

# THE CANNOPHORI AND THE MARCH FESTIVAL OF MAGNA MATER

DUNCAN FISHWICK

*St. Francis Xavier University*

The calendar of Philocalus, composed in A.D. 354, gives the program of the March festival of Magna Mater as follows (*CIL* 1<sup>2</sup> p. 260):<sup>1</sup>

*Id. Mart.* (15 March): *Canna intrat*  
*XI K. Apr.* (22 March): *Arbor intrat*  
*IX K. Apr.* (24 March): *Sanguem*  
*VIII K. Apr.* (25 March): *Hilaria*  
*VII K. Apr.* (26 March): *Requietio*  
*VI K. Apr.* (27 March): *Lavatio*  
*V K. Apr.* (28 March): *Initium Caiani*

With the exception of the *initium Caiani*,<sup>2</sup> which probably was unrelated to the cult despite its juxtaposition in Philocalus, these ceremonies make up the various episodes of the festival as it was celebrated

<sup>1</sup> Bibliographical references are to be interpreted as follows: **Rel. Or.** = F. Cumont, *Die Orientalischen Religionen im Römischen Heidentum*<sup>4</sup> (Leipzig-Berlin 1931). **Lambrechts, Fêtes** = P. Lambrechts, "Les Fêtes 'Phrygiennes' de Cybèle et d'Attis," *Bulletin de l'Institut Historique Belge de Rome* 27 (1952) 141-170. **Lambrechts, Attis** = P. Lambrechts, *Attis: Van Herdersknep Tot God* (Brussels 1962). **Beaujeu** = J. Beaujeu, *La Religion Romaine à l'Apogée de l'Empire*, 1 (Paris 1955). **Hepding** = H. Hepding, *Attis seine Mythen und sein Kult* (Giessen 1903). **Graillot** = H. Graillot, *Le Culte de Cybèle* (*Bibl. des écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome* 107: Paris 1912). **RuKR** = G. Wissowa, *Religion und Kultus der Römer*<sup>2</sup> (Munich 1912). **GGR** = M. P. Nilsson, *Geschichte der griechischen Religion*<sup>2</sup> (Munich 1961). **RRG** = K. Latte, *Römische Religionsgeschichte* (Munich 1960). **Meiggs** = R. Meiggs, *Roman Ostia* (Oxford 1960).

<sup>2</sup> On this day (28 March) Caligula entered Rome after the death of Tiberius. As the phrase *initium muneris* is used by Philocalus to mark the beginning of the quaestorian games on 2 December, it is possible that *initium Caiani* may be a relic of some similar celebration instituted by Caligula, who certainly loved to race chariots in the Caianum on the Vatican hill (Cass. Dio 59.14). The supposition that a connection existed between the *initium Caiani* and the initiation rite of the *taurobolium* is unlikely, as the *taurobolium* was not attached to any particular day; cf. A. D. Nock, *JRS* 38 (1948) 156-57, quoting Chr. Hülsen, *Diss. pontif. Accad. di arch.* 2, 8 (1903) 359-60. The

in the fourth century A.D.<sup>3</sup> At some stage these "Phrygian" rites of March had supplanted the old "Roman" rites of April (the Megalesia) which were celebrated under the Republic following the official installation of Magna Mater in Rome in 204 B.C.<sup>4</sup> So much at least is clear: but it is not known for certain when the change took place nor whether it was by one stage or in several. For the only evidence we have on the question is a passage concerning the *dendrophoria* in the *De mensibus* of the Byzantine author J. Lydus writing in the sixth century A.D.: τῇ πρὸ δεκαμῆας καλενδῶν Ἀπριλίων δένδρον πίτυς παρὰ τῶν δενδροφόρων ἐφέρετο ἐν τῷ Παλατίῳ· τὴν δὲ ἑορτὴν Κλαύδιος ὁ βασιλεὺς κατεστήσατο (4.59).

