the mistreatment of envoys "twenty *fetiales*, who are learned in these matters, judged, decided and legislated".⁷⁷ Unlike Cicero, Varro did in fact claim to be reporting how Rome functioned and implies that the *fetiales* as a recognised authority were given rein to make their deliberations, once again lending credence to the idea of a *consilium* composed of *fetiales*. Finally, Dionysius in a very similar vein wrote of the *fetiales*' capacity to "determine whether they have suffered anything in violation of their alliance", referring to Rome's allies.⁷⁸ Each of these three sources places the authority of judging a citizen's behaviour in accordance with religious laws, with the *fetiales*. Therefore, Broughton tepidly comes to agree with Mommsen's suggestion. However, he soon turns to the question of Roman religious conservatism and the likelihood of those established *fetial* duties continuing into the Republic. As has thus far been argued, what the evidence suggests is not a picture of conservative religion involving no changes on the one hand or a simple discarding of established religious practices on the other. Instead, the *fetiales* continually evolved over their history. Thus, it is highly likely that while they may have possessed jurisdiction to judge and condemn independently in the archaic period, by the time of the Republic, they would indeed have functioned as part of a *consilium* in such cases. In practice, this might have happened in 188 BC when two Romans, Lucius Minucius Myrtilus and Lucius Manlius were charged with assaulting Carthaginian ambassadors in Rome. Livy reports that the pair were surrendered to them by the *fetiales* and then taken to Carthage, but their ultimate fate remains mysterious.⁷⁹

Since each of these sources ascribes the *fetiales* with some capacity to 'judge' rather than simply to advise we can conclude that the college was invested with significant authority over the behaviour of fellow Romans. Once again, however, it is important to note the time in which these particular sources were written. All three date from between 51 BC and 7 BC with Cicero's account being the oldest and Dionysius' the latest. Thus, we are receiving from them a view of what late Republican and early Imperial authors thought the proper function of the college was. Therefore, the answer to the previous question of whether the Republican *fetiales* were responsible for making independent decisions or simply carrying out the orders of other

⁷⁷ Non. 850L.

⁷⁸ Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 2.72.5

⁷⁹ Livy, 38.42 and Val. Max. 6.6.3

magistrates and government bodies is a mixture of the two. The *fetiales* might render their judgement as part of a *consilium*, however, they did not get to make rulings independently. On the one hand, the *fetiales* had the prerogative to judge a Roman citizen's guilt or innocence in infringing on foreign ambassadors. On the other hand, it appears that specifically senatorial *fetiales* did so rather than any *fetiales* who happened not to be senators. This would indicate that there was some degree of control that the senate exercised over the college either by restricting the true decision-making to their peers who also happened to be *fetiales* or simply by ensuring that the group was composed only of senators, to begin with. This question of the body's actual membership will be returned to in chapter five in greater detail. Amongst this discussion of the *fetiales* acting as protectors of foreign envoys, it is important to pick out an earlier incident. According to Dionysius during the First Secession of the Plebs, Lucius Junius Brutus was joined in his negotiations with the senate by "the arbiters of peace who are called by the Romans *fetiales*." This would indicate, according to Dionysius' account of the duties of the *fetiales* that the Romans had effectively split into two separate peoples.⁸⁰ Although the incident could be taken as a unique incident of the *fetiales* using their powers of arbitration between Romans rather than two separate peoples, this would be missing the point of Dionysius' account of the secession which represented a crisis point for Roman society in which circumstances were far removed from ordinary times. One particular incident (387 BC) is also reported by Plutarch in which a Roman envoy incited and joined a battle between the Gauls and Clusians after being asked by the Clusians to help negotiate with the besieging Gauls led by Brennus. The senate led particularly by the *fetiales* condemned the assault and hoped "to turn the curse of what had been done upon the one guilty man, and so to make expiation for the rest" however the people instead appointed the offending envoy military tribune.⁸¹ This rejection of the proper religious order led to the disastrous Battle of Allia, the death of tens of thousands of Romans and the infamous sacking of the city, indicating the sort of misfortune that would befall Rome if the *fetiales* were unable to perform their duties. It should be remembered that in the Livian narrative Camillus eventually rescues the city going on to be a founder of Rome by righting that religious wrong, just as Numa had been a founder by establishing Rome's religious practices.⁸² The *fetiales* are tightly wound into both narratives and thus their importance to the religious order of Rome is paramount. While it was always established that the *fetiales* were nominally responsible for protecting peace between Rome

⁸⁰ Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 6.89.1

⁸¹ Plut. *Vit. Cam.* 18.1-2

⁸² McIntyre (2018: 65)

and its neighbours, the sources outlined above indicate exactly how this worked in practice. By ensuring that shamed generals were surrendered to the enemy, the *fetiales* avoided any religious pollution which Rome might have incurred. The sort of framework the *fetiales* were using should be best understood with Jack Lennon's work on the topic of pollution, drawing on a variety of Latin vocabulary to make the point that there were many ways in which the '*pax deorum*' could be polluted and then require cleansing.⁸³ The rituals of the *fetiales* should be understood as falling within that remit. Similarly, by protecting foreign envoys from trespasses committed by any Roman citizens, they ensured that no pretext for a war against Rome would be given to any foreign nations. The *fetiales* were also empowered to enforce these strictures in the rare cases where it became necessary, by the judicial power granted to their senatorial members. This meant that they could convict citizens for breaches of their religious laws. This aspect of the college stands in rather stark contrast to the bellicose activities described in the previous chapter. Thus, we can see that as the Roman state evolved and developed increasingly complex relationships with its neighbours, the *fetial* college adapted by taking on additional roles as peacemakers. Despite the Romans' religious conservatism, there is significant evidence of an adaption to circumstances. Indeed, this evolution and adaptation reached an apex in the later Republic, as we will now turn to investigate.

⁸³ Lennon (2012: 53)

Chapter 3: The Later Republic and Disappearance of the College

In all discussions of the *fetial* college, one aspect of their history has been the most significant driver of debate. That is the question of the college's supposed disappearance and later revival. As was touched upon earlier in chapter one, the evidence that the college did not exist until the reign of Augustus does not hold up to scrutiny. However, the question of whether the college ceased to function at some point and was later revived by the first *princeps* remains open. We will now turn to that question, particularly by investigating the apparent withdrawal of the *fetiales* from the ritual declaration of war. As has been established in earlier chapters, the *fetiales*' role and position in Roman society was subject to change over time and was far from being a fixed conception of rigid religious conservatism which has been recently advocated.⁸⁴ As will be seen, their part in the declaration of war was no different. At different points in their history, the *fetial* college played very different roles in the formal declaration of war. As a college most frequently thought of in connexion with the '*fetial* rite', the ritual ceremony used to declare wars, it might easily be thought that if the college ceased to carry out that function, it was simply taken as a sign of discontinuance in general. However, as has been established in the previous two chapters, the *fetiales* had many more duties than just performing the '*fetial* rite'. But first, it will be necessary to establish that a break in those responsibilities did occur. It is difficult to disentangle gaps in the evidence which are simply a result of the fragmentary nature of our sources and those which represent actual changes in the college's history, but this chapter will do so, building upon the work of previous historians.

The Ritual Outside the Temple of Bellona

As early as 280 BC and the Pyrrhic War, evidence begins to emerge of the breakdown of the *fetial* procedure as it was established in chapter one. Quite logically, the involvement of a priesthood common amongst Latin tribes declaring war on other Latin tribes with the same priesthood ceases to make sense once Rome begins waging war against foreign powers which do not share their religion let alone have an equivalent *fetial* college. This is made explicit in accounts of the Pyrrhic War. Servius, commenting on the Aeneid (c. 400-420 AD), explains that since Rome was now at war with an overseas enemy, there was no suitable place from which to conduct the usual *fetial* declaration of war, particularly the final spear-throwing.⁸⁵

⁸⁴ Zollschan (2012: 144)

⁸⁵ Serv. Serv. Dan. 9.52

Therefore, the legalistically minded Romans simply had a captured soldier of Pyrrhus purchase a plot of land in the Circus Flaminius which was thereby designated enemy territory and a suitable place to conduct the ritual. It is a rather tortured workaround for a problem arising out of an extremely outdated religious ritual found only beyond the text of Servius, in Ovid who suggests: “Her [Bellona's] founder was Appius, who, when peace was refused to Pyrrhus, saw clearly in his mind...a small open space commands from the temple...From it the custom is to hurl by hand a spear, war’s harbinger”.⁸⁶

However, Alan Watson has made the interesting observation that the *fetial* ritual in particular was not only a religious procedure, but a mirror of Roman legal proceedings and the ‘*legis actio per conductionem*’.⁸⁷ The formula, he suggests, calls upon Jupiter as a legal judge ‘*testis*’.⁸⁸ In this sense, it is quite unsurprising that the Romans willingly altered the ritual to preserve its original formula, while discarding its spirit. Consider the original intentions of the spear-throwing, which was to provide a notice to the receiving nation that the Romans were declaring a state of war. By throwing the spear within an enclave of enemy territory in the city of Rome, that purpose was circumvented. The *fetiales* are no longer performing a practical and important function of foreign relations, they are simply carrying out an archaic ritual. Yet such rituals were vital to the practice of Roman religion and thereby we begin to see the *fetiales* acting more as priests than political actors or ambassadors of the Roman state. Subsequently, the question would arise of whether to entrust the more practical aspect of declaring a war: actually, alerting the enemy nation, to a more secular body. And indeed, this is what eventually occurred. Despite this, it is crucial to note the objections of scholars who dispute the authenticity of Servius’ story. Wiedemann states unquestionably that the story is fictitious, based on the fact that if the Romans had captured an enemy soldier to purchase the land, they must already have been fighting before the ritual was conducted. Moreover, an enemy could not legally purchase land in Rome and the leader of the enemy side was Tarentum, not Epirus.⁸⁹ These are indeed significant objections that Watson attempted to deal with by way of reference to similar logical breaks in the use of ‘*mancipatio*’ and the simple fact that the ritual was no longer functioning as a legal appeal to the gods, but as a way to formally declare wars.⁹⁰ On the whole, scholars tend to agree with Wiedemann that reference to the specific account from

⁸⁶ Ov. *Fast.* 6.199

⁸⁷ Watson, (1993: 62) and Ogilvie (1965: 127) and Ferrary (1995: 427) cf. Rich (2011: 215)

⁸⁸ Watson (1993: 11)

⁸⁹ Wiedemann (1986: 481)

⁹⁰ Watson (1993: 57)

Servius, which we can see as fictitious.⁹¹ While Watson is right that the already contrived logic of the *fetial* ritual should allow for another layer of contrivance, the story on the whole does appear too neat an explanation for what was likely to have been a very gradual change. In this context though, the important thing to consider is why such an aetiology was even necessary. Evidently, between Augustus' performance of the ritual at the temple of Bellona in 32 BC and its original incarnation as reported in sources such as Livy and Dionysius, a significant change occurred, which had to be explained to Romans living centuries after these events. That change to the *fetial* procedure described here provides yet another instance of Roman religion adapting to altered circumstances. While Roman religion was quite slow and resistant to change, it did eventually change when necessary. The evolution of the *fetial* college and its rituals reflect that, and we should expect to see changes or inconsistencies between rituals at different points in time.

The Legati Declare War

The question was raised earlier of whether the separation of the religious ritual of declaring war outside the temple of Bellona and the practical diplomatic procedure of informing an enemy of the declaration would eventually lead to a separation of the people performing those roles. That question will now be returned to, and its answer comes in the form of the *legati*. Many scholars begin to date that change from the start of the Pyrrhic War, for instance, Wiedemann, Harris and Goar.⁹² All of whom date the end of direct *fetial* involvement with the declaration of war to 281 or 280 when the innovation of the Pyrrhic War occurred. The sources are inconclusive regarding the involvement of the *fetiales* in the declaration of war although it does seem clear that there was some movement toward more senatorial rather than priestly involvement. For instance, considering the outbreak of the Second Punic War, two entirely different conclusions could be drawn from the available evidence.

According to Polybius, in 218 BC when the Roman delegation went to Carthage to deliver an ultimatum and declare war, it was composed of an "envoy", or "ambassadors", "*πρέσβεις*" in the original Greek.⁹³ Similarly, Livy who had previously taken pains to delineate the role of the *fetiales* in his narrative only refers to the group as "ambassadors" or "*legati*".⁹⁴ This does

⁹¹ Santangelo (2008: 87) Rich (2011: 206)

⁹² Wiedemann (1986: 480) and Harris (1979: 166) and Goar (1972: 10)

⁹³ Polyb. 3.33

⁹⁴ Livy, 21.18.1

indeed point to a change in the procedure of declaring wars and would seem to indicate that ordinary senators rather than *fetiales* were now involved in foreign embassies. Scholars such as Macdonald and Walbank have indeed read the sources in this way.⁹⁵ More recently Santangelo re-examined the issue with rather more detail concluding that there was no evidence the “ambassadors” named in Livy or Polybius were *fetiales*. What changes then, did the switch to senatorial *legati* have on the established ‘*ius fetiale*’? Significant debate has surrounded the ordering of the procedure of the Roman declaration of war under the *legati*. While the *fetiales* had first presented the enemy with a series of demands and then returned to Rome to hold a vote on whether to go to war before returning to declare it, under the *legati* the procedure operated quite differently.

Broadly speaking, two schools of thought have developed regarding the diplomatic preliminaries of war in this period. On the one hand, some scholars argue that the *legati* took over a formal procedure whereby a pre-emptive war vote was held in Rome before the *legati* presented their demands backed up by the real threat of war. If the demands were rejected the *legati* would then declare war on the spot before returning to Rome. This line of thinking is opposed by an alternative one whereby no such established procedure existed, and the senate simply ordered the *legati* to proceed according to the individual circumstances of each situation.

First, we will deal with the former suggestion expounded by McDonald and Walbank based once again on the outbreak of the Second Punic War.⁹⁶ The aforementioned embassy of senatorial *legati* recorded by Polybius and Livy arrived in Carthage having already concluded a vote in the city to authorise a war. According to Polybius, the *legati* said to the Carthaginian Senate that his toga “held both war and peace for them”.⁹⁷ Livy likewise states that the embassy arrived with “peace and war; take which you please.” But only after it had proposed to the people in Rome “whether they willed and commanded that war should be declared against the people of Carthage;”.⁹⁸ This order of events stands in contrast to the older ‘*ius fetiale*’ in that a provisional war vote was held before the first diplomatic meeting and the ambassadors need not have made a second return trip to finally declare the war if their demands were not met. Walbank added further evidence to this reconstruction of events concerning the Carthaginian

⁹⁵ Macdonald and Walbank (1937: 14) and Walbank (1949: 15)

⁹⁶ Macdonald and Walbank (1937: 194)

⁹⁷ Polyb. 3.33

⁹⁸ Livy, 21.17.4 and 21.18.14

and Roman contest over Sardinia (238-237 BC).⁹⁹ Particularly taking Polybius' reference to the way that the Romans "announced their intention of making war on Carthage," as another provisional war vote and that if the Carthaginians had refused the terms, it would have immediately led to the war already voted on.¹⁰⁰ In turn, Oost added further evidence from the Jugurthine War based on the length of time between the death of Adherbal, the fall of Cirta and the actual commencement of hostilities.¹⁰¹

Such is the evidence in favour of a 'modified *fetial* procedure' as argued by McDonald and largely Walbank but as mentioned earlier, significant objections have been raised by both Rich and Bickerman. Bickerman partially concurs with Walbank by agreeing that the new procedure developed directly from the old *fetial* one.¹⁰² Conversely, rather than identifying the declaration of war as a final step to be delivered by the embassy of *legati*, Bickerman believes that the formal declaration was simply replaced by a series of back-and-forth embassies.¹⁰³ Regardless, it is John Rich's criticism that mounts the most formidable case against the 'modified *fetial* procedure'. Rich's conclusion comes from a close and extensive examination of a set of eight Roman wars or threatened wars between 237 and 88 BC.¹⁰⁴ Rich considers the Sardinian Affair (237-235 BC), the First Illyrian War (229-228 BC), the Second Macedonian War (200-197 BC), the Syrian War (192-188 BC), the Third Macedonian War (171-168), the Third Punic War (149-146 BC), the Jugurthine War (112-106 BC) and the First Mithridatic War (89-85 BC). He concludes that in many cases the Romans felt no need to initiate diplomacy with an enemy after a war vote had been successful to present an ultimatum, which only happened on three occasions, the Second Punic War, Second Macedonian War and Jugurthine War.¹⁰⁵ This starkly contrasts with the strict formal proceedings imagined by Walbank and yet Rich's analysis is so thorough as to be practically impossible to discount. Thus, we find that as senatorial *legati* took over the role the *fetiales* used to play in formally declaring wars, the practice went from a formalised ritual proceeding to a much more flexible secular affair.

⁹⁹ Walbank (1949: 16)

¹⁰⁰ Polyb. 3.10.1

¹⁰¹ Oost (1954: 159)

¹⁰² Bickerman (1945: 138)

¹⁰³ *Ibid.*

¹⁰⁴ Rich (1976: 14 and 64-104)

¹⁰⁵ Rich (1976: 103)

The *Fetiales* as Advisors

This raises the obvious problem of what happened to the college once this primary function was taken over by senatorial *legati*. Several cases exist which might provide some answers to this question. The first is the circumstances surrounding the outbreak of the Second Macedonian War (200-197 BC). Following the decision in Rome to go to war against Philip, Livy writes that the consul Sulpicius sought advice from the *fetiales* as to whether the war should be formally declared to Philip himself or simply the nearest garrison of his, to which the *fetiales* answered “that they would do rightly whichever course they should adopt”.¹⁰⁶ This example provides a clear indication that although the college was no longer delivering the declaration of war to enemies outside of Rome (although they very likely were still quietly performing the ritual at the Temple of Bellona) they still functioned as an expert advisory group on matters relating to the declaration of wars. A further example follows nine years later at the start of the Seleucid War (192-188 BC). In preparing to go to war the consul, this time Manius Acilius and apparently at the senate’s direction consulted the college again with the same question of whether the war should be declared to a garrison or Antiochus personally.¹⁰⁷ This time, however, Acilius also posed the additional question of whether it would be necessary to have “directed a separate declaration against the Aetolians, and whether their alliance and friendship ought not to be renounced before war was declared.”¹⁰⁸ Since a *fetial* priesthood was a lifelong appointment, it can be readily assumed that only nine years after the declaration of war against Philip, many of the same individuals would have comprised the group to whom Acilius directed his questions. Therefore, Livy reports that they answered “they had given their judgement before, when they were consulted respecting Philip,” but furthermore, “in their opinion, friendship had been already renounced; because, after their ambassadors had so often demanded restitution, the Aetolians had not thought proper to make either restitution or apology.”¹⁰⁹ Therefore we find that the *fetiales* in this period are quite capable of providing extremely specific and expert advice on matters within their purview. But evidently, their roles had undergone a profound shift. This move from the people responsible for actually comprising embassies and making declarations of war in person, to simply advising the consul and senate on how best to proceed independently is indicative of the sort of conservatism which characterises Roman religion. A conservatism that was able to dynamically adapt to rapidly

¹⁰⁶ Livy, 31.8.3

¹⁰⁷ Livy, 36.3.7

¹⁰⁸ *Ibid.*

¹⁰⁹ Livy, 36.3.8

evolving historical contexts while preserving many of the forms and functions that a group such as the *fetial* college fulfilled. By the time of Polybius in the latter half of the second century BC, the Romans were noteworthy for their continued adherence to the custom of declaring wars, it was simply not the same group of people who were making the declaration.¹¹⁰

The increasing power of the senate in the middle Republic meant that the *fetiales*' position as both a religious and political institution was becoming more tenuous. The outdated ritual of the '*ius fetial*' involving multiple trips to foreign territories and the subsequent innovation of the ritual outside the temple of Bellona put the situation in stark contrast. The political and diplomatic roles of the college could be better served by senatorial *legati* while the ritual functions were still carried out in altered form within Rome by *fetiales*, and the college continued to provide expert advice to the newly empowered senate. In this way, the *fetiales* were able to continue existing long after their obvious functions were becoming increasingly redundant. The dynamic conservatism which characterised the college continued well after this period too with the turbulent collapse of the Republic as the next chapter will show.

¹¹⁰ Polyb. 13.3

Chapter 4: The *Fetiales* under the Julio-Claudians

Historical analysis of the *fetial* college has often focused on the triumviral and imperial period, particularly under the reign of Augustus. In part, this is due to the large amount of evidence that dates from around that time, as has been shown in earlier chapters. But it is also due to the significant and dramatic changes that the college underwent as part of the new imperial system of government. As has been established, in earlier decades the *fetiales* had been relegated to an advisory position within the city of Rome, furnishing the senate with advice regarding the proper procedures around the declaration of war while they no longer acted as foreign embassies or delivered those declarations in person. Yet if one were to pick a single incident most commonly associated with the college, it would certainly be Octavian's declaration of war against Mark Antony in 32 BC which he did as a *fetial* priest. What then, did the ostentatious political performance represent for Roman religious history? The invention of an entirely new religious group and ritual? The revival of past customs as a marker of legitimacy? Or a genuine restoration of defunct religious practices? Scholars have offered many varied opinions, but 32 BC certainly marked a significant turning point for the *fetial* college. By any measure, during and after the reign of Augustus, the *fetiales* once again take up a more prominent role in Roman history if not a more genuinely influential one. Furthermore, we see again that although Roman religion went to great lengths to conserve its forms, a significant amount of flexibility characterised that innate conservatism. They continued to exist into the imperial period, but in a vastly different form to that which they had originated or settled into under the Republic.

