

Dijana Beljan

Filozofski fakultet / *Faculty of philosophy*
Univerzitet u Sarajevu / *University of Sarajevo*
Franje Račkog 1
BA – 71000 Sarajevo
hostilia87@yahoo.com

UDK/UDC:

94(37)“218/215“ : 255,6

doi: 10.15291/misc.3611

Pregledni rad / *Review article*

Primljeno / *Received*: 31. III. 2021.

RIMSKA KONTROLA STRANIH OBREDNIH SPISA U VRIJEME RATA S HANIBALOM



ROMAN CONTROL OF FOREIGN RITUAL TEXTS DURING THE WAR WITH HANNIBAL

Jedno od najburnijih razdoblja u rimskoj povijesti svakako je razdoblje Drugoga punskog rata, a osobito su godine 218. – 215. pr. Kr. bile burne za rimsku religiju. Među podacima antičkih autora izdvajaju se dvije predaje. Prva, iz vremena rata s Hanibalom, objašnjava utemeljenje svečanosti *ludi Apollinares* u Rimu prema proroštvima proroka Marcija, a druga, iz razdoblja nakon njega, govori o pronalasku škrinjā Nume Pompilija. Obje podrazumijevaju pronalazak stranih spisa koje rimska država stavlja pod svoju kontrolu i povjerava decemvirima posao ispitivanja i donošenja rješenja u vezi njih. Iako nisu jedini primjer intervencije rimske države u neslužbeni kult, te dvije predaje predstavljaju dobar primjer njezina različitog postupanja s obrednim spisima jer ih je, boreći se između tradicije i inovacije, u jednom slučaju (*carmina Marciana*) prihvatila, a u drugom (Numine škrinje) uništila. U radu će se, na temelju postojećih izvora, analizirati i interpretirati obje predaje čiji je autor Tit Livije, no kao dopuna će se naći drugi antički i kasnoantički povjesničari te leksikografi.

Ključne riječi: *Marcius vates*; *carmina Marciana*; *libri Sibyllini*; *ludi Apollinares*; rat s Hanibalom; rimska religija; rimski kult; *decemviri sacris faciundis*; *Lucius Petilius*; *Numa Pompilius*.

One of the most turbulent periods in Roman history is certainly the period of the Second Punic War. The years 218 – 215 BC were especially turbulent for the Roman religion. Two traditions stand out among the information offered by ancient authors. The first, from the time of the war with Hannibal, explains the foundation of the celebration of *ludi Apollinares* in Rome according to the prophecies of the prophet Marcius, and the second, from the period after the war, speaks of the discovery of the books attributed to Numa Pompilius that were found in two stone chests. Both involve the discovery of foreign texts, put under the control of the Roman state which entrusted the decemvirs with the task of examining and making decisions on them. Although they are not the only example of Roman intervention in the unofficial cult, these two traditions are a good example of how ritual texts were treated differently in Rome. The Roman state, hesitating between tradition and innovation, accepted them in one case (*carmina Marciana*) and destroyed them in the other (Numa's books). Based on existing sources, the paper will analyse and interpret both traditions noted by Livy. In addition, other antique and late antique historians and lexicographers will be mentioned.

Keywords: *Marcius vates*; *Carmina Marciana*; *Libri Sibyllini*; *Ludi Apollinares*; The war with Hannibal; Roman religion; Roman cult; *Decemviri sacris faciundis*; *Lucius Petilius*; *Numa Pompilius*.

1. UVOD¹

Dvije predaje, koje se nalaze kod Livija, jedna iz razdoblja rata s Hanibalom, a druga ubrzo nakon njega, govore o prodoru stranih kultova u Rim. Prva od njih tiče se uvođenja Apolonovih igara u Rimu prema proroštvima (*carmina*) proroka Marcija.² Druga je predaja vezana za događaj iz 181. kada su pronađene dvije škrinje, od kojih je jedna sadržavala tijelo kralja Nume Pompilija, a druga njegove knjige.³ Za razliku od primjera s Marcijevim proroštvima, koja je država prihvatila i postupila prema njihovu napatku ne bi li odagnala nesreću zvanu Hanibal, u drugom se slučaju „pobrinula“ tako da je knjige spalila. U radu se dakle promatraju dva različita primjera postupanja rimske države sa stranim obrednim spisima.

¹ U jednom od prijašnjih radova (Beljan 2018) naglasila sam opasnost od iskrivljenja rimskih imena kada se ona adaptiraju po fonetskom načelu – kako to upućuju važeći pravopisi južnoslavenskih štokavskih normi – do te mjere da često budu neprepoznatljiva u izvornom obliku. Daniel Nečas Hraste je u „Prevoditeljevoj riječi“ Ciceronove *Države* (Zagreb: Demetra, 1995.) napisao: „Vjerujem da način pohrvaćivanja latinskih i grčkih imena treba promijeniti. Latinska se imena adaptira po fonetskom načelu, što samo po sebi smatram lošim, jer pisati „Cezar“ za latinsko *Caesar* čini mi se podjednako besmislenim kao pisati „Džon“ za englesko *John*; osim toga, time se zanemaruje jedan od dva legitimna izgovora latinskoga. S grčkim je imenima još gore: njih se izobličava po pravilima koji odgovaraju kombinaciji byzantskog i tradicionalnog latinskog izgovora, tako da se i učeni iznenade kad u riječima poput „Pita“ ili „Kenid“ (ili čak „Cenid“) uspiju prepoznati grčka imena *Kaineidês* odn. *Peithô*.“ U radu se latinska imena prilagođava hrvatskoj ortografiji, s tim da su pojedini latinski termini ostavljeni ili dodani u zagradi u izvornom obliku, da se ne bi stvorila zabuna s njihovim prevedenicama u hrvatskom jeziku. Na primjer, *remedium* kao „lijek“ u obrednoj praksi (podrazumijeva određene radnje da bi se negativan znamen ublažio), „proroštvo“ koje je čas *carmen*, čas *vaticinium*, a jednom i *oraculum* (iako prvo označava isključivo stihovano proroštvo, takva mogu biti sva tri) ili „znamen“ koji je u izvornom tekstu čas *omen*, čas *prodigium*. Općenito smatram da se takve termine koji nemaju adekvatnu zamjenu u praksama abrahamskih religija i modernim europskim kulturno-povijesnim i etnološko-antropološkim tokovima, kao i vlastita imena (koja su hrvatskom jeziku zapravo strana) treba što češće pisati izvorno.

² Liv. XXV 12.

³ Liv. XL 29, 2–14.

1. INTRODUCTION¹

Two traditions found in Livy, one from the period of the war with Hannibal and the other shortly after that, speak of the penetration of foreign cults into Rome. The first of these concerns the introduction of the *ludi Apollinares* in Rome according to the prophecies (*carmina*) of the prophet Marcus.² The second tradition relates to the event from the year 181 when two chests were found, one containing the body of King Numa Pompilius and the other containing his books.³ Unlike the example of Marcus' prophecies, which were accepted by the state, and acted upon in order to ward off the calamity called Hannibal, in another case the state “took care” of the books by burning them. The paper therefore observes two different examples of how the Roman state treated foreign ritual texts.

¹ In one of my previous works (Beljan 2018), I emphasized the danger of distorting Roman names when adapting them phonetically – as is the custom of current spellings of South Slavic Shtokavian standards – to the extent that they are often unrecognizable in their original form. Daniel Nečas Hraste wrote in the *Translator's Note of Cicero's Republic* (Zagreb: Demetra, 1995): “I believe that the way in which Latin and Greek names are made to sound Croatian should be changed. Latin names are adapted phonetically, which I consider bad in itself, because writing ‘Cezar’ for Latin *Caesar* seems to me as meaningless as writing ‘Džon’ for English *John*; moreover, this disregards one of the two legitimate Latin pronunciations. It is even worse with Greek names: they are distorted according to rules that correspond to a combination of Byzantine and traditional Latin pronunciation, so that even scholars are surprised when they manage to recognize Greek names such as *Kaineidês* or *Peithô* in words like “Pita” or “Kenid” (or even “Cenid”).” In this paper Latin names are adapted to Croatian orthography, but some Latin terms are left or added in parentheses in their original form, so as not to create confusion with their translations in the Croatian language. For example, *remedium* as a “remedy” in ritual practice (involves certain actions to mitigate a negative sign), “prophecy” which is sometimes *carmen*, sometimes *vaticinium*, and once *oraculum* (although only the first signifies exclusively verse prophecy, all three can be such), or “sign” which in the original text is sometimes *omen* and sometimes *prodigium*. In general, I believe that such terms which have no adequate replacements in the practices of Abrahamic religions and modern European cultural-historical and ethnological-anthropological trends, as well as proper names (which are actually foreign to the Croatian language), should be spelled in their original forms as often as possible.

² Liv. XXV 12.

³ Liv. XL 29, 2–14.

Također je važno znati o kakvom se razdoblju u povijesti radi. Drugi punski rat Rimljani su vodili protiv Kartage uvjereni u ispravnost svojih težnji (*bellum iustum*).⁴ Bio je to sukob za koji su od početka znali da neće lako završiti. Sām početak rata bio je Rimljanima svojevrsan *omen* da će pobjeda uslijediti nakon mnogih krvoprolića.⁵ Kako su Rimljani vjerovali da sve ovisi o volji bogova, tako su i nepovoljne događaje voljeli interpretirati kao rezultat božje srdžbe, odnosno nepravilno izvršenoga obreda.⁶ Budući da je rat s Hanibalom bio vrlo težak i da su bilježene razne čudne pojave poput poplavā, kiše kamenja, brojnih bolesti (kuge), narod je počeo posezati i za stranim božanstvima ili kultovima.⁷ Odatle brojni navodi znamenja (*prodigia*), uglavnom nepovoljnih za Rimljane – burno je razdoblje zahtijevalo da se sve podredi volji bogova radi spašavanja Rima. Odatle i brojne interpretacije događaja, znamenja i proroštava, okajanja (*expiatia*), osnivanja hramova i posvećivanja igara nerimskim božanstvima te, na koncu, posjeta proročištu u Delfima.⁸

Govoriti o Marciju, i općenito o spisima obrednoga karaktera u Rimu, nemoguće je bez spomena Sibile i njezinih proročkih knjiga jer su one te koje su po nalogu Senata konzultirane kad su spisi pronađeni. Stoga je, prije nego počnem s interpretacijom izvora, poželjno reći nešto o Sibili i podrijetlu njezinih knjiga, kao i kolegiju zaduženom za njihovo tumačenje, poznatom pod imenom *quindecimviri sacris faciundis*.

It is also important to understand this period in history. The Second Punic War was waged by the Romans against Carthage, who were convinced of the righteousness of their objective (*bellum iustum*).⁴ They knew from the beginning that this was a conflict that would not end easily. The Romans considered the very beginning of the war as a sort of an *omen* that victory would follow after the bloodshed.⁵ Since the Romans believed that everything depended on the will of the gods, they tended to interpret adverse events as the result of God's wrath, or an improperly performed ritual.⁶ Since the war with Hannibal was very difficult and various strange phenomena such as floods, rain of stones, numerous diseases (plague) were recorded, the people began to resort to foreign deities or cults.⁷ Hence the numerous recordings of signs (*prodigia*) mostly unfavourable for the Romans – this turbulent period required submitting everything to the will of the gods in order to save Rome. Hence the numerous interpretations of events, signs and prophecies, expiation rites (*expiatia*), founding of the temples and dedication of games to non-Roman deities, and finally a visit to the oracle in Delphi.⁸

It is impossible to speak of Marcius, and of ritual writings in Rome in general, without mentioning Sibyl and her prophecy books, because it was precisely those books that were consulted by order of the Senate when the texts were found. Therefore, before the interpretation of the sources, it is advisable to say something about Sibyl and the origin of her books, and the collegium in charge of their interpretation, known as *quindecimviri sacris faciundis*.

⁴ Usp. Dumézil 1996: 459; Briscoe 1989: 44–80. Polibije (*Hist.* III) i Livije (v. XXI–XXII) temeljna su dva antička izvora za Drugi punski rat, koji se vodio 218. – 201. pr. Kr.

⁵ Izgubljeno je mnogo rimskih vojnika u borbi s numidskom konjicom (v. Dumézil 1996: 459).

⁶ Cf. Dumézil 1996: 457 i dalje.

⁷ Liv. XXI 62, 1–5.

⁸ Liv. XXI 62, 6–11.

⁴ Cf. Dumézil 1996: 459; Briscoe 1989: 44–80. Polybius (*Hist.* III) and Livy (Liv. XXI–XXII) are two fundamental ancient sources for the Second Punic War, which was fought in the period 218 – 201BC.

⁵ Many Roman soldiers were lost in battle with the Numidian cavalry (see Dumézil 1996: 459).

⁶ Cf. Dumézil 1996: 457 ff.

⁷ Liv. XXI 62, 1–5.

⁸ Liv. XXI 62, 6–11.

1.1. *Libri Sibyllini*

Različiti su izvori o tome tko bi ona mogla biti,⁹ ali najviše se autora slaže da je prava Sibila Kumanka *Amaltheia*, također zvana *Herophile* ili *Damophile*, te da je ona ta koja je donijela **knjige** u Rim još u vrijeme kralja Tarkvinija Oholog.¹⁰ Najstariji autor koji govori o dolasku Sibile u Rim je Varon (kod Laktancija),¹¹ a na njega se poziva Dionizije iz Halikarnasa. Kod Dionizija je priča najopširnija: Neka je žena stranoga podrijetla došla tiraninu da proda devet knjiga sa Sibilnim proročanstvima. Budući da Tarkvinije nije htio kupiti knjige po traženoj cijeni, ona je otišla i spalila tri. Ubrzo zatim donijela je preostalih šest i ponudila ih po istoj cijeni. No, pošto su je ismijali jer je za manji broj zatražila istu cijenu, otišla je i spalila pola preostalih knjiga te je, donijevši posljednje tri, zatražila istu cijenu kao za svih devet. Tarkvinije se začudio, pa je pitao augure što mu je činiti. „Oni ga pak, spoznavši putem znamenja da je on odbio od boga poslano dobro i prokazujući veliku nevolju ne kupi li knjige, nagovore da plati ženi koliko traži i uzme preostala proročanstva. Ta žena više nije viđena među ljudima, pošto je dala knjige i rekla im da na njih brižno paze.“¹² Knjige su potom smještene u Jupiterov hram na Kapitoliju i za njihovo je čuvanje bio zadužen poseban kolegij.¹³

⁹ O etimologiji imena: Varro, *Ant. div. ap. Lact. Div. Inst.* I 6, 7–13; Isid. *Etym.* VIII 8, 1; Serv. *Aen.* III 445. Svi se slažu da je Sibila apelativ jer se na eolskome bogovi nazivaju *σολί*, a Sibila je svaka žena koju obuzima *numen*, božja volja: *βουλή*. Na istome mjestu Varon navodi da ih je bilo deset, nabrajajući ih sve poimence. Usp. *OCD* 1400–1401 (*s.u. Sibylla*), Takács 2008: 62 i dalje.

