

Vita, Pudicitia, Libertas:
Juno, Gender, and Religious Politics in Valerius
Maximus

Hans-Friedrich Mueller
The Florida State University

“We must never forget that Juno, like all else Roman and Italian, ... was remolded and viewed differently by the common people, the politicians, and finally the poets....”

R. E. A. Palmer, *Roman Religion and Roman Empire: Five Essays* (4)

Valerius Maximus, who dedicated his work to the emperor Tiberius, culled some one thousand anecdotes from Greek and Roman history and arranged them in nine books.¹ Because he preserves records from the Roman republic available nowhere else and because his sources are generally good, Valerius has always found ready welcome in the learned footnotes of ancient historians. On the other hand, in spite of the recent work of Martin Bloomer and of Clive Skidmore, who have begun to rehabilitate him as an author, Valerius is not much read as literature. There remains the accumulated weight of philological prejudice. The last century has been particularly cruel to Valerius. Eduard Norden, for example, refused to include him in his survey of Roman prose style:

Valerius Maximus opens that long series of Latin authors who, on account of their artificiality, are unendurable to the point of

¹A work on Roman nomenclature, the *De praenominibus*, accompanied manuscripts of Valerius as a “tenth book,” but is in fact not by him. The long-standard edition of Valerius has been Kempf’s Teubner of 1888, though his earlier *editio maior* of 1854 remains by far the more useful. New editions are, however, beginning to arrive: the Budé volumes of Combès 1995 and 1997 have appeared, as has a new Teubner by Briscoe (unavailable at this writing). One may also consult the English of Speed, the French of Constant, the German of Hoffmann, or the Italian of Faranda. Wardle’s commentary on book 1 is forthcoming. Linderski 1990: 87–88 n. 7 surveys the older commentaries (compare Schullian 324–403; Briscoe 395 n. 5). Basic orientation to Valerian studies and bibliography may conveniently be had from Bliss, Bloomer, Briscoe, Guerrini, Maslakov, Schullian, Sinclair, and Skidmore, all with further references.

desperation...I have no desire to investigate the disgusting elements of his style.²

Desire aside, Valerius is a crucial author. He stands at both a literary and a political crossroads. Augustan literature had only just faded to silver; the solemn ceremony marking the irrevocable passing of the free state was still a living memory.³ To be sure, the “virtues” (*uirtutes*) of the past are extolled, honored, and perhaps cultivated, but a new age has dawned. Valerius is very much a child of that new society; thus his peculiar literary perceptions of the republican past offer insight into his view of the contemporary scene. Particularly interesting are Valerius’ views of religion, gender, and personal morality in the context of Tiberian Rome,⁴ especially since he comes so closely on the heels of Augustus’ efforts at religious revival and moral reform. His voice still awaits an audience willing to listen.

How, though, might we begin to listen? In her review of *Römische Religionsgeschichte*, Agnes Kirsop Michels is disturbed by Kurt Latte’s static conception of Roman religion and offers a suggestion for recovering ancient points of view:

One wonders what results might be obtained if one worked on the perhaps naive assumption that most Latin authors (not all) in most of their works (not all) were saying quite sincerely just what they really thought. One would have to allow for the possibility that they frequently changed their minds, but the experiment might be interesting.⁵

This article represents part of such an experiment. Valerius’ work is vast and varied. We shall thus attempt no grand assessment of the literary merits or demerits of Valerius Maximus. Rather, we shall begin from the premise that a relatively neglected extant Latin text is worth occasional critical attention. We shall further, for the sake of economy, pursue one state god, Juno, through his work in order to observe what role she plays in relation to human behavior

²Norden 303–4. One notes that Kenney and Clausen more recently provide no appendix for Valerius. More inclusive treatment may be found in von Albrecht 2.852–59.

³Syme 1939: 1.

⁴General consensus maintains that the work appeared around C.E. 30 (cf. Kempf 1854: 6–8; Briscoe 398–402; Combès 1995: 7–11; Wardle 1997: 328–29). Bellemore disagrees, placing the work at the end of Augustus’ reign. For our purposes here, it is sufficient that Valerius’ work appeared in the Tiberian era and within living memory of the age of Augustus.

⁵Michels 1962: 441.

(variously defined as virtue, morality, politics, depending on the context). Moreover, because Valerius composes set-pieces on historical *topoi* (*exempla*),⁶ the work of other ancient authors dealing with the same *topoi* is often extant as well. Comparison of Valerius with these other authors will allow us to isolate what is peculiar to Valerius and where his emphases lie. These peculiarities in the Valerian point of view we may in turn place in the political context of Tiberian Rome. Granted, we shall follow the representation of but one goddess. Nevertheless, the experiment will suggest that Valerius viewed Juno not only as a living god, but also as a god who concerned herself with personal morality in general and chastity (*pudicitia*) in particular. In fact, we shall discover that this virtue was from the Valerian perspective essential to the political stability of the state and that its burdens were shared by both men and women alike, but, as we shall see, certainly not by both equally.

Valerius divides his *exempla* into two categories: Roman and foreign, mostly Greek. In this study, we shall take care to note such distinctions. Roman Juno appears as a stern goddess, somewhat prone to anger. She is animated by the power of chastity (6.1.*init.*), sets an austere example of earlier manners (2.1.2), takes offense at the presence of a beautiful male actor in her husband's chariot (1.1.16), takes vengeance on Q. Fulvius Flaccus for stealing marble from her temple (1.1.20), receives a temple on the spot where M. Manlius Capitolinus' house once stood (6.3.1), but, in spite of all provocations, comes

⁶This is not the place to rehearse the rhetorical and literary problems associated with *exempla*. One may conveniently begin with Arist. *Rh.* 1356b; cf. 1394a. For a general overview of the ancient *testimonia* on *exempla*, see Lausberg 1.227–35 (= §§410–26); cf. 2.699–700. A useful introduction is provided by Lumpe. For analysis of the psychological mechanisms by which *exempla* do their persuasive work, see Hauser 1968, Consigny, Benoit, Hauser 1985, and Natali. Although details differ, these scholars generally agree that the *exemplum* persuades by affording positive proof of a proposition, and that such positive proof enables the recipient to make conclusions as to general validity without bothering with logical analysis. Von Moos traces the *exemplum*, or “history as *topos*,” from antiquity to modern times. See von Moos 69–187 for development of the *exemplum* in Latin literature, including an illuminating discussion of the role *exempla* played in ideological struggles between Christians and adherents of classical religions under the empire, and pointing the way to much further literature. Full-length studies devoted exclusively to the *exemplum* as a rhetorical device in classical literature have been undertaken by Alewell, Kornhardt, and Price. “Moral” aspects of Roman *exempla virtutis* are investigated by Litchfield and Lind. Ancient (Greek) religious aspects of the *exemplum* are examined by Koch. On the usefulness of historical anecdotes for investigations into the ideology of the principate, see Saller 1980: 82 (for a less sanguine view, compare Dover). Readers seeking to explore the general function of *exempla* in Valerius' work may consult Bloomer 3–9 and Skidmore *passim*.

willingly to Rome from Veii (1.8.3).⁷ Foreign Juno's temple is the site of a miracle; winds cannot move ashes there (1.8.ext.18); she forgives the sacrilege of Masinissa (1.1.ext.2), and she takes the lives of Cleobis and Biton (5.4.ext.4). The rubrics under which Juno appears are revealing also: she is harsh, she is concerned with proper behavior, and she has power to intervene in the affairs of this world: *de neglecta religione* (1.1.16, 1.1.20, 1.1.ext.2); *de miraculis* (1.8.3, 1.8.ext.18); *de seueritate* (6.3.1); *de pudicitia* (6.1.init.); *de institutis antiquis* (2.1.2); *de pietate erga parentes et fratres et patriam* (5.4.ext.4); and *de parentibus, qui obitum liberorum forti animo tulerunt* (5.10.2).⁸

Numen Pudicitiae

More detailed examination of course reveals a clearer picture. Chastity was always a concern to Juno.⁹ Fittingly, when Valerius at 6.1.init. introduces a series of examples illustrating *pudicitia*, he invokes the places where the abstract goddess *Pudicitia* resides.¹⁰ Traditionally included among these places

⁷Chronology is alien to *exempla*. The moral lessons taught by history all remain equally relevant to any particular present moment. We are thus entitled to follow Valerius' example, and to organize our inspection thematically.

⁸It is generally agreed that the rubrics are likely the work of a later hand. Nevertheless, they are often adapted versions of Valerius' own words and handy summaries of a chapter's contents.

⁹Wissowa 1912: 190 calls Juno Regina a "Frauen- und Ehegöttheit." Cf. Paul. p. 248.5–7 Lindsay; the so-called *lex Numae* (*Paellex aram lunonis ne tangito...*) enjoined restrictions on women whose sexual relations with men were not sanctioned by marriage, but who desired to approach the altar of Juno. Pl. *Poen.* 1219–22 shows that also in his times these ritual regulations generally correspond to other popular associations of Juno with chastity upon which the playwright could draw: *ita me di amabunt, ut ego, si sim Iuppiter, / iam hercle ego illam uxorem ducam et lunonem extrudam foras. / ut pudice verba fecit...* Chastity and motherhood are also closely linked in Cicero's offhand description of a statue of Juno (*castissime colitur a matribus*, *Div.* 2.85). The "epitaph" of Mart. 10.63.5–8 similarly combines Juno and chastity, showing that such linkages were still comprehensible centuries later, and, moreover, his sarcasm specifically links the gifts of Juno (children) with the deceased's sexual temperance (specifically the chastity of a one-man woman [*uniuira*]): *Quinque dedit pueros, totidem mihi Iuno puellas / ... / una pudicitiae mentula nota meae*. One may not often think of Martial as a moralist, but *castitas/pudicitia* appears to have been a real concern to him. In his poems, variations of the root *pudic-* occur some 15 times (compare the more general *pudor* at 29) and the adjective *castus* another 27. We may cite the famous example of Paetus and Arria: *casta suo gladium cum traderet Arria Paeto...* (1.13). See Howell 136–39 for discussion and further references.

¹⁰*Pudicitia* is central to understanding Valerius' Juno. We may note here the literary and historical context. On the Latin literary tradition of *exempla pudicitiae*, see Alewell 73–74. Fehrle traces "Keuschheit," or *pudicitia*, through both Greek and Roman antiquity. See Fehrle 123–26 for Juno in particular. The statue of *Pudicitia Patricia* stood in Rome's Forum Boarium (Fest. p. 282.18–22 Lindsay). *Pudicitia Plebeia* once had her own altar and *sacellum*

are, according to the ancient religion (*prisca religione*), Juno's *puluinaria*. *Pudicitia* also resides, not surprisingly, at the hearth of Vesta. Valerius concludes, however, by invoking the places where *Pudicitia* resides in his own times; that is, among the gods as well as in the imperial household itself (*Palatii columen, augustos penates sanctissimumque Iuliae genialem torum* [problems to which we shall return]).¹¹ Just as Juno, although a deity with a special relationship to women, was also a protector of the Roman state and was thus concerned with men as well, so also *Pudicitia* is equally supportive of both men and women (*uirorum pariter ac feminarum praecipuum firmamentum*). We thus have a chance to see both how the goddess of the old religion, Juno,¹² is correlated with moral virtue and how she is accommodated to contemporary imperial conditions and religious developments.¹³

From Julia's holy bed (6.1.*init.*) we pass immediately to Lucretia's manly spirit mistakenly allotted by fate (*fortunae errore*) to a female body (6.1.1). An

also (Liv. 10.23). This *Pudicitia Plebeia*, however, passed into oblivion (Liv. 10.23.10; on Livy's view of *pudicitia*, see Moore 122–24 with further references). Gagé 120–222 connects the moral value of *pudicitia* with religion under Augustus (cf. Fears 837 and 894). For the changing valuation of *pudicitia* in the context of various cults in the imperial period, see Cantarella 151–55. Valerius, who praises *pudicitia* in general, singles out especially in 2.1.3 the *pudicitia* of *uniuirae* under the rubric *de institutis antiquis: Quae uno contentae matrimonio fuerant corona pudicitiae honorabantur: existimabant enim eum praecipue matronae sincera fide incorruptum esse animum, qui depositae uirginitatis cubile [in publicum] egredi nesciret, multorum matrimoniorum experientiam quasi legitimae cuiusdam intemperantiae signum esse credentes*. Epigraphical corroboration of such sentiments are not hard to find. One may compare inscriptions extolling *uniuirae* in particular (e.g., *CIL* 6.2318, 3604, 13299, 13303, 14771, 25392, 26268, 31711) and the *pudicitia* of chaste wives in general (e.g., *CIL* 6.1341, 1527, 1779, 2141, 9693, 10230, 11252, 11602, 12072, 15448, 19128, 22380, 23297, 23397, 25427, 26192, 26442, 28785, 30102, 30213, 31986, 32041, 32424, 34728, 39086). Augustus was certainly interested in *pudicitia* as well, having passed the *lex Iulia de maritandis ordinibus* in 18 B.C.E., and was in fact quite proud of his moral legislation (Aug. *RG* 2.12: *ip[s]e multarum rerum exempla imitanda post[er]is tradidi*). *Pudicitia* also played a role in Livia's propaganda (Flory 1984a). That *pudicitia* should have mattered to Valerius is thus hardly incongruous. Cf. in general Raditsa; Treggiari 277–98; and, on Augustus' marriage laws in the context of efforts to reform contemporary morals, Baltrusch 162–89. Chastity was a moral concern of the first century C.E. and beyond.

¹¹Cf. Ov. *Fast.* 9.949–54 on the house of Augustus with similar tripartite division. On Juno in Ovid, see Kötze 117–76.

¹²Juno was one of Rome's oldest goddesses (Roscher, s.v. "Juno," in Roscher 3.574–75; Wissowa 1912: 181).

¹³Is *pudicitia* a religious concern? Fears 939 notes that "there does not exist a major general study devoted to the 'deified abstractions' as a group and to their role in Roman religion and thought." We shall thus have to examine below comparative evidence for the relation of *pudicitia* to religion.

inspection of the thirteen Roman and three foreign examples illustrating *pudicitia* quickly demonstrates that *Pudicitia* may be an equal support to men and women, as Valerius tells us, but that the requirements and consequences, we must note, are unequal indeed. Only free men violate the *pudicitia* of others, while only free-born females (*ingenuae*) and free-born boys (*ingenui*) have *pudicitia* that can be violated.¹⁴ *Pudicitia* is thus revealed to reside in free-born females and boys in a fashion analogous to the manner in which it resides on Vesta's hearth, on Juno's *puluinaria*, and on Julia's bed. Valerius' organization by category rather than chronology brings the past into close proximity with the present (all events become equally past and relevant to the present purpose) and thus creates the impression of an unchanging, divinely sanctioned and eternal chastity.

We may also see the same conception in Valerius' opening invocation to *Pudicitia*. By the divine sanction of this holy power, boys, all youth, and married women are kept safe:¹⁵

...tuo praesidio puerilis aetatis insignia munita sunt, tui numinis respectu sincerus iuuentae flos permanet, te custode matronalis stola censetur.

...through your vigilance the glorious honors of childhood are protected, by the cultivation of your divine power the flower of adolescence remains uncut, under your guardianship the matron's garb receives its just recompense. (6.1.*init.*)¹⁶

We may note especially the word *numen*. Because *numina* are divine forces, *numen* underscores the divine nature of this moral force or virtue. *Numen* in fact reveals that *Pudicitia* possesses a manifest power greater than mere

¹⁴See Adams 195–96 on the euphemistic use of *pudicitia* in polite prose, and Treggiari 103–7 on the ideological importance of *pudicitia* in contracting marriages.