On the basis of this text J. Carcopino has demonstrated conclusively that the emperor in question was not Claudius Gothicus (A.D. 268–270), as held by A. von Domaszewski, but the Julio-Claudian emperor of the same name who also associated with the festival of *arbor intrat* a college of *dendrophori* newly instituted for the purpose.<sup>5</sup> Furthermore, on Carcopino's interpretation, Claudius introduced the whole March cycle of ceremonies which henceforth gravitated around the death and resurrection of Attis. In an outstanding paper published fifteen years ago P. Lambrechts effectively challenged this thesis and instead proposed that the rites listed by Philocalus developed in two distinct steps: the first under Claudius, the second under Antoninus Pius.<sup>6</sup> Lambrechts' arguments have in general been accepted<sup>7</sup> and need not be repeated *in extenso* here. His main points are that only from the time of Antoninus does Attis fully emerge in the literary and epigraphical texts<sup>8</sup> as a god of life and resurrection in response to the ideas of rebirth

mere circumstance of juxtaposition in the calendar does not prove the relation of the *initium Caiani* to the rites of 15–28 March; cf. the *tubilustrium* which Philocalus lists between the *dendrophoria* and the *dies sanquinis*.

<sup>3</sup> For a definitive exposition of the content of these colorful rites see *Rel. Or.* 52–53.

<sup>4</sup> See the recent study by Th. Köves, "Zum Empfang der Magna Mater in Rom," *Historia* 12 (1963) 321–47.

<sup>5</sup> "La Réforme romaine du culte de Cybèle et d'Attis" in *Aspects Mystiques de la Rome Païenne*<sup>3</sup> (Paris 1941) 49–171.

<sup>6</sup> Lambrechts, *Fêtes* 141–70; cf. "Attis à Rome," *Mélanges G. Smets* (Brussels 1952) 461–71; *Attis* 8, 26 ff.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Beaujeu 313–20.

<sup>8</sup> See Lambrechts' analysis of the literary, epigraphical, and iconographic sources, *Attis* 20–52. The earliest epigraphical reference to Attis as god in the West is *CIL* vi 30973 (Antonine or later: cf. *Fêtes* 150, note 2.)

and *renovatio* abroad at this period. Until then the character of the March rites was appropriate rather to a festival of mourning celebrating the death of Attis, the consort of Cybele. As a result the introduction of one festival in particular, the Hilaria of 25 March, which (at least in the third and fourth centuries A.D.) commemorated the resurrection of Attis, must be deferred until the latter part of the second century A.D. or later. One might add that a further conclusion following from this is that the *requietio* of 26 March must also have found its place in the March program at a relatively late stage. For it follows immediately after the Hilaria and was presumably intended to provide time to rest after the unrestrained merrymaking of the previous day.

The opening rite of the ceremonies listed by Philocalus is that of 15 March: *canna intrat*. On this day the reed entered borne by members of the college of *cannophori*:<sup>9</sup> their solemn procession, like that of the *dendrophori* seven days later, is thought to have made its way through the town to the temple of Magna Mater on the Palatine. What exactly was the significance of this parade is still very uncertain. Nothing final can be inferred from the Ostian *cista* of M. Modius Maximus, the *archigallus* or high priest of the Cybele cult, representing the head of Attis flanked by reeds (*CIL* xiv 385); nor from a bronze statuette at Toulouse showing Attis holding in one hand the syrinx and in the other a sheaf of reeds.<sup>10</sup> The most likely interpretation is that the festival recalled the finding of the infant Attis by Cybele on the banks of the river Gallos, where he had been exposed at birth by order of his grandfather Sangarios.<sup>11</sup> The main text on which this is based is Julian, *Orat.* V, p. 165B: ἀποδιελόντες ἐκείνου (τοῦ τρίτου δημιουργοῦ) τὸν Ἀττιν, τὴν ἄχρι τῆς ὕλης καταβαίνουσιν αἰτίαν, καὶ θεὸν γόνιμον Ἀττιν εἶναι καὶ Γάλλον πεπιστεύκαμεν, ὃν δὴ φησιν ὁ μῦθος ἀνθῆσαι μὲν ἐκτεθέντα παρὰ Γάλλου ποταμοῦ ταῖς δίναις, εἶτα καλὸν φανέντα καὶ μέγαν ἀγαπηθῆναι παρὰ τῆς Μητρὸς τῶν θεῶν. (Cf. p. 180A: τὸν Ἀττιν ἐκτεθέντα περισωσαμένη;