The Restaged Ritual

It is crucial to note that Augustus himself was a *fetialis*. This simple fact colours much of the subsequent discussion surrounding the activities of the *fetiales* in the very late Republic and the beginning of the imperial period. Listing his achievements in the *Res Gestae*, Augustus notes "I have been... a *fetial* priest."¹¹¹ It is unsurprising then, that to galvanise support for a civil war against his rival Mark Antony, Augustus, then Octavian, would have staged the elaborate and public *fetial* ritual to declare war against a foreign enemy, Cleopatra outside the Temple of Bellona.

¹¹¹ CIL 3.p774=EDCS-20200013

As noted in the previous chapter, the ritual outside the temple of Bellona as it was described by Servius involved hurling the ritual spear over a column in front of the Temple of Bellona in Rome, “so that they could declare war legitimately, as though in a place belonging to the enemy”.¹¹² It is, of course, the same ritual which Dio refers to when he recounts Octavian’s declaration of war against Cleopatra, “to the temple of Bellona where they performed through Caesar as *fetialis* all the rites preliminary to war in the customary fashion.”¹¹³ But as was alluded to in chapter one, a great deal of scrutiny surrounds the authenticity of this re-staging of the *fetial* ritual. Wiedemann in particular took issue with the specific details of the ritual as they are recorded in Roman history.¹¹⁴ Using the same sources that Octavian had available to construct his history of the *fetiales*, Wiedemann concludes the following. First, he traces back the reference in Servius to Varro, explaining that “at the point when Commanders were about to enter an enemy field, they first used to throw a spear into that field for the sake of an omen, to capture a place for their camp.”¹¹⁵ Wiedemann infers that Octavian would have been likely to have read the passage of Varro’s in question and may have been duly inspired to create the fetial ritual outside the temple of Bellona.¹¹⁶ Furthermore, he claims that in Roman symbology spears represented power in general, rather than conquered property which was a Greek concept, Octavian would therefore be importing Greek symbology into Roman politics and religious practice. The line of reasoning, as other scholars have noted is far from conclusive.¹¹⁷ Note for example, that Dio specifically refers to Octavian’s practice of the ritual as “the customary fashion” whether he refers to the fashion of his own, or Octavian’s day is somewhat unclear but the evidence in favour of a revived or even continuing ritual is at least as strong as the evidence of an invented one.¹¹⁸ It is possible the ‘revival’ of the *fetiales* under Augustus was just a renewed emphasis on their rituals. They had been performing them in various iterations since the college’s inception. The declaration of war against Cleopatra marks the first incidence where the *fetial* declaration of war was deliberately weaponised by the Romans. In this case, Octavian recasts his civil war against Antony as a foreign war against Cleopatra. For that reason, the ritual gained a renewed significance and was therefore reported in the sources, but this does not indicate that the ritual had been abandoned earlier.

¹¹² Serv. *Serv. Dan.* 9.52.

¹¹³ Cass. Dio. 50.4.5

¹¹⁴ Wiedemann (1986: 483)

¹¹⁵ Serv. *Serv. Dan.* 9.52

¹¹⁶ Wiedemann (1986: 483)

¹¹⁷ Santangelo (2008: 87)

¹¹⁸ Cass. Dio. 50.4.5

While this is the only explicit mention of the *fetiales* in connexion with the War of Actium, Dio's narrative is underpinned by a strong basis in established narratives about failed generals and the role of *fetiales* in purging their pollution. Consider first, that one of Antony's alleged crimes was "deceiving, arresting and putting in chains the Armenian king", a direct echo of the sort of abuse against ambassadors that *fetiales* were charged with punishing, as established in chapter two.¹¹⁹ Antony, according to Octavian then reported in Dio had "caused much ill repute to attach to the Roman people".¹²⁰ This is precisely the sort of religious pollution that the *fetiales* were responsible for punishing when it arose from the actions of Roman citizens, including magistrates and generals. This connection is reemphasised by Dio's accounts, after the declaration of war, of the various ill omens directed towards Antony. This is highly relevant for the way it echoes similar accounts in Livy and Appian, of unfavourable omens given to Mancinus before his defeat at Numantia which subsequently had to be dealt with by the *fetiales*.¹²¹ Thus, when Dio recounts that "many and divers rumours were noised abroad by men, and many clear portents were shown by the gods." It very clearly indicates that either Antony or Octavian have brought pollution to Rome through their actions.¹²² After spending six lines specifically describing the portents generally, and building suspense he then delivers the payoff which seals Antony's fate in the narrative "In the case of Antony, an omen of his defeat was given beforehand by the children in Rome... And his death was portended by what happened to a statue of him that stood on the Alban Mount beside that of Jupiter; for in spite of its being of marble it sent forth streams of blood." More compelling than any other narrative device, this catalogue of ill omens directed towards Antony emphasises the fact that as a *fetial* priest, it falls to Octavian to bring Antony to justice and restore religious order in Rome.

The Iconography of the *Fetiales*

The *fetiales*, just like other Roman religious colleges were associated with distinct symbology and iconography. This included their ritual objects, clothing and even a temple. Each of these

¹¹⁹ Cass. Dio. 50.1.4

¹²⁰ *Ibid.*

¹²¹ App. *Hisp.* 17.83 and Livy, *Epit.* 55.

¹²² Cass. Dio. 50.8.1

will be considered but perhaps most significant is their connection with the Temple of Jupiter Feretrius.

Established on the Capitol, it was recognised by Valerius Maximus who notes that Romulus “brought away rich spoils and trophies which he offered to Jupiter Feretrius”.¹²³ Dionysius on the other hand adds the detail that in his own time “the ancient traces of it still remain, of which the longest sides are less than fifteen feet”.¹²⁴ This fills in a gap that is left by Livy because in his next reference to the site he then used the term *aedis* which according to Springer meant an actual built structure, likely the stone-walled enclosure referred to by Dionysius.¹²⁵ According to Livy, the temple was then “enlarged” during the reign of Ancus.¹²⁶ Finally and most critically in the site’s history came its association with the reign of Octavian, hence its inclusion in this chapter. By the time of Octavian’s reign, the temple had fallen into almost complete ruin, described by Cornelius Nepos as “unroofed and falling down through age and neglect,” therefore Atticus induced Octavian, his close personal friend, to repair it and the work took place around 31 BC.¹²⁷

The undertaking is subsequently reported in Augustus’ epitaph the monumental *Res Gestae*, “I built... the temples on the Capitol of Jupiter Feretrius”, this claim should be contrasted with the assertion in the appendix that “He restored the Capitol and sacred buildings to the number of eighty-two” unlike those unnamed restored buildings, the Temple of Jupiter Feretrius was “built” likely out of near ruin considering the structure would have been around six hundred years old, according to Livy’s attribution to the reign of Numa.¹²⁸ The fact that the temple is also named, whereas the other eighty-two buildings were not, speaks to its prominence. We should expect therefore that a rebuilding rather than a repair would have been required.¹²⁹ Such claims have been contested based on epigraphic evidence alone, but in this case, significant literary evidence exists too.¹³⁰ Of particular interest, however, is the political use Octavian found for his rebuilding of the temple and its intrusion into Livy’s writing.

Hitherto the ancient sources agree that only three Romans had ever dedicated the *spolia opima* in the temple, namely, Romulus followed by Aulus Cornelius Cossus and finally Marcus

¹²³ Val. Max. 3.2.3

¹²⁴ Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 2.34.4

¹²⁵ Springer (1954: 29) and Livy, 1.33.9

¹²⁶ Livy, 1.33.9

¹²⁷ Nep. *Att.* 20.3 and Springer (1954: 31)

¹²⁸ Livy, 1.33.9

¹²⁹ Springer (1954: 31)

¹³⁰ Thomas and Witschel (1992: 136)

Claudius Marcellus.¹³¹ Augustus himself only deposited laurel in the temple in 8 BC and this was already “contrary to custom” according to Cassius Dio.¹³² This was because “only to a general who with his own hand has performed the exploit of slaying an opposing general, has the privilege of dedicating the “*spolia opima*” been granted.” According to Plutarch.¹³³ Therefore, when Crassus accomplished the feat of killing the Bastarnian King, Deldo himself in 27 BC, he threatened to eclipse Augustus but only “had he been general in supreme command”.¹³⁴ The curiously convenient (for Augustus) stipulation is explained by Livy who wrote in a revealing footnote “only those are properly held to be “spoils of honour” which one commander has taken from another commander, and that we know no “commander” but him under whose auspices the war is waged, the very words inscribed upon the spoils disprove their account and mine, and show that it was as a consul that Cossus captured them.” Livy notes that his firsthand source for the inscription supposedly found in the temple was Augustus himself. Since Livy’s first five books were published between 27 and 25 BC, a period of at least five years would have elapsed between Octavian rebuilding the temple, reading the inscription within, and then using it to bar Crassus from dedicating the *spolia opima*. Then at most another two years would have passed for him to read Livy’s history and issue the correction in 25 BC at the latest.

This constitutes a clear example of Octavian/Augustus, as *fetialis* entering the temple associated with his particular college and thereby fabricating or perhaps genuinely discovering historical evidence which he then used to political advantage, by barring Crassus from dedicating the *spolia opima*.¹³⁵ In turn, we then find a direct admission on Livy’s part that his historical account was challenged by Augustus and subsequently revised. This is the only evidence of such a revision to be found in connection with the *fetiales*. Once again, as was outlined in chapters one and three there is no evidence that Augustus fabricated the account which we find in Livy, of the history of the *fetiales*. In the single case where there was tampering with the history, it is directly and openly discussed.

Returning to the iconography of the *fetiales*, only one visual representation was thought to have survived, a gold stater, RRC 28/1-2, 216 BCE. The coin depicts the sacrifice of a pig by two figures. However more recent scholarship has concluded that because the coin depicts the ritual

¹³¹ Livy, 1.10.7 and Plut. *Rom.* 16.7

¹³² Cass. Dio. 55.5

¹³³ Plut. *Rom.* 16.7

¹³⁴ Cass. Dio. 51.24.4

¹³⁵ Livy, 4.20.5-7

being conducted with swords rather than the silices which would have symbolised the *fetiales*, the coin must not represent *fetiales* but an older mythological scene before their introduction to Rome.¹³⁶ We must therefore conclude that unfortunately no visual representations of the *fetiales* have survived and only the literary sources already discussed can shed light on the issue.

The *Fetiales* and the Julio-Claudians

The epigraphic evidence attesting to the *fetiales* under the Julio-Claudians will be examined later in the chapter, but significant mentions of the college remain to be considered in literary sources.

Already by the reign of Tiberius the question of the *fetiales*' place in Roman society had to be broached explicitly and in public. According to Tacitus, Lucius Apronius had moved for the *fetiales* to be included in the celebration of the *Ludi Magni*, along with the *Pontiffs*, *Augurs*, *Quindecimviri*, *Septemviri Epulones* and *Augustales*.¹³⁷ However, Tiberius opposed the measure because "the *fetials* had never had that degree of dignity, while the *Augustales* had only been admitted among the others because theirs was a special priesthood of the house for which the intercession was being offered."¹³⁸ Evidently, according to Tiberius at least, the *fetiales* were not among Rome's most illustrious priesthoods and the *Augustales* only merited inclusion because of their connection with the imperial family in whose honour the games were being held. It is worth considering then, why Apronius moved for their inclusion in the first place. An obvious answer would be that Apronius himself might have been a *fetial* priest, seeking to enhance their prominence and by extension his own by their inclusion at the Games. Although there is no conclusive evidence to confirm it, precedent certainly exists, around the same period Publius Cornelius Lentulus Scipio was a *fetial* priest and much like Apronius, a consul and military legate as well.¹³⁹ It might appear to be an overly cynical interpretation yet in the very next paragraph Tacitus laments the fact that "so tainted was that age, so mean its sycophancy, that... all senators of consular rank... vied with one another in rising to move the

¹³⁶ Zollschan (2011: 52)

¹³⁷ Tac. *Ann.* 3.64

¹³⁸ Tac. *Ann.* 3.64

¹³⁹ CIL 5.4329=EDCS-04203381 and

Brian Campbell, "Apronius, Lucius" (published 22 December 2015), on *Oxford Classical Dictionary*, <https://doi-org.simsrad.net.ocs.mq.edu.au/10.1093/acrefore/9780199381135.013.626>

most repulsive and extravagant resolutions.”¹⁴⁰ It would hardly be uncharacteristic then, based on this assessment, for a consular senator to seek to enrich his position by granting undue honours to a priesthood of which he was a member. Note that these events occurred between the deaths of Germanicus and Drusus in 19 and 23 AD and before the ascendance of Sejanus at which point dissent against Tiberius would have been far more dangerous.

The next mention of the *fetiales* in the Julio-Claudian period comes during the reign of Claudius. Suetonius remarking on various policies enacted by Claudius ends with the observation that “He struck his treaties with foreign princes in the Forum, sacrificing a pig and reciting the ancient formula of the *fetial* priests.”¹⁴¹ The short comment reveals a great deal about the role of the *fetiales* by this point. It also throws up several issues which demand consideration. First, is whether or not Claudius was a *fetial* priest himself. It would be unusual to imagine the enactment of their rituals were he not himself a *fetialis* and it is also difficult to imagine that if the emperor wished to join the college that he would not have been able to. Regardless, despite having a relatively reliable account of the changes to *fetial* responsibilities for declaring wars, their involvement in the signing of peace treaties, while no less significant is not as well-attested. As has already been established the *silex* used by the *fetiales* to strike the ritually sacrificed pig were kept in the Temple of Jupiter Feretrius. It is unlikely that they were used while the temple was in ruins before its rebuilding by Octavian. Indeed, the particular ritual as described in chapter one being performed by Claudius was practised in the earliest days between the tribes of Italy each with their own *fetiales*. The use of the ritual by Claudius is anachronistic then, despite the continued existence of the college well into and after the period. But this anachronistic behaviour is in keeping with what we know of Claudius’ character, whose antiquarian tendencies were well known and reported by Suetonius, “he even wrote historical works in Greek” and particularly on the observance of old religious rites, Tacitus “the oldest art of Italy should not become extinct through their indolence... the sacred rituals observed in times of hazard were not forgotten in the day of prosperity”.¹⁴²

Early Inscriptions

¹⁴⁰ Tac. *Ann.* 3.65

¹⁴¹ Suet. *Claud.* 25.3

¹⁴² Suet. *Claud.* 42 and Tac. *Ann.* 11.15 and Levick (1978: 79)

At this point in the college's history, the first inscriptions that name *fetiales* begin to appear in our historical record. Although these inscriptions can be difficult to date conclusively, some specific ranges can be drawn often based on the names of emperors which appear in them. The following chapter will deal with the vast majority of these inscriptions, but some require examination here, in connection with the earlier decades of imperial government. Seven of these inscriptions range in date from the reign of Augustus. One of those is the Res Gestae which will not be discussed here, but its relevant parts have been considered earlier. Another is the Fertor Resius inscription EDCS-17800460, discussed earlier in chapter one. This leaves five inscriptions including '*fetial*' which date from this period.

CIL 11.7553=EDCS-21000529

CIL 9.2845=EDCS-14803844

CIL 6.1583=EDCS-18000436

CIL 3.248=EDCS-22300505

AE 2000.465=EDCS-20401479

As can be seen from every one of these inscriptions, the *fetiales* under Augustus were largely civil administrators. Many at a high level with each one being a *praetor* at least. Two of the treasuries and one *legatus pro praetore*. Many of them also held other religious offices. Two were *quindecimvir*. One was also a *tribune* of the plebs as well as *proconsul*. No military ranks are mentioned here. Evidently at this point under the '*Pax Augusta*,' the *fetiales* were more involved with administrative and religious duties than actually waging wars. As will become clear, this is a trend that did eventually change. Additionally, Narbonne, Cyprus and Galatia are mentioned in connection with these *fetiales* meaning that sixty percent were associated with areas outside Rome. At this time we can be confident that one of the *fetiales*' primary duties, the ritual outside the Temple of Bellona must have taken place within the city itself. Thus, we begin to see tension between the *fetiales* carrying out their duties in the city as well as taking on additional roles throughout the growing empire, in this case in its administration. These five inscriptions from the reign of Augustus represent about ten percent of the total corpus of inscriptions that mention '*fetial*' and they are the earliest ones that can be dated. We will now move on to the next eight inscriptions which will bring the study to the end of the Julio-Claudian period.

CIL 5.4329=EDCS-04203381

CIL 6.913=EDCS-17301036

CIL 8.6987=EDCS-13002015

EDCS-75600256

AE 1935.32=EDCS-16000278

AE 1951.85=EDCS-06000277

AE 1987.989=EDCS-06000473

CIL 8.11002=EDCS-22000655

In these later inscriptions, we see a continuing association of the college with the imperial family following Augustus' tenure as a *fetialis* with Nero Julius Caesar, Emperor Tiberius' adopted son also holding the position before his downfall. He is also listed as a *sacerdos* of Augustus and *quaestor*. The majority of *fetial* priests continue to be civil administrators despite one military reference to the *legate* of *Legio VIII*, this is the first time a direct military association appears in the epigraphic record of the *fetiales*, and they will only become more prevalent. Once again, a treasury position, *praefect* this time is associated with one of the priests and a *consul*, the highest ranking official thus far, apart from the emperor Augustus himself. Interestingly, the *fetiales* appear to be dispersing out amongst the provinces. Gaul, Hispania, Galatia, Africa and Cyprus are all mentioned. Taken with the inscriptions from Augustus' reign we see a repetition of Gaul, Galatia and Cyprus but an increasing dispersal into the provinces with the addition of Hispania and Africa. Due to the lack of inscriptions from earlier periods, it is impossible to tell whether this was a new development or a continuation of the earlier practice, but it is interesting to note that out of the relatively small group of *fetiales* active at any one time, at least some number of them could have been away from Rome in the long term, governing provinces. It is also worth noting the repetition of Quintus Marcius Cai, proconsul of Africa who appears in six inscriptions from the period. The remaining inscriptions which constitute the majority of the corpus will be dealt with in the next, final chapter.

Chapter Five: Fetiales in the Later Empire and the End of the College

Following the reign of Augustus and his tenure as a fetial priest, the college faced a rapidly changing Roman religious and political sphere. From the apex of their renewed prominence in Roman life under Augustus, one might expect to see a decline in their activities as power became increasingly centralised with a hereditary autocracy. This was not the case, and the survival of the college remains well-attested into the Third Century AD and with a final reference into the Fourth. Just as they had done in previous centuries as has been explored thus far, the college adapted and survived through dynamic conservatism by changing just enough to suit its contemporary context while still retaining the majority of the rituals, structures and duties that had been assigned to the college in its very early days.

The Fetiales in the Later Empire

Over a century later during the reign of Marcus Aurelius comes the next reference to the fetiales in the ancient sources. Cassius Dio writes that after securing public funds for the war effort against the Scythians from the Senate he thereafter began the war by “hurling the bloody spear, that was kept in the temple of Bellona, into what was supposed to be the enemy’s territory”.¹⁴³ Although Dio does not explicitly mention the fetiales, it is without a doubt the enactment of the traditional fetial declaration of war, just as Augustus had performed it against Cleopatra.¹⁴⁴ Once again, as in the case of Claudius, the question arises whether Marcus Aurelius was a fetial priest when he performed the ritual. A fuller accounting of the epigraphy from this period will follow but it is without question that the fetiales existed into this period and indeed after it. It is quite possible then, that Marcus Aurelius was indeed a fetial priest when he performed the ritual outside the Temple of Bellona. It is important to note that this section of Dio exists only in summary, the brevity with which it treats the performance of the ritual is not unexpected then. It is a simple side note to the commencement of the war and one which was likely included because Dio had “heard men who were present relate” it.¹⁴⁵ We could therefore assume that although the emperor himself did not always perform the ritual, it was still in practice by this period. The activity of the fetiales in the declaration of war survived the transition to imperial government.

¹⁴³ Cass. Dio. 72.33

¹⁴⁴ Cass Dio. 50.4.4

¹⁴⁵ Cass. Dio. 72.33

The point is reinforced further still by a consideration of the last mention of the *fetiales* in the historical record. Ammianus Marcellinus describing the Siege of Amida (359 AD) for which he was present described vividly the enemy King Grumbates who “hurled a bloodstained spear, following the usage of his country and the custom of our *fetial* priest”.¹⁴⁶ The event is an extraordinary one for several reasons. The first is the sheer longevity of the *fetiales* which it speaks to. A religious order founded in Rome’s earliest mythic past survived right into the early decades of Christianisation. Even after the reign of Constantine and into that of his son Constantius II, it is a testament to the college’s dynamic conservatism that it survived for that long. Second, the use of a Roman religious ritual by a foreign King against the Romans themselves is remarkable. Precisely what significance Grumbates attached to his hurling of the spear is impossible to tell. Ammianus relates that it was done “following the usage of his country” and the association with the *fetiales* may be simply imagined on Ammianus’ part.¹⁴⁷ The particular timing of throwing the spear to commence hostilities certainly lends credence to Ammianus’ interpretation but it should be remembered that analogous rites had been performed for many centuries in the ancient world and Grumbates may have picked up the practice from any number of sources.¹⁴⁸

The Disappearance of the College

After this, the *fetiales* disappear from the historical record. The increasing Christianisation of the Roman Empire and its subsequent fragmentation no doubt put an end to the ancient college of *Fetiales*. There would be no place for a pagan priesthood in a firmly Christian Roman and post-Roman world. Precisely when the *Fetiales* were abolished or died out is impossible to tell based on our present sources. One which does stand out for its apparent contradiction of earlier sources is Arnobius’ deliberately anachronistic reference to the *fetiales*. Cataloguing defunct Roman traditions, he asks “When you are preparing for war, do you hang out a flag from the citadel, or practise the forms of the *Fetiales*, solemnly demanding the return of what has been carried off?” This would seem to indicate that even if the *Fetiales* were still performing the ritual declaration of war, it was understood to be archaic to perform the entire procedure of *res reptendas*.¹⁴⁹ As will be discussed shortly, the epigraphic record ends by 300 AD, coinciding

¹⁴⁶ Amm. Marc. 19.2.6

¹⁴⁷ Amm. Marc. 72.33

¹⁴⁸ Serv. Serv. Dan. 9.52

¹⁴⁹ Arn. Adv. nat. 67

roughly with the declining tail of the epigraphic culture. Ammianus' last reference dates from 359 AD. If we take one of the earliest possible dates for the institution of the college, the beginning of Numa's reign in 715 BC it provides a total length of over one thousand years for the college's existence. To reiterate, this is a remarkable achievement in its own right, that despite the seismic upheavals undergone by the Roman state over this period, a particular priesthood was able to survive uninterrupted and with many of their original duties intact in one form or another. The dynamic conservatism and ability to adapt religious rituals and duties to a shifting political landscape mark the *fetiales* as an incredibly important institution of Ancient Rome.

