The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

Duplicated Altars and Offerings in Virgil, *Ecl.* V. 65; *Aen.* III. 305; and *Aen.* V. 77 ff

W. Warde Fowler

The Classical Review / Volume 31 / Issue 07 / November 1917, pp 163 - 167

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00009239, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00009239

How to cite this article:

W. Warde Fowler (1917). Duplicated Altars and Offerings in Virgil, *Ecl.* V. 65; *Aen.* III. 305; and *Aen.* V. 77 ff. The Classical Review, 31, pp 163-167 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00009239

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

confronts us with a long list of featureless items that offer no clue to their origin, and the suspicion arises that it has been a structure raised piece by piece through a long period of time, and with material collected from every conceivable quarter. But in the case of Philox. the likelihood approaches to certainty that each and every item (even the paradigms of declension) can be assigned to its source (marginalia in this or that MS. of some monastery library?). In investigating Abol. and Abstr. the plan I found best was to read through the items until I came on a definite clue and then to follow it out: if it led to nothing, to read on until another clue showed itself. In the P-section of Philox. a clue appears at 148, 11 Personarum acceptio: *προσωπολημφία*. For this is a Biblical phrase: e.g. in the Vulgate of 2 Par. 19, 7; Rom. 2, 11, etc. But I would drop a hint that not the Vulgate, but the Itala may be the real source for (to mention one indication out of many) the Latin *Thesaurus* confines *acceia* (variously deciphered by the scribe at 13, 16 Accia et accela: *ἀσκαλάφη*) to the Itala (not the Vulgate) of Lev. 11, 17. This bird-name might, of course, conceivably come from a list of birds (and yet many of the bird glosses emanate from Festus), just as the numerous plant-names may come from a botanical list, possibly a chapter of some medical book from which the many medical glosses come. But we must get certainty to replace vague conjecture, and certainty will be got if the actual medical or botanical treatise used by 'Philoxenus' can be identified. The Itala question can be deferred till the appearance of Denk's revised edition. The item *Conventiculum perditorum* (115, 36) suggested Cicero to me, but *Thes. Lat.* offers no

Ciceronian (or other) example. Can it come from the Itala? It appears also in St. Columban's (?) Latin phrase-book (discussed on another page of this *Review*), transcribed on a leaf of the famous Naples MS. of Charisius; and (what interests a palaeographer) the transcriber has preserved the 'ven'-symbol which was current in St. Columban's time (although in the transcriber's it would denote 'ver').

Loewe (*l.c.*) refers to Rudorff (*l.c.*) for some speculations regarding the time and place of the compilation. I can offer nothing better than the following remarks: Antea (18, 26), described as a *πόλις Σπανίας*, is apparently the town-name wrongly given as Anteae in *Thes. Lat.*, and described as 'statio in Gallia Narbonensi,' with a citation of the Peutinger Table. The Greek rendering of the 'god of secret counsel' as Harpocrates (112, 43 Conso: *τῷ νιῶ τῆς Ἰσιδος*) is quite consistent with Italian provenance. Although the Cologne papyrus-fragment (C.G.L. II. 561), clearly connected with the Cyrillus Glossary, is ascribed to the sixth century (by Goetz in Pauly-Wiss.) and the Cyrillus Glossary MS. (Harleianus) to the seventh (by the Pal. Soc. editors), Traube in his list of uncial MSS. (in the appendix to his *Vorlesungen und Abhandlungen*, Vol. I.) abstains from dating any uncial MS. by the mere evidence of the script. The suggestion however that the Harleian MS. had a papyrus original is very attractive. A glance at the photographed page in C.G.L. II. will show that the lacunae present quite the appearance of lacunae in a papyrus MS. The use of papyrus continued in Italy for a fairly long time.

W. M. LINDSAY.

DUPLICATED ALTARS AND OFFERINGS IN VIRGIL, *ECL.* V. 65; *AEN.* III. 305; AND *AEN.* V. 77 FF.

SOME time ago I was asked by the late Professor W. R. Hardie if I could explain this duplication in religious rites. I could not do so then, nor have I since then come across any attempt at explanation. Just lately a Nor-

wegian scholar, Dr. Eitrem, has sent me a large and learned work of his on *Opferritus*, but in all its five hundred pages I have so far discovered no allusion to the problem. Why on certain occasions does Virgil represent either

the altars, or the victims and accompanying offerings, or both altars and offerings, as doubled? I will quote the passages directly, but in order to clear the ground I will at once mention the attempted explanation of Servius, who was evidently as much puzzled as we are.