¹⁰ Za popularnost kumanske Sibile koja kao Pitija pada u trans, zaslužan je Vergilije (usp. *Aen.* VI 42–51), no upravo to „padanje u trans“, nije odlika rimske tradicije o Sibili (usp. *Div.* II 54). Možda bi u prilog eritrejskoj Sibili išlo poslanstvo Senata 78. pr. Kr. u Eritreju nakon požara na Kapitoliju sa zadatkom prikupljanja knjigā (o tome detaljnije: A. Gillmeister, 28 i dalje, kao i o datiranju knjigā: 32 i dalje).

¹¹ *Lact. Div. Inst.* I 6, 7–13.

¹² *Ant. Rom.* IV 62.

¹³ Gelije (I 9) i Dionizije govore o Tarkviniju Oholom (*Superbus*), a Laktancije o Tarkviniju Starom (*Priscus*). Istu priču, samo u kraćoj varijanti, potvrđuju i Servije (*Aen.* III 445), navodeći da su *knjige* sadržavale proroštva i „lječarije“, Gelije koji na istom mjestu dodaje da tim knjigama decemviri prilaze kao proročistu kada se bogove treba javno pitati za

1.1. *Libri Sibyllini*

There are various sources about who she might be,⁹ but most authors agree that the true Sibyl was a Cumaean called *Amaltheia*, also known as *Herophile* or *Damophile*, and that she was the one who brought **books** to Rome during the rule of king Tarquin the Superb.¹⁰ The oldest author who mentions the arrival of Sibyl in Rome is Varro (in Lactantius),¹¹ and he is referred to by Dionysius of Halicarnassus. The story is most extensive in Dionysius: A woman of foreign descent came to the tyrant to sell nine books of Sibylline prophecies. Since Tarquinius did not want to buy the books at the demanded price, she went away and burned three books. Soon after, she brought the remaining six and offered them at the same price. Since she was ridiculed for asking the same price for a smaller number of books, she went and burned half of the remaining books, and returned with the last three books asking for the same price as for all nine. Tarquinius was astonished, so he asked the augurs what to do. “They recognised from the signs that he had rejected the goods sent from god and foretold a great trouble if he did not buy the books, and persuaded him to take the remaining prophecies and pay to the woman as much as she asked. After she gave the books and told them to take good care of them, the woman was never seen again among the people.”¹² The books were then placed in the Temple of Jupiter on the Capitoline Hill, and a special collegium was put in charge of keeping them.¹³

⁹ On the etymology of the name: Varro, *Ant. div. ap. Lact. Div. Inst.* I 6, 7–13; Isid. *Etym.* VIII 8, 1; Serv. *Aen.* III 445. Everyone agrees that Sibyl is an appellation, because in the Aeolian dialect the gods are called *σολί*, and Sibyl is every woman possessed by *numen*, the will of god: *βουλή*. In the same place, Varro states that there were ten of them, listing them all by name. Cf. *OCD*, 1400–1401 (*s.u. Sibylla*), Takács 2008: 62 ff.

¹⁰ Virgil (cf. *Aen.* VI 42–51) is responsible for the popularity of the Cumaean Sibyl, who falls into a trance like Pythia (cf. *Aen.* VI 42–51), but this “fall into a trance” is not a feature of the Roman tradition about Sibyl (cf. Cic. *Div.* II 54). Perhaps in the favour of the Erythraean Sibyl is the commission of the Senate in Erythrae with the task of collecting books in 78AD after the fire at the Capitol. (More details on this in: A. Gillmeister 2019: 28 ff., as well as on the dating of the books: 32 ff.)

¹¹ *Lact. Div. Inst.* I 6, 7–13.

¹² *Ant. Rom.* IV 62.

¹³ Gellius (I 9) and Dionysius speak of Tarquin the Superb (*Superbus*), and Lactantius speaks of Tarquin the Elder (*Priscus*). The same story, only in a shorter version, is confirmed by Servius (*Aen.* III 445), stating that the Books contained prophecies

Kada su dakle Sibiline knjige potvrdile ono što je Marcijevo proročanstvo govorilo, Apolonove su igre mogle biti osnovane. Slično je s mnogim drugim stranim kultovima u čijem su prihvaćanju i legalizaciji Sibiline knjige odigrale važnu ulogu.¹⁴ Zapravo se radi o obrednim spisima grčkoga podrijetla,¹⁵ koji su određivali mjere u postupanju s određenim znamenjima (*prodigia*). Gotovo uvijek kada bi se one konzultirale u Rimu, rezultat je bio posvećenje hrama ili uvođenje novog kulta *Graeco ritu*. Sibiline knjige nisu bile pojašnjenja čudnih ili nesretnih događaja, već onoga što bi se

savjet te Laktancije (*Div. Inst.* I 6, 7–13), pozivajući se na Varona: „quo nemo umquam doctior, ne apud Graecos quidem nedum Latinos vixit, in libris rerum divinarum (...)“ i dodaje da je broj od tri knjige kasnije uvećan kada je obnovljen Kapitolij jer su iz svih rimskih i grčkih gradova, osobito eritrejskih, knjige skupljene i donesene u Rim, a nosile su ime *neke Sibile*. Plinije Stariji također govori o knjigama (*N. h.* XI 105). Zonara (IX 1) za 216. godinu izvješćuje da je Rimljane pogodila velika nesreća kojoj su: „prethodile određene najave i proročanstva Sibile, koja im je prorekla katastrofu prije toliko godina.“ Nadalje, za Marcija kaže: „On je bio neki prorok koji je predvidio da bi, koliko god oni bili Trojanci od davnina, trebali biti poraženi na Diomedovom polju. (...) Sibila ih je upozorila na to da se čuvaju mjesta (Diomedovog polja), no ipak je rekla da im to neće ništa koristiti, čak i ako ga budu čuvali pod najstrožom stražom.“ Upravo zato što je očito da se proroštvo izbjeći ne može, što god čovjek napravio ili božanstvo odlučilo, Dion se uzdržava od svakog komentara na poznata proroštva (XV 57, 22). Svi su dakle izvori o Sibilinih knjigama iz Augustova razdoblja ili kasniji.

¹⁴ Npr. kult Velike Majke (*Magna Mater*) uspostavljen je 205. također prema uputama iz Sibilinih knjiga, pošto se pogledalo u njih da bi se protumačilo padanje kamenja s neba (*Liv.* XXX 10). Jednako važan kult Venere, Enejine majke (*Venus Erycina*), utemeljen je prema naputku iz knjigā koje su konzultirane nakon poraza kod Trasimenskog jezera 217. pr. Kr. Naputak iz knjigā predviđao je pobjedu ako se uvede strano božanstvo (*Ov. Fasti* IV 863–876; *Diod. Bibl.* IV 84). *Usp.* Nikoloska 2012: 365–366; Gillmeister 2019: 103–105. Za razliku od ta dva strana kulta, predaje o kojima je riječ u ovome radu predstavljaju, prva namjeran, a druga slučajan, pronalazak stranih spisa kojima se tek trebala otkriti svrha i podrijetlo, a ne ciljanu konzultaciju Sibilinih knjiga da bi se otklonila konkretna nesreća ili potražio savjet u situaciji opasnoj za opstanak Rima.

¹⁵ Podrijetlo knjigā još uvijek je predmet žustrih rasprava među učenjacima, no vrlo su vjerojatno sadržavale grčke elemente i posve ili djelomično bile etruščanskog podrijetla; nakon što su prebačene u Apolonov hram, čuvali su se s etruščanskim obrednim knjigama (*libri rituales*), povezanim s nimfom po imenu *Begoe* (v. Gillmeister 2019: 34 i dalje; *usp.* Latte 1960: 303, bilj. 1).

When the Sibylline Books confirmed Marcius' prophecy, the games could be founded. It is similar with many other foreign cults where the Sibylline Books played an important role in their acceptance and legalisation.¹⁴ In fact, these were ritual texts of Greek origin,¹⁵ which determined the actions when dealing with certain signs (*prodigia*). Almost always

and “remedies”; also, by Gellius, who adds that the decemvirs, in situations when the gods should be asked directly for an advice, approached these books as an oracle; and finally, by Lactantius (*Div. Inst.* I 6, 7–13), who, referring to Varro: “quo nemo umquam doctior, ne apud Graecos quidem nedum Latinos vixit, in libris rerum divinarum, (...)” adds that the number of three books was increased later when the Capitoline Hill was rebuilt, since books from all Roman, Greek, and especially Erythraean cities were collected and brought to Rome, and they bore the name of *a certain Sibyl*. Pliny the Elder also speaks about the books (*N. h.* XI 105). Zonaras (IX 1) reports for the year 216 that the Romans were struck by a great calamity, which was “preceded by certain proclamations and prophecies of Sibyl, who foretold them a catastrophe many years ago.” Furthermore, he says of Marcius: “He was a prophet who foretold that, regardless of their Trojan origins from ancient times, they would be defeated in the Plain of Diomedes. (...) Sibyl warned them to beware of the place (the Plain of Diomedes), but still said that it would be of no use to them, even if they guarded it under the most watchful guard.” Precisely because it is obvious that prophecy cannot be avoided, whatever the man does or the deity decides, Dio refrains from any comment on known prophecies (XV 57, 22). Hence all the sources about the Sibylline Books are from the period of Augustus or later.

¹⁴ For example, the cult of the Great Mother (*Magna Mater*) was established in 205 also according to the instructions found in the Sibylline Books, because they were consulted to interpret the stones falling from the sky (*Liv.* XXX 10). An equally important cult of Venus, the mother of Aeneas (*Venus Erycina*) was founded according to instructions from the Books, which were consulted after the defeat at Lake Trasimenus in 217 BC. The instruction from the Books foresaw a victory if a foreign deity was introduced (*Ov. Fasti* IV 863–876; *Diod. Bibl.* IV 84). Cf. Nikoloska 2012: 365–366; Gillmeister 2019: 103–105. In contrast to these two foreign cults, the traditions mentioned in this paper represent, firstly, the intentional, and secondly, the accidental discovery of foreign writings that had yet to reveal their purpose and origin, rather than a targeted consultation of the Sibylline Books in order to remove a specific misfortune or to seek advice in a situation which was dangerous for the survival of Rome.

¹⁵ The origin of the *Books* is still the subject of a fierce debate among the scholars, but they most likely contained Greek elements and were wholly or partly of Etruscan origin; after being transferred to the Temple of Apollo, they were kept together with the Etruscan ritual texts (*libri rituales*), associated with a nymph named *Begoe* (see Gillmeister 2019: 34 ff. Cf. Latte 1960: 303, note 1).

trebalo poduzeti da se izbjegne nadolazeća katastrofa; stoga su se često pozivale na stare izreke ili proročanstva da bi potvrdile svoju vjerodostojnost.¹⁶ Prema Dioniziju iz Halikarnasa,¹⁷ Sibiline su se knjige čuvale u hramu na Kapitoliju do građanskoga rata između Marija i Sule. Na istom mjestu on dodaje da su namjerno ili slučajno spaljene. Poznato je da su izgorjele u Jupiterovu hramu tijekom požara na Kapitoliju 83. pr. Kr.; razlog se ne zna, ali se vremenski poklapa sa Sulinim pohodom na Rim. Po završetku njegove diktature, Senat je 78. pr. Kr. formirao povjerenstvo (najprije u Eritru, a zatim i u druga mjesta) da skupi i tako rekonstruira Sibilina proroštva.¹⁸

Na početku principata kolekciju Sibilinih knjiga kontrolirao je August, čak se posvetio i njezinu „čišćenju“,¹⁹ ali one su se inače vrlo rijetko konzultirale u carskome razdoblju.²⁰

1.2. *Quindecimviri sacris faciundis*

Osim augurā i pontifikā koji su čuvali obredne knjige u Rimu još od vremena Nume Pompilija, posebnu ulogu u državnoj rimskoj religiji imao je kolegij *virī sacris faciundis*.²¹ No o njegovim članovima nemamo podataka kao što je to slučaj s augurima i svećenicima. Rimska se tradicija slaže da je kolegij isprva bio sastavljen od dvojice patricija, otprilike u vrijeme kasnoga kraljevstva. Od

when the books were consulted in Rome, the result was the consecration of a temple or the introduction of a new cult *Graeco ritu*. The Sibylline Books were not explanations of strange or unfortunate events, but of what should be done to avoid an impending catastrophe; therefore, they often referred to old sayings or prophecies to confirm their authenticity.¹⁶ According to Dionysius of Halicarnassus,¹⁷ the Sibylline Books were kept in the temple on the Capitoline Hill until the period of the Civil War between Marius and Sulla. He also adds that the books were either intentionally or accidentally burned. They are known to have burned in the Temple of Jupiter during the fire at the Capitoline in 83 BC; the reason is unknown, but it coincides with Sulla's expedition to Rome. After the end of his dictatorship, in 78 BC the Senate formed a commission (first in Erythrae and then in other places) to gather and reconstruct Sibylline prophecies.¹⁸

At the beginning of the Principate, the collection of the Sibylline Books was controlled by Augustus, who even devoted himself to “cleaning” them,¹⁹ but the Books were rarely consulted during the imperial period.²⁰

1.2. *Quindecimviri sacris faciundis*

In addition to the augurs and pontiffs, who kept the ritual books in Rome since the time of Numa Pompilius, the collegium *virī sacris faciundis* had a special role

¹⁶ Usp. Wissowa, 1912: 538 i dalje; Beard, North & Price 2017: 179–180.