The Remaining Epigraphy

Following the reigns of the Julio-Claudians, the explosion of inscriptions throughout the Roman Empire which was rapidly becoming an 'epigraphic culture' has meant that a good number of sources survive to us mention the *fetiales*. The 34 inscriptions which can be given a date range will be discussed here, to be followed by the 13 inscriptions which cannot be dated. The set of thirty-four ranging from 69 to 300 AD represent about half of the total body of inscriptions. They proceed as follows.

From the Flavian Dynasty

EDCS-06000522: No name is given for this inscription except that of the emperor Vespasian and his son Titus. The *fetial* priest it recognises however was also *proconsul* of Africa, *septemvir epulonum* and *praefect* of auxiliaries against the Germans. He was also chosen by Vespasian to be *legatus augusti pro praetore* in Africa. See CIL 11.5210= EDCS-22901152 below for a provided name.

CIL 3.291= EDCS-22300548: Lucius Caesennius son of Publius Stellatinus Sospitus was a *fetial* and *legatus augusti pro praetore* in Galatia, Pisidae, Phrygia, Lycaonia, Isauria, Paphlagonia, Ponti Galatia, Ponti Polemoniani and Armenia. He was also the *legate* of *Legio XIII Gemina* and helped fund a campaign against the Suebians and Sarmatians. He won the *corona muralis*, *corona vallare* and *corona aurea*. He was also *praefect* of the grain dole by the Senate's decree and *praetor*, *curule aedile* and *quaestor* of Crete and Cyrenaica, *tribune* of *Legio XII Primigenia*. This *fetial* was both a highly decorated veteran and civilian governor.

Despite his many honours and offices, he places *fetial* before any others. Indicating its pride of place in his long list of accomplishments.

CIL 6.1462= EDCS-17900128: Marcus Metius son of Marcus Terentinus Rufus, overseer of the Via Aurelia was *praetor*, *proconsul* of Achaëa and *legatus augusti*. In this inscription, however, *fetialis* is placed at the end of the front side. With *curator* and *legatus* taking a side each.

CIL 11.5210= EDCS-22901152: Gnaeus Domitius son of Sextus Voltinus was *consul* and *proconsul* of Africa Province as well as its *legate*. *Septemvir epulonum*, *legatus augusti pro praetore* of Africa and *praefect* of Auxiliaries against the Germans. He also won the *corona muralis*, *corona vallare* and *corona aurea*. Additionally, he was *praetor*, *tribune* of the plebs, *quaestor pro praetore* of Africa and military *tribune* of *Legio V Alauda*. The additional naming of Emperor Vespasian and Titus as well as its marked similarities would indicate that this was the same man as EDCS-06000522, thus providing a name for that inscription.

CIL 8.7058= EDCS-13002087: Quintus Aurelius Pactumeius son of Publius Quirinus Fronto was a senator under Vespasian and Titus. He was a *sacerdoti*, *praefecto aerarii*, and military *consul* from Africa. *Fetial* is preceded in his offices only by senator and *sacerdoti*.

AE 1955.123=EDCS-13400167: Again, no individual is named in this inscription, but they were a *consul*, *septemvir epulonum*, *sacerdos augustalis*, *proconsul* of Africa and *legatus augusti pro praetore* for Moesia and Dalmatia as well as *curator* of public works.

Compared to the earlier Julio-Claudian inscriptions, *fetiales* under the Flavian dynasty were more involved in military matters. Half of these inscriptions, even accounting for the same individual named twice, provide a military rank. Compare to a single military office under the Julio-Claudians. Again, we continue to see the spread of the *fetiales* throughout the provinces in Africa, Galatia, Pisidae, Phrygia, Lycaonia, Isauria, Paphlagonia, Ponti Galatia, Ponti Polemoniani, Armenia, Crete and Cyrenaica, Achaëa, Moesia and Dalmatia. Interestingly, the highly decorated military *fetialis* contributed eleven of those locales to the set, indicating the sort of adventurism that went hand in hand with military service and was therefore being introduced to the *fetial* college. Consider that in the Middle Republic the *fetiales* role in declaring wars had been taken over by the *legati* precisely so that the *fetiales* could avoid

excessive travel and better perform their duties in Rome. The continual expansion of the empire reversed that dynamic.

From the Nerva-Trajan Dynasty

AE 1952.115=EDCS-13900410: Aelius Rufus Julianus was both *consul* and *proconsul* of Africa, *septemvir epulonum* as well as a *fetial*. This inscription has an incredibly wide date range but has been placed at the start of the Nerva-Antonine dynasty for its earliest date.

AE 1946.131=EDCS-06000535: Publius Septimius Getae was a *decemvir stlitibus iudicandis* and *tribunis laticlavius*. Served in *Legio II Augusta* and was quaestor of Crete and Cyrene. Grain *aedile* and *curator rei publicae* of Ancon. *Sacerdoti* and *legate* of *Legio I Italicae*, *proconsul* of Sicily, *legatus augusti pro praetore* of Lusitania, Moesia Inferioris and Dacia. His religious titles including *fetial* are placed well above his positions as *legatus augusti pro praetore*.

CIL 10.6658=EDCS-21300943: Gaius Julius son of Marcus Voltinia Proculus was *consul*, *quindecemvir sacris faciendis* and *curator* of public works. He was a *legatus augusti pro praetore* of Lugdunensis and Transpadanae. Also *legate* of *Legio VI Ferratae* and the *tribune* of the plebs under Trajan. *Tribune* of *Legio IV Scythia* and *quaestori augustorum*. Of particular note is the association with multiple legions, bringing military associations to a new level.

AE 1911.114=EDCS-10300129: Lucius Catilius son of Claudius Severus Julianus was *consul* twice and *proconsul* of Africa, *septemvir epulonum*, *legatus augusti pro praetore* of Syria, Armenia Major and Minor and Cappadocia. *Praefect* of military funds and *legate* of *Legio XXII Primigenia Pia Fidelis*. Also *legatus augusti pro praetore* of Asia. *Equite* and urban *praetor* of Rome and *quaestor* of Asia Province.

EDCS-09801898: Quintus Lollius son of Marcus Quirina Urbico, consular *legato augusti* of Germania Inferioris and *legate* of Hadrian in Judaica campaign. Won the *corona aurea*, *legate* of *Legio X Geminae*. Candidate for *praetor* and *tribune* of the plebs, *proconsular legate* of Asia, urban *quaestor*, *tribuno laticlavio* of *Legio XXII Primigenia*. One of four men for repairing roads.

CIL 8.6706=EDCS-13001747: This inscription is another for Quintus Lollius almost an exact copy except that it notes the inscription was paid for by public funds.

The militarization of Rome and consequently the *fetiales* is evident in this collection of inscriptions. Every single one except AE 1952.115=EDCS-13900410 which cannot be dated very reliably mentions the priests' association with a specific legion, sometimes more than one. Furthermore, we see the mention of far fewer religious positions. The trend will subside somewhat into the Antonine dynasty which follows. Africa, Crete, Cyrene, Ancon, Sicily, Lusitania, Moesia, Dacia, Lugdunensis, Transpadanae, Syria, Armenia, Cappadocia, Asia and Judaica are all mentioned this time spread more evenly across the inscriptions than the last set continuing the trend of the *fetiales* dispersing across the empire as they take on additional civic but more importantly military roles.

From the Antonine Dynasty

CIL 6.41114=EDCS-01000232: Lucius Pomponius son of Lucius Bassus Cascus Scrobonianus was a *consul*, *augur* and *fetial*.

AE 1973.200=EDCS-09401384: Lucius Pomponius son of Lucius Bassus again this time with the addition of *titii sodales* and urban *praefect* for Latin festivals.

CIL 8.7059=EDCS-13002088: Publius Pactumeius son of Publius Quirinus Clementinus was a *decemvir stlitibus iudicandis*, *quaestor*, *proconsul* in Achaia, *tribune* of the plebs, *fetial*. *Legate* of Hadrian in Athens Thespis, Plataea as well as Thessalia. Accordingly, upon Hadrian's death, he was made *proconsul* of Africa by Antoninus.

CIL 8.7060=EDCS-13002089: Another almost exact copy of the inscription above, CIL 8.7059=EDCS-13002088.

CIL 14.2405=EDCS-05800371: Quintus Licinius Modestinus Sextus Attius Labeonus was *quindecemvir sacris faciundis* and *fetial*. Also, *consul* and *proconsul* of Achaea province, *praefect* of the treasury of Saturn, *curator* of the *Via Salaria*, *praetor*, *tribune of the plebs* and *quaestor* of Africa province, *quindecemvir* for judging lawsuits and *sodali augustali*.

CIL 14.2941=EDCS-05800924: This inscription is missing a name, but it does record that the individual was a *sacerdos augustalis*, *fetial*, *praefect* of grain by senatorial decree, *curator* of the colony of Oriculanorum and *legatus augusti* of Asturiae and Calleciae as well as the *proconsul* of a province which is missing its name.

CIL 6.1517=EDCS-18000410: Marcus Servilius, Son of Quintus, Horatius Fabianus Maximus was *legatus augusti pro praetore* of Mysia Superior and Inferior province. *Curator* of sacred shrines, *consul*, *fetial*, *praefect* of the treasury of Saturn, Legate of *Legio III Gallicae*, *curator* of the *Via Valeria* and *legato pro praetore* of Asia Province. *Praetor*, *curule aedile* by decree of the senate, *urban quaestor*, military *tribune* of *Legio I Minerva*.

CIL 2-5.718=EDCS-08700782: An inscription from a Temple of Hercules which names Lucius Vibius as a *fetial* who paid for the consecration of the Temple.

CIL 14.4238=EDCS-05802221: A Fragmentary inscription that does not provide a name except for the *fetialis*' adopted mother and sister, Bassilla and Procula. However, the *fetial* priest was also a candidate for *quaestor* and military *tribune* of *Legio IV Flavia* and *quindecimvir stlitibus iudicandis*.

CIL 6.41146=EDCS-01000265: Marcus Pontius son of Marcus Pupinius, Laelianus Larcus Sabinus was *consul*, *pontifex*, *sodali Antoninus Verianus*, *fetial*, *legatus augusti pro praetore* of Syria, Pannonia Superior and Inferior. *Comes* of Verus Augustus and donated to the soldiers of the Armenian and Parthian War waged by Emperor Antoninus and Verus Augustus. He won the *corona muralis* during the war against the Germans with Emperor Antoninus and Verus as well as the War Against the Sarmatians with *Legio I Minerva*. He was *curator* of the town of Arausionensium in Gallia Narbonensis and *praetor*, candidate for *tribune* of the plebs. *Quaestor* of Narbonensis Province, *tribune* of the soldiers of *Legio VI Victrix* when crossing from Germany to Britannia. Marcus Aurelius ordered the inscription be set up in Trajan's Forum along with a statue.

AE 1954.58=EDCS-13800079: Marcus Asinius Sextius son of Horatius Rufinus, Valerius Verus Sabinianus former *praetor* of Commodus was a *fetial* and *curator* of the *Via Appia* and *consul*.

AE 1965.240=EDCS-10700449: This inscription was for the good health of Commodus in the name of Liber and Apollo. It was set up by Quintus Aurelius Polus son of Tarentianus Syriacus. He was a *fetial* and *legate* of *Legio XXII Primigenia Pia Fidelis* and *Legio II Augusta*.

AE 1965.241=EDCS-10700450: A very similar inscription to the one above, except the name of the emperor is missing and it appeals to Mars and Victory for good health.

CIL 6.41140=EDCS-01000259: Gaius Aufidius son of Gaius, Maecius Victorinus Mulvius Marcellinus Rhesius was *consul*, twice urban *praefect*, *quindecimvir sacris faciundis*.

Curiously here *sodali Hadrianali* and *fetiali* are mixed reading ‘*Sodali Fetiali Hadrianali*’. Regardless, Gaius Aufidius was also *legatus augusti pro praetore* for Syria, *proconsul* of Africa, *legatus augusti pro praetore* for Nearer Hispania and Baetica, specifically at the same time. Comes of Emperor Aontinus Pius and Verus Augustus in the First War against the Germans. Twice gave gifts to the troops for that war and won the *corona aurea* twice, the *corona vallare* twice and the *corona muralis* twice as well as the *corona navalis* twice. He was also *curator aedium sacrum* and *legate* of Augustus in Germania Superior province. The inscription along with a statue was placed in Trajan’s Forum by Commodus. It is a career very similar to that recognised above in CIL 6.41146=EDCS-01000265 however outdoes that inscription by winning two of each *corona*.

AE 1954.138=EDCS-13800133: Tiberius Claudius son of Tiberius, Quirina Gordianus Tyana from Cappadocia was *quaestor* and *legate* of Cyprus Province, *proconsul* of Macedonia Province and *legate* of *Legio XI Claudia* as well as *Legio III Augusta*. *Praefect* of the treasury of Saturn and *consul* designate, *sacerdoti* and *fetial*.

In this collection, only seven out of the fifteen inscriptions mention an association with the legions. Instead, we see more civic and religious offices. There is a tension here between the religious roles of the *fetiales* and their involvement in the military, a tension which ebbed and flowed in either direction rather than simply travelling in a single linear direction as we can see a clear decrease from the previous dynasty.

From the Severan Dynasty

AE 1948.241=EDCS-10000199: This inscription is very fragmentary and difficult to interpret, but it records a *fetial* who was also a *consul*.

CIL 10.6663=EDCS-21300948: Marcus Gavius son of Marcus, Velina Crispus Numisius the younger was *fetial*, *consul*, *proconsul* of Asia, Lycia and Pamphylia Provinces. *Legate* of *Legio X Geminae*, *praetor*, candidate for *tribune* of the plebs and *quaestor* as well as *tribuno laticlavio* of *Legio IV Flavia*. *Quindecimvir stlitibus iudicandis*.

CIL 6.1450:EDCS-17900117: Lucius Marius, son of Lucius, Quirinus Maximus Perpetuo Aurelianus was *consul*, *sacerdoti*, *fetial* and *legatus augusti pro praetore* of Coele-Syria and Germania Inferioris as well as Belgica. Commander of the infantry in Mysia Byzantium and near Lugdunum. *Legate* of *Legio I Italica*, *curator* of the *Via Latinae*. Stood for election for

tribune of the plebs. Was also urban *quaestor* and *tribuno laticlavio* of *Legio XXII Primigenia* and *Legio III Italica*.

CIL 10.6764=EDCS-21400082: Lucius Marius Maximus Perpetuo Aurelianus, urban *praefect*, *proconsul* of Asia and Africa twice, *fetial*. Patron and *curator* of Colonia Ardeatium. Possibly the father of the aforementioned Lucius Marius since the two careers do not match up.

AE 1955.188=EDCS-13700399: Again Lucius Marius son of Lucius Quirinus Maximus Aurelianus, *fetial* twice *consul*, *proconsul* of Asia and Africa, urban *praefect*. Likely an earlier iteration of the above inscription before the second *proconsulships*.

CIL 10.6567=EDCS-21300075 Once again Lucius Marius son of Lucius Maximus Aurelianus, *fetial*, twice *consul*, *proconsul* of Asia and Africa, urban *praefect*.

EDCS-13301414: Extremely fragmentary, only notes that the *fetial* was *clarissimo viro*.

Once again, this set records a much-reduced association with the military. Only two out of the seven record military associations. The data is skewed however because of the three records of Lucius Marius son of Lucius Maximus. In the end, this set is probably too limited to make much conclusive analysis.

Undated Inscriptions

EDCS-08200286: A single fragment that only reads “*fetial*”.

CIL 9.1812=EDCS-12401318: Lucius Clodius, a *fetial* priest who freed Clodia Mani. No other titles are associated.

AE 1995.355=EDCS-03300075: Gaius Julius son of Marcus, Voltinia Proculus was *consul* twice, *quindecimvir sacris faciundis*, *fetial*. Stationed in the Province of Lugdunensis however the office is missing. *Praetor*, *tribune* of the plebs.

CIL 3.14195.35=EDCS-30000380: Extremely fragmentary and includes multiple names however, the *fetial* was also *tribune* of the plebs.

CIL 12.3164=EDCS-09201632: Lucius Aemilius son of Marcus of Voltinia was an honoured *triumvir*. *Quaestor pro praetore* of Pontus and Bithynia, *legatus* of the same province. *Aedile*, *plebis praetore*, *praefect* of grain by the senate’s decree, *sacerdoti*, *fetial*, *proconsul* of Crete and Cyrenarum.

CIL 14.3595=EDCS-05801585: Titus Marcius son of Titus was *sacerdoti, fetial*, military *tribune* of *Legio XIV Gemina*, *quaestor pro praetore* of Achaëia province by decree of the senate. *Curule aedile, praetor, curator* of the *Via Latina*, *legate* of *Legio II Augusta*.

AE 1914.281=EDCS-16300167: This lengthy inscription does not provide a name, however the individual it records was *consul, sacerdoti* and *fetial*. *Quadviro viarum curandarum*, military *tribune* of *Legio I Minerva*, *quaestor pro praetore* of Macedonia Province, *sevir equitum romanorum*, *tribune* of the plebs, *legatus pro praetore* of Africa Province, *legate* of *Legio VI Ferratae* and *Legio II Adiutris*, gave donations to the Parthian War where he won the *corona muralis* and *corona vallaris*. *Legatus augusti pro praetore* of Arabia.

AE 1893.88=EDCS-13100076: Quintus Antistius Adventus son of Quintus, Quirina Postumius Aquilinus was *consul, fetial* and *legatus augusti pro praetore* of Germania Inferior, *Legate* of Augustus from Alpium in the campaign against the Germans. *Legatus augusti pro praetore* of Arabia Province, *Legate* of Augustus of *Legio VI Ferratae* and gave gifts to the soldiers of the Parthian War, where he won the *corona muralis* and *corona vallaris*. *Praetorian legate* of Africa Province, *tribune* of the plebs, *quaestor pro praetore* of Macedonia Province, military *tribune* of *Legio I Minerva Pia Fidelis*.

CIL 6.2318=EDCS-18300402: Listed alongside two *septemvir epulonum* is Iustus Gavianus who was a *fetial*.

CIL 6.32430=EDCS-21600023, CIL 6.32431=EDCS-21600024 and CIL 15.796=EDCS-34500662 are all too fragmentary to glean any useful information.

Less can be said of this collection because they are undated and don't provide the names of any emperors to date them from. Despite this, they are a fairly representative group. Indicating the breadth of military, civic and religious offices the *fetiales* held as well as their wide distribution throughout the empire. Considering the entire corpus as a whole, several important points become clear. At various times, notably under the Nerva-Trajan dynasty, the *fetiales* were more strongly associated with the military than was usual. This was likely due to the expansionistic mode of the empire, particularly under Trajan but also with Hadrian's consolidation. When considering the specific legions mentioned, one stands out in particular. *Legio XXII Primigenia* is mentioned a total of four times, twice as many as any other legion. Ultimately, this is likely to be due to its early inception and continuity well into the period at which references to the *fetiales* stop. *Legio I Minerva*, *II Augusta*, *IV Flavia* and *X Geminae* are also mentioned twice each. Each of these legions was also founded relatively early and saw service late into the

Empire. Throughout the Imperial period, we can see that as in the Republic, the position of the *fetiales* remained in flux but in general there was a trend towards more association towards the military and wider dispersion throughout the provinces of the empire.

Conclusion

Having reached the end of over a millennium of Roman history, the importance of the *fetial* college throughout its long tenure is clear. The dramatic yet gradual changes they underwent over those one thousand years can be summarised here. First emerging as a priesthood with counterparts amongst Rome's neighbours responsible for upholding peace treaties. Then taking on the converse role of actually declaring wars and making the demands which would potentially circumvent them. In turn, policing the behaviour of Roman citizens so that divine punishment or the armies of foreign peoples did not fall on the city. And with the increasing power of the senate, a move towards an expert advisory body no longer directly involved in the declaration of wars but experts on the proper manner of doing so and still responsible for the old religious rituals. Then a renewed prominence under Augustus and final establishment as an important religious group increasingly with military connections right up until the establishment of state Christianity.

The *fetial* college could meet each of the difficult changes in their historical context head-on, which enabled them to adapt while still conserving their core religious functions. In many cases, even when the *fetiales* seemed to take a step back from direct involvement with political matters, such as their replacement in the declaration of war by the *legati*, it is obvious that they were still able to retain a great degree of importance within Roman society, being called upon at least twice to provide expert advice on matters of war and foreign diplomacy. The existence of the college in the epigraphic record and the insight it provides into the elite nature of their membership tells a story that is quite different from the one often imagined. The *fetiales* were certainly active well into the imperial period as their membership attests and as time went on, became increasingly associated with the military itself. The *fetiales* truly in the end can be said to have been War Priests, despite their origins as a group dedicated to the establishment and renewal of peace. Perhaps as a testament to the militaristic nature of Rome and its pre-eminence amongst the communities of Italy. It is possible to imagine another history in which the *fetiales* under the leadership of a different community continued their role in mutual diplomacy, but of course, that is not what happened. In the end, then, the story of the *fetiales* became one of militarisation.