¹⁵On the corresponding legal protections afforded to *pudicitia* by the state, see Mommsen 1899: 682–704.

¹⁶Valerius has been condemned for excessive rhetoric. Compare, however, Tert. *Pud.* 1.1: *Pudicitia, flos morum, honor corporum, decor sexuum, integritas sanguinis, fides generis, fundamentum sanctitatis, praeiudicium omnibus bonae mentis*.... Tertullian's rhetoric allows strong emotions and moral values to find strong expression. Literary critics do not in general doubt either Tertullian's religious sincerity or his moral fervor. For the sake of our literary experiment, we grant the adherent of a classical religion similar benefit of the doubt. One may compare Sinclair 72–89, who views Valerius' apostrophes (including 6.1.*init.*) as both an infusion of the author's personality into the text and a symptom of contemporary literary style.

abstraction.¹⁷ The *exempla* that Valerius relates will illustrate how *Pudicitia*, and thus Juno as well, wishes behavior regulated:

ades igitur et <re>cognosce quae fieri ipsa uoluisti.

Be present, therefore, and recall those events that you yourself desired should occur. (6.1.*init.*)

Juno is demonstrably linked, then, not just to a moral virtue, but to a virtue considered a divine goddess in her own right, one with a long-established cult of her own. This indeed accords well with the traditional concept of Juno as a goddess to whom chastity mattered. More importantly, this link allows us a glimpse into Valerius' personal religious conceptions, namely, the manner in which a moral force, considered divine, relates to the ancient goddess Juno. We may, on our part, desire to separate Juno's *numen* specifically from *Pudicitia*'s, but we must admit that Valerius views the possibility that the one can reside on the other's *puluinaria*, and in fact elsewhere as well, without thereby losing her own divinity. Divine interests are not discrete; they are interlocking.

Marius and *Pudicitia Germanica*

The connection of gods with moral virtue is also confirmed at the end of the chapter. Although he admires the German women captured by Marius who committed suicide after having been denied their request for chaste slavery in the service of Vesta, Valerius is thankful that the gods did not grant the German men similar strength of character during the battle:

di melius, quod hunc animum uiris earum in acie non dederunt: nam si mulierum suarum uirtutem imitari uoluissent, incerta Teutonicae uictoriae tropaea reddidissent.

¹⁷Valerius' clear identification of the concept of *pudicitia* with the goddess *Pudicitia*, whose *numen* he invokes, becomes more striking in the light of Moore's statement that in Livy "*pudicus* and *pudicitia* are never directly connected with religious ritual (122)." Our discussion (below) of V. Max. 1.1.6 will show, on the other hand, that *pudicitia* is in the Valerian (as opposed to the Livian) view indeed germane to religious ritual. V. Max. 9.7.1 tells us more generally that those who violate religion through sexual misconduct are detested. The phrasing implies that they are mutually exclusive. A vitriolic attack of Apuleius upon a woman he terms an enemy of chastity (*hostis pudicitiae*) also suggests the close connection between *pudicitia* (a moral quality) and religion. Apul. *Met.* 9.14 denounces the unchaste woman for her treatment of *numina*: *tunc spretis atque calcatis diuinis numinibus...matutino mero et continuo stupro corpus manciparat.*

It was a rather good thing that the gods did not bestow this spirit on the German women's men in the battle line, for if the men had been willing to imitate the virtue of their women, they would have rendered the trophies of our Teutonic victory less than certain. (6.1.ext.3)

How, we might ask, would "imitation" of this female virtue, *pudicitia*, by German men have caused trouble for Roman troops? The German men, we must conclude, were not as zealous in the defense of this crucially important virtue as were their women.¹⁸ Again, reflection on Roman examples shows that, beginning with Lucretia, Roman greatness is often revealed in how jealously Roman women guard their chastity, and how zealously Roman men vindicate violated chastity. In fact, proper regard for this virtue can often either usher in great political change or root out political corruption.¹⁹ Moreover, Valerius illustrates clearly that it is especially incumbent on those invested with military authority to respect chastity. In 6.1.10 he tells the story of a centurion executed for relations with a free-born male. A military tribune meets a similar fate at 6.1.11.²⁰ Power may be vested in males and standards of conduct may vary according to gender and status. Nevertheless, the privileges of power do not, in the Valerian view, render anyone less beholden to the demands of chastity.

That Valerius was not alone in making *pudicitia* a male concern may be corroborated through later numismatic propaganda. We find, for example, an issue of Hadrian from C.E. 119–22 with the reverse legend *P. M. TR. P. COS.*

¹⁸We speak in Valerian terms. We may compare the action taken by P. Atilius Philiscus in V. Max. 6.1.6, who, although his own chastity was violated when he was a boy, killed his daughter for the same crime (*stupri...crimine*). Valerius has high praise for this act on behalf of "holy chastity" (*sanctam...pudicitiam*). In V. Max. 6.1.3 *stuprum* even between those betrothed elicits the same punishment (cf. Linderski 1990). Tacitus also presents barbarians motivated by chastity, who, moreover, are convinced that this value is a concern to the gods. Boudicca in Tacitus *Ann.* 14.35 claims that she fights on behalf of her daughters' violated chastity (*contrectatam filiarum pudicitiam*), and that the gods of just vengeance (*deos iustae vindictae*) are on the British side. Boudicca's reasoning certainly conforms, perhaps not coincidentally, to Valerius' thinking.

¹⁹Flor. 1.3 indicates that he, like Valerius, viewed this moral value (Lucretia's chastity) as something of interest to the gods: *populus Romanus ad vindicandum libertatis ac pudicitiae decus quodam quasi instinctu deorum concitatus regem repente destituit...* Despite his *quasi*, Florus appears ready to accept such divine concern as natural. Flor. 1.17 similarly juxtaposes divinity and morality.

²⁰Of the sixteen anecdotes in Valerius' chapter dedicated to *pudicitia*, six involve males only (6.1.5, 6.1.7, 6.1.9, 6.1.10, 6.1.11, 6.1.12) and fourteen of them view males as criminal.

III. *PVDIC*.²¹ Hadrian also put the chaste goddess Juno on his coins.²² Hadrian was, moreover, hardly the only emperor or male member of the imperial family to display *Pudicitia* as one of his own special virtues. Among issues of Antoninus Pius from C.E. 140–44 we find depictions of a personified *Pudicitia*.²³ We find further examples of reverse legends proclaiming “*PVDICITIA*” in issues of Septimius Severus, Severus Alexander as Augustus, Gordian III, Trajan Decius, Herennius Etruscus as Augustus, Hostilian, Trebonianus Gallus, Volusian, and Gallienus as sole regent, all of whom, we may emphasize, display their own names and offices in the obverse legends.²⁴ We thus need not express surprise that Valerius should have felt relief that German men had not imitated this Roman virtue.²⁵

***Pudicitia*: Julia and Livia**

In Tacitus we also see that vindicating *pudicitia* was for Valerius a contemporary religious concern. Tacitus not only relates that Augustus offered “violated religion,” *laesarum religionum* (*Ann.* 3.24), as part of his justification for severity towards Julia, but also goes on to similar examples in the time of Tiberius. Tacitus thus reveals a grim religious relevance to the old tales or, in more Valerian terms, the time-honored *exempla*.²⁶ Valerius, moreover, allows us to see that the great goddess Juno Regina is still concerned with this moral value. Juno is more than merely associated with chastity; her name is invoked

²¹Mattingly 1968: 2.356 no. 135 obv. *IMP. CAESAR TRAIAN. HADRIANVS AVG.* Further examples are provided by Mattingly 1968: 2.360–61 nos. 176–78, which display the obverse *HADRIANVS AVGVSTVS* and the reverse legend *COS. III.* along with representations of *Pudicitia* (cf. Mattingly 1968: 2.380 no. 343).

²²Mattingly 1968: 2.385 no. 389 obv. *HADRIANVS AVG. COS. III. P. P.* rev. *IVNONI REGINAE.*

²³Mattingly 1968: 3.117 no. 702 obv. *ANTONINVS AVG. PIVS P. P.* rev. *TR. POT. COS. III S. C.* “*Pudicitia* standing front...raising r. hand and holding veil with l.”

²⁴All citations refer to Mattingly 1968: Septimius Severus: 4.1.162 no. 524 (C.E. 198–202); Severus Alexander: 4.2.94 no. 307 (undated); Gordian III: 4.3.40 no. 240: obv. *IMP. GORDIANVS PIVS FEL. AVG.* rev. *PVDICITIA AVG.* (C.E. 238–44; *Pudicitia* herself is portrayed with the features of Gordian’s wife Otacilia Severa); Trajan Decius: 4.3.125 no. 46a (undated); Herennius Etruscus: 4.3.141 no. 159 (c. C.E. 251); Hostilian: 4.3.146 no. 196, 4.3.147 no. 203 (c. C.E. 251); Trebonianus Gallus: 4.3.168 no. 88 (c. C.E. 251; cf. also 4.3.171 nos. 109–12 with the rev. *IVNONI MARTIALI*); Volusian: 4.3.185 nos. 232–33 (c. C.E. 251); Gallienus: 5.1.154 no. 272 (undated).

²⁵Compare also Valerius’ contemporary admiration (in his chapter *de abstinencia et continentia*) for Germanicus, a “one-woman-man,” whose only sexual relations took place within the bonds of matrimony: *Drusum...Germanicum...constitit usum ueneris intra coniugis caritatem clausum tenuisse* (4.3.3).

²⁶Cf. Flory 1984a.

because *Pudicitia*, a manifest and divine power, actually resides on Juno's *puluinaria* in the great Capitoline temple.

Pudicitia also, however, resides on the marriage bed of Julia. This, especially in light of Tac. *Ann.* 3.24, could be construed as a problem. Julia, Augustus' daughter, wife to Tiberius, exiled for scandalous adultery? Pighius wished to insert *gentis*, thus making the Julian *gens* chaste.²⁷ The problem is Julia, and Lipsius in 1585 offered the most logical way out of the problem.²⁸ After the death of her husband Augustus, Tiberius' mother Livia was adopted into the Julian *gens* (hence Julia), and was granted the name *Augusta* by the senate.²⁹ Lipsius' supposition of 1585 is, in addition to the supporting chronological arguments of Helm,³⁰ corroborated also by the fact that the name *Iulia Augusta* appears closely associated with Tiberius' in the contemporary *Acta Fratrum Arvalium*, where she is even termed, in direct reference to Tiberius, "his mother" (*eius mater*).³¹ One may also adduce coins minted at Rome during the reign of Tiberius, each bearing the legend *S•P•Q•R IVLIAE AVGVST*.³² Thus, "the peak of the Palatine (*palatii columen*), the household gods of Augustus' family (*augustos penates*), and Julia's most holy marriage bed (*sanctissimum Iuliae genialem torum*)," all refer to places where *Pudicitia*

²⁷Pighius 532 (ad 6.1.*init.*): *sanctissimumque Iuliae gentis genialem torum*. Also discussed by Kempf 1854: 461; one manuscript does offer *genitalem torum* (ibid.).

²⁸Lipsius 640 (ad 6.1.*init.*). Also discussed by Kempf 1854: 461 and by Helm 91–92.

²⁹Elschner 23, however, does not see the logic: *me non intellegere confiteor*. He is hardly alone. Thormeyer 11 finds it somewhat absurd for Valerius to discuss Livia in this way: *paene ridiculum videtur de pudicitia loqui mulieris iam plus quam LXXX ann. agentis*. Carter 32 insists that Valerius refers to Tiberius' former wife: "If there is any Julia here it is the obvious one, Tiberius' former wife, the notorious daughter of Augustus....To inject Livia into the passage, ingeniously exploiting that 'happy' coincidence of name, is a distortion of natural sense and hopelessly contrived." Bellemore 76 agrees with Carter. For the most recent vindications, however, of Helm and Lipsius (the view adopted here), compare Briscoe 400–401 and Combès 1997: 230. On the fate of the less fortunate Julia, see Linderski 1988.

³⁰Helm 91–92.

³¹*Acta Fratrum Arvalium* p. 33.12 Henzen [Jan. 4, A.D. 27], and p. 34.13 Henzen [Jan. 30, A.D. 27].

³²Mattingly 1923: 130–31, nos. 76–78; cf. Sutherland 51–53. Cf. Mattingly 1923: cxxxvi and Grant 108–14.

resides in the imperial household³³ in strict analogy with its traditional places of residence (including the *puluinaria* of Juno) according to the *prisca religio*.³⁴

The connections of chastity, Juno, and the imperial family are interesting in the light of later early imperial developments as well. Just as every man had long had his own Genius, so also every woman would soon have her own Juno.³⁵ Not only are regular sacrifices recorded during the reign of Tiberius in the *Acta* of the Arval brethren to the Juno in whose *puluinaria* Valerius told us chastity resides,³⁶ but sacrifices are also eventually recorded to the individual Junos of women belonging to the imperial family.³⁷ Valerius thus both quite perceptively saw (and felt) the close connection between Juno and Livia,³⁸ perhaps even anticipating later developments. Valerius' view at the very least, however, not only corresponds to contemporary evidence, but more significantly provides a contemporary literary perspective on how such religious, legal, and political ideas would be synthesized by a supporter of the new order.

Later numismatic propaganda reveals that the rhetorical passions of Valerius for Juno and the chastity of the imperial family once again anticipate later developments. *Pudicitia* does not seem to appear on Republican coinage

³³Cf. Fishwick 423–35 on the *domus diuina*, who argues that “the imperial house as a whole came to be paid the same divine honours as the emperor himself [and that] unofficially, at least, the *domus divina* evidently acquired the status that under the early principate was attributable to the emperor alone (435).” Valerius appears to provide corroboration.

³⁴*Ov. Pont.* 3.1.114–18 provides another very similar literary example, not only with many of the same elements (Livia, *pudicitia*, Juno) but also with some of the same ideologically charged terms used by Valerius (*priscus*, *torus*). Neither should we neglect Valerius' admiration for the way Indian women respect their marriage beds (*geniales tori*). *V. Max.* 2.6.14 describes suttee and concludes with ringing admiration for such wifely devotion (*uxoria pietas*). The fact that Julia Augusta never married certainly proved her *uxoria pietas* as well.

³⁵See Rives; Palmer 27; Haug 1115; Wissowa 1912: 182; Ihm, s.v. “Iunones,” in Roscher 3.615–18.

³⁶*Acta Fratrum Arvalium* p. 34.22 Henzen [Jan. 4, A.D. 27].

³⁷Cf., e.g., the inscription of Dessau (120) from Africa in C.E. 3 cited by Mattingly 1923: cxxxvi: *Iunoni Liviae Augustae sacrum*. Also, the *Acta Fratrum Arvalium* p. 82.24–31 Henzen: “*immolavit in Capi-tolio et in templo divi Augusti novo...Genio imp(eratoris) Ne-ronis ... taurum, Iunoni Messallinae vacc(am)*.” Rives sees in the later development of the *Iuno Feminae* a reflection of the social and economic advances made by women under the early empire.

³⁸We may note that not only had Augustus restored the temple of Juno, but Juno was also a goddess whom Livia herself especially favored (Taylor 232).