<sup>9</sup> On the *cannophori* see F. Cumont in de Ruggiero, *Diz. Epig.* 2 (1910) 80–81 s.v.; *RE* 3 (1897) 1484–85 s.v.; Hepding 147–49; Graillot *Index* s.v.; *RuKR* 321 and 322 no te 5; *GGR* 644; *RRG* 342.

<sup>10</sup> For documentation and bibliography see Hepding 148–49; Graillot 117.

<sup>11</sup> So Cumont, Hepding, and Wissowa; Nilsson suspends judgment; for a more fanciful *aition* see Graillot 117–18.

Sallustius philosophus, *De diis et mundo* 4: παρὰ τῷ Γάλλῳ λέγεται εὐρεθῆναι ποταμῶ.)

The epigraphical record, if it does not offer outright confirmation of this *aition*, certainly corroborates the link between the college and Attis and Cybele. At Ostia Q. Caecilius Fuscus, the *archigallus*, presented the *cannophori* with a silver image of Cybele and a representation of Nemesis: *imaginem Matris Deum argenteam p(ondo) I cum signo Nemesem kannophoris Ostiensibus d.d.* (CIL XIV 34). On another occasion the same priest gave a silver statue of Attis and a bronze *sigillum* of the sacred fruit of the Great Mother: *imaginem Attis argentiam (sic) p(ondo) I cum sigillo frugem aereo kannophoris Ostiensibus donum dedit* (xiv 35). Similarly Q. Domitius Aterianus and his wife Domitia Civitas, who bear the honorary titles *pater* and *mater* conferred by the *cannophori*, have bestowed a statuette of Attis: . . . *signum Attis can(n)ophoris Ost(iensibus) d.d.* (xiv 37); and Calpurnia Chelido gave a two-pound silver likeness of the stone fetish of the goddess: *typum Matris Deum argenti p. II cantnophoris (sic) Ost. d.d. et dedicabit (sic)* (xiv 36). These inscriptions throw no light upon the significance of the reed, but a link between Attis and the banks of the Gallos, along which the reed grew, would seem very likely.<sup>12</sup>

The procession was not the only rite of 15 March. After the reed had entered (presumably), the high priest joined by the *cannophori* sacrificed a six year old bull to ensure the fertility of the fields on the mountains (visible from the Palatine). The source here is once again J. Lydus, *De mensibus*: Εἰδοῖς Μαρτίαις ἑορτὴ Διὸς διὰ τὴν μεσομηνίαν καὶ εὐχαὶ δημόσιαι ὑπὲρ τοῦ ὑγιεινὸν γενέσθαι τὸν ἐνιαυτόν. ἱεράτευον δὲ καὶ ταῦρον ἐξέτη ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐν τοῖς ὄρεσιν ἀγρῶν, ἡγουμένου τοῦ ἀρχιερέως καὶ τῶν κανηφόρων τῆς Μητρὸς (4.49).

Now an inscription from Ostia explicitly attests the participation of the *cannophori* in the *taurobolium*: *taurob[olium factum matri deum magn. idaeae pro salute] im[p. caesaris] M. Aurel[i antonini aug. et] L. Aureli [commodi caes. et] Faustin[ae aug. matris castro]rum libe[rorumque eorum senatus XVvir s.f. equestr.] ordin. ex[ercituum] naviga[ntium] decuri[onum col. ost.] cann[ophori] nat [. . .] in [. . . (CIL XIV 40). Further, the high priest commonly associated with the *taurobolium* was the *archigallus*. This is certainly the case with the official *taurobolium* for the emperor's*

<sup>12</sup> The reed seems to have been important in other cults; cf. Hepding 149.