But for a moment return to the beginning. The first chapter found that the *fetiales* were borrowed from the Aequi, Ardeans or Faliscans most likely during the reign of Numa. They held the authority to sign peace treaties with other Italian communities who also kept their own

college of *fetiales* and worshipped Jupiter too. It was later during the reign of a later king, Ancus or Tullus that their typical involvement in the declaration of war developed and they were tasked with performing the '*ius fetiale*'; the ritual involving the process of '*res repetere*' and '*indictio belli*'. Yet despite this early association with declaring wars, their primary function was still to avoid them, by first seeking reparations and negotiating. This point was reinforced in the second chapter, elaborating on the role that the *fetiales* played in monitoring the behaviour of Roman citizens, particularly generals and ensuring the safety of foreign envoys. Through this purpose, they also maintained peace as well as a religious order. Clearly in the sources which survive to us, cases where the *fetiales* are unable to uphold that religious order lead very quickly to disastrous results for Rome, highlighting the importance of the *fetiales*' duties to contemporary Romans. Later on, in the course of the republican government and the increasing power of the senate, the *fetial* rituals started to break down in the face of a rapidly changing Mediterranean rather than just an Italian context. The '*indictio belli*' became a religious ritual performed in Rome, outside the Temple of Bellona rather than at the enemy borders since those borders were increasingly out of convenient reach. In turn, the more diplomatic roles of the *fetiales* such as the '*res repetere*' were transferred over time to senatorial *legati* and it is this changing of duties from the diplomatic and political to the more strictly religious which has often led to a narrative of *fetial* 'disappearance'. Instead, the college endured as an expert advisory body, performing their adapted rituals in Rome, and providing advice on the proper procedures when necessary to the *consuls* of the day. Eventually, with the rise of Augustus, himself a *fetial* priest, the college found a renewed prominence as their pre-existing rituals were put to political use to justify the War of Actium. At this point the first inscriptions naming the *fetiales* also begin to appear, associating them most often with other religious and civic administrative offices. The reigns of subsequent Julio-Claudians continued to reframe the place of the *fetiales* in Roman society, with Tiberius explicitly rating them below the other major religious colleges while Claudius later revived their ritual of making peace out of antiquarian interest. Finally, the later centuries of imperial government saw the *fetiales* endure as an elite institution which on specific occasions finds prominence in the surviving sources for the routine performance of the ritual outside the Temple of Bellona, by far the most enduring image associated with the college even in modern scholarship. Yet at this point, the epigraphic evidence begins to tell its own, different story. The increasing militarization of the college reflects Roman elite society at the time and that is where the *fetiales* eventually end. As a college known for its declaration of war, directly connected to the legions. In some ways, a direct descendent of their origin as a religious order dedicated to upholding peace amongst

the communities of Italy, in others a distinct contrast, the product of one thousand years of turbulent history and societal upheaval. The long journey of the *fetiales* ended as War Priests but they arrived there by way of a dynamic religious conservatism. As Rome changed, so too did its priests. Yet at the heart of this history remains a core ideal to the Romans; religious conservatism. In the end, this conservatism was much more dynamic than might have been expected. But the *fetiales* stand as one of the most significant examples of the Romans' inherent desire to preserve the honoured rituals of the past, long after those rituals served their original purpose.

Appendix A: Activities of the Fetiales

During the Monarchy

Treaty with Fidenae (715 - 763 BC)

In the reign of Numa, rather than going to war after being raided by the people of Fidenae, Numa instituted the *fetiales* to try and seek a peaceful accommodation which they did.

Sources: Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. 2.72.3

κατεστήσατο δ' αὐτὸ Νόμας ὅτε Φιδηνάταις ἔμελλε πολεμεῖν ληστείας καὶ καταδρομὰς τῆς χώρας αὐτοῦ ποιησάμενοις, εἰ βούλοιντο συμβῆναι δίχα πολέμου πρὸς αὐτόν, ὅπερ εἰς ἀνάγκην καταστάντες ἐποίησαν. οἶομαι δ' ἐπειδήπερ οὐκ ἔστιν ἐπιχώριον Ἑλλήσι τὸ περὶ τοὺς εἰρηνοδίκας ἀρχεῖον ἀναγκαῖον εἶναί μοι πόσων καὶ πηλίκων ἐστὶ πραγμάτων κύριον διελθεῖν, ἵνα τοῖς ἀγνοοῦσι τὴν Ῥωμαίων εὐσέβειαν, ἣν οἱ τότε ἄνδρες ἐπετήδευον, μὴ παράδοξον εἶναι φανῇ τὸ πάντα αὐτοῖς τὸ κάλλιστον λαβεῖν τοὺς πολέμους τέλος.

Treaty with the Albans (672 - 641 BC)

During the reign of Tullus, a war against the Alban people was resolved by a battle of champions, the *fetiales* were directed to establish the peace treaty.

Sources: Livy, 1.24.4

foedera alia aliis legibus, ceterum eodem modo omnia fiunt. tum ita factum accepimus, nec ullius vetustior foederis memoria est. fetialis regem Tullum ita rogavit: 'iubesne me, rex, cum patre patrato populi Albani foedus ferire?' iubente rege 'sagmina' inquit 'te, rex, posco.'

During the Republic

The Secession of the Plebs (494 BC)

Lucius Junius Brutus and the senate negotiated with *fetiales* to end the secession, leading to the creation of the *Tribunate* of the Plebs.

Sources: Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. 6.89.1

τῇ δ' ἐξῆς ἡμέρᾳ παρήσαν μὲν οἱ περὶ τὸν Βροῦτον πεποιημένοι τὰς πρὸς τὴν βουλὴν συνθήκας διὰ τῶν εἰρηνοδικῶν, οὓς καλοῦσι Ῥωμαῖοι Φητιάλεις. νεμηθεὶς δ' ὁ δῆμος εἰς τὰς τότε οὖσας φράτρας, ἥ ὅπως βούλεται τις αὐτὰς προσαγορεύειν, ἃς ἐκεῖνοι καλοῦσι κουρίας, ἄρχοντας ἐνιαυσίους ἀποδεικνύουσι τούσδε: Λεύκιον Ἰούνιον Βροῦτον καὶ Γάιον Σικίννιον Βελλοῦτον, οὓς καὶ τέως εἶχον ἡγεμόνας, καὶ ἔτι πρὸς τούτοις Γάιον καὶ Πόπλιον Λικιννίου καὶ Γάιον Οὐισκέλλιον Ῥοῦγαν.

War Against Aequi (466 BC)

Aequi harboured Antiates refugees and was preparing for war against Rome. Refused the *fetiales' res repetendas* leading to a war delayed by illness.

Sources: Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. 9.60.6

καὶ ἀφικόμενος εἰς τὴν Ῥώμην ἀπήγγειλε πρὸς τὴν βουλὴν, ἃ τ' ἤκουσε καὶ ἃ εἶδε. κακείνη οὐδὲν ἔτι ἐνδοιάσασα τοὺς εἰρηνοδίκας ἐψηφίσατο πέμπειν καταγγελοῦντας Αἰκανοῖς τὸν πόλεμον, ἐὰν μὴ τοὺς τ' Ἀντιατῶν φυγάδας ἀπελάσωσιν ἐκ τῆς πόλεως καὶ δίκας τοῖς ἡδικημένοις ὑπόσχωνται. οἱ δ' Αἰκανοὶ θρασυτέρας πρὸς τοὺς ἄνδρας ἐποίησαντο τὰς ἀποκρίσεις, καὶ τὸν πόλεμον οὐκ ἀκούσιοι δέχεσθαι ὠμολόγησαν.

War Against Aequi (458 BC)

Cloelius Gracchus, an Aequian leader insulted Roman envoys, subsequently, Rome sent a second embassy composed of *fetiales* who performed *res repetere* but did not receive satisfaction, leading to war.

Sources: Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. 10.23.1

Ῥωμαῖοι δὲ τοιαῦτα ὑβρισθέντες ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς οὐκ εὐθὺς ὀργῇ ἐπιτρέψαντες ἐξήγαγον τὴν στρατιάν, ἀλλὰ καὶ δευτέραν ὥς αὐτὸν ἀπέστειλαν πρεσβείαν καὶ τοὺς Φητιάλεις καλουμένους ἄνδρας ἱερεῖς ἔπεμψαν ἐπιμαρτυρόμενοι θεοῦ τε καὶ δαίμονας, ὅτι μὴ δυνηθέντες τῶν δικαίων τυχεῖν ὅσιον ἀναγκασθήσονται πόλεμον ἐκφέρειν: καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα τὸν ὕπατον ἀπέστειλαν.

War Against Veii (437 BC-427 BC)

Fetiales declared a war against Veii which was delayed so that the *res repetere* could be properly performed.

Sources: Livy 4.30.13

nihil quoque, ne confestim bellum indiceretur neve exercitus mitterentur, religio obstitit; fetiales prius mittendos ad res repetendas censuere.

End of Truce with Veii (406 BC)

Fetiales were dispatched to perform *res repetere* but an embassy of Veientes stopped them asking to go before the senate first.

Sources: Livy 4.58.1

eo anno, quia tempus indutiarum cum Veienti populo exierat, per legatos fetialesque res repeti coeptae. quibus venientibus ad finem legatio Veientium obvia fuit.

Denouncement of Quintus Fabius Ambustus (387 BC)

As an envoy, Quintus Ambustus provoked a battle between the Gauls under Brennus and the Clusians. He was denounced by the senate and particularly the *fetiales* but lauded by the people.

Sources: Plut. Vit. Cam. 18.1, Vit. Num. 12.7

ἐν δὲ Ῥώμῃ τῆς βουλῆς συναχθείσης ἄλλοι τε πολλοὶ τοῦ Φαβίου κατηγοροῦν, καὶ τῶν ἱερέων οἱ καλούμενοι Φητιαλεῖς ἐνήγον ἐπιθειάζοντες καὶ κελεύοντες τὸ τῶν πεπραγμένων ἄγος τὴν σύγκλητον εἰς ἓνα τὸν αἴτιον τρέψασαν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἄλλων ἀφοσιώσασθαι.

τούτους τοὺς Φητιαλεῖς Πομπήλιος Νομάς, βασιλέων ἡμερώτατος γενόμενος καὶ δικαιοτάτος, κατέστησε φύλακας μὲν εἰρήνης, ἐπιγνώμονας δὲ καὶ βεβαιωτὰς αἰτιῶν, αἱ σὺν δίκη πόλεμον συνάπτουσι.

τὰ μὲν οὖν τῆς μάχης εὐτυχεῖτο καὶ καταβαλὼν ἐσκύλευσε τὸν ἄνδρα γνωρίσαντες δὲ οἱ Κελτοὶ πέμπουσιν εἰς Ῥώμην κήρυκα τοῦ Φαβίου κατηγοροῦντες ὡς ἐκσπόνδου καὶ ἀπίστου καὶ ἀκατάγγελτον ἐξενηνοχότος πρὸς αὐτοὺς πόλεμον. ἐνταῦθα τὴν μὲν σύγκλητον οἱ Φητιαλεῖς ἔπειθον ἐκδιδόναι τὸν ἄνδρα τοῖς Κελτοῖς, καταφυγὼν δὲ ἐκεῖνος εἰς τοὺς πολλοὺς καὶ τῷ δήμῳ σπουδάζοντι χρησάμενος διεκρούσατο τὴν δίκην. μετ' ὀλίγον δὲ ἐπελθόντες οἱ Κελτοὶ τὴν Ῥώμην πλὴν τοῦ Καπιτωλίου διεπόρθησαν. ἀλλὰ ταῦτα μὲν ἐν τοῖς περὶ Καμίλλου μᾶλλον ἀκριβοῦται.

War Against Hernici (366 BC)

Fetiales were dispatched to perform *res repetere* and their demands were refused leading to war.

Sources: Livy 7.6.7

post tanti prodigii procurationem eodem anno de Hernicis consultus senatus cum fetiales ad res repetendas nequiquam misisset, primo quoque die ferendum ad populum de bello indicendo Hernicis censuit, populusque id bellum frequens iussit.

War Against Falisci (357 BC)

Fetiales performed *res repetere* demanding the return of Roman refugees to Falerii. They were refused and war broke out.

Sources: Livy 7.16.2

ad bella nova priore anno destinata Falisci quoque hostes exorti duplici crimine, quod et cum Tarquiniensibus iuventus eorum militaverat, et eos, qui Falerios perfugerant, cum male pugnatum est, repetentibus fetialibus Romanis non reddiderant.

First Samnite War (343 BC)

Fetiales performed *res repetere* after Samnites raided Campania. They were refused leading to war.

Sources: Livy 7.32.1

hac legatione Romam relata positus omnium aliarum rerum curis patres fetialibus ad res repetendas missis belloque, quia non redderentur, sollemni more indicto decreverunt, ut primo quoque tempore de ea re ad populum ferretur;

War Against Palaepolis (328 BC – 327 BC)

Performed *res repetere* because of “many hostile acts”. Refused leading to war.

Sources: Livy 8.22.8

igitur L. Cornelio Lentulo Q. Publilio Philone iterum consulibus, fetialibus Palaepolim ad res repetendas missis, cum relatum esset a Graecis, gente lingua magis strenua quam factis, ferox responsum, ex auctoritate patrum populus Palaepolitanus bellum fieri iussit.

Second Samnite War (326 BC)

Roman *fetiales* had performed *res repetere* before this war, after being defeated Samnite *fetiales* attempted to fulfil the demands but were refused.

Sources: Livy 8.39.13

de eo coacti referre praetores decretum fecerunt, ut Brutulus Papius Romanis dederetur et cum eo praeda omnis Romana captivique ut Romam mitterentur, quaeque res per fetiales ex foedere repetitae essent, secundum ius fasque restituerentur.

Caudine Forks (321 BC)

Peace agreed to without a treaty and *fetiales*, therefore rendered invalid. Offending general surrendered to the Samnites by the *fetiales*.

Sources: Livy 9.5.1-5, 9.8.6, 9.9.3, 9.10.2, 9.11.8

consules profecti ad Pontium in conloquium, cum de foedere victor agitare, negarunt iniussu populi foedus fieri posse nec sine fetialibus caerimoniaque alia sollemni. itaque non, ut vulgo credunt Claudiusque etiam scribit, foedere pax Caudina, sed per sponsionem facta est. quid enim aut sponsoribus in foedere opus esset aut obsidibus, ubi precatione res transigitur, per quem populum fiat, quo minus legibus dictis stetur, ut eum ita Iuppiter feriat, quem ad roturn a fetialibus porcus feriat? spoponderunt consules, legati, quaestores, tribuni militum, nominaque omniur, qui spoponderunt, extant, ubi, si ex foedere acta res esset, praeterquam duorum fetialium non extarent; et propter necessariam foederis dilationem obsides etiam sescenti equites imperati, qui capite luerent, si pacto non staretur.

dedamur per fetiales nudi vinctique; exsolvamur religione populum, si qua obligavimus, ne quid divini humanive obstet, quo minus iustum piumque de integro ineatur bellum.

nam quod deditione nostra negant exsolvi religione populum, id istos magis, ne dedantur, quam quia ita se res habeat, dicere quis adeo iuris fetialium experts est, qui ignoret?

magistratu inde se extemplo abdicaverunt traditique fetialibus cum ceteris Caudium ducendi.

non probat populus Romanus ignominiosa pace legiones servatas; pacem sibi habeat, legiones captas victori restituat: hoc fide, hoc foederibus, hoc fetialibus caerimoniis dignum erat.

War Against Aequi (304 BC)

Fetiales had performed *res repetere* after Aequians had given aid to the Samnites and Hernici, enemies of Rome. They were not only refused but accused of attempting to intimidate with threats of war.

Sources: Livy 9.45.7

et postquam icto Romae cum Samnitibus foedere fetiales venerant res repetitum, temptationem aiebant esse, ut terrore incusso [p. 560] belli Romanos se fieri paterentur, quod quanto opere optandum foret, Hernicos docuisse, cum, quibus licuerit, suas leges Romanae civitati praeoptaverint;

Third Samnite War (298 BC)

After allying with Lucania *fetiales* were sent to perform *res repetere* demanding Samnites leave Lucanian territory. *Fetiales* were met by Samnite messengers warning that they would be harmed if they went before any Samnite council. War was subsequently declared.

Sources: Livy 10.12.2

benigne responsum Lucanis ictumque foedus; fetiales missi, qui Samnitem decedere agro sociorum ac deducere exercitum finibus Lucanis iuberent, quibus obviam missi ab Samnitibus, qui denuntiarent, si quod adissent in Samnio concilium, haud inviolatos abituros.

War Against Falisci (293 BC)

Faliscans allied with Samnites against Rome leading to *fetiales* performing *res repetere*. They were refused leading to war.

Sources: Livy 10.45.7

ut fetiales mittendos ad res repetendas censerent. quibus non redditis ex auctoritate patrum iussu populi bellum Faliscis indictum est iussique consules sortiri, uter ex Samnio in Etruriam cum exercitu transiret.

Assault of Apollonian Ambassadors (270 BC)

Quintus Fabius and Gnaeus Apronius, former *aediles* assaulted Apollonian ambassadors and were surrendered to them by the *fetiales*. They were escorted to Brundisium and eventually returned unharmed.

Sources: Val. Max. De Publica Fide 6.6.5

Repraesentamus etiam illud senatus nullo modo praetermittendum opus. Legatos ab urbe Apollonia Romam missos Q. Fabius Cn. Apronius aedilicii orta contentione pulsaverunt. Quod ubi comperit continuo eos per fetiales legatis dedit quaestoremque cum his Brundisium ire iussit, ne quam in itinere a cognatis deditorum iniuriam acciperent.

End of the Second Punic War (201 BC)

The *fetiales* are sent to Africa to secure the peace treaty with Carthage. Each one takes a *sillex* and tuft of *vervena* according to a decree in the senate which they requested be passed.

Sources: Livy 30.43.9

fetiales cum in Africam ad foedus feriundum ire iuberentur, ipsis postulantibus senatus consultum in haec uerba factum est ut priuos lapides silices priuasque uerbenas secum ferrent ut, ubi praetor Romanus imperaret ut foedus ferirent, illi praetorem sagmina poscerent.—herbae id genus ex arce sumptum fetialibus dari solet.

Advice to begin Second Macedonian War (200 BC)

The *fetiales* advise the *consul* on the proper procedure to declare war against Philip V deciding that the declaration could either be given to Philip in person or to one of his outposts.

Sources: Livy 31.8.3

consultique fetiales ab consule Sulpicio, bellum, quod indiceretur regi Philippo, utrum ipsi utique nuntiari iuberent, an satis esset, in finibus regni quod proximum praesidium esset, eo nuntiari. fetiales decreverunt, utrum eorum fecisset, recte 1 facturum.

Advice to begin the Roman-Seleucid War (191 BC)

The *fetiales* are again consulted on the declaration of war against Antiochus III and refer to their previous decision regarding Philip II they additionally advise that an independent declaration was not needed against the Aetolians since they had already taken many hostile actions against Rome.

Sources: Livy 36.3.7

consul deinde M'. Acilius ex senatus consulto ad collegium fetialium rettulit, ipsine utique regi Antiocho indiceretur bellum, an satis esset ad praesidium aliquod eius nuntiari;

Assault of Carthaginian Ambassadors (188 BC)

Lucius Minucius Myrtilus and Lucius Manlius were charged with assaulting Carthaginian ambassadors. They were surrendered to them by the *fetiales*.

Sources: Livy 38.42.7, Val. Max. De Publica Fide 6.6.3

eo anno L. Minucius Myrtilus et L. Manlius, quod legatos Carthaginienses pulsasse dicebantur, iussu M. Claudii praetoris urbani per fetiales traditi sunt legatis et Carthaginem avecti.

Adversos eosdem hostes (the Poeni) parem fidem in iure legationis tuendo patres conscripti exhibuere: M. Aemilio Lepido L. Flaminio consulibus (sic) L. Minucium et L. Manlium Karthaginiensium legatis, quia manus his attulerunt, per fetiales a M. Claudio praetore dedendos curaverunt. Se tunc senatus, non eos, quibus hospraestabat

Surrender of Mancinus (136 BC)

Gaius Hostilius Mancinus is defeated in the Numantine War and accepts a peace treaty. It is refused by the senate and Mancinus is surrendered to the Numantines shamed.

Sources: Vell. Pat. 2.1.5

Sed Pompeium gratia impunitum habuit, Mancinum verecundia poenam non recusando perduxit huc, ut per fetialis nudus ac post tergum religatis manibus dederetur hostibus. Quem illi recipere se negaverunt, sicut quondam Caudini fecerant, dicentes publicam violationem fidei non debere unius lui sanguine.

Octavian's Ritual Outside the Temple of Bellona (32 BC)

Declaring war on Cleopatra as a foreign enemy, Octavian performs the *fetial* ritual outside the Temple of Bellona thus legitimising his civil war against Antony.

Sources: Cass. Dio. 50.4.5

καὶ ἐν χερσὶν ὄντος αὐτοῦ μετημπίσχοντο, καὶ πρὸς τὸ Ἐννεῖον ἐλθόντες πάντα τὰ προπολέμια κατὰ τὸ νομιζόμενον, διὰ τοῦ Καίσαρος ὡς καὶ φητιαλίου, ἐποίησαν: ἅπερ πού λογῶ μὲν πρὸς τὴν Κλεοπάτραν, ἔργῳ δὲ καὶ πρὸς τὸν Ἀντώνιον

During the Empire

Claudius Uses *Fetial* Rituals (41 – 54 AD)

Emperor Claudius is noteworthy for using the ritual formulas of the *fetiales* to make treaties in the forum.

Sources: Suet. Claud. 25.5

Druidarum religionem apud Gallos dirae immanitatis et tantum ciuibus sub Augusto interdictam penitus aboleuit; contra sacra Eleusinia etiam transferre ex Attica Romam conatus est, templumque in Sicilia Veneris Erycinae uetustate conlapsum ut ex aerario pop. R. reficeretur, auctor fuit. cum regibus foedus in foro iecit porca caesa ac uetere fetialium praefatione adhibita. sed et haec et cetera totumque adeo ex parte magna principatum non tam suo quam uxorum libertorumque arbitrio administravit, talis ubique plerumque, qualem esse eum aut expediret illis aut liberet.