(although Juno, Juno Regina, and Juno Sospita certainly do),³⁹ nor do we find Juno or *Pudicitia* on early imperial coinage. We find Juno again, however, on the coins of Hadrian's wife Sabina.⁴⁰ During the reign of Antoninus Pius we also find that the coins of Faustina I, in addition to numerous reverses with legends dedicated to Juno, portray *Pudicitia* herself with the legend *AETERNITAS*.⁴¹ The coins of Faustina II, moreover, not only offer reverse legends dedicated to Juno, but also display the legend *PVDICITIA*.⁴² *Pudicitia* (like Juno) is thereafter and until the murder of Carinus in C.E. 285⁴³ regularly employed as a legend on coins issued in honor of women belonging to the imperial family. A survey of coins displaying reverse the legend *PVDICITIA* will illustrate just how standard this virtue and legend became for such women (with corresponding regent in parentheses): Faustina Iunior (Marcus Aurelius), Lucilla (Marcus Aurelius), Julia Domna (Septimius Severus), Julia Paula (Elagabalus), Julia Soaemias (Elagabalus), Julia Maesa (Elagabalus), Orbiana (Severus Alexander as Augustus), Julia Mamaea (Severus Alexander as Augustus), Otacilia Severa (Philip I), Herennia Etruscilla (Trajan Decius), Salonina (joint reign of Gallienus and Saloninus), Salonina (sole reign of Gallienus), and Magnia Urbica (Carinus).⁴⁴ Mattingly summarizes the meaning of this legend and associated legends in reference to Julia Domna:

³⁹See Crawford 864 for references.

⁴⁰Juno: Mattingly 1968: 2.386–88 nos. 394, 401–4; cf. Vesta: 2.387–88 nos. 397, 410.

⁴¹Juno: Mattingly 1968: 3.68 no. 338; 3.73 no. 391; *AETERNITAS* (*Pudicitia*): 3.69 no. 346a.

⁴²*Pudicitia*: Mattingly 1968: 3.94 nos. 507–8.

⁴³Carinus defeated Diocletian in C.E. 285 only to be murdered after the battle by an officer whose wife he had seduced.

⁴⁴All references are to Mattingly 1968 and, unless otherwise specified, all citations are to coins advertising *PVDICITIA*: Faustina Iunior: 3.270 nos. 707–8 (cf., e.g., Juno: 3.269–70 nos. 687–98; Mater Magna: 3.270 nos. 704–6; Vesta: 3.271 no. 737). Lucilla: 3.275–76 nos. 778–80 (no. 779 with the features of Lucilla); 3.353 nos. 1758–59 (cf., e.g., Juno: 3.275 no. 772; 3.353 nos. 1744–52; Mater Magna: 3.353 nos. 1753–54). Julia Domna: 4.1.170 nos. 575–76; 1.178 no. 644; 4.1.273 nos. 385–86; 4.1.310 no. 589; 4.1.312 no. 602. Julia Paula: 4.2.46 no. 221a–b. Julia Soaemias: 4.2.48 no. 238 (cf., e.g., Juno: 4.2.48 nos. 235–36). Julia Maesa: 4.2.50 no. 267; 4.2.61 nos. 417–20 (cf., e.g., Juno: 4.2.49–50 nos. 253–60). Orbiana: 4.2.97 no. 324. Julia Mamaea: 4.2.98 no. 347 (cf., e.g., Juno: 4.2.98 nos. 340–42). Otacilia Severa: 4.3.83 no. 123; 4.3.83 no. 128a; 4.3.86 no. 145; 4.3.94 nos. 209–11 (no. 210 *Pudicitia* veiled and with child; no. 211 sim., but with child and cornucopia; cf., e.g., Juno: 4.3.83 nos. 127–28). Herennia Etruscilla: 4.3.125 no. 46a; 4.3.127–28 nos. 58–60; 4.3.137–38 nos. 136–37 (cf., e.g., Juno: 4.3.127 no. 57). Salonina (joint reign of Gallienus and Saloninus): 5.1.111 nos. 24–25; 5.1.115 no. 65 (cf., e.g., Juno: 5.1.110 nos. 20–21; 5.1.112 nos. 40–41, 46; 5.1.113 nos. 49, 53). Salonina (sole reign of Gallienus): 5.1.194 nos. 24–25; 5.1.195 no. 43; 5.1.196 nos. 46–47, 51 (cf., e.g., Juno: 5.1.193 nos. 11–15). Magnia Urbica: 5.2.183 no. 339.

Her types...are partly devoted to the goddesses whom she chiefly worshipped and whose characters serve as divine patterns of her functions on earth—Juno, Diana Lucifera, Venus Genetrix, Vesta—...[and to] the central sanctity of Roman religion. Scenes of sacrifice to Vesta suggest a special interest in the correct performance of religious ceremonies at Rome....Domna is above all closely assimilated to the Great Mother, Cybele⁴⁵—she is ‘mother of the Augusti, mother of the senate, mother of the fatherland’—the counterpart on earth of the mother of the gods. Her special virtues are her ‘Fecunditas’, ‘Felicitas’, ‘Pietas’ and ‘Pudicitia’....She is devoted to religious duty and...personal purity of character....⁴⁶

Valerius was early in sympathy with later imperial developments.

The *Epulum Iouis*: Juno and Traditional Female Conduct

Valerius’ testimony regarding Juno’s conduct at the *epulum Iouis* (2.1.2)⁴⁷ also attests not only to Juno’s concern with austere and upright conduct but also to his admiration for his own idealized view of the female conduct of earlier ages:

Iouis epulo ipse in lectulum, Iuno et Minerua in sellas ad cenam inuitabantur. quod genus seueritatis aetas nostra diligentius in Capitolio quam in suis domibus conseruat....

At the feast of Jupiter, Jupiter himself was invited to a couch, but Juno and Minerva were offered chairs at the meal; our own age preserves this decorum with greater care on the Capitol than in our homes.... (2.1.2)

What follows, however, is somewhat odd (and for Valerius, unusually ironical⁴⁸), because it is not readily apparent why it is more to the point to preserve the discipline of goddesses than contemporary women:

⁴⁵As one of this essay’s anonymous readers pointed out, the ability of Claudia Quinta, because of her outstanding personal *pudicitia*, to rescue the stone of Magna Mater in 204 B.C.E. (Ov. *Fast.* 4.305–49; cf. Liv. 29.14.5–14) deserves mention here, inasmuch as others have seen in allegorizing accounts of this event attempts by Romans to introduce moral lessons into religious ceremonies: see Sharples and Michels 1966. Such allegorizing, which finds its way eventually into the propaganda of Julia Domna, was part of Valerius’ contemporary cultural milieu. One may compare similar contemporary interest in foreign goddesses with moral concerns such as Venus Verticordia (the Semitic Astarte) who turned thoughts from lust to chastity (V. Max. 8.15.12; cf. Preller 392–93).

⁴⁶Mattingly 1968: 4.1.89. Examples of reverse legends to Diana, to Juno, to Julia Domna as “Mother of the Senate, of the Country, etc.” may be found in Mattingly 1968: 4.1.310 nos. 583–88.

⁴⁷Cf. Bloomer 123–26.

⁴⁸Cf. Combès 1995 300 n. 4.

...uidelicet quia magis ad rem pertinet dearum quam mulierum disciplinam contineri.

...no doubt because it is more important to preserve the discipline of goddesses than women.

We might look to recent and contemporary moral legislation for our answer. Laws on adultery show that the restoration of traditional virtues was considered necessary for the restoration of the state.⁴⁹ Liebeschuetz also points out that moral legislation (i.e., the regulation of behavior) accompanied every re-establishment of the *pax deorum*, including the religious renewal inaugurated by Augustus.⁵⁰ It is widely recognized that Roman gods cared deeply about ritual, that is, extremely regulated behavior, but were these gods unconcerned about more general behavior, about "morality"? We have seen Juno's immediate association with chastity. We have observed that Juno was not only closely associated with the Capitoline triad, which was invoked from Augustan times on behalf of the ruling *princeps*, but also that Juno herself was invoked for the health of the imperial family (in whose house *Pudicitia's numen* resides as on her own *puluinaria*). Finally, Valerius himself consciously muses that in his day Juno still embodies the sterner virtues of the past. Valerius thus seems to view traditional virtues as unchanging forces that must be kept at their established strength through traditional methods, at least with respect to the gods if not to humans (good laws, however, might correct the human realm as well).⁵¹ Valerius does not lecture on Juno, but the patterns that illuminate his view begin to emerge. We still have a few more elements, however, to add to this Valerian perspective.

⁴⁹Compare also Valerius' admiration for other examples of chaste conduct from the past; 2.1.5 (*de institutis antiquis*): formerly women did not drink wine, contributing to physical continence.

⁵⁰Liebeschuetz 90–100.

⁵¹Fehrle 54–64 identifies *pudicitia* as a source of power. Understanding *pudicitia* as a source of power (*uirtus*), as in the case of the German women (V. Max. 6.1.*ext.*3) makes sense within the Valerian outlook and illuminates the rationale of his rhetoric. Ritual and laws control and adjust sources of power (*uirtutes*) according to the interests of the ruling elite in particular and of patriarchy in general. (Cf. Fustel de Coulanges 92–103.) We may note that changes in the patterns of sexual behavior (or demands for such change) can in fact accompany substantial changes in a society's political organization (i.e., adjustments in the distribution of power). For the legal underpinnings as well as discussion of possible sources for Rome's double standard, see Treggiari 299–319.

The Punishment of Aemilius Paullus

In addition to chastity, Juno is traditionally associated with childbirth,⁵² but in Valerius she takes children away. L. Aemilius Paullus Macedonicus⁵³ lost one of his two younger sons by his second wife some four days before his great triumph in November, 167 B.C.E., and the other three days later (*in triumphali curru conspectus post diem tertium expiravit* [5.10.2]).⁵⁴ He consoled himself with the knowledge that this calamity had spared the Roman state disaster.⁵⁵ The calamity nevertheless extinguished his family name.

How should Valerius' Juno have reacted to a man who divorced his first wife (Papiria) and the mother of his four children?⁵⁶ This man, moreover, had

⁵²Roscher, s.v. "Juno," in Roscher 3.576–94.

⁵³Broughton 1.381, 427; cf. 2.528: L. Aemilius L. f. M. n. Paullus Pat. (114) Cos. 182, 168.

⁵⁴Younger sons traditionally rode with the father in the triumphal chariot, while older sons walked. A triumph was a dangerous time; *Invidia* a particular threat. Cf. Künzl 87–88 and Ryberg 21. Would the gods of Valerius' day have noticed that the son of Paullus' second wife rode in the chariot while the spurned wife's son, no longer part of the family, walked?

⁵⁵Paullus' personal calamity was actually in answer to his prayers and a fulfillment of his vows. According to V. Max. 5.10.2, Paullus had prayed to the great Capitoline triad (*Iouem optimum maximum Iunonemque reginam et Mineruam precatus sum*) that they might turn any disaster threatening the Roman state instead upon his own house. Paullus had done this for the sake of Roman *felicitas*, a word which Valerius, according to Zieske (258), uses "häufig mit religiöser Nuance." Valerius, moreover, is the only ancient source to name the gods to whom Paullus prays. His contemporary Velleius Paterculus (who has Paullus pray in direct speech before the calamity) terms the gods *deos immortales* (1.10.4–5). What Valerius and Velleius, however, represent as prayer to gods, their predecessor Livy had reduced to a mere desire (*Illud optavi, ut...*, 45.41.1–12). Greek versions of the story (D.S. 31.11.2–3, Plut. *Aem.* 36, and App. 19.1–5) provide commonplaces on τύχη. Of our sources, Valerius exhibits the greatest religiosity.

⁵⁶V. Max. 2.1.4 condemns the first man in Rome ever to divorce his wife (for sterility). At 2.9.2 Valerius praises the censors C. Iunius Brutus Bubulcus and M. Valerius Maximus who in 307 B.C.E. (Broughton 1.165) removed Lucius Annius from the senate because he had divorced a wife who was a virgin when he married her (thus scoring *pudicitia*) and likewise sent her away without consulting his friends (thus neglecting social constraints). Valerius considers Annius' action even worse than celibacy, *coniugalia sacra sprete* (2.9.1), again revealing that marriage, procreation, and the protection of *pudicitia* are in his mind moral values backed by religious force. That Valerius alone of all our ancient sources names the goddess Juno when relating the anecdote of L. Aemilius Paullus does not seem out of place in the context outlined by Csillag 127–43 on the less tolerant legal attitude towards divorce under Augustus. On the other hand, Valerius approves of divorces when the woman's *pudicitia* has been compromised: 6.3.11, 6.3.12, and 8.2.3. Cf. Csillag 175–99 and Baltrusch 167–68 on Augustus' *lex de adulteriis*. Valerius' rhetoric supports the law. Not everyone did so: Baltrusch 179–80 outlines the opposition; Valerius does not appear.

subsequently given away his older sons through adoption,⁵⁷ thus retaining only the two younger sons by the second woman to carry on the family line (Paullus' daughters by his first marriage having been married, thus providing the vehicle for the continuation of other families but of no significance to the continuation of Paullus' family).⁵⁸ A man divorces the mother of his sons, a free-born Roman *matrona* whose fecundity may be taken as a token of her *pudicitia*,⁵⁹ dispenses with those sons,⁶⁰ and then puts his new son by the second wife in his triumphal chariot (in full view of human and divine *invidia*) after invoking Juno by name. We have seen, moreover, that Valerius values *pudicitia* and that he views it as one of Juno's animating powers. Should the results surprise us? This, however, is merely circumstantial. All we may safely state is that Valerius alone of all our extant sources has Paullus call on the goddess Juno by name.

Juno's Anger: *Infamia* and *Cannae*

That Juno took offense at a male for reasons related to *pudicitia* can, however, be observed in the misfortunes that did not befall the passenger in a triumphal

⁵⁷One went to P. Scipio Africanus Major's son (P. Scipio Africanus). This son became P. Scipio Africanus Aemilianus or Minor. The other went to Q. Fabius Maximus, becoming Q. Fabius Maximus Aemilianus.

⁵⁸To understand the nature of the calamity in Valerius' day, one must also recall that a man's *manes* could be cared for only by direct male descendants, whether by blood or by adoption. For Paullus, aristocrat and augur, the blow must have been grievous; the adopted sons would by rights have tended the *manes* of their new fathers. Cf. Fustel de Coulanges 49–57.

⁵⁹Thurmond 21.