safety usually said to be accomplished *ex vaticatione archigalli*, when, however, the actual sacrifice was carried out not by the high priest of the cult but by an accompanying *sacerdos*.<sup>13</sup> The sacrifice in which the *cannophori* shared is not said to be *pro salute imperatoris*, it is true, but it is of a corporate nature and is mentioned by Lydus immediately after *εὐχαὶ δημόσiai ὑπὲρ τοῦ ὑγεινὸν γενέσθαι τὸν ἐνιαυτόν*; it is a *sacrifice* as in the official *taurobolium* rather than an initiation rite as is predominantly the case with later private *taurobolia*;<sup>14</sup> and it is performed *ἡγουμένου τοῦ ἀρχιερέως*. The natural interpretation, then, is that the sacrifice to which Lydus refers is the *taurobolium* and that the *ἀρχιερεύς* involved is the *archigallus*—not the *pontifex maximus* as believed by Mommsen (*CIL* I<sup>2</sup> 312).<sup>15</sup>

If this interpretation is correct, it has important chronological implications. For while the earliest private *taurobolium* attested in the West is at Puteoli in A.D. 114 (renewed 134), the first official *taurobolium* for the emperor's safety is at Lyons in A.D. 160 (*CIL* XIII 1751), the last year of Antoninus Pius. As Lambrechts has shown, the official *taurobolium* first organized by Antoninus was attached by him exclusively to the Cybele cult.<sup>16</sup> Furthermore, the earliest possible *archigallus* so far attested is Q. Caecilius Fuscus at Ostia, who made his gifts to the *cannophori* between A.D. 169 and 176 (*CIL* XIV 34–35)—later than the Lyons inscription, that is; the earliest date to which one can assign an *archigallus* with certainty is A.D. 184 (*CIL* XII 1782). It would seem probable, therefore, that this office also was instituted by Antoninus, if not Marcus. If then the *cannophori* joined with the *archigallus* in sacrificing a bull after the entry of the reed, that part at least of the ceremonies of 15 March can have been introduced no earlier than Antoninus. But this conclusion raises the larger question of whether the ceremonies of 15 March were not in fact all instituted at approximately the same time. We have seen that on Lambrechts' interpretation

<sup>13</sup> *RRG* 355, note 4.

<sup>14</sup> See further H. Oppermann in *RE* 9<sup>2</sup> (1934) 16–21 s.v. *taurobolia*; J. Dey, *ΠΑΛΙΓΓΕΝΕΣΙΑ* (Münster 1937) 65–86; *GGR* 645–46, 651–54; and the useful lists of Graillot 159 ff., 167 ff.; cf. H. Bloch in *HTR* 38 (1945) facing p. 244.

<sup>15</sup> So Cumont, Hepding, Graillot; Wissowa refers simply to the "Oberpriester"; Nilsson and Latte omit mention of the rite.

<sup>16</sup> *Fêtes* 157–58; cf. Beaujeu 314 ff., who dates the institution of the rite to A.D. 158–59 with supporting numismatic arguments.

the March rites remained appropriate to a festival of mourning until the middle of the second century A.D.—no other conclusion can be drawn from references in the contemporary sources.<sup>17</sup> Certainly the entry of the pine tree decked out to represent the dead Attis and the startling rites that followed two days later are ceremonies of a funerary festival that ended with the washing of Cybele's image in the Almo; cf. Arrian, *Tactica* 33.4 (ed. A. G. Roos): ἡ Φρυγία τιμᾶται ἐκ Περσινούοντος ἐλθοῦσα, καὶ τὸ πένθος τὸ ἀμφὶ τῷ Ἀττῇ Φρύγιον <ὄν> ἐν Ῥώμῃ πενθεῖται, καὶ τὸ λουτρὸν δ' ἡ Ῥέα, ἐφ' οὗ τοῦ πένθους λήγει, τῶν Φρυγῶν νόμῳ λούεται. It is difficult to see how this can be true of the *cannophoria*, however, which on the interpretation suggested can hardly have been other than a joyous festival. The difference in character between this and the following rites is quite marked. Perhaps then the entry of the reed was not an original part of the festival: the very fact that it precedes the funerary rites beginning 22 March by a full week raises the suspicion that it was attached later when a change took place in the nature of the whole festival. One would think that the addition of an earlier stage to the cycle of Attis' life coincided with the new importance Attis assumed in the second half of the second century when he first became a god of resurrection and the rival of Dionysus and Osiris.<sup>18</sup>