Marcus Aurelius' Ritual Outside the Temple of Bellona (178 AD)

Marcus Aurelius declares war against the Quadi using the *fetial* ritual outside the Temple of Bellona.

Sources: Cass. Dio. 72.33

ὑμετέρᾳ οἰκίᾳ οἰκοῦμεν.' ταῦτά τε εἰπὼν, καὶ τὸ δόρυ τὸ αἱματῶδες παρὰ τῷ Ἐννείῳ ἐς τὸ πολέμιον δὴ χωρίον, ὥς γε καὶ τῶν συγγενομένων αὐτῷ ἤκουσα, ἀκοντίσας ἐξωρμήθη, καὶ τῷ Πατέρνῳ δοὺς χεῖρα μεγάλην ἔπεμψεν αὐτὸν ἐς τὸν τῆς μάχης ἀγῶνα. καὶ οἱ βάρβαροι ἀντέτειναν μὲν διὰ τῆς ἡμέρας ἀπάσης, κατεκόπησαν "

Grumbates Imitates the Ritual Against the Romans (359 AD)

Barbarian King Grumbates imitates the *fetial* declaration of war, hurling a bloodstained spear to commence battle during the Siege of Amida.

Sources: Amm. Marc. 19.2.6

Vixque ubi Grumbates hastam infectam sanguine ritu patrio nostrique more coniecerat fetialis, armis exercitus concrepans, involat muros, confestimque lacrimabilis belli turbo crudescit, rapido turmarum processu, in procinctum alacritate omni tendentium, et contra acri intentaque occursatione nostrorum.

Appendix B: Inscriptions by Date

1. CIL 11.7553=EDCS-21000529: 23BC-30AD

Cn(aeo) Pullio [3] / Pollioni feti[ali Xvir(o)] / stlit(ibus) iud(icandis) ex s(enatus) c(onsulto) tr(ibuno) pl(ebis) pr(aetori) ad [aerar(ium)] / proco(n)s(uli) [pr]ovinciae Narb(on(ensis) comiti Imp(eratoris) Caes(aris)] / Augus[ti i]n Gallia comat[a itemque(?)] / in Aqu[ui]t[ani]ca Athena[s 3] / August(o) legatus in [3] / Ilvir(o) quinquenna[li ex praef(ectura)] / Claudi[enses patrono(?)]

2. CIL 9.2845=EDCS-14803844: 14BC-1BC

P(ublius) Paquius Scaevae et Flaviae filius Consi et Didiae nepos Barbi et Dirutiae pronepos / Scaeva quaestor decemvir stlitibus iudicandis ex s(enatus) c(onsulto) post quaesturam quattuorvir / capitalis ex s(enatus) c(onsulto) post quaesturam et decemviratum stlitium iudicandarum tribunus plebis / aedilis curulis iudex quaestionis praetor aerarii proconsule provinciam Cyprum optinuit / viar(um) cur(ator) extra u(rbem) R(omam) ex s(enatus) c(onsulto) in quinq(uennium) proco(n)s(ule) iterum extra sortem auctoritate Aug(usti) Caesaris / et s(enatus) c(onsulto) misso ad componendum statum in reliquum provinciae Cypri fetialis / consobrinus idemque vir Flaviae Consi filiae Scapulae neptis Barbi proneptis simul cum ea conditus // Flavia Consi et Sinniae filia Scapulae et Sinniae neptis Barbi et Dirutiae / proneptis consobrina eademque uxor P(ubli) Paquii Scaevae filii Scaevae Consi / nepotis Barbi pronepotis simul cum eo condita

3. CIL 6.1302=EDCS-17800460: 1AD-50AD

Fert[o]r Resius / rex Aequeicolus / is preimus / ius fetiale paravit / inde p(opulus) R(omanus) / disciplineinam except

4. CIL 6.1583=EDCS-18000436: 1AD-130AD

[3] fetiali prae[t(ori) XV]vir(o) / [3] P[ont]iae [3] / t[3] / [3]ul Ful[

5. CIL 3.248=EDCS-22300505: 14AD-21AD

] Axius leg(atus) pro pr(aetore) / fetialis

6. CIL 3.p774=EDCS-20200013: 14AD-14AD

Rerum gestarum divi Augusti quibus orbem terra[rum] imperio populi Rom(ani) / subiecit et i<m=N>pensarum quas in rem publicam populumque Romanum fecit incisarum / in duabus aheneis pilis quae su[n]t Romae positae exemplar sub[i]ectum // [1] Annos undeviginti natus exercitum privato consilio et privata impensa / comparavi per quem rem publicam a dominatione factionis oppressam / in libertatem vindicavi eo [nomi]ne senatus decretis honorif[i]ci(i)s in / ordinem suum m[e adlegit C(aio) Pansa et C(aio) Hirt]io consulibus consula/rem locum s[ententiae dicendae simu]l [dans et i]mperium mihi dedit / res publica n[e quid detrimenti caperet] me pro praetore simul cum / consulibus pro[videre iussit] p[opulus] autem eodem anno me / consulem cum [consul uterqu]e in bel[lo cec]i[dis]set et triumvirum rei publi/cae constituend[ae creavit] / [2] qui parentem meum [trucidaver]un[t eo]s in exilium expuli iudiciis legi/timis ultus eorum [fa]cin[us] et postea bellum inferentis rei publicae / vici b[is] a[cie] / [3] [b]ella terra et mari c[ivilia ex]ternaque toto in orbe terrarum s[aepe gessi] / victorque omnibus v[eniam] petentib[us] civibus peperci exter[nas] / gentes quibus tuto [ignosci pot]ui[t] c[o]nservare quam excidere ma[lui] / millia civium Roma[no]rum [sub] sacramento meo fuerunt circiter [quingen]ta ex quibus dedu[xi in coloni]as aut remisi in municipia sua stipen[di]i[s] emer[i]tis millia aliquanto [plura qu]am trecenta et iis omnibus agros a[dsignavi] / aut pecuniam pro pr[ae]miis milit[ia]e dedi naves cepi sescen[tas praeter] / eas si quae minore[s quam] trir[emes] fuerunt / [4] [bis] ovans triumphavi et tri[s egi] curulis triumphos et appella[tus sum v]iciens et / semel imperator [decernente pl]uris triumphos mihi sena[tu] qu[ibus omnibus] / [su]persedi l[aurum de f]asc[i]bus deposui in Capit[olio votis quae] / quoque bello nuncupaveram [sol]utis ob res

a [me aut per legatos] / meos auspici(i)s meis terra ma[riqu]e prospere gestas qui[n]quagiens et q[ui]n/quiens decrevit senatus supp[lica]ndum esse dis immortalibus dies a[utem] / [pe]r quos ex senatus consulto [s]upplicatum est fuere DC[CCLXXXX in triumphis] / [meis] ducti sunt ante curram meum reges aut re[g]um lib[er]i novem consul] / [f]ueram ter deciens cum [scribeb]a[m] haec [et eram se]p[timum et t]ricen[simu]m / tribuniciae potestatis / [5] [dic]tat[ura]m et absent[i] e[t] praesent[i] mihi delatam et a popu]lo et a se[na]tu / [M(arco) Marce]llo e[t] L(ucio) Arruntio [co(n)s(ulibus)] non rec[epi] non sum] deprecatus in s[umma] / [f]rum[enti p]lenuria curationem ann[on]ae [qu]am ita ad[mi]nist[ravi ut intra] / die[s] paucos metu et periculo [p]raesenti civitatem univ[ersam liberarem] / [impensa et] cura mea consul[at]um quoqu[e] tum annum e[t] perpetuum / [mihi] dela[tum non recepi] / [6] [consulibus M(arco) V]in[icio et Q(uito) Lucretio] et postea P(ublio) Lentulo et Cn(aeo) L[entulo et] / [terti]um [Paullo Fabio Maximo et Q(uito) Tuberone] senatu populo[qu]e Romano] / [consentientibus] ut cu[rator legum et morum summa potestate solus cre]/[arer nullum magistratum contra morem maiorum delatum recepi quae] / [tum per me geri senatus] v[o]luit per trib[un]ici[a]m p[otestatem] perfeci cuius] / [potes]tatis conlegam et [ips]e ultro [quinq]uiens a sena]tu [de]poposci et accepi / [7] [tri]umv[i]rum rei pu[blicae c]on[s]ti[tuendae fui per continuos an]nos [decem] / [p]rinceps s[enatus] usque ad e]um d[iem] quo scrip]seram [haec per annos] / quadra[ginta fui pon]tifex [maximus augur XVvir]um sacris fac[iundis] / [VII]virum ep[ulon]um frater Arvalis sodalis Titius] fetialis fui // [8] patriciorum numerum auxi consul quintum iussu populi et senatus sena/tum ter legi et in consulatu sexto censum populi conlega M(arco) Agrippa egi / lustrum post annum alterum et quadragesimum feci quo lustro civi/um Romanorum censa sunt capita quadragiens centum millia et sexa/ginta tria millia tum [iteru]m consulari cum imperio lustrum / solus feci C(aio) Censorino [et C(aio)] Asinio co(n)s(ulibus) quo lustro censa sunt / civium Romanorum [capit]a quadragiens centum millia et duce[n]ta triginta tria m[illia et ter]tium consulari cum imperio lustrum / conlega Tib(erio) Cae[sare filio] m[eo] feci Sex(to) Pompeio et Sex(to) Appuleio co(n)s(ulibus) / quo lustro cen[sa sunt] civ[ium Ro]manorum capitum quadragiens / centum mill[ia et n]onge[n]ta tr[iginta et septem] millia / legibus novi[s] m[ea] auctore l[at]is m[ulta e]xempla maiorum exolescentia / iam ex nostro [saeculo] red[uxi et ipse] multarum rer[um] exe[m]pla imi/tanda pos[teris tradidi] / [9] vota p[ro salute mea] suscep[i] p[er c]onsules et sacerdotes qu[in]to / qu[o]que anno decrevit senatus ex iis] votis s[ae]pe fecerunt vivo / me [ludos aliquotiens sacerdot]um quattuor amplissima colle/[gia aliquotiens consules pr]iva[t]im etiam et municipatim universi / [cives unanimite]r con[tinente]r apud omnia pulvinaria pro vale/[tu]din[e mea] supp[licaverunt] / [10] nom[en me]um [sena]tus c[onsulto] inc[lusum] est in Saliare carmen et sacrosan[ctu]s in perp]etu(u)m [ut essem et q]uoad viverem tribunicia potestas mihi / e[sset per lege]m st[atu]tum est pontif]ex maximus ne fierem in vivi conle/[gae mei] l[ocum] [populo id] sacerdotium deferente mihi quod pater meus / [habuer]at r[ecusavi] quod sacerdotium aliquo<t=D> post annos eo mor/[t]uo d[emum] qui civilis tu]m[ultus] occasione occupaverat cuncta ex Italia / [ad comitia mea] confluen[te] m[u]ltitudine quanta Romae nun[qu]am / [fertur ante i]d temp[us] fuisse] recep[i] P(ublio) Sulpicio C(aio) Valgio consulibus / [11] aram [Fortunae R]ed[ucis a]nte aedes Honoris et Virtutis ad portam / Cap[en]am pro] red[itu me]o senatus consacravit in qua ponti/[fices et] vir[gines Ve]stal[es an]niversarium sacrificium facere / [decrevit eo] di[e] quo co]nsul[ibus Q(uito) Luc]retio et [M(arco) Vi]nic[i]o in urbem ex / [Syria redieram et diem Augustali]a ex co[gnomine] nostro appellavit / [12] [ex senatus auctoritate] pars p[raetorum e]t tribunorum / [plebi cum consule Q(uito)] Lu[cre]tio et principi]bus viris [ob]viam mihi / mis[s]a e[st in Campan]iam qui honos [ad h]oc tempus nemini prae/ter [m]e es[t] decretus cu]m ex H[isp]ania Gal[lia]que rebu[s] in iis provinciis prospe/re [gest]i[s] R[omam] redi] Ti(berio) Nerone P(ublio) Qui[n]tilio c]o(n)s(ulibus) aram / [Paci]s [A]u[gust]ae senatus pro] reditu meo consa[c]randam [censuit] ad cam/pum [Martium in qua] magistratus et sac[er]dotes [vi]rgines[que] V[est]ales / [ann]iver[sarium sacrifici]um facer[e] decrevit] / [13] [ianum] Quirin[um] quem cl[aus]u[m] esse [maiores nostri voluer]unt / cum per totum i[mperium] populi Roman[i] terra marique es]set parta vic/toriis pax cum pri[usquam] nasceret a [condita] u[rb]e bis omnino clausum / [f]uisse prodatur m[emori]ae ter me principi]pe senat]us claudendum esse censuit / [14] [fil]ios meos quos iuv[enes m]ihi eripuit for[tuna] Gaium et Lucium Caesares / honoris mei caus[s]a senatus populusque Romanus annum quintum et deci/mum agentis

consules designavit ut eum magistratum inirent post quin/quennium et ex eo die quo deducti sunt in
 forum ut interessent consiliis / publicis decrevit senatus equites autem Romani universi principem /
 iuventutis utrumque eorum parm[is] et hastis argenteis donatum ap/pellaverunt / [15] plebei Romanae
 viritim HS trece[n]os numeravi ex testamento patris / mei et nomine meo HS quadringenos ex bellorum
 man<u=I>biis consul / quintum dedi iterum autem in consulatu decimo ex [p]atrimonio / meo HS
 quadringenos congiari viritim pernumeravi et consul / undecimum duodecim frumentationes frumento
 privatim coempto / emensus sum et tribunicia potestate duodecimum quadringenos / nummos tertium
 viritim dedi quae mea congiaria p[e]rvenerunt / ad [homi]num millia numquam minus quinquaginta et
 ducenta / tribuniciae potestatis duodevicensimum consul XII trecentis et / viginti millibus plebis
 urbanae sexagenos denarios viritim dedi / et colon[i]s militum meorum consul quintum ex
 man<u=I>biis viritim / millia nummum singula dedi acceperunt id triumphale congiarium / in colonis
 hominum circiter centum et viginti millia consul ter/tium decimum sexagenos denarios plebei quae
 tum frumentum publicum / accipieba[t] dedi ea millia hominum paullo plura quam ducenta fuerunt /
 [16] pecuniam [pr]o agris quos in consulatu meo quarto et postea consulibus / M(arco) Cr[a]sso et
 Cn(aeo) Lentulo Augure adsignavi militibus solvi municipi(i)s ea / [s]u[m]ma s]estertium circiter
 sexsies milliens fuit quam [p]ro Italicis / praedi(i)s numeravi et ci[r]citer bis milliens et sescentiens
 quod pro agris / provincialibus solvi id primus et solus omnium qui deduxerunt / colonias militum in
 Italia aut in provinci(i)s ad memoriam aetatis / meae feci et postea Ti(berio) Nerone et Cn(aeo) Pisone
 consulibus itemque C(aio) Antistio / et D(ecimo) Laelio co(n)s(ulibus) et C(aio) Calvisio et L(ucio)
 Pas(s)ieno consulibus et L(ucio) Le[nt]ulo et M(arco) Messalla / consulibus et L(ucio) Caninio et
 Q(uinto) Fabricio co(n)s(ulibus) milit[i]bus quos eme/rit{e}is stipendi(i)s in sua municipi[a] deduxi
 praemia numerato / persolvi quam in rem sestertium q[ua]ter milliens circit[e]r / impendi(i) / [17]
 quater pecunia mea iuvi aerarium ita ut sestertium milliens et / quingentiens ad eos qui prae(er)ant
 aerario detulerim et M(arco) Lepido / et L(ucio) Arruntio co(n)s(ulibus) in aerarium militare quod ex
 consilio m[eo] / co[n]stitutum est ex [q]uo praemia darentur militibus qui vicena / [aut plura]
 stipe[ndi]a emeruissent HS milliens et septing[e]nti/[ens ex pa]t[ri]monio [m]eo detuli / [18] [ab e]o
 [anno q]uo Cn(aeus) et P(ublius) Lentuli c[on]sules fuerunt cum deficerent / [vecti]g[alia] tum centum
 millibus h[om]inum tum pluribus multo fru/me[n]tarios et n[um]ma[r]io[s] t[ri]butus ex horr[eo] et
 patr[i]monio meo / edidi / [19] curiam et continens ei Chalcidicum templumque Apollinis in / palatio
 cum porticibus aedem divi Iuli Iulercal porticum ad cir/cum Flaminium quam sum appellari passus ex
 nomine eius qui pri/orum eodem in solo fecerat Octaviam pulvinar ad circum maximum / aedes in
 Capitolio Iovis Feretri et Iovis Tonantis aedem Quirini / aedes Minervae et Iunonis Reginae et Iovis
 Libertatis in Aventino / aedem Larum in summa sacra via aedem deum Penatium in Velia / aedem
 Iuventatis aedem Matris Magnae in palatio feci / [20] Capitolium et Pompeium theatrum utrumque
 opus impensa grandi refeci / sine ulla inscriptione nominis mei rivos aquarum compluribus locis /
 vetustate labentes refeci et aquam quae Marcia appellatur duplicavi / fonte novo in rivum eius inmisso
 forum Iulium et basilicam / quae fuit inter aedem Castoris et aedem Saturni coepta profligata/que
 opera a patre meo perfeci et eandem basilicam consumptam in/cendio ampliato eius solo sub titulo
 nominis filiorum m[eorum] i[n]c(h)o[h]avi et si vivus non perfecissem perfici ab heredibus [meis
 ius]si / duo et octoginta templa deum in urbe consul sext[u]m ex [auctori]tate / senatus refeci nullo
 praetermisso quod eo tempore [refici debeba]t / consul septimum viam Flaminiam ab [urbe]
 Ari[mini]um refeci pontes]que / omnes praeter Mulvium et Minucium / [21] in privato solo Martis
 Ultoris templum forumque Augustum [ex ma]n[u]biis feci theatrum ad aedem Apollinis in solo
 magna ex parte a p[ri]vatis / empto feci quod sub nomine M(arci) Marcelli generi mei esset don[a
 e]x / man<u=I>biis in Capitolio et in aede divi Iuli et in aede Apollinis et in ae/de Vestae et in templo
 Martis Ultoris consacravi quae mihi consti/terunt HS circiter milliens auri coronari(i) pondo triginta et
 quin/que millia municipiis et colonis Italiae conferentibus ad triumphos / meos quintum consul remisi
 et postea quotiens cumque imperator a[p]pe[l]atus sum aurum coronarium non accepi decernentibus
 municipiis / et colonis aequ[e] benigne a<t=D>que antea decreverant / [22] ter munus gladiatorium
 dedi meo nomine et quinqu(i)ens filiorum meo/rum aut nepotum nomine quibus muneribus
 depugnaverunt homi/num ci[r]citer decem millia bis athletarum undique accitorum / spectaculu[m]