⁶⁰Adoption does not meet with the ringing disapproval that Valerius reserves for divorce (one recalls too that adoption played a significant role in the dynastic politics of the day). Neither, however, does it enjoy Valerian praise (unreserved for many another Roman custom). V. Max. 2.10.4, on the one hand, seems to view Paullus' action in giving Scipio Aemilianus away in adoption as a legitimate scheme to increase the glory of two families: [*eum*] *in adoptionem dando duarum familiarum ornamentum esse uoluit*. Other glimpses of adoption in Valerius are, however, decidedly negative. Valerius proclaims, for example, that natural bonds justly prevail over adoptive (and legal) bonds. At 7.7.2 he recounts the tale of M. Anneius Carseolanus who was able to contest successfully his natural father's will (which had passed him over), even though he had been adopted by his uncle and although Pompey backed Anneius' opponents. What power was able to prevail over both the letter of the law and the great man? Blood—because procreation, according to Valerius, constitutes the tightest bond between human beings: *artissimum inter homines procreationis uinculum* (7.7.2). Cf. V. Max. 7.7.5 (sim.); 7.8.5 (for an adoptive father in a negative light); and 9.1.2 (for a view that sees adoption as way to rid oneself of an unworthy son). Valerius appears ambivalent about adoption, and we may thus legitimately raise questions about what position a Valerian Juno might take. Cf. Corbier who concludes that, whatever the utilitarian value of adoption (a practice also liable to abuse), stable marriage and natural descendants remained the Roman ideal (77).

chariot (5.10.2) but occurred because of a passenger (1.1.16). Valerius tells us that the disaster at Cannae (where, coincidentally, Aemilius Paullus' father lost his life) was the result of the offense Juno took at the pretty boy actor whom Varro had placed in Jupiter's triumphal chariot. Valerius does not tell us why Juno took offense, merely that she did. Others, however, have tried to answer this question, and we may ask ourselves whether their answers make sense in the general context of Valerius' other anecdotes. Kappius argues that the offense lay in the boy's possible harm to the morals of the Roman populace: *In eo peccaverat Varro, quod ad excubias posuisset...eximia facie puerum, a quo cum ipse tum populus posset ad libidinem incitari.*⁶¹ Köves-Zulauf dismisses Valerius altogether as "sekundäre Historisierung."⁶² Valerius' presentation is thus, one infers, unworthy of investigation. Lactantius, on the other hand, seems to have taken Valerius' presentation of Juno's wrath rather seriously. He goes on at length about the absurdity of the offense, reveals a subtle appreciation of the issues involved, and thus deserves quoting:

quotiens autem pericula impendent, ob aliquam se ineptam et leuem causam profitentur iratos [deos], sicut Iuno Varroni, quod formosum puerum in tensa Iouis ad exuias tenendas conlocauerat: et ob hanc causam Romanum nomen apud Cannas paene deletum est. quodsi Iuno alterum Ganymeden uerebatur, cur iuventus Romana luit poenas? uel si dii tantummodo duces curant, ceteram multitudinem neglegunt? cur Varro solus euasit qui hoc fecit? et Paulus qui nihil meruit, occisus est?

Whenever dangers threaten, the gods declare that they are angry for some frivolous and inappropriate reason, as was Juno with Varro, because he had put a beautiful boy in Jupiter's chariot to carry his weapons, and for this reason the Roman name was almost extinguished at Cannae. But if Juno feared another Ganymede, why punish the youth of Rome? Or if the gods care so much for state leaders, do they neglect the rest of the multitude? Why did Varro alone escape who did this thing? And Paulus, who did not deserve his fate, why was he killed? (*Div. inst.* 2.16.16-17)

Lactantius assumes that Juno was offended for personal reasons; Jupiter could have been aroused by this pretty Ganymede. Aside from his not strictly relevant (but rhetorically useful) introduction of Greek mythology, Lactantius is perhaps not completely off the mark, given the traditional concern of Juno for the marriage bond. His opinion is especially interesting inasmuch as he himself was

⁶¹Kappius 130 n. "r."

⁶²Köves-Zulauf 1972: 258 n. 484.

brought up in the practices of traditional Roman religion. Hase, however, offers the most immediately cogent explanation:

[Histriones] levis notae macula siue infamia quadam erunt aspersi. Cum igitur infamis conditionis puerum excubiis Iouis praefecisset Varro, hoc erat expiandum.

Actors were stained with the stigma of licentiousness or a certain *infamia* (moral disgrace bringing with it civil disabilities). When therefore Varro placed a boy of this *infamis* condition in charge of guarding Jupiter, this had to be expiated.⁶³

Infamia, interestingly, however, is not considered in the standard accounts of Roman religion. The word does not occur in the index to any of the standard works, thus leading one to conclude that the moral concerns that lead to legal *infamia* would not concern the gods.⁶⁴ Those, however, who were *infames* (prostitutes, actors, those convicted of *dolus malus*, etc.) were barred from holding municipal offices.⁶⁵ The *Digest* of Justinian, for example, recognizes unchastity in contravention of laws passed by Augustus as bringing about *infamia*; 3.2.2: *Miles, qui lege Iulia de adulteriis fuerit damnatus, ita infamis est...*; and 47.10.1 shows us the relation between *infamia* and *pudicitia*: *iniuriam...ad infamiam pertinere: ...cum pudicitia adtemptatur*. Given the fact that civil magistrates performed religious duties, it would appear consistent that anyone *infamis* should likewise be barred from religious duties.⁶⁶ If the boy in the chariot had been free (e.g., a *calator*), it is difficult in fact to see how regulations concerning *infamia* would not have applied.⁶⁷ Gellius also provides some circumstantial evidence that might help us directly connect *infamis* as a

⁶³Hase 19 n. 1. Hoffmann 21 n. 3 concurs: "Diese Leute galten in Rom für ehrlos."

⁶⁴As Watson ix points out, the opposite has also been true. Studies of Roman law have traditionally ignored Roman religion.

⁶⁵Dieter Medicus, s.v. "Infamia," in Ziegler 2.1406–7. Cf. Mommsen 1887–88: 2.377–88 [364–74]; Kaser; and, for a discussion of *infamia*'s place in the moral legislation of Augustus, Mette-Dittmann 67–73.

⁶⁶Marcianus *Dig.* 1.22.2.pr. tells us that *infames* are barred even from auxiliary roles in the government: *infames autem licet non prohibeantur legibus adsidere, attamen arbitror, ut aliquo quoque decreto principali refertur constitutum, non posse officio adessoris fungi*. In this light, although Cicero is speaking of foreign religion, it is certainly worth noting that the only occurrence of the term *adessor* before Suetonius (*Gal.* 14.2) refers to the augur that assisted the Spartan kings (Cic. *Div.* 1.95).

⁶⁷For a discussion of the various assistants employed by priests and in religious ceremonies see Marquardt 1881–85: 3.224–30. Cf. Mommsen 1887–88 1.325 [311] on *servi publici* and 1.359 on *calatores*; and Samter, s.v. "Calatores," in *RE* 1899: 3.1335–36.

concept both to traditional Roman religion and to the magistrates to whom its rituals were entrusted (as well as connecting religion to moral conduct in general). Gell. 4.9.3–5 tells us Nigidius Figulus wrote that one who is *religiosus* conducts oneself in accordance with laws and moral regulations, and that magistrates incorrectly use the word *nefastus* when referring to *dies religiosi*, that is days subject to ritual restriction, days Gellius terms *infamis*.

Before Valerius, *pudicitia*, *religio*, and *infamia* were linked in the public rhetoric of Cicero as well.⁶⁸ That Valerius' contemporaries likewise associated religion and chastity is evinced by Velleius Paterculus, who explains that Cicero could not be friends with Clodius because Clodius was a man who was *infamis* (because unchaste) and who had polluted Roman religion (through that unchastity).⁶⁹ Valerius concurs, adding that one detests those who have sacrificed religion for illicit sex (*qui religionem stupro permutarunt*, 9.1.7). Religion and sexual incontinence are, in certain instances, incompatible. The gods take offense. This appears obvious to Valerius (and Cicero). Ritual restrictions, moreover, based on considerations of *pudicitia*, were also placed on women who desired to approach the altar of Juno.⁷⁰ In light of all this, it appears logical that Valerius should accept Juno's anger without question or comment. Given the internal logic of the system, Juno would obviously have been offended. Furthermore, given the moral considerations that must have entered

⁶⁸Early in his career Cic. *Verr.* 1.1.43–44 calls on the gods when chastising jurors in order to recall to the jurors the religious values that should animate their judgments so as to preserve themselves from charges of *infamia*. In *Verr.* 2.1.8–9 he suggests that Verres' violations of *pudicitia* ought to be expiated along with his offenses against religion. Later in his career, Cicero is outraged that Clodius, against whom so many decrees had been passed by the senate on religious grounds, should dare complain about neglected religion, and especially scandalized because Clodius had violated the *puluinaria* of a goddess with *stuprum* (*Har.* 8–9). Cicero likens the appropriateness of Clodius' complaints about the neglect of religion to an harangue from Clodius on *pudicitia*. In *Prov.* 24 he explains that he hates Clodius because Clodius violated religion and chastity. These passages not only suggest connections between *infamia*, *religio*, and *pudicitia*, but also imply that Roman gods may have concerns that extend beyond ritual in general and to morality in particular. Cicero's philosophical reflections underscore these public appeals. It is argued in *N.D.* 1.3–4 that without true piety and religion society and justice become impossible. *Leg.* 2.24 similarly stresses that purity of mind is even more important than bodily purity when performing religious ceremonies. Ritual concerns do not preclude, but rather include, moral considerations. Cf. Tatum.

⁶⁹Vell. 2.45.1: *etiam sororis stupro et actus incesti reus ob initum inter religiosissima populi Romani sacra adulterium*. Cf. Woodman 66.

⁷⁰Paul. p. 248.5–7 Lindsay.

into the treatment of the person deemed *infamis*, Kappius also seems correct in bringing in moral considerations.

Vita: Libido and the Safety of the State

Valerius in fact himself states elsewhere that *libido* harms both the *penates* and the state, that is, the state and its religious foundation:

magna cura praecipuoque studio referendum est quantopere *libidinis* et auaritiae furori similis *impetus* ab inlustrium uirorum pectoribus consilio ac ratione summoti sint, quia ii demum penates, ea ciuitas, id regnum aeterno in gradu facile steterit, ubi minimum uirum *ueneris* pecuniaeque *cupido* sibi uindicauerit: nam quo istae generis humani certissimae pestes penetrarunt, iniuria dominatur, *infamia*, uis habitat, bella gignuntur.

We must relate very carefully and with special zeal how attacks of lust and greed (similar in nature to raging madness) have by means of good counsel and reason been dispatched from the hearts of famous men, because in the final analysis, those household gods, that state, that realm only will stand eternally secure where the desire for sex and money will have laid fewest claims to power: for wherever those most inexorable infections of the human race have penetrated, crime prevails, sexual license and violence dwell, wars occur. (4.3.*init.*)

Although he does not address Juno here specifically, Valerius thus clearly associates illicit sexual desire both with *infamia* and with violence (political oppression and war), considering it positively inimical to general religious welfare, the surest protection of the state.⁷¹ Valerius' rhetoric conforms in every respect to the (hardly cooler) reflection of Roman jurists:

sollicitatores alienarum nuptiarum itemque matrimoniorum interpellatores et si effectum sceleris potiri non possunt, *propter uoluntatem perniciosae libidinis* extra ordinem puniuntur. *fit iniuria contra bonos mores*, ueluti si quis fimo corrupto aliquem perfuderit, caeno luto oblinet, aquas spurcauerit, fistulas laeas quidquid aliud ad iniuriam publicam contaminauerit....

The tempters of others' marriage bonds and likewise the seducers of wives, even if they fail to obtain the object of their crime, are on account of their inclination towards dangerous lust punished severely. A damage is done to society's good morals, just as if one doused another with rancid excrement, besmeared someone with filth and mire,

⁷¹Cf. Liebeschuetz 1.

polluted the waters, pipes, lakes, or contaminated something else causing public harm.... (Paul. *Dig.* 47.11.1.pr. 1)

Private lust is, according to Roman thinking, simply inimical to public health. It should therefore cause no surprise that Valerius' Juno should take offense at Varro's *infamis* actor, the moral equivalent of a prostitute, someone who, indeed, would have been barred from general civic participation.⁷²

Although (or perhaps rather because) he seeks to demonstrate the absurdity of traditional Roman religion, Lactantius (*Div. inst.* 2.16.16) very well appreciates the issues involved. His rhetorical genius is revealed as well when we ask ourselves once more why Lactantius should introduce Ganymede into a discussion of Roman state religion. Through this device he reduces a complex religious, legal, and moral issue to a farcical story from Greek mythology. Lactantius uses an *exemplum* to fight an *exemplum*. Because his caricature crystallizes these various elements so well (Juno's moral indignation at Jupiter for potential violation of the marriage bond, the *infamia* of the Ganymede type), it is effective. As for Juno's anger (Lact. *Div. inst.* 2.16.16: *quotiens autem pericula impendent, ob aliquam se ineptam et leuam causam profitentur iratos [deos]*), we see not only that the *causa* was really not trivial at all according to the traditional ideological system (one might compare the same author's *De ira Dei*), but that Lactantius also seems to have known quite well what he was up against and how best to attack. Like other Christian authors writing in the *exempla* tradition, he thus warrants close attention for the insights he provides. In short, we note again the involvement of moral considerations with the Roman state religion (in the mind of one early imperial author), which, although perhaps not obvious to us at first glance as we look back, seem, on closer examination, to have been in fact implicit to Valerius.

We may turn to Tacitus for the wider context. In C.E. 15 *delatores* were thinking about *infamia* and religion in terms very similar to their contemporary Valerius, thus demonstrating the relevance of such considerations to contemporary politics even though Tiberius failed to act upon them:

⁷²Cf. Liv. 5.22.4, where those selected for the duty of bearing Juno's statue from Veii to Rome, although described in terms indicating physical cleanliness, demonstrate a corresponding religiosity or moral devoutness as well: *delecti ex omni exercitu iuvenes, pure lautis corporibus, candida ueste, quibus deportanda Romam regina Iuno adsignata erat, uenerabundi templum iniere, primo religiose admouentes manus, etc.* Cf. Cicero (above, n. 68).

Falanio obiciebat accusator, quod inter cultores Augusti, qui per omnis domos in modum collegiorum habebantur, Cassium quendam *mimum corpore infamem* adsciuisset, quodque uenditis hortis statuam Augusti simul mancipasset.

An accuser charged Falanius with having admitted a certain Cassius (a mime, *infamis* in body and person) among the worshippers of Augustus (who throughout all households were organized in the manner of colleges) and with having conveyed a statue of Augustus along with some gardens he had sold. (*Ann.* 1.73)

The gods of course, as Valerius shows us in the case of Juno's anger at the *infamis* actor placed by Varro in Jupiter's *tensa*, were not only interested but could exact punishment. The accuser of Falanius could thus quite logically (i.e., consistently with traditional religious views) have entertained the belief that his information should have interested the state's newest divinity's son.⁷³ Falanius escaped. By C.E. 23, however, Tiberius' attitude perhaps was changing. Cassius Dio tells us that Tiberius banished actors from Rome because they corrupted women and fomented sedition (τάς τε γυναῖκας ἡσχυρον καὶ στάσεις ἤγειρον, 57.21.3).⁷⁴

***Seueritas* and *Libertas*: The Case of M. Manlius Capitolinus**

To Lactantius, Juno had seemed harsh. On the other hand, Valerius points out in the introduction to his chapter *de seueritate* (6.3.*init.*) that the reader's heart must harden itself with the weapon of indifference (*armet se duritia pectus necesse est*),⁷⁵ and severity is in fact another virtue that Juno promotes. Significantly, the first anecdote that suggests itself to Valerius in order to illustrate the virtue of severity not only includes a reference to Juno (*Moneta*), but also concludes with an image of *Iuno Moneta*'s temple atop the arx on the Capitoline (6.3.1). The anecdote quite briefly alludes to the story of M. Manlius Capitolinus.⁷⁶ Manlius was hurled to his death from the Capitoline hill

⁷³Cf. Regling, s.v. "Spintria," in *RE* 1929: 3A.1814. Tokens (*lasciua numismata*) were enjoined as payment in brothels in order to protect the image of the emperor present on regular coinage. *Sacra numina* were not to look upon such unchaste matters.

⁷⁴Nor did Tiberius remain neglectful of his *divus pater*. In C.E. 25, Tacitus tells us, Cyzicus lost its *libertas* for neglecting the cult of Augustus (*Ann.* 4.36), and Apidius Merula was removed from the senate for refusing to take an oath of obedience to the acts of the divine Augustus (*Ann.* 4.42).

⁷⁵For a discussion of the attitude expressed in this introduction, and its relation to Roman atrocities in warfare, see Westington 1 and *passim*.