¹⁷ *Ant. Rom.* IV 62,5: *κείμενοι κατὰ γῆς ἐν τῷ ναῷ τοῦ Καπιτωλίνου Διὸς ἐν λιθίνῃ λάρνακι, ὑπ’ ἀνδρῶν δέκα φυλαττόμενοι.* „... (knjige) leže podno hrama kapitolijjskog Jupitera u mramornom kovčegu; čuvaju ih desetorica.“

¹⁸ Usp. Gillmeister 2019: 30–31. Od antičkih izvora taj događaj spominje Fenestela (*Ann. fr.* 18), Dionizije iz Halikarnasa (*Ant. Rom.* IV 62, pozivajući se na Varona) i Tacit (*Ann.* VI 12, 4).

¹⁹ August je dvaput osobno pregledao Sibiline knjige. Prvi put ih je, 18. pr. Kr., uoči stoljetnih igara (*ludi saeculares*), dao prepisati zbog navodno lošeg fizičkog stanja (Dio. Cass. LIV 17, 2); drugi put je kao *pontifex maximus* 12. pr. Kr. naredio da se svi grčko-rimski proročki zapisi spale, osim Sibilinih. No i njih je „očistio“ od nepoželjnih elemenata (Suet. *Aug.* 31). Usp. Gillmeister 2019: 39.

²⁰ Od Tacita, npr., poznato je da je car Neron naredio da ih se pogleda nakon požara u Rimu 64. (*Ann.* XV 44). Također v. bilj. 35.

²¹ Detaljno o podrijetlu i funkciji toga kolegija, v. Gillmeister 2019.

¹⁶ Cf. Wissowa 1912: 538 ff.; Beard, North & Price 2017: 179–180.

¹⁷ *Ant. Rom.* IV 62,5: *κείμενοι κατὰ γῆς ἐν τῷ ναῷ τοῦ Καπιτωλίνου Διὸς ἐν λιθίνῃ λάρνακι, ὑπ’ ἀνδρῶν δέκα φυλαττόμενοι.* “... (the Books) lie at the foot of the Temple of the Capitoline Jupiter, in a marble coffin, guarded by the body of ten members.”

¹⁸ Cf. Gillmeister 2019: 30–31. In ancient sources this event is mentioned by Fenestella (*Ann. Fr.* 18), Dionysius of Halicarnassus (*Ant. Rom.* IV 62, referring to Varro) and Tacitus (*Ann.* VI 12, 4).

¹⁹ Augustus personally reviewed the Sibylline Books twice. The first time, in 18 BC, on the eve of the century-old games (*ludi saeculares*), he had them rewritten due to allegedly poor physical condition (Dio. Cass. LIV 17, 2); the second time, in 12 BC, he ordered, as *pontifex maximus*, the burning of all Greco-Roman prophetic texts except the Sibylline Books. But he also “cleaned” them of undesirable elements (Suet. *Aug.* 31). Cf. Gillmeister 2019: 39.

²⁰ In Tacitus, for example, it is known that Emperor Nero ordered them to be seen after the fire in Rome in 64 (*Ann.* XV 44). Also see note 35.

367. pr. Kr. broj je povećan na deset članova, *decemviri sacris faciundis* (Liv. VI 37, 12), a krajem Republike na petnaest, *quindecimviri sacris faciundis* (najvjerojatnije je Sula povećao broj, iako ne postoji direktan navod)²². Njegova je funkcija često predmet rasprave. U najranijem obliku, kao *duumviri*, kolegij je, čini se, bio zadužen samo za čuvanje *knjigā*,²³ dok je kralj imao obrednu funkciju i moć divinacije. U vrijeme rane Republike, kao *decemviri*, kolegij postaje senatsko povjerenstvo *de religione*, s jednakim brojem patricijā i plebejaca. Tada, a osobito u vrijeme rata s Hanibalom, kolegij dobiva na važnosti i, osim za čuvanje *knjigā*, postaje direktno nadležan i uključen u njihovo čitanje te donošenje „lijeka“ (*remedium*) za nastale situacije. Funkcija kolegija od tada se nije bitno mijenjala. Kolegij je direktno vezan za Sibiline knjige i, budući da su one imale status državnoga proročišta, uživao je poseban ugled. Djelovao je dakle s posebnom svrhom i uz suglasnost Senata.²⁴

U vrijeme rata s Hanibalom najviše je zabilježenih konzultacija Sibilinih knjiga i direktne aktivnosti kolegija *decemviri sacris faciundis*. Izvori to potvrđuju čak 80 puta u tom razdoblju.²⁵ Za *knjigama* se posezalo kada bi društveni nemiri dosegli vrhunac ili kada bi se pojavio neki neobjašnjiv znamen (*prodigium*). Neka znamenja nisu bila u direktnoj vezi s političkom situacijom i velikim društvenim nemirima – takva su upućena etruščanskim prorocima. No ako su bila osobito prijeteća, teška za interpretaciju ili se radilo o političkoj krizi, Senat bi preporučio da se pogledaju **knjige** i u tome činu Senat je imao završnu riječ. Znamenje (*prodigium*) zahtijevalo je lijek (*remedium*) po nalogu *knjigā*, odnosno obred okajanja (*expiatio*), da bi se ponovo uspostavio mir. Najčešće je to rezultiralo molitvom (*supplicatio*), ali nerijetko i odlukom o osnivanju hrama, novih igara ili ceremonija u čast božanstva, uvođenjem

in the Roman state religion.²¹ However, there is no information about its members, unlike in the case with augurs and priests. The Roman tradition agrees that the collegium was originally composed of two patricians, around the period of the late kingdom. In 367 BC the number was increased to ten members, *decemviri sacris faciundis* (Liv. VI 37, 12), and by the end of the Republic to fifteen, *quindecimviri sacris faciundis* (Sulla most likely increased the number, although there is no direct citation)²². Its function is often the subject of a dispute. In its earliest form, as *duumviri*, the collegium seemed to be in charge only of keeping the Books,²³ while the ritual function and the power of divination lay in king's hands. During the period of the early Republic, as *decemviri*, the collegium became a senate commission *de religione*, with an equal number of patricians and plebeians. Then, and especially during the war with Hannibal, the collegium gained importance, and in addition to keeping the Books, became directly responsible for and involved in their reading, and administering the “remedy” (*remedium*) for certain situations. The function of the collegium has not changed significantly since then. The collegium is directly related to the Sibylline Books and, since the books had the status of a state oracle, the collegium enjoyed a special reputation. It acted with a special purpose and with the consent of the Senate.²⁴

The consultation of the Sibylline Books and direct activities of the *collegium decemviri sacris faciundis* occurred mostly during the war with Hannibal. Sources confirm this as many as 80 times in that period.²⁵ The *Books* were consulted during the peak of social unrests or when an inexplicable sign (*prodigium*) appeared. Some of the signs were not directly related to the political situation and the great social unrest – for such signs the advice of the Etruscan prophets was used. But if they were particularly threatening, difficult to interpret, or it was a matter of a political crisis, the Senate would recommend looking at the **Books**,

²² Najraniji spomen kolegija od 15 članova je iz 51. pr. Kr., u Cic. *Fam.* VIII 4, 1 (jedan od članova navodi se kao *quindecimvir*); komentator Servije (*Aen.* VI 63) povećanje broja na 15 članova smješta u Sulino vrijeme.

²³ *Ant. Rom.* IV 62, 4.

²⁴ Usp. Gillmeister 2019: 47.

²⁵ Usp. Gillmeister 2019: 138.

²¹ For more details on the origin and function of this collegium, see Gillmeister 2019.

²² The earliest mention of a 15-member collegium is from 51 BC, in Cic. *Fam.* VIII 4, 1 (one of the members is referred to as *quindecimvir*); the commentator Servius (*Aen.* VI 63) places the increase to 15 members during Sulla's time.

²³ *Ant. Rom.* IV 62, 4.

²⁴ Cf. Gillmeister 2019: 47.

²⁵ Cf. Gillmeister 2019: 138.

novog kulta, „gozbom bogova“ (*lectisternium*) itd. Najviše je promjenā u javnoj rimskoj religiji uvedeno upravo po nalogu Sibilinih knjiga, a uloga je kolegija bila pristupiti im, obavijestiti Senat o njihovom naputku i pobrinuti se za obrede okajanja.

2. CARMINA MARCIANA

2.1. *Marcus vates* / *Marcii vates*?

Rimska predaja o proroku Marciju usko je vezana za navode o njegovim proroštva (*carmina Marciana*), Sibilinim knjigama (*libri Sibyllini*) i osnutku Apolonovih igara (*ludi Apollinares*) u Rimu. Predaja se može podijeliti već prema podnaslovu ovoga poglavlja.

Većina izvora potvrđuje jednu osobu pod imenom *vates Marcus*. Nastariji izvor, Ciceron, navodeći neke primjere stihovanih proročanstava, kazuje da su „slično pjevali proroci Marcije i Publicije“,²⁶ *similiter Marcus et Publicius vates cecinisse dicuntur*. Tit Livije govori o njegovu plemenitom podrijetlu: *Vates hic Marcus illustris fuerat*.²⁷ Za njim kronološki slijede: komentator Horacijevih *Oda* Pomponije Porfirion: ... *veteris Marcii vatis Sibyllaeque et similibus*;²⁸ gramatičar Fest, koji jedini navodi Marcijevo osobno ime: *in carmine Cn. Marcii vatis*;²⁹ Amijan Marcellin: *velut Amphiarao referente aut Marcio, quondam vatis inclitis*;³⁰ kasnoantički autor Makrobije: *ex vaticinio Marcii vatis ...*³¹ te Isidor Seviljski u svojim *Etimologijama*:³² *Primus autem praecepta apud hebraeos Moyses scripsit; apud Latinos Marcus vates primus praecepta composuit. Ex quibus est illud, Postremus dicas, primus taceas*. Među Zonaranim dopunama petnaeste knjige Diona

and in this matter the Senate had the final say. The sign (*prodigium*) required a remedy (*remedium*) according to the books, or an expiation rite (*expiatio*) in order to restore the peace. This most often resulted in a supplication ceremony (*supplicatio*), but often in the dedication of a temple, new games or ceremonies in the honour of a deity, the introduction of a new cult, “the feast for the gods” (*lectisternium*), etc. Most changes in the Roman public religion were introduced according to the Sibylline Books, and the role of the collegium was to consult the Books, inform the Senate of their instructions, and arrange for the expiation rites.

2. CARMINA MARCIANA

2.1. *Marcus vates* / *Marcii vates*?

The Roman tradition about the prophet Marcus is closely linked to the mentions of his prophecies (*carmina Marciana*), the Sibylline Books (*libri Sibyllini*) and the founding of the games in Apollo’s honour (*ludi Apollinares*) in Rome. The tradition can be divided according to the subtitle of this chapter. Most sources confirm one person named *vates Marcus*.

The oldest source, Cicero, citing some examples of verse prophecies, says that “the prophets Marcus and Publicius sang similarly”,²⁶ *similiter Marcus et Publicius vates cecinisse dicuntur*. Livy speaks of his noble origin: *Vates hic Marcus illustris fuerat*.²⁷ He is followed chronologically by: the commentator to Horace’s *Odes*, Pomponius Porphyryon: ... *veteris Marcii vatis Sibyllaeque et similibus*;²⁸ grammarian Festus, who is the only one to mention Marcus’ personal name: *in carmine Cn. Marcii vatis*;²⁹ Ammianus Marcellinus: *velut Amphiarao referente aut Marcio, quondam vatis inclitis*;³⁰ the late antique author Macrobius: *ex vaticinio Marcii vatis...*;³¹ and Isidore of Seville in his

²⁶ Div. I 115. Tome dodaje: *quo de genere Apollinis aperta prolata sunt (credo etiam anhelitus quosdam fuisse terrarum quibus inflatae mentes oracla funderent)*. „jednako tako su prenošena Apolonova proročanstva (vjerujem da su se događala nekakva isparavanja iz zemlje – njima raspljene duše sipale su proročanstva).“

²⁷ Liv. XXV 12, 3.

²⁸ Ep. II 1, 26.

²⁹ Fest 165, 28–30.

³⁰ Amm. Marc. XIV 1, 7.

³¹ Sat. I 17, 25–30.

³² Etym. VIII 12.

²⁶ Div. I 115. He adds: *quo de genere Apollinis aperta prolata sunt (credo etiam anhelitus quosdam fuisse terrarum quibus inflatae mentes oracla funderent)*. “the prophecies of Apollo were transmitted in the same way (I believe that there were some evaporations from the earth – the souls affected by them poured out the prophecies).”

²⁷ Liv. XXV 12, 3.

²⁸ Ep. II 1, 26.

²⁹ Festus 165, 28–30.

³⁰ Amm. Marc. XIV 1, 7.

³¹ Sat. I 17, 25–30.