This occurs in Servius' comment on *Ecl.* V. 66 ('en quattuor aras: ecce duas tibi, Daphni,' etc.) Odd numbers, he says, suit heavenly gods, even numbers suit *di inferi*: Daphnis belongs to the latter class as a newly departed spirit, and should therefore have two altars and offerings, not one or three. For this he refers to the 'pontificales libri.' But unluckily for this theory, Apollo, a heavenly deity, was also to share in the duplication,¹ and I shall be able to show later on from authentic records that the rule never really held good. Servius of course saw the difficulty in Apollo's case, and tried to scramble out of it by quoting Porphyrius for a notion that Apollo had three natures, one of which was a chthonic one. But we need not follow Servius into Pythagorean obscurities: it is clear that he did not know the true reason for the duplication, and was only groping in the dark. Leaving him, let us consider the passages themselves.

In *Aen.* V. 42 ff. Aeneas celebrates in Roman fashion the *Parentalia* or yearly renewal of the burial of his father Anchises on its anniversary. The ritual is thus described ('ad tumulum,' l. 76):

hic duo rite mero libans carchesia Baccho
fundit humi, duo lacte novo, duo sanguine sacro,
purpureosque iacit flores, etc.

After the appearance of a mysterious serpent which fed upon these offerings, Aeneas proceeds to slay victims:

caedit binas de more bidentis
totque sues, totidem nigrantis terga iuencos,²
vinaque fundebat pateris animamque vocabat
Anchisae magni manisque Acheronte remissos.

¹ 'en quattuor aras:

ecce duas tibi, Daphni, duas altaria Phoebo.

² The combination of ox, sheep, and pig, as in the *suovetaurilia* of lustration, may be a slip of Virgil's. So far as I know it is not elsewhere mentioned in connection with *inferiae*: in the *Cenotaphia* of Pisa (see below, and Dessau, *Inscr. Select.* I. 140) only sheep and ox are mentioned. Virgil only speaks of the ox as being black, but he probably meant it to be understood of the other victims.

As Henry saw (whose comments here are particularly interesting) the rite is practically that of the fulfilment of a vow undertaken by the son: wherever he might be at the time, Aeneas would do his best to fulfil it:

annua vota tamen sollemnisque ordine pompas
exsequeretur strueremque suis altaria donis
(l. 54 ff.).

and will continue to do this after his final settlement in Italy:

poscamus ventos, et haec me sacra quotannis
urbe velit posita templis sibi ferre dicatis
(59-60).

The *votum* is probably at the root of all these annual observances of private life, as of the yearly renewed vows of the magistrate for the welfare of the state. Servius Interp. saw an anomaly here (commenting on l. 53 'annua vota,' etc.), because *vota* 'rerum secundarum sint,' i.e. in a *votum* you want to procure some favourable result, which in this instance he (Servius) does not perceive. But as Henry saw, Aeneas is really trying to kill two birds with one stone—to do his duty to his father's Manes; and to get favourable winds for his voyage to Italy. Was not the attitude of the primitive Roman to his *parentes* much the same as this, when once he had settled firmly down on the land, and could institute a yearly rite of duty to them, resting as they did near his own dwelling? Did he expect no benefit from them? We know for certain that he did: if he omitted to pay them the proper rites (*iusta facere*), he had to make a piacular offering, lest the earth-power (of which they had become a part) should not yield him a good harvest. (*Rel. Exp.* 121, 139). In the later *Parentalia* the *votum*, so far as we know, is not apparent, and the benefit expected from the *parentes* is hardly present to the mind of the worshipper. But I think this treatment of the subject by Virgil makes it highly probable that an Italian, if not a Roman, could still understand the idea: and the association of funeral rites with *vota* is also present in at least one other passage of our poet.

This is not indeed quite plain in III.

300 ff., where Andromache is sacrificing to the Manes of Hector :

progredior portu classis et litora linquens,
sollemnis cum forte dapes et tristia dona
ante urbem in luco falsi Simoentis ad undam
libabat cineri Andromache manisque vocabat
Hectoreum ad tumulum, viridi quem caespite
inanem
et geminas, causam lacrimis, sacrauerat aras.

But here we have the double altar, which was not mentioned in the Fifth Book, and we may take it that the duplication of the offerings is thereby indicated. The word *sollemnis* seems to me to suggest a regularly recurring rite, and the meaning of the duplication, whatever it be, must be the same in each case. But let us turn to the more explicit passage in the Fifth Eclogue.

Whether the Daphnis of this poem be meant for Julius Caesar or not, it is certain that lines 56 ff. proclaim his deification, and in language and allusion which is not Greek or Theocritean but Virgilian and Roman. It is also certain that this deification is accompanied by vows for the annual performance of sacrifice on its anniversary (we may presume), as in the case of the establishment of a deity in a temple under Roman pontifical law (Wissowa, *R.K.*, ed. 2, p. 474) ;

semper honos nomenque tuum laudesque manebunt.
ut Baccho Cererique, tibi sic vota quotannis
agricolae facient : damnabis tu quoque votis.