p[o]pulo pra[ebui me]o nomine et tertium nepot[is] mei no/mine ludos feci me[o no]m[ine] quater aliorum autem m[agist]ra/tuum vicem ter et viciens [pr]o conlegio XVvirorum magi[s]ter [con]/legii collega M(arco) Agrippa lu[dos s]aec(u)lares C(aio) Furnio C(aio) Silano co(n)s(ulibus) [feci] / [c]onsul XIII ludos Mar[tia]les pr[imus] feci quos p[ost i]d tempus deincep[s] / ins[equen]ti[bus] annis [s(enatus) c(onsulto) et lege fe]cerunt [consul]les [ven]ationes best[ia]/rum Africanarum meo nomine aut filiorum meorum et nepotum in ci[r]/co aut in foro aut in amphitheatris populo [d]edi sexiens et viciens quibus / confecta sunt bestiarum circiter tria m[ill]ia et quingentae / [23] navalis proeli(i) spectac(u)lum populo de[di] trans Tiberim in quo loco / nunc nemus est Caesarum cavato [s]olo in longitudinem mille / et octingentos pedes in latitudine[m mille] e[t] ducent<os=I> in quo tri/ginta rostratae naves triremes a[ut birem]es plures autem / minores inter se conflixerunt q[ui]bu[s] in classibus pugnave/runt praeter remiges millia hom[inum tr]ia circiter / [24] in templis omnium civitatum prov[inci]ae Asiae victor orna/menta reposui quae spoliatis temp[li]s cum quo bellum gesseram / privatim possederat statuae [mea]e pedestres et equestres et in / quadrigis argenteae steterunt in urbe XXC circiter quas ipse / sustuli exque ea pecunia dona aurea in aede Apollinis meo nomi/ne et illorum qui mihi statuarum honorem habuerunt posui / [25] mare pacavi a praedonibus eo bello servorum qui fugierunt a dominis / suis et arma contra rem publicam ceperant triginta fere millia capta / dominis ad supplicium sumendum tradidi iuravit in mea verba tota / Italia sponte sua et me be[lli] quo vici ad Actium ducem depoposcit iura/verunt in eadem ver[ba provi]nciae Galliae Hispaniae Africa Sicilia Sar/dinia qui sub [signis meis tum] militaverint fuerunt senatores plures / quam DCC in ii[s] qui vel antea vel pos]tea consules facti sunt ad eum diem / quo scripta su[n]t haec LXXXIII sacerdo]tes circiter CLXX / [26] omnium prov[inci]arum populi Romani quibus finitimae fuerunt / gentes quae non p[arerent imperio nos]tro fines auxi Gallias et Hispa/nias provincias i[tem] Germaniam qua inclu]dit oceanus a Gadibus ad osti/um Albis flumin[is] pacavi Alpes a re]gione ea quae proxima est {H}A/driano mari [ad Tuscum pacari feci] nulli genti bello per iniuriam / inlato cla[ssis] mea p[er] oceanum] ab ostio Rheni ad solis orientis re/gionem usque ad fi[nes Cimbroru]m navigavit quo neque terra neque / mari quisquam Romanus ante id tempus adit Cimbrique et Charydes / et Semnones et eiusdem tractus alii Germanorum populi per legatos amici/tiam meam et populi Romani petierunt meo iussu et auspicio ducti sunt / [duo] exercitus eodem fere tempore in Aethiopiam et in Ar[a]biam quae appel[latur] Eudaemon [maxim]aeque hostium gentis utr[ius]que cop[iae] / caesae sunt in acie et com[plu]ra oppida capta in Aethiopiam usque ad oppi/dum Nabata perventu[m] est cui proxima est Meroe in Arabiam usque / in fines Sabaeorum pro[ces]sit exercitus ad oppidum Mariba / [27] Aegyptum imperio populi [Ro]mani adieci Armeniam maiorem inter/fecto rege eius Artaxe c[u]m possem facere provinciam malui maiorum / nostrorum exemplo regnum id Tigrani regis Artavasdis filio nepoti au/tem Tigranis regis per Ti[berium] N]eronem tradere qui tum mihi privignus erat / et eandem gentem postea d[e]sciscientem et rebellantem domitam per Gaium / filium meum regi Ariobarzani regis Medorum Artaba[zi] filio regen/dam tradidi et post eius mortem filio eius Artavasdi quo [i]nterfecto Ti[gra]ne(m) qui erat ex regio genere Armeniorum oriundus in id regnum misi pro/vincias omnis quae trans {H}Adrianum mare vergunt ad orien[te]m Cyre/nasque iam ex parte magna regibus eas possidentibus et antea Siciliam et / Sardiniam occupatas bello servili recipravi / [28] colonias in Africa Sicilia Macedonia utraque Hispania Achai[a] Asia S[y]ria / Gallia Narbonensi Pi[si]dia militum deduxi Italia autem XXVIII [colo]ni/as quae vivo me celeberrimae et frequentissimae fuerunt me[a auctoritate] / deductas habet / [29] signa militaria complur[a p]er alios d[u]ces amissa devicti[s ho]st[ibu]s re[cipe]/ravit ex Hispania et [Gallia et a Dalm]ateis Parthos trium exercitu(u)m Romano/rum spolia et signa re[ddere] mihi supplicesque amicitiam populi Romani / petere coegi ea autem si[gn]a in penetrati quod est in templo Martis Victoris / reposui / [30] Pannoniorum gentes qua[s] ante me principem populi Romani exercitus nun/quam adit devictas per Ti[berium] [Ne]ronem qui tum erat privignus et legatus meus / imperio populi Romani s[ubie]ci protulique fines Illyrici ad ripam fluminis / Danu(v)i citr[a] quod [D]a[coru]m tr]ansgressus exercitus meis ausp[iciis] vict]us profliga/tusque [es]t et pos]tea tran[s Da]n[u]m ductus ex[er]citus me[u]s Dacorum / gentes im[peri]a p[opuli] R[omani] perferre] coe[git] / [31] ad me ex In[di]a regum legationes saepe] m[issae] sunt non visae ante id t]em[pus] / apud qu[em]q[uam] R[omanorum] du]cem

nostram amic[iti]am appetive]run[t] / per legat[os] B[a]starnae Scythaeque et Sarmatarum qui su[nt] citra flu]men / Tanaim et ultra reg[es Alba]norumque rex et Hiberorum e[t Medorum] / [32] ad me supplices confug[erunt r]eges Parthorum Tirida[te]s et post[ea] Phrate[s] // regis Phratis filiu[s] Medorum Ar[tavasdes Adiabenorum] Artaxa/res Britann[o]rum Dumnobellaunus et Tin[comarus Sugambr]orum / Maelo Marcomanorum Sueborum [3 rus] ad [me re]x Parthorum / Phrates Orod[i]s filius filios suos nepot[esque omnes] misit in Italiam non / bello superatu[s] sed amicitiam nostram per [libe]ror[um] suorum pignora / petens plurimaeque aliae gentes exper[tae sunt p]opuli Ro]m[ani] fidem me prin/cipe quibus antea cum populo Roman[o] nullum extitera]t legationum / et amicitiae commercium / [33] a me gentes Parthorum et Medorum [per legatos] principes earum gen/tium reges petitos acceperunt Par[thi Vononem regis Phr]atis filium / regis Orod[is] nepotem Medi Arioba[rzanem] regis Artavazdis fi/lium regis Ariobarzanis nepotem / [34] in consulatu sexto et septimo postqua[m b]el[la civil]ia exstinxeram / per consensum universorum [po]tens re[ru]m om[n]ium rem publicam / ex mea potestate in senatus [populi]que R[om]ani [a]rbitrium transtuli / quo pro merito meo senatu[s] consulto Au]gust[us appe]llatus sum et laureis / postes aedium mearum v[estiti] publ[ice] corona]ue civica super / ianuam meam fixa est [et cli]peus [aureu]s in [c]uria Iulia pos[itu]s quem mihi senatum po[pulum]ue Rom[an]um dare virtutis cle/ment[iaequ]e iustitiae et pietat[is cau]sa testatu[m] est pe[r e]ius cl[ic]i=U>pei / [ins]c[ription]em post id tem[pu]s a]uctoritate [omnibus praestiti pote]s/[t]atis autem nihilo ampliu[s] habu]i quam cet[eri qui m]ihi quo/que in ma[gis]tra[t]u conlegae f[uerunt] / [35] tertium dec[i]mum consulatu[m] cum gereba]m sena[tus et e]quester ordo / populusqu[e] Romanus universus [appell]avit me p[at]r[em] p[at]riae idque / in vestibulo a]edium mearum inscribendum et in c[u]ria [Iulia e]t in foro Aug[usto] / sub quadrigi[i]s quae mihi ex s[enatus] c[onsulto] pos[it]ae [sunt censuit cum scri]psi haec / annum agebam septuagens<i=U>[mum sextum] / summa pecuniae quam ded[it vel in aera]rium [vel plebei Romanae vel di]mis/sis militibus denarium sexien[s milliens] / opera fecit nova aedem Martis [Iovis] Ton[antis] et Feretri Apollinis / divi Iuli Quirini Minervae [Iunonis Reginae Iovis Libertatis] / Larum deum Penatium Iuv[entatis] Matris Magnae Luperca]l pulvina]r / ad circum curiam cum Ch[alcidico] forum Augustum basilica]m / Iuliam theatrum Marcelli [p]or[iticum] Octaviam nemus trans T]iberim / Caesarum / refecit Capito]lium sacr]asque aedes [nu]m[ero octoginta] duas thea[t]rum Pom/pei aqua[rum r]iv[os v]iam Flamin[iam] / impensa p[raestita] in spect]acula sca[enica] et munera] gladiatorum at/[que] athletas et venationes et] naumachi[am] et donata pe[c]unia / [colonis municipiis op]p[idi]s terrae motu incendioque consum/ptis a[u]t [viritim] a[micis] senat]oribusque quorum census explevit / in[n]umera[bili]s //

7. AE 2000.465=EDCS-20401479: 14AD-37AD

[3 Arr]eno [3] / [3 Vel]ina S]abino / [quaest]ori trib[un]o pleb[is] / [pr]aetori proc[on]s[ul]i fetial[i] / [legato d]ivi Aug[usti] / [provinci]ae Gal[at]iae?) / [patr]ono

8. CIL 5.4329=EDCS-04203381: 24AD-30AD

P[ublio] Cornelio Len[tulo] / Scipioni co[n]s[ul]i pr[ae]t[ori] / aerari legato Ti[ber]i / Caesaris Aug[usti] leg[ion]is / VIII Hispan[ae] pontif[ic]i / fetiali d[ecreto] d[ecurionum]

9. CIL 6.913=EDCS-17301036: 26AD-29AD

Neroni Caesari / Germanici Caesaris f[ilio] / Ti[ber]i Caesaris Aug[usti] n[epoti] / divi Aug[usti] pron[epoti] / flamin[i] Aug[ustali] / sodali Aug[ustali] / sodali Titio fratri Arvali / fetiali quaestori / ex s[enatus] c[onsulto]

10. CIL 8.6987=EDCS-13002015: 41AD-43AD

Divae Aug[ustae] sacrum / Q[uintus] Marcius C[ai] f[ilius] Barea co[n]s[ul] X[V]i[r] s[acris] f[aciundis] f[etialis] pro[co]n[ul] prov[inci]ae Africae(?) ded[icavit] / Coelia Sex[ti] filia Vi[cto]ria Potita flaminica di[v]ae Aug[ustae] de sua pe[c]unia faciendum curavit

11. EDCS-75600256: 41AD-43AD

[3] divae Aug[ustae sacrum] / [Q(uitus) Marcius C(ai) f(ilius) Barea co(n)s(ul) XVvi]r s(acris) f(aciundis) fetialis pro[co(n)s(ul) prov(inciae) Africae(?) dedicavit(?)] / [Coelia Sex(ti) filia Victo]ria Potita flaminica di[vae Augustae de sua pecunia faciendum curavit]

12. AE 1935.32=EDCS-16000278: 41AD-54AD

[Ti(berio) Claudio Drusi f(ilio) Caesari] / Aug(usto) Germ(anico) [pontif(ici) max(imo) tribun(icia)] / potest(ate) iter(um) imp(eratori) [III co(n)s(uli) II p(atri) p(atriciae)] / senatus populusque [Hipp(onensium) Regior]um p(ecunia) [p(ublica)] / Q(uito) Marcio C(ai) f(ilio) Baria co(n)s(ule) XVv[ir(o) sa]cris faciund(is) fetial(i) proco(n)s(ule) II / patrono Q(uitus) Allius Maxi/mus leg(atus) pro pr(aetore) II patron(us) dedi/cavit

13. AE 1951.85=EDCS-06000277: 42AD-43AD

Dis Augustis / Q(uitus) Marcius C(ai) f(ilius) Barea co(n)s(ul) XVvir s(acris) f(aciundis) fetialis proco(n)s(ul) II patronus dedicavit / Iddibal Magonis f(ilius) Tapapius Lepcitanus de sua pecunia fecit

14. AE 1987.989=EDCS-06000473: 42AD-43AD

[Ti(berio) Claudio Caesari A]ug(usto) pont(ifici) [max(imo) tribunicia pot]estat[e II co(n)s(uli) II des(ignato) III imp(eratori) III patri patriae] / [Q(uitus) Marcius C(ai) f(ilius) B]area co(n)[s(ul) XVvir sacris faci]undis f[etialis proco(n)s(ul) II dedicavit]

15. CIL 8.11002=EDCS-22000655: 42AD-42AD

[Ti(berio) Claudio] Caesari [Aug(usto) Germ]anico p(ontifici) m(aximo) [tri]b(unicia) pot(estate) co(n)s(uli) II imp(eratori) III / [Q(uitus) Marc]ius C(ai) f(ilius) Barea [co(n)s(ul) XVvi]r s(acris) f(aciundis) fetialis proco(n)s(ul) / dedicavit

16. EDCS-06000522: 69AD-96AD

proco(n)s(uli) provin]ciae Africae / [3 VII]vir(o) epul(onum) fetiali praefec(to) / [auxiliorum omnium adversus Germa]nos qui cum esset candidat(us) / [Caesar(is) pr(aetor) des(ignatus) missus est ab Imp(eratore) Vespasian]o Aug(usto) leg(ato) pro pr(aetore) exercit(us) qui est / [in Africa 3 donato ab Im]p(eratore) Vespasiano Aug(usto) et T(ito) Aug(usti) f(ilio) / [

17. CIL 3.291=EDCS-22300548: 71AD-100AD

[L(ucio) Caesennio] / P(ubli) f(ilio) Stel(latina) Sosp[il]ti fetiali leg(ato) Aug(usti) / pro pr(aetore) provinc(iarum) Gal(atiae) / Pisid(iae) Phryg(iae) Lyc(aoniae) Isaur(iae) / Paphlag(oniae) Ponti Galat(iae) / Ponti Polemonian(i) / A[r]m(eniae) le[g(ato)] leg(ionis) XIII Gem(inae) / donat(o) don(is) militarib(us) / expedit(ione) Suebic(a) et Sarm(atica) / cor(ona) mur(ali) cor(ona) vall(ari) cor(ona) / aur(ea) hast(is) pur(is) trib(us) ve/xill(is) trib(us) curat(ori) colo/niar(um) et municipior(um) prae[f(ecto)] / frum(ento) dand(o) ex s(enatus) c(onsulto) praet(ori) / aed(ili) curul(i) q(uaestori) Cret(ae) et C[yr(enarum)] / trib(un)o leg(ionis) XXII Primigen(iae) / IIIvir(o) a(uro) a(rgento) a(ere) f(lando) f(eriundo) / Thiasus lib(ertus)

18. CIL 6.1462=EDCS-17900128: 71AD-130AD

Curator / viae / Aureliae // M(arcus) Mettius M(arci) f(ilius) Ter(etina) / Rufus / pr(aetor) proco(n)s(ul) / provinciae Achaiae / fetialis // legatus / Aug(usti)

19. CIL 11.5210=EDCS-22901152: 79AD-81AD

Cn(aeo) Domitio Sex(ti) f(ilio) Volt(ina) / Afro Titio Marcello / Curvio Lucano / c(o)n(suli) proco(n)s(uli) provinciae Africae / legato eiusdem provinciae Tu[lli] / fratris sui septemviro epulonum

f[etiali(?)] / praetorio legato provinciae Af[ri]c[ae] / Imp(eratoris) Caesar(is) Aug(usti) praef(ecto) auxiliorum omnium / adversos Germanos donato ab / Imp(eratore) Vespasiano Aug(usto) et T(ito) Caesar(e) Aug(usti) f(ilio) coronis / murali vallari aure<a=IS> hastis puris III / vexillis III adlecto inter patricos praetori / tr(ibun) pl(ebis) quaest(ori) pro praetore provinciae Afric[ae] / [tr(ibun)] mil(itum) leg(ionis) V Alaud(ae) IIIIvir(o) viarum curandar(um) patrono / optimo / d(ecreto) d(ecurionum)

20. CIL 8.7058=EDCS-13002087: 79AD-81AD

[Q(uito) Aur(elio) Pactumeio P(ubli) f(ilio) Quir(ina) Frontoni in senatu inter praetorios allecto] / [ab] Imp(eratore) [Cae]s(are) V[espasi]/[a]no Aug(usto) et Tito / Imp(eratoris) Aug(usti) f(ilio) sacerdoti fe/tiali praef(ecto) aerarii / militaris co(n)s(uli) ex Afric[a] / [p]rimo Pactumeia VEV/[3]/[3] patr[i] o]pt[i]mo

21. AE 1955.123=EDCS-13400167: 91AD-100AD

cons[ul(i)] VIIv(i)ro ep(ul)on(um) fet(iali) sodal(i) Augustal(i) / [proco(n)s(uli)] Africae leg(ato) Augustorum pro pr(aetore) / [provinc(iarum)] M]oesiae item Dalmatiae / [curatori o]perum publ[icorum]

22. AE 1952.115=EDCS-13900410: 101AD-300AD

[3]C[3] / [3]is Aelia[n(o) 3] / [3]o Rufo Iulian[o] / [co(n)s(uli)] proco(n)s(uli) prov(inciae) / [Af]ric(ae) VIIvir(o) epul(onum) / [fet]iali sodali Flavi/[a]li Titiali / ex testamento / T(iti) Aemili T(iti) f(ili) Pap(iria) / Saturnini

23. AE 1946.131=EDCS-06000535: 106AD-119AD

P(ublio) Septimio Getae c(larissimo) v(iro) X/vir(o) stlitibus iudican/dis trib(uno) latic(lavio) leg(ionis) II Aug(ustae) / quaest(ori) provin(ciae) Cretae et / Cyrenarum aed(ili) cereali / curatori rei pub(licae) Anconita/norum praet(ori) hastario et tu/telar(io) sacerdoti fetiali leg(ato) / leg(ionis) I Italicae proco(n)s(uli) Siciliae / le<g=S>(ato) Augg[[[g(ustorum)]]] pr(o) pr(aetore) provinciae / Lusitaniae co(n)s(uli) leg(ato) Augg[[[g(ustorum)]]] / pr(o) pr(aetore) provinciae M<oe=Y>siae in/ferioris leg(ato) Au[g[[[g(ustorum)]]] p]r(o) pr(aetore) / provinc(iarum) Daciarum / curia Dacica ex voto posuit

24. CIL 10.6658=EDCS-21300943: 109AD-117AD

C(aio) Iulio M(arci) f(ilio) Volt(inia) / Proculo co(n)s(uli) XVvir(o) / sacris faciundis fetiali cur(atori) / operum publicorum leg(ato) Aug(usti) / p(ro) p(raetore) ad census provinciae Lug(dunensis) leg(ato) Aug(usti) p(ro) p(raetore) region(is) / Transpadanae legato leg(ionis) VI / Ferrat(ae) praet(ori) trib(uno) pl(ebis) ab actis / Imp(eratoris) Traiani Aug(usti) tr(ibun) leg(ionis) IIII Scy/thic(ae) q(uaestori) Augustor(um) IIIviro a(ere) a(rgento) a(uro) f(lando) f(eriundo) / Antiates publice / patrono

25. AE 1946.131=EDCS-10300129: 114AD-118AD

L(ucio) Cat[i]lio C[n(aei) f(ilio) Cla]u(dia) Sev[e]ro I[u]lia[no] / Claudio [R]eg[i]no co(n)s(uli) II pr[o]c[o(n)s(uli) provin[c(iae)] / Africae VIIvir(o) [epu]l(onum) [fet]ia]l[i] leg(ato) Aug(usti) [pro] / [praet(ore)] pro[v(inciae)] Syriae l]eg(ato) Aug(usti) pr[o] pr(aetore) Arm[eniarum] / [m]aiori[s] e]t m[inoris] et Ca[p]padoci[ae] / [p]raef[ecto] aer[a]r(ii) m[ilitar(is)] leg(ato) leg(ionis) XX[II] Primi[g(eniae)] P(iae) F(idelis)] / [c]urato[ri 3] le[g(ato)] pro pr(aetore) [p]rovinc[iae] / Asiae [VI]vir(o) e]q(uitum) R(omanorum) pr(aetori) u[rb(ano)] q[uaest(ori)] [prov(inciae)] As]iae d(ecreto) d(ecurionum) [p(ecunia) p(ublica)]

26. EDCS-09801898: 132AD-138AD

Q(uinto) Lollio M(arci) f(ilio) Qui[r(ina)] / Urbico co(n)s(uli) leg(ato) / Aug(usti) provinciae Ger[m(aniae)] / inferioris fetiali le[g(ato)] / Imp(eratoris) Hadriani in exp[e]/diti(oe) Iudaica qua [do]/natus est hasta pur[a] / corona aurea l[eg(ato)] / leg(ionis) X Gemin(ae) praet(ori) / candidato Caes(aris) / tr(ibuno) pl(ebis) candidat(o) Cae[s(aris)] / leg(ato) proco(n)s(ulis) Asiae qu[aest(ori)] / urbis tr(ibuno) laticlavio [leg(ionis)] / XXII Primig(eniae) IIIIviro [vi]/ar(um) curand(arum) patrono[o]

27. CIL 8.6706=EDCS-13001747: 136AD-138AD

Q(uinto) Lollio M(arci) fil(io) / Quir(ina) Urbico co(n)s(uli) / leg(ato) Aug(usti) provinc(iae) Germ(aniae) / inferioris fetiali legato / Imp(eratoris) Hadriani in expedition(e) / Iudaica qua donatus est / hasta pura corona aurea leg(ato) / leg(ionis) X Geminae praet(ori) candidat(o) / Caes(aris) trib(uno) pleb(is) candidat(o) Caes(aris) leg(ato) / proco(n)s(ulis) Asiae quaest(oris) urbis trib(uno) / laticlavio leg(ionis) XXII Primigeniae / IIIIviro viarum curand(arum) / patrono / d(ecreto) d(ecurionum) p(ecunia) p(ublica)

28. CIL 6.41114=EDCS-01000232: 138AD-160AD

[L(ucius) Pomponius L(uci) f(ilius) Bassus] / [Cascus] Scribonianus / co(n)s(ul) augur fetialis

29. CIL 8.7059=EDCS-13002088: 138AD-161AD

P(ublio) Pactumeio P(ubli) f(ilio) / Quir(ina) Clementi / Xvirum stlitibus iudicand(is) / quaest(ori) leg(ato) Rosiani Gemini / [s]oceri sui proco(n)s(ulis) in Achaia / [t]rib(uno) pleb(is) fetiali legato divi / Hadriani Athenis Thespiis / Plataeis item in Thessalia / praetori urbano legato / divi Hadriani ad rationes / civitatum Syriae putandas / legato eiusdem in Cilicia / consuli legato in Cilicia / Imp(eratoris) Antonini Aug(usti) leg(ato) Rosiani / Gemini proco(n)s(ulis) in Africa / iurisconsulto / patrono IIII coloniarum / d(ecurionum) d(ecreto) p(ecunia) p(ublica)

30. CIL 8.7060=EDCS-13002089: 138AD-161AD

[P(ublio)] Pactu[meio P(ubli) f(ilio) Quir(ina) Clementi Xvirum stlitibus iudican]/[dis] quaest(ori) le[g(ato) Rosiani Gemini soceri sui proco(n)s(ulis) in Achaia] / [tr(ibuno)] pl(ebis) fetiali [leg(ato) divi Hadriani Athenis Thespiis Plataeis item in] / [Thes]salia pr(aetori) ur[b(ano) leg(ato) divi Hadriani ad rationes civitatum Syriae pu]/[tan]das leg(ato) e[iusdem in Cilicia consuli legato in Cilicia] // [Imp(eratoris) Antonini August]i leg(ato) Ro[siani Gemini proco(n)s(ulis) in Africa] / [iuriscons]ulto patrono / Clara P[3] / [3]T[]