Kasija nalazimo i podatak:³³ *θαυμαστὸν δὲ καὶ τὸ τοῦ Μάρκου προμάντευμα*, što je očito pogreška za ime *Marcus*.³⁴

Ciceron³⁵ najprije govori o dvojici braće, *Marcii fratres*, kao autorima proročanstava, nabrajajući augure i proroke poznate od starine: *quo in genere Marcios quosdam fratres nobili loco natos apud maiores nostros fuisse scriptum videmus*.³⁶ Iako će u nastavku spomenuti Marcija u jednini, u drugoj knjizi³⁷ opet navodi *Marcije proroke: eodemque modo nec ego Publicio nescio cui nec Marcii vati- bus nec Apollinis opertis credendum existimo*. Da je Marcijā bilo više, navode i Plinije Stariji: *Divinitas et quaedam caelitem societas nobilissima ex feminis in Sibylla fuit, ex viris in Melampode apud Graecos, apud Romanos in Marcios*;³⁸ Simah: *Marciorum quidem vatum divinatio (...)*³⁹ te dvaput Servije u komentaru na *Eneidu*: (VI 70) *FESTOSQVE DIES DE NOMINE PHOEBI ludos Apollināres {dicit}, qui secundum quosdam bello Punico secundo instituti sunt, secundum alios tempore Syllano ex responso Marciorum fratrum, quorum extabant, ut Sibyllina, responsa; (VI 72) qui libri in templo Apollinis servabantur, nec ipsi tantum, sed et Marciorum et Begoes nymphae ...*

Očito je da je tradicija vrlo skromna kada je u pitanju prorok Marcije i da postoje znatna neslaganja među izvorima. Antički autori od kojih bismo očekivali jasnije podatke, poput Cicerona, pokazuju da ni njima samima nije jasno o kojoj se osobi radi, već samo naznačuju da ju je tradicija poznavala. *Gens Marcia* bila je svakako jedan od poznatijih rimskih plemićkih rodova. Kao i familije *Aemilii*, *Pomponii*, *Calpurnii* i *Pinari*, izvlačila

Etymologies:³² *Primus autem praecepta apud hebraeos Moyses scripsit; apud Latinos Marcus vates primus praecepta composuit. Ex quibus est illud, Postremus dicas, primus taceas*. Among Zonaras' additions to the fifteenth book of Cassius Dio, the following information is found:³³ *θαυμαστὸν δὲ καὶ τὸ τοῦ Μάρκου προμάντευμα*, which is obviously a mistake for the name *Marcus*.³⁴

Cicero³⁵ first mentions two brothers, *Marcii fratres*, as the authors of prophecies, enumerating augurs and prophets known since antiquity: *quo in genere Marcios quosdam fratres nobili loco natos apud maiores nostros fuisse scriptum videmus*.³⁶ Although in continuation he mentions a single *Marcus*, in the second book³⁷ he again speaks about two prophets called *Marcus*: *eodemque modo nec ego Publicio nescio cui nec Marcii vati- bus nec Apollinis opertis credendum existimo*. That there was more than one *Marcus* is also stated by Pliny the Elder: *Divinitas et quaedam caelitem societas nobilissima ex feminis in Sibylla fuit, ex viris in Melampode apud Graecos, apud Romanos in Marcios*;³⁸ Symmachus: *Marciorum quidem vatum divinatio (...)*³⁹ and twice by Servius in his commentary to the *Aeneid*: *FESTOSQVE DIES DE NOMINE PHOEBI ludos Apollināres {dicit}, qui secundum quosdam bello Punico secundo instituti sunt, secundum alios tempore Syllano ex responso Marciorum fratrum, quorum extabant, ut Sibyllina, responsa; (VI 72) qui libri in templo Apollinis servabantur, nec ipsi tantum, sed et Marciorum et Begoes nymphae ...*

It is obvious that the tradition is very modest concerning the prophet *Marcus* and that there are significant discrepancies among the sources. Ancient authors that are expected to offer more precise information, such as Cicero, show that it is not clear even to them who this person is; they merely indicate that

³³ Zonara IX 1: „Znamenito je bilo proroštvo Markovo“.

³⁴ Usp. Liv. XXV 12: „Taj prorok Marcije bijaše znamenit ...“

³⁵ *Div.* I 89.

³⁶ Vjerojatno su dva proročanstva dovela do vjerovanja u postojanje dvojice Marcija (Schanz 1890: 11). Usp. *OCD* 922 i *KP* (Bd. 3) 998: I. 2. (*s.v. Marcus*). Bilo je pokušaja i da se Ciceronovi navodi u *Div.* I 50 i II 55 shvate kao potvrda za dva Marcija, koji bi se zvali *Publicius Marcus* i *Gnaeus Marcus*, što postaje besmisleno već nakon prvoga čitanja. Detaljnije o tome v. Russo 2005: 9–12.

³⁷ *Div.* II 113.

³⁸ *N. h.* VII 119, 8–10.

³⁹ *Epist.* IV 34.

³² *Etym.* VIII 12.

³³ Zonaras IX 1: “Famous was the prophecy of Marcus”.

³⁴ Cf. Liv. XXV 12: “The prophet Marcus was famous...”

³⁵ *Div.* I 89.

³⁶ It is likely that the two prophecies led to the belief in the existence of the two *Marcii* (Schanz 1890: 11). Cf. *OCD* 922 and *KP* (Bd. 3) 998: I. 2. (*s.v. Marcus*). There have also been attempts to understand Cicero's quotes in *Div.* I 50 and II 55 as confirmation for the existence of two *Marcii*, who would be called *Publicius Marcus* and *Gnaeus Marcus*, which becomes meaningless after the first reading. For more details on this see Russo 2005: 9–12.

³⁷ *Div.* II 113.

³⁸ *N. h.* VII 119, 8–10.

³⁹ *Epist.* IV 34.

je svoje podrijetlo od Sabinjana i rado ga isticala na brojnim spomenicima.⁴⁰ Jedno od takvih je denar C. Marcija Cenzorina iz 97. pr. Kr. s prikazom Apolona, koji aludira na Apolonove igre.⁴¹ Stoga i ne čudi da Ciceron tvrdi da su Marciji *loco nobilitatos*, a Livije da je prorok Marcije bio *illustris*. Dakle, u Marcijevo postojanje ne sumnja ni Livije, no on kao analist ne propušta ništa što se određene godine zbilo te raspravama o Marciju kao stvarnoj osobi ne daje prostora. Za njega je važno objasniti razloge uvođenja Apolonovih igara u Rimu. Plinije Stariji, Amijan Marcelin i Zonara spominju Marcija samo kao primjer nekakvoga proroka. Simah, Isidor te Paul i Fest citiraju Marcija, odnosno Marcije, i kao autora „pravila“ (*praecepta*) koja su kružila Rimom. Od njih je jedno do nas došlo u cijelosti i dva fragmentarno. S obzirom na to da se ta *praecepta* mogu izmjeriti saturnijskim stihovima, vjerojatno su starija od II./I. st. pr. Kr. Servije povezuje braću Marcije s uvođenjem Apolonovih igara i navodi ih kao autore spisa koji su se čuvali u Apolonovu hramu, sa Sibilnim knjigama.

2.2. *Carmina Marciana* i uvođenje Apolonovih igara u Rimu

Godine 213. pr. Kr. od Livija saznajemo da je ulicama Rima vladao nered zbog pojave novih „religija“ (*religiones*) u vrijeme rata s Hanibalom; rat u kojem su se nizali uspjesi i porazi mijenjao je stav ljudi i pogodovao uplivu stranih praznovjerja i obreda, porastu broja svećenika i trgovine proroštvima do te mjere da se to počelo pokazivati javno, pa je rimska država pokušavala kaznama i raznim dekretima vratiti rimske obrede. Budući da to nijednom nižem magistratu nije

this person was known to the tradition. *Gens Marcia* was certainly one of the most famous noble families of Rome. Similar to the *Aemilii*, *Pomponii*, *Calpurnii* and *Pinarii* families, this family traced its origins from the Sabinians and liked to emphasize it on numerous monuments.⁴⁰ An example is the denarius of C. Marcus Censorinus from 97 BC depicting Apollo and alluding to *ludi Apollinares*.⁴¹ Therefore, it is not surprising that Cicero claims that Marcii were *loco nobilitatos*, and Livy that the prophet Marcius was *illustris*. Hence, Livy has no doubts concerning Marcius' existence either, but as an analyst he does not miss anything that happened in a certain year, and he does not give room to discussions about Marcius as a real person. It is important for him to explain the reasons for the introduction of the *ludi Apollinares* in Rome. Pliny the Elder, Ammianus Marcellinus and Zonaras mention Marcius only as an example of a prophet. Symmachus, Isidore, Paul and Festus quote Marcius, or Marcii as the author(s) of the “precepts” (*praecepta*) that circulated in Rome. Since these *praecepta* can be measured by the Saturnian verses, they are probably older than 2nd and 1st century BC. Servius connects the brothers Marcii with the introduction of the *ludi Apollinares* and cites them as the authors of the texts kept in the Temple of Apollo, along with Sybilline books.

2.2. *Carmina Marciana* and the introduction of *ludi Apollinares* in Rome

According to Livy, in the year 213 BC the streets of Rome were in disarray due to the emergence of new “religions” (*religiones*) during the war with Hannibal; a war of success and defeats changed the attitude of the people, enabled the penetration of foreign superstitions and rites, the increase in the number of priests, and the trade of prophecies to such an extent

⁴⁰ Turner 2016: 6.

⁴¹ Turner 2016: 4–5. Osnatak Apolonovih igara dovodi u vezu s prorokom Marcijem, prema čijim su proroštvima igre utemeljene, porodicu Marcijā. Ona je svoje podrijetlo mogla lako povezati s Numom Pompilijem preko njegova unuka, kralja Anka Marcija, i Nume Marcija koji je, prema analističkoj tradiciji *pontifex maximus* za vrijeme Nume Pompilija (usp. Gillmeister 2019: 137–138; Humm 2014: 46; Russo 2005: 12–16 te 31–32). Sibila i Apolon često su se stavljali u kontekst osnivanja Grada (usp. Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* I 55; Lycoph. *Alex.* 1250–1262; Verg. *Aen.* III 250–257; Tib. *Eleg.* II 5, 1–69), što je za sobom povlačilo i Troju i trojanske korijene.

⁴⁰ Turner 2016: 6.

⁴¹ Turner 2016: 4–5. The foundation of the *ludi Apollinares* associates the family of Marcii with the prophet Marcius, according to whose prophecies the *Games* were founded. The family could easily link its origins to Numa Pompilius through his grandson, King Ancus Marcus, and Numa Marcus who, according to the analytical tradition, was *pontifex maximus* during Numa Pompilius (cf. Gillmeister 2019: 137–138; Humm 2014: 46; Russo 2005: 12–16 and 31–32). Sibyl and Apollo were often placed in the context of the founding of the City (cf. Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* I 55; Lycoph. *Alex.* 1250–1262; Verg. *Aen.* III 250–257; Tib. *Eleg.* II 5, 1–69), which entailed both Troy and Trojan origins.

uspjelo, senat je povjerio gradskom pretoru Mar-ku Emiliju dužnost da narod oslobodi novih vj-erovanja. On je osobno donio edikt kojim je nare-dio da mu se donesu bilo kakve knjige prorošta-va, pisane molitve ili zapisi o obrednim žrtvama te zabranio žrtvovanje prema novom ili stranom obredu.⁴²

U to vrijeme Hanibal se pokušava domoći Tarenta, a ostatak rimske vojske od poraza kod Kane boravi na Siciliji nezadovoljan svojim po-ložajem.⁴³ Rezultat istrage o pojavi stranih pro-ročanstava u godini koja slijedi (212.) potvrđuje i Makrobije,⁴⁴ a priču navodim u cijelosti prema Liviju:⁴⁵

U Rimu su se konzuli i pretori zadržali La-tinskim festivalom sve do petog dana prije majskih kalendi (26. 4.). Tog dana, pošto su izvršili obred na Brdu⁴⁶, svaki je pošao u svoje provincije. Zatim je novo vjerovanje (*religio*) nametnuto prema Marcijevim proročanstvi-ma (*carmina*). Taj Marcije bijaše znamenit prorok, a kad se prethodne godine (213.) prema senatskoj odluci obavljala potraga za takvim knjigama, proročanstva su došla u ruke gradskog pretora Marka Emilija, koji je bilo zadužen za to. On ih je odmah predao novom pretoru Suli. Od dva proročanstva tog Marci-ja, vjerodostojnost prvoga (koja je potvrđena ishodom, pošto se događaj već odvio) davala je povjerenje u drugo, kojem vrijeme još nije došlo. U prvom je prorečena nesreća kod Kane otprilike ovim riječima: „Rijeku Kanu izbjega-vaj, rode trojanski, da te tuđin ne bi natjerao da na Diomedovu polju zametneš bitku. No nećeš mi povjerovati sve dok polje krvlju ne ispuniš i mnoge tisuće tvojih ubijenih rijeka ne odnese s plodnog tla u veliko more; riba-ma, pticama i divljim zvijerima koje nastanjuju zemlju bit će hrana meso tvoje. Naime, tako mi je Jupiter proreкао.“ Oni koji su se borili blizu, na tome mjestu prepoznali su i polje Diome-da Argejca, rijeku Kanu i samu nesreću. Tad

that it began to be shown publicly, so the Roman state tried to restore Roman rites through punishments and various decrees. Seeing as no lower magistrate succeeded in this, the senate entrusted the duty to free the people from new beliefs to the city praetor Marcus Aemilius. He personally issued an edict ordering that any books of prophecy, written prayers or records of ritual sacrifices be brought to him, and forbade sacrifice according to a new or foreign rite.⁴²

At the time, Hannibal was trying to capture Taren-tum, and the rest of the Roman army remained in Sicily after the defeat at Cannae, dissatisfied with their position.⁴³ The result of the investigation into the appearance of foreign prophecies in the follow-ing year (212) is also confirmed by Macrobius,⁴⁴ and the story is quoted in its entirety according to Livy:⁴⁵

In Rome, the consuls and praetors remained un-til the fifth day before the calends of May (April 26). After they performed the rites on that day on the Hill⁴⁶, each went to their provinces. Then the new belief (*religio*) was imposed according to Marcus' prophecies (*carmina*). This Marcus was a famous prophet, and since the search for such books was carried out in the previous year (213) by the decree of the senate, they (*carmina*) came into the hands of Marcus Aemilius, the praetor urbanus, who was in charge of the matter. He im-mediately handed them over to the new praetor, Sulla. Of the two prophecies of this Marcus, the credibility of the first (which was confirmed by the outcome, since the event had already taken place) gave credibility to the second, whose time had not yet come. The first prophecy predicts a ca-lamity near Cannae with these words: "Avoid the river Cannae, you Trojan kin, so that a foreigner may not force you to start a battle on the Plain of Diomedes. But you will not believe me until you fill the Plain with blood, and many thousands of your slain are taken by the river from the fertile ground to the great sea; the fish, the birds, and the wild beasts that inhabit the earth will feed on your flesh. For this is what Jupiter has prophesied to

⁴² Liv. XXV 1, 6–12.

⁴³ Liv. XXIII 25, XXIV 18 i, osobito, XX 5–6. Usp. Briscoe 1989: 54.

⁴⁴ *Sat.* I 17, 25–27.

⁴⁵ Liv. XXV 12. V. Gillmeister 2019: 134 i dalje. Svi prijevodi u radu pripadaju autoru ovoga članka, kao i kronološki dodatci.

⁴⁶ *Mons Albanus*.

⁴² Liv. XXV 1, 6–12.

⁴³ Liv. XXIII 25, XXIV 18 and in particular XX 5–6. Cf. Briscoe 1989: 54.

⁴⁴ *Sat.* I 17, 25–27.

⁴⁵ Liv. XXV 12. See Gillmeister 2019: 134 ff. All translations to Croatian in the paper belong to the author of this article, as well as chronological additions.