I speak of annual vows : but for these, under the *ius divinum*, had been substituted in the city the *lex templi*, in which all necessary instructions were laid down for the ritual of the temple's *dies natalis*. But in the country, and in the city before the introduction of regular temples, permanent altars, and written *leges*, I can have no doubt that the machinery for permanence and exactness was that of the vow, which, though by no means peculiar to Rome, was far more frequent and striking there, both in public and private life, than in any other State known to me.

And here again we find the duplicated altar and offerings. There are to be two *arae* to Daphnis, two *altaria* to Apollo, who is to share in the new cult :

en quattuor aras ;
ecce duas tibi Daphni, duas altaria Phoebo.
pocula bina novo spumantia lacte quotannis
craterasque duo statuat tibi pinguis olivi . . .

Whether the *vota* undertaken necessitate two festivals in the year or one does not matter for my argument (lines 70 and 75 seem to imply the former, and are not very easy to interpret). But they are beyond doubt the important feature of the whole proceeding.¹

It may be as well at this point to refer to an example which seems to stand half-way between *parentatio* and apotheosis, and is therefore worth comparing with the *parentatio* of *Aen.* V and the apotheosis of *Ecl.* V. The so-called 'Cenotaphia' of Pisa included an *ara* erected by decree of the Senate of Pisa in honour of L. Caesar, the grandson of Augustus, and at this altar *inferiae* were to be offered to the Manes of the dead youth. This process is called *parentatio* in the inscription² which records the same decree in honour of the elder brother, Gaius Caesar : 'eodem modo quo L. Caesari *parentari* institutum est *parentetur*,' i.e. on a particular day each year, 'a.d. VIII Kal. Mart.' Here we seem to see at a glance the connection between the ordinary cult of the dead, the *lex templi*, and the performance of annual vows by a community. It is not indeed stated that the victims offered as *inferiae* were duplicated : but the black sheep prescribed are in the plural, and it seems to me so unlikely that their exact number should not be laid down, that I am inclined to think that the number (i.e. II) dropped out in the cutting on the marble. That this was natural enough will be seen at once : BOSQUE ET OVIS ATRI INFULIS CAERULEIS INFULATI, etc.² I should insert II between ATRI and INFULIS.

It is very seldom that we find more than one victim at a time specified in

¹ Virgil's altars are conceived as of the primitive rural kind—a raised turf, one for each victim. For a permanent temple and altar Anchises was to wait till the foundation of the city : V. 60 ff. The turf altar of rural life and primitive times survived in the ritual of the Fratres Arvales, in the form of a *foculus* with a *caespes* on the top of it (see Henzen, *Acta*, 23 and 27).

² Dessau, *Inscr. Selectae*, I. 140.

Roman religious documents. In the *Acta* of the *ludi saeculares* of 17 B.C., the victims and offerings are nine in number, *i.e.* have a mystical significance, like the choirs of 27 boys and 27 girls, and do not concern us in any way ('septem,' *Aen.* VI. 38). But in the *Acta Fratrum Arvalium* we find a great number of examples of double sacrifices, if not of double altars: and these I will now go on to examine.

As we work through the ritual performances of the *Fratres Arvales* in their chronological order, so far, that is, as they are preserved in the inscriptions that have been discovered, the first instance we meet with of a double sacrifice of victims occurs on Jan. 23 A.D. 37, when the *magister* of the brethren with the consent of consul and Senate offered two *boves mares* to Jupiter 'ob securitatem et salutem Ti. Caesaris Augusti.' No vow is here mentioned; the recovery of Tiberius, who was already very ill and died on March 16, was in this miserable time hardly a proper object of solemn *vota*. But apparently they offered the double sacrifice which was appropriate to such vows.

It is on Jan. 3, in the year 58, that we first find double victims accompanying vows made for the safety of a princeps (Nero): Jupiter, Juno, Minerva, Salus, Augustus, Augusta (Livia), and Claudius, are also so honoured.¹ This recurs in 59, also on Jan. 7, after the victims vowed in the previous January had been immolated: and again in 60 on the same day, though on all other occasions throughout the year the victims are single. The next year in which Jan. 3 is mentioned in the surviving fragments is 69, when we are surprised to find the victims vowed for Galba single instead of double; but the duplication recurs under Vespasian and again under Titus on the same Jan. 3: after which time it seems to become unusual.

Now this day, Jan. 3, is of peculiar importance under the Empire, and was known as *votorum nuncupatio*; *i.e.* it

was the day on which public vows were paid and made by consuls, pontifices, etc., for the safety of the Emperor, as on Jan. 1 for the safety of the State. It seems certain that under Augustus and Tiberius both ceremonies had taken place together on Jan. 1, and after the death of the latter the two were for the first time separated: Jan. 3 being chosen instead of Jan. 2, because all days after Calends were unlucky.² The question naturally occurs, were the victims offered for the State also double, and had they been so in Republican times? It does not seem possible to answer this question. Did each consul sacrifice a victim? Or were the victims doubled on occasions of special urgency—perhaps in order to make sure that if one victim were in some way imperfect, the other might be accepted?