⁷⁶Broughton 1.92; cf. 2.586: M. Manlius T. f. A. n. Capitolinus Pat. (51) Cos. 392.

after his prosecution for treason by Q. Publilius⁷⁷ in 384 B.C.E. The venue of this trial had also been transferred by Camillus⁷⁸ in order that the hill from which Manlius had himself repulsed the Gauls so heroically in 390 B.C.E., a year in which Camillus was dictator, would not be visible.⁷⁹ Moreover, patricians were afterwards prohibited from dwelling on the Capitoline. According to Valerius, this prohibition was enacted because the patrician renegade Manlius' house had once stood "where now we gaze upon the temple of Juno Moneta" (6.1.3.par.1).⁸⁰

Valerius fails to mention that this temple was erected forty years later by another Camillus (the dictator's son).⁸¹ Instead, he leaves the reader with the impression of a direct connection between Manlius' penalty and the temple of Juno Moneta:

propter illum enim lege sanciri placuit ne quis patricius in arce aut Capitolio habitaret, quia domum eo loci habuerat, ubi nunc aedem Monetae uidemus. (V. Max. 6.1.3.par.1; translation in following text)

The four clauses of this anecdote's conclusion lead the reader through a string of associations: on account of Manlius it was pleasing [to whom?] that it be prohibited [i.e., *sanciri*, "rendered sacred and inviolable"] by law that any patrician live on the Capitol, inasmuch as Manlius had once had his house on the spot where we now gaze upon Juno's temple. We move (rhetorically) from the "sacred" in law (*sanciri*) to a sacred place (*aedem Monetae*). Indeed, in spite of the fact that *lege sanciri* can be used as a standard legal phrase of

⁷⁷Broughton 1.102; cf. 2.609: Q. Publilius (*4).

⁷⁸Broughton 2.569: M. Furius L. f. Sp. n. Camillus Pat. (44) Mil. Tr. c. p. 401, 398, 386, 384, 381.

⁷⁹See Broughton 1.95 (for 390) and 1.102 (for the transfer of venue). Cf. Mommsen 1887–88: 2.615–18 [598–601] and 1899: 550–53 on *perduellio*. On the location of the *saxum Tarpeium*, see Coarelli 2.80–87. Cf. Jordan-Huelsen 1.2.127–31; Platner-Ashby 509–10; and Richardson 377–78.

⁸⁰Jordan-Huelsen 1.2.108–11 (cf. 1.3.165–67); Nash 1.515–17; Richardson 215. For a discussion of the technical difficulties in the topography of Manlius' trial, see Wiseman; for the rhetorical implications of the topography, Vasaly 15–16.

⁸¹This, however, is not certain either. There are two candidates. Broughton 1.128, 131; cf. 2.569: L. Furius M. f. L. n. Camillus Pat. (41 [assigned no. 42 on 1.131]) Dict. 350, Cos. 349, ?Dict. 345. Broughton 1.131, 138, 147; cf. 2.569: L. Furius Sp. f. M. n. Camillus Pat. (42 [assigned no. 41 on 1.131]) ?Dict. 345, Cos. 338, 325. Liv. 7.28.4–6 separates the destruction of Manlius' house from the dedication of the temple as does Ov. *Fast.* 6.183–89. Plut. *Cam.* 36.7–9, on the other hand, like Valerius, seems to connect Manlius' trial with Camillus' dedication of the temple. For discussion, see Ziolkowski 345–44.

prohibition, the words must still carry the associations of both sacredness and inviolability. Thus whatever was so prohibited must have appeared backed by religion. One is led to believe, then, in the context of Valerius' narrative sequence, that this place was rendered sacred for the protection of the state, that is, for its *libertas* (more below), and that the existence of Juno's temple is the natural outcome of that action. The treatment of Manlius? That was severe, but severity is a virtue.

Moreover, the next anecdote tells the story of Sp. Cassius, whose house was torn down for a temple to Tellus. As a result, according to Valerius, what had before been the house of a violent would-be tyrant (*domicilium impotentis uiri*, 6.1.3.par.2) became a monument to religious severity (*religiosae seueritatis monumentum*). Valerius thus clearly associates religion with severity in general, and the erection of temples after the destruction of a house in particular. This, according to Valerius, involves a massacre of the household gods (*penatium...strage* [6.3.1.par.2]) or utterly rooting them out from the deepest foundations (*penates ab imis fundamentis eruti* [6.3.1.par.3]). The destruction of houses and the transfer of jurisdiction from *ius humanum* to *ius diuinum* is thus for Valerius a religious act of some emotional violence, some "severity."⁸² This severity, however, is sanctioned by religion and protects the state.

Similarly revealing is the contrast between Valerius' concluding sentence in 6.3.1.par.1 and the ordering of the corresponding sentence in Livy:

huius supplicio aeternae memoriae
nota inserta est: propter illum enim
lege sanciri placuit ne quis patricius
in arce aut Capitolio habitaret, quia
domum eo loci habuerat, ubi nunc
aedem Monetae uidemus.

adiectae mortuo notae sunt: publica
una, quod, cum domus eius fuisset,
ubi nunc aedes atque officina
Monetae est, latum ad populum est,
ne quis patricius in arce aut Capitolio
habitaret; gentilicia altera, quod
gentis Manliae decreto cautum est,
ne quis deinde M. Manlius uocaretur.

⁸²Cf. Wissowa, s.v. "Consecratio," in *RE* (1901): 4.896–902. Cicero did not make use of these historical anecdotes featuring the replacement of houses with temples in the defense of *libertas*. What historical anecdotes Clodius' speeches may have contained is unfortunately unknown.

By means of his punishment a censorial mark was branded in eternal memory: for it was on account of that man that it was pleasing to prohibit by law any patrician from dwelling on the citadel or on the Capitol, because Manlius had once had his house on that spot where now we gaze upon Moneta's temple.

(V. Max. 6.1.3.par.1)

Marks of infamy were heaped on the dead man; one mark derived from the state, inasmuch as a law was brought before the people decreeing that no patrician should dwell on the citadel or on the Capitol because Manlius' house had stood where now stand the shrine and mint of Moneta; the other indignity was imposed by his family, inasmuch as a decree of the Manlian clan ordained that no member should thenceforth be called Marcus Manlius.

(Livy 6.20.13)⁸³

One phrase Valerius actually uses verbatim: *ne quis...habitaret*. We immediately note, however, that Valerius changes Livy's more neutral and technically descriptive *latum ad populum est* to the rhetorically intensified but legally vague *sanciri lege placuit*.⁸⁴ In Livy the logic proceeds from Manlius' house to Manlius' posterity (as opposed to the *aedem Monetae*). The *officina* of Livy's phrase *aedes atque officina Monetae*, carrying as it does pedestrian associations of a workshop (i.e., the mint located there), is eliminated in Valerius. Valerius focuses only on the rhetorically more purely religious *aedem Monetae*, which in fact concludes the sentence, the anecdote, and the logical progression of thought, as opposed to Livy's parenthetically explanatory placement of the clause. Valerius, moreover, has revealed to us but one result, a

⁸³The story is, however, told at greater length in Livy, and involves many more religious elements than the Temple of Juno. Levene 206–7 analyzes literary elements only; for a rigorous approach to religion in Livy that remains sensitive to literary issues, compare Linderski 1993. It is also worth remarking, in light of the similar decree regarding Cn. Piso's son in C.E. 20 (Tac. *Ann.* 3.17), that Valerius, unlike Livy, does not tell us that the Manlian *gens* was forbidden the use of the praenomen Marcus.

⁸⁴Lewis and Short reveal an even division between the phrase's religious uses as opposed to civil uses; the *OLD* places a greater emphasis on the latter. For Valerius' contemporaries, the phrase *latum ad populum est* would have had little relevance. Not only had the Senate replaced the old assemblies as the usual legislative body, but it was at the beginning of Tiberius' reign as well that elections were finally transferred to the senate, reducing the role of the people in general to occasional displays of *acclamatio*. Valerius' vaguer *sanciri lege placuit* thus leaves unexpressed the dative locus of desire, a place that could easily be supplied with authorities more appropriate to parallel situations in Valerius' day. Compare, e.g., Suet. *Aug.* 34.1.1: *Leges retractavit et quasdam ex integro sanxit, ut sumptuariam et de adulteriis et de pudicitia, de ambitu, de maritandis ordinibus*. Also Tac. *Ann.* 15.22.3: *mox auctore principe* [= Nero] *sanxere* [= consuls and senate] *ne quis ad concilium sociorum referret...*

nota; Livy, *notae*. Livy, the historian, then moves on to related concerns. Valerius, the rhetorician, moves on to other discrete and self-contained anecdotes illustrating *seueritas*.⁸⁵

Valerius thus employs Juno both logically and rhetorically to back up the virtue of *seueritas*, and *seueritas* likewise seems an appropriate attribute for Juno. Just as the demagogue had expelled the Gauls from the Capitol, Juno's temple came to occupy the site of the demagogue's house. In this connection we should not miss Juno's association with *libertas*:

M. Manlius, unde Gallos depulerat, inde ipse praecipitatus est, quia fortiter defensam *libertatem* nefarie opprimere conatus fuerat.

Because of his vile attempt to overthrow the liberty⁸⁶ he had once so bravely defended, Marcus Manlius was hurled from the very spot where he had himself beaten back the Gauls. (6.3.1.*par.*1)

We see then that Juno is associated with liberty in a fashion analogous to her association with chastity.⁸⁷ Her temple now protects Roman *libertas* from the

⁸⁵Maslakov 468–71 discusses Valerius' sources for the sequence *de seueritate*. For *seueritas* in Livy, cf. Moore 137–41.

⁸⁶Preller 616 summarizes the general meaning of this *libertas* in imperial times: "Unter den Kaisern verstand man unter *Libertas* die Befreiung von dem Joche des Despotismus im Gegensatz zu dem milderen Regiment der besseren Kaiser...." Fears 869–75 traces its changing meaning and defines its religious nature: "a political order brought into being through the operation of this goddess in the person of the charismatic figure [870]." For fuller discussions, see Wirszubski and Brunt 281–350; cf. Raaflaub 155–62 and Syme 1977.

⁸⁷As noted above, vindication of chastity can also lead to vindication of liberty, e.g., Lucretia. Hyg. *Fab. pr.* 24 actually derives the abstract deity *Libertas* from the union of Jupiter and Juno: *Ex Ioue rursus et Iunone, Iuuentus Libertas*. We have seen already Juno's links to *pudicitia*. The relation, however, of *pudicitia* and *libertas* is elsewhere attested. Compare the devout reasoning offered by T. Annius, bloody knife in hand, over Clodius' corpse in Cic. *Mil.* 77: *ut unum ius aequitas, leges libertas, pudor pudicitia maneret in ciuitate....* In fact, Cicero closely associates, as if by some natural and rational logic, life, chastity, and liberty: *Bonorum autem partim necessaria sunt, ut uita, pudicitia, libertas....* (*Part.* 86.4–5). Sen. *Ben.* 1.11.4, on the other hand, reformulates the trinity as *libertas et pudicitia et mens bona*. Liberty and chastity are linked in more Valerian fashion with the gods in Sen. *Con.* 1.2.17. Compare also Liv. 3.52.4 on the secession of the *plebs*: *prosequuntur coniuges liberique, cuinam se relinquerent in ea urbe in qua nec pudicitia nec libertas sancta esset miserabiliter rogitanes*. That the concatenation of these virtues resonated even outside the higher social classes we can glean from the self-introduction in Liv. 42.34.3 of a modest man, Sp. Ligustinus, who relates that his wife brought with her nothing except her *libertatem pudicitiamque* (like the woman mocked by Mart. 10.63.5–8 who was granted so many children by Juno: *cum his fecunditatem.... sex filii nobis, duae filiae sunt*). Cic. *Part.* 42–43

spot on which it was threatened both by external and internal foes (the Gauls and Manlius). The goddess-protector of the Roman state is thus in Valerius' presentation clearly associated with chastising an overly ambitious patrician.

It is not difficult to reconcile such a presentation with Valerius' contemporary political situation. This example of patrician overreaching would, in the context of Tiberian Rome, certainly have provided an edifying example backed by the rhetorical power of religion. Tiberius' reign offers sufficient examples of *nobiles* to whom Valerius could perhaps have provided useful instruction. Like the houses of their traitorous republican predecessors, the property of traitors in Valerius' day was often confiscated.⁸⁸ Valerius was hardly the first to teach that submission to authority is a moral value enforced by gods. Vergil had recently offered lessons as well to Italy's ancient and haughty native sons. Turnus, we may recall, had dared question the authority of a ruler inspired by religion. *Pius* Aeneas was accompanied, preserved, and protected by gods. Aeneas' sword, like Augustus' violence, was sanctioned by religion. Valerius, living in somewhat quieter times, but under no less religiously resplendent a *princeps*, also uses religion to sanction appropriate behavior (i.e., "morals"). The traitors, however, do not appear on the battlefield but in the senate. The gods can defend liberty there too.

The Impious Shall Die: Q. Fulvius Flaccus

Juno becomes angry at offenses not only against the state but also against herself. V. Max. 1.1.20 shows us an irate Juno who takes vengeance both upon the object of her anger and upon the children belonging to him. It seems that Q. Fulvius Flaccus⁸⁹ (cos. 179 B.C.E.) as censor (elected 174 B.C.E.) had marble

tells us how one can in general use these values rhetorically to defend an action: *Aut iure factum depellendi aut ulciscendi doloris gratia, aut pietatis aut pudicitiae aut religionis aut patriae nomine, aut denique necessitate, inscitia, casu.* Cicero links religion, chastity and defense of one's country in a way hardly to be compartmentalized by the emotions. Even in his private letters Cicero writes, conforming to this ideology, that those who wish for gain from the destruction of the republic hope to gain when its defenses fall: *cum religio, cum pudicitia, cum iudiciorum fides, cum senatus auctoritas concidisset...* (Att. 1.16.7).

⁸⁸Cf. also Flory 1984a: 330 on the propaganda-value of dedicating private residences to public use: "Rising up on land where once had stood a house symbolic of a luxurious and self-centered past, which Augustus was determined to eradicate as completely as he had razed Vedius' house to the ground, the porticus and the Aedes Concordiae emphasize the traditional importance of the community and the insignificance of the individual."

⁸⁹Broughton 1.382, 391–93, 404, 414; cf. 2.568: Q. Fulvius Q. f. M. n. Flaccus (61) Pr. 182, Cos. 179, Cens. 174, Pont. 180–72.

tiles brought from the temple of Juno Lacinia⁹⁰ in Locri to Rome in order to adorn the temple he was building to *Fortuna Equestris*⁹¹, vowed during his successful engagement against the Celtiberians. They had attacked while he was returning to Italy after the year of his praetorship in Spain (to which he had been elected in 182).

Before we proceed to the issues raised by Valerius' anecdote, we must note that Valerius confuses the temple of Juno at Locri with her temple at Croton despite the fact that he correctly identifies the temple of Juno at Croton elsewhere (1.8.ext.18).⁹² To Valerius' geographical confusion we must add topographical confusion. He claims to have seen the temple of Juno Moneta on both the Aventine (1.8.3) and the Capitoline (6.3.1). Such conflation has earned Valerius the sternest rebukes and elicited the greatest exasperation from modern commentators.⁹³ Their despair, however, is our gain, because we are not after antiquarian precision but rather something broader, a general view of what Juno means rhetorically to Valerius.