For confirmation of this let us turn to the inscriptions, eighteen of which now confirm the presence of the *cannophori*.<sup>19</sup> No clues to chronology are to be gleaned from their organization, which closely resembled that of the *dendrophori*—*collegium*: *CIL* v 5840, ix 2480; *collegius* (sic): x 24, 8339<sup>d</sup>; *corpus*: xiv 116–17; *q(uinquennales) q(uatuor) . . . qui cura[m] gesser[unt]*: xiv 284; *pat(er), mat(er)*: xiv 37—nor from the fact that the *cannophori* acted as a burial college on occasion

<sup>17</sup> Seneca, *Agamemnon* 690; Statius, *Thebaid* 12.224; Martial, 14.204; *CIL* vi 10098 = Bücheler, *Carm. Ep.* 1100; Suetonius, *Otho* 8; Valerius Flaccus, *Argonautica* 8.239–242; Arrian, *Tactica* 33.4 (composed in A.D. 136–37). See the definitive analysis of these passages by Lambrechts, *Fêtes* 165–67.

<sup>18</sup> Lambrechts, *Attis* 11–19.

<sup>19</sup> *CIL* v 5840 (Mediolanum); ix 2480 (Saepinum); x 24, 8339<sup>d</sup> (Locri); xiv 34, 35, 36, 37, 40, 116, 117, 118, 119, 284, 285 (Ostia); *AEpigr* 1952, no. 142 (two dedications from Ostia). For an unpublished fragment of a role of the Ostian *cannophori*, see Meiggs 361. I am informed by Mr. Meiggs that this is certainly post-Hadrianic and may belong to the late second or early third century. The exact location of the *schola* of the *cannophori* in the *metreon* is uncertain.

(IX 2480; X 24, 8339<sup>d</sup>) and admitted female members (IX 2480). We must therefore confine our attention to those inscriptions which can be dated, all of which come from Ostia. This circumstance is particularly significant, because it is possible to determine the period when the area by the Porta Laurentina was first adapted to the Cybele cult.<sup>20</sup> Not only is the earliest *dendrophorus* from the area dated A.D. 139, but an inscription published a few years ago records an *honoratus* or past-officer of the college of *hastiferi* in A.D. 140,<sup>21</sup> which would take the presence of this college back at least as far as 139. Furthermore, the last years of Hadrian's reign are the period assigned by Meiggs to the construction of Cybele's temple,<sup>22</sup> the architectural remains of which were identified by Visconti at the western apex of the vast triangular *metroon*. It was apparently about the same time also that a small temple at the east end of the area was constructed for Bellona, whose cult was served by the *hastiferi*.<sup>23</sup> A nearby shrine of Attis, on the other hand, though its original walls may go back to the Julio-Claudian period, is dated by its apse, the twin Pans guarding the entrance, and the preserved dedications to Attis, to a somewhat later period in the time of Antoninus Pius.<sup>24</sup> This would be consistent with the contemporary development of Attis' divinity and in keeping with current ideas of rebirth and *renovatio* which are reflected in the new rite of the *taurobolium*.

<sup>20</sup> The area was originally explored by C. L. Visconti, *Annali dell' Istituto di Corrispondenza Archeologica* 40 (1868) 362; 41 (1869) 208. Present knowledge of the area is mainly indebted to the excavations of G. Calza, which have completed and modified the picture, particularly for the imperial period: "Il santuario della Magna Mater a Ostia" *Atti della Pontificia Accademia Romana di Archeologia, Memorie* 6 (1947) 183-205.

<sup>21</sup> H. Bloch, *Notizie degli Scavi di Antichità* 7 (1953) 243-44, no. 7. On the office of the *hastiferi* see my article forthcoming in *JRS* 57 (1967).