⁴⁶ *Mons Albanus*.

je pročitano drugo proročanstvo, ne toliko nejasno zbog toga što je budućnost tajnija od prošlosti, koliko nerazgovijetno zbog načina na koji je napisano: „Rimljani, ako neprijatelje želite otjerati, kugu koja dolazi izdaleka, predlažem da se Apolonu zavjetuju igre, koje će se usrdno odvijati za Apolona svake godine; kada narod bude davao dio iz javne blagajne, privatni građani neka pridonesu za sebe i svoje; za izvođenje tih igara nadležan će biti onaj pretor koji bude glavni sudac narodu i *plebi*⁴⁷; decemviri neka žrtvama obreduju prema grčkom običaju. Ako ovo pravilno učinite, radovat ćete se uvijek i vaša će država biti bolja; naime uništiti će vaše neprijatelje onaj bog koji vaša polja ugodno napāsā.“

Za tumačenje tog proroštva uzeli su jedan dan; sutradan je donesena senatska odluka da decemviri pogledaju knjige u vezi s Apolonovim igrama i obavljanjem svetog obreda. Kad je to učinjeno i izneseno pred Senat, oci odlučiše da se zavjetuju i održe igre Apolonu te da, kada igre budu završene, 12.000 asā i dvije veće žrtve treba dati pretoru za sveti obred. Donesena je druga senatska odluka, da decemviri obred izvrše prema grčkom običaju ovim žrtvama: Apolonu pozlaćenim⁴⁸ volom i dvjema bijelim pozlaćenim kozama⁴⁹, Latoni pozlaćenom kravom. Kad je kanio održati igre u Cirku, pretor donese edikt da narod za vrijeme igara dā prilog

me.” Those who had fought close to that place recognised the Plain of Diomedes the Argive, the river Cannae and the disaster itself. Then the second prophecy was read, which was not only obscure because the future is more uncertain than the past, but ambiguous because of the way it was written: “Romans, if you wish to repel your enemies, the plague from afar, I suggest that you vow games to Apollo, which will be zealously held in Apollo’s honour every year; when the people when the people contribute a share from the public treasury, private citizens shall contribute on their own behalf and of their (families); the praetor, as the chief judge of the people and the *plebs*,⁴⁷ shall be in charge of conducting these games; let the decemvirs offer sacrifices according to the Greek custom. If you do this correctly, you will always rejoice and your state will be better; for the god that fills your fields with plenty will destroy your enemies.”

They took one day to interpret that prophecy; on the next day the Senate made a decree that the decemvirs should consult the Books with regard to *ludi Apollinares* and the performance of the sacred rite. When this was done and brought before the Senate, the fathers decided that games should be vowed and held in Apollo’s honour, and that after the games, 12,000 assēs and two greater sacrifices should be given to the praetor for the sacred rite. A second decree was made by the Senate, that the decemvirs should offer sacrifice according to Greek rite: to Apollo a gilded ox⁴⁸ and two white gilded goats⁴⁹, to Leto a gilded cow. When he intended to

⁴⁷ *I.e. praetor urbanus*. Fraza *plebeique populo*, koja se u vezi s istim događajem ponavlja kod Makrobija (*Sat.* I 17, 25–27) nalazi se i u odjecima stare molitve koju navode Livije (XXIX 27): *ut ea mihi populo plebique Romano bene verruncent* i Ciceron (*Mur.* 1): *ut ea res mihi fidei magistratuique meo, populo plebique Romanae bene atque feliciter eveniret*. Antički pisci nisu obraćali pažnju na razliku između ta dva termina, jer je u njihovo vrijeme zapravo i nema, ali *carmina Marciana* mogla bi održavati vrijeme društveno-političke organizacije prije reformi Servija Tulija, odnosno vrijeme u kojem je *populus* sačinjavao vojsku za razliku od *plebi* (Momigliano 1990: 104). Iako, prema nekima (Drummond 1990: 166), fraza ne dokazuje da je *plebs* bila *infra classem* (nije sačinjavala vojsku) i da se radi o dvije različite grupe.

⁴⁸ Podrazumijeva se u tekstu da su se životinje žrtvovale pozlaćenih rogova (op. prev.).

⁴⁹ Kozu se inače posvećuje Dijani, a ne Apolonu. Ime trećeg božanstva u tekstu je možda izbrisano ili oštećeno (usp. Livy, *History of Rome, Volume VI: Books 23–25*, 1940: 387, bilj. 3). Isti je navod i kod Makrobija (*Sat.* I 17, 25–27) što znači da, ako je i došlo do iskrivljenja teksta, to se dogodilo vrlo rano i najvjerojatnije ima veze s uništenjem prve verzije nakon požara na Kapitoliju 83. pr. Kr.

⁴⁷ *I.e. praetor urbanus*. The phrase *plebeique populo*, which is repeated in connection with the same event recorded in Macrobius (*Sat.* I 17, 25–27) is also found in the echoes of the old prayer quoted by Livy (XXIX 27): *ut ea mihi populo plebique Romano bene verruncent* and Cicero (*Mur.* 1): *ut ea res mihi fidei magistratuique meo, populo plebique Romanae bene atque feliciter eveniret*. The ancient writers did not pay attention to the difference between the two terms, because in their time it did not exist, but *carmina Marciana* could reflect the time of socio-political organisation before the reforms of Servius Tullius, i.e. the time when the army was comprised of *populus* unlike the *plebs* (Momigliano 1990: 104). Although, according to some (Drummond 1990: 166) the phrase does not prove that the *plebs* was *infra classem* (they were not a part of the army), and that they were two different groups.

⁴⁸ Translator’s note: It is understood in the text that the sacrificed animals had gilded horns.

⁴⁹ The goat is otherwise offered to Diana, not Apollo. The name of the third deity may have been erased or damaged in the text. (Cf. Livy, *History of Rome, Volume VI: Books 23–25*, 1940: 387, note 3). The same statement is made in Macrobius (*Sat.* I 17, 25–27), which means that even if the text was

za Apolona, svatko prema svojoj mogućnosti. To je početak Apolonovih igara, zavjetovanih i održanih radi pobjede, a ne radi zdravlja kako većina misli. Narod je ovjenčan promatrao, matrone su se ponizno molile; narod se javno gostio u atrijima, s vratima širom otvorenim, i taj je dan proslavljen ceremonijama na razne načine.

Budući da su navodi o Marcijevim proroštvima (*carmina Marciana*) uvijek povezani sa Sibilininim knjigama, najvjerojatnije su se zajedno čuvali u hramu na Kapitoliju te je stoga lako pretpostaviti da su zajedno i uništeni u požaru 83. pr. Kr. i da je stvorena nova verzija, osobito jer sama proročanstva aludiraju⁵⁰ na heksametre. Stoga i danas postoje neslaganja o istraživanju, autentičnosti i vremenu nastanka kada su u pitanju *carmina*, kao i o njihovoj raspodjeli u *praecepta* ili *vaticinia* (izreke i proročanstva). Postoje i poteškoće koje izranjaju iz Livijeve tvrdnje da je drugo proročanstvo „teže shvatiti jer predviđa budućnost“ (za razliku od prvoga koje se potvrdilo) i „jer je sam tekst kompliciran“. No tekst uopće nije „težak“ kako bi se očekivalo, pa je moguće da je do nas došao u pojednostavljenoj, mlađoj verziji.⁵¹ Također, može se postaviti pitanje zašto prva objava ne sadrži *remedium* kojim se poraz kod Kane mogao izbjeći, ali zaključujem da prorok (tko god on bio) vjerodostojnost druge objave želi postići navođenjem starije, da bi se nova nesreća izbjegla.⁵² Prva se objava već obistinila i stoga nije bilo potrebno navoditi obredni „lijek“, *remedium* (ako ga je uopće i zahtijevala). To što u tom slučaju Livije posvećuje neobičnu pažnju proročkom tekstu ne znači da takvih slučajeva nije bilo više. Postojanje proroka i proročkih knjiga zasigurno nije bilo strano italskoj tradiciji⁵³ i zasigurno nije svaka pojava takvih tekstova u Rimu iziskivala intervenciju države. Da se u *knjigama* nije našla

hold the games in the Circus Maximus, the praetor issued an edict that the people should give a contribution to Apollo during the games, everyone according to their means. This was the beginning of the ludi Apollinares, vowed and held for victory, not for health like the majority believes. The laurelled people watched, the matrons prayed humbly; the people feasted publicly in the atriums, with the doors wide open, and that day was celebrated with ceremonies in various ways.”

Since the mentions of Marcius’ prophecies (*carmina Marciana*) are always associated with the Sibylline Books, they were most likely kept together in the temple on the Capitoline Hill, so it is easy to assume that they were destroyed together in a fire in 83 BC, and that a new version has been created, particularly since the prophecies themselves point⁵⁰ to hexameters. Therefore, even today there are disagreements about research, authenticity and the period of creation concerning the *carmina*, and their division as *praecepta* or *vaticinia* (sayings and prophecies) as well. There are also difficulties that arise from Livy’s claim that the second prophecy is “harder to understand because it foretells the future” (unlike the first that has been confirmed) and “because the text itself is complicated.” But the text is not at all “difficult” as expected, so it is possible that it came to us in a simplified, later version.⁵¹ Furthermore, one may ask why the first prophecy does not contain a *remedium* by which the defeat at Cannae could have been avoided, but I conclude that the prophet (whoever he was) wanted to make the second prophecy credible by quoting the older one, in order to avoid a new calamity.⁵² The first prophecy had already come true and therefore it was not necessary to present the ritual “remedy”, *remedium* (if it was required at all). The fact that Livy pays unusual attention to the prophetic text does not mean that this was the only case. The existence of prophets and prophetic books was certainly not foreign to the

⁵⁰ Usp. Schanz 1890: 16; Latte 1960: 255, bilj. 5. Jednako pretpostavlja i Russo 2005: 5. Složenice poput *Troiugena*, *armigera*, *frugifera* svakako upućuju na epski jezik i metrički odgovaraju epskom stihu.

⁵¹ Usp. North 2000: 101–102.

⁵² Jednako smatra i Russo 2005: 5 i 12.

⁵³ Tradicija obrednih knjiga poznata je još od Etruščana kod kojih su, osim *libri haruspicini*, postojale *libri fulgurales* te *libri rituales* (Cic. *Div. I* 72).

distorted, this happened very early and is most likely connected to the destruction of the first version after the fire at the Capitoline Hill in 83 BC.

⁵⁰ Cf. Schanz 1890: 16; Latte 1960: 255, note 5. Russo 2005: 5 assumes the same. Compounds such as *Troiugena*, *armiger*, *frugifer* certainly point to epic language and metrically correspond to epic verse.

⁵¹ Cf. North 2000: 101–102.

⁵² Russo (2005: 5 and 12) believes the same.

potvrda za Marcijeva proročanstva, ona se ne bi niti smatrala vjerodostojnima. S druge strane, ratno stanje iziskivalo je žurnost izvršavanja naputaka iz *knjigā*, pa je Senat povjerio decemvirima nadležnost u slučaju s Marcijevim proroštva. Prenošnje odgovornosti s konzula na Senat, sa Senata na decemvire i ponovo vraćanje na Senat koji donosi konačnu odluku, pokazuje karakter rimske religije u to vrijeme.⁵⁴ Naime, događaj s pojavom Marcijevih proroštava iz 213. navodi na misao da su postojali mnogi tekstovi italskog podrijetla koji nisu bili dio službenog rimskog korpusa, ali su to postali pošto su probrani oni koji bi mogli biti od rimskog interesa i stavljeni pod državnu kontrolu. To nužno ne umanjuje vjerodostojnost Marcijevih objava, ali svakako pokazuje da je uloga pojedinca nadahnutog direktno od božanstva zamijenjena državnim autoritetom (u ovom slučaju Senatom) koji ispituje njihovu vjerodostojnost.

3. LUCIUS PETILIUS

Priča o Luciju Petiliju drugi je primjer kako su se Rimljani ophodili prema stranim spisima. Međutim, boreći se između očuvanja tradicije i inovacije, ovoga su puta postupili krajnje brutalno.

Radi se o knjigama Nume Pompilija koje su pronađene 181. pr. Kr., a do kojih se došlo sasvim slučajno. Najopširniji izvor za tu priču također je Livije, s tim da su okolnosti drukčije u odnosu na prvi spomenuti slučaj s Marcijevim proroštva. Naime, dok se u prvom slučaju radilo o svojevrsnoj inspekciji i „potrazi“ za tekstovima koji nisu dio državnoga kulta, u slučaju s Numinim knjigama do spisa se došlo posve slučajno. Nadalje, za razliku od prvoga slučaja, u koji Livije uvodi govoreći o neprestanim nepovoljnim znamenjima u Rimu i koji mu služi kao objašnjenje okolnosti koje su dovele do osnivanja igara u čast Apolonu, u drugom nema nikakvoga uvoda. Prije nego prijeđe na priču o Numinim knjigama, Livije jedino kaže da te godine nije kišilo šest mjeseci. Možda se to treba shvatiti kao svojevrsan nepovoljan znak (*prodigium*) za ono što slijedi?

⁵⁴ V. North 2000: 92–94.

Italic tradition,⁵³ and not every appearance of such texts in Rome required the intervention of the state. If the prophecies of Marcius had not been confirmed in the Books, they would not have been considered credible. On the other hand, the state of war required hasty execution of instructions from the Books, so the Senate entrusted the decemvirs with the responsibility for Marcius' prophecies. The transfer of responsibility from the consul to the Senate, from the Senate to the decemvirs, and the return to the Senate, which makes the final decision, reveal the character of the Roman religion during that period.⁵⁴ Namely, the event with the appearance of Marcius' prophecies from 213 suggests that there were many texts of Italic origin that were not part of the official Roman corpus, but they became as such after those that might be of Roman interest were selected and placed under state control. This does not necessarily diminish the credibility of Marcius' prophecies, but it certainly shows that the role of the individual inspired directly by the deity has been replaced by the state authority (in this case the Senate) which examines their credibility.

3. LUCIUS PETILIUS

The story of Lucius Petilius is another example of how the Romans treated foreign writings. However, while hesitating between the preservation of tradition and innovation, this time they acted extremely brutally.

These are the books of Numa Pompilius which were found in 181 BC quite by accident. The most extensive source for this story is also Livy, with the circumstances being different from the first case of Marcius' prophecies. Namely, while in the first case it is a kind of inspection and “search” for texts that are not part of the state cult, in the case of Numa's books, the texts were found by accident. Furthermore, unlike the first case, for which Livy gives an introduction by talking about the constant unfavourable signs in Rome and which serves as an explanation for the circumstances that led to the founding of the games in Apollo's honour, in the second case there is no introduction. Before moving on to the story of Numa's books, Livy

⁵³ The tradition of ritual books has been known since the Etruscans, who, in addition to *libri haruspicini*, had *libri fulgurales* and *libri rituales* (Cic. Div. I 72).