As further evidence for the rhetorical conflation of Junos, we may cite the *interpretatio Valeriana* of the famous story of Cleobis and Biton (a tale ultimately going back at least to Herodotus). Valerius places the story in the context of anecdotes illustrating the conduct of children who demonstrate reverence for their parents, and who fulfill the *uota* that their parents had offered on their behalf. Valerius thus sets the story in the context of Roman private religion, the vows that Roman parents would naturally have offered up on behalf of their offspring (a fitting context for Juno):⁹⁴

de piis loquamur. ...uenite igitur in manus nostras, prospera parentium uota, felicibus auspiciis propagatae suboles, quae efficitis ut et genuisse iuuet et generare libeat.

⁹⁰On theft from gods (*sacrilegium*), see Mommsen 1899: 760–72. For Roman citizens in general, such theft from the gods of Rome was a capital offense. As a magistrate, however, Fulvius was more than a mere citizen, and his theft from Juno took place outside the territory governed by Roman law. Nevertheless, in Valerius Juno exacts punishment, providing a perhaps not insignificant parallel between divine and civil procedure. Cf. Scheid 140–42.

⁹¹This goddess was still active in Valerius' day; a vow was made in C.E. 22 during Livia's sickness to *Fortuna equestris* in Antium (Tac. *Ann.* 3.71).

⁹²Kempf 1854: 118.

⁹³See especially Kempf 1854: 118, who accuses Valerius of having hallucinated, and Zschech 11.

⁹⁴Cf. Marquardt 1886: 82–88 (on the religious ceremonies surrounding the births of children), 119–22 (on attitudes towards childrearing after Augustus), and Cicero's definition of *superstitio* in *N.D.* 2.72: *ut sui sibi liberi superstites essent* (discussed by Wagenvoort 236–37).

Let us discuss the pious. ...Therefore, o vows of parents happily fulfilled, you offspring produced under happy auspices, come gather round all you who make it both gratifying to have begotten and agreeable to bring forth. (5.4.*init.*)

Pietas towards parents was not only valued but was, in fact, one of the Roman virtues *par excellence*.⁹⁵ This private religious value had also in a past not too distant from Valerius' own day been carried into the public arena of civil war and celebrated in a great national epic.⁹⁶ Valerius has provided the Greek tale with a thoroughly Roman context.

Herodotus informs us that the story of Cleobis and Biton illustrates that God (ὁ θεός) believes that death is better than life.⁹⁷ Valerius, on the other hand, although he admires the filial devotion of Cleobis and Biton, evinces some frustration at the outcome: *sed neutris pro spiritu parentium expirare propositum fuit* (5.4.*ext.*4). The death of one's sons (as in the story of Aemilius Paullus at 5.10.2) was a disaster, although sometimes not without benefit if the result of some *propositum*, some deal struck. Valerius' rhetorical lens does not allow close attention to local details.

We may, thus reassured by the consistency of Valerian rhetoric, return to Juno's temple, wherever her temple may have been, and the sacrilege of Q. Fulvius Flaccus. How did Juno defend her interests? Fulvius lost his sanity. He heard that one of his two sons fighting in Illyria had fallen in battle and that the other had become gravely ill. Fulvius then died. The Senate, becoming aware of these circumstances, had the marble tiles brought back to Locri in order to undo this consciously irreligious (*impius*)⁹⁸ man's work.

⁹⁵*Duae sunt praecipuae Romanae uirtutes, militaris uirtus et pietas* (scholiast to Luc. 1.11 cited by Liegle 229). Cf. Moore 56–61.

⁹⁶As Galinsky 54 remarks, however, Valerius oddly failed to include Aeneas among his examples illustrating *pietas*.

⁹⁷Hdt. 1.31. Cic. *Tusc.* 1.113 reports this opinion also but attributes it to the *scholae*. Valerius, on the other hand, ignores philosophical issues; focusing on conduct in a Roman context, he simply adapts the story to his own purposes. Significant differences occur also in the narration of the story. Valerius, unlike Herodotus and Cicero, does not have the mother of Cleobis and Biton pray to the goddess, but rather focuses attention on how the sons carried their mother in order that she perform sacred rites: *ad sacra lunonis peragenda matrem uexerint* (5.4.*ext.*4). Cicero, on the other hand, never mentions the goddess by name, and does not discuss specifically why the mother needed conveyance to the temple, thus rendering the story more philosophically general.

⁹⁸Cf. Var. L. 6.30: *praetor qui tum fa[c]tus est, si imprudens fecit, piaculari hostia facta piatur; si prudens dixit, Quintus Mucius a[b]i[g]ebat eum expiari ut impium non posse.*

Livy also tells the story (42.3.1–11), but focuses his attention not on the man but on the actions of the senate.⁹⁹ Whereas Valerius summarizes the actions of the senate only insofar as was necessary to make the action clear, Livy goes into detail: he even tells us that the marble, after it had been returned, was simply left standing in the temple's sacred area because no workman could be found who could put the marble tiles back on the temple's roof. Such details are discursively interesting, but would hardly contribute to a morally uplifting anecdote. Effective anecdotes may admit only immediately useful details.

Valerius, on the other hand, relates information not mentioned by Livy in this context. Valerius relates incidents from Q. Fulvius Flaccus' unhappy personal life and presents these details as if they were the consequence of his irreligious act, the result of *religio neglecta*. Valerius states at the beginning of the anecdote that the man's actions did not go unpunished, *impune non tulit*. One problem, however, is the senate's motivation in setting things right again. In Livy there is no question that it was the sacrilegious procurement of the marble tiles that motivated the senators' compensatory measures (42.3.5–8). Valerius, however, arranges his material somewhat ambiguously. He relates the gist of the actions Fulvius took as censor, and then turns to the consequences:

negatur enim post hoc factum mente constitisse. quin etiam per summam aegritudinem animi expiravit, cum ex duobus filiis in Illyrico militantibus alterum decessisse, alterum grauitur audisset adfectum. cuius casu motus senatus tegulas Locros reportandas curauit....

Indeed, they say that after this deed he was no longer of sound mind. Moreover, he died because of extreme mental anguish brought on by the news that, of his two sons on military duty in Illyricum, one had died and the other had been seriously wounded. Alarmed by this misfortune, the senate took care that the roof-tiles be returned to Locri.... (1.1.20)

Hase insists that *casu* refers to the sacrilegious act.¹⁰⁰ Given the associations of personal misfortune that *casus* carries, however, it would not be unreasonable to conclude that Valerius actually implies that after the senate perceived the misfortunes of the man, they realized the irreligious nature of his previous deeds, and of course then hastened to set things right again. To Valerius' way of thinking, those whose conduct was not proper, and who were not motivated by

⁹⁹Cf. Levene 108–9.

¹⁰⁰Hase 21 n. 2: *immo sacrilegio motus fuit senatus, ut tegulae reportarentur*.

proper moral purpose, would be punished by the gods. The gods, Juno in particular, were thus not only interested in morality but had the power to intervene in nature, that is, in the world open to human inspection, on their own behalf. Why was Q. Fulvius Flaccus punished so severely? In vowing a temple, Fulvius did not act improperly. He was, however, consciously irreligious (*impius*).¹⁰¹ As Varro (*L.* 6.30) points out, this could not be expiated, and further, as Valerius tells us, Juno exacted punishment.

Livy, however, also relates Fulvius' misfortunes but does so in his account of the year in which they actually occurred (172 B.C.E.; the temple affair was in 173 B.C.E.), along with his death, which is listed among other deaths occurring that year:

eo anno sacerdotes publici mortui L. Aemilius Papus decemuir sacrorum et Q. Fulvius Flaccus pontifex, qui priore anno fuerat censor. hic foeda morte perit. ex duobus filiis eius, qui tum in Illyrico militabant, nuntiatum alterum <mortuum, alterum> graui et periculoso morbo aegrum esse. obruit animum simul luctus metusque: mane ingressi cubiculum serui laqueo dependentem¹⁰² inuenere. erat opinio post censuram minus conpotem fuisse sui; *uulgo Iunonis Laciniae iram ob spoliatum templum alienasse mentem ferebant.*

In that year the following state priests died: L. Aemilius Papus, decemvir sacrorum, and Q. Fulvius Flaccus, pontifex, who during the previous year had been censor. The latter died a foul death. Of his two sons who at that time were serving their military duty in Illyricum, it was reported that one had died and that the other was sick with a serious and dangerous illness. Simultaneous grief and fear clouded his reason: in the morning the slaves who entered his chamber found him hanging by a noose. Opinion has it that after his censorship he had been less than of sound mind; common opinion that the anger of Juno Lacinia had driven him insane in recompense for the robbery of her temple. (42.28.10–12)

Valerius not only does not mention the man's suicide (thus leaving him in the depths of his insanity and sorrows), but also reports, without comment, the version Livy termed *uulgo*.¹⁰³ The version the historian rejects is rhetorically the more effective version for one interested in the moral conduct of

¹⁰¹Compare Moore 61: "*Impius* in Livy can almost always be translated 'in opposition to divine law.' "

¹⁰²Compare the prescriptions of the *lex Libertinaria* (*AE* 1971: 88.II.22–23) on the special funeral arrangements required for deaths by hanging.

¹⁰³Cf. Levene 112.

individuals.¹⁰⁴ Again, we find not only historical compression but also an intensification of the religious element in relation to personal moral conduct.¹⁰⁵

This point is brought out even more clearly by a corresponding story that, while dealing with a foreign Juno, offers parallels to Q. Fulvius Flaccus' situation close enough to warrant discussion here. Moreover, Valerius himself tells us that the anecdote must be attributed to force of character since it hardly conforms to the characteristics of the protagonist's Punic blood.¹⁰⁶ Valerius is therefore viewing the action through his lens of universally right conduct rather than through his conception of the natural ethnic proclivities of people he identifies as *Puni*.¹⁰⁷ Masinissa receives a gift from the commander of his fleet: large ivory tusks from a shrine to Juno located in Malta. When, however, Masinissa learns the source of this gift, he immediately returns the tusks with an inscription stating that he had received them in ignorance but was returning them of his own free and joyful will (*libenter*).¹⁰⁸ We thus note once more that for Valerius intention seems to matter. Q. Fulvius Flaccus and Masinissa both contributed to the desecration of a temple of Juno. Fulvius, however, did so consciously; Masinissa, unwittingly. Masinissa restored Juno's property willingly (*libenter*), the senate did so with a moral uprightness most religious (*circumspectissima sanctitate* [1.1.20]). Masinissa is thus in the same position as the Roman senate, which, once it had become aware of the sacrilege, ordered Juno's property restored.

The Miracle at Veii

Augustus himself had recently restored the temple of *Iuno Regina* on the Aventine (*RG* 4.6), which housed the wooden statue of Juno brought back from Veii by Camillus. Valerius, however, in words destined to be corrected ever since, calls it the *simulacrum*¹⁰⁹ *Iunonis Monetae* (1.8.3).¹¹⁰ We may surmise

¹⁰⁴This is also the version reported by Lactant. *Div. inst.* 2.7.16. Like Valerius, Lactantius believes that such events reveal the power of divinity to perform miracles (*Div. inst.* 2.7.7–8).

¹⁰⁵Valerius continues to interpret the political history of Fulvius from a religious perspective in 2.8.3 where Fulvius' refusal of a triumph is deemed an offense against religion that is punished, rightly in Valerius' view, with exile: *continuo quaestione publica adflictus exilio multatus est, ut, si quid religionis insolentia commisisset, poena expiaret*. (Cf. Kempf 1854: 223–24.)

¹⁰⁶V. Max. 1.1.ext.2: *factum <magis> Masinissae animo quam Punico sanguini conueniens!*

¹⁰⁷Masinissa was of course a Numidian.

¹⁰⁸V. Max. 1.1.ext.2: *...ignorantem eos accepisse, libenter deae reddidisse*.

¹⁰⁹On *simulacra*, see Daut 73–75.

that the temple, since Augustus himself had restored it, retained some significance to the conservative Tiberius and his contemporaries in Valerius' day. Valerius tells the story of Camillus' transfer of Veian Juno to Rome in his chapter *de miraculis*. Therefore his definition of miraculous events is worth examining:

multa etiam interdum et uigilantibus acciderunt perinde ac tenebrarum
somniaque nube inuoluta. quae, quia unde manauerint aut qua ratione
constiterint dinoscere arduum est, merito miracula uocentur.

Many events just like those covered by the mist of sleep and shadows also occur during daytime to those who are awake. Such events, because it is difficult to know whence they have arisen or by what reason they have come to be, may aptly be termed miracles. (1.8.*init.*)

Although they may be difficult to understand, then, the author believes that *miracula* are not to be doubted.¹¹¹

Valerius underscores this belief once more a little later in the same chapter, under the rubric of foreign examples:

...aut in liberis potentissimorum regum aut in rege clarissimo aut in
uate ingenii florentis aut in uiris eruditissimis aut in homine sortis
ignotae, ne ipsa quidem, omnis bonae malaeque materiae fecunda
artifex rationem rerum natura reddiderit....

Whether the events we have considered concern the children of very powerful kings or a very famous king or a poet of outstanding genius or men of great learning or a person of low origin, not even nature itself,

¹¹⁰Cf. Platner-Ashby 290. We should also note here that Valerius 2.9.1 [*de censoria nota*] relates that Camillus, as censor and in keeping with his connection to Juno, punished men who remained celibate, telling them: *natura uobis quemadmodum nascendi, ita gignendi legem scribit*.... Is it coincidence that the man who brought Juno from Veii to Rome (and whose scrupulous observance of the gods and *ritual* is emphasized throughout the fifth book of Livy) should have been interested in this sort of *morally* motivated behavior?

¹¹¹As Bulhart 1055–56 illustrates, the word *miraculum* begins to serve as a popular synonym for *monstrum*, *ostentum*, *portentum*, and *prodigium* only among imperial authors, occurring frequently, for example, in the works of Livy, Tacitus, and especially Pliny the Elder (cf. Köves-Zulauf 1978: 266–72). Valerius himself uses the word nine times (seven of which are in his chapter *de miraculis*). One may, moreover, contrast Valerius' apparently earnest sincerity with Cicero's philosophical investigations. The word *miraculum* occurs only once in Cicero's surviving corpus: the Epicurean Velleius calls the theories of Plato regarding divinity *portenta et miracula non disserentium philosophorum sed somniantium* (*N.D.* 1.18), changing, we may note from our Valerian perspective, the context of *miracula* from day to night and from waking to sleeping. Sallust and Caesar never use the word.

the fertile creator of all substance good and bad, has provided a rationale for these things.... (1.8.ext.18)

Valerius then proceeds to list a variety of inexplicable natural phenomena. Ranked here also are winds powerless to move ash in the temple of Juno Lacinia in Croton (1.8.ext.18).¹¹² If we, as readers, prefer to believe that exceptional literary artists provide typical Roman religious attitudes,¹¹³ and thus ignore the stated beliefs of a man obviously and traditionally educated in the rhetorical schools, a man of high enough social rank to dedicate his work to Tiberius himself, then we ignore what are perhaps not atypical ways of thinking. It may not be scientific or philosophical, but Valerius tells us how he thinks:

non admiratione ista [miracula], sed memoria prosequi debemus, cum sciamus recte ab ea [= natura] plurimum licentiae uindicari, penes quam infinitus cuncta gignendi labor consistit.

We ought not to be amazed at these miracles but rather commit them to memory because we perceive that this nature in whose charge the endless task of creating all things resides legitimately claims extensive freedom of action. (1.8.ext.18)

He does not see an irrational violation of mechanical operations but rather moral lessons writ large.¹¹⁴

Turning back then once more to Roman examples, Valerius relates a series of anecdotes with the utmost sincerity. At least there are no hints of irony. In 1.8.1 he lists various appearances of Castor and Pollux, beginning with the Battle of Lake Regillus (c. 499 B.C.E.).¹¹⁵ He describes in great detail the Roman deputation to the Temple of Aesculapius at Epidaurus in 293 B.C.E. at the

¹¹²Cf. Plin. *Nat.* 2.240–41 for another sympathetic account. Liv. 24.3.7, however, simply dismisses the story: *miracula aliqua adfinguntur*. Cf. Levene 18–19.