<sup>22</sup> Meiggs, Appendix 9, p. 548.

<sup>23</sup> See the temple inscriptions, *AEpigr* 1949, nos. 26-27, with the arguments of Meiggs 364-65. A date about 137 or 138 is supported by the fact that there is no reference in these inscriptions to the college of *hastiferi*, whose institution was probably contemporaneous with or a little later than the building of Bellona's temple. If the *hastiferi* had been in existence before its construction, one would have expected some mention of the college in connection with work on the temple.

<sup>24</sup> Meiggs 364; G. Calza (above, note 20) 198. A life-sized representation in marble of a reclining Attis, which may have been the central statue of the sanctuary, has been dated on stylistic grounds to the decade A.D. 130-140; R. Calza, "Sculpture rinvenute nel Santuario," *Mem. Pont.* 6 (1947) 216-17. A later date is perhaps suggested by the rays of the sun crowning the head and a crescent moon on the Phrygian cap. The

What is immediately striking in this context is that a gap of fully thirty years intervenes between the earliest data relating to the Cybele cult and the first evidence for the presence of the *cannophori* at Ostia.<sup>25</sup> Datable inscriptions begin in the reign of Marcus Aurelius and thereafter continue until A.D. 212 and later. The full list in chronological order is: *CIL* XIV 40 and 117 (A.D. 161–180); 34 and 35 (A.D. 169–176); 116 (A.D. 195); 118 (A.D. 200); 284 (ca. A.D. 200); 119 (4 April A.D. 212); *AEpigr* 1952, no. 142 (third century A.D.). While no certainty is possible with regard to undated inscriptions, there is nothing to indicate that any of these should be placed before the second half of the second century. The dangers inherent in arguing from absence of evidence are obvious and need no emphasizing, but sufficient numbers of inscriptions of all types have been found at Ostia and a long enough run of the *cannophori* in particular to warrant the conclusion that the *cannophori* (and therefore the rites of 15 March) were grafted onto the Cybele cult here at a considerably later date than when a full scale cult of Magna Mater was first installed by the Porta Laurentina. The occasion was probably at the end of the reign of Antoninus Pius, and the institution of the *cannophori* and the entry of the reed must therefore be associated with the innovations in the Cybele cult which we have assigned to this period in the foregoing sketch.

It is now possible to determine the approximate chronological development of the March rites listed in their final form by Philocalus. As instituted by Claudius the festival seems to have been of a predominantly funerary nature, its focal points being the *dendrophoria* (22 March), the *dies sanguinis* (24 March), and the *Lavatio* (27 March).<sup>26</sup> Evidence for these rites in the first century B.C., while not always

characters on the base are also somewhat later; cf. the suggestion by R. Calza that they were added later.

<sup>25</sup> *CIL* xiv 97 is incorrectly related to the *cannophori* by Beaujeu 313. The inscription refers only to the *dendrophori*.

<sup>26</sup> This helps to clear up a minor point of chronology. Suetonius records that in March 69 Otho hurriedly departed from Rome to do battle with the followers of Vitellius: "Expeditionem autem impigre atque etiam praepropere inchoavit, nulla ne religionum quidem cura, sed et motis necdum conditis ancilibus (quod antiquitus infaustum habetur), et die, quo cultores Matris lamentari et plangere incipiunt; praeterea adversissimis auspiciis" (*Otho* 8). Carcopino (above, note 5) 67, note 3, took the day of Otho's departure to have been the *dies sanguinis* of 24 March, a suggestion that was rejected by Lambrechts, *Fêtes* 165, note 2, on the grounds that the day the devotees of



explicit, is clear enough, Wissowa notwithstanding.<sup>27</sup> The earliest epigraphical traces of the *dendrophori*, whose *natalicium* (1 August) coincided with that of their founder, begin soon after the reign of Claudius: *CIL* x 7 (from Regium Iulium) A.D. 79; *CIL* vi 641 (from Rome) A.D. 97; cf. a Julio-Claudian fragment from Vienne in Narbonensis with the letters *DEND: AEpigr* 1956, no. 6. The earliest direct allusion to the *dies sanguinis* is in connection with the death of Marcus Aurelius in A.D. 180 (Tertullian, *Apolog.* 25), but a passage in Valerius Flaccus (ob. A.D. 92 or 93) seems to make clear reference to the sanguinary rites of the day as early as the Flavian period (*Argonautica* 8.239-42):

sic ubi Mygdonios planctus sacer abluit Almo  
laetaque iam Cybele festaeque per oppida taedae  
quis modo tam saevos adytis fluxisse cruores  
cogitet aut ipsi qui iam meminere ministri?