⁵⁴ See North 2000: 92–94.

Prema Livijevu izvješću za 181. godinu pr. Kr. (XL 29, 3–14):

Iste godine, dok su na polju pisara Lucija Petilija⁵⁵ pod Janikulom ratari dublje orali zemlju, pronađene su dvije kamene škrinje, gotovo osam stopa duge, po četiri široke, s poklopcima vezanima olovom. Obje su škrinje bile ispisanе latinskim i grčkim naslovima: na jednoj (je pisalo) da je pokopan Numa Pompilije, Pomponov sin, rimski kralj; na drugoj da su (to) Numine knjige. Kad ih je, prema savjetu prijatelja, vlasnik otvorio, otkrilo se da je prazna ona s imenom pokopanoga kralja (i) bez ijednoga traga ljudskoga tijela ili bilo kakve stvari; sve je nestalo zbog protoka tolikih godina. U drugoj su pronađena dva svežnja zamotana užadi natopljenom voskom, sa sedam knjiga koje ne samo da su izgledale netaknute, nego posve nove. Bilo je sedam⁵⁶ latinskih knjiga o pontifikalnom pravu (*de iure pontificio*), sedam grčkih koje su se bavile mudrošću (i.e. filozofijom, *de disciplina sapientiae*), koliko je bilo moguće u to vrijeme. Valerije Ancijat dodaje da su bile pitagorejske naravi, dajući vjerodostojnost općepoznatom mišljenju da je Numa bio Pitagorin učenik, a time i vjerodostojnost fikciji. Knjige su najprije pročitali prijatelji, koji su nazočili tom događaju; kad se, pošto su ih mnogi pročitali, pronio glas o njima, uzeo ih je od Lucija Petilija gradski pretor Kvint Petilije želeći ih pročitati; (među njima) je postojao i prijateljski odnos jer je

only states that it had not rained for six months that year. Maybe this should be understood as a kind of unfavourable sign (*prodigium*) for what follows?

According to Livy's report for 181 BC (Liv. XL 29, 3–14):

During the same year, while the farmers were ploughing the ground deeper in the field of the scribe Lucius Petilius,⁵⁵ two stone chests were discovered, about eight feet long and four feet wide, with their lids fastened with lead. Both chests bore an inscription in Latin and Greek: on one (it was written) that Numa Pompilius, son of Pomponius, and king of Rome, was buried there; on the other that (it) contained Numa's books. When the owner opened them on the advice of his friends, it was discovered that the chest bearing the name of the buried king was empty (and) without any trace of a human body or anything else; everything had disappeared after many years. In the other chest, two bundles wrapped with waxed ropes were found, each containing seven books not only intact, but brand new. There were seven⁵⁶ books in Latin on pontifical law (*de iure pontificio*), and seven in Greek about wisdom (i.e. philosophy, *de disciplina sapientiae*). Valerius Antias adds that they were of a Pythagorean nature, giving credence to the common opinion that Numa was a disciple of Pythagoras. The books were first read by friends who were present at the event; after many had read them, and the word about books had spread, they were taken from Lucius Petilius

⁵⁵ Postoje i neka manja odstupanja u izvorima. Varon (*Logistorici*, 40) za vlasnika imanja navodi Terencija (*Terentius*), a pronalazač knjigā njegov je govedar koji je orao blizu Numina groba. Plinije Stariji (*N.h.* XIII 84, 4) također za vlasnika imanja navodi Gneja Terencija, koji je osobno iskopao Numin lijes. U nastavku (88) Plinije podsjeća i na sudbinu Sibilinih knjiga koje su spaljene ili zahvaljujući starici koja ih je nudila Tarkviniju Oholom ili u požaru na Kapitoliju.

⁵⁶ Rimski se izvori razlikuju u izvješću o broju knjigā. Livijeva verzija govori o sedam latinskih i sedam grčkih knjiga. Jednako tvrdi i Plinije (*N.h.* XIII 27, 87) citirajući za izvor L. Calpurnija Pizona (*ensor*), ali dodaje da C. Sempronije Tuditan govori o 12 knjiga *Numae decretorum*. Plinije navodi i da je prema Varonu pronađeno samo sedam knjiga *humanarum antiquitatum*, a prema Valeriju Ancijatu 12 knjiga pontifikalnoga prava na latinskome i isto toliko knjigā grčke filozofije. Valerija Ancijata citira i Plutarh (*Num.* XXII 4). Kasije Hemina, koji je Plinijev prvi izvor, spominje samo jedan lijes s Numinim tijelom i tri knjige Pitagorine filozofije. Jedini izvor koji govori da je spaljeno zapravo sedam grčkih knjiga, a sedam latinskih sačuvano, jest Valerije Maksim (I 1, 12). Usp. Prowse 1964: 37.

⁵⁵ There are also some minor discrepancies in the sources. Varro (*Logistorici*, 40) states that *Terentius* was the owner of the estate, and that the books were found by his cattleman who ploughed near Numa's tomb. Pliny the Elder (*N.h.* XIII 84, 4) also cites *Gnaeus Terentius* as the owner of the estate, who personally excavated Numa's coffin. In the continuation (88), Pliny recalls the fate of the Sibylline Books, burned both by the old woman who offered them to Tarquin the Proud, and by the fire on the Capitol.

⁵⁶ Roman sources differ in reporting on the number of books. Livy's version speaks of seven Latin and seven Greek books. The same is claimed by Pliny (*N.h.* XIII 27, 87), quoting L. Calpurnius Piso (*ensor*) as the source, but he adds that C. Sempronius Tuditanus speaks of twelve books *Numae decretorum*. Pliny also states that according to Varro, only seven books *humanarum antiquitatum* were found, and according to Valerius Antias, twelve books of pontifical law in Latin and the same number of books of Greek philosophy were found. Valerius Antias is also quoted by Plutarh (*Num.* XXII 4). Cassius Hemina, who is Pliny's first source, mentions only one coffin with Numa's body and three books of Pythagoras' philosophy. The only source that actually states that seven Greek books were burned, and seven Latin preserved is Valerius Maximus (I 1, 12). Cf. Prowse 1964: 37.

Kvint Petilije kao kvestor dao namještenje pisaru u dekuriji. Pročitao je najvažnije dijelove i, kad je shvatio da većina njih može dovesti do uništenja (državne) religije, rekao je Luciju da će ih baciti u vatru; prije nego što to učini, dopušta mu da (sudski) ispita, ako smatra da se putem prava posjedovanja ili zagovora (tribunā) knjige mogu potraživati natrag: no to treba učiniti tako da sačuva prijateljstvo s njim (pretorom). Pisar je pošao k pučkim tribunima, stvar je prebačena s tribuna na Senat. Pretor je rekao da je spreman zakleti se da te knjige ne treba niti čitati niti sačuvati. Senat je procijenio da je dovoljno to što pretor obećava zakletvu; knjige neka se spale čim prije na komiciju; neka se vlasniku (zemlje) isplati cijena za knjige, koliko se prikladnim bude činilo pretoru Kvintu Petiliju i većini pučkih tribuna. Pisar je to odbio. Knjige su na komiciju spaljene vatrom koju su načinile žrtvene sluge (*victimarii*) naočigled narodu.

Uočljiva je povezanost dvojice Petilija, a to nije promaklo ni Liviju. On ih dovodi u vezu na citiranom mjestu riječima: „Dva čovjeka su povezana: dok je Kvint bio *quaestor*, za Lucija je stekao položaj pisara.“ Stoga se pomišlja da su su mogli biti u odnosu *patronus – cliens*.

No zanimljivije je kako se u tako nevažnom događaju kriju znamenite okolnosti: vjerski čin spaljivanja knjigā, iako su se krile pod Numinim imenom, pokazuje da je taj incident proizveo golem učinak na Senat. Numa je uživao veliko poštovanje među Rimljanima kao kralj s kojim je započelo razdoblje mira pošto se, kao mudrac i mirotvorac, posvetio organizaciji državne religije te prekinuo s osvajačkom politikom koju je vodio ratoborni Romul.⁵⁷ Unatoč tomu, nije se gledalo blagonaklono na knjige koje su pod njegovim imenom pronađene i prema tradiciji napisane njegovom rukom. Ključne su riječi *pleraque dissolvendarum religionum esse* – knjige su sadržavale inovacije ili su bile suprotne tradiciji; u svakom slučaju, predstavljale one opasnost za religiju ili bile previše „nespretne“ da ih se ispita, nitko ih nije imao namjeru braniti.

⁵⁷ Usp. Turner 2016: 2 i dalje. Od antičkih izvora v. Liv. I 18–21; Plut. *Num.* Etimologija njegova imena izvodila se od grčke riječi za ‘zakon; običaj’: νόμος. Usp. Serv. *Aen.* VI 808, 11–12: *unde etiam Numa dictus est ἀπὸ τῶν νόμων, ab inventione et constitutione legis, nam proprium nomen Pompilius habuit.*

by Quintus Petilius, the City praetor, who wanted to read them; there was a friendly relationship (between them), because Quintus Petilius, as a quaestor, had given the scribe an appointment in the decury. After reading the most important passages and, realising that most of the books would lead to the destruction of the (state) religion, he told Lucius that he would throw them into the fire; but before doing so he allowed him to (judicially) examine the books, if he believed that the books could be reclaimed either by the right of possession or by the authority (of the tribunes of the plebs): but this was to be done in such a way as to preserve the friendship with him (the praetor). The scribe approached the tribunes, and the matter was transferred from the tribunes to the Senate. The praetor said that he was ready to give an oath that these books should neither be read nor preserved. The Senate decided that it was sufficient that the praetor promised an oath; let the books be burned at the assembly as soon as possible; let the owner (of the land) be paid the price for the books, in the amount the praetor Quintus Petilius and most of the tribunes of the people found sufficient. The scribe refused. The books were burned in the *comitium* in a fire made by *victimarii* in front of the people.

The connection between the two Petilii is noticeable, and Livy did not miss that either. He connects them in the quoted place with the words: “The two men are connected: while Quintus was quaestor, he settled Lucius with the position of a scribe.” It is therefore thought that they may have been in a *patronus – cliens* relationship.

However, it is more interesting how significant circumstances are hidden in such an insignificant event: the religious act of book burning, although the books were hidden under Numa’s name, shows that this incident had a huge effect on the Senate. Numa enjoyed great respect among the Romans as the king under whom the period of peace began, and because he devoted himself, as a sage and peacemaker, to the organization of the state religion, and broke with the policy of conquest led by the warmongering Romulus.⁵⁷ Nevertheless, the books which bore his

⁵⁷ Cf. Turner 2016: 2 ff. For ancient sources see Liv. I 18–21; Plut. *Num.* The etymology of his name was derived from the Greek word for “law; custom”: νόμος. Cf. Serv. *Aen.* VI 808, 11–12: *unde etiam Numa dictus est ἀπὸ τῶν νόμων, ab inventione et constitutione legis, nam proprium nomen Pompilius habuit.*

Neki su učenjaci objašnjavali brutalno postupanje Rimljana s knjigama kroz mitološku povezanost Nume i Pitagore⁵⁸ koja je vjerojatno nastala s ciljem da istakne grčku izvornost Numinih vjerskih reformi i rimskih institucija. Numa je bio pontifik, ali i filozof. Od Ciceronove *Države*⁵⁹ do Plutarhove biografije⁶⁰ predmet su rasprave Pitagorin život i povezanost s Numom. Iako ih je rimska tradicija dovela u vezu kao mudrace te je odatle i proizišlo vjerovanje da je Numa bio Pitagorin učenik, ne može se isključiti mitski element u predaji o njihovom odnosu. Već je Ciceron doveo u pitanje tu povezanost Pitagore s Numom kao njegovim učenikom zbog kronološke nepodudarnosti. Prema njemu je Pitagora u Rim došao tek za vrijeme posljednjega kralja, odnosno za 62. Olimpijade 532. – 528. pr. Kr.⁶¹ Dionizije iz Halikarnasa također tvrdi da je povezanost nemoguća jer je Pitagora u Rim došao čak četiri generacije nakon Nume.⁶² Postoje i druge poveznice, a tiču se načina Numina života u skladu s pitagorejskom filozofijom, poput beskrvne žrtve, vegetarijanstva, načina pokapanja (ne u lijes, već direktno u zemlju) ili imena sinova obojice (*Mamercus*).⁶³ Brežuljak Janicul tradicijom jest vezan za Numu kao mjesto njegova groba⁶⁴ i mjesto na kojem boravi bog Jan, koji je posebno važan u Numinoj religiji (osnutak hrama, koji je prvi put u znak mira zatvorio Numa)⁶⁵, ali tradicija⁶⁶ o pokapanju direktno u zemlju zapravo ide u prilog tome da jedan kovčeg nije bio i Numin lijes. S druge strane, čest je

name, and according to tradition were written by his hand, were not viewed favourably. The key words are *pleraque dissolvendarum religionum esse* – the books contained innovations or were contrary to the tradition; in any case, whether they posed a danger to religion or were too “awkward” to be examined, no one intended to defend them.

Some scholars have explained the Roman brutal treatment of the books through the mythological connection of Numa and Pythagoras⁵⁸ that probably arose with the aim of emphasizing the Greek authenticity of Numa’s religious reforms and Roman institutions. Numa was a pontiff, but also a philosopher. From Cicero’s *Republic*⁵⁹ to Plutarch’s biography⁶⁰, the subject of discussion is Pythagoras’ life and his connection with Numa. Although the Roman tradition brought them together as sages and hence the belief that Numa was a student of Pythagoras, the mythical element in the legend of their relationship cannot be ruled out. Even Cicero had questioned the connection of Pythagoras and Numa as his disciple because of chronological inconsistencies. According to him, Pythagoras came to Rome only during the last king, i.e. during the 62nd Olympics in 532 – 528 BC.⁶¹ Dionysius of Halicarnassus also claims that a connection is impossible because Pythagoras came to Rome as many as four generations after Numa.⁶² There are other connections, regarding Numa’s way of life according to Pythagorean philosophy, such as bloodless sacrifice, vegetarianism, burial methods (not in a coffin, but directly in the ground) or the names of both of his sons (*Mamercus*).⁶³ The Janiculum Hill is traditionally associated as Numa’s burial site⁶⁴ and the place where resides the god Janus, who is especially important in Numa’s religion (the founding of a temple, which was closed for the first time by Numa as a sign of peace)⁶⁵, but the tradition⁶⁶ of burials

⁵⁸ Usp. Dumézil 1996: 523–525; Humm 2014: 35–37 (o mogućim okolnostima nastanka toga mita v. 40–43; o modernim interpretacijama toga mita v. Musial 2005).