¹¹³Not without reason are great literary artists suspect sources for typical beliefs. Compare Liebeschuetz' qualms about using Seneca as the basis for ideological analysis of Neronian Rome (109). On the other hand, cf. Jocelyn 1966–67: 103 on the value of Valerius: "Authors with an interest in superstition, such as Valerius Maximus and Plutarch, were able to report plenty in both the beliefs and the behaviour of their Roman subjects."

¹¹⁴Compare Fustel de Coulanges 136–42 on the close connection of Roman religion to the forces of nature, and Radke 174: "Das Licht des Tages und das Dunkel der Nacht, jeder Blitzschlag und jedes Erdbeben, aber auch das Blühen und Wachsen der Frucht, das Gedeihen von Mensch und Vieh, der Sieg über die Feinde oder eine Niederlage sind Äußerungen von Gottheiten, lassen deren Wirken erkennen."

¹¹⁵Cf. Broughton 1.10–11.

behest of the Sibylline books in order to avert plague (1.8.2). This includes an involved description of the snake that followed the deputation back to Rome.¹¹⁶ The rationale given for relating the tale (*ut ceterorum quoque deorum propensum huic urbi numen exequamur*, 1.8.2) makes it clear that Valerius is not just simply convinced that the gods are on Rome's side; he tells the stories that prove this fact. Hence, he likewise begins the anecdote relating Juno's no less voluntary transfer (through *euocatio*) from a conquered Veii to a victorious Rome with an introduction referring back to Aesculapius' similar voluntary move: *nec minus uoluntarius in urbem nostram Iunonis transitus* (1.8.3). Livy had his doubts about this aspect of the story (*inde fabulae adiectum est...* [5.22.6]).¹¹⁷ The historian was forced to relate the miraculous (as opposed to the merely devout) since it formed part of the historical tradition.¹¹⁸ Valerius, on the other hand, uses the same material to prove his points without any (expressed) concern as to its historical probability.¹¹⁹ He tells us that one of those sent in to carry the statue made a joke: Juno was asked whether she wanted to go to Rome.¹²⁰ Unexpectedly, she answered in the affirmative. The

¹¹⁶Livy's version exists only in epitome (*Per.* 11). Cf. Ov. *Met.* 15.622–745. Lactant. *Div. inst.* 2.7.22–23 seems to have found Valerius' examples plausible (cf. Bosch 38–40). Did Valerius believe the *miracula* he relates? Obviously belief varies from age to age and from individual to individual (Latin authors included). This was recognized in antiquity by Roman jurists as well. Cf. Ulp. *Dig.* 28.7.8.pr. on the varieties of religious sensibility extant in his day: *...faciles [sunt] nonnulli hominum ad iurandum contemptu religionis, alii perquam timidi metu diuini numinis usque ad superstitionem....*

¹¹⁷Cf. Levene 175–203, especially 182–88.

¹¹⁸See, however, Levene 184 for a way around this skepticism. Like Livy, Plut. *Cam.* 6.1 wishes to distance himself from this material, and concludes that one should at least allow the possibility that the event actually took place since amazing things are reported as taking place in his own times as well. Nevertheless, Plutarch does not himself take a stand as to historical authenticity, merely concluding philosophically that moderate religiosity is good, but that too much is bad (*Cam.* 6.5–6). Valerius had no such qualms. The most dispassionate account may be found in D.H. *Ant. rom.* 13.3.2. Stübler 50–51 discusses Livy's differences from Dionysius, but, having ignored Valerius, incorrectly concludes: “bei [Livy] allein [wird] die Überführung als wehevoller Akt geschildert.” Livy is hardly alone.

¹¹⁹Valerius, in light of his religious proclivities, may very well have accepted the procedure on faith. Compare Latte 125 n. 3, who points out that a rite akin to *euocatio* survived, in private ceremonies, into imperial times as evinced by Ulp. *Dig.* 1.8.9.2: *sacrarium est locus in quo sacra reponuntur, quod etiam in aedificio privato esse potest, et solent qui liberare eum locum religione uolunt, sacra inde euocare*. Moreover, Hall reports on an inscription demonstrating the use of *euocatio* proper well into the late Republic (cf. Macr. *Sat.* 3.9.7–12; Mommsen 1887–88: 3.579 and 3.1049–50; Marquardt 1881–85: 3.21; Wissowa 1912: 44, 383–84; and Le Gall). The rite was thus for Valerius likely a living one.

effect was profound—amusement changed to astonishment: *hoc uoce audita lusus in admirationem uersus est* (1.8.3). Significantly, this revealed not the will of the statue, but the will of celestial Juno herself (*iamque non simulacrum, sed ipsam caelo Iunonem petitam* [1.8.3]), whom the bearers concluded they were actually carrying. Just as Valerius concluded his anecdote regarding the Temple of Juno Moneta on the arx of the Capitoline (6.3.1), he also concludes this anecdote with a contemporary vision of this second temple to Juno “Moneta” on the Aventine: *Iunonem...laeti in ea parte montis Auentini, in qua nunc templum eius cernimus, collocauerunt* (1.8.3). Rhetorically, he is thus again able to bring the remote past into immediate, still manifestly visible, connection with the present.

If we take Valerius seriously, readers of his day could, with an image of the miraculous statue of Juno in their minds, gaze upon her hilltop temple and recall how Juno herself had chosen Rome,¹²¹ a not unedifying image. We may also observe that Livy, although, like Valerius, he places the story in the context of Veii’s capture, unlike Valerius concludes the anecdote not with a glimpse of Juno’s temple still visible on the Aventine but rather with a melancholy vision of the rich and powerful city the Romans had just conquered.¹²² Livy’s image is

¹²⁰There is some controversy as to who posed the question (cf. Ogilvie 678 *ad* 5.22.5; Palmer 27; Otto 222–23, Shields, Rives, and Piccaluga 32–36; cf. Dumézil 129–39 for an Indo-European perspective). Gagé 80–86 points out another “problem:” why, in the context of its importation by Roman men, should the cult hold such great significance for Roman women? Here, however, *pudicitia* may serve as an illuminating example. Men defend and vindicate the *pudicitia* of women with consequences for their own political organization. Women can through *stuprum*, however, endanger men. Juno guards men and *libertas*, but also *pudicitia* and women. Juno’s involvement with the affairs of men is hardly inconsistent with, and thus cannot preclude, her involvement with the affairs of women (and vice versa).

¹²¹The notion that educated Romans in the age of Tiberius believed such stories will perhaps elicit some resistance. We may compare the rhetorical question posed in Cic. *Div.* 1.101 on another Junonian miracle: *atque etiam scriptum a multis est, cum terrae motus factus esset, ut sue plena procuratio fieret, vocem ab aede Iunonis ex arce extitisse; quocirca Iunonem illam appellatam Monetam. haec igitur et a dis significata et a nostris maioribus iudicata contemnimus?* Who were the *multi* by whom such miracles were recorded? Tac. *Hist.* 1.86 similarly informs us that various writers attested to a miracle associated with Juno’s *cella* in the Capitoline temple that occurred after Nero’s assassination: *prodigia insuper terrebant diversis auctoribus vulgata: in vestibulo Capitolii omissas habenas bigae, cui Victoria institerat, erupisse cella Iunonis maiorem humana speciem....* We cannot depose Valerius. Nevertheless, contemporary circumstantial evidence may be adduced; Augustus made ample use of Roman propensity to believe in miracles (cf. Flory 1984b).

¹²²Liv. 5.22.8: *hic Veiorum occasus fuit, urbis opulentissimae Etrusci nominis....* Livy of course has larger narrative goals, and is here pausing dramatically before proceeding to the capture of Rome by Gauls.

more fitting for the history of a nation, as opposed to Valerius' focus on more personally relevant elements.

Conclusions

How then may we summarize Valerius' conception of Juno? Let us begin by noting Fowler's disappointed verdict on the religion of the late republic, including the veneration of Juno:

[T]hough the family worship was in Cicero's day neither extinct nor meaningless, the same cannot be said with confidence of the worship of the gods of the State. Many of the gods were quite dead, and nothing shows this better than the attempts of Cicero and Varro to treat them as if they were still alive....I need not go over the list of them or point out what changes they have suffered. Janus, Juno....¹²³

We can now, if belief brings joy, happily report that for Valerius (and possibly, by extension, for others like him) the goddess Juno was not only alive but viewed as a powerful force. Through the stories of Fulvius, his sons, and the sons of Paullus, he has amply illustrated her power to punish and kill. In keeping with her power is the stern nature Valerius assigns her (revealed in her seated position at the *epulum Iouis*). The powerful force she represents, however, willingly resides at Rome (as proved by her willing transfer from Veii). Juno guards the state and is concerned with the affairs of men (*uita*). This we observe through her association not only with the Roman victory over Veii but also with the vindication of *libertas* in the story of Manlius. That she is concerned with chastity can be deduced not merely from her traditional role as the goddess of marriage but from Valerius' own observation that *pudicitia* resides in Juno's *puluinaria*. Valerius tells us that men who defend the chastity of their women are victorious in battle (thus preserving their freedom; the Germans are a counter-example). We therefore conclude that, although Juno's involvement with men and women differs significantly on the basis of gender, she is very much involved with both spheres. But these are stories from the ancient past, from history. How could they have religious relevance? As we have discovered, Valerius remolded such stories to focus on individual conduct and intensified their religious element, thus associating intimately religion and

¹²³Fowler 29–30. Compare also Latte 287–89 on the decline of religion in Cicero's time, and Liebeschuetz 29–39 on the "rationalism of the late republic." Jocelyn 1966–67 and 1976–77, however, as noted above, disagrees.

behavioral conduct, i.e., “morality.”¹²⁴ Moreover, by removing chronology, Valerius removed time. They are present, not ancient, examples.

Because the gods of modern religions are said to state their positions on moral issues openly does not necessarily imply that Roman gods, simply because they are more taciturn, could not be involved with moral conduct. Roman gods were, after all, not so anthropomorphized. When Roman gods did speak, it was more often than not through a language we no longer find quite so natural: omens, lightning, birds. We have, however, seen in Valerius that religious, legal, and moral considerations are all bound together in the context of the human actions he relates. To appreciate one, we must be aware of the others.

Through religious forces (*numina*) often moral, like *pudicitia*, Valerius can, moreover, not only associate chastity with Juno, but also Juno with Livia (the divine nature of whose house Valerius also intimates), thus directly connecting old and new. The punishment at Cannae of Varro’s “mistake” was revealed to involve moral concepts beyond mere ritual neglect. Given the legal and moral context explored above, Valerius did not need to expatiate on the obvious. Tacitus’ *delatores* confirm that Valerius’ perceptions were not unique. The lesson for us is that unwritten rules can also be deduced from patterns of behavior taught through *exempla*. We have noted that Valerius’ conception of Juno conforms to contemporary religious developments. Valerius also tells us that he is himself personally reminded of Juno’s presence by the temples he sees atop the Aventine and Capitoline.

Moreover, Valerius’ apparently increased credulity in comparison to that of Cicero or Livy corresponds to his place in history following upon Augustus’ extensive efforts at religious and moral revival. The associations he makes between Juno, *pudicitia*, and Livia are not only corroborated by contemporary numismatic and inscriptional evidence but also anticipate later imperial developments. If we simply dismiss Valerius as falsely pious and merely rhetorical, his Juno at least conforms to contemporary imperial propaganda. On the other hand, if we read Valerius as genuinely enthusiastic and writing in the rhetorical style of the times—both possible and plausible—then he represents, if not contemporary religious sensibilities in general, at least the success of the new imperial gospel in this one instance. In any event, through careful analysis

¹²⁴Valerius may thus help provide evidence for what Momigliano 163 termed “difficult to know,” namely, “how people lived a faith or, to put it in a less Christian way, how they behaved according to religious tradition.”

of Valerius' rhetoric, we may begin to capture the elusive vapors of an ancient religious devotion.¹²⁵

Works Cited

- Adams, J. N. 1982. *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary*. London.
- Albrecht, M. von. 1992. *Geschichte der römischen Literatur von Andronicus bis Boethius*. 2 vols. Bern and Munich.
- Alewell, K. 1913. *Über das rhetorische Paradeigma: Theorie, Beispielsammlung, Verwendung in der römischen Literatur der Kaiserzeit*. Leipzig.
- Baltrusch, E. 1989. *Regimen morum: Die Reglementierung des Privatlebens der Senatoren und Ritter in der römischen Republik und frühen Kaiserzeit*. Munich.
- Bellemore, J. 1989. "When did Valerius Maximus Write the *Dicta et Facta Memorabilia*?" *Antichthon* 23: 67–80.
- Benoit, W. L. 1980. "Aristotle's Example: The Rhetorical Induction." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 66: 182–92.
- Bliss, F. R. 1952. "Valerius Maximus and his Sources: A Stylistic Approach to the Problem." Diss. North Carolina.
- Bloomer, W. M. 1992. *Valerius Maximus and the Rhetoric of the New Nobility*. Chapel Hill.
- Bosch, C. 1929. *Die Quellen des Valerius Maximus: Ein Beitrag zur Erforschung der Literatur der historischen Exempla*. Stuttgart.
- Briscoe, J. 1993. "Some Notes on Valerius Maximus." *Sileno* 19: 395–408.
- Broughton, T. R. S. 1984 [1951–52]. *The Magistrates of the Roman Republic*. 3 vols. Chico, CA.
- Brunt, P. A. 1988. *The Fall of the Roman Republic and Related Essays*. Oxford.
- Bulhart, V. 1936–66. "Miraculum." *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*. Leipzig. 8:1053–59.
- Cantarella, E. 1987. *Pandora's Daughters: The Role and Status of Women in Greek and Roman Antiquity*. Baltimore and London.
- Carter, C. J. 1975. "Valerius Maximus." In T. A. Dorey, ed., *Empire and Aftermath: Silver Latin, II*. London and Boston. 26–56.
- Coarelli, F. 1985. *Il foro romano: periodo repubblicano e augusteo*. Vol. 2. Rome.
- Combès, R., ed. and trans. 1995. *Valère Maxime: Faits et dits mémorables (Tome I: Livres I–III)*. Paris.
- , ed. and trans. 1997. *Valère Maxime: Faits et dits mémorables (Tome II: Livres IV–VI)*. Paris.
- Consigny, S. 1976. "The Rhetorical Example." *Southern Speech Communication* 41: 123–24.
- Constant, P., ed. and trans. 1935. *Valère Maxime: Actions et paroles mémorables*. Paris.
- Corbier, M. 1991. "Divorce and Adoption as Roman Familial Strategies." In B. Rawson, ed., *Marriage, Divorce, and Children in Ancient Rome*. Oxford. 47–78.
- Crawford, M. H. 1974. *Roman Republican Coinage*. 2 vols. Cambridge.
- Csillag, P. 1976. *The Augustan Laws on Family Relations*. Trans. J. Decsényi. Budapest.
- Daut, R. 1975. *Imago: Untersuchungen zum Bildbegriff der Römer*. Heidelberg.