31. AE 1973.200=EDCS-09401384: 143AD-160AD

L(ucio) Pomponio L(uci) Bassi co(n)s(ulis) / et Torquatae filio / Horatia Basso Casco / Scriboniano co(n)s(uli) / auguri fetiali sodali / [Tit]iali praefecto urbis / [f]eriarum La[tin]arum

32. CIL 14.2405=EDCS-05800371: 146AD-170AD

Q(uinto) Licinio [3] / Modestin[o Sex(to) Attio] / Labeoni XV[viro sacr(is) fac(iundis)] / fetiali consuli [proco(n)s(uli) prov(inciae) Achaiae] / praef(ecto) aerari [Saturni curator]i / viae Salariae [praetori tribuno] / plebis quaesto[ri] provinciae Afri]/cae Xvir(o) stlit[ibus iudicandis] / sodali [Augustali] / Albani Longani / Bovillen[ses patr(ono)]

33. CIL 14.2941=EDCS-05800924: 151AD-200AD

A]ug(ustali) sacerdoti [fetiali(?)] / [pr]aef(ecto) frum(enti) dandi ex [s(enatus) c(onsulto)] / [curator]i coloniae Ocric[ul(anorum?)] / [leg(ato)] Aug(usti) provinciar(um) As[turiae] / [et C]alleciae proco(n)s(uli) provinci[ae 3] / [pa]trono munic(ipium) d(ecreto) [d(ecurionum)]

34. CIL 6.1517=EDCS-18000410: 162AD-161AD

] / M(arco) Servilio Q(uinti) f(ilio) Ho[r(atia)] / Fabiano Maximo / leg(ato) Augustorum pro prae/tore provinciarum Mysiae / superioris item Mysiae inferi/oris curatori aedium sacra/rum co(n)s(uli) fetiali praef(ecto) aer(arii) S(aturni) / leg(ato) leg(ionis) III Gal(licae) cur(atori) viae Vale/riae leg(ato) pr(o) [pr(aetore)] provin(ciae) Asiae prae[t(ori)] / aed(ili) cur(uli) ab actis senatus q(uaestori) / urb(ano) tr(ibunus) mil(itum) leg(ionis) I Minerv(iae) / IIIIviro viar(um) curandar(um) / Licinii Fortis et Honoratu[s] / centuriones leg(ionis) I[3] / ami[co]

35. CIL 2-5.718=EDCS-08700782: 171AD-250AD

Templum Herculis / quot L(ucius) Vibius Fetialis / rei p(ublicae) Osquens(i) promiserat / rece[p]tis a re p(ublica) HS VI mil(ibus) / L(ucius) Vibius Fetialis nepos / eius fecit et cum signo / Herculis d(edicavit)

36. CIL 14.4238=EDCS-05802221: 171AD-230AD

] / candid(ato) [quaest(ori) tr(ibunus) mil(itum)] / leg(ionis) IIII Fl(aviae) Xv[ir(o) stl(itibus) iud(icandis)] / fetiali GAV[3] / Bassilla sor[or et 3] / Procula fil[ia] / heredes ex [testamento]

37. CIL 6.41146=EDCS-01000265: 175AD-177AD

M(arco) Pontio M(arci) f(ilio) Pup(inia) / Laeliano Larcio Sabino co(n)s(uli) pon/tifici sodali Antoniniano Veriano / fetiali leg(ato) Aug(usti) pr(o) pr(aetore) prov(inciae) Syriae leg(ato) Aug(usti) / pr(o) pr(aetore) prov(inciae) Pannon(iae) super(ioris) leg(ato) Aug(usti) pr(o) pr(aetore) Pan/non(iae) infer(ioris) comiti divi Veri Aug(usti) donato donis / militarib(us) bello Armeniaco et Parthico / ab Imp(eratore) Antonino Aug(usto) et a divo Vero Aug(usto) / [coron(is)] mu[rali] vallari clas[sica] aur[ea] / [hastis puris IIII vexillis IIII comiti Imp(eratoris) Anto]/[n]ini Aug(usti) et divi Veri bello Germanic(o) / item comiti Imp(eratoris) Antonini Aug(usti) Germanici Sar/matici leg(ato) leg(ionis) I Miner(viae) curatori civit(atis) Araus(ionensium) / prov(inciae) Galliae Narb(onensis) praetori trib(uno) pleb(is) candidato / Imp(eratoris) divi Hadriani ab act(is) senat(us) quaestori prov(inciae) / Narb(onensis) trib(uno) mil(itum) leg(ionis) VI Victr(icis) cum qua ex Germ(ania) in / Brit{t}an(niam) transiit IIIIvir(o) viar(um) curandar(um) / huic senatus auctore M(arco) Aurelio Antonino Aug(usto) / Armeniac(o) Medic(o) Parthic(o) maximo Germ(anico) Sarmat(ico) / statuum poni habitu civili in foro divi Traiani / pecunia publica censuit

38. AE 1954.58=EDCS-13800079: 176AD-192AD

M(arco) Asinio Sex(ti) / fil(io) Hor(atia) Rufino / Valerio Vero Sa/biniano ad/lecto inter praet(orios) / ab Imp(eratore) M(arco) Aurelio / [[Commodo]] Antoni/no Aug(usto) Pio exorn(ato) / sacerdotio fet(iali) curat(ori) / viae Appiae co(n)s(uli) / cultores do/mus ob merit(a)

39. AE 1965.240=EDCS-10700449: 180AD-192AD

Libero et Apol/lini pro salute / [[Im[p(eratoris)] C]a[es]ar(is) M(arci) [Au]r(eli)] / [[Commod[i] 3]] / [[6]] / [[3]] Q(uintus) Aurel(ius) / Polus Terentianus / cum Q(uinto) Aur(elio) Polo / Syriaco filio / fetialis leg(atus) / leg(ionis) XXII Pr(imigeniae) P(iae) F(idelis) / item leg(ionis) II Aug(ustae)

40. AE 1965.241=EDCS-10700450: 180AD-192AD

Marti et Vict[o]riae pro salut[e] / [[6]] / [[6]] / [[6]] / [[6]] / [Q(uintus) Au]rel(ius) Polus [Te]/[ren]tianus c[um] / [Q(uinto) A]ur(elio) Polo Syr[i]/[a]co fil(io) fetial(is) / [

41. CIL 6.41140=EDCS-01000259: 184AD-185AD

[C(aio) Aufidio C(ai) f(ilio) Mae]c(ia) Victorino Mulv[io 3] / [3 Mar]cellino Rhesio Per[3] / [3 Nu]misio Rufo Arrio Paul[ino? 3] / [3]io Iust[o Co]cceio Gallo [co(n)s(uli) II praef(ecto) urbi] / [XVvir]o sacris f[aciun]dis sodali fetia[li] Hadrianali? Antoni]/[niano] Verian[o Ma]rciano leg(ato)

Augg(ustorum) [pr(o) pr(aetore) provinciae Syriae] / [proco(n)s(uli) p]rov[inci]ae Africae leg(ato) Au[gusti pr(o) pr(aetore) provinciarum] / [Hispania]e citer[ior]is et Baeticae [simul 3 comiti] / divorum Augg(ustorum) Ant[onin]i et Veri in [expeditione Germa]/[nica prima] bis don[ato do]nis milit[aribus ab isdem coronis] / [aureis duabus c]oronis [vallaribus duabus coronis muralibus duabus] / [coronis n]aval[ibus duabus hastis puris VIII vexillis VIII] / [curatori aedium sacr]arum leg(ato) [Augg(ustorum) provinciae] / [Germaniae superioris in] qua auctor[ibus divis Augustis] / [Antonino et Vero census? ad]ministrati[onem 3] / [leg(ato) divi Antonini Pii A]ug(usti) pr(o) pr(aetore) pro[vinciae // M(arco) Aurelio Commod] / [Ant]o[nino Aug(usto) Pio Germanico Sarmatico maximo] / Britan[nico statuam pon]i hab[itu civili in foro] / divi T[raiani pecunia pub]lica c[ensuit]

42. AE 1954.138=EDCS-13800133: 191AD-191AD

Ti(berio) Claudio Ti(beri) f(ilio) / Quir(ina) Gordiano / Tyanae ex Cappad(ocia) / q(uaestori) provinciae Cypri / leg(ato) prov(inciae) eiusd(em) proco(n)s(uli) / prov(inciae) Macedoniae leg(ato) / leg(ionis) XI Claud(iae) leg(ato) [[leg(ionis)]] / [[III]] Aug(ustae) praef(ecto) aer(arii) Sat(urni) / co(n)s(uli) desig(nato) sacerdoti / fetiali / P(ublius) Iulius Theodorus / |(centurio) [[leg(ionis) III]] Aug(ustae) / praesidi optimo

43. AE 1948.241=EDCS-10000199: 201AD-250AD

[dus I[3] / [3] co(n)s(ul) fetial[is 3] / cum Publicia Quar[ta] / et Catiis Maximina C[lementina 3] / Clementino Clemente Li[3] / [3]us Afrodissius flam[en]

44. CIL 10.6663=EDCS-21300948: 201AD-210AD

[M(arco) Gav]io M(arci) f(ilio) V[el(ina) Crispo Num]/[isio iu]niori feti[ali consuli] / pro[co(n)s(uli) pro]vinciae Asi[ae pro]co(n)s(uli) [provinci]ae Lycia[e et Pam]/[phyliae 3] / [6] / [3 le]g(ato) leg(ionis) X Gemin[ae pr]aetor[i] / [candida]t(o) trib(uno) plebei ca[ndi]dat(o) / [quaestori] candidat(o) trib(uno) [la]ticl(avio) / [leg(ionis) IIII F]laviae Xviro / [stl]itibus iudican[dis] / [3 Pr]jscilla c(larissima) f(emina) m[arito] / [inc]ompara[bili] / l(ocus) d(atus) d(ecreto) d(ecurionum)]

45. CIL 6.1450=EDCS-17900117: 208AD-213AD

L(ucio) Mario L(uci) f(ilio) Quir(ina) / Maximo Perpetuo / Aureliano co(n)s(uli) / sacerdoti fetiali leg(ato) Augg(ustorum) pr(o) pr(aetore) / provinc(iae) Syriae Coelae leg(ato) Augg(ustorum) pr(o) pr(aetore) / provinc(iae) Germaniae inferioris item / provinc(iae) Belgicae duci exerciti Mysia/ci aput Byzantium et aput Lugudunum / leg(ato) leg(ionis) I Italic(ae) cur(atori) viae Latinae / item rei p(ublicae) Faventinorum allecto in/ter praetorios trib(uno) pleb(is) candidato / quaestori urbano trib(uno) laticl(avio) leg(ionis) / XXII Primig(eniae) item III Italic(ae) / IIII(viro!) viarum curandarum / M(arcus) Iulius Artemidorus |(centurio) / leg(ionis) III Cyrenaicae

46. EDCS-13301414: 221AD-249AD

[rino c(larissimo) v(iro) / [3 f]etiali / [

47. CIL 10.6764=EDCS-21400082: 223AD-223AD

L(ucio) Mario Maximo / Perpetuo Aureliano / c(larissimo) v(iro) praef(ecto) urbi pr[o]co(n)s(uli) / provinciae Asiae II pro[co(n)s(uli) prov(inciae) Africae co(n)s(uli) II / fetiali patrono et cura/tori coloniae / Ardeatium / dignissimo / [// Dedic(ata) II]V I[d(us)] Oct(obres) M[a]rio M[a]xi]mo II / Ros[cio Aeliano] c[o(n)s(ulibus) c]u[ram ag]en[t]ib(us) / CA[3] C[3]ET / [3] D[3]TO et / [3]T

48. AE 1955.188=EDCS-13700399: 223AD-230AD

L(ucio) Mario L(uci) f(ilio) [v(iro)] c(larissimo) Quirin(a) Maximo / Aureliano fetiali bis co(n)s(uli) / proco(n)s(uli) Asiae proco(n)s(uli) Africae / praef(ectus) urbi M[a]rius Lysima[ch]us(?)

49. CIL 10, 06567=EDCS-21300075: 224AD-225AD

L(ucio) Ma[ri]o / L(uci) fil(io) / Max[imo] / Aure[liano] / feti[ali] / bis co(n)[s(uli)] / [proco(n)s(uli)] / Asi[ae] / proco(n)[s(uli)] / Afri[cae] / urb[i]s p[raef(ecto)] / patr[ono]

Undated Inscriptions

50. EDCS-08200286:

] fetial[i?]

51. CIL 9.1812=EDCS-12401318:

Diligens Clodiae [M(ani) l(ibertae)] Restituta[e] / et L(ucio) Clodio L(uci) l(iberto) Albano fetiali / primigenio Cyparisso / Felici Secundo h(oc) m(onumentum) h(eredem) n(on) s(equitur)

52. AE 1995.355=EDCS-03300075:

[C(aio) Iulio M(arci) f(ilio) Volt(inia) Pro]culo co(n)s(uli) II / [3 XVviro] s(acris) f(aciundis) fetiali / [3 pro]vinc(iae) Lugudun(ensis) / [3]r() pr(aetori) trib(un)o pl(ebis) / [3] IIIviro a(ere) a(rgento) a(uro) f(lando) f(eriundo) / [3] Larinat[es] remissa / [3]us [3] / l(ocus) d(atus) d(ecreto) d(ecurionum)

53. CIL 3.14195.35=EDCS-30000380:

]XIX[3] / [3]M Caetu[3] / [3] M(arcus) Fulvius / [3]tius Larci/[anus] qu[aestor] / [3] tri[bunus] / [plebis] fet[ialis](?) / [3]nus / [3]stus / [3]E

54. EDCS-36700005:

[3] ges[ta]rum divi Augu[s]ti / [3] i[mper]io 3 Roma[ni] su[biecit] / im[pensarum] 3 p[opolu]mqu[e] Ro[manu]m fecit incis[a]rum / [3] positae R[oma]e exempla[r] subiect[um] // [3] pri[va]to consi[lio] et pri[va]ta 3 q[u]em rem pu[blica]m a domi[natione] faction[is] 3 libert[at]em vindic[avi] / [3] nomi[n]e senatus [3] hon[orificis] 3 su[um] m[e] 3 Hirti[o] con[sulib]us co[nsula]re[] 3 dicendae simu[l]l[an]s et i[mper]iu[m] mihi 3 me pro[] praetore 3 p[opolu]s / [3] uterqu[e] in bel[lo] 3 trium[virum] r[ei] // ex[ter]naque 3 / [3] omnib[us] v[eniam] 3 / [3] tut[o] 3 co[n]se[r]vare / [3] Romano[rum] [//] triumphavi tri[s] egi cur[ulis] / [3] v[ic]iens et semel imp[er]ator 3 / [3] triumphos mihi sena[tu] qu[ibus] 3 / [3] f[asci]bus deposu[i] i[n] Ca[pitolio] 3 / [3] n[un]cupaveram sol[utis] 3 / ob res a [me] 3 meis terra ma[ri]que 3 qui[n] / quag[en]s et quinquag[en]s decr[evit] 3 supplica[n]dum / [3] immo[r]talibus dies a[utem] 3 co[n]sulto 3 supplicat[um] est fuere DC[3] / [3] meum rege[s] 3 / [3] f[uer]am 3 deciens cu[m] 3 / [3] t[ri]cen[sim]u[m] tribunici[ae] 3 [5] [dic]tat[uram] et ap[er]se[nti]e t[ra]esent[i] 3 popu[lo] et a se[] na[tu] 3 A[rruntio] 3 non rec[epi] 3 depreca[tus] i[n] s[um]ma f[rum]enti penu[r]ia curati[onem] annon[ae] / [qua]m 3 ist[is] die[s] paucos m[] p[er]ic[ulo] / [p]raesen[ti] civit[ate] 3 / [me]a con[sul] 3 / [6] [3] V[ic]in[icio] 3 / [3] terti[um] 3 e[st] 3 / [3] ut cu[rator] //] v[oluit] per trib[un]ici[a]m p[] pote[] s[atis] co[n]legam et [ips]e ultro 3 sena[tu] 3 / poposci et accepi / [7] [tri]umv[irum] rei pu[blicae] co[n]s[ul]ti[tuendae] 3 an[nos] de[] cem p[ri]nceps s[enatus] 3 e[um] d[iem] 3 / [3] quadra[ginga] pon[tifex] 3 quindecim[] r[um] sac[ris] fac[] iundis ep[ulon] 3 / [3] fetiali[s] fu[i] / [8] patricioru[m] 3 / [sen]atum t[er] 3 consu[latu] 3 A[gr]ip[] p[] egi l[ustrum] 3 quadra[] g[] ens[] v[] mum 3 quo 3 / [3] sunt 3 / [3] sex[aginta] tri[a] m[illia] tum 3 lus[trum] / [sol]us feci [C(aio) Censo]rino 3 sunt c[iv]ium Ro[ma]norum [capit]a qua[] dragiens 3 trig[in]ta tri[a] 3 e[st] t[er]tium 3 con[le]ga Tib(erio) / [3] m[] eo 3 q[uo] lus[trum] / [3] civ[ium] 3 cen[tu]m / [3] n[on]ge[nta] 3 se[] p[tem] 3 leg[ibus] 3 / m[e] 3 l[atis] m[] ulta 3 m[] iorum 3 i[am] e[st] x[] nost[er] / ro[] saeculo red[uxi] 3 mul[tarum] 3 imitan[] da p[] osteris 3 / [9] vota p[ro] 3 suscipi p[er] 3 quin[] to qu[] oque 3 fe[] cer[unt] / vivo m[e] 3 quattuor[] am[] pliss[ima] / co[n]le[] g[ia] pri[va]tim etia[m] e[st] m[] unicip[] a[tim] u[niversi] 3 unanimite[r] con[] tinenter[] ap[] ud om[nia] pul[] v[] ina[] ria 3 valetu[din]e 3 s[] upp[] licaverunt / [10] nom[] en me[] um [sen]atus co[n]sulto inclusu[m] 3 / [sacrosan]ctu[s] i[n] p[er]petu[um] 3 quo[] ad 3 pot[] e[st] as 3 lege[m] st[] atutum 3 fier[em] / i[n] viv[] 3 l[] ocum 3 mi[] hi / quo[] d 3 habuer[] at r[] ecusavi qu[] od 3 an[] nos 3 mo[] rtuo d[] emum qui