⁵⁹ *Rep.* II 28.

⁶⁰ *Plut., Num.* 1, 11.

⁶¹ *Rep.* II XV 28–29.

⁶² *Ant. Rom.* II 59.

⁶³ Usp. Prowse 1964: 39; Latte 1960: 269–270.

⁶⁴ *Cic. Leg.* II 56, 5–7.

⁶⁵ *Liv.* I 19, 2–4.

⁶⁶ *Cic. Leg.* II 56: *At mihi quidem antiquissimum sepulturae genus illud fuisse videtur, quo apud Xenophantem Cyrus utitur: redditur enim terrae corpus et ita locatum ac situm quasi operiment<o> matris obducitur. Eodemque ritu in eo sepulcro quod <haud> procul a Fontis ara est, regem nostrum Numam conditum accepimus, gentemque Corneliā usque ad memoriam nostram hac sepultura scimus esse usam.*

⁵⁸ Cf. Dumézil 1996: 523–525; Humm 2014: 35–37 (on the possible circumstances of the origin of this myth, see 40–43; on modern interpretations of this myth see Musial 2005).

⁵⁹ *Rep.* II 28.

⁶⁰ *Plut., Num.* 1, 11.

⁶¹ *Rep.* II XV 28–29.

⁶² *Ant. Rom.* II 59.

⁶³ Cf. Prowse 1964: 39; Latte 1960: 269–270.

⁶⁴ *Cic. Leg.* II 56, 5–7.

⁶⁵ *Liv.* I 19, 2–4.

⁶⁶ *Cic. Leg.* II 56: *At mihi quidem antiquissimum sepulturae genus illud fuisse videtur, quo apud Xenophantem Cyrus utitur:*

bio slučaj da određene familije u Rimu, kao što su *Aemilii*⁶⁷, *Calpurnii*⁶⁸ ili *Cornelii*⁶⁹, dovode u vezu svoje podrijetlo s razdobljem kraljeva i, ako su bile sklone pitagorejskom učenju, zasigurno su na taj način tradiciju mogle okrenuti u svoju korist.

Najbanalniji zaključak da se radi o krivotvorini Lucija Petilija, ne bi li se domogao lake zarade, moramo ovdje odbaciti jer Livije kazuje da je on odbio novac ponuđen za odštetu. No svakako se radi o pokušaju pojedinaca da utječu na državni kult spisima pod autorstvom Nume, priznatoga osnivača rimske religije. Vjerojatno neočekivano za njih, Senat bez ikakve temeljite istrage odbacuje spise kao nevjerodostojne.

4. ZAKLJUČNA RAZMATRANJA

1. Iako ni jedna od ovdje obrađenih predaja nema svoj izvor stariji od Livija, to ne znači da nisu Rimljanima bile poznate. Nakon požara koji je izazvala provala Gala 390. pr. Kr., malo je tekstova o ranoj rimskoj religiji i povijesti moglo preživjeti, ali usmena predaja i sjećanje na nju bilo je itekako živo. Ako je Livije i imao pismeni izvor, očito nije bio precizan ili je i taj izvor (ili izvori) na isti način kao i Livije dvojio o tekstu Marcijevih proroštava (ako uzmemo u obzir da tekst koji imamo nije pretrpio kasnije izmjene). Također, takve „pričice“ zgodne su za ukrašavanje historiografije s jedne strane, a s druge nesumnjivo ukazuju na potrebu za isticanjem povezanosti nekih utjecajnih rimskih familija s božanskim osobama i samim božanstvima, poput spomenutih Emilijā, Kalpurnijā ili Kornelijā koji su sebe povezivali s Numom, osnutkom Rima, a time i trojanskim korijenima.

⁶⁷ Dugo su nosili prezime *Mamercini*, što se vezuje za legendu o Numinu potomku (*Mamercus*) koji je ime dobio po Pitagorinu sinu ili ocu. Odatle je lako bilo povezivati ime s imenom boga Marsa i osnutkom Rima. Usp. Humm 2014: 45, bilj. 34.

⁶⁸ Svoje su podrijetlo izvodili od jednoga od Numinih sinova, Kalpa. Usp. Prowse 1964: 39–40.

⁶⁹ Prema Ciceronu (*Leg. II* 56, 5–7), jednako su se kao Numa pokapali: tijelom položenim direktno u zemlju.

directly in the ground actually supports the fact that one of the excavated chests was not actually Numa's coffin. On the other hand, it was often the case that certain families in Rome, such as *Aemilii*⁶⁷, *Calpurnii*⁶⁸ or *Cornelii*⁶⁹, linked their origins to the period of kings and, if they were inclined to Pythagorean teachings, they could certainly turn the tradition to their own benefit.

The most basic conclusion that this was a forgery by Lucius Petilius, so he could make easy money, must be rejected because Livy says that he refused the money offered as compensation. But it is certainly an attempt by individuals to influence the state cult with the writings authored by Numa, a recognized founder of the Roman religion. Probably unexpectedly for them, the Senate rejected the credibility of books without any thorough investigation.

4. CONCLUDING REMARKS

1. Although none of the traditions mentioned and interpreted here have a source older than Livy, this does not mean that they were unknown to the Romans. After the fire caused by the Gaul sacking in 390 BC, a few texts on early Roman religion and history could have survived, but the oral tradition and the memory of it were very much alive. If Livy had a written source, it was obviously not precise, or even that source (or sources) doubted the text of Marcius' prophecies in the same way as Livy did (considering that the available text did not undergo later changes). Furthermore, on the one hand such "stories" are convenient for embellishing historiography, and on the other they undoubtedly indicate the need to emphasize the connection of

redditur enim terrae corpus et ita locatum ac situm quasi operiment<o> matris obducitur. Eodemque ritu in eo sepulcro quod <haud> procul a Fontis ara est, regem nostrum Numam conditum accepimus, gentemque Corneliam usque ad memoriam nostram hac sepultura scimus esse usam.

⁶⁷ For a long time, they bore the surname *Mamercini*, which is related to the legend of Numa's descendant (*Mamercus*), which was named after Pythagoras' son or father. Hence it was easy to associate the name with the name of the god Mars and the founding of Rome. Cf. Humm 2014: 45, note 34.

⁶⁸ They traced their origins to one of Numa's sons, Calpus. Cf. Prowse 1964: 39 – 40.

⁶⁹ According to Cicero (*Leg. II* 56, 5–7), they were buried like Numa: with a body laid directly into the ground.

2. Osnivanje igara u čast Apolonu 212. pr. Kr. nije jedini niti najstariji primjer obrednog „lije-ka“ (*remedium*) prema naputku Sibilinih knjiga. Kod Plutarha se nalazi vijest da se igre Apolonu posvećuju već 504. pr. Kr. s ciljem ublažavanja bijesa bogova za vrijeme teškoga rata sa Sabinjanima.⁷⁰ Također, utemeljenje Apolonovih igara 212. pr. Kr. kao redovnoga godišnjeg obreda ne treba miješati s početkom štovanja Apolona u Rimu. Kult grčkoga Apolona postojao je u Rimu od najranijih vremena, dugo kao relativno nevažno božanstvo i prije svega bog iscjelitelj. Njegov prvi hram posvećen je 433. pr. Kr. „da liječi narod“.⁷¹ Vjerojatno ga je kasnija analogija s grčkom religijom, u kojoj se smatrao zaštitnikom proročišta, povezala sa Sibilinim knjigama. No one se pod njegovu zaštitu stavljaju tek 28. pr. Kr., kada ih je August premjestio u novi hram na Palatiju.⁷²

3. Slučaj s pronalaskom Numinih knjiga pokazuje drugu stranu rimskoga utilitarizma. Kako se iz dosad rečenoga dalo naslutiti, pojava novih znamenja rezultirala je uvijek pozitivnim „lijekom“ (*remedium*), odnosno osnivanjem nove svečanosti, kulta, hrama ili prihvaćanjem stranoga božanstva.

U slučaju s Numinim knjigama Orlin⁷³ vidi suprotstavljene dvije tradicije, grčku i rimsku, pri čemu je rimska predstavljena Sibilinim knjigama, a grčka Numinim knjigama pitagorejske filozofije. Obje nisu mogle zajedno postojati. To je možda jedan od razloga zašto su filozofske knjige (na grčkome) uništene, a one pontifikalne (na latinskome) nisu.

Postoji još jedan razlog zbog kojega nije bilo mudro čuvati ili čak širiti knjige povezane s pitagorizmom iz 181. pr. Kr., a to je podsjećanje na nedavni slučaj s Bakanalijama 186. pr. Kr.⁷⁴

⁷⁰ *Popl.* 21, 1–3. Prema tom izvješću sve žene trudne u to vrijeme rađale su unakaženu djecu i svi su porodi bili prijevremeni.

⁷¹ *Usp. Liv.* IV 25, 3; XL 5, 6; *OCD* 122–123 (*s.u. Apollo*); *KP* (*Bd. 1*) 441–447; *Wissowa* 1912: 294; *Orlin* 2002: 22.

⁷² *Gillmeister* 2019: 36 i dalje; *Dumézil* 1996: 605.

⁷³ V. kod: *Gillmeister* 2019: 137; bilješka 44.

⁷⁴ Tadašnji konzul Spurije Postumije pokrenuo je istragu o novome obredu grčko-etruščanskog podrijetla. Obred je poprimao odlike orgijastičnog kulta, u početku dostupan

some influential Roman families with divine persons and deities, such as Aemilii, Calpurnii or Corneli who associated themselves with Numa, the founding of Rome, and thus with Trojan origins.

2. The founding of the games in the honour of Apollo in 212 BC is not the only or the oldest example of a ritual “remedy” (*remedium*) according to the instructions from the Sibylline Books. The news that the games were dedicated to Apollo as early as 504 BC with the aim of alleviating the wrath of the gods during the difficult war with the Sabines⁷⁰ is found in Plutarch. Furthermore, the founding of the *ludi Apollinares* in 212 BC as a regular annual rite should not be confused with the beginning of the worship of Apollo in Rome. The cult of the Greek Apollo has existed in Rome since the earliest times; for a long time, he was a relatively unimportant deity and above all a healing god. His first temple was dedicated in 433 BC in order “to heal the people.”⁷¹ He was connected with the Sibylline Books probably by later analogy with Greek religion, in which he was considered as the protector of oracles. However, the Books were placed under his protection only in 28 BC, when Augustus moved them to a new temple on the Palatine Hill.⁷²

3. The case of the discovery of Numa’s books shows the other side of Roman utilitarianism. As can be inferred from what has been said so far, the appearance of new signs has always resulted in a positive “remedy” (*remedium*), i.e. the establishment of a new ceremony, cult, temple or the acceptance of a foreign deity.

In the case of Numa’s books, Orlin⁷³ sees two opposing traditions, Greek and Roman, with Roman being represented by the Sibylline Books, and the Greek by Numa’s books of Pythagorean philosophy. The two could not coexist. This may be one of the reasons why the philosophical books (in Greek) were destroyed and the pontifical ones (in Latin) were not.

There is another reason why it was not wise to keep or even distribute books from 181 BC related to Pythagoreanism, and this is the memory of the recent

⁷⁰ *Popl.* 21, 1–3. According to that report, all women pregnant at the time, gave birth to mutilated children and all births were premature.

⁷¹ *Cf. Liv.* IV 25, 3; XL 5, 6; *OCD* 122 – 123 (*s.u. Apollo*); *KP* (*Bd. 1*) 441 – 447; *Wissowa* 1912: 294; *Orlin* 2002: 22.

⁷² *Gillmeister* 2019: 36 ff.; *Dumézil* 1996: 605.

⁷³ See in: *Gillmeister* 2019: 137; note 44.

kada je država intervenirala u neslužbeni kult. Tako pitagorizam, jedna od najstarijih filozofija u Rimu i bezazlena dok savjetuje o načinu življenja, postaje opasna kada pod svojim imenom širi spise koji bi mogli potaknuti religiozne osjećaje mase i utjecati na tradiciju. Prema Prowseu,⁷⁵ „pitagorejski elementi u gradu, osobito u opasnosti od progona nakon Bakanalija, vidjeli su mogućnost pokušaja dokazivanja autentičnosti svojih uvjerenja, tako da iznesu na vidjelo knjige koje su ‘pronašli’ zakopavši ih ranije u novi, ili možda stari, grob.“

U tom se slučaju, smatram, preslikava borba između rimskoga konzervatizma, koji se temelji na očuvanju *mos maiorum* i rimskih vrijednosti, i kulturne otvorenosti prema novoosvojenim područjima na istoku.

4. Od vremena rata s Hanibalom uvedeni su mnogi novi kultovi i drastično se povećao broj igara. No, s obzirom na to da je rimska država bila vrlo osjetljiva prema novim kultovima, osobito onima koji podrivaju ili umanjuju značaj državnih, obredi poput bakanalija morali su biti stavljani pod državnu kontrolu, a tako je zasigurno bilo i sa svakim „divljim“ proročištem i privatnim zbirkama proročkih izreka. Stoga je lako zaključiti da su i Numine knjige, koje bi svojom reformom pitagorejskoga učenja postale nadređene državnim vjerskim propisima, morale biti uništene. Nasuprot rimskom konzervatizmu, koji je tako očit u slučaju s Numinim knjigama, primjer s Marcijevim proroštvima potvrđuje utilitarnost rimskoga svijeta, koja se očituje u spremnosti prihvaćanja stranih religija i kultova, njihova prilagođavanja rimskom obredu i nazivlju, a sve u svrhu odvratanja nesreće koja bi inače, u tom slučaju, pogodila Rim.

samo za žene, a kasnije i za muškarce. Masovna popularnost novog obreda za rimsku je državu, inače osjetljivu na bilo kakva nova vjerovanja, bila iznimno opasna. Nakon provedene istrage, privođenja i pogubljenja sumnjivih sudionika te uništenja svetišta, donesena je senatska odluka kojom se Bakanalije legaliziraju, ali pod uvjetima kontroliranim tako da u praksi nastavak štovanja bude nemoguć. Usp. Nečas Hraste 2019: 64; Rüpke 2006: 38–40.