With this may be compared a text of Martial (ca. A.D. 40-104) suggesting that the *lavatio* served also to purge the instruments used on the *dies sanguinis* (3.47.1-2):

Capena grandi porta qua pluit gutta  
Phrygiumque Matris Almo qua lavat ferrum.

It is also relevant to the chronological argument that devotees performed their rites around the new pine tree brought into the temple of Cybele by the *dendrophori* two days earlier and that the practice of auto-castration was forbidden by law in the reign of Domitian.<sup>28</sup> The rite of the *Lavatio*, on the other hand, is attested by a long series of texts,<sup>29</sup> the earliest of which is the *Menologium Colotianum* of ca. A.D. 50 (*CIL* vii 2305). During the second half of the second century

Cybele began their ceremonies was rather the *cannophoria* of 15 March. But if the analysis of the festival given above is correct, not only were the rites of 15 March not of a funerary character, but in the first century A.D. the *cannophoria* simply did not exist. The day Otho departed to fight the Vitellians was therefore the *dendrophoria* of 22 March, when the lamentations began that lasted until 27 March (*die quo cultores deum Matris lamentari et plangere incipiunt*).

<sup>27</sup> *RUKR* 322.

<sup>28</sup> Hitzig in *RE* 3 (1877) 1772-73 s.v. *castratio*, with refs. A substitution for auto-castration has been seen in the castration of the animal victim in the *taurobolium*; cf. *RRG* 354, note 2.

<sup>29</sup> Collected by Wissowa, *RUKR* 319, note 7.

A.D., probably towards the end of Antoninus Pius' reign, the character of the festival underwent a fundamental change. This is reflected in the new rite of the *taurobolium* and the office of *archigallus* and is associated with the rise of Attis as a god of rebirth. To judge from the inscriptions it seems probable that at this time was added a preliminary rite, the entry of the reed borne by *cannophori* on 15 March. The final stage of development saw the growth of the Hilaria into the high point of a festival that by the third and fourth centuries A.D. celebrated the death *and* resurrection of Attis. When exactly the joyful rites of this day (their nature is uncertain) first found their place in the cult is not clear. The earliest possible mention is a passage in the *Historia Augusta* from the life of Alexander Severus (37.6); all other texts belong to the late third and fourth centuries.<sup>30</sup> Perhaps then the origins of the Hilaria<sup>31</sup> go back to Antoninus Pius but the day was not yet as important as later, its significance increasing in proportion to that of Attis' godhead. Expressed in a table the development of the March festival would therefore be:

	Claudius	Antoninus Pius	Antoninus Pius or later
15 March		<i>canna intrat</i> ( <i>cannophori</i> )	
22 March	<i>arbor intrat</i> ( <i>dendrophori</i> )		
24 March	<i>sanguis</i> ( <i>Galli</i> )		
25 March			<i>hilaria</i>
26 March			<i>requietio</i>
27 March	<i>lavatio</i> (? <i>hastiferi</i> )		

<sup>30</sup> See Lambrechts' discussion in *Fêtes* 160, with note 5, quoting the list of passages assembled by Graillot 131, note 3, and Hepding 166–72.

<sup>31</sup> The attempt of Maternus on the life of Commodus (Herodian 1.10.5–7) I would place on the *Lavatio* rather than on the *Hilaria*, as held by Mommsen (*CIL* 1<sup>2</sup> 313) and Hepding 168. There is no evidence for a procession on the Hilaria of the kind Herodian describes in his account of the plot.