tu[m]ultus 3 // [3] confluen[te mu]ltit[udine] qua[n]/[ta 3 i]d temp[us 3] recep[i P(ublio)] Su[l]picio / [C(aio) Va]lgi[o 3] / [11] aram [3 R]ed[ucis a]nte ae[des 3] / Cap[enam pro] red[itu me]o sena[tus 3] / vir[gines Ve]stal[es anniv]er[sarium 3] / di[e 3 co]nsul[3 Vi]nic[i]o 3 / [3] nos[tro 3] / [12] [3 p]ar[s 3 e]t trib[unorum 3] Lu[cret]/[io et principib]us viris [3 Campania]m qui / [3 ho]c tempus n[3 Hisp]ania [G]al/[liaque rebu]s in iis pr[ovinciis 3 T]ib(erio) Nerone et / [3 co(n)]s(ulibus) aram [3] consa[c]randam / [3 ad ca]mpum [3 sacer]dotes [vi]rgines / [3 ann]iver[sarium 3] / [13] [3 volueru]nt cum / [3] victoriis / [3 om[nino cl]ausum / [/ [14]]/tum [3 des]ign[a]vit [3] / ini[rent 3 e]x eo d[ie 3] inte[r]re[ssent 3] / [3 uni]ver[si 3] / [3 d]on[at]um 3 / [15]] / [ex bel]lo[rum 3] / [3 d]eci[mo / homi]num milli[a 3] ducent[a] / tribunicia[e 3] et viginti [mil]/libus plebi[s urb]an[ae s]exagen[os 3] dedi et co[lonis] / militum m[eoru]m con[s]ul quintum [3] viritim milli[a num]/[m]um singu[la d]edi acceperunt id t[ri]umpha[l]e congiar[iu]m i[n co]lonis ho[minu]m circiter [c]entum [et vi]ginti millia [3] ter[tium decimu]m sexag[e]nos den[arios] pleb[ei] quae tu[m frume]ntu[m] / pu[blicum acci]pieb[a]t dedi ea milli[3] paullo [3] quam / [d]u[centa fue]runt / [16] pec[uniam pr]o agris qu[os in] co[n]sulatu 3 quar[to e]t [t] postea consu[libus M(arco) Cra]sso et Cn(aeo) [Lent]ulo [3] m[ilit]ibus solvi / mu[nicipiis 3] sestertiu[m ci]rciter se[xs]iens m[illi]e[n]s fu[it] / quam [3 pra]edi(i)s nume[ra]vi et ci[rciter bi]s mill[iens] / [et] ses[centiens 3] agris prov[i]ncialib[us s]olv[i i]d prim[us et] / [so]lus [3] dedux<e=I>runt c[ol]onias m[ilit]um [3] / [p]rovi[n]ciis ad memo[ria(m)] aetati[s] meae fec[i] et poste[a Ti(berio) Nero]ne 3 / [3] itemque C(aio) [3 Lael]io consu[libus 3] / [C]alvisio [3 Pass]ieno co[n]su[libus et L(ucio)] Le[n]tulo et M(arco) Me[ss]alla con[s]ulib[us e]t 3 Fab[ricio co(n)s(ulibus)] milit[i]bus quos eme[ritis sti]/[pe]ndi(i)s in [su]a m[unicipia dedux]i prae[mi]a nu[me]rato persol[vi 3] / [re]m sest[er]tium q[uater millie]ns cir[citer i]mp[en]di / [17] [3 pecu]nia mea iuvi aer[arium] ita u[t 3 millie]ns et / [quingent]ie(n)s ad eos qui prae[erant aerari]o d[etulerim 3 Lep]ido et / [L(ucio) Arrunti]o consu[libus in 3] / [3 cons]titutum e[st 3] / [3 plur]a sti[pendia emeruisse]nt sest[er]tium / [18] [3 fu]erun[t cu]m deficer[ent 3] / [3] tum plur[ib]us multo [fru]me[n]/[tarios 3] horreo et patr[i]monio m[eo] edidi // [19] [3 continen]s ei Ch[alcidicum 3] / [3 porticu]s aedem divi Iu[li 3] / [Fla]minium qua[m s]um appellar[i 3] nom[in]e 3 / [eod]em in solo fecera[t] Octaviam p[ulvinar ad c]ircu[m] / [3] in Capitolio Iovis Feretri Io[vis Tonanti]s ae[dem 3] / [Mi]nervae et Iunonis Reginae et Io[vis Libertat]is i[n 3] / [La]rum in summa sacra via aedem [3 Iu]/[venta]tis aedem Matris Magnae in [3] / [20] [Capitoliu]m [e]t [Po]mpeium theatrum [3] opus [impe]n[sa 3] / re[feci 3] inscrip[tione 3] rivo[s] aqua[rum com]plu[ribus 3] vetus[tate la]bentes 3 aqua[m q]uae ap[pellatur] / Marc[ia 3] fonte novo i[n 3 i]nm[isso] for[um Iuli]/um et basil[icam] quae fuit inter a[edem Cas]tor[is et aede]m Sat[ur]ni coe[pta] proflig[ata]que o[pera] a patre me[o] perf[eci] et eande[m] basil[ic]am con[s]umpta[m] [3] am[pli]ato eius sol[o su]b t[itu]lo nom[in]is fi[li]o[rum] / [3 in]c(h)o[h]a[vi 3] si vivus non [perf]ecisse[m] perfici ab [her]edibus / [3 ius]si duo e[st] oc[toginta] templa [d]eum in [3 sextu]m ex / [auctori]tate senatu[s] r[efeci] nullo praeterm[isso 3] temp[ore] / [3 deb]ebat consul septimum viam Flam[iniam 3] / [3 pontes]que om[n]e[s] praeter Mu[l]vium et Min[ucium 3] / [21] in [3 sol]o Martis Ultoris templu[m] f[orum]que [3 ma]/n[ibiis 3] theatru[m] a[d] aedem Apol[linis in s]olo m[agna 3] / [3 emp]to feci quod sub nom[in]e 3 / [3 manib]is in Capitol[i]o et in aede [3] aede A[pollinis 3] / [3 e]t in templo [Marti]s Ultor[is] consac[ravi] q[uae] mihi co[n]st[itu]er[unt] sestertiu[m] circit[3] co[r]ona[ri] po[n]do tri[gin]ta e[t quinqu]e millia m[unicipiis 3] conferentibus / [ad t]riu[m]phos 3] qu[i]ntu[m] c[onsul 3] quotie(n)s cumque / [imp]er[ator appel]latus [3 aur]um c[oronarium 3] accepi decernenti[bus] / m[unicipiis 3] co[lonis] ae[que] beni[gne 3] decrever[an]t / [22] ter [3 gladiat]oriu[m] de[di] m[eo 3] quinq[ui]en[s fi]liorum meo[r]um 3 nomin[e] quib[us 3] pug[naver]u[n]t h[ominu]m / c[irciter 3] mill[ia] bis athl[etarum 3] acc[itorum] spe[ctaculu]m / p[opulo 3] me[o] no[m]ine et te[r]tium [3] nomine ludos / [3] quater aliorum autem m[agistratu]m vicem ter et vi[ciens] [pro]co<l=N>legio XVvirorum ma[gister col]legii collega M(arcus) / Agrippa [3 sa]lec(u)lares C(aio) F[urnio] C(aio) Sila[no 3] consul XIII ludos / Mar[tiales 3] feci quos p[ost 3] de[n]c[eps 3] / ann[is 3] fecerunt [3 vena]tion[es 3] Afri/ca[narum 3] nomi[n]e aut [3 e]t n[epotum 3] / i[n 3 amphit]hea[t]ris 3 pop[u]lo [3] e[t v]iciens 3 con[f]ecta 3 bestiaru[m] circiter tri[a 3] / [23] [3 spectaci]lum populo d[edi] 3 n[unc] / [3 ca]vato [s]olo in [3] oc[t]ingentos pedes / [3] q[uo t]rigint[a 3] rostratae triremes [3] / [3] in[ter] [3] quib[us] in clas[sibus 3] mill[ia 3] ci[rciter] / [24] [3 in templ]is o[mn]iu[m] 3] prov[incia]e

A[siae 3] ornam[en]/[ta 3 q]uo b[ellum 3 p]riv[a]/[tim 3] eq[uestres 3 quad]rigis a[r]/[gentee 3] octo[ginta 3 ex]qu[e ea pecu[ni]/[a don]a aurea i[n aede Ap]ollin[is 3 mih]i statu[aru]m honore[m habue]ru[nt] po[sui] / [25] [3] paca[vi 3] domi[nis s]uis [3 co]ntr[a 3] mill[ia] / [capt]a dom[inis] ad supp[licium 3] ver[ba] / [3 I]tal[ia spo]nte su[a 3] Actiu[m du]cem d[ep]o[po]/[scit 3] <ea=AE>de[3 Galli]ae Hi[spani]ae Af[rica] / [3 f]uerun[t 26] [omni]um pr[ovinciarum 3 fi]niti[mae fuer]unt [3] / [qu]ae non p[arere]nt 3 G[all]ias et Hispa[nia]s pro/[v]incias i[tem 3] / [f]lumin[is 3 Hadria]/[no] mar[i 3] / [m]ea p[er] Eud[ae]mo[n 3] / [3 s]unt [in a]cie et [3] oppi[da 3] // [in Aethio]piam [3 a]d oppi[dum 3] cui proxima / [3 Mero]e in Arab[iam] usque i[n 3] exercitus / [ad opp]idum Mari[ba] / [27] [Aegyp]tum imper[io 3] maiorem in/[terf]ecto rege [3 provincia]m malui ma[ioru]m no[stro]r[um 3 A]rtavasdis [3] / [3 aut]em T[igran]is 3 Neron[em t]radere q[ui] tum [3] / [3 er]at et [3 de]sciscen[tem 3] / [3] Gaiu[m 3 Ario]barz[ani 3] / [3] filio regen[dam 3 ei]us [3] / [3 i]nterfecto Ti[granem 3] reg[io] gener[is] Armenio[rum 3] / [3 i]n id regnum m[isi 3] trans Had[rianum] / [3] vergunt ad ori[entem 3 pa]rte magn[a 3] / [3 possi]dentibus et [3] occup[atas 3] / [3 rec]iperavi / [28] colo[nias in Afri]ca Sicil[3 Hispani]a A[chaia] / Asi[a 3] Ita[lia] / aute[m 3 frequen]tiss[imae] / fuer[unt 3] / [29] [3 hostib]us re/[ciper]avi [3] Ro[ma]nor[um 3] popu[li] / [Ro]m[ani] pe[tere 3] templ[o Ma]rtis / [U]lto[ris 3] / [30] [6] / [nun]quam [3] / [meu]s impe[rio 3] / [flum]ini[s 3] / [3 es]t et p[ostea 3] / [3 imperi]a p[opuli] R[omani] [3] coe[git] / [31] [3] m[issae 3 t]em[us 3] amic[iti]am pitie[run]t / [3 Sarmataru]m qui s[unt 3] flum[en] / [3 Hib]erorum e[st 3] / [32] [3 Tiridate]s et post[ea 3] // [3] filiu[s M]edorum Ar[tavasdes 3] / [3 Britanno]rum D[um]nobellaunus [3] / [3 Marcom]an[oru]m Sue[bo]rum [3] ad [me]re[x Par]thorum / [3 su]os n[epotesque 3] misit i[n Ital]ia[m 3] / [3 libe]ror[um] suoru[m 3] / [3 gente]s ex[pertae 3 Ro]m[ani] f[idem] / [3] popu[lo 3] / [3 comme]rcium / [33] [6] / [3 acc]eperunt Par[thi 3] / [3] Medi Arioba[rzanem 3 Artavazdi]s f[ili]i/[um 3 nep]otem / [34] [3 septi]mo postqua[m b]el[la 3] exst[er]min[er]am [3] / [3 po]tens re[ru]m om[nium rem pu]blicam [3] / [3 populi]que R[omani] [3 tr]anst[ra]m [3] m[eo] se[natus 3 Au]gust[us 3] s[um] e[st] / [3] mear[um 3] publ[ice 3] civ[ica] / [su]per [3 mea]m fixa es[t 3] clu[peus 3] / [positus 3] senatum po[pulum]que Rom[anum 3] cle[ment]ia[que] iusti[tiae] et pieta[ti]s cau[sa] testatu[m 3] / [3] p[ost] id t[empus] auctoritate [3] / [3 nihil]o am[p]li[us habu]i quam cet[eri 3] mi[hi 3] / [3] f[uerunt] [35] [3 gereba]m sena[tus et e]qu[e]ster o[r]do [3] appell[avit 3] pa[tr]em p[atr]ia[e] id[que] / [3] insc[ri]b[e]ndum et in c[u]ria [3] / [3 quad]rig[is] quae mihi ex s[enatus] c[onsulto] p[osit]ae [3] / [3] a]geba[m] septu[age]nsimum [3] / [su]m[ma 3] ded[it 3] aera[r]ium [3 di]m[issis] denariu[m] sexien[s 3] // [3 M]art[is 3] Ton[antis 3] / [6] [3 de]u[m] P[enatium 3] / [3] curia[m 3] / [3 th]eatrum [3] / [3] Ca]esarum / [r]iv[os 3] / [3 spac]ta[la] sca[enica 3] / [3] naum[a]chi[am 3] / [3] terrae motu [3] / [3] senatoribus[que] q[uoru]m

55. CIL 12.3164=EDCS-09201632:

L(ucio) Aemilio M(arci) f(ilio) Vol(tinia) / Honorato / IIIvir(o) capitali q(uaestori) pro pr(aetore) / provinc(iae) Ponti et Bithyniae / leg(ato) eiusdem provinc(iae) aed(ili) pleb(is) pr(aetori) / praef(ecto) frumenti dandi ex s(enatus) c(onsulto) / sacerdoti fetiali proco(n)s(uli) provinc(iae) / Cretae et Cyrenarum / hic hos honores beneficio Opt<i=U>mi(!) princip(i) / maturius quam per annos permitti solet / gessit

56. CIL 14.3595=EDCS-05801585:

T(ito) Marcio T(iti) f(ilio) [3] / sacerdoti fetiali tr(ibuno) [mil(itum)] / leg(ionis) XIII Gem(inae) q(uaest(ori) pr(o) pr(aetore)) / provinciae Achaiae a[b actis] / senat(us) aed(ili) cur(uli) praet(ori) c[and(idato)] / curatori viae Latinae [legato] / leg(ionis) II Aug(ustae) / Grania Tertull[a

57. AE 1914.281=EDCS-16300167:

co]nsu[li sacer]/[doti fe]tiali IIIIv[iro viar(um)] / [curand(arum) trib(uno)] mil(itum) leg(ionis) I M[inerviae] / [q(uaestori) pr(o) pr(aetore) pr(ovinciae) Ma]cedoni[ae se]viro / [eq(uitum) Roma]nor(um) tr(ibuno) pl(ebis) [leg(ato) pro] / [pr(aetore) pr(ovinciae) Africae] praet(ori) leg(ato)

[Aug(usti) leg(ionis) VI] / [Ferratae] et leg(ionis) II A[diutricis] / [translato] in eam e[xpeditio]ne] / [Parthica] in qua d[onatus est] / [donis mi]litaribu[s coronis mu]/[rali vall]ari aur[ea hastis pu]/[ris tri]bus vex[illis duobus] / [legato] Augu[sti pro praet(ore)] / [provinciae A]rabi[ae curatori] / [operum loc]oru[m]que publicorum] / [

58. AE 1893.88=EDCS-13100076:

[Q(uinto) Antistio Advento] / Q(uinti) f(ilio) Quir(ina) Postumio A[q]u[i]/lino co(n)s(uli) sacerdoti fetia/li leg(ato) Aug(usti) pr(o) pr(aetore) provinc(iae) Ger/maniae inferioris leg(ato) Aug(usti) / at praetenturam Italiae et / Alpium expeditione Germa/nica cura(tori) operum locorumq(ue) / publicorum leg(ato) Aug(usti) pr(o) pr(aetore) / provinc(iae) Arabiae leg(ato) Aug(usti) leg(ionis) / VI Ferratae et secundae Ad/iutricis translato in eam ex/peditio]ne Parthica qua do/natus est donis militaribus / coronis murali vallari au/rea hastis puris tribus ve/xillis duobus praetori leg(ato) / pr(o) pr(aetore) provinc(iae) Africae tr(ibuno) pl(ebis) se/viro eq(uitum) R(omanorum) q(uaestori) pr(o) pr(aetore) provinc(iae) / Macedoniae tribuno mil(itum) / leg(ionis) I Minerviae P(iae) F(idelis) IIIIvir(o) / viarum curandarum / Sex(tus) Marcius Maximus ob in/signem eius in se ben<e=I>volen/tiam s(ua) p(ecunia) p(osuit) d(e)d(icavit)

59. CIL 6.2318=EDCS-18300402:

D(is) M(anibus) / Apolaustus Modian[us] / publ(icus) VIIvir(um) epulon(um) item / Apolaustus Claudianu[s publ(icus)] / VIIvirum epulon(um) [et] / Iustus Gavianus publ(icus) fet[ial(ium) et] / P(ublius) Volusius Renatu[s] / Volusiae Iustae matri [caris]/simae omnium feminaru[m sanc]/tiori univiriae qu(a)e v(ixit) mec[um an(nis) 3] / m(ensibus) II d(iebus) XXI ceterisque [suis] / posterisque eorum

60. CIL 6.32430=EDCS-21600023:

] / Maxuma(!) [3] / filia fetialis V[

61. CIL 6.32431=EDCS-21600024:

] / Caec[3] / fetial[

62. CIL 15.796=EDCS-34500662:

L(uci) Anni Fetiali

Bibliography

Secondary Sources:

- Bickerman, E. J. (1945), 'Bellum Philippicum: Some Roman and Greek Views concerning the Causes of the Second Macedonian War', *Classical Philology* 40, 137-148.
- Broughton, T. R. S. (1987), 'Mistreatment of Foreign Legates and the Fetial Priests: Three Roman Cases', *Phoenix* 41, 50-62.
- Campbell, B. (2015), 'Apronius, Lucius', *Oxford Classical Dictionary*, <https://doi-org.simsrad.net.ocs.mq.edu.au/10.1093/acrefore/9780199381135.013.626>
- Ferrary, J. L. (1995), 'Ius fetiale et diplomatie', *Les relations internationales* 1995, 411-432.
- Frank, T. (1912), 'The Import of the Fetial Institution', *Classical Philology* 7, 335-342.
- Garani, M. (2007), 'Propertius' temple of Jupiter Feretrius and the spolia opima (4.10): a poem not to be read?', *L'Antiquité Classique* 76, 99-117.
- Goar, R. J. (1972), *Cicero and the State Religion*, Amsterdam.
- Gruen, E. S. (1968), *Roman Politics and the Criminal Courts*, 149-78 B.C. Cambridge.
- Harris, W. V. (1979), *War and Imperialism in Republican Rome 327-70 BC*, Oxford.
- Hobsbawm, E. Ranger, T. (2012), *The Invention of Tradition*, Cambridge.
- Lennon, J. (2012), *Pollution and Religion in Ancient Rome*, Cambridge.
- Levick, B. M. (1978), 'Antiquarian or Revolutionary? Claudius Caesar's Conception of His Principate', *The American Journal of Philology* 99, 79-105.
- Macdonald, A. H. and Walbank, F. W. (1937), 'The Origins Of The Second Macedonian War', *Journal of Roman Studies* 27, 180-207.
- McIntyre, G. (2018), 'Camillus as Numa: religion in Livy's refoundation narratives', *Journal of Ancient History* 6, 63-79.
- Mommsen, T. (1871), *Römisches Staatsrecht*, Cambridge.
- Ogilvie, R. M. (1965), *A Commentary on Livy. Books 1-5*, Oxford.

- Oost, S. I. (1954), 'The Fetial Law and the Outbreak of the Jugurthine War', *The American Journal of Philology* 75, 147-159.
- Penella, R. J. (1987), 'War, Peace, and the ius fetiale in Livy 1', *Classical Philology* 82, 233-237.
- Rich, J. (1976), 'Declaring War in the Roman Republic in the Period of Transmarine Expansion', *Collection Latomus* 149, 1-145.
- Rich, J. (2011), 'The fetiales and Roman International Relations', *Priests and State in the Roman World* eds. Richardson, J. H. and Santangelo, F. 187-242.
- Santangelo, F. (2008), 'The Fetials And Their "Ius"', *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 51, 63-93.
- Santangelo, F. (2014), 'I feziali fra rituale, diplomazia e tradizioni inventate', *Sacerdos / a cura di Gianpaolo Urso*, 83-104.
- Saulnier, C. (1980), 'Le rôle des prêtres fétiaux et l'application du « ius fetiale » à Rome', *Revue historique de droit français et étranger* 58, 171-199.
- Springer, L. A. (1954), 'The Cult and Temple of Jupiter Feretrius', *The Classical Journal* 50, 27-32.
- Thomas, E. and Witschel, C. (1992), 'Constructing reconstruction: claim and reality of Roman rebuilding inscriptions from the Latin west', *Papers of the British School at Rome* 60, 135-177.
- Walbank, F. W. (1949), 'Roman Declaration of War in the Third and Second Centuries', *Classical Philology* 44, 15-19.
- Watson, A. (1993), *International Law in Archaic Rome*, Baltimore.
- Wiedemann, T. (1986), 'The Fetiales: A Reconsideration', *The Classical Quarterly* 36, 478-490.
- Zollschan, L. (2011), 'The Ritual Garb of the Fetial Priests', *Museum Helveticum* 68, 47-67.
- Zollschan, L. (2012), 'The Longevity Of The Fetial College', *Law and Religion in the Roman Republic* 336, 119-144.

Primary Sources:

Ammianus Marcellinus, *Res Gestae* trans. J. C. Rolfe, from LacusCurtius, accessed 23 Feb 2022.

Appian, *Ἱβηρική* trans. H. White, from Livius.org, accessed 23 Feb 2022.

Appian, *Σαυνιτική* trans. H. White, from Livius.org, accessed 23 Feb 2022.

Arnobius, *Adversus nationes* trans. H. Bryce and H. Campbell, from NewAdvent.org, accessed 23 Feb 2022.

Aulus Gellius, *Noctes Atticae* trans. J. C. Rolfe, from Perseus.tufts.edu, accessed 23 Feb 2022.

Cassius Dio, *Historia Romana* trans. E. Cary, from LacusCurtius, accessed 23 Feb 2022.

Cicero, *De legibus* trans W. Keyes, from Loeb Classical Library, accessed 23 Feb 2022.

Cicero, *De officiis* trans. W. Miller, from LacusCurtius, accessed 23 Feb 2022.

Cicero, *De republica* trans. W. Keyes, from Attalus.org, accessed 23 Feb 2022.

Cicero, *In Verrem* trans. C. D. Yonge, from Perseus.tufts.edu, accessed 23 Feb 2022.

Diodorus Siculus, *Bibliotheca historica* trans. G. Booth and F. Hoefer, from Attalus.org, accessed 11 Aug 2022.

Dionysius Halicarnassensis, *Antiquitates Romanae* trans. E Cary, from LacusCurtius, accessed 23 Feb 2022.

Festus, *Glossaria Latina* trans. W. M. Lindsay. Second edn. Vol. 4.

Livy, *Ab Urbe Condita* trans. B. O. Foster, D. Spillan, C. Edmonds, C. Roberts, from Perseus.tufts.edu, accessed 24 Feb 2022.

Livy, *Epitomae* trans. W. A. McDevitte, from Perseus.tufts.edu, accessed 24 Feb 2022.

Nepos, *Atticus* trans. J. S. Watson, from Attalus.org, accessed 7 Nov 2022.

Nonius, *De compendiosa doctrina* trans. W. M. Lindsay. Second edn. Vol. 3.

Ovid, *Fasti* trans. J. G. Frazer, from Theoi.com, accessed 25 Nov 2022.

Pliny, *Naturalis historia* trans. J. Bostock, from Perseus.tufts.edu, accessed 25 Feb 2022.

Plutarch, *Vitae Parallelae Camillus* trans. B. Perrin, from LacusCurtius, accessed 25 Feb 2022.

Plutarch, *Vitae Parallelae Numa* trans. B. Perrin, from LacusCurtius, accessed 25 Feb 2022.

Plutarch, *Vitae Parallelae Romulus* trans. B. Perrin, from LacusCurtius, accessed 25 Nov 2022.

Polybius, *Histories* trans. H. J. Edwards, from LacusCurtius, accessed 25 Feb 2022.

Servius, *Scholia Danielis* trans. T. Wiedemann, from The Classical Quarterly, 1986, Vol. 36, No. 2, pp. 478-490 accessed 28 Jul 2021.

Suetonius, *Divus Claudius* trans. J. C. Rolfe, from LacusCurtius, accessed 25 Feb 2022.

Tacitus, *Annales* trans. J. Jackson, from Lacus Curtius, accessed 25 Feb 2022.

Valerius Maximus, *Facta et dicta memorabilia* trans. S. Bailey, from Loeb Classical Library, accessed 3 Aug 2022.

Varro, *De lingua Latina* trans. R. G. Kent, from Attalus.org, accessed 25 Feb 2022.

Velleius Paterculus, *Historiae* trans. F. W. Shipley, from LacusCurtius, accessed 2 Aug 2022.