⁷⁵ Prowse 1964: 42.

case of the Bacchanalian Affair of 186 BC⁷⁴ when the state intervened in the unofficial cult. Thus Pythagoreanism, one of the oldest philosophies in Rome, harmless while advising on the way of life, becomes dangerous when it spreads the writings in its name that could entice the religious feelings of the masses and influence the tradition. According to Prowse:⁷⁵ “It may be that Pythagorean elements in the city, perhaps especially in danger of persecution after the affair of the Bacchanalia, seized an opportunity to attempt to prove the authenticity of their beliefs, by bringing the books to light, after “finding” them where they had been planted in a new, or perhaps old, tomb.”

I believe that this case reflects the struggle between Roman conservatism, which was based on the preservation of *mos maiorum* and Roman values, and the cultural openness to newly conquered areas in the east.

4. Since the war with Hannibal, many new cults have been introduced and the number of games has drastically increased. But as the Roman state was very sensitive to new cults, especially those that undermined or diminished the importance of state rites, the rites like the Bacchanalia had to be brought under the control of the state, and it was certainly the same with every “wild” oracle and private collections of prophetic sayings. Therefore, it is easy to conclude that Numa’s books, which would come to a superior position above the religious regulations of the state with their reform of Pythagorean teaching, had to be destroyed. Contrary to Roman conservatism, which is evident in the case of Numa’s books, the example of Marcius’ prophecies confirms the utilitarianism of the Roman world, manifested in its willingness to accept foreign religions and cults, and to adapt them to Roman rites and terminology, all in the purpose of preventing a misfortune which would otherwise strike Rome.

⁷⁴ Consul at that time, Spurius Postumius launched an investigation into a new rite of Greco–Etruscan origin. The rite took on the characteristics of an orgiastic cult, initially available only to women and later to men. The massive popularity of the new rite was extremely dangerous for the Roman state, which was sensitive to any new beliefs. After the investigation, arrest and execution of suspicious participants, and the destruction of the shrines, a decree by the Senate was made to legalize the Bacchanalia, but under controlled conditions so that the practice of worship was impossible to continue. Cf. Nečas Hraste 2019: 64; Rüpke 2006: 38–40.

⁷⁵ Prowse 1964: 42.

Bibliografija / Bibliography**Popis izdanja korištenih literarnih izvora /***List of editions of literary sources*

Amm. Marc.

Ammianus Marcellinus. *History, Volume I: Books 14–19*, with an English translation by J. C. Rolfe, Cambridge, London: Harvard University Press, 1950.

Cic., *Fam.*

Cicero, *Epistulae ad Familiares*, 2 vols., ed. D. R. Shackleton Bailey, 1977.

Cic., *Div.*

M. Tulli Ciceronis Scripta Quae Manserunt Omnia. Part. 4, Vol. 2, ed. C. F. Mueller, 1890.

Cicero, *On Old Age, On Friendship, On Divination*, with an English translation by W. A. Falconer, Cambridge, London: Harvard University Press, 1923.

Cic. *Leg.*

Cicero, *On the Republic. On the Laws*, with an English translation by Clinton W. Keyes, Cambridge, London: Harvard University Press, 1928.

Cic., *Mur.*

M. T. Cicero *Pro Murena* (M. Tulli Cicerōnis Orationes. Vol. 1, ed. A. C. Clark, 1905.)

Cic., *Rep.*

Cicero, *On the Republic. On the Laws*, with an English translation by Clinton W. Keyes, Cambridge, London: Harvard University Press, 1928.

M. T. Ciceron, *Libri politici. Sv. 1: Država. Preveo D. Nečas Hraste*, Zagreb: Demetra, 1995.

Dio Cass. / Zonar.

Roman History, Volume II: Books 12–35, with an English translation by E. Cary, Hebert B. Foster, Cambridge, London: Harvard University Press, 1914.

Dion. Hal., *Ant. Rom.*

K. Jackoby, *Dionysii Halicarnasei antiquitatum Romanarum quae supersunt*, 4 vols., Leipzig: Teubner, 1:1885; 2:1888; 3:1891; 4:1905 (repr. 1967).

Fenest., *Ann.*

Historicorum Romanorum Reliquiae, Vol. 2, ed. H. Peter, Leipzig: Teubner, 1906.

Gell.

Gelli Noctes Atticae. Vols. 1–2, ed. K. Marshall, 1968.

Isid., *Etym.*

S. Isidōri Hispalensis Episcopi opera omnia, Tomus III. *etymologiarum, libri X priores*, Roma, 1798.

[ed.] Lindsay, W. M., *Isidōri Hispalensis episcopi etymologiarum sive originum libri XX*, Scriptorum Classicorum Bibliotheca Oxoniensis, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1911.

Liv.

Ab Urbe Condita (Bks. 1–5: *Titi Livi Ab Urbe Condita*. Vol. 1, ed. R. S. Conway; C. F. Walters, 1955; Bks. 6–10, 21–25: *Ibid.* Vols. 2–3, ed. C. F. Walters; R. S. Conway, 1919–1950; Bks. 26–30: *Ibid.* ed. R. S. Conway, S. K. Johnson, 1953; Bks. 36–40; *Ibid.* Part. 3, ed. W. Weissenborn; M. Mueler n. d.).

Livy, *History of Rome, Volume V: Books 21–22*, with an English translation by B. O. Foster, Cambridge, London: Harvard University Press, 1929.

Livy, *History of Rome, Volume VI: Books 23–25*, with an English translation by F. G. Moore, Cambridge, London: Harvard University Press, 1940.

Livy, *History of Rome, Volume XII: Books 40–42*, with an English translation by Evan T. Sage, Alfred C. Schlesinger, Cambridge, London: Harvard University Press, 1938.

Livy, *History of Rome, Volume VIII: Books 28–30*, with an English translation by F. G. Moore, Cambridge, London: Harvard University Press, 1949.

Lycop., *Alex.*

Lycophronis Alexandra, ed. L. Masciliano, Leipzig: Teubner, 1964.

Macrobi., *Sat.*

Macrobius, *Saturnalia* (ed. F. Eyssenhardt), Leipzig: Teubner, 1893.

Marcius vates, *Praecepta*

Fragmenta Poetarum Latinorum Epicorum et Lyricorum praeter Ennium et Lucilium, ed. W. Morel, 1927.

Ov., *Fasti P. Ovidi Nasonis Fastorum Libri Sex*, ed. E. H. Alton; D. E. W. Wormell; E. Courtney, 1978.

Paulus – Festus

Sexti Pompei Festi De Verborum Significatu Quae Supersunt cum Pauli Epitome, ed. W. M. Lindsay, 1913.

Plin., *N.h.*

C. Plini Secundi Naturalis Historiae Libri XXXVI. Vols. 1–5, ed. C. Mayhoff. 1892–1909.

Pliny, *Natural History, Volume II, Books 3–7*, with an English translation by H. Rackham, Cambridge, London: Harvard University Press, 1942.

Pliny, *Natural History, Volume VIII, Books 8–11*, with an English translation by H. Rackham, Cambridge, London: Harvard University Press, 1940.

Plut., *Num.*

Plutarch, *Lives, Volume I: Theseus and Romulus. Lycurgus and Numa. Solon and Publicola*, with an English translation by B. Perrin, Cambridge, London: Harvard University Press, 1914.

Plut., *Popl.*

Plutarch, *Lives, Volume I: Theseus and Romulus. Lycurgus and Numa. Solon and Publicola*, with an English translation by B. Perrin, Cambridge, London: Harvard University Press, 1914.

Polyb.

Polybius, *The Histories, Volume II: Books 3–4*, with an English translation by W. R. Paton, Cambridge, London: Harvard University Press, 1927.

Porph., *In Hor.*

Pomponi Porphyrii Commentum in Horati Flaccum, ed. A. Holder, 1894.

Serv., *Aen.*

Servii Grammatici Qui Feruntur In Vergilii Carmina Commentarii. Vols. 1–2, ed. G. Thilo, 1878–1884.

Suet. *Aug.*

C. Suetoni Tranquilli Opera. Vol. 1, ed. M. Ihm, 1908.

Tac., *Ann.*

Cornelius Tacitus. *Annales (Cornelii Taciti Annalium Ab Excessu Divi Augusti Libri)*, ed. C. D. Fisher, 1906.

Tib. *Eleg.*

Albii Tibulli Aliorumque Carminum Libri Tres, ed. F. W. Lenz; G. K. Galinsky, 1971.

Val. Max.

Valerii Maximi Factorum et Dictorum Memorabilium Libri Novem cu Iulii Paridis et Ianuarii Nepotiani Epitomis, ed. C. Kempf, 1888.

Varro, *Logist.*

I Logistorici, ed. E. Bolisani, 1937.

Verg. *Aen.*

P. Vergili Maronis Opera, ed. R. A. B. Mynors, 1972.

Popis skraćenica / List of abbreviations

KP – H. Gärtner, A. F. Pauly, W. Sontheimer & K. Ziegler, *Der Kleine Pauly: Lexikon der Antike*, A. Druckenmüller, 1964–1975.

OCD – S. Hornblower & A. Spawforth, *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.

Popis literature / Literature

Beljan 2018 – Dijana Beljan, O adaptaciji latinskih imena i nekih rimskih tehničkih termina: vlast – pravo – religija, *Acta Illyrica. Godišnjak udruženja BATHINVS*, 2, Sarajevo, 2018, 427–450.

Beard, North & Price 2017 – John North, Mary Beard & Simon Price, *Religions of Rome*, Volume 2, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017.

Briscoe 1989 – John Briscoe, The Second Punic war, u / in: *The Cambridge Ancient History*, 8, eds. F. W. Walbank, A. E. Astin, M. W. Frederiksen & R. M. Ogilvie, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989, 44–80.

Coulter 1950 – Cornelia C. Coulter, The Transfiguration of the Sibyl, *The Classical Journal*, 46(2), 1950, 65–78. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3292757> (pristupljeno / accessed 07/12/2020).

Drummond 1990 – Andrew Drummond, Rome in the fifth century I: the social and economic framework, u / in: *The Cambridge Ancient History*, 7/2, eds. A. Drummond, F. W. Walbank, A. E. Astin, M. W. Frederiksen & R. M. Ogilvie, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990, 113–171.

Dumézil 1996 – Georges Dumézil, *Archaic Roman Religion*, Baltimore – London: The John Hopkins University Press, 1980.

Gillmeister 2019 – Andrzej Gillmeister, *The Guardians of the Sibylline Books. The Viri Sacris Faciundis College in Roman Religion*, Sarzana, 2019.

Gudeman 1894 – Alfred Gudeman, Literary frauds among the Romans, *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, 25, 1984, 140–164.

Humm 2014 – Michael Humm, Numa and Pythagoras: The life and Death of a Myth, u / in: *The Roman historical tradition: regal and Republican Rome*, eds. H. Richardson & F. Santangelo, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.

Latte 1960 – Kurt Latte, *Römische Religionsgeschichte*, München: C. H. Beck, 1960.

Momigliano 1990 – Arnaldo Momigliano, The Origins of Rome, u / in: *The Cambridge Ancient History*, 7/2, eds. A. Drummond, F. W. Walbank, A. E. Astin, M. W. Frederiksen & R. M. Ogilvie, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990, 52–112.

Musial 2005 – Danuta Musial, Les livres de Numa: remarque sur l'hellenisation de la culture romaine, u / in: *Society and Religions: studies in Greek and Roman History*, ed. D. Musial, Torún: Uniwersytetu Mikolaja Kopernika, 2005, 63–75.

Nečas Hraste 2019 – Daniel Nečas Hraste, *Starolatinski natpisi*, Zadar: Sveučilište u Zadru, 2019.

Nikoloska 2012 – Aleksandra Nikoloska, The sea voyage of Magna Mater to Rome, *Histria Antiqua*, 21, 2012, 365–371.

North 2002 – John North, Prophet and text in the third century BC, u / in: *Religion in Archaic and Republican Rome and Italy. Evidence and Experience*, eds. E. Bispham & Ch. Smith, Chicago: Fitzroy Dearborn, 2002, 92–114.

Orlin 2002 – Eric Orlin, *Temples, religion, and politics in the Roman Republic*, Leiden: E. J. Brill, 2002.

Prowse 1964 – K. Prowse, Numa and the Pythagoreans: A Curious Incident, *Greece and Rome*, 11/1, 1964, 36–42.

Russo 2005 – Federico Russo, I *Carmina Marciana* e le tradizioni sui Marcii, *La Parola del Passato*, 60(340), 2005, 5–32.

Rüpke 2006 – Jörg Rüpke, *Die Religion der Römer*, München: C. H. Beck, 2006.

Schanz 1890 – Martin Schanz, *Geschichte der römischen Literatur bis zum Gesetzgebungswerk des Kaisers Justinian* Vol. 8/1, München: Beck, 1890.

Takács 2008 – Sarolta A. Takács, *Woman in Roman Religion*, Austin: University of Texas Press, 2008.

Turner 2016 – Aimee Turner, The importance of Numa Pompilius: A Reconsideration of Augustan Coins, *Open Library of Humanities*, 2/1, 2016, p. e16 (1–19). doi: <https://doi.org/10.16995/olh.58> (pregledano / accessed 07/12/2020).

Wissowa 1912 – Georg Wissowa, *Religion und Kultus der Römer*, München: C. H. Beck, 1912.

Internetski izvori / Internet sources

Isidore: <http://penelope.uchicago.edu/Thayer/E/Roman/Texts/Isidore/home.html> (pregledano / accessed 07/12/2020).

Classical Latin authors: <https://latin.packhum.org/> (pregledano / accessed 07/12/2020).

Classical Greek authors: <http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/Iris/demo/tsearch.jsp#> (pregledano / accessed 07/12/2020).

Lactantius: https://www.documentacatholicaomnia.eu/30_10_0240-0320-_Lactantius.html (pregledano / accessed 07/12/2020).

Symmachus: <https://digiliblt.uniupo.it/> (pregledano / accessed 07/12/2020).

Thesaurus Linguae Latinae: <https://www.thesaurus.badw.de/en/tll-digital/tll-open-access.html> (pregledano / accessed 07/12/2020).