¹²⁵I thank the editor of *TAPA* and the two anonymous readers for corrections and for their many helpful suggestions. For valuable comments and correctives to various versions of this paper, I thank also M. Beck, W. M. Bloomer, J. N. Bremmer, D. Felton, D. Fishwick, G. W. Houston, G. M. Koeppl, B. A. Marshall, R. E. A. Palmer, P. M. Smith, P. A. Stadter, W. J. Tatum, C. W. Wooten, and, above all, J. Linderski. Faults that remain accrue, of course, to my account alone.

- Dover, K. J. 1988. "Anecdotes, Gossip and Scandal." *The Greeks and their Legacy: Collected Papers*. 2 vols. Oxford. 2:45–52.
- Dumézil, G. 1980. *Camillus: A Study of Indo-European Religion as Roman History*. Berkeley.
- Elschner, C. 1864. *Quaestiones Valerianae*. Berlin.
- Faranda, R., ed. and trans. 1971. *Detti e fatti memorabili di Valerio Massimo*. Torino.
- Fears, J. R. 1981. "The Cult of Virtues and Roman Imperial Ideology." *ANRW* 2.17.2: 827–948.
- Fehrle, E. 1910. *Die kultische Keuschheit im Altertum*. Giessen.
- Fishwick, D. 1991. *The Imperial Cult in the Latin West: Studies in the Ruler Cult of the Western Provinces of the Roman Empire*, 2.1. Leiden.
- Flory, M. B. 1984a. "Sic exempla parantur: Livia's Shrine to Concordia and the Porticus Liviae." *Historia* 33: 309–30.
- . 1984b. "Octavian and the Omen of the Gallina Alba." *CJ* 84: 343–56.
- Fowler, W. W. 1914. *Roman Ideas of Deity in the Last Century before the Christian Era*. London.
- Fustel de Coulanges, N. D. 1984 [1864]. *La cité antique*. Paris.
- Gagé, J. 1963. *Matronalia: Essai sur les dévotions et les organisations culturelles des femmes dans l'ancienne Rome*. Brussels.
- Galinsky, G. K. 1969. *Aeneas, Sicily, and Rome*. Princeton, NJ.
- Grant, M. 1950. *Aspects of the Principate of Tiberius: Historical Comments on the Colonial Coinage Issued outside Spain*. New York.
- Guerrini, R. 1981. *Studi su Valerio Massimo (con un capitolo sulla fortuna nell'iconografia umanistica: Perugino, Beccafumi, Pordenone)*. Pisa.
- Hall, A. 1972. "New Light on the Capture of Isaura Vetus by P. Servilius Vatia." *Akten des VI. Internationalen Kongresses für Griechische und Lateinische Epigraphik, München 1972*. Munich. 568–71.
- Hase, B., ed. 1822–23. *Valerius Maximus: De dictis factisque memorabilibus...cum...selectis eruditorum notis*. 2 vols. Paris.
- Haug, F. 1919. "Iuno." *RE* 10.1: 1114–25.
- Hauser, G. A. 1968. "The Example in Aristotle's Rhetoric." *Ph&Rh* 1: 78–90.
- . 1985. "Aristotle's Example Revisited." *Ph&Rh* 18: 171–80.
- Helm, R. 1955. "Valerius Maximus." *RE* 8A: 90–116.
- Hoffmann, F., trans. 1829. *Valerius Maximus: Sammlung merkwürdiger Reden und Thaten*. Stuttgart.
- Howell, P. 1980. *A Commentary on Book One of the Epigrams of Martial*. London.
- Jocelyn, H. D. 1966–67. "The Roman Nobility and the Religion of the Republican State." *JRH* 4: 89–104.
- . 1976–77. "The Ruling Class of the Roman Republic and Greek Philosophers." *BRL* 59: 323–66.
- Jordan, H., rev. by Ch. Huelsen. 1871–1907. *Topographie der Stadt Rom im Alterthum*. 2 vols. in 5 vols. Berlin.
- Kappius, M. J., ed. 1823. *Valerii Maximi Factorum dictorumque memorabilium libri novem [in usum Delphini]*. 3 vols. London.
- Kaser, M. 1956. "Infamie und ignominia in den römischen Rechtsquellen." *ZRG* 73: 220–78.
- Kempf, C., ed. 1888. *Valerii Maximi Factorum et dictorum memorabilium libri novem cum Iulii Paridis et Ianuarii Nepotiani Epitomis*. Leipzig.
- Kempf, K., ed. 1854. *Valeri Maximi Factorum et dictorum memorabilium libri novem cum incerti auctoris fragmento De praenominibus*. Berlin.
- Kenney, E. J., and W. V. Clausen, eds. 1982. *Cambridge History of Classical Literature. Vol. 2: Latin Literature*. Cambridge.
- Koch, C. 1960 [1956]. "Vom Wirkungsgeheimnis des menschengestaltigen Gottes." In O. Seel, ed., *Religio: Studien zu Kult und Glauben der Römer*. Nuremberg. 205–52.

- Kornhardt, H. 1936. *Exemplum: Eine bedeutungsgeschichtliche Studie*. Göttingen.
- Kötze, M. 1991. *Weibliche Gottheiten in Ovids 'Fasten'*. Frankfurt am Main.
- Köves-Zulauf, T. 1972. *Reden und Schweigen: Römische Religion bei Plinius Maior*. Munich.
- . 1978. "Plinius d. Ä. und die römische Religion." *ANRW* 2.16.1: 187–288.
- Künzl, E. 1988. *Der römische Triumph: Siegesfeiern im antiken Rom*. Munich.
- Latte, K. 1960. *Römische Religionsgeschichte*. Munich.
- Lausberg, H. 1960. *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik: Eine Grundlegung der Literaturwissenschaft*. Munich.
- Le Gall, J. 1976. "Evocatio." *Mélanges offerts à Jacques Heurgon: l'Italie préromaine et la Rome républicaine*. 2 vols. 1:519–24.
- Levene, D. S. 1993. *Religion in Livy*. Leiden, New York, and Cologne.
- Liebeschuetz, J. H. W. G. 1979. *Continuity and Change in Roman Religion*. Oxford.
- Liegle, J. 1967 [1932]. "Pietas." In H. Oppermann, ed., *Römische Wertbegriffe*. Darmstadt.
- Lind, L. R. 1979. "The Tradition of Roman Moral Conservatism." In C. Deroux, ed., *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History*. Brussels. 1: 7–58.
- Linderski, J. 1988. "Julia in Regium." *ZPE* 72: 183–200 [= Linderski 1995: 375–94].
- . 1990. "The Death of Pontia." *RhM* 133: 86–93 [= Linderski 1995: 320–27].
- . 1993. "Roman Religion in Livy." In W. Schuller, ed., *Livius: Aspekte seines Werkes*. Konstanz. 53–70 [=Linderski 1995: 608–25].
- . 1995. *Roman Questions*. Stuttgart.
- Lipsius, J. 1612 [1585]. "Breves notae ad Valerium." In Pighius, ed. 619–47.
- Litchfield, H. W. 1914. "National *Exempla Virtutis* in Roman Literature." *HSPH* 25: 1–71.
- Lumpe, A. 1966. "Exemplum." In Th. Klauser, ed., *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum: Sachwörterbuch zur Auseinandersetzung des Christentums mit der Antiken Welt*. Stuttgart. 6: 1229–57.
- Marquardt, J. 1881–85. *Römische Staatsverwaltung*. 2nd ed. 3 vols. Leipzig.
- . rev. by A. Mau. 1886. *Das Privatleben der Römer*. 2nd rev. ed. Leipzig.
- Maslakov, G. 1984. "Valerius Maximus and Roman Historiography: A Study of the *Exempla* Tradition." *ANRW* 2.32.1: 437–96.
- Mattingly, H. 1923. *Coins of the Roman Empire in the British Museum, Volume I: Augustus to Vitellius*. London.
- . et al. 1968 [1923–49]. *The Roman Imperial Coinage*. Vols. 1–5 [Augustus–Amandus]. London.
- Mette-Dittmann, A. 1991. *Die Ehegesetze des Augustus: Eine Untersuchung im Rahmen der Gesellschaftspolitik des Princeps*. Stuttgart.
- Michels, A. K. 1962. Review of Kurt Latte, *Römische Religionsgeschichte*, Munich, C. H. Beck, 1960. *AJPh* 83: 434–44.
- . 1966. "Lucretius, Clodius, and Magna Mater." *Mélanges d'archéologie, d'épigraphie e d'histoire offerts à Jerome Carcopino*. [Paris]. 675–79.
- Momigliano, A. 1987. *On Pagans, Christians, and Jews*. Middletown, CT.
- Mommsen, Th. 1887–88. *Römisches Staatsrecht*. 3 vols. in 5 vols. Leipzig.
- . 1899 [reprinted 1955]. *Römisches Strafrecht*. Graz.
- Moore, T. J. 1989. *Artistry and Ideology: Livy's Vocabulary of Virtue*. Frankfurt am Main.
- Moos, P. von. 1988. *Geschichte als Topik: Das rhetorische Exemplum von der Antike zur Neuzeit und die historiae im 'Polycraticus' Johann von Salisbury*. Hildesheim.
- Nash, E. 1968. *Pictorial Dictionary of Ancient Rome*. rev. ed. 2 vols. London.
- Natali, C. 1989. "Paradeigma: The Problems of Human Acting and the Use of Examples in Some Greek Authors of the 4th Cent. B.C." *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 19: 141–52.
- Norden, E. 1958 [1898]. *Die Antike Kunstprosa*. 2 vols. Stuttgart.

- Ogilvie, R. M. 1965. *A Commentary on Livy: Books 1–5*. Oxford.
- Otto, W. F. 1905. "Iuno: Beiträge zum Verständnis der ältesten und wichtigsten Thatsachen ihres Kultes." *Philologus* 64: 161–223.
- Palmer, R. E. A. 1974. *Roman Religion and Roman Empire: Five Essays*. Philadelphia.
- Piccaluga, G. 1965. *Elementi spettacolari nei rituali festivi romani*. Rome.
- Pighius, S., ed. 1612 [1567]. *Valerii Maximi Dictorum factorumque memorabilium libri LX*. Lugdunum [Leiden].
- Platner, S. B., rev. by T. Ashby. 1929. *A Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome*. London.
- Preller, L. 1978 [1865]. *Römische Mythologie*. 2nd ed. New York.
- Price, B. J. 1975. "Paradeigma and Exemplum in Ancient Rhetorical Theory." Diss. Berkeley.
- Raaflaub, K. 1974. *Dignitatis contentio: Studien zur Motivation und politischen Taktik im Bürgerkrieg zwischen Caesar und Pompeius*. Munich.
- Raditsa, L. F. 1980. "Augustus' Legislation concerning Marriage, Procreation, Love Affairs and Adultery." *ANRW* 2.13: 278–339.
- Radke, G. 1987. *Zur Entwicklung der Gottesvorstellung und der Gottesverehrung in Rom*. Darmstadt.
- Richardson, L. 1992. *A New Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome*. Baltimore and London.
- Rives, J. 1992. "The Iuno Feminae in Roman Society." *EMC* 36 n. s. 11: 33–49.
- Roscher, W. H., ed. 1884–37. *Ausführliches Lexikon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie*. 6 vols. in 9 vols. Leipzig.
- Ryberg, I. S. 1955. *Rites of the State Religion in Roman Art*. Rome.
- Saller, R. P. 1980. "Anecdotes as Historical Evidence for the Principate." *G&R* sec. ser. 27: 69–83.
- Scheid, J. 1981. "Le délit religieux dans la Rome tardo-républicaine." *Le délit religieux dans la cité antique (Table ronde, Rome, 6–7 avril 1978)*. Rome. 117–71.
- Schullian, D. M. 1984. "Valerius Maximus." In F. E. Cranz and P. O. Kristeller, eds., *Catalogus translationum et commentariorum*. Washington. 5: 287–403.
- Sharples, R. W. 1985. "Cybele and loyalty to parents." *LCM* 10: 133–34.
- Shields, E. L. 1926. *Juno: A Study in Early Roman Religion*. Northampton, MA.
- Sinclair, B. W. 1980. "Valerius Maximus and the Evolution of Silver Latin." Diss. Cincinnati.
- Skidmore, C. 1996. *Practical Ethics for Roman Gentlemen: The Work of Valerius Maximus*. Exeter.
- Speed, S., trans. 1976 [1678]. *Romae Antiquae Descriptio: A View of the Religion, Laws, Customs, Manners, and Dispositions of the Ancient Romans and Others, Comprehended in their Most Illustrious Acts and Sayings Agreeable to History, Written in Latine by that Famous Historian Quintus Valerius Maximus, and now Carefully rendred into English, together with the Life of the Author*. Microfilmed: Ann Arbor.
- Stübler, G. 1964 [1941]. *Die Religiosität des Livius*. Amsterdam.
- Sutherland, C. H. V. 1938. "Two 'Virtues' of Tiberius: A Numismatic Contribution to the History of his Reign." *JRS* 28: 129–40.
- Syme, R. 1939 [corr. repr. 1952]. *The Roman Revolution*. Oxford.
- . 1977. "Liberty in Classical Antiquity." *Memoirs of the American Philosophical Society* 118: 8–15 [= Syme 1978–91: 3.962–68].
- . 1978–91. *Roman Papers*. 7 vols. Oxford.
- Tatum, W. J. 1993. "Ritual and Personal Morality in Roman Religion." *SyllClass* 4: 13–20.
- Taylor, L. R. 1931. *The Divinity of the Roman Emperor*. Middletown, CT.
- Thormeyer, G. 1902. *De Valerio Maximo et Cicerone quaestiones criticae*. Göttingen.
- Thurmond, D. L. 1992. "Felicitas: Public Rites of Human Fecundity in Ancient Rome." Diss. North Carolina.
- Treggiari, S. 1991. *Roman Marriage: Iusti Coniuges from the Time of Cicero to the Time of Ulpian*. Oxford.

- Vasaly, A. 1993. *Representations: Images of the World in Ciceronian Oratory*. Berkeley and Los Angeles.
- Wagenvoort, H. 1980 [1972]. "Characteristic Traits of Ancient Roman Religion." *Pietas: Selected Studies in Roman Religion*. Leiden. 223–56.
- Wardle, D. 1997. "'The Sainted Julius': Valerius Maximus and the Dictator." *CPh* 92: 323–45.
- , ed. and trans. Forthcoming 1998. *Valerius Maximus' Memorable Deeds and Sayings: Book One*. Oxford.
- Watson, A. 1992. *The State, Law, and Religion: Pagan Rome*. Athens, Georgia, and London.
- Westington, M. McCl. 1938. "Atrocities in Roman Warfare to 133 B.C." Diss. Chicago.
- Wirszubski, C. 1950. *Libertas as a Political Idea in Rome*. Cambridge.
- Wiseman, T. P. 1979. "Topography and Rhetoric: The Trial of Manlius." *Historia* 28: 32–50.
- Wissowa, G. 1912. *Religion und Kultus der Römer*. 2nd ed. Munich.
- , et al., eds. 1893–1978. *Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*. 33 vols. and 15 supplemental vols. Stuttgart.
- Woodman, A. J. 1983. *Velleius Paterculus: The Caesarian and Augustan Narrative (2.41–93)*. Cambridge.
- Ziegler, K., and W. Sontheimer, eds. 1964–75. *Der Kleine Pauly*. 5 vols. Munich.
- Zieske, L. 1972. *Felicitas: Eine Wortuntersuchung*. Hamburg.
- Ziolkowski, A. 1993. "Between Geese and the Auguraculum: the Origin of the Cult of Juno on the Arx." *CPh* 88: 206–19.
- Zschech, F. 1865. *De Cicerone et Livio Valerii Maximi fontibus*. Berlin.