Though the material for answering our question is very limited, I am inclined to guess that this common-sense solution is really the right one. The evidence is strong, both in Virgil and in the *Acta*, that duplication is likely to happen in the case of vows, and especially in those of peculiar importance, *e.g.* the *parentatio* at the tomb of Anchises, the deification of Daphnis, and the yearly *vota publica* for the *salus* of the reigning Caesar. I should prefer this explanation to the Pythagorean one of Servius, and to the suggestion which has, I believe, been made, that the double victim may represent the Genius plus the personality, of the object of the vow.

That the object of duplication was in the main to emphasise the act of sacrifice and make it more efficacious, seems to be borne out by the fact that in the *Acta* all important piacular offerings, *e.g.* those offered for abnormal and ominous phenomena, such as the growth of a fig-tree on the roof of the temple or the introduction of iron into the grove, were double, *i.e.* two female pigs. Henzen has commented on this, but without further explaining it (p. 22 of *Acta*). So also we find duplication in another curious piece of piacular ritual in the year 207 B.C., when the temple

¹ Henzen, *Acta Fratr. Arv.* lxxi. This shows plainly that Servius' explanation of our difficulty will not do. The gods here who have double victims are heavenly ones.

² Marquardt, III. 267; Wissowa, *RR*². 448.

of Juno Regina on the Aventine had been struck by lightning. Two white cows were driven in procession from the Porta Carmentalis to the temple, and there sacrificed by the *decemviri sacris faciundis* (Liv. 27. 37). A strange feature of this procession was that two images of the goddess were carried in it and deposited in the temple. On the other hand, in the lustration-ritual of the Fratres Atiedii of Iguvium the victims seem to have been always three in number.

My conclusion therefore is that the duplication means only particular emphasis in sacrifice:¹ and that it might be adopted by individual or State according to circumstances, but, according to such evidence as we have, was especially liable to be so adopted in the case of vows made either to the dead at *parentatio*—the most primitive form, which Virgil had preserved in *Aen.* V.—in the case of vows at a deification, as in *Ecl.* V., or in the closely connected yearly *vota* for the welfare of the Emperor on Jan. 3.

¹ In *Aen.* VIII. 556 we read 'vota metu duplicant matres,' i.e. at a time of particular peril. Servius writes, 'nam inest semper in matribus votum. . . .' Though we must not press 'duplicant' here, it seems to me to have a bearing on our question. In ix. 263 foll.: the gifts are doubled which Ascanius promises to Nisus.

NOTE ON THE *quattuor arae* OF *Aen.* V. 639.

When the Trojan women determine to burn the ships, Juno, in the form of Beroe, urges them on: 'iam tempus agi res, | Nec tantis mora prodigiis. En quattuor arae | Neptuno: deus ipse faces animumque ministrat.' From these altars, and also from *foci penetrales* (l. 660) they snatch the necessary fire. 'Rapiuntque focus penetralibus ignem | (Pars spoliant aras), frondem ac virgulta facesque | Coniciunt.'

I think there is no doubt that these four altars had been erected to Neptune by the four competitors in the boat-race. It is true that only Cloanthus is expressly said to have vowed a victim to the gods of the sea (235 ff.), but we may reasonably suppose, with Servius *ad loc.* 639, that the other three had done the same. This seems to me to be confirmed by what we are told in 699, that only four ships were destroyed by the flames. Virgil imagined that the four competitors had drawn up their ships on the shore near the altars they had erected, and as the fires on these altars were still alight, the four ships were set on fire first of all, and thus came to be destroyed while the rest escaped.

We may note, however, that the Sibyl offers four victims to Hecate (*Aen.* VI. 243), whom she invokes (247) as *caeloque Ereboque potentem*.

W. WARDE FOWLER.

REVIEWS

THE FRAGMENTS OF SOPHOCLES.

The Fragments of Sophocles. Edited, with additional notes from the papers of Sir R. C. Jebb and Dr. W. G. Headlam, by A. C. PEARSON, M.A., formerly scholar of Christ's College, Cambridge. Cambridge: University Press, 1917.

WITH these three volumes Jebb's *Sophocles* is at last complete. *Finis coronat opus*, and no one, whose opinion is worth considering, will attach less im-

portance to the work that is now to be reviewed than to the volumes which we know so well already. Mr. Pearson modestly deprecates disappointment on the part of his readers when they find how small is the share of his two distinguished predecessors. (Dr. Headlam did little more than contribute elegant translations of some important fragments.) But the solid labour and sound judgment of Mr. Pearson are above all praise. He has mastered all the litera-